Issues in Treating Determinologized Lexemes in the eSSKJ General Explanatory Dictionary of Slovenian

Nina Ledinek, Mija Michelizza

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

ABSTRACT

This paper presents the treatment of determinologized lexemes in the most recent growing monolingual general explanatory dictionary for Slovenian—Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, 3. izdaja (Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, 3ʳᵈ Edition), or eSSKJ—while also drawing attention to conceptual differences in the understanding of the status of this vocabulary compared to previous editions of the dictionary (SSKJ and SSKJ2) and according to the treatment of terminology in the terminological dictionaries of the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language. It focuses on specific lexicographic issues that arise due to determinologization when dealing with this relatively extensive and hybrid segment of vocabulary in eSSKJ, addressing it from two points of view. It draws attention to the issues that editors face due to lexicographic requirements. At the same time, it presents issues and reservations external terminology consultants have as experts in individual subject fields when reviewing dictionary entries for determinologized vocabulary. Due to the specific nature of the work, both types of issues sometimes overlap.

Key words: lexicography, general monolingual explanatory dictionary, determinologization, terminology, dictionary editing

Outline of Treating Determinologized Lexemes in General Explanatory Dictionaries

As terms transition from specialized language to general language, various degrees of determinologization occur. The newly formed lexemes may retain some characteristics of terms, but to a large extent, they function like the rest of general vocabulary. A large-scale transition of medical and pharmaceutical terms into general vocabulary could be observed, for example, during the COVID-19 epidemic, whereas individual cases of this type of transition occur continuously. The transition of a term into general vocabulary causes its "meaning" to change—albeit to a small extent—because non-experts do not understand such terms in their full complexity, as experts within the conceptual system of an individual subject field understand them. In general language, there can also be significant changes in the meaning of original terms, which are clearly defined in the terminology. An example in Slovenian is the terms *varoja* 'varroa mite' and *varoza* 'varoosis'; experts define the first as 'a parasitic mite that infects adult bees and bee larvae' and the second as 'a disease of adult bees and bee larvae caused by a parasitic mite'. Although the distinction is relatively unambiguous in terminology, the two terms are synonymous in common parlance. The highest level of determinologization in a linguistic system usually occurs with meanings created through metaphorical transfer, which are often also expressive, such as *alergija* 'allergy' in the sense of 'antipathy toward someone or something'.

This paper presents ways of dealing with and solving issues in determinologized vocabulary in the latest growing monolingual general explanatory dictionary for Slovenian: *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, 3. izdaja* (Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, 3ʳᵈ Edition), or eSSKJ. Whereas the first two editions of this dictionary (SSKJ and SSKJ2) treated this type of vocabulary in an independent microstructural section of the dictionary called a nest of terms, for which the decisions regarding inclusion and editorial arrangement within the nest were primarily made by experts and then reviewed by lexicographers, eSSKJ proceeds from the conceptual assumption that determinologized lexemes are equal to the rest of vo-

cabulary at the level of lexicographic principles. The dictionary entries are prepared entirely by lexicographers, based on the reference corpora for Slovenian; the dictionary entries are then reviewed and commented on by experts in individual subject fields, and corrections are made by lexicographers based on general lexicographic principles. Determinologization and the method presented here for working with determinologized lexemes raise many editorial questions and issues, from the viewpoint of both lexicographers and experts in individual subject fields as terminology consultants. The key ones are presented in the rest of this paper.

eSSKJ and Differences in Treating Determinologized Lexemes Compared to Other Slovenian Dictionaries

Presented below are the conceptual features of eSSKJ that are important for understanding how determinologized vocabulary is treated in it, especially in relation to the previous two editions of the general explanatory dictionary of Slovenian and the terminological dictionaries compiled by the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language.

eSSKJ is the latest monolingual general explanatory dictionary for Slovenian. It describes the conceptual world of modern Slovenian interpreted according to the language usage attested in modern sources, especially corpora. Despite its name, the dictionary has been designed completely anew in terms of its concept and material. It is, therefore, not a reworking or expansion of any of the previous editions of the dictionary, but a dictionary that is new and unique both in terms of material and (especially) specific dictionary solutions.[1–3] eSSKJ is known as a growing dictionary, and it is intended for use in the online environment and other digital environments. New entries for the dictionary are generally published once a year on the freely accessible central Slovenian dictionary portal Fran[4, 5] (www.fran.si). Annual additions to the dictionary are also available as e-books (https://fran.si/knjige).

eSSKJ is an informative-normative dictionary. Currently (as of February 2023), it comprises approximately 3,000 entries, and when the editing is complete, it will include approximately 100,000 entries, introduced at the macrostructural level by a one-word headword. As part of these entries, the semantic, grammatical, pragmatic, and other properties of multi-word lexical units that require a semantic definition and contain a headword will be systematically and comprehensively described. Although the dictionary does not list multi-word lexical units as headwords, it places more emphasis on multi-word lexical units than has been customary in Slovenian general lexicography to date. In eSSKJ, these units are generally described with the same set of information as single-word headwords, and they are presented in two microstructural sections: the first section includes semantically opaque non-phraseological (terminological and non-terminologi-

cal) multi-word lexical units,[6, 7] and the second describes phraseological lexical units—that is, idioms and paremiological lexical units.[8, 9]

Treating multi-word lexical units as part of the microstructural sections for phraseological and non-phraseological lexical units (without a nest of terms) is a departure from hitherto established Slovenian general lexicographic practice. The decision to organize the dictionary information in this way is based on the fact that the determinologized vocabulary included in the emerging dictionary is already determinologized and, as such, part of general vocabulary. eSSKJ also displays syntactic-level information and illustrative material differently than its two typological predecessors. For individual meanings of lexical units, it shows the most common syntactic patterns in which the lexical unit is realized in language use, together with the typical collocators that it co-occurs with.[10] Each meaning of the lexical unit is illustrated with at least one example of use.

