

# MAPPING THE LAW

*Essays in Memory of Peter Birks*



# Mapping the Law

*Essays in Memory of Peter Birks*

Edited by

ANDREW BURROWS

and

LORD RODGER OF EARLSFERRY

OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan Poland Portugal Singapore  
South Korea Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press  
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States  
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© The various contributors, 2006

The moral rights of the authors have been asserted  
Database right Oxford University Press (maker)

Crown copyright material is reproduced under Class Licence  
Number C01P0000148 with the permission of OPSI  
and the Queen's Printer for Scotland

First published 2006

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address above

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data  
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data  
Data available

Typeset by Newgen Imaging Systems (P) Ltd, Chennai, India  
Printed in Great Britain  
on acid-free paper by  
Biddles Ltd, King's Lynn, Norfolk

ISBN 0-19-920655-4 978-0-19-920655-1

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

# *Biographical Outline of Peter Birks 1941–2004*

Educated at Trinity College, Oxford, and University College, London

## **Degrees and Honours**

MA (Oxon), LL.M (Lond), DCL (Oxon), LL.D (Edinburgh)  
Fellow of the British Academy, 1989  
Fellow of the Royal Society for the Encouragement of Arts, Manufactures  
and Commerce, 1992  
Fellow of University College London, 1993  
Elected to Membership of Accademia dei Giusprivatisti Europei  
(Academy of European Private Lawyers), 1994  
Honorary Fellow, Trinity College, Oxford, 1994  
Queen's Counsel (honoris causa) 1995  
Doctor of Law (honoris causa) Regensburg, 1996  
Doctor of Law (honoris causa) De Montfort, 1999  
Foreign Member, Royal Netherlands Academy, 2001  
President of the Society of Legal Scholars, 2002–3  
Doctor of Law (honoris causa) Nijmegen, 2003

## **Chronological Outline of Academic Career**

Teaching Associate, Northwestern University Law School, 1964–5  
Lecturer, University College London, 1967–71  
Law Fellow, Brasenose College, Oxford and, concurrently, CUF Lecturer  
(Law), University of Oxford, 1971–81  
Professor of Civil Law, University of Edinburgh, 1981–8  
Professor of Law, University of Southampton, 1988–9  
Regius Professor of Civil Law, University of Oxford, and Professorial  
Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford, 1989–2004

## **Visiting Posts**

Mallesons Stephen Jacques Visiting Professor, Australian National University, 1989  
Visiting Scholar, Albert Ludwigs University, Freiburg-im-Breisgau, 1992  
Wisselleerstoelhouder, Catholic University of Nijmegen, 1994–96  
Visiting Scholar, University of Western Australia, 1993, 1995  
Distinguished Visitor, University of Hong Kong, 1991, 1995  
Distinguished Visitor Academy of Law, Singapore, 1995  
University of Auckland Research Foundation Scholar, 1997  
Miegunyah Distinguished Visitor, University of Melbourne, 1998  
Centennial Visiting Fellow, Victoria University, Wellington, 1999  
Visiting Professor University of Texas at Austin, 2000  
Professor of Anglo-American Law, University of Leiden, 2001–2004



*Addresses given at the Memorial Service  
for Peter Birks on 20 November 2004 in  
the University Church of St Mary  
the Virgin, Oxford*

**First Address (given by Andrew Burrows)**

As I was taught by Peter Birks and taught with him, I have been asked to say some words about Peter as a teacher and as a colleague here in the Oxford Law Faculty.

I first met Peter thirty years ago when I came to Brasenose for my Oxford entrance interview. He was interviewing with the senior law tutor at BNC, John Davies, who, in customary fashion, began the interview by trying to relax me with some general questions. Peter said nothing during those first ten minutes but I was very conscious of him sitting restlessly on the settee. Then suddenly, pushing his hand back through the mop of hair that he then had, he said this, 'I am a Roman barber. I have set up stall in an open square. As I am shaving the beard of a customer, my hand is knocked by a ball kicked by boys playing nearby and I slash the face of my customer. Should I, the barber, have to pay compensation to the injured customer?' I cannot recall what answer I gave but I vividly remember the feeling of nervous excitement as whatever I said and whichever way I turned Peter was there firing another variation at me as we explored aspects of negligence and causation and volenti.

Tutorials in Brasenose with Peter engendered similar feelings of excitement tinged with fright. Peter was so passionate about the subjects he was teaching and so anxious for his students to share in the enterprise of constructing clear and elegant pictures of the law. But it could be nerve-racking because he would sometimes ask fiendishly difficult questions and expect us to come up with acceptable answers. Many people here may remember the grandfather clock that he had in his room. It had a very loud tick and Peter would ask these questions and we would sit in silence sometimes for several minutes with just the clock ticking away while Peter waited for us to come up with some sort of answer that he could use to guide us further towards the truth. He was also a meticulous marker of essays. Earlier this week I found one of my tutorial essays entitled 'The Relationship between the Doctrine of Consideration and the Doctrine of

Promissory Estoppel'. In typical Peter style there is half a page of tightly written comments at the end, which begin, 'Very Good but Fundamentally Flawed'.

When I returned to Oxford as a Tutorial Fellow it was a particularly great privilege to teach with Peter on the Restitution postgraduate BCL seminars (which I had attended as a student a decade earlier when being run by Peter and Jack Beatson). By now Peter had become the Regius Professor of Civil Law and, following on from the great pioneering work of Robert Goff and Gareth Jones, he had published his seminal book *An Introduction to the Law of Restitution*. Lord Rodger will be saying more about Peter's scholarship but it is noteworthy here that, for Peter, research and teaching complemented each other so that it was natural for him to continue to use the Restitution seminars to develop his published views. Those seminars constituted the most rewarding experience as a teacher that I have ever had. And it was all down to Peter. He assumed that the students had carefully read the cases on the reading list and knew what the judges had said; and Peter would take it on from there, provoking and challenging them with his latest interpretations and forever being able to cut through the detail with a masterly, decisive, crisp explanation. At times the depth of Peter's knowledge was simply breathtaking. He could move seamlessly from the latest case through English Legal History to Roman law to German law. In Peter's legal world there was no place for misleading labels and fictions and so it was that, in those seminars, we first heard the new precise language that so permeated Peter's work: unjust factors, subtractive enrichment, stultification, disimpoverishment, and so on. What was being discussed was at the cutting edge of the law and many of Peter's views as to what the law was, or what it ought to be—which was just about the only distinction that he did not draw sharply—have subsequently become law. Of course, Peter was never afraid to change his mind in the search for an ever more precise and stylish picture of the law so that as one came to the seminar one could never be sure what he was going to say. Indeed it was possible for what was indisputably correct one year to be indisputably incorrect the next—and vice versa. That all added to the fun. It was a two-hour seminar. We never had a break and we always ran out of time. Peter adored it and the students adored him. It is no surprise that many came to Oxford primarily to attend his seminars and that many went into academia, or out into practice, preaching the Birksian message of the importance of clear classification and of transparent rationality in the law.

Peter was not only a gifted teacher. He was an inspirational and dedicated doctoral supervisor, as several here today will testify. He regarded a DPhil as a joint project in which there was as much for him to learn as for the supervisee. It is a humbling experience to see in his rooms at All Souls a shelf laden with the bound theses of his many doctoral students.

Peter was a warm and entertaining companion but I am not sure he ever really switched off from thinking about law or legal matters. When they were under nines, his son Theodore and my oldest son played in the same football team. I was once acting as linesman in a match but that didn't stop Peter expecting me



to explain, as I was trying to concentrate on the offside, when, if ever, you could refuse restitution because of a change of position that was not a disenrichment. I also remember going round to Peter's house in Boar's Hill one Sunday lunch-time to drop off a book. Peter was there under the trees in the garden working away with a rake and looking very relaxed. As he saw me he came over and said, 'I've had a really good hour's gardening. I've sorted out *Boulter v Barclays Bank*. The Court of Appeal has definitely got the burden of proof point wrong.'

Never attracted by practice, Peter regarded working in a university law school as a privilege in enabling one to search for the truth unhindered by the demands of clients or the fear of falling out with an employer. In the Oxford Law Faculty, as well as being our intellectual leader, he worked tirelessly and selflessly for the faculty's well-being. He would respond with an unconditional yes to any request to take on extra teaching or an administrative task or supervision. In addition to serving on many other committees, he was twice Director of Graduate Studies (Research), three times Chairman of FHS or BCL examiners, Chairman of the Management Committee at the Centre for Socio-Legal Studies, the person behind the Clarendon Law Lecture Series now in its tenth year, and, taking huge amounts of his time and energy over several years, he was the driving force behind the creation in 1994 of the Oxford Institute of Legal Practice and was still Chair of its Board of Studies until a few weeks before he died. And it is not as if he did these jobs in a token way. On the contrary, he threw himself into them and often spearheaded important and lasting reforms.

There have been many great figures in the long and distinguished history of the Oxford Law Faculty. But surely no one has combined the roles of teacher, supervisor, administrator, and scholar with such brilliance and such passionate commitment as Peter Birks.

There are many here today who became academic lawyers because of Peter and many others whom he helped in some way through his work. We are so grateful to him for being our mentor, our generous friend, and our inspirational colleague.

I want to conclude by reading a small extract from the cover of his *Introduction to the Law of Restitution*. Over the years, I have read this extract to students both here and abroad and although Peter would not express it in quite the same way today—in particular, he would be referring to the law of unjust enrichment rather than the law of restitution—this passage will for me be a poignant reminder forever of Peter's passion and enthusiasm for the subject and indeed for the study of law generally.

Restitution is an area of the law no smaller and no less important than, say, Contract, Tort, or Trusts. A series of intellectual and historical accidents has, however, scattered its raw material to the fringes of other subjects. Homes have been found for it under dishonest or opaque labels: quasi-contract . . . constructive trust, money had and received, and so on. Dispersed in this way, Restitution has escaped the revolution in legal learning

which has happened over the past century. It has been the age of the textbook. Successive editions have settled the case-law of other subjects into well-trying and now familiar patterns. The case-law of Restitution remains disorganized: its textbooks have only just begun to be written . . . It is the last major area to be mapped and in some sense the most exciting subject in the modern canon. There is everything to play for.

## Second Address (given by Alan Rodger)

We are here to give thanks for the life of Peter Birks. In the short time available it would be impossible to outline his career, far less all his achievements. But it is scarcely necessary to do so, since most of the story is well known to this congregation, if only from the two excellent obituaries which appeared shortly after Peter's death in July. In any event, we have come here from far and wide because Peter was one of the best loved, as well as one of the most distinguished, scholars in the history of the Oxford Law Faculty. What we are trying to capture today are some of those qualities that made him so.

Inevitably, on a University and College occasion such as this, the focus is on *iura virumque*, laws and the man. The double aspect is not inappropriate since the qualities that shaped the private man were essentially those that made the academic lawyer. First and foremost, Peter was a man of passions. For that reason, his public career could never have been one of smooth progress against the background of a serene and ordered private life. Rather—as Peter would readily acknowledge—until his late thirties, his relationships often seemed to bring more misery than happiness both to himself and, unfortunately, to those around him. Inevitably, that misery took its toll. But, in 1979, just when he was at his lowest ebb, he met Jackie; and, at a stroke, his life changed. Or, as he put it more passionately, in the words from *Fidelio* that he used in dedicating his Restitution book to her: 'Your faithfulness has saved my life'. Peter believed that, quite literally. His life began anew; Peter and Jackie married on 29 October 1984—significantly enough, the notional date that he gave to the preface to *Restitution*. In due course, Theodore was born. No doubt, Peter's family still had to make sacrifices, but, for the rest of his days, his home life was supremely happy and secure. With this dramatic change, his academic life too could flourish as never before. Even Jackie might admit that the statistics go far towards proving the point: in the 11 years from 1969 to 1980, Peter published 13 items; in the following 11 years, from 1981 to 1992, he published 52. Doubtless, the advent of computers also had something to do with the upsurge. The early printers, spewing forth lengths of faintly printed text, gave terrifyingly concrete form to Peter's enthusiasms. Six feet on the intricacies of Roman procedure could be daunting, to say the least.

From the outset, Peter had no doubt about his vocation as an academic lawyer. Not for him the temptations of practice: though he was delighted to be made an honorary QC in 1995, he had never qualified as a solicitor or barrister

and it did not cross his mind that he might be better as a practitioner or sitting as a judge. He had no desire to concoct arguments that might serve the needs of the hour or of some particular client. This did not mean that he underestimated the role of litigation or of the courts. On the contrary, he always insisted that 'the law was an intellectual and academic discipline which derived its autonomy, its difficulty and its satisfactions from its focus on litigation and, ultimately, adjudication'. But he wanted to take part in that difficult intellectual and academic discipline, rather than in the underlying litigations or adjudications. With this unclouded perception of his role, Peter did not suffer from the kind of inferiority complex that, at one time, crippled academic lawyers in this country. Let practitioners practise and judges judge; academics had their own job to do. And for Peter that job was, ultimately, more important than the others.

Not only more important, but more enjoyable too. Peter simply loved what he did. If he could never really see the point of taking holidays and was bad at the so-called work-life balance, this was because he was far too busy enjoying himself, in the congenial surroundings of Brasenose or All Souls, working with friends who happened also to be his colleagues and pupils. His ability to transmit this enjoyment to others was central to his success. He made any project seem not only worthwhile but enormous fun. Why did even hung-over young men and women prise themselves from their beds to attend the restitution classes which he loved to schedule, quite deliberately, for the early morning? Surely, because, under his leadership, the classes were both the most rigorous, and the most enjoyable, show in town. There were jokes galore but, above all, a feeling that the participants were lucky to be spending a couple of hours engaged together on an unendingly fascinating exercise. Similarly, more often than not, letters or, latterly, emails on a matter of business would contain a devastating aside on some absurdity or pomposity that had caught his eye. If you found yourself sitting near Peter at dinner, you knew that an entertaining evening was in prospect.

There was more to it than that, however. Like Justinian—not a comparison he would have permitted—Peter believed that there is a *cupida legum iuventus*, that there are young people eager to learn the law. Teaching, whether in Oxford or elsewhere, was therefore not a chore, but an opportunity to engage with them. He regretted not having been able himself to study full-time for a higher degree. In compensation, he was a devoted supervisor of his DPhil students, tirelessly questioning and probing but, above all, encouraging. His reward was a succession of fine theses which turned into important books. To his intense pride, his pupils went on to distinguished careers in practice and in universities throughout the Commonwealth and beyond. For instance, in Germany you constantly come across successful young lawyers who delight in recalling his restitution classes. It is no accident, either, that Peter received honorary degrees, for example, from Nijmegen and Regensburg. By his teaching, as well as his writing, Peter maintained and spread the influence of Oxford. And if in his approach one could sometimes detect imperial echoes, Peter was, after all, a son of the Raj. Indeed,

while, to his regret, the sun might be setting on the Privy Council in Downing Street, Peter was a kind of one-man Privy Council, welcoming the contributions of scholars and courts everywhere, but aiming to bring order and reason to the common law throughout the world. Outbursts of legal nationalism, whether in Scotland or in the far Antipodes, he treated with particular contempt, precisely because he saw them as introducing essentially irrational considerations into an area where they had no valid role to play.

Although Peter is best known for his work on unjust enrichment, his first love was Roman Law, which he learned in lively discussions with his tutor at Trinity, the charismatic John Kelly. At University College London the ebullient Tony Thomas encouraged his interest in the subject, and most of his early published work was on Roman Law. His Roman Law articles have many of the hallmarks that distinguish his work on English Law: a refined sensitivity to language and a concern with the precise wording of the pleadings, with what the parties would have said in court and, more generally, with the procedures that they used. Most importantly, perhaps, when the judges came to decide the cases, where did they find the law in the days before it was written down? In all this, the influence of English legal historians, especially Toby Milsom and Sir John Baker, is unmistakable and it gave Peter's work on Roman Law its distinctive character.

For Peter, at least, there was nothing strange in applying insights from English legal history to Roman Law. For instance, his fascination with fictions in both systems meant that, when, in 1983, he was shown the text of the recently discovered *Tabula Contrebiensis* from first century BC Spain, he immediately spotted—what other scholars had missed—that the second of the two formulae contained a remarkable and sophisticated fiction. Peter's insight proved to be the key to unravelling the inscription. And perhaps the key to unravelling Peter's career and his understanding of the role of the Regius Professor of Civil Law lies in his belief—which had also been the belief of Rudolf Jhering—that, fundamentally, Roman and English lawyers were doing the same kind of work—work, besides, which only trained lawyers could do. So, as Peter liked to remark—if not rebuked by the Lord Chief Justice for using Latin—Ulpian could sit in the appellate committee of the House of Lords on Monday morning, whereas, not being a lawyer, even so omniscient a Roman historian as Sir Ronald Syme could not. The study of Roman Law was therefore an essentially legal pursuit not remote from, but complementary to, the study of modern law, and vice versa. Peter's work on Roman Law flowed into his work on English Law.

Contrary to what is sometimes suggested, Peter's concentration on modern law in his more recent publications did not mean that his enthusiasm for, or commitment to, the study of Roman Law had diminished. A moment's conversation with him would have exploded that myth. Moreover, his unfulfilled ambition was to write a history of the Roman law of delict, for which he had prepared the way in a series of penetrating articles on the *Lex Aquilia*. But,

although Peter loved the countless intellectual puzzles to be found on every page of the Digest, he was not seduced by them. He, at least, never doubted that the importance of Roman Law for university education today lies in the Institutes of Gaius and Justinian, which offer a unique overview of the grammar of a legal system—the distinctions between property and obligations, between ownership and possession, etc. In Peter's judgment, only Barry Nicholas's *Introduction to Roman Law* could provide some of the same necessary insights. But the Institutes were the genuine article and so, along with Grant McLeod, Peter produced a marvellously readable translation of Justinian's version.

Peter loved the (true) story of the Scottish advocate who said to the judge in an insolvency case, 'Speaking personally, I have never seen much difference between rights *in rem* and rights *in personam*'. The story appealed to him because it demonstrated so clearly the pitfalls which lie in wait for lawyers, even intelligent lawyers, who have never had an opportunity to absorb the basic concepts. Hence Peter's very real concern about the proliferation of conversion courses, which profess to turn botanists into lawyers in the space of a year. Of course, when friends screwed up their courage to confess to him that their son or daughter had actually embarked on one of these courses, Peter tended to say, 'Oh, well, Sophie's different: I'm sure it will be all right in *her* case'. But he felt real anger—bitterness would not be too strong a word—at what he saw as the unthinking way in which, with the connivance of the profession, English law faculties had abandoned the study of Roman Law and so had deprived their students of the insights which that study offered. Even his beloved Oxford had taken a step in the same direction while he was on sabbatical leave in Freiburg. In Oxford Peter could, and did, fight relentlessly, and successfully, to maintain the position of Roman Law. He did so, not out of any selfish motive, but because he believed, with every fibre of his being, that today's students, just as much as their sixth-century counterparts, deserve the best possible start to their legal lives.

As early as 1971 Peter devoted a paper to the group of quasi-delicts in Roman Law. This is surely one of the dreariest topics known to man and one which not even Peter could really cheer up. In his view, however, it was a current legal problem deserving our attention, because it related to the manner in which a great legal system classified obligations. Years later, Peter felt unable to acquit his hero, Gaius, of responsibility for introducing the vocabulary of quasi-contracts and quasi-delicts, but he added, in mitigation, that Gaius probably did not expect 'them to do two thousand years of taxonomic service'. In the 1971 article we find a throwaway line that quasi-contractual obligation 'should be based on the redress of unjust enrichment'. In those few words one can already detect the beginnings of his thinking on restitution or, as he later came to see the subject, unjust enrichment.

