

Article

Harmonizing Law-Making: A Comparative Study of Italian Stability and Ukrainian Adaptability in the European Context

Vladyslav Teremetskyi¹, Viktor Lazariev², Nataliia Onishchenko³, Yuliia Krasnova⁴, Balynska Olha⁵, Oleh Roy⁶, Ihor Soroka⁷

¹Department of modernising commercial law and law, State organisation "V. Mamutov Institute of Economic and Legal Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine", Kyiv, Ukraine, E-mail: vladvokat333@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2667-5167>. ²Department of Theory and History of State and Law, Kharkiv National University of Internal Affairs, Kharkiv, Ukraine, E-mail: judge2101@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9468-0497>.

³Institute of State and Law named after V.M. Koretsky National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, E-mail: nataliyaonischenko@gmail.com, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1671-2139>. ⁴Department of Modernising Commercial Law and Law, State organisation "V. Mamutov Institute of Economic and Legal Research of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine", Kyiv, Ukraine, E-mail: krasnova_yulya@ukr.net, ORCID ID: orcid.org/0000-0001-7898-9603. ⁵Research Laboratory for the Study of Human Trafficking Counteraction, Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, Lviv, Ukraine, E-mail: olga_bal@ukr.net, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0168-143X>. ⁶Department of Public Administration and Administrative Law, V.M. Koretsky Institute of State and Law of the National Academy of Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine, E-mail: olegroys@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-3474-0874>. ⁷Department of Civil Law Disciplines, Institute of Law and Security, Odessa State University of Internal Affairs, Odessa, Ukraine, E-mail: copokaigor@gmail.com, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2122-7936>

Correspondence: Ihor Soroka, E-mail: copokaigor@gmail.com

Abstract

This study conducts a comparative analysis of legislative terminology and law-making practices in Italy and Ukraine within the broader framework of European legal integration. Its central aim is to illuminate how conceptual foundations, institutional arrangements, and procedural mechanisms shape legislative practice in both jurisdictions, with the objective of aligning Ukraine's law-making system with European Union standards. The theoretical grounding draws on a multidisciplinary corpus spanning legal language, terminology unification, and the normative bases of legislative procedures. Methodologically, the study employs an integrative approach – terminological analysis, hermeneutics, comparative law, and abstraction – supported by empirical examination of legislative texts and doctrinal sources. Findings indicate that, despite a shared commitment to popular sovereignty, Italy exhibits greater constitutional stability, procedural clarity, and civic participation through instruments such as popular initiative and referenda. By contrast, Ukraine's model is characterized by legislative flexibility and statutory calibration, offering adaptability at the potential expense of predictability and transparency. The study concludes that codifying law-making procedures at the constitutional level, institutionalizing citizen participation, and harmonizing Ukrainian terminology with EU standards would enhance the legitimacy, efficiency, and democratic quality of national legislation. Such reforms would facilitate Ukraine's integration into the European legal space and bolster institutional resilience in periods of crisis.

Keywords: Legislation, Legal terminology, Norm drafting, European Union, Ukraine, Italy, Comparative law, Constitutional law

Introduction

Law-making represents a foundational mechanism of state functioning that determines the content and structure of the legal system. The quality of law-making activity directly correlates with the precision, coherence and stability of legal terminology, which serves as the primary tool for expressing the content and legal force of normative acts. This issue becomes particularly relevant when comparing legal systems with differing traditions, such as those of Ukraine and Italy. A



comparative analysis reveals both structural and linguistic characteristics of law-making and highlights the challenges that emerge from these differences.

The development of the doctrine of law-making in Ukraine has evolved through two main stages: (1) the formation of a national scientific school, and (2) the legislative institutionalisation of law-making standards. Initially, law-making procedures were primarily regulated by the *Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine* (Law of Ukraine No. 1861-VI, 2010), which functioned as an internal regulatory act of the legislature. However, the adoption of the Law of Ukraine "On Law-Making Activity" (Law of Ukraine No. 2957-IX, 2023) marked a qualitative shift in Ukrainian legal development by codifying terminology and procedures of law-making and by introducing European-aligned standards into national practice.

This legislative development, combined with the socio-political transformations of the 2010s, more firmly oriented Ukraine towards the European legal space. In particular, it has led to increased demands for harmonisation of Ukrainian legal terminology and procedure with the legal standards of the European Union.