In creating SSKJ (as well as SSKJ2), the lexicographers primarily approached the description of the original terms from an onomasiological perspective, as is typical for terminological dictionaries. In contrast, the awareness that monolingual general explanatory dictionaries describe determinologized terms was considerably lower. Perhaps this "more terminological" approach was also due to the awareness that SSKJ often filled a gap in the linguistic sources; namely, there were few terminological dictionaries. With eSSKJ, lexicographers approach the description of determinologized terms from a semasiological perspective. In SSKJ, the original terms are usually explained in the nest of terms, and they are typically described only with a definition and a terminological label. In eSSKJ, determinologized lexemes are presented in the semantic description of a one-word headword or a special section for non-phraseological lexical units, as in many other recent dictionaries,[11] and they are described from all the aspects that are usually presented in the description of general vocabulary.[1]

When dealing with determinologized lexemes, eSSKJ also differs in a key way from the terminological dictionaries compiled by the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language.[12–17] The most important conceptual differences are presented in Table 1.[18]

The aim of terminography, as we understand its role at the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language,[12] is to unambiguously define concepts in the conceptual system of the subject field under consideration and to present the relationships between them and at the same time to assign a term that represents an expressive element to each concept as a cognitive element. The approach to dealing with terminology is, therefore, onomasiological. It does not make sense to treat terms in terminological dictionaries as independent units but as units of a system of related entities. Their definitions primarily come from defining their place in the conceptual system of the specific subject field.[19]

TABLE 1

FUNDAMENTAL CONCEPTUAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TERMINOLOGICAL AND GENERAL EXPLANATORY DICTIONARIES COMPILED BY THE ZRC SAZU FRAN RAMOVŠ INSTITUTE OF THE SLOVENIAN LANGUAGE

Aspect	Terminological dictionaries	General dictionaries
Object of study	Terms and concepts used in a specific subject field	Lexemes
Diasystem studied	Specialized language used in a specific subject field	General language
Type of treatment	Prescriptive	Descriptive
Approach to treatment	Onomasiological (concept → term)	Semasiological (lexeme → meaning)
Primary users	Experts in a specific subject field	General users
Dictionary information	Terms, definitions, foreign-language equivalents, preferred terms, relationships between concepts in the conceptual system of a specific subject field	A comprehensive set of information on the expressive and semantic properties of the lexeme, typical use, lexeme-related normative guidelines, special grammatical features, etymology, etc., is given.

Contrary to what has been written, the connection between the determinologized lexeme and the units of the conceptual system of the specific subject field, if at all, is somewhat looser. General language takes shape spontaneously, with the consensus of the speakers of the language, as it is realized in language use.[20] Therefore, the perspective on treating general vocabulary is descriptive and semasiological. The fundamental task of general lexicography is to explain what the various lexemes of a language mean and how they are commonly used. Monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, including eSSKJ, thus have a significantly more complex microstructure than terminological dictionaries.

The aim of terminological dictionaries is primarily to define concepts within the conceptual system of a particular subject field and to determine preferred terms. In contrast, general dictionaries focus on describing the use of determinologized lexemes as they appear in texts for non-experts. Therefore, although the definition of a term in a terminological dictionary and the definition of the "same" lexeme in a general explanatory dictionary may be similar, they describe a different phenomenon. The difference is not only in the degree of reliability of the definition in terms of its relevance to the subject field. Namely, general lexicography deals with describing terms after they have already been affected by determinologization,[21] and this raises several editorial issues.

Determinologization

One of the basic processes that should be considered in treating original terms in general explanatory dictionaries is determinologization. Determinologization refers to specialized terms from specialized texts (where they are usually used) entering general use through texts intended for a broad range of users. In this process, a term otherwise precisely defined within the conceptual system of a subject field loses this characteristic. Its "meaning" becomes looser or changes. Poštolková[22] notes that in determinologization a term loses its connection with other terms in the conceptual system of the subject field. When it becomes part of general vocabulary (of course, it still functions as a term in the original subject field), it loses its previously defined "meaning," but it acquires the flexibility characteristic of general vocabulary. Determinologization has been discussed in linguistics for several decades. It was first dealt with by Czech and Slovak linguists; for example, Horecký,[23, 24] Jedlička et al.,[25, 26] Poštolková,[22, 27, 28] Holubová,[29] Bozděchová,[30] and Nová.[31] Somewhat later, determinologization was considered by British and American linguists (Meyer and Mackintosh[32, 33]) and studied in Slovenian (Žele,[34] Žagar[35, 36] and Ledinek[21, 37]).

Determinologization is primarily caused by changes in modern society, in which specialized knowledge plays an important role. The areas where such terms are often determinologized are thus ones that are particularly relevant in modern society; for example, computing and telecommunications, economics, medicine, ecology, political science, and so on. Determinologization can also be influenced by specific extralinguistic events, which are more extensively reported by the mass media.

