AN INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRIVATE LAW

Second Edition

These readings place side by side the principal doctrines of contracts, torts, unjust enrichment, and property of the United States, England, France, Germany, and China. They include code provisions, cases, and other legal materials that describe the law in force, and place these doctrines in their historical context, showing how the resolution of current issues depends upon how past issues were resolved. It both provides a road map of the private law of these jurisdictions, and shows how private law has been shaped by history, by the effort to solve common problems, and by differences in culture.

James Gordley holds the W.R. Irby Chair at Tulane Law School. He writes in the areas of comparative law, comparative legal history, and private law.

Hao Jiang is Assistant Professor of Comparative Law at Università Bocconi. He writes in the fields of comparative law, American corporate and contract law, and Chinese and European private law.

Arthur Taylor von Mehren was Story Professor of Law at Harvard Law School, and a leading scholar in comparative law and international private law.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF PRIVATE LAW

READINGS, CASES, MATERIALS

Second Edition

JAMES GORDLEY
Tulane Law School

HAO JIANG
Università Bocconi

ARTHUR TAYLOR VON MEHREN
Harvard Law School

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

79 Anson Road, #06–04/06, Singapore 079906

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108835848
DOI: 10.1017/9781108869348

First published 2006
This digitally printed version 2009
Second Edition 2021

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

ISBN 978-1-108-83584-8 Hardback
ISBN 978-1-108-79888-4 Paperback

Contents

Preface *page* xviii
Foreword by Shiyuan Han xx
Foreword by Reinhard Zimmermann xxiii
Foreword by André Tunc xxvi
Foreword by Roscoe Pound xxviii
Table of Abbreviations xxxi
Table of Cases xxxv
Table of Legislation l
Table of Restatements and Kindred Sources lvii
Table of EU Legislation lix
Table of Roman, Canon Law and Ancient Chinese Sources lx

INTRODUCTORY READINGS 1

I. TRADITIONS 3

A. The West 3
1. The Civil Law Tradition 3
a. Roman Law 3
i. The Roman Jurists 3
ii. The Medieval Jurists 9
b. The Natural Law Schools 15
i. The Late Scholastics 15
ii. The Northern Natural Law School 18
c. Codification and the Rise of Positivism 19
i. France 19
ii. Germany 23
iii. Conceptualism in France and Germany 26
2. The Common Law Tradition 28
a. The Writ System 28
b. Transformation in the Nineteenth Century 30

i. The Rationalization of the Common Law: From Writs to Legal Doctrines 30
ii. Positivism and Conceptualism 31
3. Since the Nineteenth Century 34
a. The Revolt against Positivism and Conceptualism 34
b. The Emergence of Comparative Law 35
B. China 36
1. Law in Imperial China 36
a. Law versus *Li* 37
b. Distributive Justice versus Commutative Justice 38
c. The Responsibility of the Family versus that of the Individual 41
d. A Law of Punishments 42
2. Law in Modern China 48
a. The Early Twentieth Century 48
b. The Republic of China (1911–1949) 50
c. The People's Republic of China 51
i. Some Persistent Problems 51
ii. The Socialist Experience 54
iii. The Reform 60

II. INSTITUTIONS 65

A. The West 65
1. Germany and the United States 65
2. France 99
3. England 110
B. China 122
1. The Structure of the Court System 122
2. The Role of Judges 123
a. Managerial Judging 123
b. Service-Oriented Judging 123
3. Judicial Independence 124
a. Collective Independence of the Courts 124
b. The Influence of a Higher Court 125
c. The Political-Legal Committee 125
4. The Emerging Case Law System 126
5. Professionalism 127

COMPARATIVE PRIVATE LAW 131
PART ONE: THE LAW OF OBLIGATIONS

CONTRACT LAW 133

I. THE STRUCTURE OF CONTRACT LAW 133

1. Civil Law 133
2. Common Law 141
3. Chinese Law 146

II. VOLUNTARY COMMITMENT 152

1. The Moment at which a Commitment Is Binding 152
   Common Law 152
   German Law 155
   French Law 156
   Chinese Law 156
   The Draft Common Frame of Reference 157
   The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 158
2. Liability before a Final Commitment Is Made 160
   English Law 160
   Law in the United States 163
   French Law 168
   German Law 171
   Chinese Law 175
   The Draft Common Frame of Reference 177
   The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 178
3. Mistake 178
   a. The Search for a Rule 180
   b. When Relief Is Granted 184
      i. Mistakes in Authenticity 184
      ii. Mistakes in Suitability for a Purpose 188
      iii. Mistakes in Value 191

III. FAIRNESS 193

1. Fairness of the Price Term 193
   a. Origins 193
   b. Modern Law 201
      English Law 201

Law in the United States 202
German Law 205
French Law 212
Chinese Law 218
The Draft Common Frame of Reference 220
The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 221
c. Chinese Law and the State-Owned Enterprise 221
2. Fairness of the Auxiliary Terms 227
English Law 227
Law in the United States 228
French Law 229
German Law 231
Chinese Law 233
The Law of the European Union 233
The Draft Common Frame of Reference 238
The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 240

IV. EXCUSES FOR NON-PERFORMANCE 240

1. Impossibility and *Force Majeure* 240
Common Law 242
French Law 244
German Law 245
Chinese Law 247
The Draft Common Frame of Reference 248
The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 248
2. Changed Circumstances 249
a. Origins 249
b. Modern Law 251
English Law 251
Law in the United States 253
French Law 255
German Law 256
Chinese Law 263
The Draft Common Frame of Reference 266
The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 267

V. REMEDIES 267

1. Specific Performance 267
a. Origins 267
b. Modern Law 269
English Law 269
Law in the United States 272
French Law 272
German Law 273
Chinese Law 275
2. Damages 276
a. The General Principle 276
English Law 276
Law in the United States 276
French Law 276
German Law 276
Chinese Law 277
b. Excessive Cost of Performance 277
English Law 277
Law in the United States 279
French Law 280
German Law 281
Chinese Law 281
c. Liquidated Damages 282
English Law 282
Law in the United States 283
French Law 283
German Law 283
Chinese Law 283
d. Recovery for Non-Economic Harm 284
English Law 284
Law in the United States 286
French Law 286
German Law 287
Chinese Law 290
e. Recovery for Unforeseeable Harm 290
i. Origins 290
ii. Modern Law 291
French Law 291
English Law 293
Law in the United States 296
Chinese Law 297

The Draft Common Frame of Reference 297
The Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts 297
German Law 298

TORT LAW 301

I. THE SCOPE OF THE RIGHTS PROTECTED 301

1. Introduction: The Structure of Tort Law 301
   a. Civil Law 301
      i. The Civil Codes 301
      ii. From Roman Law to Modern Code Provisions 302
   b. Common Law 307
      i. A List of Torts 307
      ii. From the Forms of Action to the Modern Torts 309
   c. Chinese Law 313
      i. The Absence of Private Law 313
      ii. The Sources of Contemporary Chinese Tort Law 314
      iii. The Scope of Rights Protected 315
2. Harm to Dignity 316
   a. Insult in General 316
      Traditional Common Law 316
      Modern English Law 317
      Modern Law in the United States 320
      French Law 322
      German Law 323
      Chinese Law 328
   b. Problems of Free Speech, Group Insult, and Minority Rights 328
      Law in the United States 328
      French Law 332
      German Law 336
      The European Convention on Human Rights 342
3. Invasion of Privacy 350
   a. Dissemination of Pictures 350
      English Law 350
      Law in the United States 351
      French Law 353
      German Law 354
      Chinese Law 364

b. Dissemination of True Information 366
i. About Current Events 366
English Law 366
Law in the United States 372
French Law 376
German Law 377
Chinese Law 378
ii. About Historical Events 379
Law in the United States 379
French Law 380
German Law 381
Chinese Law 382
c. Electronic Collection and Dissemination of Information 383
4. Purely Economic Harm 408
a. Liability in Principle for Purely Economic Harm 408
French Law 408
b. No Liability in Principle for Purely Economic Harm 410
i. Origins 410
ii. Note on Chinese Law 415
iii. Physical Harm to a Third Party's Property 416
Anglo-American Law 416
German Law 418
Chinese Law 419
iv. Plaintiff's Property Made Unusable 420
Law in the United States 420
German Law 421
Chinese Law 422
v. False Information 422
English Law 423
Law in the United States 424
German Law 426
5. Harm Suffered Because Another Is Harmed 428
Traditional Anglo-American Law 428
Modern Law in the United States 430
Modern English Law 432
French Law 435
German Law 439

II. THE CONDUCT FOR WHICH ONE IS LIABLE 441

1. Introduction 441

2. Intent 446
a. The Intention to Do Harm or to Do Wrong 446
Civil Law 446
Chinese Law 446
Common Law 446
b. The Intent to Cause a Different Harm or Commit a Different Tort 450
Law in the United States 450
English Law 451
German Law 453
French Law 453
c. Intent and Knowledge 457
English Law 457
Law in the United States 457
French Law 458
German Law 459
Chinese Law 459
3. Negligence 459
a. The Meaning of Negligence 459
b. The Weighing of Consequences 460
i. An English Description 460
ii. Some American Descriptions 460
iii. Some French Descriptions 462
iv. Some German Descriptions 462
v. A Chinese Description 464
c. The Reasonable Person 464
i. The General Principle 464
ii. Children and the Mentally Ill 465
English Law 465
Law in the United States 467
German Law 467
French Law 468
d. The Duty to Act 469
i. The General Principle 469
English Law 469
Law in the United States 471
Chinese Law 477
French Law 478
German Law 479
ii. Implications of Recognizing a Duty to Rescue 479

4. Strict Liability 482
a. Liability for Dangerous or "Non-Natural" Activities 482
English Law 482
Law in the United States 488
German Law 489
Chinese Law 496
b. Liability for Harm Caused by Objects in One's Custody in French Law 497
i. Introduction 497
ii. The Rise of Strict Liability 498
iii. The Requirement of an "Act of an Object" 503
iv. *Cas Fortuit* and *Force Majeure* 506
v. "Guard" 507
vi. The Extent of Liability 510
c. Liability for Defective Products 511
Law in the United States 511
Law in Europe 516
Chinese Law 519
5. "Liability in Equity" in Chinese Law 520

UNJUST ENRICHMENT 526

I. THE PRINCIPLE 526
1. Origins 526
2. Modern Law 528
English Law 528
Law in the United States 532
German Law 534
French Law 538
Chinese Law 539

II. MUST ONE PARTY GAIN AT THE OTHER'S EXPENSE? 542

1. Recovery When the Plaintiff Did Not Lose 542
a. The Use or Violation of Another's Property Rights 542
English Law 542
Law in the United States 543
French Law 544
German Law 544
b. The Question of What the Defendant Should Pay 545

2. Recovery When It Is Doubtful What the Defendant Gained 547
Anglo-American Law 547
German Law 549
Chinese Law 552
3. Denial of Recovery When the Plaintiff Lost and the Defendant Gained: Chinese Law 553

PART TWO: THE LAW OF PROPERTY 555

I. POSSESSION 557

1. Possession as a Means of Acquiring Rights 557
a. Wild Animals 557
Roman Law 557
Anglo-American Law 557
French Law 558
German Law 559
Chinese Law 560
b. Found Objects 560
Roman Law 560
Anglo-American Law 560
French Law 561
German Law 562
Chinese Law 563
c. Treasure 564
Roman Law 564
Anglo-American Law 564
French Law 565
German Law 565
Chinese Law 565
d. Adverse Possession and Prescription 565
Roman Law 565
English Law 566
Law in the United States 569
French Law 570
German Law 571
2. The Protection of Possession against Non-Possessors 571
a. Legal Remedies 571
Anglo-American Law 571
Continental Law 573

French Law 574
German Law 574
b. The Debate over Why Possession Should Be Protected 575
i. Savigny 575
ii. Ihering 576
iii. Pollock 576

II. OWNERSHIP 577

1. The Boundaries between Private and Public Rights 577
a. Public Ownership of Land in China 577
i. Exclusive State Ownership of Property 577
ii. The Socialist Market Economy and the Rise of Property Law 580
b. Rights to Natural Resources 583
c. Water Rights 584
Roman Law and the *Ius Commune* 584
Anglo-American Law 586
Law in the United States 591
English Law 592
French Law 592
German Law 594
Chinese Law 595
2. The Scope of Private Rights: Interference with Neighboring Proprietors 595
a. Origins 595
b. Activities that are Intended to Bother Another 599
c. Activities that Happen to Bother Another 600
i. Remedies 600
English Law 600
Law in the United States 603
French Law 604
German Law 605
Chinese Law 606
ii. The Character of the Neighborhood 606
English Law 606
Law in the United States 608
German Law 609
French Law 610

iii. Priority in Time 611
English Law 611
Law in the United States 612
German Law 613
French Law 613
iv. The Character of the Interference Height 614
English Law 614
Law in the United States 615
German Law 616
French Law 617
v. Ugliness 618
Law in the United States 618
German Law 619
French Law 620
vi. Offensive Conduct 620
English Law 620
Law in the United States 621
German Law 622
French Law 623
3. Voluntary Changes in the Scope of Rights: Easements, Covenants, and Servitudes 624
a. Overview 624
i. Anglo-American Law: Easements, Covenants, and Equitable Servitudes 624
ii. Continental Law: Servitudes and Kindred Relationships 626
French Law 626
German Law 626
Chinese Law 627
b. Burdens for the Benefit of One Who Does Not Own Land 627
Anglo-American Law 627
French Law 630
German Law 631
c. Burdens That Require a Land Owner to Do an Affirmative Act 632
English Law 632
Law in the United States 632
French Law 634
German Law 635
4. Necessity 635
a. Origins 635
b. The General Principle 640
Law in the United States 640

English Law 644
German Law 646
Chinese Law 647
French Law 647
c. Necessity and Land Use 649
English Law 649
Law in the United States 649
German Law 650
Chinese Law 651
d. Necessity and Intent 652
Law in the United States 652
German Law 653

Index 658

Preface

This new edition places side by side the principal doctrines of contracts, torts, unjust enrichment, and property of the United States, England, France, Germany, and China. The materials have been chosen so that these doctrines can be examined from an historical, a functional, and a cultural point of view. Each doctrine is placed in historical perspective. One can ask to what extent differences in doctrines are due to differences in the common law tradition, the civil law tradition, and in the experience of a non-Western nation adapting Western law to its own needs. Cases are presented alongside code provisions and commentaries to enable one to compare the orthodox view of these doctrines with what courts actually do. Scholars who take a functional approach to comparative law, such as Arthur von Mehren and Hein Kőtz, have observed similarities in what courts often show that they have found solutions to common problems, which are masked by formal statements of the doctrines that they apply. Finally, as the materials illustrate, some differences in doctrine reflect differences in culture, both among Western jurisdictions and between the West and China.

The innovation of the new edition is to cover Chinese law in the same way. Given the cultural, linguistic, and ideological differences, Chinese law continues to mystify Western lawyers. Some think of Chinese law as a purely Western legal transplant while others regard China as a unique jurisdiction governed by traditions that cannot be compared with those of the West. The truth, as this book has tried to illustrate, is somewhere in between. The Chinese legal system takes the form of a typical civilian jurisdiction but with its own distinct features. Among them are the way in which the role of state-owned enterprises changes the presuppositions of contract law, and the way Confucian ideals are translated, in tort law, into a new form of liability, and, in property law, into a more communitarian approach to rights.