At the very core of his revolutionary work on this subject lay questions of classification or taxonomy. Jackie introduced him to some undergraduate texts on taxonomy in the natural sciences and reminded him of Darwin. Soon his

articles and books began to be peopled, so to speak, with aquatic and herbivorous animals, as well as wolves, dingos, labradors, and six other breeds of dog. Those of us who had tended to skip over such abstract issues soon found ourselves confronted with grids, boxes, and maps, which were subtly revised as publication followed publication. Where was it all going?

The answer was that it was eventually going to end in a fundamental reassessment of Peter's own work on the English law of restitution. Nothing could better illustrate the importance which he attached to these issues of classification. For him the classes which he so painstakingly identified were not mere inventions which one could apply or not apply to the law, at will. Rather, for Peter, when Gaius set out the classifications, he was in effect giving the results of a discovery which he had made about the nature of legal systems. That discovery had indeed been imperfect, especially so far as unjust enrichment was concerned. Peter's aim, therefore, was to go further. Eventually, he reached a point where he had to change the entire focus of his work from the response of restitution to the event of unjust enrichment. That done, he set out to show how the obligation to reverse an unjust enrichment operated in English law. At first, he thought that English law worked differently but, under the pressure of the arguments of one of his restitution pupils, Dr Sonja Meier, a German lawyer, he came to believe that this could not be so and that the 'no basis' approach had to be followed in English law too. Moreover, he thought that, coincidentally, the courts had in effect reached the same position in the swaps cases. Hence, in what was to be the last year of his life, there came forth his book on Unjust Enrichment—the New Testament, as one of his colleagues has called it. The thesis has met with resistance, as he knew that it would, but Peter's view was that, ultimately, there was no answer to the criticisms of the old approach and so there could be no going back. Even his critics pay generous tribute to the sheer power and intellectual honesty of his argument. Whatever the personal cost, Peter felt compelled to make the argument and then, when he knew that he was fatally ill, to revise it.

Time and the courts will tell whether the new approach prevails and, if so, in what form. It is not only sad, but a great misfortune for the law, that Peter is not here to take his part in the arguments as they develop. That is no mere conventional compliment to an academic lawyer, such as judges frequently pay in after-dinner speeches or on occasions like this. Although, in a rather unattractive conceit, judges sometimes like to portray themselves as brutish day labourers who look to academic lawyers for a deeper understanding of the law, the truth is that only comparatively rarely do academics actually produce those novel fundamental insights. But one who did, to an exceptional extent, was Peter. To accord him his own highest accolade, Peter was 'the real thing'. Quite simply, everyone recognizes that he knew far more about unjust enrichment and its impact on other fields of private law than anyone else in the world. Judges do not scatter references to his writings through their opinions in order to give a spurious impression of intellectual depth. They refer to Peter because they find

in his work insights into the law which they could never hope to achieve for themselves. In most areas of unjust enrichment, it is Peter who has guided the courts. In Scotland, for example, two short articles which he wrote during his time as a professor at Edinburgh were sufficient to reinvigorate a previously moribund area of the law.

Sometimes critics in any given system might feel that he had rationalized some of the cases in a manner that would have surprised the authors of the judgments. But, in a very real sense, that was to miss the point: in his view, Peter was fitting the cases into the true structure of the law which he had worked out or—as I think he would have put it—which he had uncovered. In that respect, his writings more closely resemble the jurisprudence of German or French professors. It is therefore no coincidence that he was the first British academic lawyer to be honoured with an obituary in the *Juristen Zeitung*. In this kind of scholarly work, the opinions of the judges are just as likely to be criticized as those of other academic writers. The fact that, thanks to Peter, among others, the courts now welcome constructive writing of this kind means that the standing of British academic lawyers is higher today than at any time in the past.

Perhaps of all things, his role in that development would have pleased Peter, the immediate Past President of the Society of Legal Scholars. It has rightly been said that the Society owes a greater debt to him than to anyone in living memory. During his time as Secretary of the Society of Public Teachers of Law between 1989 and 1996, he not only embarked on a root-and-branch reform of its structures but somehow found time to organize a remarkable series of Saturday seminars in All Souls which attracted senior judges, practitioners, and academics from around the world. The whole point of these occasions was that everyone took part on an equal footing and that they all learned from one another. That was Peter's vision of how our understanding of the law would grow.

Unavoidably, my time has run out before the tale of Peter's life and works is even half told. That is, perhaps, as it should be, since it is all too clear that Peter's life too came to a close when there were still many things which he wished to say and do. In fact, however, he achieved an extraordinary amount and his influence was felt all over the legal world. Above all, Peter laid the intellectual foundations of a whole area of the law. That is given to very few.

With Peter's death, the legal world has lost one of its most inspiring figures; his University and colleges one of their most faithful servants; his family and friends a warm-hearted, generous, entertaining, and loyal companion. In our sadness we all have much, very much, for which to be grateful.





## Foreword

This collection of essays has been written by his colleagues, friends and former pupils in honour of Peter Birks. Peter's interest in law was all-embracing—there was no part of the legal map he would have regarded as *terra incognita*—but these essays deal with the sections of that map which were closest to his heart. They constitute a remarkable testimony to his influence; there could be no better memorial to his work. It is particularly welcome that the editors have included the moving addresses they gave at Peter's Memorial Service, which captured so much of his personality and achievements, both the intellectual eminence of the scholar and the warmth and kindness of the man. It is good to have these addresses in permanent form.

There is little that I can, or would wish to, add. I came to know Peter during the ten years he spent as an Official Fellow of Brasenose College. Peter was the best of colleagues, not just for the other law tutors (Peter and I were subsequently joined by Hugh Collins), but for the Fellowship as a whole. He was as generous with his friendship as he was with his energy and enthusiasm. He was a brilliantly successful college tutor, demanding and inspiring, taking infinite pains with his pupils. All Brasenose lawyers of that decade will recognize Andrew Burrows's account (in his memorial address) of a Birks tutorial.

One of Peter's most admirable qualities was his strong sense of loyalty, as a virtue to be practised lifelong not only to his friends but also, just as strongly, to his institutions. He became very attached to Brasenose, and remained in close touch long after his departure. In that sense, it can be said that he never did depart. At one period, he even came from Edinburgh to Oxford on a fortnightly basis to teach Roman Law to Brasenose first year students. That was an heroic undertaking, travelling by the Edinburgh—London coach throughout Friday night (having taken two sleeping tablets, of a brand now withdrawn due to its alarming side-effects), and arriving by the London—Oxford coach on Saturday morning in time to give a full set of tutorials.

Peter's other great personal quality was his generosity; that generous spirit which led him to give so much time and thought to helping or supporting the work of others, whether they were pupils, research students, or colleagues. My own debt to him is immeasurable. Advice, comments, suggestions, vigorous discussion were always available and were always warmly encouraging. Peter was a great morale booster: after two hours in his company all things seemed possible.

The contributors to this distinguished collection of essays would no doubt have hoped to produce a book to mark his retirement. We can imagine the

pleasure with which he would have received it. Since, however, the book has to serve as a memorial, we must be grateful to them that they have produced a worthy one.

John Davies

## *Acknowledgements*

We are grateful to Eric Descheemaeker, who was one of Peter's doctoral students at the time of his death, for compiling the list of Peter's publications. We are also grateful to Tony Weir, Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, for his translation from German into English of Essay 23. Oxford University Press has done an excellent job turning the essays into the fitting memorial intended and we would particularly like to thank Darcy Ahl, Gwen Booth, John Louth, and Virginia Williams. Thanks are also due to Alan Rodger's judicial assistant, Charles Banner, and Andrew Burrows's secretary, Lyn Hambridge.



# Contents

<i>Table of Cases</i>	xxv
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	xlvii
<i>Roman Law</i>	li
<i>List of Contributors</i>	lvii

Introduction	1
<i>Andrew Burrows and Alan Rodger</i>	

## I THE ENGLISH LAW OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT AND RESTITUTION

1. The Evolution of the Species	13
<i>Francis Rose</i>	

### General Concepts

2. Absence of Basis: The New Birksian Scheme	33
<i>Andrew Burrows</i>	
3. Three Enrichment Issues	49
<i>Robert Stevens</i>	
4. Some Thoughts on Change of Position	65
<i>Gareth Jones</i>	
5. The Role of Fault in the Law of Restitution	83
<i>Graham Virgo</i>	
6. Subrogation: Persistent Misunderstandings	105
<i>Charles Mitchell</i>	
7. Tracing	119
<i>Lionel Smith</i>	
8. Gain-Based Damages and Compensation	141
<i>James Edelman</i>	

### Some Particular Unjust Factors

9. Unlawful Statutes and Mistake of Law: Is There a Smile on the Face of Schrödinger's Cat?	163
<i>Jack Beatson</i>	
10. The Further Travails of Duress	181
<i>Ewan McKendrick</i>	

11. Undue Influence: *Beyond* Impaired Consent and Wrongdoing towards a Relational Analysis 201  
*Mindy Chen-Wishart*
12. Unjust Enrichment, Discharge for Breach, and the Primacy of Contract 223  
*Gerard McMeel*

### Property, Insolvency, and Restitution

13. Resulting Trusts 247  
*Robert Chambers*
14. *Jones v Jones*: Property or Unjust Enrichment? 265  
*Peter Millett*
15. Unjust Delivery 277  
*William Swadling*
16. The Avoidance of Transactions in Insolvency Proceedings and Restitutionary Defences 299  
*Roy Goode*

## II THE COMPARATIVE LAW OF UNJUST ENRICHMENT AND RESTITUTION

17. Restitution after Termination for Breach of Contract: German Law after the Reform of 2002 323  
*Reinhard Zimmermann*
18. No Basis: A Comparative View 343  
*Sonja Meier*
19. Unjust Enrichment as Absence of Basis: Can English Law Cope? 363  
*Gerhard Dannemann*
20. The Fallacy of 'Restitution for Wrongs' 379  
*Thomas Krebs*
21. Peter Birks and Scots Enrichment Law 401  
*Hector MacQueen*

## III ROMAN LAW

22. What did *Damnum Iniuria* Actually Mean? 421  
*Alan Rodger*

23. The Romanization of Spain: The Contribution of City Laws in the Light of the <i>Lex Irnitana</i> <i>Joseph Georg Wolf</i>	439
24. Absent Parties and Bloody-Minded Judges <i>Ernest Metzger</i>	455
25. 'You Never Can Tell with Bees': Good Advice from Pooh for Students of the <i>Lex Aquilia</i> <i>Arianna Pretto-Sakmann</i>	475
26. Late Arrivals: The Appendix in Justinian's Digest Reconsidered <i>Tony Honoré</i>	497
27. Logic and Experience in Roman Law <i>David Johnston</i>	513
28. Unjust Enrichment: The Tenant's Tale <i>Eltjo Schrage</i>	525

## IV LEGAL HISTORY

29. Bezoar-Stones, Gall-Stones, and Gem-Stones: A Chapter in the History of the Tort of Deceit <i>John Baker</i>	545
30. Denials Ancient and Modern, with some Roman Footnotes <i>Jeffrey Hackney</i>	561
31. Rumford Market and the Genesis of Fiduciary Obligations <i>Joshua Getzler</i>	577
32. Slavery and the Roman Law of Evidence in Eighteenth-Century Scotland <i>John W Cairns</i>	599
33. Sir William Jones and the Nature of Law <i>David Ibbetson</i>	619
The Publications of Peter Birks 1969–2005 <i>Compiled by Eric Descheemaeker</i>	641
<i>Index</i>	653





## *Table of Cases*

Acme Process Equipment Company v United States 347 F 2d 509 (Ct. Cl. 1965), reversed 385 US 138 (1966) .....	61
Acquaculture Corporation v New Zealand Green Mussel Co Ltd [1990] 3 NZLR 299.....	146
Actionstrength Ltd v International Glass Engineering IN.GLEN SpA [2003] UKHL 17; [2003] 2 AC 541.....	307, 369
Adam Browne's Case (1368) YB 42 Lib Ass 8 .....	546
Adams v Angell (1877) 5 Ch D 634 .....	113
Adamson, Ex p (1878) 8 Ch D 807 .....	145
Adderley v Dixon (1824) 1 Sim & St 607; 57 ER 239.....	258
Addis v Clement (1728) 2 Peere Williams 456; 24 ER 811.....	587
Admiralty Commissioners v SS Chekiang [1926] AC 637 .....	156–7
Admiralty Commissioners v SS Susquehanna [1926] AC 655 .....	156–7
Adras Building Material Ltd v Harlow & Jones GmbH [1995] RLR 234.....	26
AG Spalding & Bros v AW Gamage Ltd (1915) 32 RPC 273 .....	147
Agar v Lisle, Hobart 187 .....	571
Agip (Africa) Ltd v Jackson [1990] Ch 265; affirmed [1991] Ch 547 (CA) .....	266–7
Ahmed Angullia bin Hadjee Mohamed Salleh Angullia v Estate and Trust Agencies (1927) Limited [1938] AC 624.....	146
Air Canada v British Columbia [1989] 1 SCR 1161; (1989) 59 DLR (4th) 161 .....	72, 168, 174
Air Jamaica Ltd v Charlton [1999] 1 WLR 1399 .....	248
Alec Lobb (Garages) Ltd v Total Oil (Great Britain) Ltd [1983] 1 WLR 87; [1985] 1 WLR 73.....	99, 189, 197
Alev (The) [1989] 1 Lloyd's Rep 138 .....	190
Alf Vaughan & Co Ltd v Royscot Trust plc [1999] 1 All ER (Comm) 856.....	189
Alfred McAlpine Construction Ltd v Panatown Ltd [2001] 1 AC 518 .....	158–9
Alghussein Establishment v Eton College [1988] 1 WLR 587 .....	236
Allcard v Skinner (1887) 36 Ch D 145 .....	68–70, 204, 206–8, 213–5, 219, 222
Allen v Flood [1898] AC 1.....	197
Allen and Mearns v Skene and Burnet (1728) Mor 9454.....	613
Ames' Settlement, <i>Re</i> [1946] Ch 217.....	262
Andrew v Boughey (1552) 1 Dyer 75 .....	548
Anon (1315) YB 2 & 3 Edw II; 19 Selden Soc 195; B&M (1986) 265 .....	567
Anon (1430) B&M 509.....	550–1
Anon (1452) Statham.....	548
Anon (1471) B&M 511.....	547–8
Anon (1491) Caryl's reports; 115 Selden Soc 73; B&M 515.....	550
Anon (1514) 1 Dyer 1b.....	569
Anon (1576) KU Ms (B&M 529) .....	568
Anon (1579) LI MS Misc 488 (B&M 533).....	568
Anon (1582) HLS MS Acc 704755, fo 106 .....	568

Anon (1601) Goulds 155 pl 183 .....	569
Appleby v Myers (1867) LR 2 CP 651 .....	58
Armagas Ltd v Mundogas SA [1986] AC 77 (CA); affirmed [1986] 1 AC 717 (HL) .....	148
Armory v Delamirie (1722) 1 Str 505 .....	281
Ashby v White (the Aylesbury Voter's case) (1703) 6 Mod 45; 87 ER 810; (1703) 2 Ld Raym 938; 92 ER 126, Holt KB 524; 90 ER 1188 (KB), reversing (1703) 1 Sm LC (13th edn) 253; 1 ER 417 (HL) .....	52, 584
Ashburn Anstalt v Arnold [1989] Ch 1 .....	280
Astley v Reynolds (1731) 2 Stra 915 .....	191
Atlas Express Ltd v Kafco (Importers and Distributors) Ltd [1989] QB 833 .....	188
Attorney-General v Blake [2001] 1 AC 268 .....	91, 126, 148, 150, 153, 354, 381, 397–8
Attorney-General v Gray [1977] 1 NSWLR 406 .....	74
Attorney-General v Guardian Newspapers (No 2) ('Spycatcher') [1990] 1 AC 109 .....	148, 171
Attorney-General for Hong Kong v Reid [1994] 1 AC 324; [1994] NZLR 1 .....	26, 254, 271, 274, 583
Auckland Harbour Board v R [1924] AC 318 .....	74
Autologic Holdings plc v IRC [2005] UKHL 54; [2005] 3 WLR 339 .....	166, 176
Aylesbury v Wottes (1382) YB Mich 6 Rich III (Ames Fdn) 119 pl 27; CM 40/987, m 561; 103 Selden Soc 447 .....	546
B & S Contracts and Design Ltd v Victor Green Publications Ltd [1984] ICR 419 .....	190
Baily v Merrell (1615) 3 Buls 95; Cro Jac 386; 1 Rolle Rep 275; 1 Rolle Abr 96–7 .....	557
Bainbridge v Browne (1881) 18 Ch D 188 .....	69
Bairstow v Queen's Moat Houses plc [2001] 2 BCLC 531 .....	157
Bank of Credit & Commerce International SA v Aboody [1990] 1 QB 923; [1992] 4 All ER 955 .....	69, 209, 215
Bank of Credit & Commerce International (Overseas) Ltd v Akindele [2001] Ch 437 .....	87, 89
Bank of Credit & Commerce International SA (in liq) v Hussain and another [1999] All ER (D) 1442 .....	217
Bank of Montreal v Stuart [1911] AC 120 .....	215, 220
Bank of Scotland v Bennett [1997] 1 FLR 801 .....	218
Banks v Whetston (1596) Cro Eliz 457 .....	571
Banque Financière de la Cité v Parc (Battersea) Ltd [1999] 1 AC 221 .....	3, 101, 108–11, 115–8
Barclays Bank Ltd v WJ Simms, Son and Cooke (Southern) Ltd [1980] 1 QB 677 .....	22, 37, 84, 277
Barclays Bank plc v Boulter [1997] 2 All ER 1002; [1998] 1 WLR 1 (CA); [1999] 4 All ER 513; [1999] 1 WLR 1919 .....	69, 296
Barclays Bank plc v O'Brien [1993] 4 All ER 417; [1994] AC 180 .....	68–9
Baring Bros & Co Ltd v Cunninghame DC [1997] CLC 108 .....	27
Barker v Corus UK Ltd [2006] UKHL 20; [2006] 2 WLR 1027 .....	184

