

Property in Goods and the CISG

by

Till Maier-Lohmann

Basler Dissertation

The digital version of this work is published as Open Access under the CC BY 4.0 licence.

Licence terms: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

**Bibliographical data of the German National Library
(Deutsche Nationalbibliothek)**

The German National Library lists this publication in the German National Bibliography (Deutsche Nationalbibliografie). Detailed bibliographical information is available online at <http://dnb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-8005-1942-2

dfv Mediengruppe

© 2024 Deutscher Fachverlag GmbH, Fachmedien Recht und Wirtschaft, Mainzer Landstr. 251, 60326 Frankfurt am Main, buchverlag@ruw.de

www.ruw.de

This work and all its individual parts are protected by copyright law. Any unauthorized use outside the narrow limitations laid down by copyright law (Urheberrechtsgesetz) is unlawful and liable for prosecution. This applies in particular to reproduction, editing, translation, micro-filming and storage and processing in electronic systems.

Printing: Beltz Grafische Betriebe GmbH, 99947 Bad Langensalza

Printed in Germany

Preface

This study, accepted by the Faculty of Law of the University of Basel as a PhD thesis in the spring of 2022, has been updated with the available literature and case law as of June 2024.

I would like to express my deep gratitude to my doctoral advisor Professor Ulrich G. Schroeter. The academic freedom I enjoyed while working for him allowed me to explore research topics independently, challenge prevailing opinions, and develop my scholarly perspectives in an encouraging and supportive environment. I thank Professor Corinne Widmer Lüchinger and Pascal Hachem for their helpful comments and contributions to my dissertation committee.

Additionally, I wish to thank Professor Reinhard Zimmermann for his early support during my studies in Freiburg and his interest in my research. Both of my stays at the Max Planck Institute for comparative and international private law Hamburg were invaluable to me due to the extraordinary and generous group of scholars who carry out research there. Furthermore, I am grateful to Professor Ingeborg Schwenzer who introduced me to the complexities of academic work on the CISG at her chair between 2014 and 2017.

Ben Köhler, Linus Dethloff-Wieland, Julian Juhasz, and Rory Price offered insightful feedback on specific chapters. Alissa Palumbo Högger provided linguistic revisions of this study. While it is difficult to fully capture their impact on this specific work, I am deeply indebted to Nadja Harraschain, Alexander Ruckteschler, Steffen Lindemann, David Tebel, and many others in the Vis Moot community. Their influence has profoundly shaped my approach to legal reasoning and argumentation, far more than they may realize.

Most importantly, I thank my family, and my wife Sita, whose unwavering support, patience, and encouragement have been the bedrock of this endeavor.

Freiburg, June 2024

Till Rau (born Maier-Lohmann)

Table of contents

Preface	V
Overview	VII
Abbreviations	XIX
§ 1: Introduction	1
I. Outline of the problem	2
1. Unharmonized domestic sales law and property law	2
2. CISG and national property law	3
II. Outline of the study	5
III. Remarks on methodology	7
1. History of unified sales law, the accessible material, and its usefulness in interpreting the CISG	7
a) Unidroit: 1928–1951	8
b) Conference in The Hague in 1951 and the Special Commission	9
c) ULIS and ULF	10
d) Usefulness of historical records	10
2. Comparative law pre- and post-unification	11
3. Summary	13
§ 2: Groundwork	15
I. Terminology	15
II. Notions of property	17
1. Absolute notion of property on the European continent ...	18
2. Relative, absolute, and otherwise different notions of property under Roman law	19
3. Relative notion of property	20
4. Reduced significance of a “lump” concept of property ...	23
a) Nordic countries	23
b) USA and its UCC	25
5. Summary	26
III. Differences in the transfer of property with regard to sales transactions	26
1. Transfer of property due to mere consent or additional requirement of handing over of the goods	26
2. Causal or abstract relationship between transfer of prop- erty and the sales contract	29
IV. Law applicable to questions of property	29
	IX