Determinologization is a matter of degrees. From the viewpoint of editing determinologized vocabulary in monolingual general explanatory dictionaries, it makes sense to distinguish two degrees of determinologization: partial and complete.[29] Both are categories that Žagar Karer places in the framework of determinologization in the linguistic system. This is in contrast to textual determinologization, which is individual and which involves a single instance of creative use of language.[35]

Partial determinologization refers to when a determinologized lexeme still designates the same concept after it moves into general vocabulary, but the semantic properties of the originally very precisely defined concept begin to loosen; for example, *bronhiolitis* 'bronchiolitis; viral inflammation of the smallest airways in the lungs, which is usually accompanied by a cough, shortness of breath, and fever'. Non-experts' understanding of this concept is

simplified because they are unaware of the complexity of the phenomenon it describes and all the relationships that the concept establishes with other units in the conceptual system of the subject field.[32] Therefore, when a partially determinologized lexeme is used by non-experts, their conceptualization of the phenomenon that the original term refers to is similar to but less precise than that of an expert.

In complete determinologization, there is an even more significant departure from the "meaning" of the term. In the first phase of the process, the original term begins to be used in a non-specialized context. Then, through the establishment of shades of meaning, lexicalization and the formation of a completely new meaning gradually occur. Complete determinologization, which is less frequent than partial determinologization, occurs when the semantic deviation is such that the determinologized lexeme no longer designates the original concept;[32] for example, when the a*lergija* 'allergy' mentioned above designates 'antipathy toward someone or something'.

Treatment of Determinologized Lexemes in eSSKJ

Determinologized lexemes are treated in two ways in eSSKJ: 1) as meanings or sub-meanings of headwords when they are single-word lexemes, and 2) as meanings and sub-meanings of multi-word lexical units presented in a special section called fixed expressions, which also includes other (not just terminological) multi-word lexical units (e.g., *barski stol* 'bar stool', *francoska manikura* 'French manicure'). Editing one-word and multi-word lexical units occurs similarly: by analyzing a word sketch and reviewing random concordances in corpus material (especially Gigafida and Gigafida 2.0). The editor disambiguates the meanings of a lexeme, forms definitions, and, based on the criteria of individual groups of lexemes, prepares typical collocations and finds the most representative examples of use.

Lexicographic treatment of determinologized lexemes and labeling of such vocabulary in eSSKJ proceeds from two assessments, which are the result of an analysis of this vocabulary in sources; namely, 1) the degree of determinologization of the lexeme and 2) the extent to which the determinologized lexeme is known to the dictionary user, or whether it is generally used and can therefore be found in a variety of sources.

A terminological label—which appears in eSSKJ in the form [*iz* 'from' + subject field] (e.g., *iz jezikoslovja* 'from linguistics', *iz kemije* 'from chemistry', *iz medicine* 'from medicine') and is marked in the database with the element <*KV*> (for *kvalifikator* 'label')—is used when an expression is still semantically connected with a specific subject field. This label is a clear indicator of its original terminological nature, which is also indicated in eSSKJ by the form of the label itself; that is, with the preposition *iz* 'from' in the sense of 'expressing a starting point, origin'.

This is in contrast to the first two editions of the dictionary, in which labels in an abbreviated form were placed next to the original terms; for example, *jezikosl.* for *jezikoslovje* 'linguistics', *kem.* for *kemija* 'chemistry', or *med.* for *medicina* 'medicine'.[21] For partially determinologized lexemes for which the lexicographic analysis determines that they are frequently used and distributed throughout various kinds of texts, and it is thus deemed that they are generally known, no terminological label is provided, but in the dictionary database, the element <*področje*> 'field' is added (e.g., *jezikoslovje* 'linguistics', *kemija* 'chemistry', *medicina* 'medicine'), which allows the lexicographer to trace them (as explained below, this is also important for creating extracts of the material, which are sent to terminology consultants for review). Still, this information is not visible to users of the dictionary portal.

Definitions of partially determinologized lexemes in eSSKJ must meet the criterion of content correctness, which means that the definition must not contain elements that are incorrect or inappropriate from an expert's point of view. On the other hand, the definitions of this vocabulary do not provide information as detailed and precise as the definitions in terminological dictionaries. One of the more pressing questions is how much simplification is still acceptable for the definition to be still technically correct and acceptable. The fact that the source for the dictionary is mainly general texts, which involve different degrees of determinologization, is also a challenge of its own, and it is sometimes difficult to judge whether the determinologization is partial or complete.

The treatment of determinologized lexemes in the first phases of creating a dictionary is similar to the treatment of the rest of the vocabulary. After the editing of the general part (phase 1) and phraseological part (phase 2) of the entry and the first two reviews, made by lexicographers (phases 3 and 4), which are common to all the entries in eSSKJ, determinologized lexemes undergo a special review by experts in individual subject fields as terminology consultants (phase 5). The first editor and the reviewers (lexicographers) can enter special technical notes in the dictionary database at any time up to phase 4. These are the only notes from the database included in the material subsequently received by the terminology consultant for the particular subject field.

The review of the determinologized lexemes by terminology consultants in eSSKJ is carried out in such a way that each terminology consultant receives by e-mail an extract of the dictionary entries for their subject field no more than twice a year, which is specifically prepared for each terminology consultant based on the content of the elements <*KV*> [*iz* 'from' + subject field] and <*področje*> 'field' from the dictionary database. For each dictionary entry, the notes mentioned above can also be provided. The editors ask the terminology consultants questions about the information key for technically reliable editing. After the terminology consultants have reviewed the entries, the dictionary editors (especially the first editor) review the comments and answers to any questions in the technical

note. If they comply with the dictionary principles, they are taken into account. If they are inconsistent with the conceptual assumptions of eSSKJ, the editors consult with the terminology consultant, come to an agreement, and supplement the editing. In exceptional cases, they reject the comments. All comments, remarks, and answers from terminology consultants are always archived.