Italy, which experienced major political and constitutional transitions in the 20th century, offers a distinct model of law-making, constitutionally enshrined in Chapter II of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023). Unlike Ukraine, where law-making procedures are regulated by laws, Italy embeds the legislative process at the constitutional level. This contrast illustrates divergent legislative architectures: established at the level of the Constitution of the Italian Republic and at the level of laws in Ukraine.

A comprehensive comparative study of law-making and legal terminology in Ukraine and Italy is not only academically valuable but also practically important. It facilitates the identification of successful foreign practices, supports the harmonisation of legal language and contributes to the enhancement of legal certainty. This is particularly crucial for Ukraine in the context of war-related challenges, efforts to build institutional resilience and the continued pursuit of European integration.

Literature Review

Legal terminology has long been in the focus of academic research, which underlines the relevance of this study. F. Romano and A. Cammelli (2023) described the IS-LeGI information system developed for the analysis of Italian legal language. R. Gualdo (2007) studied features of modern Italian legal language in the context of European integration, with particular attention to terminology and simplification efforts within the REI project, aimed at improving the comprehensibility of legal texts.

I. Genew-Puhalewa (2011) attempted to characterise the unification of terminology in the European Union's legislative system in both content and form. E. Kościałkowska-Okońska (2011) focused on the peculiarities of translating legal terms and texts related to EU law. L. Goletiani (2020) conducted a comparative analysis of modal verbs expressing obligation in Ukrainian and Italian legal texts, based on translations of the Directive 2006/43/EC. G. Bednarek (2012) investigated

challenges in translating legal concepts, especially in transferring both legal terminology and conceptual legal foundations from one system to another. M.-T. Sagri and D. Tiscornia (2009) examined the use of legal language in the multilingual EU context by analysing issues related to translation and interpretation across EU languages.

In terms of law-making, M. Baschiera (2006) analysed mechanisms of delegated legislative powers and their impact on law-making processes. R. Caroccia (2019) focused on the influence of contemporary legislative interpretations on law-making and the guarantee of legality. W. J. Nardini (1998), in his dissertation, studied the role of the Italian Constitutional Court in shaping the legislative process.

Ukrainian scholars have also significantly contributed to the field. M. I. Liubchenko (2015) developed a monographic study of the general theoretical foundations of legal terminology by highlighting its role in the functioning of law. N. P. Yatsyshyn (2013) and S. Shestakova (2018) examined legal terminology through the lens of legal categories as tools for effective communication between legal science and practice. H. Herhul (2008) conducted a comprehensive analysis of terminological requirements by distinguishing between "word terms" and "concept terms". V. Lazariev (2022) has studied the conceptualisation of legal terminology. V. Teremetskyi and V. Lazariev (2025) have conducted an analysis of the essence of legal terminology and specifics of its formation, mechanisms of its unification and standardisation, as well as defined the key principles affecting its application.

As the overview shows, both Italian and Ukrainian researchers have thoroughly addressed legal terminology and law-making. However, legal terminology as the foundation of law-making has received only partial attention. Moreover, there is a clear lack of comparative research focused specifically on the legal terminology used in law-making in Italy and Ukraine.

Thus, a comprehensive study of legal terminology as a foundation of legislative precision remains a relevant task for contemporary legal science. Its resolution could contribute to legislative improvement, higher legal culture and enhanced efficiency of legal regulation.

Methodology

This research is grounded on a multidisciplinary methodological framework that integrates both theoretical and empirical approaches to legal research. A set of scientific methods was applied to ensure the comprehensiveness and objectivity of the analysis of legal terminology in the context of law-making in Ukraine and Italy.

The terminological approach provided the foundation for the systematic study of legal terminology. It enabled a deeper understanding of the essence of legal terms by analysing their semantic structure, contextual meanings and conceptual interrelations within legal discourse. This method facilitated the clarification and refinement of the meanings of legal concepts by contributing to the internal consistency of the legal system and by improving the uniformity of interpretation and application of normative acts.

The hermeneutic method was applied to study legal terminology through the lens of legal theory, doctrinal interpretation and normative practice. This method

allowed us to analyse legal terms not only in their literal meanings, but also in terms of their historical evolution, socio-cultural embeddedness and functional roles within different legal systems. It contributed to revealing the deeper essence of legal terms and their place within the legal system, thereby enhancing interpretative accuracy.

The comparative method played a key role in this research. It enabled the identification of similarities and differences in the structure and use of legal terminology across legal systems, particularly those of Ukraine and Italy. This method also facilitated the detection of functional regularities in the application of legal concepts, shedding light on the interdependencies of legal categories and their influence on law-making processes. The comparative analysis also made it possible to detect terminological inconsistencies and structural divergences between the researched systems.