Table of contents

1. Law applicable to questions of property before State courts	30
2. Law applicable to questions of property before arbitral tribunals	32
V. Conclusion.	33
§ 3: Obligation to transfer the property and third party rights or claims.	35
I. Distinguishing different obligations to transfer the property.	36
1. Obligation to transfer unencumbered property	37
2. Obligation to fulfill the necessary acts for the transfer of property	37
II. Historical roots and comparative law.	38
1. Roman law	39
a) <i>Actio auctoritatis, stipulatio duplae, stipulatio habere licere</i> , and obligation to transfer property	39
b) Explanatory approaches	42
2. National laws	43
a) French law	43
aa) <i>Garantie d'éviction</i> and Articles 1626 et seq. of the French Civil Code	44
bb) Nullity of the sale of goods that belong to a third party under Article 1599 of the French Civil Code	44
cc) Summary	46
b) Swiss law	47
aa) Articles 184 and 192 et seq. of the Swiss Code of Obligations	47
bb) Opinions by the Swiss courts and scholars	48
cc) Position of the Swiss Supreme Court	51
dd) Discussion	52
(1) Protection of the buyer before eviction	52
(2) Systematic arguments	55
(3) Revealing the respective historical background of the Swiss Code of Obligations	56
ee) Summary regarding the obligation to transfer the property	61
ff) Nullity due to impossibility and Article 20 of the Swiss Code of Obligations	62
c) English law	63
aa) Section 12(1) of the Sale of Goods Act 1893 and 1979	64

Table of contents

bb) Failure of consideration	65
cc) Summary	66
3. The breakthrough of German law?	67
a) Germanic and Franconian law	67
b) The German Civil Code of 1900	68
c) Breakthrough of German law by introducing the obligation to transfer the property?	70
4. Summary	70
III. Current interpretations of Articles 30 and 41 of the CISG	71
1. Approach 1: Buyer has to become owner of the goods under Article 30 of the CISG	71
2. Approach 2: Article 30 of the CISG obliges the seller to fulfill the necessary acts under national law to effect a transfer of property	73
3. Approach 3: Article 30 of the CISG is merely an over- view elaborated by Article 41 of the CISG and contains no independent obligation	76
IV. A novel approach: Defining “property” under Arti- cle 30 of the CISG and applying Article 41 of the CISG with regard to third parties only	78
1. Defining “property” under Article 30 of the CISG	79
a) Deriving the meaning of “property” from existing concepts	79
b) Proposed definition of property under Article 30 of the CISG	80
c) “Transfer” of property	82
d) Intellectual property rights	82
e) Accessories to the goods	84
2. Advantages of this approach	85
a) The wording of Article 41 of the CISG and third parties	85
b) Uniformity and Article 7(1) of the CISG	86
c) Improved delineation of Articles 30 and 41 of the CISG	87
aa) Relevant point(s) in time	88
(1) Relevant point in time under Article 30 of the CISG	88
(2) Relevant point in time under Article 41 of the CISG	90
(3) Advantages of a distinction regarding the relevant point in time	92
(4) Summary	92
bb) Assessing modifications of both obligations under Article 6 of the CISG	93

Table of contents

cc) Claim for performance under Article 46(1) or 46(2), (3) of the CISG	94
dd) Article 43 of the CISG	94
d) Summary	95
3. Consequences for the type of obligation found in Article 30 of the CISG	96
4. Obligation to transfer unencumbered property under Article 41 of the CISG	98
a) Wording and the additional protection from claims of third parties	99
aa) Can there be a breach of contract by a right that is not at the same time a claim?	99
(1) Relevant point in time for the claim or the facts underlying the claim to exist	100
(2) <i>Bona fide</i> purchaser	101
(3) Threshold for existence of “claims”	101
(a) <i>Frivolous or obviously unfounded claims of third parties</i>	102
(b) <i>Against whom must the claim be raised?</i>	102
(c) <i>(No) requirements of a “claim” that surpasses a mere expression of a third party to have a right in the goods</i>	104
(4) Summary	105
bb) Are there buyers’ remedies for claims of third parties more limited than the remedies for rights of third parties?	105
(1) Claim for performance under Article 46 of the CISG and reduction of price under Article 50 of the CISG	106
(2) Avoidance of contract under Articles 49(1)(a), 25 of the CISG	106
(3) Prescription	107
cc) Summary	109
b) Purpose of Article 41 of the CISG	109
c) <i>Travaux préparatoires</i>	110
d) Summary	111
5. Broader protection for buyers under the CISG than a mere obligation to transfer unencumbered property	111
6. Preemption of remedies under national law regarding the non-transfer of property	112
7. Applying the novel approach in direct comparison to approaches 1–3	117

