framework, countries can improve their ability to fight crime and ensure the safety of their citizens.

Список використаних джерел

1. Nikulina A. G. Administrative and legal status of the pre-trial investigation bodies of the National Police of Ukraine: Candidate of Laws of Ukraine: 12.00.07. Sumy, 2017. P. 241.

2. Moshchak, H.H. (2013). Rozvytok kryminolohichnoi dumky v FRN i v Ukraini. Development of Criminological Thought in Germany and Ukraine. Kyiv: Pravo Ukrainy; Kharkiv: Pravo.

3. Svirin M. O., Davydova M. M. International Experience In Crime Prevention And Prospects For Its Development Use In Ukraine. Science And Law Enforcement. 2016.

4. Svirin M. O., Davydova M. M. International Experience In Crime Prevention And Prospects For Its Development Use In Ukraine. Science And Law Enforcement. 2016.

Гриценко А.,
здобувач ступеня вищої освіти
бакалавра Національної академії
внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Зубенко В.**

FOREIGN EXPERIENCE OF USING LEGAL LINGUISTICS IN THE EUROPEAN UNION

Language and law is an increasingly researched and studied interdisciplinary field. One of the first, and maybe most astonishing insights a lawyer will get, is that the translation of legal texts remains a myth, a sublime aim never to be truly achieved. This is closely connected to some of the typical problems in comparative law: linguistically equivalent legal notions will frequently have different contents in different jurisdictions. The legal significance of notions can differ vastly in their direction and extent. Also, the interconnections within each legal system as well as the legal culture in general influence the meaning and practical impact of legal concepts. As a result, the question in legal translation is not which translation is right, but, much more modestly, which one is less wrong [1].

All legal systems develop certain linguistic features that differ from those of ordinary language. Sometimes these practices differ only slightly, especially when a legal system is primarily oral or relatively young. At the other extreme, lawyers and judges may develop language that is entirely different from ordinary speech. Most modern legal regimes fall between these extremes. Typically,

the legal profession uses language that contains a substantial amount of technical vocabulary and a number of distinct (often archaic) features. As a result, the speech, and to a greater extent, the texts produced by such legal systems may be difficult for the lay public to understand [2].

Speakers and hearers notice the different circumstances in which language is used and they realize that they have to make use of various registers in order to cope with the linguistic situation in which they are acting, Linguistically, this difference can be observed on different text types that emerge as a result of this differentation of language use. In fact, language use in legal texts differs considerably. The typology used today mostly comprises:

– Language of statutes (language of legislation) Language of legal decisions including fact description;

– Language of the legal doctrine;

– Language used by lawyers in professional discussions and pleadings Language used by laypersons in legal contexts (testimony, comments on legal decisions);

– Language used by administrative clerks [3].

The EU-law seems to be most appropriate for the purpose of exploring in practice the interdependencies between language and law since it is based on the principle of equal authenticity of all its linguistic versions. Pursuant to Article 55 of the Treaty on European Union the text of this treaty is equally authentic in all the EU official languages in which it is drawn up. Having regard to Article 342 TFEU and Article 4 of Regulation No. 1 determining the languages to be used by the European Economic Community, that principle is recognised to be extended to all EU founding treaties and the secondary law adopted by EU-institutions on the basis of powers conferred by such Treaties. The generally recognised methodological consequence is that all linguistic versions need to be equally taken into account when EU-law is interpreted. The original language of the text may not, in principle, be prioritised. The EU law shall be interpreted within the possible meaning of its wording in all the languages used, having regard to the will of the legislating authority and the recognisable purpose of the provision in question. The latter principle is foregrounded in particular when divergences between the language versions occur which question the possibility of uniform interpretation. Such instances must, however, be accounted for in legal systems where law texts are formulated in more than one language. The limits of reliance on one specific language wording are very bluntly formulated by the ECJ. In its early case law, it held

that: "[t]he different language versions of a community text must be given a uniform interpretation and hence in the case of divergence between the versions the provision in question must be interpreted by reference to the purpose and general scheme of the rules of which it forms a part.

In theory, thus, the texts of EU law ideally are to be interpreted as if they were multilingually negotiated and agreed. The practice of the EU legislative procedures. however, does not implement such multilingualism on an equal footing. Selected case studies will show some of the inconsistencies and crevasses to which multilingual interpretation is exposed. This will lead us to the question whether, in the background of the pretended methodological canons, other shared practices of legal thinking are operating and take revenge against the alleged supremacy of language thus safeguarding the rule of the Law [4].

Currently, the European Union unites 27 Member States and is host to 24 official languages which are all accorded equal footing according to EU's language equality policy. Such linguistic diversity creates challenges in the drafting of European legislation as EU law shall function in a corresponding manner for each of its official languages.

Once translated by translators who know the linguistic specificity of the language concerned, European legislation undergoes legal-linguistic finalization by a lawyer-linguist. This becomes a key prerequisite for achieving clarity and uniform interpretation, given that the European Union, as a supranational union, forms a community that brings together different legal systems and cultures, each with its legal institutions and regulatory means, where the latter in many cases may be absent in one or more of the other legal systems in the Union. This is most evident if we look at the decision-making process in the ordinary legislative procedure (OLP). Given that the majority of EU legislation is adopted by means of the OLP, it is becoming the main legislative method in the Union. In this process of co-decision between the Parliament and the Council, legal meanings are exchanged between legislators coming from very different legal linguistic backgrounds. Such diversity is frequently offered as an argument for the particular difficulties inherent in legal translation. In addition, the final text of a piece of legislation is repeatedly the result of a compromise between the Commission, the Parliament and the Council, so that it is "often formulated with deliberate deviations in meaning". It can be seen clearly in the processes of political trialogues following the

negotiations between these institutions. It is in such a context that the figure of the lawyer-linguist is most salient [5].

Conclusion

The EU is a supranational entity that unites many different legal systems. All these united legal systems have their own linguistic arsenal and legal vocabularies, which causes many difficulties in legal translation of European legislation. Therefore, only through shared European legal discourse as a common system of interpretative rules and methods can overcome linguistic differences and ambiguities. The ultimate goal, or, as we may say, the ideal of the European law is that it come to function with equal linguistic meaning in all official languages. Without this, fundamental principles of law will be violated. A shared legal discourse could provide muchneeded uniformity of meaning. This meaning would not result from incorrigibly uniform interpretation but from mutually recognised linguistic meaning that is accepted by all.

Список використаних джерел

1. Kischel, Uwe. Legal cultures. Legal languages. Translation issues in language and law. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2009. Pp. 7–17.

2. Tiersma, Peter M., and Lawrence M. Solan, eds. The Oxford handbook of language and law. OUP Oxford, 2012.

3. Galdia, Marcus. Legal *linguistics*. Peter Lang, 2009.

4. Peter Schiffauer, Izabela Jędrzejowska-Schiffauer, Legal Linguistics Beyond Borders: Language and Law in a World of Media, Globalisation and Social Conflicts.: Relaunching the International Language and Law Association (ILLA)., 2019, pp. 187–206.

5. Boyan Bahanov, Interpretation in EU Multilingual Law.

Груздєв О.,
здобувач ступеня вищої освіти
бакалавра Національної академії
внутрішніх справ
Консультант з мови: **Зубенко В.**

THE EXPERIENCE OF USING FOREIGN LANGUAGES FOR ENSURING PUBLIC ORDER IN THE USA

Law enforcement officers interact with people from all sorts of backgrounds, including those who do not speak English.

Having officers within a department who can speak another language is an added value for not only the law enforcement agency,