Editorial Issues in Treating Determinologized Lexemes

Problems with descriptions in eSSKJ primarily occur with partially determinologized lexemes. Even though they have already crossed the border into general language, they still maintain a connection to the conceptual system of the subject field. Listed below are some editorial issues when dealing with determinologized lexemes in eSSKJ—which are, in fact, much more numerous. They are partly a result of established lexicographic conventions derived from the dictionary concept and partly a result of the discrepancy mentioned above between the properties of the diasystems of general and specialized vocabulary.

Recognizing determinologized lexemes

Because the status of a term can only be assigned to a unit in relation to the conceptual system of a specific subject field,[19] one frequent problem in editing determinologized lexemes in eSSKJ is if the editor does not recognize a partially determinologized lexeme in the material analyzed as a unit that needs a special description. The fact that it is an original term (e.g., *sveži beton* 'fresh concrete', *mlajši mladoletnik* 'young minor', *klavirski trio* 'piano trio') can be indicated by the frequency of its occurrence in the texts of a specific subject field and the fact that the lexicographer cannot really explain the meaning of the lexeme based on the analyzed texts from the corpus, but instead requires specific expertise for the unambiguous identification of such a unit as an original term and its technically reliable description. This applies to an even greater extent because terms, as mostly clearly defined and relatively stable conceptual elements, are generally universal and relatively independent of their circumstances of use—and to a considerable extent, this also applies to partially determinologized lexemes.

Technical reliability of the dictionary entry

Even more common in editing is the issue of how to explain and comprehensively describe a lexeme in such a way that the information is (still) technically reliable and, at the same time, understandable to general users. The headword *steradian* 'steradian' was initially explained in eSSKJ as 'a derived unit of measure for expressing the size of a solid angle, which corresponds to a solid angle with an apex at the center of the sphere, whose arms on the surface of the sphere define an area equal to the square of the radius of the sphere'. When reviewing the original version, an expert in mathematics suggested that

the word *krogla* 'sphere' in this definition be replaced everywhere with the word *sfera* 'sphere', which is technically more appropriate (in mathematics, a *krogla* is understood as a piece of three-dimensional space and therefore has a volume, but no surface area). We felt that general users would not understand the proposed definition because they most likely do not know the mathematical definition of a *sfera* (anymore)—the word is too specific for existing general explanatory dictionaries to provide its definition— and after additional consultation with a terminology consultant, we retained the word *krogla* in the definition. Still, we considered his comment that the "arms of the solid angle" are probably not sufficiently clearly defined as a concept. In the end, we agreed on this interpretation of the determinologized lexeme *steradian* in eSSKJ: 'a derived unit of measure for expressing the size of a solid angle, which corresponds to a solid angle with the apex at the center of the sphere, whose cone of the arms at the edge of the sphere defines an area equal to the square of the radius of the sphere'. The expert wrote a comment that perfectly summarizes the method and goal of creating definitions of determinologized lexemes for a general dictionary: "I assume that the goal [of the lexical description] is a popular definition that is as clear and accurate as possible. From a strictly mathematical point of view, suitable definitions would require an entire tree of sub-definitions and agreements in order to really define the concepts well. But you're not compiling a mathematical dictionary."

The same phenomena in different subject fields

It is also relatively common in general explanatory dictionaries to be uncertain about how one should describe lexemes that are treated from different perspectives by different subject fields. Regarding determinologized lexemes of the type *depresija* 'depression', there are a few issues. The psychological, geographical, meteorological, and economic treatments of *depresija* differ to such an extent that the dictionary treats them with different meanings. However, how should a dictionary deal with editing lexemes that denote the same phenomenon, but from different technical perspectives, whereby multiple such perspectives are found in texts of general use? Should the lexeme *ogljikov dioksid* 'carbon dioxide' be described from a chemical perspective, from the perspective of its role in biological processes, as a greenhouse gas, or from all these plus additional perspectives? In this specific case, it is also necessary to answer the editorial question of whether it makes sense in a general explanatory dictionary to understand chemical compounds only as transparent multi-word lexical units. Such a decision would mean that most chemical compounds are listed among collocations, so not much would be revealed to users about the use of these determinologized lexemes, and their chemical composition would be highlighted in a definition. With the headword *monoksid* 'monoxide' users would, for example, only learn that it is an 'oxide containing one atom of oxygen', with *ogljikov monoksid* 'carbon monoxide' listed as a colloca-

tion, but the dictionary would not provide the more "substantive" definition that *ogljikov monoksid* is a 'poisonous gas without color, smell, or taste that results from incomplete oxidation of carbon' which one can find out from SSKJ (and the same in SSKJ2). If it is decided to provide chemical compounds with a definition that highlights not only their chemical composition, but also other aspects, it is necessary to explain many originally chemical terms in the dictionary, which is very time-consuming—and, from the viewpoint of an editor that is not a chemistry expert, also very demanding.