Like the first edition, this edition is based on *The Civil Law System*, published by Arthur von Mehren in 1957. He wrote, in the Preface that "[t]his book had its beginning almost ten years ago" when he left the United States to study law at Zurich, Berlin, and Paris. Its "fundamental purpose was to give a student, having some common law training, an insight into the workings of the civil law system as typified by the French and German legal systems." He and James Gordley produced a second edition in 1977. Coverage has changed. The book's fundamental purpose is now to enable

students in civil law as well as common law systems, and in both China and the West, to gain insight into each other's law. Nevertheless, the inspiration is much the same. The comparative study of law must be based, not only on formal statements of rules by codes and commentators, but on what courts do. Differences among laws are to be found, neither in formal differences among rules, nor in easy generalizations about how "common law" and "civil law" – or Western and Chinese law – may differ.

JAMES GORDLEY

HAO JIANG

Foreword

For a long historical period, China had been an exporter of its legal system. Chinese traditional law (e.g. the Tang Code, 唐律) had influenced many Asian countries including Japan, Korea, and Vietnam. In Chinese traditional law, as T'ung-tsu Ch'ü (瞿同祖) concluded in his *Law and Society in Traditional China* (1961), the family and the class system were fundamental features. The law recognized that different laws are applicable to nobles, officials, commoners, and the "mean" people based on their social status. Much emphasis was given to status. Such a body of law corresponded with the doctrine of the Confucianists, who considered family and social status as the essential themes of *li* (礼) and the backbone of the social order.

Since the Opium War broke out in 1840, China and the two other east Asian countries, Japan and Korea, were obliged to face a major societal change that had never occurred in the past thousands of years. This change was a result of a clash of civilizations between the East and the West. As a result, the traditional laws in East Asia were replaced by Western style modern laws and China changed from an exporter to an importer of law. All three countries had to modernize their laws in order to survive. Since then, the civilian legal tradition became the main model for the three countries to follow. The traditional societies in East Asia changed accordingly, and have shown a movement similar to the one that Henry S. Maine described as *from status to contract*.

As to the contemporary private law in East Asia, as Zentaro Kitagawa (北川善太郎) described in "Development of Comparative Law in East Asia" (in Reimann and Zimmermann, eds, *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Law* (2006), 259), "[t]he modern legal systems of Japan, Korea, and China were once all shaped by the reception of Western legal models, albeit to varying degrees and in a variety of ways." "Korea will continue to adhere to the Pandectist approach. China is deviating from that approach and pursuing a more pragmatic course. And Japan is on its way to building its own civil law model but is still experimenting and deciding exactly which course to pursue" (Albert H.Y. Chen, *An Introduction to the Legal System of the People's Republic of China* (4th edn., 2011),186). The Japanese Civil Code, as a hybrid of French civil law and German civil law, was amended and modernized in 2017, and in its appearance continues to follow the German style; Korea is still on the way to modernizing its Civil Code; the People's

Republic of China will have its Civil Code in 2020. By reception, the seeds of Roman law have been planted in the soil of East Asia.

Compared with Japan, the situation in China is much more complicated. Since 1840, China suffered constantly from the changes between reformation and revolution. From things to institutions and to culture, great changes have occurred. From the Qing Dynasty to the Republic of China and to the P.R. China, changes of governments were carried out through revolutions. Among the revolutions, there were many reformations. As a result, the Civil Code (1929) of the Republic of China, which is an Asian copy of German BGB, is now still applied in Taiwan area. In Hong Kong, common law prevails, supplemented by Chinese traditional law (customary law). In Macao, the 1966 Portuguese Civil Code was in force until October 1, 1999. Now Macao has its own Civil Code. In mainland China, a Civil Code will be enacted in 2020, by reorganizing, updating, and replacing the existing General Provisions of Civil Law (2017), Contract Law (1999), Tort Law (2009), Property Law (2007), Marriage Law (1980), and Law of Succession (1985).

Anything, whether it is a house or a system, may be demolished and rebuilt. However, the culture of a nation is different. The Chinese civilization has continued for five thousand years. One important reason for this continued existence is its culture. Chinese culture is sustainable, because it is inclusive. Chinese people are not "fools," in the words of Rudolph von Jhering, "who would refuse quinine just because it didn't grow in his back garden." The reception of civil law in China is a good illustration. After wars, turbulence and setbacks, and the economic reform at the end of the 1970s, China had successfully reformed its economic system from a planned economy to a market economy, and follows a piece-meal approach towards the codification of a Chinese Civil Code. Great progress has been made. Today, China is of continually greater interest to the world. With a background of both Chinese culture and socialist market economy, Chinese civil law has become an attractive paradigm for comparative studies.

For the following reasons I would like to recommend this book, especially to law school students and scholars in the East Asia region:

Firstly, the new edition adds Chinese law as an object for comparative studies. More specifically, the book reviews the transition of Chinese traditional laws and describes its transformation in modern times. It includes both Chinese substantive law (Chinese contract law, tort liability law, and so forth) and the law of civil procedure. It not only includes positive rules in statutes in China, but also cases and Chinese scholarly materials. I believe it would be very helpful to those who are interested in Chinese law.

Secondly, following the mainstream Marxism legal theory, the nature of law is the reflection of the will of the ruling class. Every law has its class nature. Therefore, in 1949 the new government of China abolished all Kuomintang legislation as fraudulently constituted authority (伪法统). The huge vacuum in law was filled by policies of the Chinese Communist Party. For thirty years, the continuity of private laws and common elements of different private laws had been disregarded. This may be one reason why there is no civil code in mainland China until today. Through a comparative study of private law, people can discover not only the differences among private laws, but also their common features, and acquire a good understanding of the continuity of history. Therefore, I completely agree with André Tunc and Reinhard Zimmermann in emphasizing that, for students who read English, this book constitutes "an excellent tool enabling them to view law not parochially but from a wider perspective."

Thirdly, for students who read English, this is a brilliant introductory textbook on the civil law system. Using my personal experience as an example, thirty years ago when I was a law student, I read and benefited greatly from *The Civil Law System* (2nd edn., 1977), the predecessor of this book. It still benefits me and today I remember parts of the book, such as Jhering's criticism of conceptualism and Philipp Heck's ideas on interest jurisprudence. For most Chinese law students, English is their first foreign language and very few students can read French or German. This has been a common obstacle for Chinese law students that shows no sign of changing. It is true for the past forty years and still will be true for at least the coming twenty years. Given such a reality, this book will undoubtedly continue to be a very useful textbook.

Fourthly, this book is a brilliant introductory textbook on comparative private law. It covers not only civil law; it also covers common law. In China, many law schools (e.g. Tsinghua University School of Law) have "Comparative Private Law" or "Foreign Private (Civil) Law" in their curriculums. This book serves as a perfect textbook for such courses. It certainly provides an effective tool to familiarize students with the English expressions of civil law terminology, basic rules, and institutions in common law, civil law (French law and German law), European Union law, and Chinese law, and methods of comparative study (such as a functionalist approach, a historical approach, and a cultural approach to comparative law).

SHIYUAN HAN

Foreword

To James Gordley and Arthur Taylor von Mehren, *An Introduction to the Comparative Study of Private Law: Readings, Cases, Materials* (1st edn., 2006)

In his foreword to the second edition of Arthur von Mehren and James Gordley, *The Civil Law System* (1977), André Tunc commented on a sentence written by Roscoe Pound in the foreword to the first edition of that work (1957). Pound had stated categorically that the methods of the jurists "must have a basis in comparison." To what extent, Tunc asked, have we heeded that injunction? His answer was gloomy. He described the story of our efforts aimed at legal unification as sad; and most attempts to improve our domestic laws were also not based on comparative study. Today, nearly thirty years later, we have reason to be more optimistic. Of course, the picture is very different in different areas of the world. But at least in Europe the scene has changed dramatically.

Private law in Europe is in the process of acquiring, once again, a genuinely European character. The Council and the Parliament of the European Communities have enacted a string of directives deeply affecting core areas of the national legal systems. Increasingly, therefore, rules of German, French, or English law have to be interpreted from the point of view of the relevant community legislation underpinning it. The case law of the European Court of Justice, too, acquires an ever greater significance for the development of German private law. The prospect of a codification of European private law is starting to be seriously considered; and as a precursor various "restatements" of specific areas of European private law have been published or are in the process of preparation. The internationalization of private law is also vigorously promoted by the uniform private law based on international conventions which cover significant areas of commercial law. The United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, in particular, has been adopted by more than sixty states. It has started to generate a significant amount of case law, and it has shaped national law reform initiatives. The Sales Convention has been elaborated by UNCITRAL, and it aims at the global harmonization of a core area of private law. But UNCITRAL is not the only international organization active in this field. UNIDROIT, too, continues to produce ambitious instruments such as the Principles of

International Commercial Contracts which have been widely noted, internationally, and which enjoy increasing recognition as a manifestation of a contemporary *lex mercatoria*. Every year, thousands of students spend a period of one or two semesters at a law faculty in another Member State of the European Union under the auspices of the immensely successful Erasmus/Socrates programme. Alternatively, or in addition, many students acquire additional, post-graduate qualifications in other countries. More and more law faculties attempt to obtain a "Euro"-profile by offering a broad range of language courses, by establishing international summer schools, or integrated programmes on an undergraduate and post-graduate level, by setting up chairs for, or research centres in, European private law. Legal periodicals have been created that pursue the objective of promoting the development of a European private law. Interest has been rekindled in the "old" *ius commune*, and legal historians are busy rediscovering the common historical foundations of the modern law and restoring the intellectual contact with comparative law and modern legal doctrine. New approaches to legal scholarship, often emanating from the United States, have gained ground in Europe; the economic analysis of law is probably the most prominent example. Legal practice, at the top level, has been all but revolutionized. A wave of mergers has swept over the legal profession and reflects its ever-growing international orientation.

It is widely accepted today that the Europeanization, or more broadly, the internationalization of private law decisively depends on an internationalization of the legal training provided in the various universities throughout Europe. For if students in their domestic law courses continue to be taught the niceties of their national legal systems without being made to appreciate the extent to which the relevant doctrines, or case law, constitute idiosyncracies explicable only as a matter of historical accident, or misunderstanding, rather than rational design, and without being made to consider how else a legal problem may be solved, a national particularization that takes the abracadabra of conditions, warranties, and intermediate terms, or of the doctrine of consideration, for granted, threatens to imprint itself also on the next generation of lawyers. Thus, what André Tunc said in 1977 remains true today: the law schools must ask themselves whether they cannot do more to broaden the frame of mind of their students. Courses on comparative law and on legal history play a key role in this context; at the same time, however, the comparative and historical approaches should permeate the ordinary courses in the various substantive areas of private law. This makes it necessary to develop teaching materials which make the most important sources and the most influential texts readily available. James Gordley's and Arthur von Mehren's *Introduction to the Comparative Study of Private Law* meets this need. In contrast to

its predecessor on *The Civil Law System* (first edition by Arthur von Mehren, second edition by Arthur von Mehren and James Gordley) it also covers the common law; that makes it a most attractive teaching tool for comparative law courses not only in the Anglo-American world but also in countries such as France and Germany. In addition, it provides texts and materials on the historical development of modern legal doctrine and thus demonstrates the close relationship between legal history and comparative law. And so it can now be said with even greater justification than in 1977 that, for students who read English, this book constitutes "an excellent tool enabling them to view law not parochially but from a wider perspective." For a lawyer in the twenty-first century this kind of intellectual horizon is not only desirable but indispensable.

REINHARD ZIMMERMANN

Foreword

To Arthur Taylor von Mehren and James Russell Gordley, *The Civil Law System An Introduction to the Comparative Study of Law* (2nd edn., 1977)

In the masterly foreword that, as a token of esteem and friendship for the author, Dean Roscoe Pound gave to the first edition of this book, one sentence deserves our special attention and, indeed, should give us some concern: "Whether we are dreaming of a world law or thinking of the further development of our own law, to suit it to the worldwide problem of the general security in the present and immediate future, the methods of the jurists must have a basis in comparison."

They "*must* have a basis in comparison." To what extent in the last twenty years did we heed this injunction?

The story of the efforts to create a "world law" is sad; only disappointingly meager results have been achieved. In the field of civil liberties, jurists have no other weapons than hearts, mouths, and pens with which to oppose the frightening machines which crush bodies and minds. But there are other fields, such as trade law, where a "world law" is needed and does not encounter political obstacles. In these fields, parochialism is the impediment to unification of the law. This has proved, by itself, an often insuperable roadblock.

Have we then, at least, based on comparative study our efforts to improve our domestic laws to make them more responsive to the legitimate expectations of our citizens and to the needs of the future?

A totally negative answer would be unfair. In some special fields of law – securities regulation, for instance, under the influence of United States law – and even in more general fields such as torts or family law, juristic thinking has become increasingly international. For many countries, furthermore, encouraging examples could be given of valuable and sometimes systematic studies of foreign laws or institutions and of careful research on the lessons to be derived from such studies.

It remains true, however, that jurists use a comparative approach very little when one considers the importance that, rationally, such an approach should have. Of course, a deliberate effort is required to overcome the psychological difficulties, the language barriers, and the logistic problems that such an approach implies. But, just as no individual can claim to be wise

by himself, no legal system can be regarded as so advanced that it has little to gain from the study of foreign schools of thought.

Logistic problems have just been mentioned. They are, of course, very important. However, the *International Encyclopedia of Comparative Law*, when it is completed, will give to every English-speaking jurist easy access, not only to the laws, but to the trends of the laws of a great many countries. As the logistic difficulties are overcome in this and other ways, the law schools must ask themselves whether they cannot do more to broaden the frame of mind of their students and to equip them for a world where, as Dean Roscoe Pound had foreseen, international affairs occupy an increasingly large place.

The answer seems clear: much more is desirable. Much more could and should be done to cross-fertilize our legal systems and, above all, the minds of our students.

The first edition of this book has done a great deal to enlighten students trained in the common law about the civil-law system, as typified by the French and German legal orders. The author, Professor Arthur T. von Mehren, has performed the same task in his teaching. He deserves the gratitude of both common lawyers and civilians. In the preface of the first edition, he explained the way he had conceived the book. Very wisely, the second edition remains basically faithful to the original conception. For the second edition, Professor von Mehren has been joined by Dr. James R. Gordley, a young scholar with particular interest in comparative law. They have not merely brought the first edition up to date – which is already a rather formidable task – but have expanded the treatment of some subjects and treated some others for the first time. This has required the condensation or omission of certain topics handled in the first edition. Of greater interest and importance is the fact that at many points the authors have replaced quoted material by their own discussion of the matter in question. Due to such improvements, the book is, even more than in its first edition, a fortunate combination of technical, historical, and functional approaches.

Let us hope that an awakening to what is needed to prepare our students for the approaching 21st century will everywhere broaden the place given to the comparative study of law. For students who read English, this book will be an excellent tool enabling them to view law not parochially but from a wider perspective.

ANDRÉ TUNC

Foreword

To Arthur Taylor von Mehren, *The Civil Law System: Cases and Materials for the Comparative Study of Law* (1st edn., 1957)

Writing in a time in which methodology in the social sciences has become the prevailing approach, Professor von Mehren speaks of comparative study of law rather than of study of comparative law. That is, he would make the study of the legal order and of the body of authoritative precepts and authoritative technique of applying them to the adjustment of relations and ordering of conduct more effective for promoting and establishing an ideal order among men by comparison of significant features of the two matured systems of law in the modern world.

