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ABSTRACT
Overall, the search for translation equivalents is a highly difficult, time-consuming task within intercultural legal communication. It is directly linked to legal systems, with their own lexicon and meaning. In this paper, we try to display and argue how legal translators may also resort to a specific semantic relation, such as hypernymy, as an innovation to find a wider lexical equivalent. To reach our aim, we will select a list of 18 (British and North American) legal terms featured by their Spanish translation difficulty -parting from our UAM University legal translation trainees’ renderings (within an Innovative Teaching Project)- and by their allocation to court judgements. These terms will be searched (and contrasted) by using a two-headed methodology, checking both print and online dictionaries, and we will then provide one (or more) hypernym for each of them. The main findings of our study unveil how helpful hypernyms are in providing innovative translation alternatives beyond traditional translation techniques.
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INTRODUCTION
In order to render professional legal translations, translators may make full use of legal dictionaries and glossaries, legal encyclopaedias, thesauri, terminology databases, legislative codes, parallel documents, discussion forums, translation memories, experts’ consultations, etc. Undeniably, several (context-driven) translation alternatives may apply. But what happens when a term lacking an equivalent in a target language is mistranslated in several dictionaries?

Within this paper, the significance of the research underlines in providing an answer to the following research question: Is hypernymy an affordable technique within (English-Spanish) legal translation? In order to proceed to answer this question, a list of 18 (British and North American) lexical items featured by their Spanish translation difficulty was coined -parting from our UAM University legal translation trainees’ renderings- and researched so as to prove how helpful and innovative hypernyms can be when dealing with legal translation alternatives.

The genuine and unpublished results presented herein are linked to an Innovative Teaching Project granted by UAM University (‘INNOVAtio Translationis: Science and Law’, Code FYL_001.18_IMP), coordinated by the author of this article. The main aim of the Project was to gather a significant set of translation materials directly linked to legal translation trainees’ prospective skills and competencies for their professional future- by means of several Specialised Translation subjects (in this paper, we will focus on a specific Legal Translation genre: court judgements).

Considering the fact that court judgements present a significant amount of difficult legal terminology, we decided to manually extract our items from a corpus consisting of 20 documents, as shown below:
-10 US court judgements
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10 UK court judgements.

With a view to search for parallel documentation lexis, we also gathered a set of 10 documents from the same genre: Spanish court judgements.

For this research paper, we looked for their definition and (English-Spanish) translation in a monolingual dictionary and in two bilingual dictionaries. All of them were carefully selected since they are renowned in the field of Legal Translation. Additionally, we decided to include the results offered by Google Translate and DeepL, aimed at adding a machine translation perspective.

Before going into our research corpus and methodology, and since this paper is related to legal translation and hypernymy, we will briefly address the most relevant matters of both topics, starting with hypernymy.

Well known is the fact that, as stated by Encyclopaedia Britannica (online version)\(^1\), ‘Among the many examples of investigation for study within semantics are the sense relations between words.’ In this regard, Lyons clarified that ‘all sense relations are in principle context–dependent’ (1971: 452). Indeed, lexical units are researched for their relations with the system of language, whether it be syntagmatic relationships (inflections and degrees of delicacy) or semantic ones (synonymy, hypernymy, homonymy, antonymy, etc.). Let us then display the definition of the term hypernymy by following several lexicographical references.

Collins Dictionary (website\(^2\)) defines hypernymy in grammar as ‘the semantic association of being part of a higher class’. In the same vein, Cambridge Dictionary (online\(^3\)) provides us with the following data for hypernym, ‘a word whose meaning includes a group of other words.’ Accordingly, The Free Dictionary Thesaurus (url) exemplifies the term (‘the semantic relation of being superordinate or belonging to a higher rank or class’) in relation to superordination and semantic relations. As is depicted in the following chart\(^4\):

![Figure 1: Hypernymy Semantic Relations](image)

Flow chart with two-line segments describing the semantic relations entailed within ‘hypernymy’.

As stated by The Fine Dictionary (online version)\(^5\), hypernymy (or superordination) is ‘the semantic relation of being superordinate or belonging to a higher rank or class’. From our point of view, the semantic relation of hypernymy might be applicable to both

---

\(^3\) [https://dictionary.cambridge.org/es/diccionario/ingles/hypernym](https://dictionary.cambridge.org/es/diccionario/ingles/hypernym)
\(^4\) [https://www.freethesaurus.com/hypernymy](https://www.freethesaurus.com/hypernymy)
general translation and specialized translation (and that is the case of legal texts’ translation, where a significant amount of specialized terminology is encountered by professional translators).