The problem of how to describe a determinologized lexeme also arises when it is used in general language only in a very specific context, whereby the determinologization is often close to complete. For example, in the sources used as the starting point for creating eSSKJ, the word *akrilamid* 'acrylamide' primarily appears within the context of its potential harm to health (it is said to be formed in foods that are intensively thermally processed for a long time), but the sources do not show all the other aspects from which it would be more justified to describe *akrilamid* in a technical sense. A similar example is the lexeme *spirulina*, which in general texts is only referred to as a dietary supplement, although in its original sense, it is a unicellular filamentous cyanobacterium.

Synonymy in partially determinologized lexemes

Perhaps the greatest issue that the editors of eSSKJ face when editing determinologized vocabulary is how to cite synonyms for partially determinologized lexemes and whether to thereby indirectly draw attention to terms that are understood as preferred by experts. This issue is particularly relevant in connection with labeling determinologized lexemes with terminological labels, especially those less familiar to users.

With the description in eSSKJ, we want to provide users with dictionary information consistent with the use of a partially determinologized lexeme in general language. At the same time, the description is similar to the use of the term that was established in terminology by an explicit or implicit terminological agreement.[16] At the synonymy level, eSSKJ occasionally provides a description that is at odds with the narrower terminological norm of a particular subject field, which is unavoidable because it is a reference work for general language. Of course, pointing out preferred terms of individual subject fields in the sense of harmonizing terminology is not an area that we would directly deal with when preparing eSSKJ. Still, it turned out that it makes sense to think about the issue for not only for the sake of the editing but also because of the dictionary users. Namely, they often do not distinguish between terminological and general explanatory dictionaries and are not familiar with their conceptual assumptions, and so they often interpret the linguistic information in them inappropriately. This problem was, paradoxically, exacerbated to some extent by the use of the Fran portal, where all fundamental Slovenian dictionaries are available on one website. Many users on Fran

only pay attention to information from general dictionaries because their descriptions are available first on the website, but they do not check the use of terms in terminological dictionaries, which is why they often interpret the use of determinologized lexemes as technical. There is also a special website on terminology created by the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language called Terminologišče, explicitly intended for experts. However, issues still occur because the material from terminological dictionaries is also accessible via the Fran portal.

The editors of eSSKJ believe that, with partially determinologized lexemes, a certain degree of guiding users toward using preferred terms is desirable due to user needs and from a technical point of view; for example, *obvod* 'bypass' (preferred) versus *bypass* (non-preferred). For the time being, in eSSKJ, a clear sign of such guidance is the use of the terminological label, which is assigned in eSSKJ to units considered to be the original terms that are regularly used in a specific subject field. However, it is not assigned to lexemes that lexicographers find no longer have the status of a (preferred) term in the subject field. For example, the expression *klopni meningitis* 'tick-borne meningitis' and *klopni encefalitis* 'tick-borne encephalitis', which are less appropriate from the technical point of view, but established in general use, do not have a label; only the determinologized lexeme *klopni meningoencefalitis* 'tick-borne meningoencephalitis' is marked with the label *iz medicine* 'from medicine'. The only problem is that editors usually do not have the necessary knowledge and information to provide this kind of guidance; they need the help of an expert to provide a technically reliable description.

Despite the awareness that eSSKJ cannot provide information on preferred terms as systematically as terminological dictionaries, it seems reasonable to seek solutions for providing this kind of explicit information to users, both within the dictionary and in the wider context of the dictionary portal Fran, where eSSKJ is published. In addition to using terminological labels, we, therefore, consider using special pragmatic notes in eSSKJ, especially in cases where there is a significant divergence in the use of original terms between specialized and general language. Such examples include, for instance, determinologized lexemes that are already markedly obsolete in the subject field and even incorrect in this sense (e.g., *manična depresija* 'manic depression' instead of *bipolarna motnja* 'bipolar disorder'), and positive terminology, when experts reject designations that are still alive in general language but that they consider unacceptable (e.g., *dislektik* 'dyslexic (noun)' instead of *oseba z disleksijo* 'person with dyslexia'). Clarifications would also be very appropriate if the preferred term were not included in the dictionary based on its frequency of use. Still, the editors have information that it has become established in the subject field.

Experts' Issues when Reviewing Dictionary Entries for Determinologized Lexemes

Working with determinologized lexemes is just as demanding for experts in individual fields working on the dictionary as for lexicographers. In all segments of their work, these experts must express themselves unambiguously and clearly by using terms, and, when working with a general explanatory dictionary, they have to deal with determinologized vocabulary that has moved into general language. Editors can clearly see the problems of how to form and then review the definition of such words when editing originally linguistic lexemes. To illustrate this with an example: in Slovenian linguistics, one distinguishes a *poved* 'sentence; the smallest independent unit of a linguistic message, which can also be a message itself', which consists of one or more *stavek* 'clause; a group of words gathered around a finite verb form on the basis of verbal valency and compatibility', but in the general language it is usual to say that one says something *v nekaj stavkih*, whereby the word *stavek* is usually used in the sense of *poved*, which is inappropriate from the viewpoint of linguistic terminology. However, it is also necessary that this meaning of *stavek* be included in a general explanatory dictionary, given its sufficiently widespread and diffuse use. A tendency has also been noticed among editors to interpret originally linguistic terms in the eSSKJ with very detailed definitions, which of course is not in accordance and consistent with determinologized lexemes from other subject fields. We also note that reviewing the entries for determinologized vocabulary in a general explanatory dictionary is particularly difficult for terminology consultants that are also involved in the terminological dictionaries compiled by the Terminological Section of the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language because they are used to very different work in terminology committees. In the first years of dictionary preparation, we sent the terminology consultants the same extracts as we used for the review. The entire entry was included in the extract, and it sometimes happened that the terminology consultants also commented on the extracts' "incorrect" use of the lexeme in the phraseology or its etymological explanation. In the following years, we adapted the extract for terminology consultants so that we could send them mostly the parts of the dictionary entry that are only relevant to them and which, nonetheless, do not include only definitions and illustrative material for determinologized lexemes. Below, we present some of the most typical issues we have encountered with terminology consultants involved in eSSKJ.