8. Summary	120
V. Outlook on unifications of law and specifically European law	121
§4: Property and the characterization of a sales contract under the CISG	123
I. Status quo and general opinion under the CISG	123
II. Transfer of property as understood under national laws is no necessary element of characterization of sales contracts under the CISG.....	125
III. Transfer of property under Article 30 of the CISG is no necessary element of characterization of sales contracts under the CISG.....	128
1. <i>The Res Cogitans</i> and English sales law	128
a) The case.....	128
b) Reception in the English literature	131
aa) Property-transfer for a nanosecond (<i>scintilla temporis</i>).....	132
bb) Functional interpretation of the retention of title clause	133
cc) Conditional contract of sale of bunkers	134
dd) Party autonomy in characterizing the contract	135
2. The reasoning of <i>The Res Cogitans</i> and the CISG	135
a) Property-transfer for a nanosecond and functional analysis of the retention of property clause.....	136
b) Conditional contract of sale.....	136
c) Party autonomy in characterizing the contract	137
3. Property as part of the definition of a CISG contract	138
IV. Proposed characterization of a sales contract under Article 1(1) of the CISG.....	141
1. Delivery of the goods is not a necessary component of a sales contract	142
2. Benefits and risk of the goods as central elements	143
3. Applying the proposed definition of a sales contract under the CISG	145
V. Conclusion.....	148
VI. Outlook on unifications of law and specifically European law.....	149

Table of contents

§ 5: Property and the claim for the purchase price	151
I. Property in the goods and action for the price in the common law	151
1. English law and legal systems that are inspired by the Sale of Goods Act 1979	152
a) Historical roots	153
b) Current English law	155
c) <i>The Res Cogitans</i> and future English law	161
2. Other common law jurisdictions	162
3. Different motives for the shaping of the claim for the purchase price in the USA	163
4. Summary	167
II. Continental European laws' approach exemplified by German law	167
1. German law in theory	168
2. Practice of the courts	170
3. Consumer laws	172
4. Summary	172
III. Summary of national concepts	173
IV. Claiming the price under the CISG	173
1. Article 62 of the CISG	175
a) Notable widening of scope of Article 62 of the CISG compared to Article 61(2) of the ULIS	175
b) No limitation of the claim for the price under Article 77 of the CISG	177
c) No limitation of the claim for the price under Articles 85, 87 of the CISG	178
d) No limitation of the claim for the price under Article 88 of the CISG	179
e) Possible limitation of the claim for the price under Article 9(2) of the CISG	180
f) Limitation of the claim for the price under Article 58 of the CISG	182
g) Limitation of the claim for the price under Article 7(1) of the CISG	184
h) Summary	187
2. Damages claim instead of the claim for the price	187
a) Article 77 of the CISG after extinction of performance claim	188
b) Article 77 of the CISG while claim for performance still exists and is due	188

Table of contents

aa)	Article 77 of the CISG and damages due to delay . . .	189
(1)	Storage costs	189
(2)	Financing costs	190
(3)	Summary	191
bb)	Approach 1: Article 77 of the CISG generally requires a resale if the buyer refuses to perform . . .	191
cc)	Approach 2: Article 77 of the CISG does not generally require a resale if the buyer refuses to perform	193
dd)	Discussion.	194
c)	Summary	197
3.	Article 28 of the CISG and the claim for the price under Article 62 of the CISG.	198
a)	Applicability of Article 28 of the CISG to the claim for the price under Article 62 of the CISG	198
aa)	Potential consequences if Article 28 of the CISG were applicable to the claim for the price under Article 62 of the CISG	199
(1)	(Im)possibility to force the buyer to pay the price in a foreign currency	199
(2)	(Im)possibility to force the goods <i>de facto</i> onto the buyer	199
(3)	(No) indirect duty of the buyer to resell the goods	200
(a)	<i>Solea International BVBA v Basset & Walker International Inc</i>	200
(b)	<i>Law applicable to calculation of the damages.</i>	202
(c)	<i>Influence of Article 28 of the CISG on Article 77 of the CISG.</i>	202
(4)	Summary	205
bb)	Arguments for and against the application of Article 28 of the CISG to the claim for the price . . .	206
(1)	Wording of Article 28 of the CISG	206
(2)	Systematic interpretation	208
(3)	Travaux préparatoires	209
(4)	Purpose of Article 28 of the CISG	214
(5)	Result	217
b)	Application of its “own” law with regard to the claim for the purchase price	217
c)	Summary	220
V.	Conclusion.	221

