

Proces tumačenja odvija se u nizu faza. Sljedeća ili naredna razina može se koristiti samo u onoj mjeri u kojoj prethodna razina ne omogućuje jasan rezultat. Međutim, budući da pojedinačni rezultati tumačenja mogu biti više ili manje nesigurni, ne može se apstraktno reći koji je kriterij tumačenja odlučujući u konkretnom slučaju. Na kraju možemo istaći da kod tumačenja ne postoje fiksno pravilo za rangiranje kriterija tumačenja.

Enes BIKIĆ, LL.D., Full Professor
Faculty of Law, University of Zenica
enes.bikic@unze.ba

Anita PETROVIĆ, LL. D., Associate Professor
Faculty of Law, University of Tuzla
anita.petrovic@untz.ba

INTERPRETATION OF LAW - SIGNIFICANCE AND METHODS

***Abstract:** In this paper, we deal with the issues of determining the content of the text of the norm. What should be done when the text of the norm is unclear? Should we try to determine the will of the "historical legislator", i.e. the legislator who enacted the law in the past, or strive for a more modern interpretation? Should the content of the norm be interpreted narrowly (restrictively) or broadly (extensively)? Can we choose the interpretation that we personally, subjectively consider appropriate among several alternative meanings of our own choice? Is the interpreter bound by the limits of the literal meaning of the law or can, perhaps even must, seek a solution to a legal question and go beyond the literal meaning of the law (praeter verba legis) or even violate the literal meaning (contra verba legis). What if he is being asked completely new questions that the legislator could not even know about? What are the limits of judicial development of law?*

***Keywords:** interpretation, supplementary interpretation, analogy, methods, criteria, application of the law.*