Explanatory Notes in LSP Dictionaries

Abstract
Translators of LSP texts often have to face the problem of not being subject-field experts and not being able to make sufficient research of the domain in question because of short delivery deadlines. The common denominator often seems to be cognitive shortcomings.

Temmerman (2000) challenges the traditional terminology concept of ‘definition’ and suggests ‘templates of understanding’ with a varying number of modules of information for different units of understanding and different perspectives. The theory of lexicographic functions likewise operates with flexible dictionary concepts for specific users and user situations (Tarp 2004) advocating user-oriented subject-matter information as a natural category of translation dictionaries. Via further operational tools for selection and specification of subject-matter data, like the recommendations for adapting definitions to non-experts made by Svensén 2004 and the categorisation of elaborations and extensions in the van Leeuwen linking system (2005), it is demonstrated that the current framework can be specified and in that way open up for more consistent fields of subject-matter information as to both form and content.

Moreover, this paper suggests empirical user tests in order to obtain insights into cognitive shortcomings in specific domains prior to the selection of data of definitional and encyclopaedic character. It reports on a case study of how translation trainees react to explanatory notes of LSP terms. Questionnaires and interviews give a picture of domain-specific shortcomings and possible ways of composing explanatory notes dictionaries of economics for translation purposes.

1. Background
Traditionally, the compilation of bilingual LSP dictionaries has focused on the listing of terms accompanied by their equivalents in the target language – often based on collections made by professional translators within their specialist domain, as is the case of a recent accounting dictionary exemplified in (1):

(1)

| control concept | concepto de control. |
| control environment | entorno de control. |
| control in the context of an asset | control en el contexto de un activo. |
| control limits | límites de control. |
| control of another entity | control de otra entidad. |
| control procedures | procedimientos de control. |

Excerpt from Sánchez 2004: Accounting Dictionary

However, the relevance of adding more information to the wordlist in terms of for instance semantic and encyclopaedic information addressed to the head word, has been pointed out from various sides. Thus, any teacher of LSP translation will confirm that – all other things being equal – it is easier for students who have some domain knowledge to make a successful translation. But
also the professional translator often meets with fragment of domains that are new to her. Cabré (2004: 117) argues that any translator can recognise the following situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish expression</th>
<th>English translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desconocer una unidad, su significado, su uso gramatical o su valor pragmático en el ámbito especializado en la lengua de partida;</td>
<td>Not knowing a unit, its meaning, grammar, pragmatic value in the specific domain in SL;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dudar sobre el significado, el uso gramatical o el valor pragmático de una unidad en la lengua de partida;</td>
<td>having doubts about the meaning, grammar or pragmatic value of a unit in SL;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desconocer si la lengua de llegada dispone de una unidad lexicalizada equivalente semántica y pragmáticamente a la usada en el texto original;</td>
<td>not knowing if TL has lexical unit semantically and pragmatically equivalent to the one used in SL;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dudar de si una unidad de la lengua de llegada es el equivalente más apropiado;</td>
<td>having doubts whether the TL unit is the most appropriate equivalent;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>desconocer o dudar sobre la fraseología del ámbito especializado.</td>
<td>not knowing or having doubts about the phraseology in the specific domain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Emphasis added) (My translation into English)

So, from a lexicographic view and focusing on the user perspective, it is relevant to consider, how we can assist the translator in solving these problems. I shall leave out the phraseology issue and discuss the following questions:

1. What kind of subject-matter information – understood here as semantic and encyclopaedic data – is relevant in an LSP translation dictionary which pursues efficiency and user-friendliness?
2. How can the selection of data be structured?
3. How can the data be converted into explanatory notes for non-experts?

I shall use ‘subject-matter information’ as an overall term for semantic and encyclopaedic information, and I shall use ‘explanatory note’ in order to avoid confusions with the terminological or scientific ‘definition’.

2. Empirical evidence

Besides intuitive observations from the areas of teaching and translation, a couple of surveys, in fact, provide evidence for the translators’ feeling of uncertainty or doubt.