Table of contents

§ 6: Exclusion under Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	223
I. Effect on “property” under Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	224
1. “Property” as an autonomous term under Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	224
2. Indirect relevance of the CISG on the transfer by way of incidental questions	226
II. Retention of property clauses	227
1. Effects on property in the goods excluded under Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	228
2. Effects on contractual rights and obligations not excluded under Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	229
3. Consent regarding the retention of property clause under Articles 14–24 of the CISG or under national law?	230
4. Summary	233
III. The CISG’s position on parties’ agreements to regulate the transfer of property	233
1. (No) mandatory character of Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	233
2. Regulating the transfer of property under Article 6 of the CISG	234
3. Relevance of parties’ agreement outside of the CISG	235
IV. No contradiction between Article 4, sentence 2(b) CISG and Articles 30, 41 of the CISG	236
V. Suitability of the exclusion under Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the CISG	236
VI. Conclusion	237
§ 7: Remedies based on (national) property law	239
I. Different approaches regarding claims based on property under national law	239
II. Claims by or against third parties	240
III. Claims between the seller and the buyer	242
1. Buyer’s claim based on property after contract conclusion	242
2. Seller’s claims based on property after avoidance of contract	244
3. Seller’s claims based on a retention of property clause	246
IV. Conclusion	248

§ 8: Insolvency and property in the goods.	251
I. Elevated relevance of property in insolvency cases.	252
II. The CISG does not supersede national insolvency law on the available assets for distribution and priorities.	254
III. (No) indirect influence on seller's property after avoidance of contract by the CISG	256
1. <i>Schlechtriem</i> and the <i>causa</i> surviving contract avoidance	256
2. <i>Landfermann, Hornung, Krebs, Claude Witz</i> arguing for the irrelevance of the CISG	257
3. Discussion	258
a) Challenging the premise of the continuing existence of a <i>causa</i> for purposes of national property law as a matter governed by the CISG	258
b) Challenging the premise of an incidental question to the applicable contract law	259
aa) The correct methodology of incidental questions is not decisive	259
bb) Introducing a discussion on the same problem in private international law literature	260
cc) <i>Contrat translatif</i> as a requirement under the national property law	261
c) Advantages of the proposed interpretation for the CISG	265
4. Summary	266
IV. Conclusion.	266
§ 9: Conclusions and theses	267
I. Conclusions	267
II. Theses	270
Index of authorities	273
Index of further material.	307
Index of cases	311

§ 1: Introduction

Drafters of unified contract laws often deliberately exclude questions of property, ownership, or title from the scope of application. Article 8 of the Uniform Law on International Sales (ULIS) and Article 4, sentence 2(b) of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods (CISG) exemplify this exclusion. This should not, however, be mistaken to mean that a smooth delimitation of property law and unified sales law has thereby been established. The law governing the property in goods has seen no notable acts of international harmonization.¹ There are thus myriad notions of rights, liabilities, terms, and concepts from various legal systems that need to be considered when analyzing the interplay between unified sales contract law like the CISG with property in goods.

Rabel discovered a remaining relevance of property in the realm of uniform sales law in his ground-breaking work “*Das Recht des Warenkaufs*” nearly a century ago. He found the concept of property to be partly overestimated and partly underestimated regarding unified sales law, and set out to analyze the practically important facets at the end of the work.² Accordingly, the table of contents of Volume 1 contains an announcement for a “*VIII. Teil. Sicherungen des Verkäufers*”³ in Volume 2.⁴ Volume 2 does not deliver on this promise. In the preface to volume 2, *Dölle* explained this to be due to the rudimentary state in which the manuscript of this part was when *Rabel* died before the publication of the second volume.⁵ *Honnold* also was aware

1 But see for the developments under European law between 1989 and 2016, *Walczak*, pp. 15–41.

2 *Rabel*, *Recht des Warenkaufs* I, pp. 31–32.

3 My translation: Part 8: Securities of the seller.

4 *Rabel*, *Recht des Warenkaufs* I, p. XXIV.

5 *Rabel*, *Recht des Warenkaufs* II, pp. III–IV. Despite considerable efforts, I was not able to find this unpublished and maybe lost manuscript. It is neither in the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law in Hamburg, nor (as part of the so-called *Rabel Koffer*) in the archives of the Max Planck Society in Berlin. In 1969 *Landfermann* entered the Max Planck Institute for Comparative and International Private Law in Hamburg and *Zweigert* tasked him with researching this area of the law in a comparative manner. During the time of his research, the manuscript was still in Hamburg and was at his disposal. Yet, it was already then partially outdated, and judging from the book that resulted from the research (*Landfermann*, *Sicherungen des vorleistenden Verkäufers*), the manuscript was concerned with the protection of the seller after the goods have been dispatched and received by the buyer. The (limited) scope of the manuscript can be explained against the background of other assumptions and ideas *Rabel* had when drafting “*Das Recht des Warenkaufs*”. As will be discussed in more detail below (para. 75), *Rabel* considered it preferable to avoid national law concepts such as property in uniform sales law. As a result, the first draft of a uniform sales law in 1935 only contained a single reference to property, which excluded any effect of the unified sales law on the property

§1 Introduction

of the problem with regard to the “*complex, conclusionary legal idiom of ‘property’*” in uniform sales law and detected the potential for confusion therein, which “*at crucial parts need[ed] reexamination.*”⁶

- 3 Nevertheless, the interplay and tensions between property in goods and the CISG have not yet been comprehensively analyzed. This study endeavors to fill that void.