The abstraction method was applied to study legal terminology not merely as linguistic units, but as integral elements of the legal system, capable of performing communicative, regulatory and cognitive functions. It allowed the generalisation and theoretical modelling of terminology use in legislative contexts, particularly relevant in the formation of legal doctrines and standardisation procedures.

The research also included empirical analysis of legislative texts and legal doctrine. This enabled the identification of practical trends in the use of legal terminology and facilitated an understanding of the relationship between terminological clarity and legislative quality.

Results and Discussions

One of the defining features of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947/2023), in comparison with the Constitution of Ukraine (1996), is the presence of a specific section regulating the legislative process. This section explicitly enumerates fundamental law-making terminology. Article 70 refers to the "legislative function", the Article 71 to "legislative initiative", the Article 72 to "bill", Articles 73 and 74 to "promulgation of laws", the Article 75 to "referendum", the Article 76 to the "delegation of legislative function" and the Article 80 to the "ratification of international treaties" (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023).

The definition of the legislative function in Italy can be primarily found in the national legal dictionary Brocardi.it (Brocardi.it, n.d.). This dictionary indicates that lawmaking is the activity aimed at creating primary regulatory legal acts.

Referring to the current Italian legislation, we should note that the Article 70 states that the lawmaking function is entrusted to both houses of the Parliament. At the same time, the Parliament is not the only subject of lawmaking activity. In particular, the legislative function may be entrusted to the Government under exceptional circumstances (the Article 76). Legislative powers may also be exercised by regional authorities within their competence (Brocardi.it, n.d.).

Considering the doctrinal developments of Italy, we should note the fact that the right to issue regulatory legal acts is vested in the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate (DirittoEconomia.net, n.d.). N. Busani (2025), within the framework of studying this issue, classifies the legislative function into ordinary and

constitutional. The researcher understands the ordinary function as the general procedure for adopting laws. The Constitution includes more complex procedures for adopting regulatory legal acts, since they amend the Constitution or have the status of laws of constitutional rank. S. M. Cicconetti (2003, 2019) considers the legislative function as a type of political activity. G. Fontana (2010) also defines it as one of the three main functions of the Parliament, along with political control and leadership.

Analysing the Ukrainian experience and referring to doctrinal developments, in particular, we should state that V. Kolyukh (2015) considers the legislative function of the parliament as the activity that includes the adoption, amendment, repeal and suspension of laws. According to V. Kolyukh (2015, pp. 137–138), “comprehensive understanding of the legislative function is impossible without knowing the mechanism of its implementation, including subjects, elements and related types of legislative activity”.

Y. M. Nazarenko (2010, p. 159) argues that lawmaking is the main function of the Verkhovna Rada, which is broadly defined by the adoption of laws and their amendments, their repeal and suspension. Y. Nechyporenko (2013, p. 365) considers the legislative function as the activity that consists of the adoption of legislative acts.

The procedure for adopting regulatory legal acts in the Parliament is clearly defined by the Article 19-1 of the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (Law of Ukraine No. 1861-VI, 2010). Besides, the general principles are established in the Law of Ukraine “On Legislative Activity” (Law of Ukraine No. 2957-IX, 2023).

It should be noted that representative institutions – the Parliament of the Italian Republic (consisting of two Chambers) and the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine perform the legislative function both in Italy and Ukraine. This notion in both jurisdictions is considered within legal doctrine as the key expression of popular sovereignty and the main form of institutionalised normative regulation of social relations.

Nevertheless, important structural differences exist. In Italy, the legislative function is constitutionally embedded and precisely defined in the 1947 Constitution, which delineates not only the subjects of legislative authority, but also the limits, delegation mechanisms and procedural safeguards. This constitutional regulation ensures a high level of consistency and predictability in legislative activity.

In contrast, the Ukrainian approach is more fragmented. Although the law-making function of the Verkhovna Rada is mentioned in the Constitution, the mechanisms for implementing the legislative function are mainly disclosed in detail through sectoral legislation. We are talking about the Law of Ukraine “On Law-Making Activity” (2023) and the Law of Ukraine “On the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine” (2010), etc.

Having summarised, we should note that the legal nature of the legislative function reflects similar theoretical approaches in both countries. However, the degree of normative consolidation differs, which influences the structure, stability and legal hierarchy of the legislative process.