More detailed definitions and very specific terms in the definition

It often happens during the review that terminology consultants want more detailed definitions than are foreseen in the general lexicographic principles for eSSKJ, or they want to use very specific terms in the definition, which from the viewpoint of the subject field precisely ex- plain the lexeme in question. Still, the proposed solution would not be in accordance with the principles of the use of definition words in eSSKJ, which should be among the most frequent five to ten thousand words. This issue is illustrated with the lexeme *brin* 'juniper' defined as 'an evergreen needle-leafed shrub with small dark blue fruits' for which the terminology consultant wanted to replace the term *zimzeleni grm* 'evergreen bush' with the technically more appropriate (but very rarely encountered in general usage) *vednozeleni grm* 'evergreen bush' and the term *plodovi* 'fruits' (as they are usually defined in typical definitions for headwords designating plants) with *omeseneli storži* 'fleshy cones'. From the viewpoint of the subject field, juniper berries are not fruits because needle-leafed plants do not bear fruits, but cones, which are fleshy on the juniper—but in general language, juniper berries are still perceived as fruits. We have already mentioned a similar case with *steradian*, for which the terminology consultant wanted to use the word *sfera* 'sphere' in the definition of the determinologized lexeme.

Listing additional synonyms

Sometimes experts want to list synonyms that are used in terminology. Some of these are also preferred and, therefore, more appropriate from the viewpoint of the subject field. For the multi-word lexical unit *hudobni duh* 'evil spirit' in the sense of 'spiritual being in Christianity that personifies wickedness, evil' the terminology consultant also recommended providing the synonymous expression *hudi duh*. A reviewer of the entries for the semantic group of mushrooms suggested adding the following synonyms: *lepi maslenec* for *lepi goban* (*Butryboletus pseudoregius*), *leponogi postavnež* for *leponogi goban* (*Caloboletus calopus*), *vražji rubinovec* for *vražji goban* (*Rubroboletus satanas*), *žametasti novogoban* for *žametasti goban* (*Neoboletus erythropus*), and so on. The proposed synonyms do not meet the threshold for inclusion and, therefore, cannot be included in eSSKJ according to general criteria; however, they are always listed in the dictionary database, but the suggested synonym is not displayed in the dictionary on the Fran portal.

Incorrect examples of use from a technical point of view

Terminology consultants are well-informed about the structure and principles of eSSKJ. They are aware that the sources we use for examples of use are generally not specialized texts but general texts. Nonetheless, they often draw attention to examples of use that are not in accordance with terminological usage, even though this kind of usage may be very well established in general language. There is the example of *kača* 'snake' that in the general language frequently *piči* (literally, 'sting'), which is technically incorrect because it, in fact, *ugrizne* 'bite'. Of course, we always consider factual corrections in the examples of use. For instance, in the sources, we found an example indicating that the *navadni polh* 'edible dormouse' is a rodent from the dormouse family, which includes about fifteen other species that live across Europe, Asia, and

Africa. The terminology consultant pointed out that there are more species of dormice, and we edited the example of use based on the comment. The reason for an error in an example of use may also be purely mechanical. An example is a comment from a terminology consultant for physics, who noticed an error that probably occurred in transcoding the text for the text corpus, from which we took the example of use for the dictionary illustration. Instead of 7^{20}, the example of use mentions 720 megawatt hours of electricity that Slovenian power plants are expected to produce, which—as we learned from the comment from our physics terminology consultant—would mean that the five new power plants will only operate for about four hours a year, which of course would be completely pointless.

As we have seen from the examples above, there is no single answer to how to edit examples of use based on the comments of terminology consultants. Although when preparing eSSKJ, the lexicographers strive to find the best examples of usage from text corpora, which must satisfy many very different criteria, it sometimes happens that, despite the rich material at our disposal, it is difficult to choose a suitable authentic example of use. Sometimes, based on the comment of a terminology consultant, the example of use is replaced or eliminated, but if this is not possible, we must carefully consider whether to accept the comments and suggestions and adjust the example of use in the dictionary. Solving these issues can be challenging, and sometimes it takes some time to arrive at an acceptable solution for both lexicographers and terminology consultants.