In 1991, at the ASB we asked a group of professional translators and trainees to translate a financial text and register their look-ups, their time consumption and their motivations for the individual consultations of the reference works in question. The protocols showed exactly the same uncertainty as to phraseology and subject matter in both source and target language that is referred to in Cabré 2004. Apart from that, the survey revealed that the informants used very time-consuming strategies and a considerable number of look-ups in different reference works, including text books (Duvå/Laursen 1991: 126).

Another user survey conducted by Varantola concerning the user habits of translation trainees as to reference works, revealed that a common strategy was to use a monolingual reference work as a second or subsequent look-up for information other than the equivalent (Varantola 1998: 184).

In 1997, Dancette made a think-aloud experiment where she found two different types of translation strategies in the translation process of a financial text. One group of students used a bottom-up strategy, consulting a dictionary whenever a term in the target language was unfamiliar to them. The other group used a top-down strategy, consulting a dictionary once a hypothesis on meaning had been formulated (Dancette 1997: 103). The students who took the top-down ap-
proach had a certain pre-knowledge of the domain in question and produced better target texts in terms of precise lexical choices or even refinements of the target text.

Finally, in connection with another think-aloud experiment with Nigerian language students translating a law text from English to Hausa, Antia (2001: 20) underlines the following point:

A specific glossary, which provides nothing but SL terms and TL equivalents fails to mediate between the translators’ general world knowledge and the domain knowledge reflected in the text.

According to Antia, this can lead to wrong interpretations invoking an inadequate general world scene and a subsequent wrong lexical choice or a wrong interpretation of logical relationships and a subsequent wrong choice of connectors or prepositions.

To sum up, case studies of the problems related to LSP lexicography or terminology and translation, point to a certain overall uncertainty when dealing with the translation of an LSP text. In the first place, there is a general struggle for additional information, as demonstrated in the Danish survey commented upon, and a concrete strategy of posterior information search in monolingual dictionaries or encyclopaedia, as demonstrated in the Finnish survey referred to. Furthermore, errors might occur due to cognitive shortcomings as shown in the Canadian and Nigerian TAP surveys, and subsequently pre-knowledge is likely to lead to better translations as demonstrated by the Canadian informants.

3. Models for including subject-matter information

Building up the necessary stock of knowledge can of course be realized as an independent research for a specific job. However, as Sue Wright (1997: 149) puts it, translators – apart from not being subject-field experts themselves, nor having immediate access to specialists – lack time to pursue extensive research activity because of short delivery deadlines.

So, intuition and empirical data as well as the specific circumstances related to the typical user situation advocate for integrating this kind of information in the translator’s standard reference works. By amplifying the traditional concepts, term bases can be converted into knowledge bases (Sara Castagnoli 2006) and LSP dictionaries can be adapted to specific user requirements (Sven Tarp 2004) and as such contribute to building knowledge during the translation process, i.e. establishing schemata in domains in which the translator is a non-expert or semi-expert. In the following, I shall look at the specific issue of amplification of the traditional concepts from a terminological and lexicographic point of view.

3.1. A terminological approach

In terminology, the description of the meaning in terms of a definition is an inherent part of the presentation of a term or a concept. But, as pointed out by Temmerman, “the classic intentional definition does not invoke any schema in the mind of a non-specialist” (Temmerman 2000: 26), and “information which – traditionally – was referred to as encyclopaedic information, i.e. inessential information for definitions, appears to be indispensable information for the understanding certain units” (Temmerman 2000: 97).

According to Temmerman, it is possible to imagine ‘templates of understanding’ with discrete information modules (e.g. history, steps in process, aim) according to the more or less essential information relevant for each category dependent on the function of the text. She suggests the following model for the area of bioscience:
A further development of these ideas could really be a step forward in terminography and, indeed, a great inspiration for LSP lexicography.

