

CONTENTS

| | |
|---------------------------------------|------|
| <i>General Editors' Preface</i> | v |
| <i>Acknowledgements</i> | vii |
| <i>List of Cases</i> | xiii |
| <i>List of Legislation</i> | xxxi |
| <i>List of Abbreviations</i> | xxxv |
| <i>List of Contributors</i> | xli |

PART I. INTRODUCTORY MATTERS

Introduction

| | |
|---|----|
| Jaap BAAIJ, David CABRELLI and Laura MACGREGOR | 3 |
| 1. The Significance of Comparing the Interpretation of Contracts | 3 |
| 2. Three Universal Issues of Contract Interpretation..... | 5 |
| 2.1. Introduction: A Limited Scope | 5 |
| 2.2. The First Issue: The Nature of Interpretative Uncertainty | 6 |
| 2.3. The Second Issue: The Nature of the Interpretative Task | 7 |
| 2.4. The Third Issue: Cultural Differences between Common Law and Civil Law..... | 10 |
| 3. Structure of the Book | 11 |
| 3.1. Exploratory Chapters | 11 |
| 3.2. National Reports | 13 |
| 3.2.1. The Choice of Jurisdictions..... | 13 |
| 3.2.2. Selecting the Cases and Issues Addressed..... | 14 |
| 3.2.3. Editorial Comparative Observations | 14 |

Designing a Method to Compare Interpretation Methods

| | |
|--|----|
| Jaap BAAIJ | 17 |
| 1. The Choice of Comparative Methodology | 17 |
| 1.1. The Factual Approach of the Common Core Project | 17 |
| 1.2. Adapting the General Method to the Interpretation of Contracts | 18 |
| 1.3. Balancing Sameness and Difference | 20 |
| 2. Devising a Method of Translation | 21 |
| 2.1. Comparative Law and the Inevitability of Translation | 21 |

| | | |
|------|---|----|
| 2.2. | The Philosophical Underpinnings of the Factual Approach | 22 |
| 2.3. | Refuting the Relativist Criticism | 23 |
| 3. | The Translation Method for Legal Concepts and Institutions | 26 |
| 3.1. | Step 1: Using Inverted Commas | 27 |
| 3.2. | Step 2: Using Original Language for Domestic Legal Concepts..... | 28 |
| 3.3. | Step 3: Adding a (Literal) English Translation..... | 28 |
| 3.4. | Step 4: Adding an Explanation or Description | 29 |
| 4. | Concluding Remarks..... | 30 |

The Law and Economics of Contract Interpretation

| | | |
|--------------------|--|----|
| Remus VALSAN | 31 | |
| 1. | Introduction | 31 |
| 2. | Interpretive Methodologies: Textualism and Contextualism | 34 |
| 3. | Transaction Costs and the Optimal Interpretive Method..... | 38 |
| 3.1. | Ex Ante Transaction Costs and Contract Interpretation | 40 |
| 3.2. | Contract Interpretation and Ex Post Transaction Costs: Opportunism and Judicial Error | 47 |
| 4. | Conclusion | 54 |

**Interpretation in the Principles of European Contract Law, the Draft
Common Frame of Reference and the Common European Sales Law**

| | | |
|------------------------|---|----|
| Lorna RICHARDSON | 55 | |
| 1. | Introduction | 55 |
| 2. | The Approach to Contractual Interpretation | 57 |
| 2.1. | The Search for Common Intention | 58 |
| 2.2. | Relevance of Knowledge of Intended Meaning | 60 |
| 2.3. | A Move to a More Objective Approach to Interpretation..... | 63 |
| 3. | Factors to be Considered when Interpreting a Contract..... | 66 |
| 3.1. | The Circumstances in which the Contract was Concluded | 67 |
| 3.2. | The Parties' Conduct, Even Subsequent to Contract Conclusion..... | 70 |
| 3.3. | The Interpretation Already Given to the Same/Similar Terms by the Parties and the Parties' Practices | 71 |
| 3.4. | The Meaning Commonly Given to Terms in the Branch of Activity..... | 72 |
| 3.5. | The Nature and Purpose of the Contract | 72 |
| 3.6. | Usages..... | 73 |
| 3.7. | Good Faith and Fair Dealing | 74 |
| 3.8. | Protection of Third-Party Reliance | 77 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 4. Specific Rules of Interpretation | 78 |
| 4.1. Interpretation Against the Supplier of a Term | 78 |
| 4.2. Preference for Negotiated Terms | 80 |
| 4.3. Contract to be Interpreted as a Whole | 80 |
| 4.4. Terms to be Given Effect | 81 |
| 5. Interpreting Acts or Statements Other than Contracts | 82 |
| 5.1. The PECL | 82 |
| 5.2. The DCFR and the CESL | 82 |
| 6. Concluding Remarks | 85 |
| Opening Remarks on the National Reports | 87 |

PART II. CASE STUDIES

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Case 1: Jewellers King | 141 |
| Case 2: Botanical Fruits | 181 |
| Case 3: Cocktail Parties | 213 |
| Case 4: Animal Waste | 245 |
| Case 5: Shower Valves | 261 |
| Case 6: Call Centre | 287 |
| Case 7: Biscuit | 311 |
| Case 8: Crates of Beer | 331 |
| Case 9: Crystal Vases | 351 |
| Case 10: The Machine | 371 |

PART III. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

Conclusions

| | |
|--|-----|
| Jaap BAAIJ, David CABRELLI and Laura MACGREGOR | 405 |
| 1. Enriching the Conceptual Framework: Distinguishing Aims and Modalities of Interpretation | 405 |
| 2. Nuancing the Common Law versus Civil Law Dichotomy | 407 |
| 3. The Role of Good Faith | 409 |
| 4. A Common Core? | 411 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| References | 413 |
| Appendix I: <i>The Editorial Instructions for the National Reporters</i> | 433 |
| Appendix II: <i>The Questionnaire</i> | 439 |
| Index | 449 |