Study of the civil law system, of the Roman law and the codes of the Continental countries and lands in the New World settled by them had much vogue in America in the eighteenth and fore part of the nineteenth century. Kent and Story, who were the leaders in the development of our law in the formative era and along with Blackstone and Coke were its oracles, were learned civilians, and the exigencies of commercial law, for which Blackstone and Kent furnished no useful material, led to increasing use of civilian materials by text writers and courts. From commercial law a tendency to cite and rely upon the civilians spread to the private law generally. As late as 1860 the Court of Appeals in New York cited French authority upon a question of the law of fixtures. As late as 1880 Langdell, trained under Parsons in the fifties, included a discussion by Merlin in a summary of the law of contracts. To the Middle Ages the academic ideal of all Europe as the empire for which Justinian had been the law-giver, made Roman law was taken to be declaratory of the law of nature. But the great civilian treatises did not deal with the general run of questions which had to be decided by American courts in the formative era. In the end we developed treatises of our own on the basis of the English common law. The dominant historical school in the nineteenth century gave up the eighteenth-century law-of-nature idea and so Roman law could no longer be held declaratory. Moreover, the latter part of that century developed a cult of local law. For a time comparative law was in decadence.

With the passing of the hegemony of historical jurisprudence at the close of the last century there came a revival of comparative law. An idea of a comparative science of law got currency in

America through Lord Bryce's *Studies in History and Jurisprudence*. In fact all methods of jurisprudence must be comparative. But the use of civilian treatises by English and American analytical and historical jurists had led to attempts to force common-law institutions and doctrines into civilian molds which retarded their effective development. What has called for comparative method throughout the world is general economic unification and new means and methods of transportation and communication which have been making the whole world one neighborhood.

Jhering, emphasizing the effect of trade and commerce in liberalizing the strict law, vouched the introducing of Greek mercantile custom into the law of the old city of Rome. In the same way the law merchant, a characteristic product of the medieval faith in a universal law, was taken over into the common law in an era of general commercial development. In America increasing economic unification has put an end to the cult of local law. Today worldwide economic unification is challenging the self-sufficiency of systems of law.

Conditions of transportation and communication today make every locality all but the next door neighbor of every other. What happens anywhere is news in the next morning's paper everywhere. The world has become economically unified and law transcending local political limits is an economic necessity. Moreover, since the First World War we have been seeing attempts at political unification of the world and setting up of a world legal order.

Even more the worldwide development of industry, carried on with instrumentalities and under conditions increasingly dangerous to life and limb, and the mechanizing of every activity of life likewise threatening injury to every one, have been creating new legal problems calling for revision of old doctrines and finding of new means of promoting and maintaining the general security. Experience, which is no longer merely local, must be subjected to the scrutiny of reason and developed by reason, and reason, which in its very nature transcends locality, must be tested by experience. The wider the experience, the better is the test. Thus the science of law must increasingly be comparative. Whether we are dreaming of a world law or thinking of the further development of our own law, to suit it to the worldwide problem of the general security in the present and immediate future, the methods of the jurist must have a basis in comparison.

Not the least problem of legal education today is what to leave out of the regular curriculum. Above all the fundamentals of the lawyer's technique and the basic principles by which he must weigh the everyday controversies in which he is to assist clients in maintaining their rights and realizing their just claims, must be thoroughly mastered. Nothing should be allowed to detract from this minimum. But the many difficult and complicated problems

confronting the law, the lawmaker, the judge, and the practicing lawyer of today call for a science of law beyond what was required of the simpler jurisprudence of the past, and, it must be repeated, the method of that science, whether primarily analytical, historical, philosophical, or sociological, must use comparative law as its main instrument. For jurist, law teacher, and judge it is becoming more than a part of his general culture. As to the practicing lawyer, in our polity he is potentially law-writer, law teacher, legislator, or judge. Moreover, law is or ought to be a learned profession and at least an awareness of the technique, institutions, and organization of the legal systems of the other half of the legal world is part of what should make a learned lawyer.

It remains to note that Professor von Mehren gives us, not a setting side by side of detailed rules of law for comparison presumably to enable us to determine which is "the right rule." It was this sort of thing which brought comparative law into disrepute in the last century. He gives us instead material for comparison of the Continental codes with our system of judicially established and developed law, of comparing the administering method of the Continent with our own, and finally what is crucial for the development of our Anglo-American law to meet the conditions of maintaining the general security in the society of our time, materials for comparing with our own the reaction of the civil-law jurisdictions to social and economic change.

ROSCOE POUND

Table of Abbreviations

A.	Atlantic Reporter
All E.R.	All England Law Reports
Am. Dec.	American Decisions
App.	Appellate Court
App. Div.	Appellate Division
B. & C.	Barnewell and Creswell's Reports
Barn. & Adl.	Barnewell and Adolphus' Reports
BB	Betriebs-Berater
Best & S.	Best and Smith's Reports
BGHSt.	Entscheidungen des Bundesgerichtshof in Strafsachen
BGHZ	Entscheidungen des Bundesgerichtshof in Zivilsachen
Bull. civ.	Bulletin des arrêts de la Cour de cassation, chambres civiles
Burr.	Burrow's Reports
BVerfG	Entscheidungen des Bundesverfussungsgericht
C.A.	Court of Appeal
Cai.	Caines' Reports
Cal. App.	California Appellate Reports
Cal. Rptr.	California Reporter
Ch.	Chancery
ch. crim.	chambre criminelle
ch. civ.	chambre civile
ch. req.	chambre des requêtes
ch. soc.	chambre sociale
CLR	Commonwealth Law Reports
COM	Commission Proposal
D.	Recueil Dalloz
D.A.	Recueil Dalloz Analytique
D.C.	Recueil Dalloz Critique
D.H.	Recueil Dalloz Hebdomadaire de Jurisprudence
Dig.	Digest of Justinian

D.L.R.	Dominion Law Reports
D.P.	Recueil Dalloz Périodique et Critique
DR	Deutsches Recht
D.S.	Recueil Dalloz Sirey
EBVerfG	Entscheidungen des Bundesverfassungsgerichts
Eng. Rep.	English Reports
Ex.	Exchequer
F.	Federal Reporter
Fed. Cas.	Federal Cases
F.R.D.	Federal Rules Decisions
F. Supp.	Federal Supplement
Gaz. Pal.	Gazette du Palais
Gray	Gray's Reports
H.L.	House of Lords
Inst.	Institutes of Justinian
IR	Informations rapides
J	Jurisprudence
JCP	Juris Classeur Périodique
JR	Juristische Rundschau
JZ	Juristen-Zeitung
K.B.	King's Bench
L.R.	Law Reports
Met.	Metcalf's Reports
Mun. Ct.	Municipal Court
N.E.	Northeastern Reporter
NI	Northern Ireland Law Reports
NJW	Neue Juristische Wochenschrift
NJW-RR	Neue Juristische Wochenschrift-Rechtsprechungs-Report Zivilrecht
N.W.	Northwestern Reporter
N.Y.S.	New York Supplement
O.J.	Official Journal of the European Union
P.	Pacific Reporter
pan.	panorama de jurisprudence
P.C.	Judicial Committee of the Privy Council
Q.B.	Queen's Bench
Rev. trim. dr. civ.	Revue trimestrielle du droit civil
RGSt	Entscheidungen des Reichsgerichts in Strafsachen

RGZ	Entscheidungen des Reichsgerichts in Zivilsachen
S.	Recueil Sirey
S.C.	Session Cases
S.E.	Southeastern Reporter
So.	Southern Reporter
Strange	Strange's Reports
Super.	Superior Court
S.W.	Southwestern Reporter
T.L.R.	Times Law Reports
U.S.	United States Reports
VersR	Versicherungs Recht
W.L.R.	Weekly Law Reports
民一	Civil first instance
民终	Civil final (second instance)
民再	Civil retrial
民监	Civil supervision

Table of Cases

Canada

A-G of Canada v. Connolly [1999] 64 D.L.R. 4th 84 (British Colombia Supreme Court), 466–7

Buckley and Toronto Transportation Com'n v. Smith Transport Ltd., [1946] 4 D.L.R. 721 (British Columbia Supreme Court), 466–7

Caltex Oil Ltd. v. The Dredge Willemstad [1976–77] 136 CLR 529, 418

Canadian National Railway Co. v. Norsk Pacific Steamship Co. Ltd. [1992] 91 D.L.R. 4th 289, 418

China

An Y v. Shao QZ (2017) Zui Gao Fa Min Zai No. 26 (Supreme People's Court), 265–6

Baijia Real Estate Consulting LLC v. Chen Jinjin (2017) Yue 04 Min Zhong No. 2875, 247

Bureau of Forestry of Yi County v. Fang & Fang, Yuan Min Si Zhong Zi, 2014 No. 105, 223–4

Chen v. Hongta, Yun Gao Er Min Chu, 2012 No. 1; Min Shen Zi, 2013 No. 2119, 224–5

Chen Lidan v. Zhou Xuegang et al. (2016) Qian 0303 Min Chu No. 5005, 415

Chen Wei v. Amazon (2014) San Zhong Min Zhong Zi No.09383, 176–7, 233

Construction Bank of China v. Jiada Investment, LLC (2009) Yue Gao Fa Shen Jian Min Ti Zi No. 10 (High Court of Guangdong Province), 553–4

Fuzhen Construction, LLC v. Nanchang Municipal Construction, LLC (Supreme People's Court) (2017) Zui Gao Fa Min Zai No. 287, 552–3

Gao Wenjie v. Dingxi City Hee Sea Oil LLC (2014) Ding Zhong Min Er Cu Zi No. 4 (Dingxi City Intermediate People's Court), 226

Ge Changsheng v. Hong Zhenkuai, Guiding Case No. 99, 382–3

Hu v. Guanshan Huifu Brick Factory (2011) 403 Heng Zhong Fa Min Yi Zhong Zi No. 403 (2011), 522

Huang v. V3 International Sports LLC (2017) Gan 03 Min Zhong No. 240, 364–5

Jiang Yan v. Jiangsu Auction House et al., Su Min Jian Zi, 2012 No. 26, 193

Jinbo Corp. v. Yang Fan. (2016) E 08 Min Zhong No. 219, 419–20

Jinding Corp. v. Jirong Corp., Min Shen Zi, 2014 No. 1072, 219

King & Zone Law Firm v. Xinjiang LLC (2017) Jing 03 Min Zhong No. 3588, 176

Li et al. v. Yeji County Policy Department, Anhui Provincial TV Channel, Yeji High School (citation unavailable), 365–6

Liu v. Liu and Tan et al. (2017) Yue 0224 Min Chu No. 615, 422

Lu v. Hu (2011) Bai Min Chu Zi No. 2694, 187–8

Nanning City Road East Farms v. Teng Meicai, Nan Shi Min Er Er Zong Zi, 2012 No. 397 (Nanning Municipal Intermediate People's Court, 2012), 225–6

Peng Yu case (2007), 477

Shi v. Xia (2016) Su 09 Min Zhong No. 3731, 220

Shi et al. v. Xu (citation unavailable), 378–9

Tong Xu v. Liang ZF (2017) Yue 01 Min Zhong No. 23863, 220, 223

Xinyu Corp. v. Feng Yumei (2004) Ning Min Si Zhong Zi No. 470, 281–2

Xu v. Peng (2007) Gu Min Yi Chu Zi No. 212, 523

XY Renovation Corp. v. Hu Shujuan & Xu Chunhong (2014) Min Shen Zi No. 227, 284
Yang v. Zhang, Ning 03 Min Zhong, 2016 No. 801, 219
Yang Fan v. Amazon, Jing Min Zhong, 2017 No. 1120 (Beijing Municipal Intermediate People's Court (No. 3)), 176–7, 233
Zhang v. Jiangsu Performing Arts Group (PAG) & Jiangsu Huayang Corp (H Corp) (2013) Bai Shang Chu Zi No. 231, 221–3
Zhou v. Lv (First Intermediate Court of Beijing) (2016 01 495) Jing 01 Min Zhong No. 495, 524–5
ZT Corp. v. XD Corp. (2015) Min Ti Zi No. 39 (Supreme People's Court), 265

European Court of Human Rights
Aydin Tatlav v. Turkey, no. 50692/99, April 6, 2004, 347, 348
Baka v. Hungary, GC, no. 20261/12, May 27, 2014, 347
E.S. v. Austria, no. 38450/12, October 25, 2018, 344–50
Feldek v. Slovakia, no. 29032/95, §§ 73–76, July 12, 2001, 349
Fressoz and Roire v. France, GC, no. 29183/95, January 21, 1999, 347
Genner v. Austria, no. 55495/08, § 38, January 12, 2016, 349
Gibert and El Hogar Y La Moda J.A. v. Spain, no. 14929/02, May 13, 2003, 362
Gündüz v. Turkey, no. 35071/97, December 4, 2003, 348
Handyside v. United Kingdom, December 7, 1976, Series A no. 24, 347
I.A. v. Turkey, no. 42571/98, September 13, 2005, 347
Jaime Campmany y Diez de Revenga and Juan Luís Lopez-Galiacho Perona v. Spain, no. 54224/00, December 12, 2000, 362
Jerusalem v. Austria, no. 26958/95, February 27, 2001, 349
Kharmalov v. Russia, no. 27447/07, October 8, 2015, 349
Krone Verlag GmbH & Co. KG v. Austria, no. 34315/96, February 26, 2002, 361, 362
Lingens v. Austria, (1986) 8 E.H.R.R. 407, 333
News Verlags GmbH & CoKG v. Austria, no. 31457/96, January 11, 2000, 361
Observer and Guardian v. United Kingdom, no. 13585/88, July 12, 1990, 362
Otto-Preminger-Institut v. Austria, no. 13470/87, September 20, 1994, 347, 348
Pinto Pinheiro Marques v. Portugal, no. 26671/09, January 22, 2015, 349
Plon (Société) v. France, no. 58148/00, May 18, 2004, 361, 362
Prager and Oberschlick v. Austria, April 26, 1995, Series A no. 313, 349
Satakunnan Markkinapörssi Oy and Satamedia Oy v. Finland, GC, no. 931/13, June 27, 2017, 347
Schüssel v. Austria, no. 42409/98, February 21, 2002, 361
Sekmadienis Ltd. v. Lithuania, no. 69317/14, January 30, 2018, 348
Sociéte Prisma Presse v. France, no. 66910/01, July 1, 2003, 362
Stjerna v. Finland, November 25, 1994, Series A no. 299-B, 361
Tammer v. Estonia, (2003) 37 E.H.R.R. 43, 361
Verliere v. Switzerland, no. 41953/98, June 28, 2001, 361
Von Hannover v. Germany, no. 59320/00, June 24, 2004, 360–3
X and Y v. the Netherlands, March 26, 1985, Series A no. 91, 361

France
Cour de cassation
February 15, 1860, ch. civ., D. 1860.1.347, 268
December 3, 1860, ch. req., 623–4
August 27, 1861, ch. civ., S. 61.84, 621–2
April 24, 1865, ch. req., S. 66.1.169, 621–2
June 5, 1882, ch. req., S. 84.1.71, 621–2