The issue of legislative initiative in Italy is clearly regulated by the Constitution (1947/2023). Article 71 of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947/2023) even provides a clear definition of this phenomenon: "the legislative initiative should belong to the Government, to each Member of Parliament and to those entities and bodies on which it is conferred by constitutional law. The people may initiate legislation by proposing a bill drafted in articles and signed by at least fifty thousand voters".

Legal doctrine provides a detailed commentary on this provision. According to Brocardi.it (n.d.), the Article 71 assigns the right of legislative initiative to the Government, to each member of the Chambers, to regional councils and to the people, who may introduce a bill with at least 50,000 supporting signatures. Legislative initiative is exercised by submitting a bill to one of the two Chambers and is considered the first step in the legislative process (Treccani, n.d.). However, this initiative is limited to those actors explicitly authorised by the Constitution; any extension of this right requires constitutional amendment. Moreover, the right of initiative merely allows the submission of a proposal and does not imply the right to have the bill debated or adopted (Brocardi.it, n.d.).

The Government's initiative is exercised through filing the bills discussed in the Council of Ministers and approved by the President of the Republic (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023, Article 71). The people's initiative must adhere strictly to formal requirements and may concern any subject matter not constitutionally excluded from popular legislation.

Regarding legislative initiative in Ukraine, it is the Article 93 of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) clearly defines at the constitutional level the list of subjects who are granted this right. Thus, in accordance with the provisions of the Constitution of Ukraine, these subjects should include: the President of Ukraine, the national Deputies of Ukraine, and the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine. This provision establishes a more limited group of subjects compared to the Italian model and completely excludes people's legislative initiative.

The legislation of Ukraine, more specifically the Law of Ukraine "On Law-Making Activity" (Law of Ukraine No. 3354-IX, 2023), is more accurate for resolving this issue. It provides a clear list of persons having the right of legislative initiative. It specifies and expands the list of these subjects, putting the final end to this issue: those who have the right to submit draft regulatory acts for consideration.

Legislative initiative in Ukrainian legal scholarship is understood as the first stage of the legislative process. V. M. Panasiuk (2024, p. 88) defines it as the procedural stage, when authorised subjects may submit draft laws, proposals, or amendments. Similarly, V. I. Plaksa (2022, p. 128) treats the concept both as a formal stage and a legal entitlement to propose legislation. S. M. Husarov (2015, p. 55) distinguishes between two meanings of the term: (1) as a stage of the law-making process and (2) as a subjective right of authorised actors to introduce bills in the Parliament.

Thus, legislative initiative both in Italy and Ukraine marks the formal beginning of the legislative process and is granted to specific constitutional actors. However, key differences emerge. Italy provides for broader participation, including a form of direct democracy through citizen legislative initiative. Ukraine, by contrast, limits

legislative initiative strictly to institutional actors and does not include the people among the subjects of legislative initiative by reflecting a more representative and centralised model. Additionally, Italy's constitutional regulation sets out formal procedures for all forms of initiative, while Ukraine provides further procedural elaboration at the level of subordinate legislation.

Both Italy and Ukraine regulate the issue of legislative initiative at the constitutional level, which highlights its special legal and political significance in the functioning of a democratic state governed by the rule of law. The constitutions of both countries contain a list of subjects authorised to initiate the legislative process. Legislative initiative in both jurisdictions is generally attributed to the President, members of Parliament, the Government and other constitutionally or statutorily defined institutional actors.

However, the Constitution of the Italian Republic contains a distinctive feature: it expressly recognises popular legislative initiative. Article 71 provides that not only the Parliament and Government, but also citizens, upon collecting at least 50,000 signatures, have the right to submit a draft law. This reflects an institutionalised mechanism of direct democracy within the legislative process (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023, Article 71). In contrast, the Constitution of Ukraine currently lacks such a provision: although civic participation in legislative processes is generally acknowledged, there is no mechanism for direct legislative initiative by the people enshrined in the Basic Law (1996).

The next term, that is, draft law (*disegno di legge*, *progetto di legge*, *bill*), is explicitly addressed in the Article 72 of the Constitution of the Italian Republic. This Article outlines the procedure for considering draft laws in the Parliament, stating that every draft must first be examined by a parliamentary committee. After that, it is submitted to the Chamber for debate and voting, article by article, and then with a final vote. In Italy, the term *disegno di legge* is used for government bills in the Chamber of Deputies, while *progetto di legge* is applied to bills introduced by MPs; in the Senate, both terms are used interchangeably (Draft law, 2024).