As quoted by Austermühl (2001: 102), the research conducted by Arntz and Picht (1995) estimates that, in general, terminology mining takes up to 75 per cent of specialized translation time. This situation becomes even more complex when dealing with legal translation, frequently bound to far from negligible domestic legal systems.

In every single case, legal documentation arises from legal systems entailed by five legal families: Common Law, Civil Law, Customary Law, Religious Legal Systems (Jewish Law, Muslim Law), and Mixed Law⁶, and each of these has its own group of domestic terminology, with some lack of equivalence into many languages. Globally, one of the main difficulties arises from the fact that Spanish legal texts come from a Civil Law system, whereas English legal texts belong to Common Law.

As a result of independent systems of law, equivalence is a problem relevantly linked to legal translation. Indeed, one of the most significant challenges in legal translation is linked to the search for terminological and conceptual equivalents, mainly due to the lack of equivalents in other legal systems (and in the cultures possessing that diverse legal system). That problem may result in a mistranslated rendering.

When dealing with legal English, we may encounter highly specific courtroom concepts without an exact equivalent in another language lexicalized as ‘solicitor’, ‘Sheriff Court’, ‘magistrates’, to quote only a few examples of legal language highly frequently used in courtroom settings (as can be identified in our corpus of 20 court judgements⁷). As a result of their specificity and complexity, the translation of these items into Spanish frequently becomes a troublesome issue for translators.

2. Literature Review

In this section, the most significant literature resources that contributed to the research will be quoted and explained. The issue of legal translation as a cultural, legal transfer - and its translation difficulties- has been researched by many scholars. In this regard, Chromá (2004: 4) has underlined the problem of external polysemy of legal vocabulary, which may carry both a technical and non-technical meaning, which ‘[…] contributes to the incorrect choice of terminological equivalents’. On the other hand, additional cases of (domain-internal) polysemy may be encountered in legal contexts. Indeed, ‘case’ may make reference to a trial case, a police case or Case Law. The meaning of ‘sheriff’ is different in the US (the county/city official responsible for enforcing the applicable law) as compared to the UK (in Scotland, the Sheriff Court is chaired by a sheriff, similar to a magistrate in the rest of the UK), ‘section’ could mean the section of an act or the section of a court, to name only a few.

Although we feel that hyponym can be a ‘solution’ (as a relevant translation technique) to a significant number of legal translation concepts, globally, there has been a restricted number of contributions by scholars researching in a near or similar field. Accordingly, let us quote the most relevant ones in the last decades considering this research, presented in chronological order.

The works of Basili et al. (1996) provided a general-purpose corpus-based lexical taxonomy for verb classification. Indeed, as stated by Alcaraz and Hughes (2002: 153), legal discourse translation wrestles ‘[…] the original terms and syntax into a shape acceptable to users of the target language’. The works of Cruz (2002) applied a lexicon-semantic analysis to criminal procedure language and discourse.

Additionally, Chiesa (2006) identified the problems with legal dictionaries since they do not always provide the readers with the data required for valuing the location of a term within a lexical universe. ISSA’s report (2010) investigated the argumentative potential of reports within the frame of pragma-dialectics. A study by Segura (2010) applied Semiotics (or Semiotic Studies) in order to research Law and its discursive nature.

The works of Kolesnikova and Gelbukh (2011) have shown how data sets should be constructed, retrieving all hyponyms and hypernyms of both verbs and nouns, thus helping in the construction of collocations in Spanish and English language. Another study by Macías (2013) depicted how legal binomials and trinomials can be identified and translated into another language by means of Terminology and semantic relations. Szemińska (2014) assured that one dictionary is not enough when dealing with legal translation. To her, dictionaries should also include various categories of information (definitions, references to legal sources, synonyms, hypo- and hyponyms, and so forth). A study by Bestué and Orozco (2015) dived into the translation of ‘End-User

⁶https://guides.law.sc.edu/c.php?g=315476&p=2108388#:~:text=A%20Quick%20Primer%20on%20the,in%20the%20Roman%20legal%20traditio

⁷Additionally, these items can also be used in court orders, lawyers’ briefs, trial reports, criminal records, etc.
License Agreements’ from English into Spanish, discussing how several translation tools are required. Lorente (2015) dealt with information retrieval, especially the one related to ontology within the field of economics.