April 27, 1887, ch. req., D. 1888, 263, 212
June 15, 1892, ch. req., D.P. 1892. I.596, 537
June 16, 1896, ch. civ., D. 1897.I.433, 498
January 9, 1901, D. 1901.1.450, 634
June 16, 1913, ch. req., D.P. 1914.5.23, 600
December 29, 1913, ch. civ., D.P. 1916.1.117, 292–3
August 3, 1915, ch. req., D.P. 1917. I.79, 600
January 21, 1919, ch. civ., D. 1922. I.25, 500
January 27, 1919, ch. req., S. 1920. I.198, 214
November 16, 1920, ch. civ., D. 1920. I.69, 500
July 29, 1925, ch. civ., D. 1925.I.5, 501
July 7, 1927, ch. civ., D.P. 1927.I.119, 293
December 11, 1928, ch. req., D.H. 1929.18, 544
February 13, 1930, chambres réunies, D. 1930.I.57, 501–3
February 2, 1931, ch. req., 437
October 8, 1940, ch. req., Gaz. Pal. 1940.2.65, 508
December 19, 1940, ch. civ., D.A. 1941.I.33, 507
February 24, 1941, ch. civ., D.C. 1941. I.85, 505
December 2, 1941, chambres réunies, D. 1941.I.369, 508
April 16, 1945, ch. req., S. 1945.I.73, 504
October 22, 1946, ch. civ., JCP 1946.365, D. 1947, 59, 437
March 5, 1947, ch. civ., D. 1947. I.1296, 506
June 19, 1951, ch. civ., D. 1951.I.717, 510
June 11, 1953, 1e ch. civ., JCP 1953. II7825, 508
June 30, 1953, ch. comm., JCP 1953. II.7811, 509
February 15, 1956, Cass., 2d ch. civ., D. 1956.350, 437
March 19, 1956, 2e ch. civ., D&S 1956. I.349, 506
May 4, 1956, ch. soc., JCP 1957. II. 9762, 217
January 16, 1962, 1e ch. civ., JCP 1962.II.12557, 438
July 15, 1962, 2e ch. civ., Gaz. Pal. 1965.II.330, 504
July 11, 1963, Gaz. Pal. 1963.2.389, 409
November 19, 1964, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1965.II.14022, 505
December 3, 1964, 2e ch. civ., D.S. 1965.I.321, 618, 623–4
December 18, 1964, 2e ch. civ., D&S 1965.I.191, 510
April 28, 1965, 2e ch. civ., D.S. 1965. J.777, 409
October 13, 1965, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1966.II14503, 508
June 29, 1966, 2e ch. civ., D&S 966. I.645, 507
January 20, 1967, 2e ch. civ., Bull. civ. II.30, 437–8
February 16, 1967, 2e ch. civ., Bull. civ. 1967.II.77, 436, 437
March 13, 1967, 2e ch. civ., Bull. civ. 1967.120, 504
February 20, 1968, 1e ch. civ., D.S. 1968.350, 613–14
March 20, 1968, 2e ch. civ., Bull. civ. 1968.II.89, 505
November 29, 1968, ch. civ., Gaz. Pal. 1969.I.63, 217
January 3, 1969, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1969. II.15920, 618
January 5, 1970, 1e ch. civ., D.S. 1970. J.155, 453
February 23, 1970, 1e ch. civ, JCP 1970.I.16347, 185
February 27, 1970, ch. mixte, D. 1970.201, 435
April 8, 1970, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1970. I.136, 648
May 8, 1970 2e ch. civ., Bull. civ. 1970. II no. 160, 408
December 3, 1970, ch. crim., pourvoi no. 69-92.381, 323
February 4, 1971, 3e ch. civ, JCP 1971.II.16781, 618
March 29, 1971, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1972. II 17086, 506
March 16, 1972, ch. crim., 1972 Bull. crim. 109, 478
March 20, 1972, ch. comm., Bull. civ. 1972.IV.93, 167, 168–9

June 15, 1972, 2e ch.civ., Bull. civ. 1982.186, 510
March 1, 1973, ch. crim., JCP 1974.II 17615, 438–9
June 7, 1974, 1e ch. civ., Bull. civ. 1974.147, 454
November 14, 1975, 2e ch. civ., arrêt no. 729, pourvoi no. 74-11.278, 376–7
May 3, 1977, ch. crim., Bull. Crim. 1977.3.374, 435
May 23, 1977, 2e ch. civ., Bull. II.139, 436
November 3, 1977, 3e ch. civ., D.S. 1978.434, 617–18
November 3, 1977, 3e ch. civ., D.S. 1978.434, 610–11
October 12, 1978, 3e ch. civ., D.S. 1979.IR.58, 593
February 21, 1979, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1979.IV.145, 410
November 27, 1979, 3e ch. civ., Gaz. Pal. 1980.I.pan. 146, 620
December 5, 1979, 2e ch. civ., arrêt no. 1032, pourvoi no. 78-13-614, 376
October 14, 1980, 3e ch. civ., D.S. 1981.IR.511, 594
July 8, 1981, 2e ch. civ., arrêt no. 1.013; pourvois nos. 80-12.286, 80-13.079, 354
May 11, 1982, 1e ch. civ., Gaz. Pal. 1982 2.612, 291–2
July 21, 1982, 2e ch. civ., D. 1982.449, 511
June 28, 1983, ch. crim., pourvoi no. 82-92.904, 335
May 9, 1984 (4th case), Assemblée plénière, D.S 1984.I.529, 468
May 9, 1984, assemblée plénière, D.S. 1984.I.529, 510
October 17, 1984, ch. comm., JCP 1985.II.20458, 409
December 12, 1984, 3e ch. civ, JCP 1985.II 20411, 631
January 8, 1985, ch. crim., Gaz. Pal. 1985.2.480, 435
March 24, 1987, 1e ch. civ., JCP 1989. I.21300, 186
April 6, 1987, 2e ch. civ., D.S. 1988.32, 511
June 10, 1987, 1e ch. civ., pourvoi no. 86-16.185, 354
June 12, 1987, 2e ch. civ., JCP 1987. IV. 286, 410
December 12, 1987, 2e ch. civ., arrêt no. 1307, pourvoi no. 86-17.537, 454
April 13, 1988, ch. civ., Bulletin des arrêts, No 98 p. 67, 358
April 27, 1988, 2e ch. civ., pourvoi no. 86-13-303, 376
November 20, 1990, 1e ch. civ., arrêt no., 380
March 25, 1992, D.S. 1993.64, 630–1
June 9, 1993, 1e ch. civ., JCP 1994. II.22202, 509
October 22, 1996, ch. comm., Bull. civ. IV no. 261, D. 1997.Jur.121, 229
December 3, 1997, ch. crim., pourvoi 95-85-915, arrêt no. 6405, 480
May 13, 1998, ch. crim., pourvoi 97-81.969, arrêt no. 2988, 479
June 29, 2010, ch. comm., Bull. civ. IV no. 115, JCP E 2010 m 1790, 230
July 5, 2018, ch. civ., 2e ch. civ., pourvoi no. 17–14.731, 230–1
1e ch. civ., arrêt no. 1434, pourvoi no. 89–13-049, 376
ch. civ., 2d sect., Gaz. Pal. 1963.I.25., 504

Cours d'appel
Amiens, April 22, 1898, S. 1899.II.1, 648
Chambéry, July 21, 1914, Gaz. trib. Jan. 19, 1916, 600
Colmar, May 2, 1855, D.P. 1856.II.9, 172, 600
Colmar, April 20, 1955, D. 1956. J.723, 409
Douai, June 2, 1930, Jurisprudence de la Cour d'appel de Douai 82, 183, 215
Paris, October 14, 1931, D. 1934. II.128, 216–17
Paris, October 28, 1943, Gaz. Pal. 1943.II.269, 507
Paris, January 22, 1953, JCP 1953. II.7435, 215
Paris, December 13, 1984, Rev. trim. dr. civ. 1986.97, 170–1
Paris, February 15, 1988, JCP 1988. II.21115, 332–3
Paris, September 23, 1988, Rev. trim. dr. civ. 1989, 741, 186
Pau, January 14, 1969, D.S. 1969. I.716, 170

Rennes, February 15, 1980, D.S. 1983.I.R.13, 594
Riom, November 9, 1978, JCP 79. II.19107, 435
Riom, May 10, 1988, Rev. trim. dr. civ. 1989.740, 192
Toulouse, March 17, 1970, JCP 1970. II.16534, 604–5
Versailles, March 30, 1989, Rev. trim. dr. civ. 1989. 739, 191
Tribunaux de commerce
Seine, February 20, 1932, Gaz. Pal. 1932.I.895, 287
Tribunaux de grande instance
Chartres, June 18, 1941, D.A. 1942. I.13, 507
Lyon, February 24, 1971, J.C.P. II. 16822, 504

Germany
Bundesgerichthof
February 12, 1952, BGHSt 2, 150, 480
May 6, 1960, BGHSt 14, 282, 481
May 4, 2013, ZR 255/11, 479
BB 1962, 156, 211–12
BGHSt 11, 207, 336
BGHSt 2, 38, 337
BGHSt 21, 371, 338
BGHSt 6, 186, 338
BGHZ 13, 334, 324
BGHZ 131, 332, 356–8
BGHZ 2, 355, 492
BGHZ 20, 345, NJW 56, 1554, 356
BGHZ 20, 346, NJW 565, 1554, 356
BGHZ 21, 319, 551
BGHZ 24, 201, NJW 57, 1315, 356
BGHZ 29, 65, 418
BGHZ 35, 356, 550
BGHZ 36, 232, 550
BGHZ 36, 30, 550
BGHZ 40, 272, 518, 549–50
BGHZ 41, 123, 419
BGHZ 51, 396, 623
BGHZ 51, 396, 619–20
BGHZ 54, 56, 619, 623
BGHZ 55, 153, 421–2
BGHZ 56, 163, 440–1
BGHZ 61, 312–17, 262–3
BGHZ 63, 98, 289
BGHZ 7, 338, 492
BGHZ 95, 307, 622–3
GRUR 1962, 211, 356
GRUR 1962, 212, 356
GRUR 1962, 324, NJW 62, 1004, 356
JZ 1989, 644, 336–9
JZ 1991, 199, 172–5
NJW 1951, 368, 325
NJW 1956, 1234, 289
NJW 1959, 2203, 261–2
NJW 1965, 1374, 355–6
NJW 1967, 2199, 174
NJW 1969, 1208, 619
NJW 1969, 789, 299
NJW 1970, 1541, 619
NJW 1970, 1737, 427
NJW 1971, 609, 550
NJW 1974, 1762, 336
NJW 1975, 170, 619–20, 623
NJW 1975, 1774, 174
NJW 1977, 626, 336
NJW 1979, 1595, 427–8
NJW 1981, 2117, 336
NJW 1991, 2337, 288
NJW 2012, 1431, 232–3
NJW 60, 1821, 480
RGSt 39, 427, 560
RGZ 76, 130, 623
VersR 1955, 346, 492
VersR 1962, 164, 493
VersR 1963, 14, 300
VersR 1966, 283, 440
VersR 1967, 374, 494
WM 1962, 936, BB 1962, 816, no. 1335, 174
WM 1967, 798, 174
WM 1977, 618, 174
Reichsgericht
BGHZ 62, 361, 617
BGHZ 88, 344, 616–17
JW 1908, 142, 616
JW 1909, 161, 616
JW 1913, 267, 616
JW 1932, 13, 336
JW 1932, 31, 336
KG JW 1927, 1945, 274
RG JW 1932, 31, 336
RGLZ 1915, 60, 336
RGR 1, 292, 336
RGSt 33, 46, 336, 337
RGSt 75, 68, 480
RGZ 100, 129, 256–9
RGZ 103, 177, 259–60
RGZ 103, 35, 206–7
RGZ 107, 15, 273
RGZ 107, 78, 260–1
RGZ 113, 301, 655

RGZ 124, 115, 186–7
RGZ 135, 339, 187
RGZ 143, 219, 171–2
RGZ 147, 353, 495
RGZ 150, 1, 207–10
RGZ 154, 161, 609–10, 613
RGZ 22, 208, 411
RGZ 48, 114, 412
RGZ 54, 404, 492
RGZ 57, 187, 650–1
RGZ 58, 24, 412
RGZ 78, 172, 495
RGZ 97, 310, 544
RGZ 98, 15, 616
RGZ 99, 259, 257
VersR 1955, 10, 655
VersR 1985, 335, 656
VersR 1985, 66, 655
Bundesverfassungsgericht
1 BvR 2150/14 (2016), 340–2
BVerfG 24, 278, 336
BVerfG 42, 163, 336
BVerfG 07, 198 NJW 1983, 1145, 339, 341
BVerfG 101, 361, 358–60
BVerfG 124, 300, 340, 341
BVerfG 33, 1 NJW 1972, 811, 339
BVerfG 42, 163 NJW 1976, 1680, 339
BVerfG 61, 1 NJW 1983, 1415, 339
BVerfG 90, 241, 340
BVerfG 93, 266, 340, 341
NJW 1994, 2943, 339–40
Landesgerichte
Bayern, NJW 73, 565, 480
Frankfurt am Main, NJW 1969, 2286, 439–40
Hildesheim, Oct. 25, 1968, VersR 1970, 720, 441
Krefeld, VersR 69, 166, 439
Oberlandesgerichte
Bayern, St 1958, 34, 337
Bayern, February 22, 1974, NJW 1974, 1520, 481–2
Bayern, N St.Z 1983, 126, 336
Bayern, N St.Z 1983, 265, 336
Berlin Kammergericht (KG), JR 1978, 422, 336
Düsseldorf, NJW 1981, 1522, 336
Düsseldorf, NJW 1986, 1262, 336
Düsseldorf, JR 1990, 126, 326
Düsseldorf, JR 1990, 345, 325
Frankfurt, NJW 1971, 47, 381
Frankfurt, NJW 1980, 597, 381–2
Frankfurt, OLGE 29, 251, 275
Freiburg, VZ 1953, 709, 440
Hamburg, MDR 1955, 43, 274
Hamburg, NJW 1970, 1325, 377–8
Hamm, February 28, 1989, NJW 1989, 2066, 299
Hamm, NZWehrr 1977, 70, 338
Hamm, May 30, 1940, DR 1940, 1188, 653–5
Munchen, BB 1956, 866, 426–7
Munchen, MDR 1955, 682, 274
Munchen, NJW 1970, 1745, 381
Oldenburg, JR 1990, 1217, 327
Saarbrücken, NJW 1998, 2913, 287–9
Schleswig, August 10, 1976, VersR 1977, 718, 453

Italy
Cass. 9 Feb. 1962, n. 271, Giust. Civ. Rep. 1962, s. v., 100

Netherlands
AAHoge Raad
Plas v. Valburg, NJ 1983, 723, 169

New Zealand
Hosking v. Runting [2004] NZCA 34; [2003] 3 NZLR 385, 368

United Kingdom
A v. B plc [2003] Q.B. 195, 369
Abbott of Westminster v. Clerke, 1 Dy. 26b, 28b, 73 Eng. Rep. 59, 63 (K.B. 1536), 244
Adams v. Lindsell (1818) 1 Barn. & Adl. 681 (K.B.), 152–3
Adderley v. Dixon (1824) 1 C. & S. 607, 270
A-G v. British Museum Trustees [1903] 2 Ch. 598 (Eng), 564
A-G. v. Doughty (1752) 28 E.R. 290, 614
A-G v. Guardian Newspapers Ltd (No. 2) [1990] 1 A.C. 109, 369
Alcock v. Chief Constable of South Yorkshire Police [1992] 1 A.C. 310, 434–5
Aldred's Case (1611) 77 E.R. 816, 614
Amalgamated Investment & Property Co. Ltd. v. John Walker & Sons, Ltd. [1977] 1 W.L.R. 164 (C.A.), 188–9