Barlow Clowes International Ltd v Eurotrust International Ltd [2005]	
UKPC 37.....	86–7, 89
Baroness Wenlock v River Dee Co (1888) 38 Ch D 534.....	112
Barros Mattos Jnr v MacDaniels Ltd; [2004] EWHC 1188 (Ch); [2005] 1	
WLR 247; [2004] 3 All ER 299.....	71–2, 92, 95
Bartlett v Barclays Bank Trust Co Ltd (No 2) [1980] Ch 515 .....	146
Barton v Armstrong [1976] AC 104 .....	182, 184–7, 193, 198
Base Metal Trading Ltd v Shamurin [2004] EWCA (Civ) 1316 .....	146
BCCI, <i>see</i> Bank of Credit & Commerce International	
Beaney, <i>Re</i> [1978] 1 WLR 770 .....	67
Beary v Pall Mall Investments (a firm) [2005] EWCA Civ 415 .....	184
Beck v Northern Natural Gas Company 170 F 3d 1018 (US Ct of	
Apps (10th Cir, 1999) .....	54
Belmont Finance Corp Ltd v Williams Furniture Ltd (No 2) [1980] 1 All	
ER 393 .....	89
Bence Graphics Ltd v Fasson Ltd [1998] QB 87.....	156
Berye v Lone (1595) Cp 40/1552, m 1333; BL MS Add 37321, fo 21 .....	551
Bilbie v Lumlie (1802) 2 East 469.....	172
Billson v Residential Apartments Ltd [1991] 3 All ER 265 .....	177
Birch v Blagrave (1755) Amb 264; 27 ER 176.....	253
Birtchnell v Equity Trustee Executors and Agency Co Ltd (1929) 42 CLR 384.....	580
Bishop v Viscountess Montague (1601) Cro Eliz 824 .....	567
Biss, <i>In re</i> [1903] 2 Ch 40 .....	582, 586, 589
Black Clawson International Ltd v Papierwerke Waldhof-Aschaffenberg	
AG [1975] AC 591.....	177, 180
Blewett v Millett [1774] 7 Brown PC 367; 3 ER 238 .....	588
Bloor (Measham) Ltd v Calcott [2001] EWHC Ch 467; [2002] 1 EGLR 1 .....	152
Blore v Sutton 3 Meriv 247 .....	146
Boardman v Phipps [1967] 2 AC 46.....	90, 148, 354, 598
Bonfester v Reynold (1510) CP 40/992, m 354 .....	551
Bonion's Case (1315) YB P 8 Edw II, f 275; Fitz Abr, <i>Dentinue</i> 59.....	627–8
Boomer v Muir 24 P 2d 570 (Cal Sup Ct, 1933).....	59–60
Boscawen v Bajwa [1995] 4 All ER 769; [1996] 1	
WLR 328.....	78, 108–9, 117–8, 133
Bowdon v Pelleter, YB P 8 Edw II (41 SS) 136.....	627
BP Exploration Co (Libya) Ltd v Hunt (No 2) [1979] 1 WLR 783; [1981] 1	
WLR 232 (CA); [1983] 2 AC 352 (HL).....	21, 55, 57–8, 229, 236
Braam v Stichting Standvast Wonen, Hoge Raad, 5 December 2003, NJ 2004, 75....	532
Bradford Advance Co Ltd v Ayers [1924] WN 152 .....	317
Brandeis Goldschmidt & Co Ltd v Western Transport Ltd [1981] QB 864 .....	156
Bray v Ford [1896] AC 44 .....	589
Brediman's Case (1607) 6 Co Rep 56b .....	571
Breen v Williams (1996) 186 CLR 71 .....	580
Brennan v Bolt Burdon [2004] EWCA Civ 1017; [2004] 3 WLR 1321;	
[2005] QB 303 .....	73, 101, 178–9, 375
Brett, Ex p (1871) LR 6 Ch App 838.....	110
Brewer Street Investments Ltd v Barclays Woollen Co Ltd [1954]	
1 QB 428.....	61

Brickenden v London Loan & Savings Co [1934] 3 DLR 465.....	146
Brisbane v Dacres (1813) 5 Taunt 143; 128 ER 641.....	101
Bristol & West Building Society v Mothew [1998] Ch 1.....	146, 158
British Motor Trade Association v Gilbert [1951] 2 All ER 641.....	148, 156
British Oxygen Co Ltd v South of Scotland Electricity Board 1959 SC (HL) 17; [1959] 1 WLR 587.....	409
British Steel plc v Commissioners of Customs & Excise [1997] 2 All ER 366.....	177
British Telecommunications Plc v The Department of the Environment [1996] NPC 148.....	562, 572
British Westinghouse Electric and Manufacturing Co Ltd v Underground Electric Railways Co of London Ltd [1912] AC 673.....	144, 147
Brocklebank Ltd v R [1925] 1 KB 52.....	169
Brocklehurst's Estate, <i>Re</i> [1978] 1 Ch 14.....	221
Brook's Wharf and Bull Wharf Ltd v Goodman Bros [1937] 1 KB 534.....	43
Brown v Brown (1993) 31 NSWLR 582.....	252
Brown & Davis Ltd v Galbraith [1972] 1 WLR 997.....	241, 243
Bulkley v Wilford (1834) 2 Cl & Fin 102; 6 ER 1094; Sc 8 Bligh NS 111; 5 ER 888 (HL).....	583, 589
Burbage v Eltock (1637) CUL MS Gg.2.20, fo 991.....	551
Burnby v Bollett (1847) 16 M & W 644.....	550
Burrell v Earl of Egremont (1844) 7 Beav 205; 49 ER 1043.....	108, 113
Burston Finance Ltd v Speirway Ltd (in liq) [1974] 1 WLR 1648.....	116
Butler v Egg and Egg Pulp Marketing Board (1966) 114 CLR 185.....	154
Butler v Rice [1910] 2 Ch 277.....	108, 114
Byfield, <i>Re</i> [1982] 1 Ch 267.....	108
C & P Haulage v Middleton [1983] 1 WLR 1461.....	61
Caledonia North Sea Ltd v London Bridge Engineering Ltd, 2000 SLT 1123 (Court of Session (Lower House)), affirmed <i>sub nom</i> Caledonia North Sea Ltd v British Telecommunications plc [2002] UKHL 4; [2002] 1 Lloyd's Rep 553.....	106
Calverley v Green (1984) 155 CLR 242.....	258, 262
Calwodeleg v John (1479) YB Hil 18 Ed IV, fo 23, pl 5 (B&M 526).....	568–9
Cambridge Water Co v Eastern Counties Leather Plc [1994] 2 AC 264.....	154
Campbell v Campbell, 21 February 1996 (Ch D).....	212
Campden Hill Ltd v Chakrani [2005] EWHC 911 (Ch).....	78
Capital & Counties Bank Ltd v Rhodes [1903] 1 Ch 631.....	113
Cargill International v Bangladesh Sugar & Food [1996] 4 All ER 563 (QBD); [1998] 1 WLR 461 (CA).....	236
Carl-Zeiss Stiftung v Herbert Smith and Co (a firm) (No 2) [1969] 2 Ch 276.....	86
Carlisle Banking Co v Thompson (1884) 28 Ch D 398.....	108
Carr-Saunders v Dick McNeil [1986] 1 WLR 922.....	394–5
Carrier's Case (1473) <i>Select Cases in the Exchequer Chamber</i> , 64 Selden Soc 30.....	568–9
Cartwright v Green (1803) 8 Ves 405.....	288, 295, 297–8
Case of the Marsalsea (1612) 10 Co Rep 68b.....	561
Castle Finance Ltd v Piddington [1996] 1 FSCR 269.....	118
Cavendish v Lady Midleton (1628) B&M 523.....	551

Chambers v Miller (1862) 3 F & F 202.....	289–90, 292
Chancellor of Oxford's case (1613) 10 Co Rep 53a.....	571
Chandler v Webster [1904] 1 KB 493.....	59, 345–6
Chapman v Chapman (1870) LR 9 Eq 276 .....	145
Charitable Corporation v Sutton (1742) 2 Atk 400; 26 ER 642 .....	595
Chase Manhattan Bank NA v Israel-British Bank (London) Ltd [1981] Ch 105.....	92, 257, 271, 289, 406
Cheall v Association of Professional Executive Clerical and Computer Staff [1983] 2 AC 180.....	236
Cheese v Thomas [1994] 1 All ER 35; [1994] 1 WLR 129.....	70, 207, 209
Cheltenham & Gloucester plc v Appleyard [2004] EWCA Civ 291.....	109, 111, 116–8
Chester v Afshar [2004] UKHL 41; [2005] 1 AC 134 .....	184
Chesworth v Farrar [1967] 1 QB 407.....	394
Chetwynd v Allen [1899] 1 Ch 353 .....	108, 114, 118
Childers v Childers (1857) 1 De G & J 482; 44 ER 810.....	253
Chillingworth v Esche [1924] 1 Ch 97.....	42
Chinery v Viall (1860) 5 H & N 288; 157 ER 1192.....	155
Chinn v Collins [1981] AC 533.....	282
Cia de Seguros Imperiod v Heath (REBX) Ltd [2001] 1 WLR 112 .....	146
CIBC Mortgages Plc v Pitt [1994] 1 AC 200.....	68, 211
Cinema Plus Ltd v ANZ Banking Group Ltd (2000) 35 ACSR 1.....	113
Circuit Systems Ltd (in liq) v Zuken-Redac (UK) Ltd [1997] 1 WLR 721 .....	197
City of London BS v Flegg [1988] AC 54.....	282
Clarke v Dickson (1858) EB & E 148 .....	75
Clarke v Prus, 8 March 1995 (Ch D).....	218
Clarke v Shee and Johnson (1773) 1 Cowp 197 .....	283
Clea Shipping Corp v Bulk Oil International Ltd (The Alaskan Trader) (No 2) [1984] 1 All ER 129 .....	238
Cleadon Trust Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1939] Ch 286 .....	39, 353
Cleaton v Gower (1674) Fin 164; 23 ER 90 .....	145
Clifford v Brooke 13 Ves 130 .....	146
Clydebank Engineering and Shipbuilding Co Ltd v Don Jose Ramos Yzquierdo Y Castaneda [1905] AC 6.....	156
Cochrane v Moore (1890) 25 QBD 57 .....	287
Coggs v Bernard (1703) 2 Ld Raym 909; 3 Ld Raym 163; 1 Com 133; 1 Salk 26; 2 Salk 735; 3 Salk 11, 3 Salk 268; Holt KB 13; Holt KB 131; Holt 528.....	365–6, 573, 626–7, 631, 633
Combes v Throckmorton (1680) 2 Equity Cases Abridged 742; 22 ER 630 .....	582
Combe's Case (1725) Select Cases Temp King 46; 25 ER 214 .....	585
Comdel Commodities Ltd v Siporex Trade SN [1997] 1 Lloyd's Rep 424 .....	236
Commerzbank AG v Gareth Price-Jones [2003] EWCA Civ 1663; [2004] 1 P & CR D 15 .....	102
Commerzbank AG v IMB Morgan plc [2004] EWHC 2771 (Ch); [2004] All ER (D) 450 .....	93
Commerzbank AG v Jones [2003] EWCA 1663; [2005] 1 Lloyd's Rep 298 .....	65–6, 79, 81

Commissioner for State Revenue v Royal Insurance (1994) 182 CLR 51 .....	170, 174
Constable v Potter (1497) KB 27/945, m 49 .....	550
Cook v Deeks [1916] AC 554.....	148
Coomber, <i>Re</i> [1911] 1 Ch 723 .....	580
Cooper v Shepherd (1846) 3 CB 266; 136 ER 107 (CP).....	122
Copis v Middleton (1823) T & R 224; 37 ER 1083.....	107
Corporation of Ludlow v Greenhouse (1827) 1 Bligh (NS) 18; 4 ER 780.....	145
Costelloe v Chief Constable of Derbyshire [2001] 1 WLR 1437.....	281
Coupland v Arabian Gulf Petroleum Co [1983] 1 WLR 1136.....	171
Craig, <i>Re</i> [1971] Ch 95.....	209, 212, 218
Crawshay v Collins (1808) 15 Vesey Junior 218; 33 ER 736 .....	589
Crédit Lyonnais v George Stevenson & Co Ltd (1901) 9 SLT 93.....	408
Crédit Lyonnais Bank Nederland NV v Burch [1997] 1 All ER 144.....	209–10, 212, 220
Crehan v Intntrepreneur Pub Company [2004] EWCA Civ 637.....	395
Crescendo Management Pty Ltd v Westpac Banking Corp (1988) 19 NSWLR 40.....	181, 183
Cressman v Coys of Kensington (Sales) Ltd [2004] EWCA Civ 47; [2004] 1 WLR 2775 .....	117
Criterion Properties plc v Stratford UK Properties LLC [2002] EWCA Civ 1783; [2003] 1 WLR 2108; [2004] UKHL 28; [2004] 1 WLR 1846 .....	87–8, 95, 102, 224, 231
Crofter Hand Woven Harris Tweed Co v Veitch [1942] AC 435.....	197
Crosbie-Hill v Sayer [1908] 1 Ch 866 .....	108
Crosse v Gardner (1689) Comb 142; Holt 5; Carth 90; 3 Mod Rep 261; 1 Show KB 68 .....	549
Crown Dilm, Dilm Investments Ltd v Nicholas Sutton, Fulham River [2004] EWHC 52.....	88
Cryer v Feversham (c1573) BL MS Harley 664, fo 63v .....	551
CTN Cash and Carry Ltd v Gallaher [1994] 4 All ER 714.....	45, 189, 373–5
Cundy v Lindsay (1878) 3 App Cas 459 .....	62, 281, 291
Customs of Exeter (c1282) 21 Selden Soc 182.....	549
Dale v Hall (1750) 1 Wils 281 .....	631
Dale's Case (1585) Cro Eliz 44 (CP) .....	550
Dame Masselin v Decaens, Cour de Cassation, 29 April 1971, Bull civ III no 277 .....	539
Daniels v Drew [2005] EWCA Civ 507.....	98
Darley v Regina [1845–6] 12 Clark and Finnely 520; 8 ER 1513 (Exch Ch Ireland) .....	596
David Securities Pty Ltd v Commonwealth Bank of Australia (1992) 175 CLR 353 .....	174, 227–8, 278
Davies v Dobson 7 July 2000 (Ch D).....	212
Davies v Perpetual Trustee [1959] AC 439.....	570
Davies v Rees (1886) 17 QBD 408 .....	317
Davis v Fareham UDC [1956] AC 696 .....	213
Degelman v Guaranty Trust Co [1954] SCR 725; [1954] 3 DLR 785 .....	41, 123
Denison v Ralphson (1682) 1 Vent 365, <i>sub nom</i> Bevingsay v Ralston, Skin 66.....	548

Dennis, <i>Re</i> [1996] Ch 80 .....	314
Denton v Stewart (1786) 17 Ves 280; 34 ER 108 .....	145
Deutsche Morgan Grenfell Group plc v IRC; [2005] EWCA Civ 78; [2006] 2 WLR 103; [2005] STC 329 .....	3, 44, 66, 72–3, 165–6, 168, 171, 173, 176, 178–9
Devereux v Barclay (1819) 2 B & A 702 .....	286
Devereux v Tuchet (1310) YB 3 Ed II; 20 Selden Soc 16 .....	567
Dextra Bank and Trust Co v Bank of Jamaica [2002] 1 All ER (Comm) 193 .....	79, 81, 89, 102
Dicksey v Spencer (1587) 3 Leo 169; Gouldsborough 40; Godbolt 105; Moore 211 .....	564–5
Dies v British and International Mining and Finance Corporation Ltd [1939] 1 KB 724 .....	101, 238–9
Dimond v Lovell [2002] 1 AC 384 .....	157
Dimskal Shipping Co SA v International Transport Workers' Federation (The <i>Evia Luck</i> ) (No 2) [1990] 1 Lloyd's Rep 319; [1992] 2 AC 152 .....	181, 183, 185, 187, 197, 224
Diplock, <i>Re</i> [1948] Ch 465 (CA) .....	77–8, 108
Dixon v Wilkinson (1859) 4 De G & J 508; 45 ER 198 .....	145
DO Ferguson & Associates v Sohl (1992) 62 Build LR 95 .....	234, 239
Dodd Properties (Kent) Ltd v Canterbury City Council [1980] 1 WLR 433 .....	144, 147
Doe d Lloyd v Powell (1826) 5 B & C 308 .....	314
Doige's Case (1442) B&M 391 .....	551
Dollar Land (Cumbernauld) Ltd v CIN Properties Ltd 1998 SC (HL) 90 .....	401, 413
Drew Barantine's Case (1411) JH Baker and SFC Milsom, <i>Sources of English Legal History: Private Law to 1750</i> (1986) 509 .....	547, 557
DSDN Subsea Ltd v Petroleum Geo-Services ASA [2000] BLR 530 .....	188, 190
Dubai Aluminium Co Ltd v Salaam [202] UKHL 48; [2003] 2 AC 366 .....	88, 95, 148–9
Dunstable v Bal (1278) 46 Selden Soc 2 .....	548
Dupomex v Duijvelaar, Hode Raad, 25 June 2004, NJ 2005, 338 .....	536, 538, 540
Dyer v Grantham (1317) 23 Selden Soc 105–6 .....	549
Eagerpath Ltd v Edwards (1999) 73 TC 427 .....	180
Eagle Star Insurance plc v Karasiewicz [2002] EWCA Civ 940 .....	116
Earl of Buckinghamshire v Hobart (1818) 3 Swans 186; 36 ER 824 .....	108
Eastbourne Borough Council v Foster, 20 December 2000; [2002] ICR 1149 .....	74
Eas(t)on v Newman (1596) HLS MS 110, fo 218v (B&M 537); Cro Eliz 495; Moo KB 460; Goulds 152 .....	570
Edelsten v Edelsten (1862) 31 Beav 292; 54 ER 1151 .....	147
Eden v Foster (1725) Select Cases Temp King 36; 25 ER 208 .....	585
Edginton v Fitzmaurice (1880) 25 Ch D 459 .....	187
Edinburgh & District Tramways v Courtenay 1909 SC 99 .....	402, 415
Edwards v Lee's Administrators (the Kentucky Caves case) 96 SW 2d 1028 (Ky CA, 1936) .....	54, 130–1
Ekins v Tresham (1663) 1 Lev 102, <i>sub nom</i> Leakins v Clissel, 1 Sid 146 .....	558