The works of Zuliarso et al. (2015) encompassed the construction of a cross-lingual legal (Indonesian-English) ontology. Macías (2016) examined the problems of legal translation from a linguistic point of view, putting forward some strategies to help and solve the particular features of legal texts. A study by Chuyeshkova (2018) discussed ‘hyperhyponymy’ in the gender of linguistics terminology. Another study by Dobrić (2018) questioned to what extent deletions are allowed for the translation of multinominal expressions by using English-Croatian contract samples. The works of Trklja (2018) proposed new empirical methods both for the study of legal discourse and for the semantic profile of lexical items. A study by Gulyamova (2019b) discussed how a legal-thesaurus factor helps ensure terms of mono-semticity.

Kalejaiye et al. (2019) recently researched the intricacies and ambiguities of courtroom cases’ language and lexis. The paper which is closest to our study was published by Gulyamova (2019a), who has identified lexemes and their main lexical units of jurisprudence, their interrelationships, and ‘hyponimas’. To this scholar, ‘In legal terminology, synonyms of two or more terms are used to express the same concept. This situation complicates the process of information exchange.’ (p. 174). When dealing with sense relations, legal discourse and its translation can make use of ‘synonymy’ (as stated by Matulewska in 2016) and ‘polysemy’ (research conducted by Chromá in 2004); being both relations later researched by Chromá in 2011. ‘Polysemy’ and ‘homonymy’ were simultaneously investigated by Grzybek in 2009.

As we have seen, this issue is prevailing within current research contributions. Nevertheless, the focus on a representation of hypernymy in English-Spanish translation of -both UK and US- lexical items seems unresearched so far. Once we have reviewed the relevant literature in the field, we perceive the need for research on legal translation concepts by using hypernymy as a translation technique. Let us now move to the materials and methods shaping our study.

3. Methodology
In order to provide a representative lexical selection encompassing a diverse series of Areas of Law, we decided to manually collect 18 lexical items (some are British English and others American English) from a legal corpus, as shown below:

-10 UK court judgements
-10 US court judgements. The research procedures and steps followed will be detailed below.

With a view to search for parallel documentation lexis, we gathered a set of 10 documents from the same text genre: court judgements issued in Spain.

Accordingly, UK judgements provided us with British English lexical items, whereas US judgements provided us with American English lexical items.

The main reason behind this corpus selection; -parting from our UAM University legal translation trainees’ renderings-, all of them represent a translation challenge for both translation trainees and even professional translators, as displayed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Corpus of 18 Lexical Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-court (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-offence (UK and US ‘offense’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-misdemeanor (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-felony (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-crime (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-registrar (UK and US ‘register’)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-barrister (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-attorney (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-claimant (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-pursuer (UK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-applicant (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-complainant (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-superintendent registrar (UK)</th>
<th>-appellant (UK and US)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-clerk (UK and US)</td>
<td>-defender (US)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-solicitor (UK)</td>
<td>-defendant (UK and US)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A two-column table displays the 18 researched items, supplementing their British (UK) or North American (US) sources.

Subsequently, we looked for their definition and (English-Spanish) translation in a monolingual dictionary and in two bilingual dictionaries; all of them were carefully selected due to the fact that they are renowned in the field of Legal Translation:

- *Black’s Law Dictionary* (Online Version) [thelawdictionary.org]
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos* (Inglés-Español).
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales* (Inglés-Español/Español-Inglés).

Additionally, in order to add a machine translation perspective to our paper, we thought it would be interesting to see how *DeepL* [https://www.deepl.com/translator] and *Google Translate* [https://translate.google.es/] deal with these terms, which do not have an exact equivalent in the target language.

Subsequently, the relevant hypernyms in the Spanish language were suggested. The hypernym list hereby provided was built as a combination of the solutions offered by the above-mentioned dictionaries, the consultation of parallel documents (10 Spanish court judgements), and our own professional experience as sworn and legal translators-interpreters. Let us now summarize how each item will be displayed (with a sample entry).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Sample Item Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A single-column table displays a sample item lexicographical search. Since we used the print edition of the last two dictionaries, the quoted definition pages were also included. When no entry was found in a particular dictionary, we added the following: [Item not defined]. After selecting the relevant lexicographical references, we will now show the results of our investigation.

4. Results
As mentioned above, our main aim is to provide an answer to the following research question: Is hypernymy an affordable technique within (English-Spanish) legal translation? In order to answer the aforementioned question, let us now present the search results in all the lexicographical references consulted (both paperback and online) with each item’s definitions, explanations, and translations into the Spanish language.

