FORM AND FUNCTION IN A LEGAL SYSTEM A General Study

ROBERT S. SUMMERS

CAMBRIDGE

FORM AND FUNCTION IN A LEGAL SYSTEM – A GENERAL STUDY

ROBERT S. SUMMERS

William G. McRoberts Professor of Research in the Administration of Law, Cornell Law School, and Arthur L. Goodhart Visiting Professor of Legal Science, Cambridge University, 1991–2

B.S. 1955, University of Oregon; LL.B. 1959, Harvard Law School; Doctor of Laws, Honoris Causa, University of Helsinki, 1990; Doctor of Laws, Honoris Causa, University of Göttingen, 1994



CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore, São Paulo

Cambridge University Press 40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA

www.cambridge.org Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9780521857659

© Robert S. Summers 2006

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2006

Printed in the United States of America

A catalog record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Summers, Robert S.

Form and function in a legal system : a general study / Robert S. Summers. p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN-13: 978-0-521-85765-9 (hardback) ISBN-10: 0-521-85765-1 (hardback)

1. Law - Philosophy. 2. Law - Methodology. I. Title.

K237.S86 2006

340'.1 - dc22

2005020120

ISBN-13 978-0-521-85765-9 hardback ISBN-10 0-521-85765-1 hardback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party Internet Web sites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such Web sites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

FORM AND FUNCTION IN A LEGAL SYSTEM — A GENERAL STUDY

This book addresses three major questions about law and legal systems: (1) What are the defining and organizing forms of legal institutions, legal rules, interpretive methodologies, and other legal phenomena? (2) How does frontal and systematic focus on these forms advance understanding of such phenomena? (3) What credit should the functions of forms have when such phenomena serve policy and related purposes, rule of law values, and fundamental political values, such as democracy, liberty, and justice? This is the first book that seeks to offer general answers to these questions and thus give form in the law its due. The answers not only provide articulate conversancy with the subject, but also reveal insights into the nature of law itself, the oldest and foremost problem in legal theory and allied subjects.

Robert S. Summers is the William G. McRoberts Professor of Research in the Administration of Law at Cornell Law School. He has won international acclaim for his work in contracts, commercial law, jurisprudence, and legal theory. He has authored and coauthored multiple works in these fields for which he has received honorary degrees and other recognition. His treatise on the Uniform Commercial Code, coauthored with James White, is the most widely cited on the subject by courts and scholars. Professor Summers has served as official advisor both to the Drafting Commission for the Russian Civil Code and to the Drafting Commission for the Egyptian Civil Code. He lectures annually on jurisprudence and legal theory in the United States, Britain, Scandinavia, and Europe.

A SELECTION OF OTHER BOOKS BY THE AUTHOR

Form and Substance in Anglo-American Law, coauthored with Patrick S. Atiyah (Oxford University Press, third reprinting with minor revisions, 2002).

Contract and Related Obligation: Theory, Doctrine and Practice (4th ed.), coauthored and coedited with Robert A. Hillman (West Group, 2001).

La Naturaleza Formal del Derecho (Mexico City, Fontamara, 2001, in Spanish).

Collected Essays in Legal Theory (Amsterdam, Kluwer Academic Publshers, 2000).

The Uniform Commerical Code, coauthored with James J. White (West Group, 5th ed. of 1 vol. ed. of multi-volume treatise, 2000).

Interpreting Precedent – A Comparative Study, coedited and coauthored with members of the Bielefelder Kreis (Dartmouth Press, 1997).

The Uniform Commercial Code, 4 vols., coauthored with James J. White (West Group, 4th ed., 1995, with annual supplement).

Essays on the Nature of Law and Legal Reasoning (Berlin, Duncker and Humblot, 1992).

Interpreting Statutes – A Comparative Study, coedited and coauthored with members of the Bielefelder Kreis (Dartmouth Press, 1991).

Law: Its Nature, Functions, and Limits (3rd ed.), coauthored and coedited with several others (West Pub. Co., 1986).

Lon L. Fuller (Stanford University Press, 1984).

Pragmatischer Instrumentalismus (Karl Alber, Freiburg, 1983, German translation of next item below).

Instrumentalism and American Legal Theory (Cornell University Press, 1982).

Collective Bargaining and Public Benefit Conferral – A Jurisprudential Critique (Cornell University, ILR Monograph Series, 1976).

More Essays in Legal Philosophy (University of California Press, and Blackwells, Oxford, 1971).