### 3.2. A lexicographic approach

The theory of lexicographic functions focuses on making utility products for specific users in specific situations. One of the functions is to assist the translation of texts (Tarp 2004: 27-29). Tarp divides the translation process in three stages. The selection and inclusion of lexicographic data should take into account the variety of problems that might arise in each stage in order to assist the translator. The stages are the following (Tarp 2004: 30):

1. Reception of source-language text
2. Transfer of text from source language into target language
3. Production of target-language text

When it comes to the usefulness of subject-matter information, this three-stage division makes sense – as I see it – in that it underlines the problem-solving function of this type of lexicographic data from a specialised translator’s point of view.

Firstly, it is important for the translator to feel secure about the overall meaning of the source text as from stage one. Here, relevant information on conceptual or factual issues might contribute to adding bricks to the domain specific schemata along the translation process. Secondly, knowledge of the cognitive surroundings of the SL term can assist the translator in choosing the right equivalent in stage 2. And finally, subject-matter knowledge can contribute to a final make-over of the target text, i.e. a general refinement of the text in stage 3. An aspect which has been underestimated when legitimating stage 3 in this model is that the bricks added to the translator’s domain specific schemata will permit him to capture the gist of the message and thereby enable him to avoid a word-by-word transfer and set him free to make the paradigmatic stylistic choices which are necessary to produce an idiomatic target text.

The following example shows the set of data, i.e. lemma, grammar, definition/explanatory note, equivalent and collocations, selected in the English-Danish version of a bilingual Accounting Dictionary, which is based on the Theory of Lexicographic Functions.
group noun <a; -, -s>

Definition
A group consists of a parent company and its subsidiaries, i.e. one or more legal entities under common control

koncern noun <en; -en, -er, -erne>

Collocations
a group comprising a parent and all of its subsidiaries
en koncern, der omfatter en modervirksomhed og alle dennes dattervirksomheder
a group containing individual entities with different functional currencies
en koncern omfattende individuelle virksomheder med forskellige funktionelle valutaer
a group’s share in an associate
en koncerns andel i en associeret virksomhed

Excerpt from article in English-Danish Accounting Dictionary. (S. Nielsen & al. 2003-2007)

4. Principles for composition of subject-matter data for translators
In general, definitions or explanatory notes, if any, in LSP dictionary articles – whether it be monolingual or bilingual – show great variations as to form and content. However, different structural elements both within and outside lexicography can, especially if they are combined, provide the lexicographer with tools to get closer to a consistent selection and structuring of this cognitive segment of the dictionary articles.

4.1. Metalexicographic framework
The form and content of the subject-matter information to be included in an LSP dictionary is briefly commented upon in the Manual of Specialised Lexicography of 1995 (Bergenholtz/Tarp 1995: 145-146), where it is emphasised that

the relevant data should always be prepared with the intended user in mind in terms of both content and scope as well as of style. Thus, the expert’s requirements for scientifically precise definitions differ from those of the layman, who on the other hand requires information which to the expert may seem trivial or even superfluous.

(Emphasis added)

and that, if designed for both user types, the formulation of this segment of the dictionary article could be quite a

tightrope walking between the experts’ demand for scientific precision for instance on word level, and a popular layman version that could undermine the scientific content.

(Emphasis added)

The polarity outlined here constitutes a parallel to the observations of Bhatia, who describes the conflict between the legal claim for “precision, clarity and unambiguity and all-inclusiveness” and the position of the non-specialist, who considers it “linguistic nonsense that is pompous, verbose, flabby, and circumlocutory” and “a mere ploy to promote solidarity between members of the specialist community and to keep specialists at a respectable distance” (Bhatia 1993: 102).

For the LSP lexicographer designing dictionaries for translators, the agenda should be to shorten this distance. In the following, I shall describe some of the devices from outside the LSP metalexicography which I find useful.
4.2. Concrete suggestions

In his Handbook of Lexicography, Bo Svensén exposes some operational guidelines to the selection of form and content of what he calls ‘extended definitions’. The focus of Svensén is LGP dictionaries, which nevertheless allow for the integration of some relevant LSP terms. Considering the audience of the LGP dictionaries, in order to make the move from definitions proper to explanations for non-experts, Svensén has a number of suggestions. The following is a synthesis of his recommendations (Svensén 2004: 277-302), or rather of what I find could be relevant recommendations for LSP dictionaries as well, if the function of the specific dictionaries is to assist audiences at a non-expert level:

- adaption of content normally can be done by omitting non-prototypical characteristics
- implicit expert assumptions should be made explicit
- adaption of form can be done by replacing LSP terms by LGP words

Following the recommendations of Svensén, the adaption of the definition to a non-expert version could involve the following manoeuvres:

- exhaustive /+ prototypical features > contractions
- expert presuppositions > additions
- jargon/+ LGP terms > stylistic changes

As to the contractions and stylistic changes, there seems to be a limited scope of interventions. Making the expert presuppositions explicit, for instance by adding encyclopedic data, is where the lexicographer has at his disposal a wide range of options. In order to structure the selection of data, I find Temmerman’s templates discussed in section 3.1. very valuable. By inspiration from van Leeuwen’s typology of verbal linking, these templates can be made even more specific, as I shall show in the following section.

4.3. Types of addition

Van Leeuwen’s linking system actually refers to the linking between different modes. However, I also find it operational for the description of the linking between different genres, which is what this discussion of definition vs. explanation might really be about. Van Leeuwen classifies the information linking according to whether for instance the original fragment (be it a text or an image) is elaborated (e.g. specified or explained/paraphrased) or extended (e.g. complemented, compared or contrasted) by the additional information (van Leeuwen 2005: 230).

This typology of linking might be useful when walking the tightrope between scientific definitions and explanations to non-experts. Combined with the Temmerman templates, it should be possible to detail the different types of additional elements designed for different types of ‘units of understanding’ according to the domain, the user type and the function of a dictionary designed for translators.

In the following, I shall turn to the subfield of accounting. I have tentatively categorised the relations, activities and entities of the accounting schema into company structures, processes, results, accounting items, ratios and norms. I have approached the bilingual Accounting Dictionary of Nielsen et al. from this angle in order to see which types of elaborations or extensions, if any, are represented in the field of definition or explanatory note of this dictionary.

The extract of articles that I selected from this dictionary shows the following details:
As it appears in figure 2, in the ‘company structure’ category, two of the concepts studied (concepts no 1 and 3) highlight the typical instances. The remaining concepts in this category (concepts no 2 and 4) have the all-inclusive definition found in the Danish Financial Statements Act without any elaborations or extensions. In the ‘process’ category, two of the terms (concepts no 5 and 7) have a reformulated or paraphrased explanation while the third concept (concept no 6) has a technical definition without any elaboration or extension. In the ‘result’ category, one concept (no 8) has an extension of an encyclopaedic nature, while one (no 9) has a legal definition from the Danish Financial Statements Act without any elaboration or extension. I shall come back to the wording of these definitions in section 5. The rest of the concepts are provided with elaborations in terms of examples (concepts no 11 and 13), or extensions in the form of historical data (concept no 14) or antonyms (concepts no 10 and 12).

5. Case study on trainees’ response to the explanatory notes in the bilingual Accounting Dictionary

In order to get an impression of the user friendliness of some of the definitions/explanatory notes in the above dictionary, I have tested a number of explanatory notes of the bilingual Accounting Dictionary (Nielsen et al.) on two groups of students of
5 and 4 members, respectively. The survey was conducted by means of 1) questionnaires concerning specific entries, and 2) follow-up interviews.

The test was based on the following questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TERM</th>
<th>Explanatory note OK?</th>
<th>Need more information?</th>
<th>Unnecessary information</th>
<th>Language OK?</th>
<th>Comments, please</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koncern [group]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modervirksomhed [parent company]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ difficult language – strange formulation – complicated jargon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bestemmende indflydelse [control]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betydelig indflydelse [significant influence]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ unclear formulation – last part meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konsolidering [consolidation]</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equity metode [equity method]</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ illegible – makes no sense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udbytte [dividend]</td>
<td>result</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indtjening [earnings]</td>
<td>result</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ jargon unintelligible examples help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Questionnaire for term test