According to constitutional procedure, a draft law must receive approval from both the Chamber of Deputies and the Senate in identical wording to become law, reflecting the principle of bicameral symmetry embedded in Articles 70–73 of the Constitution (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023).

In Ukraine, the Constitution also refers to draft laws. Article 74 stipulates that referenda are not permitted with respect to draft laws on taxation, budget, or amnesty. Article 89 establishes that the committees of the Verkhovna Rada are responsible for legislative work and preliminary examination of matters within Parliament's jurisdiction (Constitution of Ukraine, 1996). These provisions are further elaborated in the Law of Ukraine "On the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada" No. 1861-VI (2010) and the Law of Ukraine "On Parliamentary Committees" No. 116/95-BP (1995), which regulate the organisation, functions and participation of committees in legislative drafting and review.

Thus, the term draft law is constitutionally embedded in both legal systems, underlining its foundational role in legislative architecture. However, procedural frameworks differ substantially. In Italy, the Constitution (Constitution of the

Italian Republic, 1947/2023) provides a detailed account of how a bill progresses from initiative to promulgation, specifying its passage through both Chambers, deadlines, amendment options and procedures for return and revision. This approach ensures predictability and procedural transparency at the highest legal level.

In contrast, Ukrainian constitutional provisions remain general, while procedural specifics are delegated to sectoral legislation. Although this allows flexibility and adaptability, it may also lead to fragmentation and uncertainty in legislative practice, particularly in times of political transition or emergency.

In contrast to the detailed constitutional regulation found in Italy, the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) outlines only the general principles of the legislative process in Articles 85, 91, 93 and others, without describing procedural stages for draft law consideration in detail. Specific mechanisms and requirements are instead regulated by specialised legislative acts, most notably the Law on the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (Law of Ukraine No. 1861-VI, 2010), the Law on Parliamentary Committees (Law of Ukraine No. 116/95-BP, 1995), and the Law on Law-Making Activity (Law of Ukraine No. 3354-IX, 2023). This model allows for flexibility in parliamentary procedures, but also creates potential risks of frequent amendments at the legislative level, bypassing the constitutional foundation (Constitution of Ukraine, 1996).

Turning to the term promulgation, Italian legal doctrine defines it as the formal act, when the Head of the State certifies the approval of a law and mandates its publication and enforcement. The President may request reconsideration by the Parliament before signing; however, this prerogative may be exercised only once. If the Parliament reapproves the same text, the President is obliged to sign and publish the law (Promulgation, 2024; How laws are made, 2024).

Article 87 of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947/2023) states that the President of the Republic shall authorise the submission to the Chambers of bills proposed by the Government and promulgate the laws and issue decrees having the force of law and regulations. Article 73 of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947/2023) indicates that laws shall be published immediately after promulgation and come into force on the fifteenth day following their publication, unless the laws themselves establish a different term. Thus, we may affirm that such a structure ensures procedural transparency and consistency at the constitutional level (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023).

By contrast, the Article 106 of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) provides that the President signs laws adopted by the Verkhovna Rada. The actual procedures for signing, publication and entry into force are detailed in the Law on Law-Making Activity (Law of Ukraine No. 3354-IX, 2023), which provides that laws generally take effect ten days after publication unless stated otherwise. Thus, promulgation in Ukraine is not constitutionally defined, but is instead functionally implemented through presidential assent and official publication – resulting in similar legal effects, but lacking constitutional anchoring.

Another important concept addressed in both constitutions is the referendum. Article 75 of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947/2023) establishes that a

popular referendum shall be held to decide on the total or partial abrogation of a law or an act having force of law, when requested, it is of five hundred thousand voters or five Regional Councils. Referendum shall not be admissible in the case of tax, budget, amnesty and pardon laws, or laws authorising the ratification of international treaties.

The Ukrainian approach is similar in some respects. Article 74 of the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) stipulates that “a referendum shall not be permitted regarding draft laws on issues of taxes, the budget and amnesty”. However, the underlying philosophy differs. In Italy, the referendum is framed as a direct democratic tool enabling citizens to participate in the legislative process by reviewing or annulling enacted laws. It operates as a post-legislative check and balance on parliamentary activity.

Conversely, the Constitution of Ukraine (1996) treats these restrictions more as systemic safeguards, aiming to preserve national financial, humanitarian and diplomatic stability. The referendum in Ukrainian constitutional doctrine is less about legislative control and more about delineating the boundaries of direct democracy. As such, Italy's model integrates civic engagement as a functional mechanism of the law-making process, while Ukraine emphasises institutional oversight and restraint.