Essays in Legal Philosophy (University of California Press, and Blackwells, Oxford, 1968).

此为试读,需要完整PDF请访问: www.ertongbook.com

PREFACE

I first lectured on themes here while I was the Arthur L. Goodhart Visiting Professor of Legal Science at Cambridge University in 1991–2, and began the book a number of years later. I have written it not only for those with academic interests in law and legal systems, such as law students, professors of law, legal theorists, and other scholars, but for lawyers and judges as well. The scope of the book is not confined to Anglo-American systems. It is addressed more generally to the forms and functions of legal phenomena in developed Western societies, and its central themes apply still more widely. I now offer the book as an ambitious yet unhurried attempt to develop systematic ways of giving form in law its due, both as an avenue of understanding and as a means of serving a variety of purposes: policy and related ends, rule of law values, and fundamental political values.

I focus here on paradigms of the forms of a varied selection of functional legal units: legislatures and courts; statutory and other rules; species of law besides rules, such as contracts and property interests; legal methodologies, such as those for interpreting statutes; and enforcive devices, such as sanctions and remedies. In addressing the make-up, unity, instrumental capacity, distinct identity, and other attributes of these functional legal units with focus on their forms, the book provides a new way of viewing the familiar. These functional units, and the system as a whole, are subjected to a special mode of analysis that I introduce here and call "form-oriented." It is so named because it focuses frontally, systematically, and holistically on how paradigms of the overall forms of such units are generally defined and organized, and also on how a paradigmatic version of the overall form of a developed Western legal system is generally defined and organized, all to serve

¹ See R. S. Summers, "The Formal Character of Law," 51 Cambridge L. J. 242 (1992).

² Many American lawyers and judges will recognize this work as highly compatible with a treatise that I coauthored: J. White and R. Summers, *The Uniform Commercial Code*, 4 vols. (4th ed., West Group, St. Paul, Minn. 1995, with annual supplements). Indeed, Chapter Seven of the present book applies the theory of form set forth here to the fields of contract and commercial law.

xiv

purposes. Readers so disposed can make this form-oriented mode of analysis part of their own general intellectual equipment and will find they can apply it to any functional legal unit and not merely to those selected for analysis here. Form-oriented analysis goes beyond analysis of functional legal units in terms of the contents of those legal rules that are reinforcive or constitutive of such units, analysis prominent in the works of major legal thinkers, such as H. L. A. Hart and Hans Kelsen.

Here, each paradigm of an overall form of a functional legal unit is defined and differentiated from the complementary material and other components of the unit. These overall forms and their constituent features are then analyzed to advance understanding of the whole. In this way, we can see that well-designed forms of functional legal units are not formalistic or bare and thin; instead, they are intrinsically purposive and value-laden and can, along with the complementary material and other components of such units, even be highly efficacious. We can also see how formal devices systematize the various functional legal units into a coherent and effective operational system.

This study also enables the reader to see how well-designed form can merit much credit for purposes served through the functioning of the various legal units within an operational system. Indeed, it is a central thesis of this book that significant credit for purposes served through deployment of functional legal units should go to well-designed form and not merely to the material or other components of these units, such as physical facilities and trained personnel. The frontal and systematic study of form is important, as well, for those who would construct functional legal units anew or improve upon existing units within particular systems, all the better to serve various ends.

There are still further reasons to study legal form. The subject itself is conceptually rich, wide-ranging, and absorbing. Also, because law is of great social importance, and form is intrinsic to law, legal form, too, is of great importance. Yet the subject has been neglected. Indeed, the subject has not yet been fully recognized as a discrete subject, let alone one for systematic study. Some American legal scholars and theorists have even treated aspects of form in law in unqualifiedly pejorative and dismissive terms. If I am right, this makes the need for such a book as this all the more pressing, although it is certain to be controversial in those quarters.

Robert S. Summers February 17, 2005

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to thank first my diligent research assistants, and the students in my annual seminars on American Legal Theory at Cornell Law School. All of these have contributed in various ways to the final version of this book.

I owe a deep debt of gratitude to my former administrative assistant, Mrs. Pamela F. Finnigan who has worked with me on this book from the beginning. Without her dedicated and highly effective assistance, it is certain the book would not yet be completed. I also wish to thank my current administrative assistant, Anne Cahanin.

I wish to record a special debt to an earlier coauthor, Professor Patrick S. Atiyah with whom, in the 1980s, I had many productive discussions of the related subject "form and substance" in law and legal reasoning.¹ The present book is a very different book from the one we coauthored; however, it is unlikely that I would have written the present one had the earlier one not preceded it.