1) Court
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘In a wide sense, any duly constituted tribunal is administering the laws of the state or nation; in a narrower sense, a court proceeding according to the course of the common law and governed by its rules and principles.’
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos*: ‘Tribunal de justicia, órgano jurisdiccional, sala, juzgado, corte, audiencia.’ (p. 175)
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: ‘Tribunal, juzgado, corte, parlamento, cortes, callejón, plazuela.’ (p. 87)
- *DeepL*: ‘Tribunal.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Tribunal, corte, cancha, juzgado, patio, juego.’

Accordingly, we would suggest ‘órgano de justicia’, ‘tribunal de justicia’, and ‘instancia judicial’.

2) Offence (Also ‘Offense’ in US English)
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘A crime or misdemeanor; a breach of the criminal laws. It is used as a genus, comprehending every crime and misdemeanor, or as a species, signifying a crime not indictable, but punishable summarily or by the forfeiture of a penalty.’
Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Delito, violación, acto punible, ofensa.’ (p. 404)
Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Infracción, delito, acto punible, ilícito, ofensa, violación.’ (p. 233)
-DeepL: ‘Delito, infracción.’
-Google Translate: ‘Ofensa, delito, crimen, transgresión, pecado.’

As hypernyms, we would use ‘hecho delictivo’, ‘acto sancionable’, and ‘acto punible’ (for more severe offences).

3) Misdemeanour (Also ‘Misdemeanor’ in US English)
-Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘In criminal law. A general name for criminal offenses of every sort, punishable by indictment or special proceedings, which do not exist in law amount to the grade of felony. A misdemeanor is an act committed or omitted in violation of a public law either forbidding or commanding it.’
-Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Falta, delito menor, contravención, infracción penal, desafuero, conducta criminal.’ (p. 380)
-Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘En el derecho anglosajón es un delito menor, contravención o falta que generalmente conlleva multa o prisión por menos de un año.’ (p. 211)
-DeepL: ‘Delito, delitos menores.’
-Google Translate: ‘Delito, falsa, delito de menor cuantía, ofensa.’

As hypernyms we would make use of ‘hecho delictivo’, ‘acto sancionable’, and ‘acto punible’. We could then add ‘leve’ to any of the translations suggested.

4) Felony
-Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘This term meant originally the state of having forfeited lands and goods to the crown upon conviction for certain offenses, and then, by transition, any offense upon conviction for which such forfeiture followed, in addition to any other punishment prescribed by law.’
-Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘US. Felonía, crimen, delito mayor o grave.’ (p. 267)
-Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Crimen o delito grave.’ (p. 135)
-DeepL: ‘Delito.’
-Google Translate: ‘Delito, crimen.’

Again, one could make full use of ‘hecho delictivo’, ‘acto sancionable’, and ‘acto punible’. We could then add ‘grave’ to the selected translation.

5) Crime
-Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘A crime is an act committed or omitted, in violation of a public law, either forbidding or commanding it; a breach or violation of some public right or duty due to a whole community, considered as a community.’
-Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Delito.’ (p. 179)
-Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Crimen, delito, violación de la ley penal.’ (p. 89)
-DeepL: ‘Delito.’
-Google Translate: ‘Crimen, delito, malhecho.’

Again, one could make full use of ‘hecho delictivo’, ‘acto sancionable’, and ‘acto punible’. If necessary, we could then add ‘muy grave’ to the selected translation.

6) Registrar (Also ‘Register’ in the US)
-Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘An officer who has the custody or keeping of a registry or register.’
-Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Registrador, secretario o registrador judicial, juez auxiliar.’ (p. 479)
-Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: [Item not defined]
-DeepL: ‘Registro’
-Google Translate: ‘Registradora, registrador’

In this case, ‘Funcionario judicial’ would be our Spanish translation by means of a hypernym.

7) Superintendent Registrar
-Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘An officer who superintends the registers of births, deaths, and marriages.’
-Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: [Item not defined]
-Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: [Item not defined]
-DeepL: ‘Secretario general.’
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- Google Translate: ‘Registrador/-a del Superintendente.’

Again, ‘funcionario judicial’ could be the Spanish equivalent hypernym.

8) Clerk (Also ‘Clerk of the Court’ or ‘Court Clerk’)
- Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘An officer of a court of justice who has charge of the clerical part of its business, who keeps its records and seal, issues process, enters judgments and orders, gives certified copies from the records, etc.’
- Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Oficial del juzgado, secretario de un tribunal, escribano, actuario.’ (p. 134)
- Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Secretario, oficinista, auxiliar administrativo, secretario de un juzgado, clérigo.’ (p. 68)
- DeepL: ‘Secretario.’
- Google Translate: ‘Empleada, empleado, secretario, oficinista, funcionario, escribiente.’