Anglo-Algerian Steamship Co. Ltd. v. The Houlder Line, Ltd. [1908] 1 K.B. 659, 412
Anonymous, Cro. Car. 449, 79 E.R. 1031 (K.B. 1638), 586
Arglasse (Earl of) v. Muschamp (1684) 1 Vern. 237, 238–39; 23 Eng. Rep. 438, 198
Armory v. Delamire (1772) 1 Strange 505 (K.B.), 560
Ashburn Anstalt v. Arnold [1989] Ch. 1, 270
Asher v. Whitlock L.R. 1 Q.B. 1 (1865), 31, 573
Bailey v. Bullock [1950] 2 All E.R. 1167, 285
Baker v. Bolton (1804) 170 E.R. 1033, 428
Ball v. Coggs (1710) 1 Bro. P.C. 140, 270
Barrow v. Chappel & Co. (1951) [1976] R.P.C. 355, 271
Bell v. Lever Brothers, Ltd. [1932] A.C. 161 (1932) (H.L.), 184, 191–2
Bessey v. Olliot (1682) Sir T. Raym. 421, 444
Beswick v. Beswick [1968] A.C. 58, 270
Bliss v. Hall (1838) 4 Bing NC 183, 612
Blyth v. Birmingham Water Works [1856] 11 Ex. 781, 464
Boardman v.Sanderson [1964] 1 W.L.R. 1317, 432
Bourhill v. Young [1943] A.C. 92, 432
Bradford (Mayor of) v. Pickles [1895] A.C. 587, 599
Brett v. East India and London Shipping Co. Ltd (1864) 2 H. & M. 404, 271
Britain v. Rossiter (1883) 11 Q.B.D. 123, 271
Burrows and Burrows v. Sharp (1991) 23 H.L.R. 82, 271
Buxton v. Lister (1746) 3 Ark. 383, 269
C.H. Giles & Co. Ltd v. Morris [1972] 1 W.L.R. 307, 271
Cambridge Water Co. Ltd v. Eastern Counties Leather plc. [1994] 2 A.C. 264 (H.L.), 484–7
Campbell v. MGN Ltd. [2003] Q.B. 633, 370
Campbell v. MGN Ltd. [2004] UKHL 22, 368–72
Campbell v. Paddington Corp. [1911] 1 K.B. 869, 624
Candler v. Crane, Christmas & Co. [1951] 1 All E.R. 426; [1951] 2 K.B. 164, 424
Carter v. Barnard 13 Q.B. 945, 116 E.R. 1524 (1849), 573
Case of Mines (1568), 1 Plowd. 310, 336, 75 E.R. 472, 510, 584
Cattle v. The Stockton Waterworks Co. (1875) L.R. 10 Q.B. 453, 412, 414, 421
Central London Property Trust Ltd v. High Trees House Ltd [1947] 1 K.B. 130, 146
Chadwick v. British Railways Board [1967] 1 W.L.R. 912, 433
Chappell v. Times Newspapers Ltd [1975] 1 Ch.D. 482, 271
Charing Cross Electricity Supply Co. v. Hydraulic Power Co. [1914] 3 K.B. 772, 484
Chesterfield v. Jannsen, 2 Ves. Sen. 125, 155, 28 Eng. Rep. 82, 100 (1750–51), 198
Chinn v. Hochstrasser [1979] Ch. 447 (reversed on other grounds [1981] A.C. 533), 269
Chinnock v. Sainsbury (1861) 30 L.J. Ch. 409, 271
Christie v. Davey [1893] 1 Ch. 316, 599
Churchward v. Studdy (1811) 6 East. 49, 104 Eng. Rep. 596, 558
Clifford v. Turrell (1841) 1 Y. & C.C.C. 138, 270
Coco v. A. N. Clark (Engineers) Ltd [1969] R.P.C. 41, 366, 368
Coggs v. Bernard (1703) 92 Eng. Rep. 107 (K.B.), 142
Colt v. Nettervill (1725) 2 P. Wms. 301, 269
Combe v. Combe [1951] 2 K.B. 215, 146
Co-operative Insurance Society Ltd v. Argyll Stores (Holdings) Ltd. [1998] A.C. 1, 269, 270
Countee de Rutland, Le v. Bowles, Palm. 290, 81 E.R. 1087 (K.B. 1622), 586
Cox v. Matthew, 1 Vent. 237 (K.B. 1673), 586
Crampton v. Varna Ry. (1872) L.R. 7 Ch. App. 562, 270
Cresswell v. Potter [1978] 1 W.L.R. 255 (Ch.), 201–2

Crown River Cruises v. Kimbolton Fireworks [1995] 2 Lloyd's Rep. 533, 484
Cud v. Rutter (1719) 1 P. Wms. 570, 269
Dalton v. Angus (1881) 6 App. Cas. 740, 614
Davison v. Gent, 1 H. & N. 744, 156 Eng. Rep. 1400 (Ex. 1857), 573
Dickenson v. Watson, Sir T. Jones 205 (1682), 444
Dickinson v. Dodds [1876] 2 Ch. Div. 463 (C. A.), 143, 153–4
Dulieu v. White & Sons [1901] 2 K.B. 669, 429, 432
Duncuft v. Albrecht (1841) 12 Sim. 189, 269
Earl of Chesterfield v. Jannsen, 2 Ves. Sen. 125, 130, 28 Eng. Rep. 82, 85 (1750–51), 198
Ellenborough Park, Re [1956] Ch. 131, 624
Elliott Steam Tug Co. Ltd. v. Shipping Controller [1922] 1 K.B. 127, 414
England v. Curling (1844) 8 Beav. 129, 271
Evans Marshall & Co. Ltd. v. Bertola S.A. [1973] 1 W.L.R. 349, 270
Fletcher v. Rylands (1866) L.R. 1 Ex. 265, 482–3
Fothergill v. Rowland (1873) L.R. 17 Eq. 137, 269
Fowler v. Lanning [1959] 1 Q.B. 156, 307, 445
Fry v. Lane (1888) 40 Ch. D. 312, 201
Garden Cottage Foods Ltd v. Milk Marketing Board [1984] A.C. 130, 269
Glyn v. Nichols, Comb. 44, 90 E.R. 333 (K.B. 1687), 586
Goldman v. Hargrave [1966] 2 All E.R. 989 at 992, [1967] 1 A.C. 64522, 602
Gough v. Thorne [1966] 3 All E.R. 398 (C.A.), 465–6
Grant v. Cigman [1996] 2 B.C.L.C. 24, 269
Greenwood v. Bennett [1973] 1 Q.B. 195 (CA), 548
Griffith v. Brymer (1903) 19 T.L.R. 434 (K.B.), 188
Guinness Mahon & Co Ltd v Kensington & Chelsea Royal London BC [1999] Q.B. 115 (C.A.), 530
Gwynne v. Heaton, 1 Bro. C.C. 1, 6, 28 Eng. Rep. 949, 951 (1778), 198
Hadley v. Baxendale (1854) 9 Ex. 341, 293–5
Hall v. Wright (1859) E.B. & E. 746, 242, 243
Hambrook v. Stokes Brothers [1925] 1 K.B. 141, 432, 434
Hamlin v. Great Northern Railway Co. (1856) 1 H & N 40852, 285
Harvela Investments Ltd. v. Royal Trust Co. of Canada (C.I.) Ltd [1986] A.C. 207, 269
Haywood v. The Brunswick Permanent Benefit Building Society [1881] 8 Law Reports 403 (Q.B.), 632
Hazell v. Hammersmith & Fulham Borough Council [1992] 2 A.C. 1 (H.L.), 530
Hedley Byrne & Co., Ltd. V. Heller & Partners, Ltd. [1964] A.C. 465 (H.L.), 423–4
Hinz v. Berry [1970] 2 Q.B. 40, 432
Hobbs v. London & South Western Railway Co. (1875) L.R. 10 Q.B. 111, [1874–80] All E.R. 458, 285
Hollywood Silver Fox Farm Ltd. v. Emmett [1936] 2 K.B. 468, 599
How v. Waldon & Edwards (1754) 2 Ves. Sen. 516, 28 Eng. Rep. 330, 198
Hughes v. Dyeball, M. & M. 345, 173 Eng. Rep. 1184 (N.P. 1829), 573
Humphrey v. Martin, Carr & M. 32, 174 Eng. Rep. 395 (N.P. 1841), 573
Hunter v. Canary Wharf Ltd. [1996] W.L.J. 348 (C.A.), 614–15
Hyde v. Dean of Windsor, Cro. Eliz. 552, 78 Eng. Rep. 798 (K.B. 1597), 243, 244
J A Pye (Oxford) Ltd v. Graham [2002] UKHL 30 (HL), 566–7, 568
James v. Campbell (1832) 5 Car. & P 372, 172 E.R. 1015, 452
Jarvis v. Swans Tours Ltd. [1973] 1 Q.B. 233, 284–6
Jobson v. Johnson [1989] 1 W.L.R. 1026, 269
Johnson v. Shrewsbury and Birmingham Ry. (1853) 3 D.M. & G. 358, 271
Johnson, Ex'r of Hill v. Nott (1684) 1 Vern. 271 23 Eng. Rep. 464, 198

Joseph v. National Magazine Co. Ltd [1959] Ch. 14, 271
Kaye v. Robertson [1991] F.S.R. 62 (C.A.), 350–1
Keebleth-wait v. Palmes, Comb. 9, 90 E.R. 311 (K.B. 1686), 586
Kelly v. Solari (1841) 9 M&W 54, 59,152 E.R. 24, 540
Kennedy v. Panama, New Zealand and Australian Royal Mail Co. [1867] 2 Q.B. 580, 191–2
Kenney v. Wexham (1822) 6 Madd. 355, 270
Kien v. Stukeley, 1 Bro. 191, 192, 1 Eng. Rep. 506, 507 (H.L. 1722), 198
King v. Phillips [1953] 1 Q.B. 429, 432
Kleinwort Benson Ltd v. Lincoln City Council [1999] 2 A.C. 349 (H.L.), 530
Kleinwort Benson Ltd v. Sandwell [1994] 4 All E.R. 890, 530
Koufos v. C. Czarnikow, Ltd., [The Heron II] [1969] A.C. 350 (H.L. 1967), 295–6
Krell v. Henry [1903] 2 K.B. 740, 250, 251
Laddingford Enclosures Ltd v. Forsyth [1994] 3 All E.R. 801, 277–8
Lamare v. Dixon (1873) L.R. 6 H.IL. 414, 270
Langen & Wind Ltd v. Bell I [1972] Ch. 685, 269
Larios v. Bonnany y Gurety (1873) L.R. 5 C.P. 346, 269
Laws v. Florinplace Ltd. [1981] 1 All E.R. 659 (Ch.), 620–1
Leaf v. International Galleries [1950] 2 K.B., 184–5
Leame v. Bray, 3 East. 593 (1803), 444
Leigh v. Gladstone (1909) 26 T.L.R. 139, 645
Letang v. Cooper [1965] 1 Q.B. 232, 452
Lipkin Gorman v. Karpnale. Ltd. [1991] 2 A.C. 548 (H.L.), 529
Livingstone v. Ministry of Defence [1984] N.I. 356 (C.A.) (Northern Ireland), 451–2, 454
Livingstone v. Rawyards Coal Co. (1879–80) L.R. 5 App. Cas. 25, 548
London County Council v. Allen [1914–1915] All E.R Rep. (C.A. 1914), 627–8
Lord Advocate v. University of Aberdeen 1963 SC 533 (Scot.), 564
M.E.P.C. v. Christian Edwards [1978] Ch. 281 at 293 (affirmed on other grounds [1981] A.C. 205), 269
Malcolm v. Chancellor Masters and Scholars of the University of Oxford, The Times, December 19, 1990, 271
Marshall v. Broadhurst (1831) 1 Tyr. 348, 243
Mason v. Hill (1833) 3 Barn. & Adl. 304, 110 Eng. Rep. 114, 589
McLoughlin v. O'Brian [1982] 2 All E.R. 298 [1983] 1 A.C. 410, 435
McLoughlin v. O'Brian [1983] A.C. 410, 432–4
Meng Leong Developments Pte. Ltd v. Tip Hong Trading Co. Pte. Ltd. [1985] A.C. 511, 270
Metropolitan Asylum District Managers v. Hill (1881) 6 App. Cas. 193, [1881–5], 620
Miller v. Fandrye (1626) Poph. 161, 218, 444, 640
Miller v. Jackson [1977] Q.B. 966, 600–3, 611–12
Milnes v. Branch (1816) 5 M. & S. 411, 632
Mortimer v. Beckett [1920] 1 Ch. 571, 271
Moses v. Macferlan [1760], 97 Eng. Rep. 676 (2 Burr. 1005), 528, 533
Mouse's Case (1609) 12 Co.Rep. 63, 218, 641, 644
Nash v. Sheen, The Times, March 13, 1953, 316
Nichols v. Gould, 2 Ves. Sen. 422, 423, 28 Eng. Rep. 270, 270 (1752), 198
Northwestern Utilities Ltd v. London Guarantee Ltd [1936] A.C. 108, 484
Odessa Tramways Co. v. Mendel (1878) 8 Ch.D. 235, 269
Orakpo v. Manson Investments Ltd. [1978] A.C. 95, 104 (HL), 528
Osmond v. Fitzroy & Duke of Cleveland (1731) 3 P. Wms 129, 198
Page v. Smith [1996] 1 A.C. 211, 429
Palmer v. Keeblethwaite, 1 Shower, K.B. 64, 64, 89 E.R. 451, 451 (K.B. 1686), 586
Paradine v. Jane, Aleyn 26, 82 Eng. Rep. 897 (K.B. 1647), 244