Italy also recognises the institution of the referendum abrogation, which has no direct analogue in Ukraine. While Ukraine's referenda tend to serve consultative or constituent functions, Italy's model allows citizens to directly repeal existing laws, thereby reinforcing their participatory role within legal procedure. This institutional feature exemplifies Italy's more flexible and citizen-driven approach to monitoring existing legislation and to enhance democratic control over law-making (Constitution of the Italian Republic, 1947/2023).

Regarding delegated legislative powers, Article 76 of the Constitution of the Italian Republic (1947/2023) provides that “the exercise of legislative function may not be delegated to the Government unless principles and criteria have been established and then only for a limited time and to specified purposes”. Such a law must clearly define the principles, criteria, scope and duration of the delegation. These legal safeguards ensure that delegated authority remains under parliamentary control and within constitutional boundaries.

In Ukraine, the Constitutional Court has affirmed the general principle of delegation in its Decision No. 4-rp/2009 (Decision No. 4-rp/2009), stating that delegation constitutes a temporary transfer of authority from one public body to another without full relinquishment of those powers. The original authority retains the ability to modify or withdraw the delegation. It reflects a more doctrinal and jurisprudential foundation of the institute rather than a constitutionally defined one.

At the scholarly level, Ukrainian researchers have addressed this issue in detail. P. P. Shliakhtun (2005, p. 101) characterises delegated legislation as the issuance of normative legal acts with the force of law, authorised by the Parliament by the government. N. A. Zhuk (2007, p. 186) points out the ambivalence of delegation: on

the one hand, it may appear to deviate from the principle of separation of powers; on the other, it may be justified under exceptional circumstances.

Having concluded, a comparative analysis of delegated legislative authority in Italy and Ukraine reveals a shared understanding of this institution as an extraordinary and time-bound mechanism that allows the executive power to exercise norm-setting functions. However, the two systems differ in their approach to regulation: while Italy embeds this procedure directly in its Constitution with clearly defined limits and safeguards, Ukraine relies more on the decisions of the Constitutional Court of Ukraine and scientific research to define and control the scope of delegated authority.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates that while Italy and Ukraine share a foundational terminological corpus and converge on certain theoretical assumptions about law making, they diverge markedly in constitutional entrenchment, institutional structures, and the procedural implementation of legislative terminology and mechanisms. Both systems affirm the legislative function as the principal conduit for popular sovereignty and as the principal instrument of legal regulation. The Parliament(s)—Italy's bicameral Legislature and Ukraine's unicameral Verkhovna Rada—constitute the central arenas of the law-making process, with the term draft law constituting a persistent element of legislative discourse in both contexts.

Nonetheless, normative consolidation exhibits important variations. Italy exhibits a high degree of constitutional codification that regulates each stage of the legislative process—from initiative to promulgation—ensuring clarity, predictability, and opportunities for civic participation. In contrast, Ukraine relies more on statutory instruments and parliamentary rules, a design that affords procedural flexibility but may yield interpretative fragmentation and reduced institutional transparency. This contrast illuminates how constitutional architecture shapes both the resilience and the legitimacy of law making under conditions of political stability and crisis alike.

A particularly illustrative contrast concerns popular participation. Italy's model includes the constitutional empowerment of popular legislative initiative under Article 71, enabling citizens to initiate legislation directly. By comparison, Ukraine, despite recognizing public participation in legislative processes, lacks a constitutionally defined mechanism for direct popular initiative. In the matter of referenda, Italy deploys post-legislative referenda as a corrective instrument, whereas Ukraine restricts referendum scope and emphasizes systemic stability over direct democratic intervention. This divergence underscores how institutional design channels citizen input into law making and, in turn, how it conditions legislative accountability.

Differences also emerge in promulgation. The Italian Constitution imposes a binding timetable for promulgation and establishes a standard entry-into-force period, reinforcing predictability and timely policy implementation. Ukraine regulates promulgation primarily at the legislative level, a characteristic that can foster agility but may compromise uniform interpretative standards across agencies

and jurisdictions. With regard to delegation of legislative power, Italy maintains tight constitutional constraints on delegated authority; by contrast, Ukraine's approach is increasingly shaped by constitutional jurisprudence and doctrinal interpretation rather than explicit constitutional norms. This difference points to broader questions about constitutional design and the durability of legislative norms under stress.