For this particular case, our hypernym suggestion would be ‘funcionario judicial’.

9) Solicitor
- Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘A legal practitioner in the court of chancery. The words ‘solicitor’ and ‘attorney’ are commonly used indiscriminately, although they are not precisely the same, an attorney being a practitioner in the courts of common law, a solicitor a practitioner in the courts of eq[uity].’
- Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Abogado, procurador, abogado-procurador. Los abogados en ejercicio en Inglaterra y Gales son Barristers o Solicitors, y en Escocia Advocates y Solicitors’ (p. 523)
- Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Abogado. Procurador. En Inglaterra es el profesional que se encarga de preparar los expedientes, de tratar directamente con los clientes y que solo puede ejercer ante tribunales inferiores.’ (p. 305)
- DeepL: ‘Abogado.’
- Google Translate: ‘Abogado/-a, notario, procurador, representante.’

In this case, both ‘letrado’, and ‘representante’ could work as hypernyms (depending on the context).

10) Barrister (Also ‘Barrister-at-law’)
- Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘An advocate; one who has been called to the bar. A counsellor learned in the law who pleads at the bar of the courts and who is engaged in conducting the trial or argument of causes.’
- Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Abogado que actúa ante los Tribunales.’ (p. 80)
- Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘En Inglaterra, el abogado que expone ante los tribunales de justicia’ (p. 44)
- DeepL: ‘Abogado.’
- Google Translate: ‘Abogada/-o.’

Again, ‘letrado’ and ‘representante’ could work as hypernyms (depending on the context). If needed, we could add ‘en tribunales superiores’ to our Spanish translation.

11) Attorney (Also ‘Attorney-in-fact’)
- Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘In the most general sense, this term denotes an agent or substitute, or one who is appointed and authorized to act in the place or stead of another.’
- Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Abogado, procurador.’ (p. 65)
- Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Apoderado, abogado, representante. Es un abogado con suficientes conocimientos legales y habilitación, que aconseja y representa a los clientes ante los tribunales de justicia.’ (p. 37)
- DeepL: ‘Abogado.’
- Google Translate: ‘Abogado, procurador, apoderado, mandatario.’

Translators may opt for either ‘letrado’ or ‘representante’ as hypernyms (considering the context).

12) Claimant
- Black’s Law Dictionary: ‘In admiralty practice. The name given to a person who lays claim to property seized on a libel in rem and who is authorized and admitted to defend the action.’
- Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos: ‘Demandante, actor, litigante, derechohabiente, reclamante. Desde la reforma procesal civil de 1998 se utiliza en Inglaterra y Gales este término en vez de Plaintiff.’ (p. 132)
- Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales: ‘Reclamante o demandante, el que ejerce o plantea alguna acción o reclamación frente a otro.’ (p. 67)
- DeepL: ‘Demandante.’
On this occasion, three hypernyms would interact: ‘parte actora’, ‘actor’, and ‘litigante’.

13) Pursuer
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘The name by which the complainant or plaintiff is known in the ecclesiastical courts, and in the Scotch law.’
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos*: ‘Demandante, equivalente al Plaintiff del derecho inglés.’ (p. 462)
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: ‘Perseguidor/a.’ (p. 266)
- *DeepL*: ‘Perseguidor.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Perseguidor/-a, demandante.’

‘Parte actora’, ‘actor’, and ‘litigante’ could be the hypernyms available.

14) Applicant
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘This term applies to a person who files a petition or makes an application; the petitioner; or the person who is applying for a legal remedy to a problem.’
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos*: ‘Demandante, aspirante, solicitante, recurrente.’ (p. 53)
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: ‘Recorrente, apelante, solicitante.’ (p. 30)
- *DeepL*: ‘Solicitante.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Solicitante, demandante, candidato, aspirante.’

Again, ‘parte actora’, ‘actor’, and ‘litigante’ would be the hypernymy options.

15) Complainant
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘One who applies to the courts for legal redress; one who exhibits a bill of complaint.’
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos*: ‘Denunciante, demandante, acusador, querellante.’ (p. 150)
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: ‘Demandante, acusador, querellante.’ (p. 76)
- *DeepL*: ‘Denunciante.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Querellante, acusador.’

Once again, ‘parte actora’, ‘actor’, and ‘litigante’ could work as hypernyms.

16) Appellant
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘The party who takes an appeal from one court or jurisdiction to another.’
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos*: ‘Recurrente, apelante, se dice de quien solicita la revisión de una resolución de los jueces o de la Administración.’ (p. 52)
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: ‘Apelante. Recurrente, parte del proceso que interpone el recurso de apelación.’ (p. 30)
- *DeepL*: ‘Recurrente.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Apelante, demandante, querellante.’