Penarth Dock Engineering Co. Ltd v. Pounds [1963] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 359, 543
Phillips v. Homfray (1883) 24 Law Reports 439 (Ch. Div.), 542
Posner v. Scott-Lewis [1987] Ch. 25, 271
Powell v. Fall (1880) 5 Q.B.D. 597, 484
Prudential Assurance Co. Ltd v. London Residuary Body [1992] 2 A.C. 386, 270
R v. Bourne [1939] 1 K.B. 687, 645
R v. Dudley and Stephens (1884) 14 Q.B.D. 273, 644
R v. Dymont [1988] 2 SCR 417, 368
R v. Ireland [1997] 3 W.L.R. 534, 317
Rainbow Estates Ltd v. Tokenhold [1998] 2 All E.R. 860, 270
Rainham Chemical Works v. Belvedere Fish Guano Co. [1921] 2 A.C. 465, 484
Ramsden v. Dyson [1866] L.R. 1 HL 129, 547
Read v. J. Lyons & Co., Ltd. [1946] 2 All E.R. 471 [1947] A.C. 156 (H.L.), 483–4
Regent International Hotels v. Page Guide, The Times, May 13, 1985, 271
Reynolds v. Times Newspapers Ltd [2001] 2 A.C. 127, 369
Richards v. Hill, 5 Mod. 206, 87 E.R. 611 (K.B. 1695), 586
Rigby v. Chief Constable of Northamptonshire [1985] 1 Q.L.R. 1242, 484
Rigby v. Connol (1880) 14 Ch.D. 482, 271
River Wear Commissioners v. Adamson [1877] 2 App. Cas. 743, 307
Robinson v. Harman (1848) 1 Ex. 850, 276
Rogers v. Challis (1859) 27 Beav. 175, 269
Russell and Handfords Case, 1 Leo. 273, 74 E.R. 248 (K.B. 1583), 586
Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v. Forsyth [1994] 3 All E.R. 801, 277–8
Rylands v. Fletcher [1826] L.R. 3 H.L. 330, 445, 483, 485
Saltman Engineering Co Ltd. v. Campbell Engineering Co. Ltd. (1948) [1963] 3 All E.R. 413, 366
Salvin's Indenture, Re, Pitt v. Durham County Water Board [1938] 2 All Eng. L. Rep. 498 (Ch. Div.), 629–30
Sands v. Trefuses, Cro. Car. 575, 79 E.R. 1094 (K.B. 1639), 586
Savile v. Savile, 1 P. Wms. 745, 746–47, 24 Eng. Rep. 596 (1721), 198
The Scaptrade [1983] 2 A.C. 694, 271
Schwabacher, Re (1908) 98 L.T. 127, 269
Sedleigh-Denfield v. O'Callaghan [1940] A.C. 880, 602
Sichel v. Mosenthal (1862) 30 Beav. 371, 269
Simpson & Co. v. Thomson [1877] 3 A.C. 279 (H.L.), 412
Smith & Payne v. Webber, 1 Ad. & E. 119, 10 Eng. Rep. 1152 (K.B. 1834), 573
Soc. des Industries Metallurgiques S.A. v. Bronx Engineering Co. Ltd [1975] 1 Lloyd's Rep. 465, 270
Société Anonyme de Remorquage a Helice v. Bennets [1911] 1 K.B. 243, 414
South African Territories Ltd v. Wallington [1898] A.C. 109, 269
Southwark London Borough Council v. Williams [1971] 1 Ch. 734, 644–5
Spartan Steel & Alloys Ltd v. Martin & Co (Contractors) Ltd, [1973] 1 Q.B. 27 (C.A.), 416–18
Sri Lanka Omnibus Co. v. Perera [1952] A.C. 76, 269
St. Helen's Smelting Co. v. Tipping (1865) 11 H.L. Cas. 642 (H.L.), 606–7
Stanley v. Powell (1891) 1 Q.B. 86, 33, 307, 445
Stephens v. Avery [1988] 1 Ch. 457, 366–7
Stickney v. Keeble [1915] A.C. 386, 270
Stokes v. Berry, 2 Salk 421, 91 Eng. Rep. 366 (K.B. 1699), 573
Stovin v. Wise and Norfolk County Council [1996] A.C. 923 (H.L), 469–70
Sturges v. Bridgman (1879) 11 Ch. D. 852, 611
Sturlyn v. Albany, Cro. Eliz. 67, 78 Eng. Rep. 327 (Q.B. 1587), 198
Swordheath Properties Ltd v. Tabet [1979] 1 W.L.R. 285, 543

Tarzwell v. Barnard, Cowp. 595, 98 Eng. Rep. 1259 (K.B. 1777), 573
Taylor v. Caldwell (1863) 3 Best & S. 826 (Q.B.), 242–4
Taylor v. N.U.S. [1967] 1 W.L.R. 532, 271
Tenant v. Goldwin, 2 Raym. Ld. 1089, 1094, 92 E.R. 222, 225 (1705), 586
Thompson-Schwab v. Costaki [1956] All E.R. 652 [1956] 1 W.L.R. 335, 620
Thorns Case, Y.B. Mich. 6 Ed. 4 (1466), 444
Tito v. Waddell (No. 2) [1977] Ch. 106, 270
Tsakiroglou & Co., Ltd. v. Noblee & Thorl G.m.b.h. [1962] A.C. 93 (H.L.) , 252–3
Tulk v. Moxhay (1848) 2 Ph. 774, 632
Twistleton v. Griffith, 1 P. Wms. 310, 311, 24 Eng. Rep. 403, 404 (1716), 198
Tye v. House [1997] 2 E.G.L.R. 171, 270
Verrall v. Great Yarmouth B.C. [1981] Q.B. 202, 270
Wagon Mound, The (No. 2) [1966] 2 All E.R. 709, [1967] 1 A.C. 617, 602
Wainwright v. Home Office [2003] 3 W.L.R. 1137, 368
Wakeman v. Robinson, 1 Bing. 213 (1823), 444
Walford v. Miles [1992] 2 A.C. 128 (H.L.), 160–1
Walton v. Waterhouse, 2 Wms. Saund. 418, 242
Ward v. James [1966] 1 Q.B. 273, 98
Weaver v. Ward, Hobart 134 (1616), 444
Wentworth v. Cock (10 A. & E. 42, 45–46), 243
Whalley v. Lancashire and Yorkshire Ry. Co. [1884] 13 Q.B. 131, 649
Whiteley Ltd. v. Hilt [1918] 2 K.B. 808, 269
Whitwham v. Westminster Brymbo Coal and Coke Co [1896] 2 Ch. 538, 546
Wilkins v. Marquis of Cleveland, 9 B. & C. 864, 109 Eng. Rep. 321 (1829), 573
Wilkinson v. Downton [1897] 2 Q.B. 57, 308, 317–18, 429
William Lacey (Hounslow), Ltd. v. Davis [1957] 2 All E.R. 712 (Q.B.), 161–3
Williams v. Hide, Palm. 548 (1624), 244
Williams v. Morland, 2 B. & C. 910, 107 Eng. Rep. 620 (K.B. 1824), 587
Williams v. Roffey Bros. & Nicholls (Contractors) Ltd [1991] 1 Q.B. 1, 144
Willis v. Jernegan, 2 Atk. 251, 26 Eng. Rep. 555 (1741), 198
Wilson v. St. Hellen's B.C. [1998] 3 W.L.R. 1070, 271
Wishart v. National Association of Citizens Advice Bureaux [1990] I.C.R. 794, 271
Wood v. Morewood [1841] 3 Q.B. 440, 548
Woolwich Equitable Building Society v. IRC [1993] A.C. 70 (HL) 177, 530
Wright v. Howard, 1 Stim. & Stu. 190, 589
Wrotham Park Estate Company v. Parkside Homes Ltd [1974] 1 W.L.R. 798 (Ch. div.), 545–7
Young v. Hitchens (1844) 6 Q.B., 115 Eng. Rep. 228, 557–8

United States

A & M Produce Co. v. FMC Corp., 135 Cal. App. 3d 473 (1982), 204
Abramzik v. Brenner (1967) 65 D.L.R. (2d) 651, 434
Alcorn v. Anbro Engineering, Inc., 468 P.2d 216 (Cal. 1970), 322
Benson v. Lee [1972] V.R. 879, 433
Berger v. Weber, 303 N.W.2d 424 (Mich. 1981), 428
Beruan v. French (1976) 56 Cal. App.3d 825, 374
Boomer v. Atlantic Cement Co., Inc., 257 N.E.2d 870 (N.Y. 1970), 603–4
Borer v. American Airlines, 563 P.2d 858 (Cal. 1977), 428
Bove v. Donner-Hanna Coke Corp., 258 N.Y.S. 229 (N.Y.App. Div. 1932), 608–9
Briscoe v. Reader's Digest Association, Inc. (1971) 4 Cal.3d 529, 373
Brown v. Collins, 53 N.H. 442 (1873), 445
Brown v. French, 104 Pa. 604 (183), 471
Brown v. Kendall, 60 Mass. 292 (1850), 33
Brown v. Superior Court (Abbott Laboratories), 751 P.2d 470 (Cal. 1988), 515–16

Bruce v. Martin Marietta Corp., 544 F.2d 442 (10th Cir. 1976), 515
Burden v. Stein, 27 Ala. 104 (1855), 591
Butcher v. Superior Court, 188 Cal. Rptr. 503 (Cal. App. 1983), 428
Byrd v. English, 43 S.E. 419 (Ga. 1902), 418
Campbell v. Cochrane 416 A.2d 211 (Del 1980), 564
Cape Publications, Inc. v. Bridges, 423 So. 2d 426 (Fla. App. 1982), review denied, 431 So. 2d 988 (Fla. 1983), 352
Carboni v. Arrospide, 2 Cal. App. 4th 76 (1991), 203–5, 212
Carey v. Daniels, 49 Mass. (8 Met.) 466 (1844), 587–8
Central Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Serv. Comm'n of Central Hudson Gas & Electric Corp., 447 U.S. 557, 100 S. Ct. 2343, 65 L. Ed. 2d 341 (1980), 331
Channel Home Centers v. Grossman 795 F.2d 291 (3rd Cir. 1986), 160, 163–5
Cilley v. Lane, 385 A.2d 418 (Me. 2009), 473–4
Clark v. Nash, 198 U.S. 361 (1905), 650
Corporacion Salvadorena de Calzado, S.A. v. Injection Footwear Corp. 533 F. Supp. 290 (S.D. Fla. 1982), 75
Cox v. Howell, 65 S.W. 868 (Tenn. 1901), 591
Crabtree v. City Auto Salvage Co. (1960), 47 Tenn. App. 616, 340 S.W.2d 940, 618
Credit Alliance Corp. v. Andersen & Co., 483 N.E.2d 110 (N.Y. 1985), 426
Cronin v. J.B.E. Olson Corp., 501 P.2d 1153 (1972), 515
Deitsch v. The Music Company, 6 Ohio Misc. 2d 6 (Mun. Ct. 1983), 286
Depue v. Flatau, 111 N.W. 1 (Minn. 1907), 642
Diaz v. Oakland Tribune, 139 Cal. App. 3d 118 (1983), 372–4
Dillon v. Legg, 441 P.2d 912 (Cal. 1968), 430–1, 432, 475
Dobrowolski v. Penn. R. Co., 178 A. 488 (Pa. 1935), 445
Eastern Steamship Lines, Inc. v. United States, 112 F. Supp. 167 (Ct. Cl. 1953), 280
Elden v. Sheldon 758 P.2d 582 (Cal. 1988), 428
Ellis v. D'Angelo, 253 P.2d 675 (Cal. App. 1953), 447–50
Escola v. Coca-Cola Bottling Co. of Fresno, 150 P.2d 436 (Cal. 1944), 511–12
European American Bank & Trust v. Strauhs & Kaye, 483 N.E.2d (N.Y. 1985), 426
Feldstein v. Kammauf, 121 A.2d 716 (Md. 1956), 618
Finger v. Omni Publs. Intl., 77 N.Y.2d 138 (N.Y. 1990), 353
Firestone & Parson, Inc. v. Union League of Philadelphia, 672 F. Supp. 819 (E.D. Pa.1987), 185
Flaherty v. Moran, 45 N.W. 381 (Mich. 1890), 599
Flamm v. Van Nierop, 291 N.Y.S. 2d 189 (N.Y. A.D. 1968), 321
Florida Star v. B.J.F., 491 U.S. 524 (1989), 374–5
Foley v. H.F. Farnham Co., 135 Me. 29, 35, 188 A.708, 712 (1936), 474
Foley v. Harris, 286 S.E.2d 186 (1982), 619
Fontainebleau Hotel Corp. v. Forty-Five Twenty-Five, Inc., 114 So. 2d 357 (Fla. App. 1959), 615–16
Ford Motor Co. v. Miles, 967 S.W.2d 377 (Tex. 1998), 428
Forsher v. Bugliosi (1980) 26 Cal.3d 792, 373
Gaeta v. New York News, 62 N.Y. 2d 340, 353
Garner v. United States, 424 U.S. 648 (1976), 80
Garratt v. Dailey, 279 P.2d 1091 (Wash. 1955), 457–8
Garwood v. N.Y. Central & Hudson R. R.R. Co., 83 N.Y. 400 (1881), 591
Glanzer v. Shepard, 233 N.Y. 236 (1922), 425
Goldman v. McShain, 247 A.2d 455 (Pa. 1968), 164
Gomez v. Hug, 645 P.2d 916 (Kan. App. 1982), 749–50
Grant v. Allen, 41 Conn. 156 (1874), 649–50
Groover v. Tippins 179 S.E. 634 (Ga. 1935), 564

Groves v. John Wunder Co., 286 N.W. 235 (1939), 280
Haehlen v. Wilson (1936), 11 Cal. App. (2d) 437, 54 P. (2d) 62, 618
Haldane & Urry v. Harvey, 4 Burr. 2484, 2487, 98 Eng. Rep. 302, 304 (K.B. 1769), 573
Halio v. Lurie, 222 N.Y.S.2d 759 (N.Y. A.D. 1961), 321
Hamilton v. Whitridge, et al., 11 Md. 128, 147, 148, 69 Am. Dec. 184, 622
Harding v. The Stamford Water Company, 41 Conn. 87 (1874), 591
Haynes v. Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 8 F.3d 1222 (7th Cir. 1993), 379–80
Hill v. Kimball, 13 S.W. 59 (Tex. 1890), 429
Hitaffer v. Argonne, 183 F.2d 811 (1950), 428
Hoffman v. Red Owl Stores, Inc. 133 N.W.2d 267 (Wis. 1965), 165–8
Hollinbeck v. Downey, 261 Minn. 481,113 N.W.2d 9 (1962), 477
Howard Frank, M.D. P.C. v. Superior Court, 722 P.2d 955 (Ariz. 1986), 428
Howell v. New York Post, Inc., 612 N.E. 2d 699 (N.Y. 1993), 352–3
Hurley v. City of Niagara Falls 254 N.E. 2d 917 (N.Y. 1969), 564
Hustler Magazine v. Falwell, 485 U.S. 46 (1988), 328–9
Ingersoll, et al. v. Rousseau, 76 P. 513, 35 Wash. 92, 622
Jensen v. Probert, 148 P.2d 248 (Ore. 1944), 549
Kapellas v. Kofman (1969) 1 Cal.3d 20, 373
Kazanjian v. New England Petroleum Corp., 480 A.2d 1153 (Pa. Super. 1984), 164
Khalid Abdullah Tarig Al Mansour Faissal Fahd Al Talal v. Fanning, 506 F. Supp. 186 (N.D. Cal. 1980), 329
King v. Tiffany, 9 Conn. 162 (1832), 591
Krieg v. Massey, 781 P.2d 277 (Mont. 1989), 474–5
Kuzniak v. Kozmanski, 65 N.W. 275 (Mich. 1895), 599
Lambert v. Brewster, 125 S.E. 244 (W. Va. 1924), 429
Leichtman v. WLW Jacor Communications, Inc., 634 N.E. 2d 697 (Ohio App. 1994), 316–17
Lenawee County Board of Health v. Messerly, 331 N.W.2d 203 (Mich. 1982), 189–90
Livingston v. Davis (1951), 1 243 Iowa 21, 50 N.W. (2d) 592, 27 A.L.R. (2d) 1237, 618
Lombardo v. Gasparini Excavating Co., 123 A.2d 663 (Pa. 1956), 164
Long v. Patterson, 22 So.2d 490 (Miss. 1945), 472–3
Losee v. Buchanan, 51 N.Y. 476 (1873), 445
Louisville Tin & Stove Co. v. Lay, 65 S.W.2d 1002 (Ky. 1933), 551
M'Calmont v. Whitaker, 3 Rawle 84 (Pa. 1831), 591
MacPherson v. Buick Motor Co. 217 N.Y. 382, 111 N.E. 1050 (1916), 511
Marshall v. Lionel Enterprises Inc. [1972] 2 O.R. 177, 433
Mason v. Whitney, 78 N.E. 881 (Mass. 1906)(dicta), 591
Matal v. Tam, 137 S. Ct. 1744 (2017), 330–2
Mathewson v. Primeau, 395 P.2d 183 (Wash 1964), 618
McLaughlin v. Sullivan (1983), 123 N.H. 335, 461 A.2d 123, 475
McPeake v. Cannon Esquire, P.C. (1989), 381 Pa.Super. 227, 553 A.2d 439, 475
Melvin v. Reid (1931) 112 Cal. App. 285, 373
Mercer v. Corbin (1889), 117 Ind. 450, 20 N.E. 132, 3 L.R.A. 221, 458
Miller v. Lutheran Conference and Camp Ass'n, 200 A. 646 (Pa. 1938), 628
Mineral Park Land Co. v. Howard, 172 Cal., 289, 156 P. 458 (1916), 253
Mitchell v. Bearden, 503 S.W.2d 904 (Ark. 1974), 621
Niederlehner v. Weatherly 69 N.E. 2d 787 (Ohio 1946), 564
Nieman-Marcus v. Lait, 13 F.R.D. 311 (S.D.N.Y. 1952), 329
Oceanside Community Association v. Oceanside Land Co. 147 Cal. App. 166 (1983), 632–3