The importance of terminology consultants

It is true that for most terminology consultants, working on eSSKJ does not take more than a few hours a year. Still, it is essential that their valuable work, which is currently performed voluntarily, be better valued in the technical and financial sense. The issues presented above already show how important it is for both lexicographers and terminology consultants to invest time in this collaboration if the dictionary is to be a reliable and credible language reference work. Most of the experts' comments are, of course, related to the subject field they are examining, where they present us with the latest knowledge in their subject field or, for example, they point out inappropriate taxonomic names, sometimes point out jargon usage that lexicographers can appropriately label, or highlight ambiguous, inappropriate, and unsuitable information in examples of use. In their work, attentive reviewers sometimes point out typos or grammatical errors that have crept into an example of use, despite many preliminary checks. Sometimes experts introduce us to interesting facts, such as the fact that the large parasol mushroom with the taxonomic name *Agaricus procerus* (today *Mac-*

rolepiota procera) was first described by the eighteenth-century Tyrolean physician and naturalist Giovanni Antonio Scopoli, who did a lot of his professional work while living in Idrija (today in western Slovenia). In addition to being extremely knowledgeable experts, terminology consultants are also people that know how to joke. Commenting on the example of use *V kozarec je stresel več kock ledu, si natočil velikodušno mero džina in skromno količino tonika* 'He shook several ice cubes into a glass, and poured in a generous measure of gin and a modest amount of tonic', the terminology consultant added a wry note: "I approve of this ratio."

Conclusion

This paper presents the treatment of determinologized lexemes in *Slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika, 3. izdaja* (Dictionary of the Slovenian Standard Language, 3rd Edition), or eSSKJ, while also briefly drawing attention to differences in the perception of this vocabulary compared to the previous editions of the dictionary and to the terminological dictionaries compiled by the ZRC SAZU Fran Ramovš Institute of the Slovenian Language. It focuses on the many issues that both the editors and experts in individual subject fields involved in preparing the dictionary as external terminology consultants encounter due to determinologization when describing determinologized lexemes in a general explanatory dictionary. Good collaboration between editors and experts in individual subject fields is key for the established system of dealing with determinologized vocabulary in eSSKJ, which has proven to be relatively effective. In addition, the paper emphasizes that it is important to continue to make both experts and general users of the dictionary aware of the differences between the terms used in an individual subject field and determinologized lexemes in general language, to ensure that the labeling of partially determinologized vocabulary is as unambiguous as possible, and to provide an unambiguous description of this vocabulary in a general explanatory dictionary. At the same time, it is necessary to consider even more effective ways of drawing users' attention to the differences between terminological and general dictionaries, and between general and narrower terminological norms, including within the context of displaying dictionary data on the Fran portal.