Two options of hypernymy would be available: ‘(parte) reclamante’, ‘(parte) apelante’, and ‘(parte) recurrente’.

17) Defendant
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘The person defending or denying; the party against whom relief or recovery is sought in an action or suit.’
- *Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos*: ‘Demandado, parte demandada, parte querellada, reo, acusado, procesado, inculpado.’ (p. 196)
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: ‘Demandado, acusado.’ (p. 98)
- *DeepL*: ‘Acusado, demandado.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Acusado/-a, demandado, encausado, mandado.’

Accordingly, ‘Parte demandada’ (civil cases) or ‘parte querellada’ (criminal ones) could be the favoured hypernyms.

18) Defender
- *Black’s Law Dictionary*: ‘To deny; to defend; to conduct a suit for a defendant; to forbid; to prevent; to protect.’
- *Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales*: [Item not defined]
- *DeepL*: ‘Defensor, defender.’
- *Google Translate*: ‘Defensor/-a, protector.’
Again, ‘parte demandada’ and ‘parte querellada’ could transfer the idea of the source item. So far, we have been witnessing the fact that the most relevant publications in the field did not offer two-headed research (dealing with both online and paperback lexicographical references). Additionally, semantic relation - so far - has not been investigated as a translation technique per se. Nonetheless, after the research carried out, we would like to mention two authors:

- we agree with Szemińska (2014) has assured that one dictionary is not enough when dealing with legal translation
- the research which proved closest to our study was published by Gulyamova (2019a), who has identified lexemes and their main lexical units of jurisprudence, their interrelationships, and ‘hyponimas’. Let us now move to the interpretation of the results achieved.

5. Conclusion
At the beginning of this paper, we posed the main objective of our study: to what extent is hypernymy an affordable technique within (English-Spanish) legal translation? In order to proceed to answer this question, a list of 18 (British and North American) lexical items featured by their Spanish translation difficulty was coined and researched so as to prove how helpful hypernyms can be when dealing with legal translation alternatives. Let us now move to the most significant results from our print dictionaries. We will present these results displayed in conceptual groups.

- ‘Court’ appeared in all the dictionaries researched (both print and online ones). Nevertheless, the Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos was the only one to provide us with a hypernym: ‘Tribunal de Justicia’ (which allowed us to add ‘órgano de justicia’ and ‘instancia judicial’), whereas the remaining bilingual dictionaries did not offer a hypernym.

- ‘Offence’ was present in all the dictionaries. In this case, both the Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos and the Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales included a hypernym, ‘acto punible’. ‘Hecho delictivo’, and ‘acto sancionable’ were added by us. In the same vein, ‘Misdemeanour’ was included in all the dictionaries. Nevertheless, due to its conceptual complexity level, the Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales introduced a Spanish definition of the mere concept. Its complexity led to a lack of hypernyms in the dictionaries. Our hypernyms’ suggestion was ‘hecho delictivo (levé)’, ‘acto sancionable (levé)’, and ‘acto punible (levé)’. A similar issue happened with ‘Felony’, and ‘Crime’ appeared in all the dictionaries, either with a rather simple translation or with a paraphrasis (Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales). To this regard, our hypernyms suggestion was ‘hecho delictivo’, ‘acto sancionable’, and ‘acto punible’, either adding ‘grave’ (to ‘Felony’) or ‘muy grave’ (to ‘Crime”).

- ‘Registrar’ was found in all the dictionaries except for the Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales. Once again, those dictionaries did not mention any kind of hypernym. A worse issue happened with ‘Superintendent Registrar’, since print bilingual dictionaries ignored this entry, whereas the remaining ones did not provide with a hypernym, although ‘funcionario judicial’ could describe its professional tasks. Similarly, ‘Clerk’ was encountered in all the dictionaries. In this specific case, the set of print bilingual dictionaries resorted to paraphrases when offering its Spanish translation. Our suggestion was, again, ‘funcionario judicial’.

- ‘Solicitor’ is a complex term. All the dictionaries included this entry, some of them suggesting ‘abogado’ as its Spanish translation. We resorted to its high register equivalent (‘letrado’) and to ‘representante’. Equally, ‘Barrister’ is strongly linked to ‘Solicitor’. Its definition and translation were provided by all the dictionaries. Nevertheless, both print dictionaries resorted to an explanatory paraphrasis. Again, ‘letrado’ and ‘representante’ would be our suggested hypernyms, adding the fact that this person is acting in ‘tribunales superiores’. All the dictionaries included Attorney, although it was the Diccionario Bilingüe de Términos Legales, the one which provided the reader with a paraphrasis. Once again, ‘letrado’ and ‘representante’ would represent our chosen hypernyms.