Taken together, the findings suggest that Italy's system provides high constitutional stability, terminological coherence, and structured avenues for citizen involvement. Ukraine's framework, by contrast, displays greater procedural flexibility and a willingness to recalibrate statutory arrangements—features that can support rapid adaptation, particularly in crisis or post-war reconstruction contexts, but at potential costs to transparency and predictability. To strengthen Ukraine's law-making legitimacy, efficiency, and democratic quality within the European integration project, several reforms emerge as priorities. Foremost is the constitutional entrenchment of law-making procedures to insulate core processes from ad hoc revision. Second is the institutionalization of popular initiative as a constitutional or quasi-constitutional device to broaden participatory legitimacy. Third is the introduction of an abrogative referendum to provide a direct mechanism for policy reversal or corrective action. Fourth is the systematic harmonization of Ukrainian legal terminology with EU standards, ensuring terminological coherence across national and supranational contexts. Finally, a careful articulation of transitional strategies—balancing crisis-driven flexibility with long-term stability—would support Ukraine's integration into the European legal space while reinforcing institutional resilience in periods of crisis.

Future research could explore comparative measures of legislative transparency and public trust, assess the practical effects of constitutional entrenchment on policy outcomes, and evaluate the performance of Ukraine's reform agenda as it progresses toward fuller EU alignment. Such work would deepen understanding of how constitutional design and terminological standardization interact to shape the legitimacy, efficiency, and democratic quality of law making in transition contexts.

References

Baschiera, M. (2006). Introduction to the Italian legal system: The allocation of normative powers: Issues in law finding. *International Journal of Legal Information*, 34(2), 279-326

Bednarek, G. (2012). The approximation of criminal laws in the European Union: the demise of incongruity of legal terminology in legal translation? *International Journal for Legal Communication*, 1, 37-51.

Brocardi.it. (n.d.). *Potere o funzione legislativa* [Legislative power or function]. Retrieved May 6, 2025, from <https://www.brocardi.it>

Busani, N. (2025). *Funzione legislativa - Governo* [Legislative function - Government]. Retrieved May 6, 2025, from <https://www.notaio-busani.it/it-IT/diritto-governo-funzione.aspx>

Caroccia, R. (2019). Rule of law in the Italian legal environment: A principle still in force? *European Journal of Transformation Studies*, 7(2), 237-244. Retrieved from

<https://czasopisma.bg.ug.edu.pl/index.php/journal-transformation/article/view/5025>

Cicconetti, S. M. (2003). Elements of Constitutional Law. Giappichelli.

Cicconetti, S. M. (2019). Parliamentary Law (3rd ed.). Giappichelli.

Constitutional Court of Ukraine. (2009). *Decision in the case of the constitutional submission of the Verkhovna Rada of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea (Decision No. 4-rp/2009)*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/v004p710-09#Text>

DirittoEconomia.net. (n.d.). *The legislative function of the parliament*. Retrieved May 6, 2025, from https://www.dirittoeconomia.net/diritto/parlamento/funzione_legislativa.htm

Fontana, G. (2010). *Parliament: Contribution to a dictionary of constitutional history. Diritto @ Storia*, (9). <https://www.dirittoestoria.it/9/Contributi/Fontana-Parlamento-dizionario-diritto-costituzionale.htm>

Genew-Puhalewa, I. (2011). European Union terminology unification – Directions for the contrastive study of two Slavic and two non-Slavic languages. *Research in Language*, 9(1), 69–79.

Goletiani, L. (2020). *Marker dell'obbligo nel linguaggio giuridico ucraino e italiano: Studio contrastivo di un testo normativo* [Markers of obligation in Ukrainian and Italian legal language: A contrastive study of a legal text] [Master's thesis, Università degli Studi di Milano]. AIR – Archivio Istituzionale della Ricerca. <https://air.unimi.it/handle/2434/745292>

Gualdo, R. (2007). Le parole della legge in prospettiva italiana ed europea. In A. Cerri (Ed.), *La ragionevolezza nella ricerca scientifica ed il suo ruolo specifico nel sapere giuridico* (pp. 155–170). Aracne Editrice. <http://hdl.handle.net/2067/1336>

Herhul, H. (2008). Requirements for legal terms. *Bulletin of Lviv Polytechnic National University*, 620, 294–297.

Husarov, S. M. (2015). Subjects of legislative initiative in Ukraine. *Our Law*, (6), 54–60.