The result of the survey was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>koncern [group]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modervirksomhed [parent company]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ difficult language – strange formulation – complicated jargon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bestemmende indflydelse [control]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>betydelig indflydelse [significant influence]</td>
<td>company structure</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ unclear formulation – last part meaningless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>konsolidering [consolidation]</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equity metode [equity method]</td>
<td>process</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ illegible – makes no sense</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>udbytte [dividend]</td>
<td>result</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>indtjening [earnings]</td>
<td>result</td>
<td>⭐⭐⭐⭐⭐ jargon unintelligible examples help</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Term test of Bilingual Accounting Dictionary. ☺ = number of satisfied students; ☹ number of dissatisfied students

5.1. Extracts from the case study

I shall look at a representative extract of these entries and try to identify what made the explanatory note good or less good. In the examples 4, 5, 6 and 7, I shall contrast pairs of affine terms and show the specific scores and the definitions or explanatory notes addressed to each of them.
4) koncern [group] vs. modervirksomhed [parent company]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. koncern [group]</th>
<th>company structure</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En modervirksomhed udgør sammen med alle sine dattervirksomheder en koncern. En typisk koncern udgøres af to eller flere juridisk selvstændige virksomheder, som er underkastet en central ledelse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[A parent company and all the subsidiaries constitute a group. A typical group consists of two or more legal entities under common control] (My translation of Danish version). (Emphasis added).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. modervirksomhed [parent company]</th>
<th>company structure</th>
<th>difficult language – strange formulation – complicated jargon odd example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>En modervirksomhed er en virksomhed, som (1) besidder flertallet af stemmerettighederne i en anden virksomhed, (2) er virksomhedsdeltager og har ret til at udnævne eller afsætte et flertal af medlemmerne i den anden virksomheds øverste ledelsesorgan, (3) er virksomhedsdeltager og har ret til at udføre en bestemmende indflydelse over en anden virksomheds driftsmæssige og finansielle ledelse på grundlag af vedtaget eller aftale med denne, (4) er virksomhedsdeltager og på grundlag af aftale med andre deltagerer råder over flertallet af stemmerettighederne i en anden virksomhed eller (5) besidder kapitalandele i en anden virksomhed og udøver en bestemmende indflydelse over dennes driftsmæssige og finansielle ledelse.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[A parent is an enterprise that (1) has majority ownership of the voting rights in another enterprise, (2) is an owner and has the right to appoint or remove a majority of the members of the senior management body of the other enterprise, (3) is an owner and has the right to control another enterprise in making operating and financial decisions in accordance with articles of association or an agreement with that enterprise, (4) is an owner and, under an agreement with other owners holds the majority of the voting rights in another enterprise, or (5) holds equity investments in another enterprise and controls that enterprise in making operating and financial decision.] (Original English version of dictionary article on parent company – identical to Danish version).

If we compare the two articles in example (4), it is obvious that the first explanatory note presents prototypical features while the second one is an example of the all-inclusiveness of the legal definition from the Danish Financial Statements Act, which makes the students characterise it as ‘difficult’, ‘strange’ and ‘complicated’.
The two articles in example (5) again illustrate the prototypical solution addressed to the head word *control* versus the all-inclusiveness of the legal definition of the Danish Financial Statements Act in the *significant influence*-article. Being sister concepts, the two definitions could have been built up according to the same template. Here, the elements ‘*in case of equity investments*’ and ‘*unless it can be demonstrated that significant influence*’ denote the precision of a legal definition, which, however, together with the jargon-use of ‘*party*’ instead of ‘*company*’ makes the students lose orientation and characterize the wording as ‘*unclear*’ and ‘*meaningless*’.
5. konsolidering [consolidation] process good

Konsolidering er et sammendrag af alle koncernselskabernes regnskaber til ét regnskab, der giver et samlet økonomisk billede af koncernen som en økonomisk enhed.

Consolidation is an aggregation of the financial statements of all the group enterprises into one financial statement, which gives a complete economic view of the group as an economic entity. (My translation of Danish version).