Of my former teachers, I single out two for their tutelage, insight, and inspiration: the late H. L. A. Hart of Oxford University and the late Lon L. Fuller of Harvard University. Only the work of the great nineteenth-century German jurist, Rudolf von Jhering, has been more of a source of inspiration in the writing of this book.

I wish to thank numerous colleagues and friends who read part or all of the manuscript and made numerous helpful comments: Professor Okko Behrends of the University of Göttingen, Professor D. Neil MacCormick of the University of Edinburgh, Professor Philip Soper of the University of Michigan, Professor William Ewald of the University of Pennsylvania, the late Dr. Geoffrey Marshall formerly Provost of the Queen's College, Oxford University, Professor Pedro Alemán Láin of the University Complutense in Madrid, Professor Manuel Atienza of the University of Alicante, Professor Glenn Altschuler of Cornell

¹ P. S. Atiyah and R. S. Summers, *Form and Substance in Anglo-American Law* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1987).

University, and Mr. Paul Markwick. I am also indebted to an anonymous reviewer of the manuscript for Cambridge University Press for various helpful suggestions.

I am grateful as well to numerous hosts and audiences at various universities in the United States and in Europe for comments and discussions following lectures I was invited to present over the years on the various themes I take up in this book. In the United States, I am indebted to hosts and lecture audiences at the Universities of Chicago, Cornell, Florida, Georgia, and Oregon. Abroad, I am indebted to hosts and lecture audiences at the Universities of Cambridge, Oxford, London, and Bristol in England; the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews in Scotland; the Universities of Göttingen, Hamburg, Heidelberg, Münster, Bielefeld, Freiburg, Tübingen, and Kiel in Germany; the Universities of Bologna, Ferrara, and Pavia in Italy; the Universities of Helsinki and Tampere in Finland; the Universities of Madrid, Alicante, and Mallorca in Spain; the Universities of Groningen and Utrecht in the Netherlands; the University of Paris (Sorbonne and also Nanterre), the University of Brussels, the University of Lund, and the University of Vienna.

I am also grateful to several deans of the Cornell Law School: Russell Osgood, the late Lee Teitelbaum, and Stewart Schwab, for research and other support.

Finally, I wish to thank my spouse, Dorothy Kopp Summers for all those many special forms of support and assistance that have always counted for so much in my book writing and other academic endeavors, and without which this particular prolonged effort simply could not have come to fruition.

Robert S. Summers Cornell Law School Ithaca, New York February 17, 2005

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | ar one. In those officer, photo oction to this permittence, | |
|-----|--|-----|
| ANI | D A GENERAL APPROACH | |
| 1 | Introduction | |
| 2 | Basic Concepts and Definitions | 37 |
| 3 | A General Approach | 64 |
| PAR | T TWO: THE FORMS OF FUNCTIONAL LEGAL UNITS | |
| 4 | Forms of Institutions – Legislative | 9 |
| 5 | Forms of Precepts – Rules | 136 |
| 6 | Form and Content within a Rule – Continued | 182 |
| 7 | Forms of Nonpreceptual Law – Contracts and Related | |
| | Property Interests | 211 |
| 8 | Forms of Legal Methodologies – Statutory Interpretation | 241 |
| 9 | Forms of Sanctions and Remedies | 283 |
| | T THREE: THE OVERALL FORM OF A LEGAL SYSTEM O ITS OPERATION | |
| 0 | The Overall Form of a Legal System as a Whole | 305 |
| 1 | Cumulative and Synergistic Effects of Legal Forms – A | |
| | Schematic Practical Application | 351 |

DETAILED TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Prej | face | page xii |
|------|--|----------------------|
| Ack | nowledgments | X |
| | RT ONE: INTRODUCTION, BASIC CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS D a general approach | , |
| 1 | Introduction Section One: Preliminary Overview Section Two: Importance of Legal Form Section Three: The Neglect of Form Section Four: Protests Against Misunderstanding | 3 17 24 33 |
| 2 | Basic Concepts and Definitions Section One: Introduction Section Two: A Selection of Functional Legal Units and Their Overall Forms Section Three: The Overall Form of a Functional Legal Unit – A General Definition and Refinements | 37 |
| | Section Four: Types of Purposes That Overall Form Is to Serve – A More Extended Account Section Five: Rationales for the General Definition of Overall Form Adopted Here Section Six: Differentiation of the Overall Form From Material or Other Components of a Functional Legal Unit Section Seven: The "Form v. Substance" Contrast | 42 47 57 61 |
| 3 | A General Approach Section One: Introduction Section Two: Advancing Understanding through Study of Form Section Three: Attributing Credit to Form for Purposes Served Section Four: A Form-Oriented Approach as Primary, with a Rule-Oriented One Secondary | 64 64 66 72 |