Olwell v. Nye & Nissen Co., 173 P. 2d 652 (Wash. 1946), 543
Parker v. Griswold, 17 Conn. 288, 300 (1845), 591
Parrott v. Wells Fargo & Co., (Nitro-Glycerin case) 15 Wall 524 (U.S. Sup. Ct. 1872), 21 L. Ed. 206, 445
Patterson v. McLean Credit Union, 805 F.2d 1143 (4th Cir. 1986), 322
Peevyhouse v. Garland Coal & Mining Co. 382 P.2d 109 (Okl. 1962), 279–80
People Express Airlines v. Consolidated Rail Corp., 495 A.2d 107 (N.J. 1985), 420–1
Petersen v. Friedman, 328 P.2d 264 (Cal. App. 1958), 624
Pierson v. Post, 3 Cai. 175, 2 Am. Dec. 264 (N.Y. 1805), 558
Ploof v. Putnam, 71 A. 188 (Vt. 1908), 640–2
Podias v. Mairs, 926 A.2d 859 (N.J. 2007), 476–7
Powell v. Taylor, 222 Ark. 896, 263 S.W. 2d 906, 622
Proctor v. Adams, 113 Mass. 376, 18 Am. Rep. 500, 641
Raven Red Ash Coal Co. v. Ball, 39 S.E. 2d 231 (Va. 1946), 543
River Wear Commissioners v. Adamson [1877] 2 App. Cas. 743, 445
Robins Dry Dock & Repair Co. v. Flint, 275 U.S. 302 (1927), 414, 421
Rocha v. Faltys, 69 S.W. 3d 315 (Tex. App. 2002), 472
Rockhill v. Pollard, 485 P.2d 28 (Ore. 1971), 475
Rosenberger v. University of Virginia, 115 S. Ct. 2510, 132 L. Ed. 2d 700, 331
Ruiz v. Formann, Tex. Civ. App. 1974, 514 S.W.2d 817, 652
Schley v. Couch 284 S.W. 333 (Texas 1955), 564
Sherwood v.Walker, 33 N.W. 919 (Mich. 1887), 181, 189–91
Smith v. Zimbalist, 38 P.2d 170 (Cal. App. 1934), 185
Soldano v. O'Daniels, 141 Cal. App.3d 443, 190 Cal. Rptr. 310 (1983), 476, 477
Spur Industries, Inc. v. Del E. Webb Development Co. 494 P.2d 700 (Ariz. 1972), 612–13
Strickley v. Highland Boy Gold Mining Co., 200 U.S. 527 (1906), 650
Strobel v. The Kerr Salt Company, 58 N.E. 142 (N.Y. 1900), 591
Talmage v. Smith, 59 N.W. 656 (Mich. 1894), 450, 454
Tam, re, 808 F. 3d 1321, 1331 (CA Fed. 2015), 330, 331
Tarasoff v. Regents of the University of California, 551 P.2d 334 (Cal. 1970), 475
Tedescki v. Berger, 43 So. 960 (1907), 622
Thunder Bay River Booming Company v. Speechly, 31 Mich. 336 (1875), 591
Thurber v. Martin, 68 Mass. (2 Gray) 394 (1854), 590
Timm v. Bear, 29 Wis. 254, 268 (1871), 591
Toker v. Westerman, 274 A.2d 78 (N.J. Super. 1970), 202–3
Transatlantic Financing Corp. v. United States, 363 F.2D 312 (D.C. Cir. 1966), 254–5
Tyler v. Wilkinson, 24 Fed. Cas. 472 (case no. 14312), 588–9
Ultramares Corporation v. Touch, 174 N.E. 441 (N.Y. 1934), 424–5, 426
Union Interchange, Inc. v. Savage (1959) 52 Cal.2d 601, 606 [342 P.2d 249], 633
United States v. Carroll Towing Co., 159 F.2d 169 (2nd Cir. 1947), 460–1
United States v. Schwimmer, 279 U.S. 644, 49 S. Ct. 448, 73 L. Ed. 889 (1929), 331
Vermont Salvage Corp. v. Village of St. Johnsbury (1943), 113 Vt. 341, 34 A.2d 188, 618
Vickery v. Hardin 133 N.E. 922 (Ind 1922), 564
Vincent v. Lake Erie Transportation Co., 124 N.W. 221 (Minn. 1910), 642–4
Weakley v. Page, 102 Tenn. 178, 53 S.W. 551, 46 L.R.A. 552, 622
Weaver v. American Oil Co., 276 N.E.2d 144 (Ind. 1971), 228–9

Weeks v. Hackett 71 A, 858 (Me 1908), 564
Western Union Telegraph Co. v. Hill, 150 So. 709 (1933), 317
White v. Guarente, 372 N.E. 315 (N.Y. 1977), 425–6
Wiggs v. Courshon, 355 F. Supp. 206 (S.D. Fla. 1973), 322
Wood v. United Airlines, 1962, 32 Misc.2d 955, 223 N.Y.S.2d 692, affirmed 16 A.D.2d 659, 226 N.Y.S. 2d 1022, appeal dismissed 11 N.Y. 2d 1053, 230 N.Y.S.2d 207. 184 N.E.2d 180, 653
Woodin v. Wentworth, 23 N.W. 813 (Mich. 1885), 591
Wyant v. Crouse, 86 N.W. 527 (Mich. 1901), 450–1, 454
Yania v. Bigan, 155 A.2d 343 (Pa. 1959), 471
Zornes v. Bowen 274 N.W. 877 (Iowa 1937), 564

Table of Legislation

China
Bankruptcy Law (draft) 1901, 48
Civil Code (draft) 1901, 48
Civil Code 1929, 49, 50, 51, 54
art. 6, 50
art. 16, 50, 146
art. 154, 146
art. 155, 146
art. 188, 314
art. 219, 146
art. 220, 146
art. 225, 146
art. 226, 146
art. 227, 146
Civil Code 2020, 52
art. 7, 173
art. 24, 519
art. 109, 326
art. 110, 326
art. 111, 326, 362
art. 112, 326
art. 121, 537
art. 122, 538
art. 140, 441
art. 147, 180
art. 182, 645
art. 207, 579
art. 247, 581
art. 249, 580
art. 250, 581
art. 251, 558
art. 261, 580
art. 291, 593, 649
art. 292, 593, 650
art. 314, 561
art. 315, 561
art. 316, 561
art. 317, 561
art. 318, 561
art. 329, 581
art. 476, 154
art. 477, 154
art. 478, 154
art. 483, 155
art. 486, 155
art. 487, 155
art. 500, 173
art. 533, 53, 262
art. 577, 273
art. 580, 53, 262, 279
art. 584, 275, 295
art. 585, 281
art. 979, 538
art. 980, 538
art. 981, 538
art. 982, 538
art. 983, 538
art. 984, 538
art. 985, 539
art. 986, 539
art. 987, 539
art. 988, 539
art. 990, 314
art. 996, 288
art. 1033, 404
art. 1034, 405
art. 1035, 405
art. 1036, 405
art. 1037, 406
art. 1038, 406
art. 1039, 406
art. 1165–1, 53, 313, 413, 440
art. 1185, 441
art. 1186, 519
art. 1203, 518
art. 1204, 518
art. 1205, 518
art. 1206, 518
art. 1207, 518
art. 1232, 441
art. 1236, 494
art. 1237, 494
art. 1238, 494
art. 1239, 494
art. 1240, 441, 494
art. 1241, 494
art. 1242, 494
art. 1243, 495

art. 1244, 495
art. 1202, 517
Civil Law General Principles 1986, 60, 218, 314, 580
art. 70, 218
art. 71, 182, 219
art. 79, 563, 565
art. 80, 582
art. 81, 583
art. 83, 595, 651
art. 92, 539, 552
art. 129, 647
art. 156, 627
Civil Law General Provisions 2017, 218, 314
art. 109, 328
art. 110, 328
art. 111, 328, 364
art. 112, 328
art. 121, 539
art. 122, 539, 552
art. 132, 520, 522
art. 151, 219
art. 184, 478
Civil Procedure Code (draft) 1901, 48
Civil Procedure Law
art. 18, 122
art. 19, 122
art. 20, 122
art. 149, 124
art. 161, 124
arts. 198 to 201, 122
Commercial Code (draft) 1901, 48
Company Law 1993, art. 2, 62
Constitution 1946, art. 7, 50
Constitution 1949, 579
Constitution 1954, 313, 580
Constitution 1975, 313, 580
Constitutional Amendment 1988, 580
Constitutional Amendment 1993, art. 3, 580
Constitutional Amendment 1999, art. 16, 580
Constitutional Amendment 2004, art. 22, 580
Contract Law 1999, 60, 148
art. 4, 62
art. 6, 146, 175, 220
art. 18, 156
art. 19, 156
art. 20, 156
art. 25, 156
art. 26, 156, 263
art. 28, 156, 284
art. 29, 284
art. 42, 175, 177
art. 42(3), 176
art. 52, s. 1, 64
art. 54, 218
art. 107, 275
art. 110, 281
art. 113, 277, 297
art. 114, 283
art. 117, 247
art. 1108, 275
Courts Organic Law
art. 25, 122
art. 34, 128
Criminal Procedure Code (draft) 1901, 48
Criminal Procedure Law, art. 20, 122
Economic Contract Law 1981, 148
art. 2, 62
Great Qing Code, 43, 46
art. 87, 41
Insurance Rules (draft) 1901, 48
Judges Law, art. 9, 128
Property Law 2007, 60
Property Law, arts. 85 to 88, 582
State-owned Assets Law 2008, 63, 148
Tang Code, 43, 46
art. 32.2, 46
art. 32.3, 46
art. 33.1a, 45
art. 34.1, 44
art. 34.3, 44
art. 155, 41
art. 300.2, 44
art. 306.1a, 46
art. 306b, 46
art. 308.1, 45
art. 308.2, 45
art. 325.4, 46
art. 326.1c, 46
art. 373, 46
art. 392.1a, 46
art. 392.1c, 46
art. 393.1a, 46
art. 393.1c, 46
art. 394.1a, 46
art. 394.1b, 46
art. 394.2a, 46
art. 395.1, 46
art. 430.1a, 46
art. 450, 47

Tort Liability Law 2010, 60, 314
art. 2, 52, 415
art. 2(2), 315
art. 6, 52, 315, 415, 442
art. 24, 521, 522
art. 32, 522
art. 33, 522
art. 41, 519
art. 42, 520
art. 43, 520
art. 44, 520
art. 45, 520
art. 46, 520
art. 47, 520
art. 69, 496
art. 70, 496
art. 71, 496
art. 72, 496
art. 73, 496
art. 74, 496
art. 75, 496
art. 76, 496
art. 77, 496
art. 87, 522
Transaction Law (draft) 1901, 48

France
Civil Aviation Code (Code de l'aviation civile), art. L 142(1), 212
Civil Code (Code civil) 288, 141, 302, 585, 592, 610, 626
art. 3(1), 100
art. 9, 353, 358
art. 414-3, 468
art. 544, 617, 639
art. 637, 626, 630
art. 644, 593, 594
art. 645, 593
art. 686, 626, 630, 634
art. 697, 634
art. 698, 634
art. 715, 558–9
art. 716, 565
art. 717, 561
art. 893, 139
art. 931, 139
art. 955, 140
art. 1104, 168
art. 1106, 212
art. 1108, 214
art. 1110, 213
art. 1112, 168
art. 1113, 213, 230
art. 1115, 156
art. 1116, 156, 213
art. 1117, 156
art. 1118, 156
art. 1130, 180
art. 1131, 180
art. 1132, 180
art. 1133, 180
art. 1134, 181
art. 1135, 181
art. 1136, 213
art. 1137, 213
art. 1140, 213
art. 1141, 213
art. 1142, 213, 268
art. 1143, 213
art. 1149, 286, 294
art. 1150, 291–3, 294
art. 1151, 294
art. 1160, 499
art. 1168, 212
art. 1170, 229
art. 1171, 230
art. 1195, 255
art. 1217, 272
art. 1218, 244
art. 1221, 272, 280
art. 1231-2, 276, 286
art. 1231-3, 291–3
art. 1231-5, 283
art. 1240, 52, 301, 303, 307, 315, 322, 353, 408, 435, 441, 478, 500
art. 1241, 52, 301, 303, 307, 322, 353, 408, 435, 478, 500
art. 1242, 498, 499, 500, 510
arts. 1242 to 1244, 497, 498
art. 1243, 497, 498
art. 1244, 497
art. 1300, 538
art. 1301, 538
art. 1301-2, 538
art. 1302-1, 538
art. 1303, 538
art. 1303-1, 538
art. 1351, 245
art. 1372, 538
art. 1375, 538
art. 1376, 538
art. 1382, 301, 353, 435, 436, 454, 468, 497, 500, 504, 510, 617, 618, 648

art. 1383, 301, 353, 435, 497, 500, 510
art. 1384, 497, 498, 499, 500, 501, 504, 507, 509, 510
arts. 1384 to 1386, 497
art. 1384(1), 500, 502, 504, 506, 507
art. 1385, 497, 498
art. 1386, 497
art. 1674, 196, 212
art. 1681, 212
art. 1733, 500
art. 1734, 500
art. 1888, 140
art. 1889, 141
art. 2220, 570
art. 2230, 570
art. 2231, 570
art. 2232, 570
art. 2233, 570
art. 2234, 570
art. 2235, 570
art. 2262, 570
art. 2279, 561
art. 2282, 574
art. 2283, 574
Consumer Practices Law, art. L. 442–6(1), 230
Criminal Code (Code pénal)
art. 63(2), 478
art. 122-2, 648
art. 379, 648
art. R-621-2, 322
Decree 80-204 (March 11, 1980), 583
Insurance Code (Code de l'assurance), 453
art. L 113(1), 458, 459
Law of 29 July 1881
art. 29(1), 322
art. 29(2), 322, 332
Law of 9 April 1898 (Employers' Liability)
art. 1, 499
art. 2, 499
art. 3, 499
Law of 8 July 1907, 212
Law of 29 April 1916, art. 7, 212
Law of 7 November 1922, 500
Law of 31 May 1925, art. 57, 212
Law of 13 July 1930, art. 12(2), 453, 458
Law of 8 July 1937, 212
Law of 8 July 1941, 631
Law of 31 December 1951, 503
Law of 11 March 1957, art. 33, 212
Law of 27 February 1958, 503
Law of 7 July 1967, art. 15, 212
Law of 3 January 1968, 468
Law of 9 January 1985, 631
Law of 5 July 1985, 502
art. 3, 511
Law of 31 December 1990, 101, 107
Law of 1 February 1995, 238
Law of 10 February 2016, 538
Mining Code (Code minier), 583
Planning Code (Code de l'urbanisme), art. L. 145(1-3), 631
Rural Code (Code rural)
art. 365, 454
art. 374, 454