El Ajou v Dollar Land Holdings plc [1993] 3 All ER 717 (Ch D); reversed [1994] 2 All ER 685 (CA) .....	253
Eldan Services Ltd v Chandag Motors Ltd [1990] 3 All ER 459 .....	262
Ellesmere v Whytbred (1467) CP 40/823 m 283 .....	551
Emson v Daxe (1495) CP 40/931, m 293 .....	547, 550
Equitable Life Assurance Society v Hyman [2002] 1 AC 408 .....	235
Erlanger v New Sombrero Phosphate Co (1878) 3 App Cas 1218 .....	75
Eso Petroleum Co Ltd v Niad Ltd [2001] AER (D) 324; [2001] EWHC Ch 458 .....	150–2
Estate of Brocklehurst, <i>Re</i> the [1978] 1 Ch 14 .....	202, 212–3, 216
Euroactividade AG v Mason Investments Ltd, 18 April 1994 (QBD) .....	108
Evans v Amicus Healthcare Ltd [2005] Fam 1 .....	307
Evia Luck (The) [1992] 2 AC 152 .....	171
Ewart v Latta (1865) 4 Macq 983 .....	110
Exall v Partridge (1799) 8 Term Rep 308 .....	43
Experience Hendrix LLC v PPX Enterprises Inc [2003] EWCA Civ 323; [2003] 1 All ER (Comm) 830 .....	91, 150–2, 226
Fairchild v Glenhaven Funeral Services Ltd [2002] UKHL 22; [2003] 1 AC 32 .....	184
Falcke v Scottish Imperial Insurance Co (1886) 34 Ch D 234 .....	114, 133
Farquharson Bros & Co v King [1902] AC 325 .....	287
Farrant v Farrant (1822) 3 Stark 130 .....	286
FC Jones (Trustee in Bankruptcy) v Jones [1997] Ch 159 .....	4–5, 53, 131, 267, 270–4, 391, 399
Featherstonhaugh v Fenwick (1810) 17 Vesey Junior 298; 34 ER 115 .....	589
Federal Sugar Refining Co v US Sugar Equalization Board Inc (1920) 268 F 575 (DCNY) .....	148
Fibrosa Spolka Akcyjna v Fairbairn Lawson Combe Barbour Ltd [1943] AC 32 .....	38, 59, 227, 345–6
Filby v Mortgage Express (No 2) Ltd [2004] EWCA Civ 759 .....	110–1
Financings Ltd v Baldock [1963] 2 QB 104 .....	233
Flatgebouw ‘Van Hogenhoucklaan’ v Staat der Nederlanden, Hoge Raad, 23 March 1979, NJ 1979, 482 .....	532
Fletcher, <i>Re</i> [1917] 1 Ch 339 .....	113
Floyd v Nangle (1747) 3 Atk 567; 26 ER 1127 .....	145
Foley v Hill (1848) 2 HLC 28 .....	282
Folkes v King [1923] 1 KB 282 .....	291
Forbes v Moffatt (1811) 8 Ves Jun 384; 34 ER 362 .....	113
Foskett v McKeown [2001] 1 AC 102 .....	53–4, 78, 90, 92, 94, 136, 255, 269, 301–2, 315
Foster v Driscoll [1929] 1 KB 470 .....	71
Fouldes v Willoughby (1841) 8 M & W 540 .....	286
Fowke v Boyle (1652) Style 343 .....	558
Fowler v Hollins (1872) LR 7 QB 616 .....	286
Fox v Mackreth (1788) 2 Brown CC 400; 29 ER 224; (1789) 1 Vesey Junior 69; 30 ER 234; (1791) 4 Brown PC 258; 2 ER 175 .....	588
French’s (Wine Bar) Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1987] BCLC 499 .....	314
Fresby v Fereby (1512) CP 40/999, m 117 .....	550



Fromond v Derk (1426) in <i>Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London 1413–37</i> , ed AH Thomas (1943) 201 .....	551
Furnis v Leicester (1618) Cro Jac 474 .....	551
Fyffes Group Ltd v Templeman [2000] 2 Lloyd's Rep 643 .....	149
Gammon v Stone (1749) 1 Ves Sen 339; 27 ER 1068 .....	107
Garden Cottage Foods v Milk Marketing Board [1984] AC 130 .....	395
Garland v Consumers Gas Co [2004] 1 SCR 629; (2004) 237 DLR (4th) 385 ....	36, 126
Garrock v Heytesbury (1387) B&M 507 .....	548
General and Finance Facilities Ltd v Cooks Cars (Romford) Ltd [1963] 1 WLR 644 .....	122
German Mining Co, <i>Re</i> (1853) De G M & G 19; 43 ER 415 .....	112
Ghana Commercial Bank v Chandiram [1960] AC 732 .....	114, 118
Gibbon v Paynton (1769) Burr 2298 .....	631
Gilbert-Ash (Northern) Ltd v Modern Engineering (Bristol) Ltd [1974] AC 689 .....	237, 240
Gill & Duffus SA v Berger & Co Inc [1984] AC 382 .....	233
GL Baker v Medway Building and Supplies Ltd [1958] 2 All ER 532 .....	95
Glanville v Glanville [2002] EWHC 1271 .....	212
Glasgow Corporation v Lord Advocate 1959 SC 203 .....	409–10
Glazier v Australian Men's Health (No 2) [2001] NSWSC 6 .....	148
Goldcorp Exchange Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1994] 3 NZLR 385; [1995] 1 AC 74 .....	261
Goldsmith v Preston (1605) 1 Rolle Abr 96 .....	550
Goldsworthy v Brickell [1987] Ch 378 .....	209
Gondal v Dillon Newsagents Ltd [2001] RLR 221 .....	150, 153–4
Goodfellow v Robertson (1871) 18 Cr 572 (Ont Ch) .....	252
Goss v Chilcott [1996] AC 788 .....	228
Grant v Gold Exploration and Development Syndicate [1900] 1 QB 233 .....	149
Gray v Richards Butler (a firm), <i>The Times</i> , 23 July 1996 .....	66
Gray's Inn Construction Co Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1980] 1 All ER 814 .....	305
Great Peace Shipping Ltd v Tsavliris Salvage (Int) Ltd [2003] QB 679 .....	289
Green v Portsmouth Stadium [1953] 2 QB 190 .....	169
Greenaway v Adams (1806) 12 Ves 395; 33 ER 149 .....	145
Greene King plc v Stanley and others [2001] EWCA Civ 1966 .....	209
Greenwood v Bennett [1973] QB 195 .....	50–1, 53–4, 57–8, 316
Greta Holme (The) [1897] AC 596 .....	156
Grete v Lane (1496) KB 27/934, m 30 .....	547
Grice v Shaw (1852) 10 Hare 76; 68 ER 845 .....	113
Guinness Mahon & Co Ltd v Kensington & Chelsea Royal London Borough Council [1999] QB 215 .....	38, 224
Gunsbourg, <i>Re</i> [1920] 2 KB 426 .....	314
Ha v New South Wales (1997) 189 CLR 465 .....	238
Halifax Building Society v Thomas [1996] Ch 217 .....	148
Halifax Mortgage Services Ltd v Muirhead [1997] EWCA Civ 2901; (1997) 76 P & CR 418 .....	110, 115, 117–8
Halifax plc v Omar [2002] EWCA Civ 121; [2002] 2 P & CR 377 .....	116, 118
Hall v Barrows (1863) 1 De GJ & S 150; 46 ER 873 .....	147

Hall v Dean and Wood (1601) Cro Eliz 841; Owen 131.....	571
Halley v The Law Society [2003] EWCA Civ 97 .....	93
Hambly v Trott (1776) 1 Cowp 371; 98 ER 1136.....	52, 76, 131, 391
Hammond v Osborn [2002] EWCA Civ 885 .....	207, 209, 212
Harding v Freeman (1651–2) Style 310; 1 Rolle Abr 91 .....	551
Harris v Digital Pulse Pty Ltd (2003) 56 NSWLR 298.....	148, 152
Hart v O'Connor [1985] AC 1000 .....	99
Harvey v Young (1597) Yelv 20 .....	558
Hawkes v Saunders (1782) 1 Cowp 289; 98 ER 1091.....	588
Heald v Carey (1852) 11 CB 977 .....	286
Healey v Healey [1915] 1 KB 938 .....	282
Hebridean Coast (The) [1961] AC 545 .....	157
Heilbut, Symons & Co v Buckleton [1913] AC 30 .....	555
Henderson v Merrett Syndicates Ltd [1995] 2 AC 145.....	171, 241, 389
Henderson v Wyborn (1995) 143 NSR (2d) 362 .....	113
Hennessey v Craigmile and Co Ltd [1986] ICR 461.....	190
Heyman v Darwins Ltd [1942] AC 356.....	234
Hill v ANZ Banking Group Ltd [1974] 4 ALR 634 .....	114
Hill v Hanks (1614) 2 Bulstrode 201 .....	566
Hill v Tupper (1863) 2 H & C 121 .....	280
Hilton v Barker Booth & Eastwood [2005] 1 WLR 567 .....	581
Hiort v London and North Western Railway Co 4 Exch Div 188.....	156
Hodgson v Marks [1971] Ch 892 .....	252
Hodgson v Shaw (1834) 3 My & K 183; 40 ER 70 .....	107
Hoechst v IRC (Cases C-397/98 & C-410/98) [2001] Ch 620 .....	165
Holiday v Hicks (1600) Cro Eliz 638.....	571
Holiday v Sigil (1826) 2 C & P 176; 172 ER 81 .....	124
Holland v Hodgson (1872) LR 7 CP 328.....	569
Hollicourt (Contracts) Ltd v Bank of Ireland [2001] Ch 555.....	305
Holt v Markham [1923] 1 KB 504 .....	20
Hong Kong Fir Shipping Co Ltd v Kawasaki Kisen Kaisha Ltd [1962] 2 QB 28.....	225
Hood, <i>In re</i> No 05–60470, 21 June 2005 (US Ct of Apps (5th Circ)).....	457
Horsford v Bird & Ors (Jamaica) [2006] UKPC 3.....	151
Hospitality Group Pty Ltd v Australian Rugby Union Ltd [2001] FCA 1040; (2001) 110 FCR 157 .....	148, 152
Houston Stewart Nicholson v Mrs Margaret Porterfield, 22 August 1771 (Commissary of Edinburgh).....	609
Hovenden v Millhof (1900) 83 LT 41 .....	149
Howard E Perry & Co Ltd v British Railways Board [1980] 1 WLR 1375 .....	286
Howe v Olyver (1498) KB 27/946, m 50d.....	550
Hughes v Hughes [2005] EWHC (Ch) 469.....	212
Hughes, Ex p (1802) 6 Vesey Junior 617; 31 ER 1223 .....	586, 589
Huguenin v Baseley 14 Ves 273 .....	215
Humphreys v Humphreys [2004] EWHC (Ch) 2201; [2005] FCR 712.....	209
Hunt v Silk (1804) 5 East 449; 102 ER 1142 .....	227
Huner v Canary Wharf Ltd [1997] AC 655.....	22
Huyton SA v Peter Cremer GmbH & Co [1999] 1 Lloyd's Rep 620 .....	186–9, 191, 197

Hydro Electric Commission of Kenora v Vacationland Dairy Co-operative Ltd [1994] 1 SCR 80 (Supreme Court of Canada).....	308
Hydro Electric Commission of the Township of Nepean v Ontario Hydro [1982] 1 SCR 347.....	172
Hyundai Heavy Industries Ltd v Papadopoulos [1980] 1 WLR 1129 .....	233, 240–1, 346
IBL Ltd v Coussens [1991] 2 All ER 133 .....	156
Ilich v R (1987) 162 CLR 110 .....	279, 296–8
Ingram v Little [1961] 1 QB 31 .....	291
International Factors Ltd v Rodriguez [1979] QB 351 .....	282
International Sales and Agencies Ltd v Marcus [1982] 3 All ER 551 .....	89
Investors Compensation Scheme Ltd v West Bromwich Building Society [1998] 1 WLR 892.....	236
Isaack v Clarke (1615) 2 Bulstr 306; 1 Rolle 59; Moore 841 .....	8, 561, 565, 570–2, 575
Item Software (UK) Ltd v Fassihi [2004] EWCA Civ 1244; [2005] ICR 450.....	101
Ive v Scott (1841) 9 Dowl 993 .....	151
J Leslie Engineers Co Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1976] 1 WLR 292 .....	305
Jackson v Jackson (1737) 1 Atkyns 513; 26 ER 324 .....	585
Jackson v Royal Bank of Scotland [2005] UKHL 3 .....	154
Jaggard v Sawyer [1995] 1 WLR 269 .....	153
James v Warren (1706) Holt KB 104; 90 ER 956 .....	112
James, Ex p (1803) 8 Vesey Junior 337; 32 ER 385 .....	586, 589
Jegon v Vivian (1871) LR 6 Ch App 742 .....	148
Jenkins v Parkinson (1833) 2 My & K 5; 39 ER 846 .....	145
Jenner v Morris (1861) 3 De G F & J 45; 45 ER 795 .....	112
Jennings v Cairns, In the Estate of Davidge [2003] EWCA Civ 1935 .....	207, 209
Johnson v Agnew [1980] AC 367.....	145, 233
Johnson v Unisys [2003] 1 AC 518.....	154
Johnstone v Milling (1886) 16 QBD 460 .....	225
Jones (RE) Ltd v Waring and Gillow Ltd [1926] AC 670 .....	352
JT Stratford & Son v Lindley [1965] AC 269 .....	198
Julien Patureau v Boudier, Cour de Cassation, 15 June 1892, DP 92.1.596, S 93.1.281 .....	539
Julius v Lord Bishop of Oxford [1880] All ER Rep 43.....	596
Kataria v Safeland plc [1998] 1 EGLR 39.....	564
Keech v Sandford (the Rumford Market Case) (1726) Select Cases Temp King 61; 25 ER 223; 2 Equity Cases Abridged 741; 22 ER 629.....	8, 581–90, 592, 597–8
Keighley, Maxted & Co v Durant [1901] AC 240 .....	133
Kelly v Cooper [1993] AC 205.....	581
Kelly v Solari (1841) 9 M & W 54; (1841) 11 LJ Ex 10; 152 ER 24.....	37, 62–3, 101, 255–6, 277, 279, 290
Kenrig v Eggleston (1648) Alleyn 93.....	631
Kenrick v Burges (1583) Moo KB 126.....	550

Kerrison v Glyn, Mills, Currie & Co (1911) 81 LJKB 465 .....	37, 352
Kettle v Miller (1585) CP 40/1444, m 406d; cited in J Herne, <i>The Pleader</i> (1657) 102 .....	550
Kinaston v Moore (1627) Cro Car 89 .....	571
King v David Allen & Sons (Billposting) Ltd [1916] 2 AC 54 .....	280
Kinge v Braine (1596) B&M 517 .....	548
King's Norton Metal Co Ltd v Edridge Merrett & Co Ltd (1897) 14 TLR 98 .....	291
Kleinwort Benson Ltd v Birmingham City Council [1997] QB 380 .....	22, 53, 172
Kleinwort Benson v Lincoln City Council [1999] 2 AC 349 .....	22, 26, 164, 167–70172–5, 177–80, 254, 348, 367–8, 375, 415–6
Knight v Wedderburn (1778) Mor 14545 .....	606–7, 616
Kok Hoong v Leong Chong Kweng Mines Ltd [1964] AC 993 .....	307–8, 311
Kolari, <i>Re</i> (1981) 36 OR (2d) 473 (Ont DC) .....	253
Kramer v Woodrow (1997) OR (3d) 118 .....	113
Kuwait Airways Corporation v Iraqi Airways Company [2002] 2 WLR 1353; [2004] EWHC 2603 .....	148, 152
Kuwait Airways Corporation v Iraqi Airways Company (Nos 4 and 5) [2002] UKHL 19; [2002] AC 883 .....	76, 92, 155–6, 286
Kyrri-Royle v Burger King Ltd [2005] EWHC 303 (Ch) .....	197
Lac Minerals Ltd v International Corona Resources Ltd [1989] 2 SCR 574; 61 DLR (4th) 14 .....	263
Lacer v Canterbury (1304) <i>CEMCR</i> , ed AH Thomas (1924), 154 .....	546
Lacey, <i>Ex p</i> (1801) 6 Vesey Junior 625; 31 ER 1228 .....	586, 589
Laird of Caprington v Geddeu (1632) Mor 9454 .....	613
Lake, <i>Re</i> [1903] 1 KB 439 .....	146
Lamine v Dorrell (1701) 2 Ld Raym 1216 .....	393
Lamplugh Iron Ore Co, <i>Re</i> [1927] 1 Ch 308 .....	107
Lancashire & Yorkshire Rly v MacNicoll (1919) 88 LJKB 601 .....	286
Lancaster custumal (1562) 21 Selden Soc 183 .....	550
Landmark Land Co v FDIC 256 F 3d 135 (Fed Cir, 2001) .....	61
Lane v Cotton (1701) 12 Modern 472; 88 ER 1458 .....	596
Lane v O'Brien Homes Ltd [2004] EWHC 303 .....	153
Langton v Langton [1995] 2 FLR 890 .....	217
Larner v London County Council [1949] 2 KB 683 .....	81, 350
Lea v Roberts, 4 July 2005 .....	88–9
Leigh & Sullivan Ltd v Aliakmon Shipping Co Ltd (The Aliakman) [1986] AC 785 .....	282
Lesley's Case (1680) 2 Freeman 52; 22 ER 1053 .....	582
Lewis v Alleyene (1888) 4 TLR 560 .....	112
Lewis v Averay [1972] 1 QB 198 .....	291
Libyan Arab Foreign Bank v Bankers Trust [1989] QB 728 .....	282
Lipkin Gorman (a firm) v Karpnale Ltd [1991] 2 AC 548 .....	24, 26, 43, 66, 68–9, 77–9, 81, 84, 91, 95–6, 115, 119, 133, 167, 255, 279, 283, 287, 307, 312, 371
Lister v Furnace, 1 Rolle Abr 90 .....	551

Lister & Co v Stubbs (1890) 45 Ch D 1.....	583
Livingstone v Rawyards Coal Company (1880) 5 App Cas 25 .....	144, 147–8, 153
Lloyds Bank Ltd v Bundy [1975] QB 326.....	99, 209
Lombard North Central v Butterworth [1987] QB 527 .....	233
Lonhro v Fayed (No 2) [1992] 1 WLR 1 .....	275
Lopus v Chandeler (1604) Cro Jac 4; (1606) B&M 518 .....	8, 549, 551, 553, 555, 557
Lord Churchill, <i>Re</i> (1888) 39 Ch D 175 .....	107
Louth v Diprose (1992) 175 CLR 621.....	99
M & I Instrument Engineers Ltd v Varsada and Beattie 1991 SLT 106 .....	407
Macarte v Gibson (1725) Select Cases Temp King 50; 25 ER 217.....	585
McDonald v Coys of Kensington [2004] EWCA 47; [2004] 1 WLR 2775.....	50–1, 86, 98–9
Macdonald v Denys Lascelles Ltd (1933) 48 CLR 457 .....	233
Mackenzie v Royal Bank of Scotland [1934] AC 468 .....	75, 81
Macklin v Dowset [2003] EWHC (Ch) 2812; [2003] All ER (D) 304 .....	209
Macmillan Inc v Bishopsgate Investment Trust plc [1995] 1 WLR 978 .....	94
Maersk Air Ltd v Expeditors International (UK) Ltd [2003] 1 Lloyd's Rep 491.....	89
Maheesan S/O Thambiah v Malaysian Government Officers Co-operative Housing Society [1979] AC 374 .....	148–9
Mahonia Ltd v JP Morgan Chase Bank [2004] EWHC 1938.....	148
Mallusk Cold Storage Ltd v Dept Finance and Personnel [2003] QBD (NI) 370.....	173
Manchester Airport Plc v Dutton [2000] 1 QB 133.....	365
Manifest Shipping Co Ltd v Uni-Polaris Insurance Co Ltd [2003] 1 AC 469.....	89
Mansel v Mansel (1732) 2 Barnardiston KB 186; 94 ER 438.....	587
Marcic v Thames Water Utilities Ltd [2004] 2 AC 42 .....	177
Maritime Electric Co Ltd v General Dairies Ltd [1937] AC 610.....	308, 311
Marlow v Pitfield (1719) 1 P Wms 558; 24 ER 516.....	112
Marpessa (The) [1907] AC 241 .....	156
Marsh v Keating (1834) 2 Cl & Fin 250; 6 ER 1149; 8 Bligh (NS) 651; 5 ER 1084; 1 Bing (NC) 198; 131 ER 1094.....	133
Marson v Cox (1879) 14 Ch D 140 .....	108
Martindale v Smith (1841) 1 QB 389.....	286
Maskell v Horner [1915] 3 KB 106.....	192, 374–5
Mason v New South Wales (1959) 102 CLR 108.....	169
Matrevers v Aland (1651) 1 Rolle Abr 97 .....	548
Mauncestre v Bolam (1305) <i>CEMCR</i> 262 .....	548
Maund's Case (1601) 7 Co Rep 28b.....	565, 571
Mayor, Aldermen and Burgesses of the Borough of Salford v Lever [1891] 1 QB 168.....	149
MCC Proceeds Inc v Lehman Bros Int (Europe) Ltd [1998] 4 All ER 675 .....	282
Meadows v Grand Junction Waterworks Co 1905 21 TLR 538.....	169
Mediana (The) [1900] AC 113 .....	156–7
Medina v Stoughton (1700) 1 Salk 210; 1 Ld Raym 593.....	549
Meinhard v Salmon 164 NE 545 (NY 1928).....	598
Merchants Express Co v Morton (1868) 15 Gr 274 (Ont Ch).....	253