PART TWO: THE FORMS OF FUNCTIONAL LEGAL UNITS

| 4 | Forms of Institutions – Legislative | . 91 |
|---|--|------|
| | Section One: Introduction | 91 |
| | Section Two: Overall Legislative Form and Its Constituent Features | 97 |
| | Section Three: The Compositional Feature | 101 |
| | Section Four: The Jurisdictional Feature | 108 |
| | Section Five: The Structural Feature | 112 |
| | Section Six: The Procedural Feature | 116 |
| | Section Seven: The Preceptual Feature | 126 |
| | Section Eight: Form and the Unity of the Legislature | 127 |
| | Section Nine: Skepticism about Institutional and Other Form, | |
| | and Responses Thereto | 131 |
| 5 | Forms of Precepts – Rules | 136 |
| | Section One: Introduction | 136 |
| | Section Two: Internal Formal Features of Rules | 141 |
| | Section Three: The Feature of Prescriptiveness | 143 |
| | Section Four: The Feature of Completeness | 147 |
| | Section Five: The Feature of Definiteness | 155 |
| | Section Six: The Feature of Generality | 161 |
| | Section Seven: The Feature of Structure | 164 |
| | Section Eight: The Encapsulatory Feature | 170 |
| | Section Nine: The Expressional Feature | 176 |
| | Section Ten: Responses to Objections | 179 |
| 6 | Form and Content within a Rule – Continued | 182 |
| | Section One: Introduction | 182 |
| | Section Two: General Purposes of the Form and Content of | |
| | Rules – A Summary | 183 |
| | Section Three: Initial Choices of Policy or Other Content and of | |
| | Formal Features in a Projected Rule | 188 |
| | Section Four: Further Initial Choices of Formal Features | 190 |
| | Section Five: Final Choices of Form and Final Choices of Policy | |
| | and Other Content | 199 |
| | Section Six: General Interactions and Other Inter-relations Between | |
| | Choices of Form and Choices of Content | 203 |
| | Section Seven: Further Responses to Objections | 207 |
| 7 | Forms of Nonpreceptual Law – Contracts and Related | |
| | Property Interests | 211 |
| | Section One: Introduction | 211 |
| | Section Two: Choices of Form and of Complementary Material or | |
| | Other Components of Content in a Contract | 215 |
| | Section Three: Due Credit to Form | 221 |
| | Section Four: Formal <i>Prima-Facie</i> Validity and Further Credit Due to | |
| | Form | 228 |

| | Section Five: Contractual Form and Related Property Interests – Still Further Credit to Form Section Six: Implementation of Contractual and Related Property Law – Credit to Form Continued Section Seven: Responses to Form-Skeptics and Law-Is-Policy Reductionists | 232236238 |
|----|---|---|
| | | |
| 8 | Forms of Legal Methodologies – Statutory Interpretation | 241 |
| | Section One: Introduction Section Two: Sources of Needs for a Well-Designed Methodology to | 241 |
| | Interpret Statutes | 245 |
| | Section Three: Study of the Overall Form of a Particular Interpretive | |
| | Methodology As an Avenue for Advancing Understanding Section Four: The General Credit That May Be Due the Overall Form | 250 |
| | of an Interpretive Methodology for Statutes | 266 |
| | Section Five: Other Related Factors of Form | 273 |
| | Section Six: Formalistic Statutory Interpretation | 275 |
| | Section Seven: Methodological Forms and Other Forms | 282 |
| 9 | Forms of Sanctions and Remedies | 283 |
| | Section One: Introduction | 283 |
| | Section Two: The Forms of Enforcive Functional Units – General Section Three: The Sanction of State Imprisonment for Criminal | 287 |
| | Offenses | 289 |
| | Section Four: Remedies for the Private Wrong of Breach of Contract | 295 |
| | T THREE: THE OVERALL FORM OF A LEGAL SYSTEM O ITS OPERATION | |
| 10 | The Overall Form of a Legal System as a Whole | 305 |
| | Section One: Introduction | 305 |
| | Section Two: Systematization of Institutions and Entities – | |
| | Centralized and Hierarchical Ordering within Each Main Type of | |
| | Jurisdictional Sphere: Legislative, Judicial, Administrative, and | |
| | Private-Ordering | 311 |
| | Section Three: Systematization <i>as between</i> Jurisdictional Spheres of Institutions and Private Entities – Prioritization | 215 |
| | Section Four: Systematization of Valid Laws within Discrete Fields | 315 319 |
| | Section Five: Systematization through Uniformity of Interpretive and | 317 |
| | Other Methodologies, and in Regard to Sanctions and Remedies | 323 |
| | Section Six: Further Systemization of Functional Legal Units through | |
| | Basic Operational Techniques | 326 |
| | Section Seven: Operation of Basic Techniques in Conformity with | |
| | Principles of the Rule of Law | 332 |
| | Section Eight: The Roles of Further Systematizing Factors | 344 |
| | Section Nine: Formalness As One Major Characteristic of a Legal | 245 |
| | System As a Whole | 345 |