Kolyukh, V. (2015). The legislative function of the parliament and the practice of its implementation in foreign states. *State and Law. Series: Political Sciences*, 68, 135–147.

Kościałkowska-Okońska, E. (2011). EU terminology in interpreter training: Selected problem areas connected with EU-related texts. *Research in Language*, 9(1), 111–124.

Lazariev, V. V. (2022). Conceptualization of legal terminology: The need for a transparent terminological approach. *Law and Safety*, 1, 73–80. <https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2022.1.08>

Liubchenko, M. I. (2015). *Legal terminology: Concept, features, types* [Юридична термінологія: поняття, особливості, види]. Kharkiv: Vydavnytstvo Prava Liudyny.

Nardini, W. J. (1998). *Italian constitutional court decisions upholding unconstitutional laws: Cautionary tales for a US balanced budget amendment* (LL.M. thesis, European University Institute). <https://hdl.handle.net/1814/5609>

Nazarenko, Y. M. (2010). Types of functions of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. *Scientific Bulletin of Uzhgorod University. Series: Law*, (14), 158–163.

Nechyporenko, Y. (2013). Legislative and constituent functions of the Parliament of Poland: Effectiveness of implementation. *Scientific Notes of the Institute of Political and Ethnonational Studies of the NAS of Ukraine*, (1), 363–376.

Openpolis. (n.d.). *How laws are made*. Retrieved May 6, 2025, from <https://www.openpolis.it/parole/come-si-fanno-le-leggi/>

Pagella Politica. (n.d.). *Disegno di legge* [Draft law]. Retrieved May 10, 2025, from <https://pagellapolitica.it/dizionario/disegno-di-legge>

Panasiuk, V. M. (2024). The right of legislative initiative: Content and forms of implementation. *Analytical and Comparative Law*, (4). <https://doi.org/10.24144/2788-6018.2024.04.13>

Plaksa, V. I. (2022). Problematic aspects of defining the concept of a "subject of legislative initiative". *Scholarly Notes of V. I. Vernadsky Tavria National University. Series: Public Administration*, (3), 125–129.

Promulgation. (2024). *Brocardi – Glossario giuridico*. <https://www.brocardi.it/promulgazione>

Romano, F., & Cammelli, A. (2023). Le risorse della banca dati IS-LeGI per lo studio della lingua del diritto. *CHIMERA: Revista de Corpus de Lenguas Romances y Estudios Lingüísticos*, 10, 237–245. Retrieved from <https://revistas.uam.es/chimera/article/view/16008>

Sagri, M.-T., & Tiscornia, D. (2009). Le peculiarità del linguaggio giuridico: Problemi e prospettive nel contesto multilingue europeo. *mediAzioni*, 7. <http://mediazioni.sitlec.unibo.it>

Senato della Repubblica. (2023). *Constitution of the Italian Republic* (English ed.). Parliamentary Information, Archives and Publications Office. https://www.senato.it/documenti/repository/istituzione/costituzione_inglese.pdf

Shestakova, S. (2018). Peculiarities of legal terminology as a specialised system of legal concepts. *Scientific Bulletin of the International Humanities University. Series: Philology*, 33 (1), 71–73.

Shliakhtun, P. P. (2005). *Constitutional law: Dictionary of terms*. Kyiv: Lybid.

Teremetskyi, V. I., Lazariev, V. V., Topchii, V. V., Vitiuk, D. L., & Roy, O. V. (2023). Legal terminology as the basis for the accuracy of legal norms. *Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology*, 9(3), 123–131. <https://doi.org/10.55214/25768484.v9i3.5242>

Treccani. (n.d.). *Procedimento legislativo* [Legislative procedure]. Retrieved May 6, 2025, from <https://www.treccani.it/encyclopedia/procedimento-legislativo/>

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (1995, April 4). *Law of Ukraine No. 116/95-BP on Committees of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/116/95-bp#Text>

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (1996, June 28). *Constitution of Ukraine No. 254k/96-VR*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/254k/96-bp#Text>

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2010, February 10). *Law of Ukraine on the Rules of Procedure of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine* No. 1861-VI. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/1861-17#Text>

Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (2023, August 24). *Law of Ukraine No. 3354-IX On Law-Making Activity*. <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws/show/3354-20#Text>

Yatsyshyn, N. P. (2013). Legal terminology as a specialised system of legal concepts. *Terminological Bulletin*, 2(2), 99–103.

Zhuk, N. A. (2007). *Parliament, president, government: From mutual restraint to balance*. Kharkiv: Kharkiv Legal.