Meredith v Lackschewitz-Martin and another [2002] EWHC (Ch) 1462.....	209, 213
Merry v Green (1841) 7 M & W 623.....	288, 295, 297–8
Metallgesellschaft Ltd v IRC (Cases C-397/98 & C-410/98) [2001] Ch 620 .....	165–6, 178
Middleton v Greenwood 2 De G J and Sm 142; 46 ER 329 .....	144
Midland Bank plc v Brown Shipley & Co Ltd [1991] 2 All ER 690 .....	178
Miles v Wakefield Metropolitan District Council [1987] AC 539.....	237
Miller v Race (1758) 1 Burr 452 .....	315
Ministry of Defence v Ashman [1993] 2 EGLR 102; 66 P & CR 195.....	151, 256
Ministry of Defence v Thompson [1993] 2 EGLR 107 .....	151
Ministry of Health v Simpson [1951] AC 251.....	43, 66, 95
M'Myn, <i>Re</i> (1886) 33 Ch D 575 .....	107
Moet v Couston (1864) 33 Beav 578; 55 ER 493 .....	147
Moggach v Milne 2005 GWD 8–107.....	413
Montagu's Settlement Trust, <i>Re</i> [1987] Ch 264 .....	43
Monyton v Wylson (1517) KB 27/1024, m 23d.....	547
Moore's Executors v M'Dermid 1913 1 SLT 278.....	350
Morgan v Ashcroft [1938] 1 KB 49 .....	278
Morgan v Palmer (1824) 2 B & C 729 .....	169
Morgan Guaranty Trust Co of New York v Lothian Regional Council 1995 SC 151 .....	174, 401, 405, 410, 412
Morris v CW Martin & Sons Ltd [1966] 1 QB 716.....	14
Morris (deceased), <i>Re</i> , Special Trustees for Great Ormond Street Hospital for Children v Rushin and others [2000] All ER (D) 598 .....	209
Mortgage Agency Services Number Two Ltd v Chater [2003] EWCA Civ 490 .....	209
Moschi v Lep Air Services [1973] AC 331.....	225
Moseley v Cressey's Co (1865) LR 1 Eq 405 .....	261
Moses v Macferlan (1760) 2 Burr 1005; 97 ER 676 .....	9, 26, 126, 367, 369, 402
Moss v Hancock [1899] 2 QB 211 .....	283
Moynes v Cooper [1956] 1 QB 439.....	290, 296
Mumpower v Castle 104 SE 706 (Virginia CA 1920).....	251
Murad v Al-Saraj [2004] EWHC 1235; [2005] EWCA Civ 959.....	92, 149, 598
Murphy v Attorney-General [1982] IR 241 .....	73
Mutual Finance Ltd v John Wetton & Sons Ltd [1937] 2 KB 389.....	189, 217
Nanwa Goldmines Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1955] 1 WLR 1080.....	261
National Bank of New Zealand Ltd v Waitaki International Processing (NI) Ltd [1999] 2 NZLR 211.....	80
National Coal Board v Evans [1951] 2 KB 861 .....	285–6
National Commercial Bank (Jamaica) Ltd v Hew [2002] UKPC 51.....	98, 214
National Pari Mutuel Association Ltd v R (1930) 46 TLR 594.....	169
Nelson v Larholt [1948] 1 KB 339.....	94
Nesbitt v Tredennick (1808) [1803–13] All ER Rep 782.....	589
Neste Oy v Lloyd's Bank [1983] 2 Lloyd's Rep 658 .....	261, 347
New Zealand Netherlands Society 'Oranje' Inc v Kuys [1973] 1 WLR 1126.....	580
Newham v May (1824) 13 Price 749; 147 ER 1142 .....	145–6

Newton v Bennet (1782) 12 Brown CC 135; 28 ER 1035 .....	588
Niru Battery Manufacturing Co v Milestone Trading Co [2002] EWHC 1425 (Comm); [2002] 2 All ER (Comm) 705; [2003] EWCA 1446 (Civ) (CA); [2004] 1 All ER (Comm) 193.....	70, 79–81, 88–9
Niru Battery Manufacturing Co v Milestone Trading Co (No 2) [2003] EWHC 1032 (Comm); [2003] 2 All ER (Comm) 365; [2004] EWCA Civ 487; [2004] 2 All ER (Comm) 289.....	102, 108, 112, 117
Nocton v Lord Ashburton [1914] AC 932 .....	145
Norris v Le Neve Ridgeway (1745) Temp Hardwicke 322; 27 ER 843 (HL), affirming Norris v Le Neve (1743) 3 Atkyns 26; 26 ER 818 .....	582, 587
North Central Wagon and Finance Co Ltd v Brailsford [1962] 1 All ER 502.....	317
North ocean Shipping Co Ltd v Hyundai Construction Co Ltd (The Atlantic Baron) [1979] QB 705.....	188, 192, 194, 196
Norwich City Council v Harvey [1989] 1 WLR 828.....	241
Norwich Union Fire Insurance Society Ltd v Wm H Prince Ltd [1934] AC 455 .....	278
Norwood v Rede (1557) B&M 448.....	558
Nurdin & Peacock v Ramsden [1999] 1 WLR 1249; [1999] 1 All ER 941.....	352, 358, 374–6
NV Slavenburg's Bank Ltd v Intercontinental Natural Resources Ltd [1980] 1 All ER 955.....	304
O'Brien Homes Ltd v Lane [2004] EWHC 303 .....	151
Occidental Worldwide Investment Corporation v Skibs A/S Avanti (The Siboen and The Sibotre) [1976] 1 Lloyd's Rep 293.....	183
OEM plc v Schneider [2005] EWHC 1072 (Ch).....	96
Olwell v Nye & Nissen Co 173 P 2d 652 (1946 SC Washington).....	147
Orakpo v Manson Developments Ltd [1978] AC 95.....	21, 114, 117
O'Reilly v Fetherston [1830] 4 Bligh NS 161; 5 ER 58.....	589
O'Reilly v Mackman [1983] 2 AC 237 .....	175
Orphanos v Queen Mary College [1985] AC 761 .....	239
Orwell v Mortoft (1505) YB Mich 20 Hen VII, fo 8, p 118 (B&M 406) .....	567, 569
Oscar Chess Ltd v Williams [1957] 1 All ER 325.....	549, 555
O'Sullivan v Management Agency and Music Ltd [1985] QB 428.....	75, 209
Oughton v Seppings (1830) 1 B & Ad 241 .....	394
Owen v Tate [1976] 1 QB 402.....	114, 360
Owen v Williams (1773) Ambler 734; 27 ER 474 .....	587
Paal Wilson & Co A/S v Partenreederei Hannah Blumenthal (The Hannah Blumenthal) [1983] AC 854.....	230
Pacific National Investments v Victoria (2004) 245 DLR (4th) 211 .....	36
Padgham v Rochelle [1978] 1 Ch 14 .....	213
Paler v Bartlett (1605) Yelverton 71.....	568
Pao On v Lau Yiu Long [1980] AC 614 .....	183, 193–4
Papamichael v National Westminster Bank plc [2003] 1 Lloyd's Rep 341 .....	88–9, 93
Papouis v West [2004] EWHC (Ch) 396 .....	212, 221
Paragon Finance v D B Thackerar & Co [1999] 1 All ER 400 .....	149
Pan Ocean Shipping Co Ltd v Creditcorp Ltd (The Trident Beauty) [1994] 1 WLR 161.....	236–7, 242

Park Ward & Co, <i>Re</i> [1926] Ch 828 .....	313
Parson Bros Ltd v Shea (1965) 53 DLR (2d) 86.....	58
Pasley v Freeman (1789) 3 TR 51; reporter's note in [1957] 1 All ER 328 .....	549, 556
Patten v Bond (1889) 60 LT 583.....	108, 113
Paul v Speirway Ltd (in liq) [1976] Ch 220 .....	114, 117
Pavey & Matthews Pty Ltd v Paul (1986) 162 CLR 221 .....	41, 55, 371
Peake's Abattoirs Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1986] BCLC 73.....	114
Pearce v Brain [1929] 2 KB 310 .....	371, 373
Peek v Gurney (1873) LR 6 HL 377.....	145
Penarth Dock Engineering Co Ltd v Pounds [1963] 1 Lloyd's Rep 359 .....	394
Personal Representatives of Tang Man Sit v Capacious Investments Ltd [1996] AC 514.....	146
Pesticcio v Hunt [2004] EWCA Civ 372.....	68
Pesticcio v Niersmans [2003] 2 Planning and Compensation Rep D22.....	209
Petrotrade Inc v Smith [2000] 1 Lloyd's Rep 486.....	148–9
Pettkus v Becker [1980] 2 SCR 834; (1980) 117 DLR (3d) 257.....	36, 263
Phillips v Brewin Dolphin Bell Lawrie Ltd [2001] 1 WLR 143.....	318
Phillips v Brooks [1919] 2 KB 243.....	291
Phillips v Homfray (1883) 24 Ch D 439.....	392
Phillips-Higgins v Harper [1954] 1 QB 411.....	179
Photo Productions Ltd v Securicor [1980] AC 827 .....	233
Pilcher v Rawlins (1872) 7 Ch App 259 .....	296
Pilmer v Duke Group Ltd (in liq) (2001) 207 CLR 165 .....	580
PJ v WE (undated) in JHB MS 109, fo 48.....	551
Planche v Colburn (1831) 8 Bing 14 .....	50, 60–1
Popowski v Popowski [2004] EWHC (Ch) 668 .....	212
Portman Building Society v Dusangh [2000] 2 All ER (Comm) 221.....	212–3
Portman Building Society v Hamlyn Taylor Neck [1998] 4 All ER 202.....	224
Powell v Aiken (1858) 4 K & J 343; 70 ER 144.....	148
Powell v Rees (1837) 7 Ad & El 427 .....	394
Predyaux v Tute (1521) CP 40/1032A, m 121 .....	550
Prichard v Briggs [1980] 1 All ER 294.....	177
Principal Group Ltd v Anderson (1997) 147 DLR (4th) 229, <i>sub nom Re Ernst and Young Inc</i> .....	309, 311–2
Pugh v Ryal (1725) Select Cases Temp King 40; 25 ER 211 .....	585
Pye v Georges (1710) 1 Equity Cases Abridged 385; 21 ER 1120.....	587
Quinn v Leatham [1901] AC 495 .....	197
Quint v Te Poel, Hode Raad, 30 January 1959, NJ 1959, 548 .....	535, 538
R v Ashwell (1885) 16 QBD 190.....	279, 293–7
R v Attorney-General for England and Wales [2003] UKPC 22.....	182, 187, 189, 192, 198, 214
R v Ghosh [1982] QB 1053.....	86
R v Hinks [2001] 2 AC 241 .....	291
R v Ladue [1965] 4 CCC 264; 45 CR 287; 51 WWR 175.....	63
R v Middleton (1873) LR 2 CCC 38.....	62, 279, 288, 292–5, 297
R v Potsik (1973) 6 SASR 389 .....	294



R v Prince (1868) LR 1 CCR 150.....	289, 292
R v Secretary of State for the Environment, Ex p London Borough of Camden, 17 February 1995 .....	74
R v Secretary of State for the Home Department, Ex p Simms [2000] 2 AC 115.....	177
R v Windham (1776) 1 Cowp 377; 98 ER 1139 .....	596
Radford v De Froberville [1977] 1 WLR 1262 .....	157
Radwan v Radwan (No 2) [1972] 3 All ER 1026 .....	177
Rakestraw v Brewer (1728) 2 Pearce Williams 511; 24 ER 839 .....	587
Ramnarace v Lutchman [2001] UKPC 25; [2001] 1 WLR 1651.....	365
Ramshire v Bolton (1869) 98 LR Eq 294 .....	145
Randall v Randall [2004] EWHC 2258; 7 Int Trusts & Estates L Rep 340; 28 May 2004 (Ch D) .....	207, 213
Randall v Russell (1817) 3 Merivale 190; 36 ER 73.....	587
Ranelagh v Hayes (1683) 1 Vern 189; 23 ER 405 .....	145
Rathwell v Rathwell (1978) 83 DLR (3d) 289.....	36
Rattlesdene v Grunestone (1317) YB 10 Ed II; 54 Selden Soc 141 (B&M 300).....	569
Raymond Harrison & Co's Trustee v North-West Securities Ltd 1989 SLT 718.....	406
Reading v Attorney-General [1951] AC 507.....	148, 397
Rees v Darlington Memorial Hospital NHS Trust [2003] 3 WLR 1091.....	154
Regal (Hastings) Ltd v Gulliver [1967] 2 AC 134 .....	148, 589, 598
Regalian Properties Ltd v London Docklands Development Corpn [1995] 1 WLR 212.....	42, 61
Reimes v Constandse qq, Hoge Raad, 17 September 1993, NJ 1993, 740 .....	533
Rempston v Morley (1383) YB Trin 7 Ric II (Ames Fdn) 30 pl 11; Fitz Abr, <i>Ley</i> 41 .....	546
Rich v Kneeland (1613) Hob 30; Cro Jac 330.....	631
Robert le Taillour v Alexander atte Medue (1320) SJ Stoljar and LJ Downer (eds), <i>Year Books of Edward II</i> ; 104 Selden Soc 1988, 39–42 .....	594
Roberts v National Guardian Mortgage Corp, 8 November 1993.....	114
Roche v Evaporated Milk Ass'n 319 US 21 (1943) .....	457–8
Rogers v Resi-Statewide Corp Ltd (1991) 105 ALR 145.....	114
Rookes v Barnard [1964] AC 1129 .....	197
Rose v AIB Group (UK) plc [2003] 1 WLR 2791, <i>sub nom Re</i> Tain Construction Ltd [2003] 2 BCLC 374 .....	305, 309, 312
Rosenberg v Cook (1881) LR 8 QBD 162 .....	281
Rosenberg v Quan (1958) 14 DLR (2d) 415 .....	110
Roswel v Vaughan (1607) Cro Jac 196 (Exch).....	551
Rover International Ltd v Cannon Film Sales (No 3) [1989] 1 WLR 912 .....	101, 227
Row Dal Construction Pty Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1966] VR 249 .....	304
Rowe v Vale of White Horse DC [2003] EWHC 388 (Admin); [2003] 1 Lloyd's Rep 418.....	42, 50, 98, 100–1
Roxborough v Rothmans of Pall Mall Australia Ltd [2001] HCA 516; (2001) 208 CLR 516.....	238
Royal Bank of Scotland v Etridge (No 2) [2001] UKHL 44; [2001] 4 All ER 449; [2002] 2 AC 773.....	22, 69, 98, 202, 204–5, 208, 210–4, 216–20, 222
Royal Bank of Scotland v Watt 1991 SC 48.....	407–8, 412

Royal Brunei Airlines Sdn Bhd v Tan [1995] 2 AC 378.....	86–8
Ruabon Steamship Co v The London Assurance [1900] AC 6.....	44
Ruxley Electronics and Construction Ltd v Forsyth [1996] AC 344.....	144, 147, 154, 157
Ryall v Ryall (1739) 1 Atk 59; 26 ER 39.....	249, 253, 256
Sabemo Pty Ltd v North Sydney Municipal Council [1977] 2 NSWLR 880 .....	61
St Mary's Parish Credit Union Ltd v TM Ball Lumber Co Ltd [1961] SCR 310 .....	113
Scottish Equitable plc v Derby [2001] 3 All ER 181 .....	101
Sebel Products Ltd v Commissioners of Customs and Excise [1949] Ch 409 .....	352
Semptra Metals Ltd v IRC [2005] EWCA Civ 389.....	166
Shah v Shah [2002] QB 35 .....	307
Shalson v Russo [2003] EWHC 1637 (Ch); [2005] 2 WLR 1213 .....	93
Sharp v McNeil (1913) 15 DLR 73 (NSSCAD); affirmed (1915) 70 DLR 740 (SCC) .....	253
Sharp v Thomson 1997 SC (HL) 66.....	514
Sheddan v A Negro (1757) Mor 14545 .....	611
Shilliday v Smith 1998 SC 725.....	357–8, 401, 413, 415
Shogun Finance Ltd v Hudson [2003] UKHL 62; [2004] 1 AC 919.....	230, 291
Shoreditch v Lane (1300) <i>Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls 1298–1307</i> , ed AH Thomas (1924) 68 .....	546
Silk v Prime [Pryme] (1768) 2 Collyer 511; 63 ER 838 and (1766) 2 Collyer 509; 63 ER 837 .....	588
Simaan General Contracting Co v Pilkington Glass Ltd (No 2) [1988] QB 758 .....	241
Simmons v Lillystone (1853) 8 Exch 431 .....	286
Sinclair v Brougham [1914] AC 398.....	113, 257
Sinclair Investment Holdings SA v Versailles Trade Finance Ltd [2005] EWCA Civ 722.....	93
Singh v Ali [1960] AC 167.....	290
Six Carpenters Case (1610) 8 Co Rep 146a .....	569–70
Skeate v Beale (1841) 11 Ad & El 983.....	195
Slade v Morley (1602) B&M 420 .....	558
Slade's Case (1602) 4 Co Rep 92b.....	554, 567–8, 570
Slim v Croucher (1860) 1 De G F & J 518.....	145
Slowery v Lodder (1900) 20 NZLR 321, affirmed <i>sub nom</i> Lodder v Slowery [1904] AC 442 (PC) .....	60
Smith v Hughes (1871) LR 6 QB 597 .....	230
Smith v William Charlick Ltd (1924) 34 CLR 38 .....	189
Smith New Court Securities Ltd v Scrimgeour Vickers (Asset Management) Ltd [1997] AC 254.....	75, 144
Social Services Appeal Board v Butler (1996) 139 Nfld and PEIR 282 (Supreme Court of Newfoundland).....	308
Sociale Woningbouw v Van der Breggen, Rechtbank's-Hertogenbosch, 29 January 1982, NJ 1983, 141 .....	532
Société Menuiseries et Toitures de Brenne v Époux Bréband, Cour de Cassation, 4 December 2002, Bull civ III no 247 .....	540
Solloway v McLaughlin [1938] AC 247.....	155–6
Soulos v Korkontzilas [1997] 2 SCR 217; 146 DLR (4th) 214 .....	258