| 11 | Cumulative and Synergistic Effects of Legal Forms – A Schematic | |
|-----|--|-----|
| | Practical Application | 351 |
| | Section One: Introduction | 351 |
| | Section Two: Choices of Forms of Basic Operational Techniques | 363 |
| | Section Three: Choices of Forms in Legislatures, Administrative | |
| | Bodies, or Other Entities | 367 |
| | Section Four: Choices of Preceptual and Related Forms at the | |
| | Law-Making Stage | 369 |
| | Section Five: Choices of Form at the Stage of Public Promulgation | 377 |
| | Section Six: Form and the Stage of Addressee Self-Application | 379 |
| | Section Seven: An Exceptional yet Important Stage – Administrative | |
| | Intervention | 381 |
| | Section Eight: Ultra-Exceptional Stage – Trial and Appellate Court | |
| | Action | 383 |
| | Section Nine: Choices of Form – Summary of Major Cumulative and | |
| | Synergistic Effects | 386 |
| | Section Ten: The Roles of Form and Information in a Linear | |
| | Progression | 387 |
| | Section Eleven: The Limits of Form and Also Its General Potency | 390 |
| Nar | ne Index | 393 |
| Sub | ject Index | 395 |
| | | |

PART ONE ~

Introduction, Basic Concepts and Definitions, and A General Approach



1 ∼ INTRODUCTION

"Theory is the most important part of...the law, as the architect is the most important... in the building of a house." - O. W. Holmes, Jr. 1

"[Die Form] . . . ist im innersten Wesen des Rechts begründet."

"Form is rooted in the innermost essence of law." - Rudolf von Jhering²

SECTION ONE: PRELIMINARY OVERVIEW

Given the unfamiliar nature of this study, an extended preliminary overview is called for. The most fundamental question of law and legal theory is: What is the nature of a legal system? Many leading scholars and theorists of law in the twentieth century, including H. L. A. Hart³ and Hans Kelsen,⁴ viewed a legal system as essentially a system of rules. In developed Western societies, however, a legal system is far more than this. It is made up of diverse functional units only one major variety of which consists of rules. These diverse units are, in turn, duly organized in complex ways to form a system. To grasp the nature of a legal system, it is first necessary to understand the diverse functional units of the system. These include institutions, such as legislatures and courts,⁵ legal precepts, such as rules and principles,⁶ nonpreceptual species of law, such as contracts and

¹ Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., Collected Legal Papers, 200 (Harcourt Brace and Co., New York, 1921).

² R. Jhering, Geist des Römischen Rechts: auf den verschiedenen Stufen seiner Entwicklung, vol. 2, at 479 (Scientia Verlag, Aalen, 1993) and see also R. Jhering, Zweck im Recht, (Breitkopf and Hartel, Wiesbaden, 1970) translated as Law As a Means to an End (I. Husik trans., The Boston Book Co., Boston, 1913). I am also indebted to Professor Okko Behrends here.

³ H. L. A. Hart, *The Concept of Law*, 8 (2nd ed., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1994). See further *infra* n. 60 and accompanying text. See also Chapter Three at 72.

⁴ H. Kelsen, *Introduction to the Problems of Legal Theory*, 55–6 (B. Paulson and S. Paulson trans., Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1992). See also Chapter Three, at 72.

⁵ See *infra* Chapter Four.

⁶ See infra Chapters Five and Six.