Acknowledgements

REFERENCES

1. GLIHA KOMAC N, JAKOP N, JEŽOVNIK J, KLEMENČIČ S, KRVINA D, LEDINEK N, MIRTIČ T, PERDIH A, PETRIC Š, SNOJ M, ŽELE A, Koncept novega razlagalnega slovarja slovenskega knjižnega jezika (Inštitut za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, 2015). — 2. GLIHA KOMAC N, JAKOP N, JEŽOVNIK J, KLEMENČIČ S, KRVINA D, LEDINEK N, METERC M, MICHELIZZA M, MIRTIČ T, PERDIH A, PETRIC Š, SNOJ M, ŽELE A., Novi slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika – predstavitev temeljnih konceptualnih izhodišč. In: MARUŠIČ F, MIŠMAŠ P, ŽAUCER R (Eds) Škrabčevi dnevi 9, Zbornik prispevkov s simpozija 2015 (Založba Univerze v Novi Gorici, Nova Gorica, 2016). — 3. LEDINEK N, Novi slovar slovenskega knjižnega jezika – temeljna konceptualna izhodišča. In: RISTIĆ S, LAZIĆ KONJIK I, IVANOVIĆ N (Eds) Leksikologija i leksikografija u svetlu savremenih pristupa: zbornik naučnih radova (Institut za srpski jezik SANU, Beograd, 2016). — 4. 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). — 5. PERDIH A, Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 46/2 (2020). 997. doi: 10.31724/rihjj.46.2.28. — 6. PERDIH A, LEDINEK, N, Slovene Linguistic Studies, 12 (2019). 113. doi: 10.3986/sjsls.12.1.07. — 7. LEDINEK N, PERDIH A, Slavistična revija, 70/4 (2022). 475. doi: 10.57589/srl.v70i4.4074. — 8. METERC M, Jezikoslovni zapiski, 25/2 (2019) 33. doi: 10.3986/JZ.25.2.2. — 9. JAKOP N, The role and position of phraseological units in the general monolingual dictionary of Slovene: macro- and microstructural aspects. In: JESENŠEK V, ENČEVA M (Eds) Wörterbuchstrukturen zwischen Theorie und Praxis (De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, 2018). doi: /10.1515/9783110598650-015. — 10. MICHELIZZA M, Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje, 47/4 (2021). doi: https://doi.org/10.31724/rihjj.47.2.13. — 11. KRŽIŠNIK E, Kam in kako s frazeologijo v novem slovarju. In: PERDIH A (Ed.) Strokovni posvet o novem slovarju slovenskega jezika (Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, 2008). — 12. ŽAGAR M, FAJFAR T, Jezikoslovni zapiski, 21/1 (2015). 23. — 13. FAJFAR T, ŽAGAR KARER M, Slavistična revija, 67/4 (2019). 551. — 14. FAJFAR T, ŽAGAR KARER M, Dvojnice v terminoloških slovarjih. In: VEROVNIK T, VRANJEK OŠLAK U (Eds.) Pravopis na zrnu graha: razprave o pravopisnih vprašanjih (Založba ZRC, Ljubljana, 2022). doi: 10.3986/9789610506201_08. — 15. ŽAGAR KARER M, Ožja terminološka norma in odstopi od pravopisne norme v terminologiji. In: DOBROVOLJC H, VEROVNIK T (Eds.). Pravopisna razpotja: razprave o pravopisnih vprašanjih (Založba ZRC, Ljubljana, 2015). — 16. ŽAGAR KARER M, Slavistična revija, 66/2 (2018). 235. — 17. ŽAGAR KARER M, FAJFAR T, Slavistična revija, 68/4 (2020). 491. — 18. ŽAGAR KARER M, LEDINEK N, Slovene linguistic studies, 13 (2021). 41. doi: https://doi.org/10.3986/sjsls.13.1.03. — 19. KAGEURA K, Terminology and lexicography. In: KOCKAERT HJ, STEURS F (Eds) Handbook of terminology. Volume 1 (John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2015). doi: 10.1075/hot.1.ter2. — 20. LEDER - MANCINI Z, O nekaterih lingvističnih pogledih na terminološko problematiko. In: PEDIČEK F (Ed.) Terminologija v znanosti: Prispevki k teoriji (Pedagoški inštitut, Ljubljana, 1984). 81–89. — 21. LEDINEK N, Obravnava izhodiščno terminološke leksike v novem slovarju slovenskega knjižnega jezika. In: SMOLEJ M (Ed) Obdobja 34: Slovnica in slovar – aktualni jezikovni opis (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 2015). — 22. POŠTOLKOVÁ B, Odborná a běžná slovní zásoba současné češtiny (Academia, Prague, 1984). — 23. HORECKÝ J, Základy slovenskej terminológie (Vydavateľstvo Slovenskej akadémie vied, Bratislava, 1956). — 24. HORECKÝ J, BUZÁSSYOVÁ K, BOSÁK J et al. Dynamika slovnej zásoby súčasnej slovenčiny (Veda, Bratislava, 1989). — 25. JEDLIČKA A, FORMÁNKOVÁ V, REJMÁNKOVÁ M, Základy české stylistiky (Státní pedagogické nakladatelství, Prage, 1970). — 26. JEDLIČKA A, Spisovný jazyk v současné komunikaci (Univerzita Karlova, Prague, 1978). — 27. POŠTOLKOVÁ B, Slovo a slovesnost, 38 (1977). 112. — 28. POŠTOLKOVÁ B, Slovo a slovesnost, 41 (1980). 54. — 29. HOLUBOVÁ V, K pojetí determinologizace. In: ŽEMLIČKA M (Ed): Termina 2000, Sborník příspěvků z II. konference 1996 a III. konference 2000 (Galén, Technická univerzita v Liberci, Prague, Liberec, 2001). — 30. BOZDĚCHOVÁ I, Současná terminologie (se zaměřením na kolokační termíny z lékařství) (Univerzita Karlova v Praze, Nakladatelství Karolinum, Prague, 2009). — 31. NOVÁ J, Terms Embraced by the General Public: How to Cope with Determinologization in the Dictionary? In: ČIBEJ J, GORJANC V, KOSEM I, KREK S (Eds) Proceedings of the XVIII EURALEX International Congress: Lexicography in Global Contexts (Ljubljana University Press, Faculty of Arts, Ljubljana, 2018). — 32. MEYER I, MACKINTOSH K, Terminology, 6/1 (2000). 111. — 33. MEYER I, Computer Words in Our Everyday Lives: How are They Interesting for Terminography and Lexicography? In: HEID U, EVERT S, LEHMANN E, ROHRER C (Eds) Proceedings of the IX EURALEX International Congress (Institut für Maschinelle Sprachverarbeitung, Universität Stuttgart, Stuttgart, 2000). — 34. ŽELE A, Stopnje terminologizacije v leksiki (na primerih glagolov). V: M. HUMAR (Ed) Terminologija v času globalizacije (Založba ZRC, Ljubljana, 2004). — 35. ŽAGAR M, Mojca. Jezik in slovstvo, 50/2 (2005). 35. — 36. ŽAGAR M, Determinologizacija v splošnih in terminoloških slovarjih. In: OREL I (Ed) Obdobja 24: Razvoj slovenskega strokovnega jezika (Znanstvena založba Filozofske fakultete, Ljubljana, 2007). — 37. LEDINEK N, Determinologizacija geografske terminologije. In: LEDINEK N, ŽAGAR KARER M, HUMAR M (Eds), Terminologija in sodobna terminografija (Založba ZRC, ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana, 2009).

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

PROBLEMI U OBRADI DETERMINOLOGIZIRANIH LEKSEMA U OPĆEM OBJASNIDBENOM RJEČNIKU SLOVENSKOGA JEZIKA eSSKJ

S A Ž E T A K

U ovome radu predstavlja se obrada determinologiziranih leksema u najnovijemu jednojezičnom općem objasnidbenom rječniku slovenskoga jezika – *Slovaru slovenskega knjižnega jezika*, 3. izdanje, poznatijega kao eSSKJ. Ističu se razlike u koncepciji obrade u usporedbi s prethodnim izdanjima rječnika (SSKJ i SSKJ2) te razlike u obradi nazivlja u terminološkim rječnicima Instituta za slovenski jezik Frana Ramovša. Pozornost se usmjerava na specifična leksikografska pitanja koja se javljaju zbog determinologizacije, a odabrani se leksemi razmatraju s dvaju gledišta – izdvajaju se problemi s kojima se susreću urednici zbog leksikografskih zahtjeva te problemi i zadrške koje vanjski terminološki konzultanti imaju kao stručnjaci za pojedina područja pri pregledu rječničkih natuknica za determinologizirani vokabular. Zbog osobitosti leksikografske obrade katkad se ti problemi preklapaju.