South Caribbean Trading Ltd v Trafigura Beheer BV [2004]	
EWHC 2676 (Comm); [2005] 1 Lloyd's Rep 128.....	194
Southcote v Bennett (1601) 4 Co Rep 83b.....	627–8
Southend-on-Sea Corp v Hodgson (Wickford) Ltd [1962] 1 QB 416.....	308
Southern v Howe (1618) 2 Rolle Rep 5; Cro Jac 468; Poph 143.....	553, 557
Spence v Crawford [1939] 3 All ER 271.....	301
Spence v Dalrymple (1770).....	611
Spettabile Consorzio v Northumberland Shipbuilding Co Ltd (1919) 121 LT 628....	563
Spiliada Maritime Corp v Cansulex (The Spiliada) [1967] AC 460.....	22
Springette v Defoe (1992) 24 HLR 552.....	251
Springwell v Allen (1648) Aleyn 91; BL MS cit 2 East 448n.....	551
Staat der Nederlanden v De Nieuwe Woning, Hoge Raad, 3 October 2003, NJ 2004, 50.....	533
Standard Bank London Ltd v Canara Bank [2002] EWHC 1574.....	74
Stanton v Honing (1317) 23 Selden Soc 102.....	548
Stears v South Essex Gas-Light Company (1860) 9 Common Bench NS 180; 142 ER 70.....	589
Steele, <i>Re</i> (1979) 97 DLR (3d) 412.....	113
Steeple v Lee [1998] 1 FLR 138.....	209
Steinberg v Scala (Leeds) Ltd [1923] 2 Ch 452.....	373
Stephen v Camden & Philadelphia Soap Co 68 A 69 (NJ, 1907).....	61
Stewart Nicholson v Stewart Nicholson (1770) Mor 16770.....	599, 608, 615
Still v Equitable Life Assurance Society of United States 54 SW 2d 947 (SCt Tenn 1932).....	374
Stocznia Gdanska SA v Latvian Shipping Co [1998] 1 WLR 574.....	240, 346
Stoke-on-Trent City Council v Wass [1988] 1 WLR 1406.....	394
Stokes v Clarke [1701] Colles 192; 1 ER 245.....	582
Stone v Theed (1787) 2 Brown CC 243; 29 ER 135.....	587
Stothers v Borrowman (1916) 33 DLR 179.....	110
Strand Electric and Engineering Co v Brisford Entertainments Ltd [1952] 2 QB 246.....	394
Tai Hing Cotton Mill Ltd v Kamsing Knitting Factory [1979] AC 91.....	144, 147
Target Holdings Ltd v Redferns (a firm) [1996] 1 AC 421.....	157
Taster v Marriott (1768) Ambler 668; 27 ER 433.....	587
Tate v Williamson (1866) LR 2 Ch App 55.....	202, 208
Taylor v Motability Finance Ltd [2004] EWHC 2619 (Comm).....	229
Taylor v Plumer (1815) 3 M & S 562; 105 ER 721.....	133
Taylor v Trerice (1511) B&M 516.....	556
TH Knitwear Ltd, <i>Re</i> [1988] 1 Ch 275.....	110
Thomas v Brown (1876) 1 QBD 714.....	370
Thomas v Times Book Co Ltd [1966] 1 WLR 911.....	288
Thompson v Gardner (1597) Moo KB 538.....	551
Thorne v Motor Trade Association [1937] AC 797.....	182
Thurgo v Sabrichesworth (1493) KB 27/929.....	550
Thurston v Nottingham Permanent Building Society [1902] 1 Ch 1, affirmed [1903] AC 6.....	117
Tichbourne v Weir (1892) 67 LT 735.....	281

Tinsley v Milligan [1993] 3 All ER 65 .....	71
Titan Investments Ltd Partnership, <i>Re</i> [2005] AJ No 141; 2005 ABQB 637 (Alberta Court of Queen's Bench) .....	312
Tito v Waddell (No 2) [1977] Ch 106 .....	153
Todd v Gee (1810) 17 Ves 273; 34 ER 106 .....	145
Tootal Clothing Ltd v Guinea Properties Ltd (1992) 64 P & CR 452 .....	348, 370
Tower Hamlets London Borough Council v Chetnik Developments Ltd [1988] 1 All ER 961 .....	73
Tracy v Veal (1609) Cr Jac 223 .....	551
Tradigrain SA v State Trading Corp of India [2005] EWHC 2206 (Comm) .....	236
Transco plc v Glasgow City Council 2005 SCLR 733 .....	414
Trident Beauty (The) [1994] 1 WLR 161 .....	171
TSB Bank plc v Camfield [1995] 1 WLR 430 .....	75
Tufton v Sporni [1952] 2 Times L Rep 516 .....	209
Turkey v Awadh [2005] EWCA Civ 382; [2005] 2 FCR 7 .....	212
Twinsectra v Yardley [2002] UKHL 12; [2002] 2 AC 164 .....	86–7, 89, 95
Twyford v Manchester Corporation [1946] Ch 236 .....	374
Tyrwhitt v Tyrwhitt (1863) 32 Beav 244; 55 ER 96 .....	113
Ulmer v Farnsworth 15 A 65 (1888) .....	44
United Australia v Barclays Bank [1941] AC 1 .....	271, 390, 562
United Pan-Europe Communications NV v Deutsche Bank AG [2000] 2 BCLC 461 .....	148
Universe Tankships Inc of Monrovia v International Transport Workers Federation (the Universe Sentinel) [1983] 1 AC 366 .....	182, 189, 197, 202, 206
Vale v Armstrong and another [2004] EWHC (Ch) 1160 .....	209
Van der Meer v Woningbouwvereniging Beter Wonen, Hoge Raad, 27 November 1998, NJ 1999, 380; Advocatenblad 1999, 99; Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Burgerlijk Recht 1999 .....	532
Van Ulzen v Goolkate, Hoge Raad, 10 June 1988, NJ 1988, 965 .....	533
Vandervell v Inland Revenue Commissioners [1967] 2 AC 291 .....	252
Vedatech v Crystal Decisions (UK) Ltd [2002] EWHC 818 .....	100
Villaswan Ltd (in rec) v Sheraton Caltrust (Blythswood) Ltd (in liq) 1999 SCLR 199 .....	108
Vinogradoff, <i>Re</i> [1935] WN 68 .....	253
Vitol SA v Norelf Ltd (The Santa Clara) [1996] AC 800 .....	238
Waderove v Oxford (1275) 2 Selden Soc 140 .....	548
Waikato Regional Airport Ltd v The Attorney-General (on behalf of the Dirctor of Agriculture and Forestry) [2003] UKPC 50 .....	72, 172
Walker v Webb (1845) Res & Eq 19 .....	275
Walsh v Deloitte & Touche Inc [2001] UKPC 37 .....	146
Walter's Deed of Guarantee, <i>Re</i> [1933] 1 Ch 321 .....	112
Warman International Ltd v Dwyer [1994–5] 182 CLR 546 .....	598
Warner v Sampson [1959] 1 QB 297 .....	562–4
Warner v Tallerd (1650) 1 Rolle Abr 91 .....	551
Watkins v Combes (1922) 30 Commonwealth L Rep 180 .....	208

Watkin's Case (1425) YB H 3 Hen VI 36b; Strath Abr <i>Accions sur le cas</i> , pl 20.....	629
Watson v Huber, 9 March 2005 (ChD).....	209
Watson, Laidlaw & Co Ltd v Pott, Cassels and Williamson [1914] SC (HL) 18; (1914) 31 RPC 104 .....	52, 131
Waverley Borough Council v Fletcher [1996] QB 334 .....	280
Weatherby v Banham (1832) 5 C & P 228 .....	50
Webb v Lugar (1836) 2 Younge and Collyer Exchequer 247; 160 ER 389.....	589
Wells v Wells [1999] AC 345 .....	523
Westdeutsche Landesbank Girozentrale v Islington LBC [1994] 4 All ER 890; [1996] AC 669 (HL) .....	38, 92–4, 113, 150, 163, 170, 227, 248, 257, 282, 289–90
Western v Cartwright (1725) Select Cases Temp King 34; 25 ER 207 .....	585
Western Trust & Savings Ltd v Rock, 26 February 1993.....	118
Westminster City Council v Porter [2002] EWHC 2179 (Ch); [2003] Ch 436.....	148, 152
Whelpdale v Cookson (1747) 1 Vesey Senior 9; 27 ER 856.....	586, 589
Whichcote v Lawrence (1798) 1 Vesey Junior Supplement 422; 34 ER 856 .....	588
Whitackre v Whitackre (1725) Select Cases Temp King 13; 25 ER 195.....	585
White v Paul Davidson & Taylor [2004] EWCA Civ 1511 .....	184
Whiteley v Delaney [1914] AC 132.....	108
Whittaker v Campbell [1983] 3 All ER 582.....	224
Wickham Holdings v Brooke House Motors Ltd [1967] 1 WLR 295 .....	156
Wienerworld Ltd v Vision Video Ltd [1998] FSR 832 .....	149
Wilchynski v Williams [1955] 1 DLR 845 .....	114
Wild v Hall (12 Car I or Car II, c 1636 or 1660) in Girdler's book of entries, CUL MS add 9430(3), fo 108.....	556
Wilkes v Collin (1869) LR 8 Eq 338 .....	113
William Lacey (Hounslow) Ltd v Davis [1957] 1 WLR 932.....	42
Williams v Bayley (1866) LR 1 LH 200.....	216
Williams v Peel River Land and Mineral Co Ltd (1886) 55 LT 689 .....	156
Williams v Roffey Bros & Nicholls (Contractors) Ltd [1991] 1 QB 1.....	181, 194
Williams v Williams [2003] EWHC 742 (Ch).....	67–8, 209
Willis Faber Enthoven (Pty) Ltd v Receiver of Taxes (1992) (4) SA 202 (South African Appellate Division) .....	174, 176
Wilson v First County Trust Ltd [2003] UKHL 40; [2004] 1 AC 816.....	370
Wisbech St Mary Parish Council v Lilly [1956] 1 WLR 121 .....	563
Woffington v Sparks (1754) 2 Ves Sen 569; 28 ER 363.....	107
Woodar v Wimpey [1980] 1 WLR 277 .....	563
Woode v Rutter (1538) CO 40/1096, m 412 .....	547
Wood's Case (1725) Select Cases Temp King 46; 25 ER 214 .....	585
Wookey v Pole (1820) 4 B & Ad 1.....	282
Woolwich Equitable Building Society v Inland Revenue Commissioners [1993] AC 70 (CA and HL), reversing [1989] 1 WLR 137.....	3, 25, 43, 46, 66, 72, 164–72, 174–7, 351, 374, 408–10, 413–4, 416
Woolwich plc v Gomm (2000) 79 P & CR 61 .....	217
Workers' Trust & Merchant Bank Ltd v Dojap Investments Ltd [1993] AC 573.....	240

Wrexham Mold & Connah's Quay Railway Co, <i>Re</i> [1899] 1 Ch 440 .....	111, 117
Wright v Cherrytree Finance Ltd and others [2001] EWCA Civ 449 .....	209
Wright v Hodgkinson [2004] EWHC (Ch) 3091; [2004] All ER (D) 427 .....	209
Wrotham Park Estate Co v Parkside Homes [1974] 1 WLR 798 .....	153
Yaxley v Gotts [2000] Ch 162 .....	307
York Buildings Company v Mackenzie [1795] 8 Brown PC 42; 3 ER 432 .....	588
Yorkshire Bank plc v Tinsley [2004] EWCA Civ 816; [2004] 1 WLR 2380 .....	98–9
Youyang Pty Ltd v Minter Ellison Morris Fletcher (2003) 196 ALR 482 .....	158
Zamet v Hyman [1961] 3 All ER 933 .....	221

#### GERMAN CASES (IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER)

RG 20.12.1919, RGZ 97, 312 .....	381, 384
BGH 25.5.1954, BGHZ 13, 334 .....	385
BGH 8.5.1956, BGHZ 20, 345 (Paul Dahlke case) .....	385
BGH 14.2.1958, BGHZ 26, 349 .....	385
BGH 18.9.1961, BGHZ 35, 356 .....	356
29.11.1965, BGHZ 44, 321 .....	356
BGH 2.2.1967, NJW 1967, 1128 .....	371
1970 NJW 136 .....	356
30.11.1976, BGHZ 68, 90 .....	384
BGHZ 77, 16 .....	384
BGHZ 82, 299 .....	384
BGH 17.2.1982, BGHZ 83, 278 .....	376
OLG Koblenz 20.9.1983, NJW 1984, 135 .....	376
1983 NJW 626 .....	350
1989 108 BGHZ 256 .....	356
1990 NJW 392 .....	350
BGH, 1990 NJW 2068 .....	327
BGH, 1994 NJW 1161 .....	327
2001 NJW 3118 .....	356

# *Table of Legislation*

UK LEGISLATION	
Act 8 Hen. IV, C9 (1430) .....	144
Act 1606 (Scotland)	
c 10.....	613
Act 1661 (Scotland)	
c 333.....	613
Act 9 Henry III 1225 .....	593
Act 25 Edw I 1297 .....	593
Apportionment Act 1870	
s 2 .....	233
s 5 .....	233
Bills of Exchange Act 1882	
s 29 .....	315
s 54.....	315
Bills of Sale Acts.....	317
Chancery Amendment Act 1858, 21 & 22 Vict C27 (Lord Cairns's Act) ....	145
Civil Liability (Contribution) Act 1978 .....	112
Civil Procedure Rules 1998 (SI 1998/3132)	
r 54.2 .....	458
Common Law Procedure Act 1852	
s 49.....	285
Common Law Procedure Act 1854	
s 78.....	284
Companies Act 1985	
s 395.....	299, 304
Consumer Credit Act	
s 61(1) .....	370
s 65(1) .....	370
s 127(3) .....	370
Contracts (Rights of Third Parties) Act 1999	
s 1 .....	241
Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988	
s 96(2) .....	395
s 97 .....	149
Finance Act 2004	
s 320.....	180
Gambling Act 1845	
s 18.....	371
Gambling Act 2005	
s 334.....	371
s 335.....	369
General Rate Act 1967.....	73
Hire-Purchase Act 1964	
s 27(1)(2) .....	291
Human Rights Act 1998 .....	396
Infant Relief Act 1874	
s 1 .....	371
Insolvency Act 1986 .....	299, 302, 319
s 127.....	304–6, 309–15, 317–9
s 213.....	306
s 214.....	306
s 219(2) .....	304
ss 238–241 .....	303
s 238.....	303, 305–6, 309–10, 315–6, 318–9
s 238(3) .....	303, 310
s 239.....	303, 305–6, 309–10, 313, 315, 318–9
s 241 .....	305, 314
(1).....	303
(2).....	302, 310
(2A)–(3C) .....	310
(3).....	316
(4).....	303
s 423.....	303, 306, 309–10, 315, 318–9
(2)(a) .....	310
s 244.....	306
s 245.....	304
s 425(2) .....	310
Law of Property Act 1925	
s 40 .....	370
s 53 .....	252
Law of Property (Miscellaneous Provisions) 1989	
s 2 .....	307, 370
(1).....	370
(5).....	307
Law Reform (Frustrated Contracts) Act 1943 .....	21, 59, 224
s 1(3) .....	56, 59
(b).....	59

s 2	
(3).....	226
(4).....	56, 233, 236
Limitation Act 1980	
s 32(1)(c).....	166
Magna Carta 1215	
cl 2–5.....	593
Mercantile Amendment Act 1856.....	360
s 5.....	107–8
Minors Contracts Act 1987	
s 1.....	371
s 3.....	372
(2).....	372
Misrepresentation Act 1967	
s 1.....	81
s 2	
(1)(2).....	81
(2).....	224
Patents Act 1977	
s 61(1)(d).....	395
Police and Criminal Evidence Act 1984	
s 19.....	281
s 22.....	281
Provisions of Merton 1236	
cc 5–7.....	593
Provisions of Westminster 1259	
cl 12.....	592
Rent Restriction Acts.....	309
Sale of Goods Act 1979	
s 2.....	280
s 17.....	280
s 18.....	280
s 19.....	280
s 20.....	280
s 53(3).....	156
Statute of Anne 1709 (8 Anne c 19) ..	395
Statute of Frauds 1677.....	369
s 4.....	242, 369–70
Statute of Gloucester 1278 (6 Edw I, c 5)144	
Statute of Marlborough 1267	
c 17.....	593
Statute of Uses 1535.....	251
Statute of Uses 1536.....	593
Statute on Feoffment to Uses 1484 ...	593
Taxes Management Act 1970	
s 33.....	166, 175–6
Theft Act 1968	
s 5(4).....	278

Torts (Interference with Goods) Act	
1977.....	21, 51
s 2(2).....	283, 286
s 3(2).....	122
s 5.....	122

## NATIONAL LEGISLATION

### Australia

NSW Frustrated Contracts Act 1978...	59
South Australian Frustrated Contracts Act	
1988.....	59
Western Australia Criminal Code	
s 371.....	296

### Canada

Bankruptcy and Insolvency Act 1985	
s 95.....	311
(1).....	311–2
British Columbia Frustrated Contracts Act	
1974.....	59
New Brunswick Public Utilities Act...	308
Ontario Public Utilities Act.....	308

### France

Code civil	
Art 1583.....	530
Art 1647.....	326
Art 1723.....	528
Art 1730.....	528

### Germany

Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch	
(BGB)) of 1896/1900.....	324
§ 276 I.....	325
§ 327.....	324, 328
§ 346 2.....	325, 327, 332, 339
§ 348.....	327
§ 349.....	326
§ 350.....	326, 328–9, 336, 339
§ 351.....	325, 328–9, 330–1, 337
§ 351 I.....	325
§ 352.....	335
§ 353.....	335
§ 361.....	330–1
§ 446.....	329
§ 459.....	328
§ 462.....	328



§ 465 .....	328	§ 518(2) .....	371
§ 467 .....	328	§§ 598–606 .....	365
§ 467 I .....	335	§§ 611–30 .....	366
§ 812 .....	339	§§ 631–51 .....	366
Civil Code (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch (BGB))		§ 638 III .....	333
of 2002 .....	5, 324, 326, 363	§§ 662–74 .....	366
General Part .....	132	§§ 687 II 1 .....	387
§ 125 .....	371	§§ 688–700 .....	365
§ 142 I .....	326	§ 690 .....	336
§§ 184–5 .....	132	§ 708 .....	336
§ 185 .....	133	§ 766 sentence 3 .....	371
§ 214(2) .....	369	§ 779 .....	376
§ 242 .....	332	§ 781 .....	376
§ 277 .....	334	§ 812 .....	332, 357, 361, 363, 387
§§ 280–3 .....	334, 337	§ 812 I .....	380, 385–6, 392
§ 280 I .....	334	1 .....	326, 331, 353
§ 280 I 2 .....	334	2 .....	353
§ 280 II .....	334	§ 812(2) .....	376
§ 286 .....	334	§ 814 .....	351, 376
§ 287 2 .....	333	§ 815 .....	351
§ 311b .....	371	§ 818 II .....	331, 386
§ 313 III 1 .....	338	§ 818 III .....	339
§ 323 VI .....	337	§ 818 IV .....	387
§ 324 .....	344	§ 962 .....	495
§ 326 V .....	337	§ 963 .....	493
§ 346 .....	323, 326–8, 338, 341, 345	§ 964 .....	495
§ 346 I .....	327, 334, 337	§ 987 .....	357
§ 346 II .....	337–8	§ 1359 .....	336
§ 346 II no 1 .....	327	§ 1664 .....	336
§ 346 II 1 no 1 .....	335	§ 2131 .....	336
§ 346 II 1 no 3 .....	332	Commercial Code (Handelsgesetzbuch)	
§ 346 II 2 .....	332–3, 335	§ 350 .....	371
§ 346 III .....	338	Consumer Credit Act	
§ 346 III 1 .....	335	§ 7 IV .....	331
1 .....	333, 338–9	Gesetz gegen den unlauteren Wettbewerb (UWG) .....	384
2 .....	327, 333, 336–9	§ 1 .....	385
§ 346 IV .....	334, 337	§ 3 .....	384
§ 347 I .....	327	§ 4 .....	384
§ 348 .....	327	§ 5 .....	385
§ 349 .....	326	§ 6 .....	385
§ 357 I .....	338	§ 10 .....	385
§ 437 no 1 .....	337	§ 16–8 .....	385
§ 437 no 2 .....	328, 337	Gesetz gegen den Wettbewerbsbeschränkungen (GWB) .....	384
§ 441 III .....	333	§ 19 .....	385
§§ 488–98 .....	365		