- Moving to the person initiating a legal process, ‘Claimant’ and ‘Pursuer’ refer to the same concept. They appeared in all the dictionaries, although the Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos offered a paraphrasis for its Spanish definition. The problem with ‘demandante’ is that it refers to a ‘demanda’ (within a civil case), although the source item may also be found in criminal cases, so the hypernyms suggested would be ‘actor’, ‘parte actora’, and ‘litigante’, terms potentially employable in both civil and criminal cases. That is the same case for ‘Applicant’. In the same vein, ‘Complainant’ was explained and translated in all the dictionaries, although it cannot be only translated as ‘denunciante’ (the person who verbally commences a legal process) nor as ‘querellante’ (for criminal cases). Therefore, ‘actor’, ‘parte actora’, and ‘litigante’ would be the Spanish hypernyms available for all these terms.

- Let us move to the other part of the trial, the one who must defend himself/herself in a trial. ‘Defendant’ was found in all the dictionaries, whereas ‘Defender’ appeared in most of them. In this case, the Diccionario de Términos Jurídicos offered the two hypernyms (‘parte demandada’ for civil cases and ‘parte querellada’ for criminal ones) that, from our point of view, are most useful; nevertheless, no hypernym was provided for ‘Defender’. Translating them the way we have just quoted could also preserve the consistency with the translations of ‘Claimant’, ‘Pursuer’, ‘Applicant, and ‘Complainant’. 
Finally, the name of the person taking the appeal, 'Appellant', were gathered in all the dictionaries (providing both bilingual ones with a paraphrase). Once again, no hypernyms were suggested. Therefore, and in order to keep the consistency, we proposed '(parte) reclamante', '(parte) apelante', and '(parte) recurrente'.

Generally speaking, providing the target readership with individual hypernyms will offer an additional translation technique with a global meaning. Nevertheless, this is not the only option available. As shown above, several hypernyms ('hecho delictivo', 'acto sancionable', and 'acto punible') could also be modified by using an adjective (subject to the severity of the offense; 'leve', 'grave', or 'muy grave' for 'misdemeanour', 'felony' or 'crime', respectively). Simultaneously, some hypernyms could add an additional explanation on the courtroom settings ('representante/letrado' + 'de tribunales superiores' for 'barrister'). The consequence of specifying additional information (in the form of adjectives or prepositional phrases, for instance) is that the target readership will receive additional relevant information as compared to only reading a complex target term.

Alternatively, in other cases, our translation into Spanish could vary from one option ('parte demandada' (civil cases)/'parte querellada' (criminal ones) for 'defender' and 'defendant') to three alternatives ('(parte) reclamante/apelante/recurrente' for 'appellant'; 'parte actora', 'actor' or 'litigante' for 'claimant', 'pursuer', 'applicant' or 'complainant').

In some cases, a single hypernym could transfer the idea of both UK and US items; 'funcionario judicial' for the North American 'register', and the British 'registrar'; 'hecho delictivo', 'acto sancionable' and 'acto punible' for 'offence', 'misdemeanor' and 'felony'). Sometimes, a single concept may diverge within UK settings ('barrister' in England and Wales means 'advocate' in Scotland).

Simultaneously, (same spelling) English-language items were detected in both UK and US settings ('clerk', 'court', 'crime', 'defendant', 'appellant', 'applicant', 'complainant', 'claimant', and 'attorney').

Overall, each legal genre will demand its own set of specific translation strategies. Due to our professional experience, we know there will be more striking differences when comparing an English court judgement to a Spanish court judgement (with legal jargon such as 'solicitor', 'barrister', 'defendant', 'claimant', 'pursuer', 'court', etc.) than when contrasting an English police criminal record or even a birth certificate to a Spanish one (since all of them present a similar structure and a strictly limited amount of legal terminology).

Remarkably, while the monolingual dictionary mentioned always provided us with definitions (and even synonyms), bilingual dictionaries did not provide us with 100% of the lexical items researched. Therefore, translators must rely on alternative options. In our sample legal corpus of 18 items, hypernyms – without altering the source item meaning and without losing the information specific to the hyponym – proved to be reliable and useful as a translation option, even helpful in diverse contexts and settings, since the meaning was not either lost or enlarged.