6. equity metode [equity method] process

Equitymetoden er den værdiansættelses- og indtægtsførelsesmetode, der anvendes som én-linjes-konsolideringsmetode i en overvirksomheds regnskab på kapitalandele i en undervirksomhed.

The equity method is a method of valuation and recognition applied as a one line consolidation method in the financial statements of a superordinate company to equity investments in a subordinate company. (My translation of the Danish version). (Emphasis added).

In (6), we have an example of a mother and daughter concept, which again could have lead to identical templates. However, in the first case, the lexicographer has chosen a paraphrased solution extended by an indication of the aim of the process addressed. In the latter case the explanatory note is a technical description containing jargons ('superordinate' in stead of 'parent company', etc.) and expert presuppositions like the expression 'apply as a one line consolidation method', and the presupposed connection between 'valuation and recognition' and 'consolidation'. All this makes the students characterize the latter as 'illegible' and 'making no sense'.

7. udbytte [dividend] vs. indtjening [earnings]


Dividend is the annual distribution of the company’s profits to shareholders. The amount of dividend is determined at the annual general meeting of the enterprise. The return that a shareholder receives on his investment consists of dividends and capital gains, if any. (My translation of the Danish version). (Emphasis added).

Indtjening forstås i regnskabsmæssig sammenhæng som generering af nettobetalinger via driften, hvor der skelnes mellem ordinær og ekstraordinær indtjening.

For accounting purposes, earnings mean generation of net payments from operations; earnings may arise from ordinary or extraordinary operations. (Original version from English/English part of dictionary formally almost identical to the Danish version). (Emphasis added).
Again the difference between the rating of the two articles is related to the jargon-free explanation versus the technical jargons of the explanatory notes. Furthermore, the two above explanatory notes both have extensions in the form of indications of the origin of the flow of amounts in question. However, in the latter case of *earnings*, this makes no sense because of the technical jargon in the first sequence of the explanation. Another aspect of the low rating of this article is that *earnings* was one of the few accounting terms the students thought they knew, and the peculiar formulation of the explanatory note made them reject it as being useful.

To sum up, what differentiates a bad rating from a good one – according to the students – is often referred to as ‘difficult language’, ‘unclear’ or ‘bungled formulations’, which, in parentheses, discursively comes close to the formulations used by Bhatia when describing the non-expert’s feeling of distance when he meets with the linguistic devices of the expert (cf. Section 4.1). These negative comments made by the translation students in the questionnaire relate to the type of explanatory notes that consist of definitions from the Danish Financial Statements Act or technical descriptions aimed at experts. Stylistically, the explanatory notes in question are marked by technical jargons. The good ratings are given to those explanatory notes that contain prototypical characteristics, at least for some of the categories, or which are paraphrased, a feature that might be especially relevant for the process category. Extensions seem to be welcomed but only in case the original definition has been elaborated, in order to meet the non-expert level of the users.

6. Conclusion
In a translation dictionary focusing on the users’ need and their shortcomings of subject-matter knowledge, explanatory notes should meet the users’ cognitive level and go on from there to bridge the knowledge gap. It seems to be possible to outline criteria for modifying original definitions or technical descriptions made for experts by means of concrete rules for changing form and content. The two most important steps should be to replace the jargons and to leave-out non-prototypical characteristics of the original definition or technical description. Furthermore, the combination of Temmerman’s ‘modules of information’ and van Leeuwen’s categorisation of ‘elaborations’ and ‘extensions’ provides an operational tool for analysis of the content of existing explanatory notes and for structuring the ideas of including subject-matter information in future LSP dictionaries. Templates of information mirroring the specific nature of the concepts to be described, on the one hand might allow for different kinds of elaborations, i.e. redundant elements like examples or explanations or paraphrases, and, on the other, extensions, e.g. causal relationships or encyclopaedic information.

As to the templates of information, there is ample research to be done in order to establish the relation between types or categories of relations, entities and activities and the relevant ‘modules of information’. Further empirical tests may reveal to what extent potential users appreciate specific types of elaborations and extensions in order to capture the meaning of a concept.
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