Revocation of Doorstep Contracts Act § 3.....	331	be Observed with Respect to negroes and Other Slaves in this Territory’ (Louisiana), c 30 .....	617
<b>Italy</b>		Act to Regulate the Conditions and Forms of the Emancipation of Slaves (Louisiana), C 10 .....	617
Cassazione 26 marzo 1974 no 837....	491	Black Code – An Act Prescribing the Rules and Conduct to be Observed with Respect to negroes and Other Slaves in this Territory (Louisiana), c 33.....	617
Cassazione 16 ottobre 1991 no 10912.....	491	s 16.....	617
Codice civile 1942		All Writs Act, 28 USC s1651 .....	458
Art 896-bis .....	491	Amendment to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 21 1996.....	458
Art 1492(3).....	326	Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 21 .....	458
Art 2043 .....	491	Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States s 20(3) .....	458
Legge 24 dicembre 2004 no 313.....	491	Uniform Sales Act 1906 s 12.....	549
Art 1.....	491		
Art 5.....	491		
Art 8.....	491		
<b>Malaysia</b>			
Moneylenders Ordinance 1951 .....	308		
<b>Netherlands</b>			
Civil Code 1838.....	534–7		
Art 1596 .....	532		
Art 1598 .....	531		
Art 1599 .....	531		
Art 1603 .....	528, 533		
New Civil Code 1992 .....	537		
Art 6:212.....	535–7, 541		
Art 7:215.....	541		
(3).....	535		
<b>New Zealand</b>			
Judicature Act			
§ 94B .....	81		
<b>United States</b>			
Act to Amend the Act Entitled ‘An Act Prescribing the Rules and Conduct to			

## EU LEGISLATION

Council Directive 97/55/EC of 6 October 1997.....	384
EC Treaty	
Art 81.....	395–6
Art 82.....	385–6

## INTERNATIONAL LEGISLATION

European Convention on Human Rights	
Art 8.....	396
Treaty of Utrecht 1713 .....	604

# Roman Law

## ROMAN LITERARY SOURCES

Aulus Gellius <i>Noctes Atticae</i>	
14.2.1.....	463
Cicero <i>de officiis</i>	
1.34–5 .....	441
Cicero <i>pro Roscio comoedo</i>	
32 .....	423
Cicero <i>Pro Tullio</i>	
4.9.....	426
5.11.....	422
5.12.....	422
6.....	469
16.41 .....	422
Horace <i>Carmen saeculare</i>	
51 .....	441
Livy <i>History of Rome</i>	
42.17 .....	441
Pliny <i>Natural History</i>	
3.7 .....	444
3.7.9 .....	443
3.30.....	444
Quintilian <i>declamationes maiores</i>	
13.1.....	422–3
13.7.....	422
Seneca <i>Controversiae</i>	
10.1.....	456
Tacitus <i>Agricola</i>	
21 .....	441
Varro <i>de lingua latina</i>	
6.5.....	471
Virgil <i>Aeneid</i>	
6.851–3 .....	441

## PRE-JUSTINIANIC LEGAL SOURCES

<i>Epistula Vespasiani</i> .....	445
Gaius' Institutes	
1.95.....	444
3.210 .....	422–3, 426
3.217 .....	422, 429
4.16.1.....	424
4.34.....	457

4.37.....	424, 457
4.52.....	457
4.53.....	457
4.58.....	457
<i>Lex Coloniae Genetivae Iuliae</i>	
Tab c, col 2, II 21–5, 32–5 (Ch 95) .....	464
<i>Lex Falcidia</i> .....	519
<i>Lex de Gallia Cisalpina</i>	
Ch 20, II 22 – 31 .....	516
<i>Lex Irnitana</i> .....	445–6, 448, 452, 454, 464, 467–9
Ch 19, 3A 5–16 .....	449
Ch 20, 3A 28–30 .....	449
Ch 21, 3A 39–45 .....	447
Ch 26, 3B, 49–52 .....	452
Ch 42, 5A 36–41 .....	448
Ch 45, 5B 10–45 .....	453
Ch 45, 5B 26–30 .....	448
Ch 49, 5C 24–32 .....	448
Ch 49, 5C 34–5 .....	448
Ch 50, 5C 46–51 .....	446
Ch 62, 7A 37–47 .....	448
Ch 63, 7B 3–13 .....	449
Ch 66, 7C 14–17 .....	448
Ch 69, 8A 10–24 .....	448
Ch 72, 8B 6–30 .....	448
Ch 73, 8B 32–5 .....	448
Ch 77, 8C 21–8 .....	448
Ch 78, 8C 29–36 .....	448
Ch 78, 8C 37–58 .....	448
Ch 79, 8C 50–1 .....	448
Ch 80, 9A 14–21 .....	448
Ch 82, 9A 29–34 .....	448
Ch 83, 9A 35–51 .....	448
Ch 84–92 .....	450
Ch 84.....	450
Ch 84, 9A 51–Ch 92 10B 51.....	450
Ch 85.....	450
Ch 85, 9B 28–42 .....	451–2
Ch 86, 9B, 42–Ch 89, 10A 25 .....	451
Ch 86, 9B 49–54 .....	448
Ch 91.....	459
Ch 91, 10B, I 14 .....	466

*Lex Iritana (cont.)*

Ch 91, 10B, I 15 .....	466
Ch 91, 10B, I 16 .....	466
Ch 91, 10B, II 10–21 .....	465
Ch 91, 10B, II 15–17 .....	466, 468
Ch 91, 10B, II 15–18 .....	466
Ch 91, 10B, II 16–17 .....	466
Ch 93, 10B 52–10C 4 .....	450, 452
Ch 96 .....	452
Ch J, 5C 10–18 .....	450

<i>Lex Malacitana</i> .....	445
Ch 51, I 1–27 .....	447
Ch 52, I 29–35 .....	446
Ch 52, I 33–5 .....	446
Ch 52, I 35–7 .....	446
Ch 54, I 60–II 3 .....	447
Ch 55, II 4–9 .....	447
Ch 55, II 8–9 .....	447
Ch 55, II 9–25 .....	447
Ch 56, II 32–47 .....	447
Ch 57, II 49–59 .....	447
Ch 57, II 59–65 .....	447
Ch 58, II 66–III 5 .....	452

*Lex metallis dicta (Vipasca)* 449*Lex Plaetoria*..... 471–2

## Paul s Sentences

5.15.6 .....	601
5.16.1 .....	601
5.16.2 .....	601

## JUSTINIANIC LEGAL SOURCES

## Code

3.32.10 .....	601
4.20.11.1 .....	600
4.20.16 .....	600
4.65.25 .....	574
4.65.33 .....	575
9.41.12 .....	601
9.41.13 .....	601
9.41.15 .....	601

## Digest

2.11.2.3 .....	462
2.14 .....	503, 507, 509
2.14.46 .....	507
2.14.47 .....	502, 506, 507
2.14.48 .....	506
2.14.49 .....	506

2.14.62 .....	501, 506
2.15 .....	506, 509
2.15.3 .....	506
3.5 .....	503, 510
3.5.42 .....	510
3.14 .....	503
4.3 .....	503, 506, 507
4.3.19 .....	506
4.3.32 .....	502, 506
4.3.40 .....	501, 506
4.4 .....	503, 507, 509
4.4.9.2 .....	422
4.4.39 .....	506
4.4.40 .....	506
4.4.50 .....	506
4.8 .....	507, 510
4.8.44 .....	506
4.9.6.1 .....	423
4.9.6.4 .....	422
5.1.18 .....	462
5.1.46 .....	462
5.1.75 .....	462
5.3 .....	503
6.1 .....	503
6.1.3 .....	529
6.1.62 .....	527
6.1.80 .....	501
6.3.1 pr .....	529
6.3.1.1 .....	529
7.1.66 .....	573
7.4 .....	503, 510
7.4.24 .....	510
7.4.5.2 .....	574
7.4.5.3 .....	574
7.8.12.4 .....	573
8.5 .....	503
9.1.1.4 .....	424
9.1.3 .....	518
9.2.1 .....	421, 424, 426
9.2.1 .....	423
9.2.3 .....	434
9.2.5.1 .....	426, 434, 436–7
9.2.5.3 .....	422
9.2.7 pr .....	518
9.2.11.7 .....	422, 429
9.2.13 .....	518, 519
9.2.21 .....	437
9.2.23 .....	437

Digest ( <i>cont.</i> )	19.1.6.4	549
9.2.23.9	19.2	510, 512
9.2.27	19.2.11.3	574
9.2.27.5	19.2.19.5	527
9.2.27.10	19.2.25.5	573
9.2.27.11	19.2.28	510
9.2.27.13	19.2.39.2	573
9.2.27.15	19.2.57	422
9.2.27.17	19.5.14.3	424
9.2.27.18	20.1.27	422
9.2.27.24	21.1	509
9.2.27.25	21.1.31.5	325
9.2.27.28	21.1.31.6	325
9.2.27.29	21.1.31.24	325, 527
9.2.29.1	21.1.38.3	325
9.2.29.3	21.1.47	325
9.2.30.1	21.1.48 pr	325
9.2.32	22.1	503
9.2.41.1	22.1.3 pr	527
9.2.49.1	22.3	503, 509
9.3.1.4	22.5.21.2	601
9.3.14	22.5.7	601
9.4	23.2.81	510
11.1	23.2.82	510
12.2	23.3	510
12.2.28.6	23.3.84	510
12.2.28.7	23.3.85	510
12.6	23.5	503
13.5	24.1.37	424
13.6.3.1	24.3	503
13.6.5.7	24.3.18.1	422
13.6.5.8	25.4	503
14.2	28.5.93	500
14.4.12	28.7	505, 509
14.6	28.7.20	505
15.3	28.8	503
15.3.19	29.2	505
15.3.20	29.2.64	505
16.3	29.5	510, 511
16.3.1.16	29.5.26	511
16.3.1.21	29.5.27	511
16.3.1.22	29.6	511
16.3.1.41	30.46	511
16.3.13	32	511
16.3.25.1	32.29	505
16.3.31.1	32.30	505
17.2.1	32.100	505
19.1.13.3	33.1	510

Digest ( <i>cont.</i> )	35.1.39.....	505
33.1.17.....	35.1.40.....	505
33.1.22.....	35.1.41.....	505
33.1.23.....	35.1.42.....	505
33.1.24.....	35.1.105.....	511
33.2.30.....	35.1.106.....	511
33.2.31.....	35.1.107.....	511
33.2.41.....	35.1.113.....	500
33.4.....	35.2.....	503, 510, 511
33.4.6.....	35.2.10.....	511
33.4.11.....	35.2.30.....	422
33.4.12.....	35.2.68 pr.....	519–521
33.4.13.....	36.1.....	510
33.4.14.....	36.1.84.....	500
33.4.15.....	36.1.85.....	500
33.4.16.....	36.2.....	511
33.4.17.....	36.3.....	503, 511
33.5.....	36.4.....	503, 510
33.5.20.....	36.4.14.....	505
33.6.....	37.14.....	511
33.7.....	37.14.24.....	500
33.7.4.....	37.19.3.5.....	601
33.8.....	38.2.....	511
33.8.2.....	38.4.....	511
33.8.22.....	38.4.2.....	511
33.8.24.....	38.4.4.....	511
33.8.25.....	38.17.....	511
33.8.26.....	39.4.1.4.....	424
33.10.....	39.5.....	511
33.10.13.....	40.1.....	511
33.10.14.....	40.1.10.....	500
34.1.....	40.1.26.....	500
34.1.20.....	40.4.....	511
34.1.21.....	40.5.....	503, 511
34.1.22.....	40.12.24.4.....	424
34.1.23.....	40.13.....	503, 509
34.2.....	40.14.....	503, 511
34.2.19.13.....	41.1.54.2.....	424
34.2.31.....	41.1.64.....	500
34.2.39.....	41.1.66.....	501
34.3.....	41.2.52.....	501
34.3.29.....	41.2.53.....	501
34.3.30.....	41.4.7.7.....	461
34.3.31.....	41.9.....	503
34.4.....	42.1.....	503
34.5.....	42.1.47.....	462
34.9.....	42.1.60.....	461–2
34.9.5.15.....	43.8.2.10.....	427
35.1.....	42.8.8.....	501, 512

Digest ( <i>cont.</i> )	44.7.5.4	458
42.8.11	45.1	503, 511
42.8.23	45.1.122	512
42.8.24	46.1	503
42.8.25	46.3	503, 511
43.19	46.5	503
43.19.4	47.2	510, 512
43.19.21.4	47.2.1.3	573
43.19.23.2	47.2.21 pr-8	627
43.19.24.2	47.2.23	424
43.19.24.4	47.2.31	423
43.19.24.6	47.2.40	573
43.19.24.8	47.2.43.5	573
43.19.24.10	47.2.43.6	573
43.19.24.12	47.2.43.7	573
43.19.24.22	47.2.43.8	573
43.19.26.7	47.2.62.2	527
43.19.26.22	47.2.83	573
43.19.29.2	47.2.92	512
43.19.29.4	47.8.2.26	424
43.19.30.5	47.8.2.26	424
43.20.8	47.10	512
43.21	47.10.1	426, 433-7
43.21.4	47.10.15.46	424
43.23	47.10.24	507
43.23.2	47.10.45	512
43.24	48.8.2	460
43.24.2	48.10	503, 510, 512
43.24.4	48.10.24	601
43.24.7.4	48.18.9 pr	602
43.24.8	49.9.1.1	457
43.24.10	49.14	503, 511
43.24.12	49.15	503
43.24.22	50.1	503, 506, 507, 509
43.26	50.1.24	506
43.26.7	50.5.13	459
43.26.21	50.7	506, 509
43.26.22	50.7.12	507
43.29	50.7.13	506, 507
43.29.2	50.9	506, 509
43.29.4	50.9.6	506
43.30	50.12	503, 510, 512
43.30.2	50.12.1	512
44.1	50.12.15	512
44.3	50.13.6	458
44.3.15	50.16.240	500
44.3.16	50.16.241	500, 501
44.7	50.16.242	501, 505

Digest (*cont.*)

50.17 .....	503, 512
50.17.23 .....	625, 626
50.17.73 .....	500

3.24.3 .....	529
3.24.5 .....	630
4.3 .....	426
4.3.13 .....	422

## Institutes

1.1 pr .....	574
2.1.30 .....	527–8
3.13.2 .....	514
3.14.4 .....	630

## Novels

1.2 .....	601
90.6 .....	600



## *List of Contributors*

**Sir John Baker** is Downing Professor of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of St Catharine's College, Cambridge.

**Sir Jack Beatson** is one of Her Majesty's judges; formerly Rouse Ball Professor of English Law, University of Cambridge.

**Andrew Burrows** is Norton Rose Professor of Commercial Law in the University of Oxford; Fellow of St Hugh's College, Oxford.

**John W Cairns** is Professor of Legal History, University of Edinburgh.

**Robert Chambers** is Professor of Law, King's College London.

**Mindy Chen-Wishart** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, Merton College, Oxford.

**Gerhard Dannemann** is Professor of British Legal, Economic, and Social Structures, Humboldt University, Berlin.

**Eric Descheemaeker** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, St Catherine's College, Oxford.

**James Edelman** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, Keble College, Oxford; Adjunct Professor, University of Western Australia.

**Joshua Getzler** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, St Hugh's College, Oxford.

**Sir Roy Goode** is Emeritus Professor of Law in the University of Oxford; Emeritus Fellow of St John's College, Oxford.

**Jeffrey Hackney** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, Wadham College, Oxford.

**Tony Honoré** is Emeritus Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford; formerly Regius Professor of Civil Law, University of Oxford.

**David Ibbetson** is Regius Professor of Civil Law in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

**David Johnston** is a Queen's Counsel; formerly Regius Professor of Civil Law, University of Cambridge.

**Gareth Jones** is Downing Professor Emeritus of the Laws of England in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge.

**Thomas Krebs** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, Brasenose College, Oxford.

**Ewan McKendrick** is Professor of English Private Law in the University of Oxford; Fellow of Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

**Gerard McMeel** is Professor of Law, University of Bristol.

**Hector MacQueen** is Professor of Private Law, University of Edinburgh.

**Sonja Meier** is at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law, Hamburg.

**Ernest Metzger** is Douglas Professor of Civil Law, University of Glasgow.

**Lord Millett** is a former Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.

**Charles Mitchell** is Professor of Law, King's College, London.

**Arianna Pretto-Sakmann** is Associate-in-Law, Columbia Law School, New York; formerly Fellow and Tutor in Law, Brasenose College, Oxford.

**Lord Rodger of Earlsferry** is a Lord of Appeal in Ordinary.

**Francis Rose** is Professor of Commercial Law, University of Bristol.

**Eltjo Schrage** is Professor of Law, University of Amsterdam.

**Lionel Smith** is James McGill Professor of Law, Faculty of Law, McGill University.

**Robert Stevens** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, Lady Margaret Hall, Oxford.

**William Swadling** is Fellow and Tutor in Law, Brasenose College, Oxford.

**Graham Virgo** is Reader in English Law in the University of Cambridge; Fellow of Downing College, Cambridge.

**Joseph Georg Wolf** is Emeritus Professor of Roman Law, Albert Ludwigs University, Freiburg-im-Breisgau.

**Reinhard Zimmermann** is the Director of the Max Planck Institute of Comparative and International Private Law, Hamburg.

# Introduction

*Andrew Burrows and Alan Rodger*

Peter Birks, the Regius Professor of Civil Law at Oxford, who died on 6 July 2004, was the most influential English academic lawyer of his generation. He was a passionate believer in the rationality of law, in correct classification of the elements of the law, and in showing how they related to one another—hence the mapping analogy in the title of this collection. Peter inspired generations of students and fellow academics with his writing, teaching, and charismatic personality. The essays in this volume, written in his honour by his colleagues and friends (many of them former students), reflect his principal academic interests in the English, and comparative, law of unjust enrichment and restitution, in Roman law, and in legal history. For Peter these were not disparate areas, unconnected with one another. On the contrary, he carried over the ideas which he developed in the area of Roman law or English legal history or in examining modern German law into his work on contemporary English law and, in particular, into his work on unjust enrichment. This is perhaps most obviously shown by the use which he made of the Roman scheme of classification, to be found in his beloved Gaius, in analysing the structure of English private law. Given his catholic interests, we hesitate to say that Peter would have singled out the English law of unjust enrichment and restitution as his favourite subject, but it is certainly the one for which he is best known throughout the English-speaking legal world. It is therefore appropriate to begin the book with the essays on that topic.