On the other hand, when dealing with the two online dictionaries used (DeepL and Google Translate), the results changed noticeably. Although they offered a translation for the 18 items of our corpus, there was a general trend towards a literal (and even calqued) translation:

- 'Tribunal, corte' were the two main options for 'Court'.
- 'Ofensa, delito, infracción, crimen, transgresión' were provided for 'Offence'.
- 'Delito, falsa, ofensa' were suggested for 'Misdemeanour'; 'Delito, crimén' for 'Felony', and 'Crimen, delito, malhecho' for 'Crime'.
- 'Abogado' was the most frequent translation provided for 'Solicitor', 'Barrister', and 'Attorney'.
- 'Secretario, empleado, oficinista, funcionario, escribiente' were the translations for 'Clerk'.
- 'Demandante, solicitante' were offered for 'Claimant'.

This trend towards a Spanish calque also led to a mistranslation in several instances: 'Registro', 'Registrador/-a' are not the correct translations for 'Registrar'; 'Secretario general', and 'Registrador del Superintendente' (a translation nonsense) do not equal 'Superintendent Registrar'; 'Grabadora', 'Flautín', 'Contador', and 'Juez Municipal' do not correspond to 'Registrar'; 'Perseguidor' is not a proper translation for 'Pursuer'; 'Candidato' and 'Aspirante' do not reflect the source idea of 'Applicant'; 'Acusador' cannot be a reasonable translation for 'Complainant'; 'Mando' is not 'Defendant', 'Protector' cannot be equated with 'Defender', and 'Demandante' is not the meaning of 'Appellant'.

In order to synthesize our findings, we will display a table summarizing the results of our research, including our Spanish hypernyms. As mentioned before, the hypernym list herein provided was built as a combination of the solutions offered by the dictionaries, the consultation of parallel documents, and our own professional experience as sworn and legal translators-interpreters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source Item</th>
<th>Settings</th>
<th>Entry within Monolingual Dictionaries</th>
<th>Entry within Bilingual Dictionaries</th>
<th>Entry within Online Dictionaries</th>
<th>Suggested Hypernyms</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-Court/Court of law/Court of justice</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-órgano de justicia</td>
<td>tribunal de justicia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-instancia judicial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Offence</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-hecho delictivo</td>
<td>acto sancionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto sancionable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto punible (+ leve)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Misdemeanor</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-hecho delictivo</td>
<td>acto sancionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto sancionable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto punible (+ grave)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Felony</td>
<td>US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-hecho delictivo</td>
<td>acto sancionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto sancionable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto punible (+ muy grave)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Crime</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-hecho delictivo</td>
<td>acto sancionable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto sancionable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-acto punible (+ muy grave)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Registrar</td>
<td>UK [US: ‘Register’ ]</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in 1 dictionary</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-funcionario judicial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Superintendent registrar</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>No entries</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-funcionario judicial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Clerk/Clerk of Court/Court Clerk</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-letrado representante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Solicitor</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-letrado representante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+ en tribunales superiores)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Barrister/Barrister-at-law</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-letrado representante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(+ en tribunales superiores)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Attorney/Attorney-in-fact</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-letrado representante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Claimant [before ‘Plaintiff’]</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-parte actora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-litigante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Pursuer</td>
<td>UK (specially in Scotland)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-parte actora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-litigante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Applicant</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-parte actora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-litigante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Complainant</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-parte actora</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-litigante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Appellant</td>
<td>UK and US</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>Entry in both</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>-(parte) reclamante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-(parte) apelante</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-(parte) recurrente</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A six-column table displaying the items’ lexicographical results according to their settings, entries in monolingual dictionaries, entries in bilingual dictionaries, entries in online dictionaries, and suggested hypernyms in the Spanish language. We feel that the print dictionaries researched by ourselves provided us with more reliable (and less calqued) definitions and translations as compared to the online ones.

Taking the above into consideration, we feel we can give an answer to our research question: legal hypernyms should be regarded as an additional –an innovative– translation option and technique, retrievable by both trainee translators as well as by professional ones, especially with those terms that do not possess a translation equivalent into another language, even more, when dealing with Common Law–Civil Law documents’ translation in a context of legal translation, a complex form of translational action. Despite the fact that the literature on this field was highly limited, overall, this research paper presents a significant contribution since hypernymy so far was not regarded as a potential legal translation technique in the relevant literature –and it has proved highly useful.–

Indeed, in a prospective research paper, we would like to expand our corpus by adding additional entries to the corpus herein studied.
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