Germany
Air Traffic Law (Luftverkehrgesetz), § 33, 493
Atomic Energy Act 1959 (Atomkraftgesetz), 494
Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch), 49, 110, 141, 146, 302, 411, 491, 626
§ 119, 181–2
§ 138, 205, 206, 207–10, 257
§ 138(1), 206, 207–10, 211
§ 138(2), 206, 207–10, 212
§ 138(b), 205
§ 145, 155, 174
§ 146, 155
§ 147, 155
§ 148, 174
§ 154(2), 173
§ 155(2), 172
§ 222(2), 536
§ 226, 600, 619
§ 227, 646
§ 228, 646, 654
§ 241, 268, 273
§ 242, 256, 260, 262
§ 249, 276, 288
§ 251, 281
§ 253, 287
§ 253(1), 324
§ 253(2), 324
§ 254, 298, 299, 300
§ 254(2), 298, 299
§§ 275 to 283, 174
§ 276, 245
§ 276(1), 172, 465
§ 283, 273

§ 307, 231, 232
§ 307(1), 232
§ 311(2), 175
§ 312, 205
§ 313, 256
§ 325, 257
§ 326, 273
§ 340, 283
§ 343, 283
§ 355, 205
§ 516, 139
§ 518, 139
§ 519, 140
§ 528, 140
§ 529, 140
§ 605, 141
§ 632, 257
§ 651f(2), 289
§ 683, 534
§ 684, 534
§ 762, 536
§ 812, 257, 534
§ 812(1), 535, 550
§ 814, 536
§ 823, 52, 288, 412, 421, 493
§§ 823 to 828, 468
§ 823(1), 288, 301, 303, 315, 324, 355, 377, 412, 418, 439, 440, 441, 492
§ 823(2), 301, 324, 479
§ 826, 172, 208, 302
§ 827, 467
§ 828, 467
§ 829, 468
§ 833, 491, 495
§ 844(2), 439
§ 845, 439
§ 847, 287, 289
§ 847(1), 324
§ 861, 574
§ 862, 574
§ 900, 571
§ 903, 605, 616, 639
§ 904, 639, 646, 651, 654, 655, 656
§ 904(1), 655
§ 904(2), 655
§ 906, 605, 616, 619
§ 907, 616
§ 927, 571
§ 937, 571
§ 938, 571
§ 943, 571
§ 958, 559, 560
§ 960, 559, 560
§ 965, 562
§ 967, 562
§ 971, 562
§ 973, 563
§ 984, 565
§ 994, 549
§ 996, 549
§ 1004, 377, 606, 616, 619
§ 1004(1), 623
§ 1018, 627
§ 1019, 627
§ 1090, 631
§ 1091, 631
§ 1092, 631
§ 1105, 635
§ 1110, 635
§ 1360, 439
§ 1570, 439
§ 1601, 439
§ 1615, 439
§ 1624, 140
§ 1736, 439
§ 1739, 439
§ 1754, 439
§ 1755, 439

Code of Civil Procedure (Zivilprozessordnung)
§ 91, 72
§ 130, 69
§ 130(5), 69
§ 138(2), 72
§ 139, 81, 83
§ 139(1), 72
§ 139(2), 72
§ 253, 68, 69
§ 253(IV), 69
§ 268, 273
§ 271, 69
§ 272(b), 68
§ 272(I), 68
§ 273, 68
§ 274(II), 69
§ 278(IV), 68
§ 279, 72
§ 313(I)(5) and (6), 91
§ 348, 69
§§ 383 to 389, 70
§§ 395 to 397, 70
§ 404(I), 77
§ 404(II), 77
§ 404(III), 77
§ 404(IV), 77

§ 406(I), 78
§ 411(I), 78
§ 412(I), 78
§ 887, 274
Code of Criminal Procedure (Strafprozessordnung - StPO), § 244(4), 78
Commercial Code (Allgemeines Handelgesetzbuch), § 286, 197
Constitution (Grundgesetz)
§ 1, 324, 377
§ 2, 324, 325, 357, 377
§ 5, 325, 357, 358
§ 5(1), 336, 339
§ 5(2), 339, 341, 377
§ 6, 359
§ 55(1), 340
Costs Statute (Kostenordnung - KostO), 72
Courts Organization Statute (Gerichtsverfassunggesetz - GVG), §§ 93 to 95, 88
Criminal Code 1935 (Strafgesetzbuch - StGB)
§ 2, 210
§ 185, 326, 327, 341
§ 185(1), 323
§ 186, 323
§ 187, 323
§ 188, 349
§ 194(1), 338
§ 194(3), 338
§ 211, 340
§ 302(a), 197
§ 323c, 479, 480, 481, 482
Environmental Damage Law 1990 (Unwelthaftungsgesetz), 494
Hunting Law (Bundesjagdgesetz)
§ 7(1), 559
§ 7(4), 559
§ 8, 559
Judiciary Statute (Deutsches Richtergesetz - DRiG)
§ 12(2), 86
§ 22, 86
§§ 27 to 29, 86
Law Amending the General Terms and Conditions Law (Gesetz zur Änderung des AGB Gesetzes), 238, 261
Liability Law 1871, 491, 493
Mining Law (Bundesberggesetz)
§§ 11 to 13, 581
§ 77, 583
§ 135, 651
Rights of Authors to Works of Art and Photography Law (Kunst Urheber Gesetz)
§ 22, 354
§ 23, 354
§ 23(1), 356, 357
§ 23(2), 356, 357
§ 24, 355
Road Traffic Act 1952 (Strassenverkehrgesetz), 493
§ 7, 492
Trade Regulation Code (Gewerbeordnung - GEWO), § 36, 77
Water Maintenance Act 1957 (Wasserhaltungsgesetz), § 22, 494
Water Maintenance Act 1996 (Wasserhaltungsgesetz)
§ 2, 594–5
§ 8(1), 594–5
§ 8(3), 594–5
§ 24(1), 594–5

Italy
Code of Civil Procedure 1942 (Codice di procedura civile)
art. 360, 100
art. 360(5), 101
art. 384(1), 100
Constitution 1948 (Costituzione), art. 111, 100

Prussia
General Land Law 1794 (Allgemeines Landrecht), § 58, 196
Railway Undertakings Law (Gesetz über die Eisenbahnunternehmungen), § 25, 491

Soviet Union
Civil Code 1922, 579
arts. 403 to 406, 522
Judiciary Statute 1918, 579

United Kingdom
Act of Settlement 1701, 114
Administration of Justice Act 1982, s. 2, 428

Administration of Justice (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 1933, s. 6, 98
Coal Industry Act 1994
s. 1(3), 584
s. 7(3), 584
Companies Act 1985, s. 195, 269
Consumer Rights Act 2015, ss. 61 and 62, 227
County Courts Act 1846, 112
Courts and Legal Services Act 1990, 115, 116
Criminal Law Act (Northern Ireland) 1967, s. 3(1), 451
Equality Act 2010, s. 26, 320
Fatal Accidents Act 1846 (Lord Campbell's Act), 429
Fatal Accidents Act 1976, s. 1(3), 429
Human Rights Act 1998, 368
s. 6, 367, 370
Land Registration Act 1925, s. 75(1), 567
Land Registration Act 2002, 567, 568, 569
Limitation Act 1980
s. 15(1), 567
s. 17, 567
London Building Act 1894
s. 7, 627
s. 9, 627
Mines (Working Facilities and Support) Act 1966, s. 8, 584
Petroleum Act 1998
s. 1(a), 584
s. 2(1), 584
Prescription Act 1832, 611
Protection from Harassment Act 1997, 320
ss. 1 to 4, 319–20
s. 7, 320
Sale of Goods Act 1893, s. 35, 184
Torts (Interference with Goods) Act 1977, s. 6(1), 548
Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Regulations 1994 (SI 1994/3159), 238
War Damage Act 1943, 161
Water Resources Act 1990
s. 27(3), 592
s. 27(4), 592
s. 27(6), 592
s. 35(2), 592
s. 38, 592
s. 39(1), 592
s. 39(3), 592
s. 46(2), 592
s. 46(4), 592
s. 48(1), 592
s. 52, 592
s. 53, 592
s. 54, 592
s. 60(2), 592
s. 61(1), 592

United States
Constitution, 5th Amendment, 650
Federal Rules of Civil Procedure
r. 26(f), 93
r. 42(b), 94
r. 53(c), 94
Federal Rules of Evidence
r. 706, 79
r. 1006, 95
Uniform Commercial Code
§ 2, 155
§ 2-205, 155
§ 2-209, 144
§ 2-302, 202, 203, 228
§ 2-615, 254
Uniform Rules of Evidence, r. 706, 79
US Code of Laws
15 U.S.C. §1052(a), 330
420 U.S.C. §492, 375

Table of Restatements and Kindred Sources

Transnational
Draft Common Frame of Reference, 157
Art II 3: 301, 177
Art II 4: 202, 158
203, 158
205, 158
206, 158
Art II 7: 102, 248
201, 183
207, 220
Art II 9: 402, 238
403, 238
404, 238
405, 239
406, 239
407, 239
408, 239
410, 239
Art III 1.110, 266
Art III 3.104, 248
Art III 3.703, 297
Unidroit Principles of International Commercial Contracts
Preamble, 159
Art. 1.1, 158, 221, 240
Art. 2.1, 159
Art. 2.3, 159
Art. 2.4, 159
Art. 2.5, 159
Art. 2.6, 159
Art. 2.15, 178
Art. 2.16, 178
Art. 2.20, 240
Art. 3.3, 248
Art. 3.4, 183
Art. 3.5, 183
Art. 3.10, 221
Art. 5.4, 248
Art. 5.5, 249
Art. 6.2.1, 267
Art. 6.2.2, 267
Art. 6.2.3, 267
Art. 7.1.7, 249
Art. 7.4.4, 297
United States
Restatement (First) of Contracts (1932), 145
§ 90, 167
§ 457, 254
Restatement (Second) of Contracts (1979)
§ 17, 143, 513
§ 25, 155
§ 26, 164
§ 63, 153
§ 71, 143
§ 87, 155
§ 89, 144
§ 90, 145
§ 152, 182
§ 208, 200, 202, 228
§ 344, 276
§ 346, 280
§ 347, 276
§ 348, 279
§ 350, 276
§ 351, 276, 296
§ 353, 286
§ 356, 283
§ 359, 272
§ 369, 272
Restatement of Property (1944), § 534, 625
Restatement (Third) of Property Servitudes (2000), 625, 628
Restatement of the Law of Restitution, Quasi-contracts and Constructive Trusts (1937), 532
§ 1, 532

Restatement (Third) of Restitution and Unjust Enrichment (2011), 534
§ 1, 532
§ 3, 532
Restatement (First) of Torts (1934), 311, 445
§ 13, 311, 450
§ 15, 311
§ 18, 311
§ 19, 311
§ 21, 311
§ 158, 450
§ 313(2), 429
§ 577, 450
§ 580, 450
Restatement (Second) of Torts (1965)
§ 1, 310
§ 13, 311, 450
§ 15, 311
§ 18, 311
§ 19, 311
§ 21, 311
§ 46, 320, 429
§ 158, 450
§ 283, 464
§ 283A, 467
§ 283B, 467
§ 299A, 467
§ 314, 471
§ 321(2), 477
§ 322, 471
§ 402A, 512, 515
§ 519, 486
§ 580, 450
§ 581, 450
§ 652D, 351, 372
§ 693(1), 311
§ 850A, 590
Restatement (Third) of Torts (2000)
§ 1, 457
§ 21, 488

Table of EU Legislation

Treaties
Charter of Fundamental Rights, 384
Art. 8(1), 384
Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union
Art. 16, 383
Art. 16(1), 384

Directives
Data Protection Directive 95/46 [1995] OJ L281/31-50, 384
Product Liability Directive 85/374 [1985] OJ L210/29-33, 516–19
Unfair Terms in Consumer Contracts Directive 93/13 [1993] OJ L95/29-34, 233–8

Table of Roman, Canon Law and Ancient Chinese Sources

Roman law
Digest of Justinian
1.1.9, 134
1.8.2.1, 7
1.8.3, 7
1.8.4, 7
1.8.5, 7
1.8.6, 7
1.8.6.1, 7
2.7.2, 268
2.14, 138
2.14.1.3, 134
2.14.7.2, 135
2.14.9, 138
3.5.3.1, 526
3.5.3.19, 526
3.5.3.21, 526
4.4.16.4, 193
8.1.8, 626
8.1.15, 626
8.2.33, 11
8.3.5.1, 626
8.3.17, 584
8.4.13, 626
8.5.8.5, 596, 597, 599
8.5.8.6, 596, 599
8.6.14.1, 635
9.2.1, 304
9.2.2, 635
9.2.5.3, 304
9.2.7.4, 304
9.2.7.8, 6
9.2.8, 304
9.2.8.1, 6
9.2.8.pr., 6
9.2.9.4, 6
9.2.11, 459
9.2.11.pr., 6
9.2.27.9, 6
9.2.27.33, 6
9.2.29.pr., 6
9.2.30.3, 6
9.2.31, 6, 13, 459
9.2.41, 304
9.2.49.1, 635
10.4.19, 635
11.4.4, 635
12.4.8, 249
12.6, 526
12.6.14, 526
12.7.1.3, 535
13.1.14.3, 11
13.4.3, 194
13.6.17.3, 138
13.6.18.pr., 195
18.1, 195
18.1.9, 178
18.1.11.1, 179
18.5, 195
19.1.1.pr., 268
19.2.22.3, 193, 197
25.2.25, 535
27.9.13, 11
41.2.3.1, 7
41.2.18.2, 7
42.1.13.1, 268
43.8.2.10, 585
43.12.1.3, 585
43.13.1.1, 584
43.13.1.3, 584
43.16.1.24, 7
43.27.1, 635
44.7.1.4, 195
45.1.137, 195, 244
47.2.21.7, 302
47.2.43, 560
47.10.15.1, 302
47.10.15.2, 302
47.10.15.7, 7
47.10.15.20, 5, 303
47.10.15.21, 303
47.10.15.22, 5, 303
47.10.15.27, 5, 302
47.10.15.29, 302

47.10.15.34, 5, 302
47.10.44, 596
50.17.185, 240
50.17.206, 526
50.37, 455
50.50, 455
Institutes of Justinian
1.2.1, 134
2.1.12, 557
2.1.13, 557
2.1.39, 564
3.13.22 to 26, 133
3.14, 133
3.88, 5, 302
4.3.16, 304
4.5, 441, 489
Canon law
Decretum of Gratian
C. 14 q. 6 c. 1, 527
C. 22 q. 2 c. 14, 249
C. 23 q. 5 c. 8, 455
C. 3 q. 1 c. 3, 249, 573
D. 1 c. 2, 635
D. 47 c. 8, 636
Chinese Law
Analects 15.24, 39
Mencius
1A 5.3, 39
3A 3.13, 40
3A 3.19, 40
3A 3.6 and 7, 39
5B 2.6, 40
6B 10.6, 40
7A 23.1, 39
7A 4.3, 39