## 1. The English Law of Unjust Enrichment and Restitution

This first part contains fifteen essays on aspects of the substantive law of unjust enrichment and restitution. But the first essay, by Francis Rose, sets the scene by offering a personal perspective on the development of the English law of restitution, both through the courts and especially through the work of academics. Some of this story, including features of Peter's role, has not previously been told. The essay leaves us with the 'cliff-hanging' question, which only time will resolve, of whether Peter's last book *Unjust Enrichment*<sup>1</sup> has correctly predicted the new

<sup>1</sup> (2nd edn, 2005).

world: if not, in Rose's poignant words, 'we shall never know whether theory might have been turned into practice by the force of Birks's intellect and personality'.

For convenience, the fifteen essays on the substantive English law of unjust enrichment and restitution are divided into three sections: general concepts; some particular unjust factors; and property, insolvency, and restitution.

### 1.1. General Concepts

Essay 2, by Andrew Burrows, analyses the new scheme in *Unjust Enrichment*<sup>2</sup> for answering the question whether an enrichment is *unjust*. It is argued that 'absence of basis' should not replace the traditional common law 'unjust factors' but should instead be used as a valuable cross-check in difficult or novel cases. There was therefore no need for Peter to say that 'Almost everything of mine now needs calling back for burning'.<sup>3</sup>

Robert Stevens then explores three controversial issues on *enrichment*. How is enrichment by services to be quantified? How is an enrichment established where it comprises an incomplete contractual performance? Can enrichment be established where title to the asset transferred does not pass? His answer to the last of these is particularly important in its firm rejection of the view, also explored in Lionel Smith's essay (see below), that unjust enrichment has no role to play where the claimant retains title to the asset in question.

In the fourth essay, Gareth Jones offers his thoughts on *change of position*, which is the most important defence, both theoretically and practically, to a claim for unjust enrichment. He principally examines the under-explored question of the impact of public policy on change of position. But his essay also looks at the following: the role of change of position in claims for rescission; whether change of position is a defence to 'claims based on the claimant's title'; and whether it is useful (he argues not) to confine one's articulated reasoning to it being 'equitable' or 'inequitable' on the facts to uphold the defence.

Graham Virgo's influential multi-causal view of restitution as being underpinned by three principles (the reversal of unjust enrichment, the giving up of wrongful profits, and the vindication of property) is well-known. In his contribution to this volume he explores the role of *fault* across that wide area. He concludes that it plays a different role in different parts of the law of restitution and that a proper analysis is being hampered by the lack of clarity in the terminology used to describe the various types of fault.

There then follow three essays by former doctoral students of Peter Birks, who (in addition to their other writings) have made major contributions to our understanding of the law by the publication of books based on their DPhil theses.<sup>4</sup> In this volume they have retuned to the subject-matter of their theses.

<sup>2</sup> *ibid*, chs 5 and 6.

<sup>3</sup> *ibid*, p xii.

<sup>4</sup> See C Mitchell, *The Law of Subrogation* (1994); L Smith, *The Law of Tracing* (1997); J Edelman, *Gain-Based Damages* (2002). Essay 13 is by a fourth doctoral student of Peter Birks's,

Charles Mitchell's essay on *subrogation* (Essay 6) shows how cases on 'reviving subrogation' over the last decade, most importantly *Banque Financière de la Cité SA v Parc (Battersea) Ltd*,<sup>5</sup> constitute a major judicial advance in explaining and clarifying the law of subrogation. But as the essay goes on to point out, some old habits die hard and some difficult questions still remain (such as the precise impact of reviving subrogation on third parties).

Lionel Smith, giving hope to us all, claims in Essay 7 that, thirteen years on, he is still not sure he understands *tracing* very well. He then proceeds to show how some of the new and controversial arguments made by Peter in *Unjust Enrichment* were, to a greater or lesser degree, influenced by his understanding of the nature of claims to traceable proceeds. Particularly significant is the concluding observation that Smith's worries about lack of fit between unjust enrichment and claims to traceable proceeds are reduced if one adopts Peter's final vision for the law of unjust enrichment.

The first section is concluded by James Edelman's essay on *gain-based damages for wrongs* and their relation to compensation. He argues that 'damages' simply means a money award for a wrong; that recent cases have continued to recognize the distinction he drew in his book on the subject<sup>6</sup> between restitutionary damages and disgorgement damages; but that a 'rights-based' measure of compensatory damages, which, he argues, has been applied in many non-commercial wrongs cases, will normally render restitutionary damages superfluous.

## 1.2. Some Particular Unjust Factors

The second group of essays focuses on what, applying the traditional common law 'unjust factors' approach to unjust enrichment, would be regarded as principal unjust factors: namely, mistake and the *Woolwich* principle,<sup>7</sup> duress, undue influence, and failure of consideration. The last three of these essays will also be of direct interest to contract lawyers.

In Essay 9, Jack Beatson looks at the relationship between the *Woolwich* principle and other common law grounds for restitution, in particular mistake of law. He argues (writing before an appeal to the House of Lords) that the Court of Appeal's reasoning in *Deutsche Morgan Grenfell Group plc v IRC*,<sup>8</sup> denying restitution of 'overpaid' tax, cannot be supported. He points out, however, that the decision might be 'saved' if one applied Peter's radical thesis that absence of basis, and not mistake of law, triggered the restitutionary claim so that the extended limitation period for mistaken payments would be inapplicable.

Robert Chambers, whose book, based on his DPhil thesis, *Resulting Trusts* (1997), has again had a major impact on our understanding of the subject.

<sup>5</sup> [1999] 1 AC 221.

<sup>6</sup> See n 4 above.

<sup>7</sup> It was laid down by the House of Lords in *Woolwich Building Society v Inland Revenue Commissioners* [1993] 1 AC 70 that a payment demanded of a citizen ultra vires by a public authority is recoverable as of right.

<sup>8</sup> [2005] EWCA Civ 78, [2005] STC 329.

In the tenth essay Ewan McKendrick examines three aspects of duress: the setting aside of a contract for duress, the recovery of a non-contractual benefit because of duress, and the award of compensatory damages for duress. Particularly significant are his acceptance of the view that a threatened breach of contract is always illegitimate pressure for the purposes of economic duress, and his rejection of any difference in the causation test to be applied as between duress of the person and economic duress.

Mindy Chen-Wishart's essay on undue influence (Essay 11) rejects the claimant-sided consent-based view of the doctrine favoured by Peter. On the other hand, like Peter, she rejects a defendant-sided 'wrongful act' explanation. This leads her to suggest that the best explanation lies in a 'relational theory of undue influence'. This goes beyond a 'single factor' explanation but in essence views the doctrine as requiring the defendant to protect the claimant or to ensure that the claimant can protect herself.

In Essay 12 Gerard McMeel looks at the relationship between contract and claims for unjust enrichment (principally for failure of consideration) and argues that, on its true construction, a contract can rule out or limit a restitutionary claim for unjust enrichment even when the contract has been discharged and even where there is no direct contractual link between the claimant and defendant. Focusing on three different contexts (where there is a subsisting contract, where there is a discharged contract, and where there is a mere 'contractual setting' between the claimant and defendant) he sees the central question about the relationship between contract and unjust enrichment as being whether a contract, as a matter of construction, ousts an otherwise arguable restitutionary claim. He labels this a 'construction' approach, although one might equally perhaps call it a 'contracting-out of restitution' approach.

### 1.3. Property, Insolvency, and Restitution

In this final section on restitution in English law, some perplexingly difficult questions on property, insolvency, and restitution are explored. It begins with Essay 13 by Robert Chambers, another of Peter's star doctoral students, whose book on *Resulting Trusts*<sup>9</sup> (based on his doctoral thesis) has greatly enhanced our understanding of a complex topic. Here Chambers returns to that area and argues that seeing resulting trusts as effecting restitution of unjust enrichment can provide the paradigm for understanding all property rights to restitution of unjust enrichment.

Peter Millett does not agree with the Chambers/Birks approach to the relationship between unjust enrichment and property law. In his contribution (Essay 14) he reproduces some correspondence between himself and Peter as to the correct analysis of *FC Jones v Jones*.<sup>10</sup> Given Peter's death, Lord Millett regrets

<sup>9</sup> (1997).

<sup>10</sup> [1997] Ch 159.

that he had the last word on this. But the second edition of *Unjust Enrichment* shows that Peter remained committed to his 'unjust enrichment' analysis of *Jones v Jones*. In his words, 'The only satisfactory explanation is that [Mrs Jones] was unjustly enriched at [the trustee in bankruptcy's] expense to the extent of the whole sum'.<sup>11</sup>

William Swadling's essay (Essay 15) focuses on when, if ever, a mistake in relation to a delivery of goods prevents title in the goods passing to the deliverer. When, in other words, is the delivery unjust? This question is of importance to unjust enrichment lawyers (in recognizing that there may be more than one way of framing a claim) even if one does not agree with Swadling that the existence of a claim in tort for unjust delivery precludes a claim for unjust enrichment.<sup>12</sup> He concludes that it is not clear that mistake should ever prevent title from passing and that three leading cases laying down the contrary are flawed.

In the final essay, Roy Goode examines the extent to which it is helpful to analyse the statutory provisions on the avoidance of transactions in insolvency proceedings as reversing an unjust enrichment. In the light of the policy of the relevant sections, he concludes that the common law rules of unjust enrichment (eg defences such as change of position) have no role to play except as regards, what he terms, 'transaction-related cross-claims' by the defendant.

## 2. The Comparative Law of Unjust Enrichment and Restitution

As we have already noted, Peter was receptive to ideas in other modern legal systems. More particularly, he openly acknowledged the significance of German law and juristic writings in bringing about the shift in thinking which gave rise to *Unjust Enrichment*. It seems fitting therefore to begin with four essays which deal with aspects of German law on this topic.

Reinhard Zimmermann was a close friend for many years and Peter was quick to recognize the significance of his *Law of Obligations: Roman Foundations of the Civilian Tradition*<sup>13</sup> which provided the first substantial and readable text from which students could trace the development of legal doctrines from Ancient Rome to the present day. In Essay 17, wearing his comparative law hat, Zimmermann explains how the German law relating to restitution after termination for breach of contract has been changed by the provisions which were inserted into the BGB (Bürgerliches Gesetzbuch: the German Civil Code) with effect from 1 January 2002. He concludes by setting those reforms in their wider European context.

In the preface to *Unjust Enrichment* Peter acknowledged the particular part which the comparative work of Sonja Meier had played in his fundamental

<sup>11</sup> *Unjust Enrichment* (2nd edn, 2005) 82.

<sup>12</sup> This issue (whether retention of title precludes unjust enrichment) is examined in the essays of Robert Stevens and Lionel Smith.

<sup>13</sup> (1990).

change to an absence of basis approach. Like everyone else, she regrets that his early death meant that she was not able to explore his new approach with Peter, but in Essay 18 she sets out her views. She welcomes the new approach to transfer, while exploring some of the difficulties which may lie ahead in adopting that approach in other areas of the law. Finally, on the basis of the experience in German law, she counsels against any tendency to over-generalize the lack of basis approach and suggests that it is preferable to concentrate on the justification for granting restitution in particular situations.

When he worked in Oxford, Gerhard Dannemann was part of the team which conducted the famous restitution seminars for the BCL. His particular role was to draw illustrations and arguments from a comparison between English and German law. In his essay (19) he too examines the new approach adopted by Peter in *Unjust Enrichment* and, in the light of the experience of German law, he suggests ways in which three particular areas of English law may have to be developed and analysed more deeply if the new approach is to work coherently.

Thomas Krebs is another former doctoral pupil of Peter's. His thesis<sup>14</sup> dealt with comparative aspects of German and English law at the very time when Peter's views were shifting. Here, in Essay 20, Krebs concentrates on the so-called *Eingriffskondiktion* and begins by sketching the way that German scholars and courts developed various theories to identify cases in which restitution should and should not be granted, with the attribution theory eventually becoming predominant. He goes on to suggest that, if English law moves in the direction advocated by Peter, then some version of the attribution doctrine may prove helpful in developing a theoretical basis for identifying those infringements of a party's rights for which restitution may be an appropriate response. The lessons of German law further lead him to suggest that the idea that restitution is triggered by a wrong may be flawed.

In Essay 21, Hector MacQueen takes us north of the border where Peter spent some years as Professor of Civil Law at Edinburgh University. Although he had never had occasion previously to look into the Scots law of unjust enrichment, Peter soon produced two remarkable papers which were to shake this area of Scots law to its core. The author traces the various ways in which Peter's influence was brought to bear not only on academics and law reformers but on the Scottish courts, culminating in decisions which sought to set the law off on a new and more coherent path.

### 3. Roman Law

This section opens with an essay (22) by Alan Rodger on the interpretation of the term *damnum iniuria*, the harm to property for which the Lex Aquilia

<sup>14</sup> On which he based his book, *Restitution at the Crossroads: A Comparative Study* (2001).



supplied a remedy. In particular, he suggests that the expression is an asyndeton in which *iniuria* refers to unlawful harm. While the suggestion runs counter to the interpretation which Peter adopted in one of his essays, the theme may be appropriate since exploration of *iniuria* in its various manifestations was one of Peter's abiding interests.

The next essay (23), by Georg Wolf, is inspired by the Lex Irnitana, a copy of the Flavian municipal law which was discovered in the south of Spain in 1981. It offered many new insights into the working of the Roman legal system and, more particularly, into the procedures of the Roman courts. From the first moment when he heard about the new discovery, after dinner in John Richardson's home in St Andrews, Peter became passionately interested in the new text. The essay highlights the importance of law in spreading that essentially urban Roman culture which has helped to shape Western civilization.

Ernie Metzger wrote a doctoral thesis, largely devoted to the Lex Irnitana, under Peter's supervision.<sup>15</sup> In Essay 24 he uses the provisions of chapter 84 of the statute and other texts to argue that what may at first sight appear simply to be requirements that the judge should adjourn proceedings in particular circumstances are better seen as a mechanism for ensuring that the parties' right to a fair trial is observed.

Arianna Pretto-Sakmann also wrote a doctoral thesis under Peter's supervision, on personal property.<sup>16</sup> She opens her essay (25) with an entertaining sketch of the way that Peter used animals, in particular the classification of animals, to illustrate his legal arguments. Then she goes on to look in detail at some aspects of the Roman law relating to bees, including the Aquilian liability of a defendant who burned bees—a topic which Peter liked to ponder in discussion with students and colleagues.

The influence of Roman law in the development of modern legal systems was only possible because of the work of the group of lawyers in sixth-century Constantinople who compiled the Digest. For almost four decades Tony Honoré, Peter's predecessor as Regius Professor of Civil Law, has been shedding light on the way that Justinian's compilers went about their mammoth task of reading and editing. In Essay 26 he returns to the vexed topic of the group of works known as the Appendix. With a wealth of detailed argument, he supports the thesis that the Appendix comprises works which were not available to the compilers until the process of reading was already under way. The compilers first shared these new works out among the existing groups but then changed their minds and allotted them to a separate ad hoc committee.

In Essay 27 David Johnston takes us backwards and forwards between classical Roman Law and the later developments which helped to shape thinking in modern law. He reminds us that, like history books, law books tend to be written

<sup>15</sup> Published as *A New Outline of the Roman Civil Trial* (1997).

<sup>16</sup> Published as *Boundaries of Personal Property: Shares and Sub-Shares* (2005).

by the victors with the result that doctrines which ultimately failed to prosper are rather overlooked. Drawing attention to two ultimately unsuccessful doctrines in contract and delict, he ponders why they failed in practice, even though, at first sight, they might seem to have been attractive, at least from the standpoint of legal theory.

Eltjo Schrage begins his essay (28) in the tenements of ancient Rome but then shows how medieval and later lawyers tackled the problem of the enrichment of a landlord which was liable to happen if, on the termination of the lease, a tenant was not allowed to remove the improvements which he had made to the landlord's property. He eventually brings the story right up to the present day with an examination of recent changes in practice and in the Dutch Civil Code, which have sought to meet the legitimate claims of tenants without forcing landlords to pay for improvements which they do not want.

#### 4. Legal History

Peter's thinking about the way that Roman law developed was heavily influenced by the thinking of his colleagues on the development of actions in English law. In his essay (29) John Baker recalls how Peter would go off to hear Professor Milsom at the London School of Economics and would return to University College London 'freighted with new ideas' which he could apply to Roman law. Developing one of the major themes which attracted Peter, Baker discusses how the action on the case for deceit developed at a time when lawyers operated in a world where the categories of contract and tort were as yet unknown. In particular, under reference to the proceedings in *Lopus v Chandeler*, he shows how at the beginning of the seventeenth century, relying on earlier views, some of the judges were prepared to contemplate the possibility of giving a remedy for false misrepresentation, in the absence of a firm warranty—a step which was not actually taken until 1789.

With his colleague, Jeffrey Hackney, in Essay 30 we are back in the law of leases and on that boundary between obligations and property which so interested Peter. Starting from the modern law on a tenant's denial of his landlord's title, he uncovers two distinct strands in the medieval law which are often confused and then shows how a supposed analogy with denial of rent was used to help rationalize the law of conversion in *Isaack v Clark*.<sup>17</sup>

In Essay 31 Joshua Getzler, a colleague of Peter's who shared his passion for Roman law and legal history, takes us to another of the frontiers in the law which Peter liked to patrol, the division between law and equity. The duties of fiduciaries were a constantly recurring theme in his work and in this essay Getzler examines *Keech v Sandford*,<sup>18</sup> which is usually regarded as the starting-point of

<sup>17</sup> (1615) 2 Bulstr 306.

<sup>18</sup> (1726) Cas T King 61.

the doctrine that a fiduciary cannot profit from his office. He explores both the reason why an apparently rather obscure decision was to come to have such great influence and the material in earlier cases which helped shape Lord Chancellor King's thinking.

In his essay (32) John Cairns takes an institution, slavery, which was a recognized part of Roman society and discusses the problems which it caused in the very different social conditions of eighteenth-century Scotland. The pursuer in a divorce action wished to call a slave from the Caribbean to give evidence of his wife's adultery. Cairns analyses the ensuing legal debate about the competence of a slave to give evidence and shows how the very fact that Scots law did not recognize or regulate slavery led to uncertainty and potential confusion.

In a world where lawyers are obsessed with the latest cases, Peter was always concerned to draw attention to the sophistication of lawyers of earlier generations. So, for instance, he would come back time and again to Lord Mansfield's judgment in *Moses v Macferlan*.<sup>19</sup> And he greatly admired Sir William Jones's *Essay on the Law of Bailments*.<sup>20</sup> Against the background of Jones's life and career, in the concluding essay in the volume David Ibbetson shows how, even though he went on to devote a great deal of attention to classification in the natural world, unlike Peter, Jones did not apply the same approach to the analysis of the law.

To some the collection may seem to lack a coherent theme. But to Peter, and to anyone who knew Peter, that is not so: they all deal with topics which would have been of immediate interest to him. In that very real sense they are a tribute to him. While the rest of us would struggle to understand, far less to assess, all the essays, it is an inspiring, if somewhat daunting, thought that Peter would have had an easy familiarity with, and clear views on, every chapter. Acutely aware of his high standards, the authors have tried to produce essays which would, at least, have stimulated him—whether into acceptance or into determined rejection. While we mourn the fact that we will never actually know Peter's views on the essays, still more do we mourn our inability to relive the intellectual excitement of debating the issues with him. But our sadness at that loss is tempered by the knowledge that, as the pages of this book make clear, Peter's influence is undimmed.

<sup>19</sup> (1760) 2 Burr 1005.

<sup>20</sup> (1781).