I. Outline of the problem

1. Unharmonized domestic sales law and property law

- 4 Property in goods and sales contract law are considered intertwined in many national legal systems. Although the categorization as two different fields of law is broadly accepted and research has accordingly become more specialized,⁷ there remain many connections between sales contract and property law. The importance and number of these connections differs widely between different legal systems, but for example in England, they are so significant as to prompt *Bridge* to refer to a “*title-fundamentalism*” in the law of sale,⁸ and *Goode* to state that “[t]he impact of the location of the property is all-pervasive”.⁹ *Llewellyn*, who came upon a similar legal situation in the USA when drafting the Uniform Commercial Code (UCC), commented in prosaic fashion that “[n]obody ever saw a chattel’s Title.”¹⁰ In this spirit of legal realism, the UCC aims at avoiding the use of property or other single concepts to decide factually unconnected questions.¹¹

in the goods. It, thus, did not contain an obligation of the seller to transfer the property in the goods. Since there was no such obligation, the characterization of a sales contract was not necessarily connected to “property”, and the scope of application therefore not connected to this notion. Moreover, the claim for the purchase price was regulated in a very different manner compared to today’s Art. 62 CISG in combination with Art. 28 CISG. Hence, although the loss is unfortunate, *Rabel’s* manuscript would probably not have provided much insight into the current interplay between the CISG and national property law.

6 *Honnold*, 30 *Law and Contemporary Problems* (Spring 1965), 326, 350.

7 *Furray*, 2 *European Property Law Journal* (2013), 220, 221; *Michaels*, *Sachzuordnung durch Kaufvertrag*, p. 50.

8 *Bridge*, *Singapore Journal of Legal Studies* (2017), 345, 348.

9 *Goode/McKendrick*, para. 8.27.

10 *Llewellyn*, XV *NYU Law Quarterly Review* (1938), 159, 165.

11 See for example, the first sentence of sect. 2-401 UCC “*Each provision of this Article with regard to the rights, obligations and remedies of the seller, the buyer, purchasers or other third parties applies irrespective of title to the goods except where the provision refers to such title.*”

I. Outline of the problem §1

While under many national laws the number of connections between property and sales law have been reduced, the remaining connections can be categorized depending on the concerned parties: Property law can have relevance between the seller and the buyer, and it can simultaneously be of significance vis-à-vis third parties. Between the seller and the buyer, property and its transfer might influence the very characterization of whether the contract at hand is in fact a sales contract, whether the seller has fulfilled his or her obligation to transfer the property as far as such an obligation exists, and whether the seller can claim the purchase price. Moreover, the passing of the risk of loss under some national sales laws is linked to the transfer of property.¹² The sales contract may also be relevant for questions linked to property, since the (re-)transfer of property might be dependent on a mere avoidance of contract,¹³ or a vindication claim based on property might only be substantiated if there is no sales contract conferring a right to possession anymore. Vis-à-vis third parties, property might have decisive relevance, e. g., for creditors in cases of bankruptcy, liability in conversion, taxation, criminal law, insurable interest, and more.¹⁴ 5

It is important to keep these (depending on the respective national law, diverging) consequences of property and sales law in mind when discussing differences and perspectives for unification or harmonization. Since national law makers mostly write laws with cases in mind to which the respective legal system would apply to in its entirety, solutions to existing problems can be provided through contract law or property law. National property law, sales law and other areas of these national legal systems can, thereby, counterbalance each other's weaknesses and specifics. 6

2. CISG and national property law

The same cannot be said of the CISG and the respective national property laws. Since Article 7(1) of the CISG requires the interpretation of the Convention to take into account its international character and the need to promote uniformity in its application, the interpretation of the CISG cannot, at first sight, cater to specifics of the applicable property law. On the other hand, the national property law cannot be interpreted only to be compatible with the CISG. It must also maintain compatibility with national contract law. 7

¹² For example, sect. 20(1) SGA 1979 in the UK; Art. 1196(3), s. 1, French Civil Code in France.

¹³ *Schlechtriem/Cl. Witz*, para. 434; but see *Cl. Witz*, para. 114.81.

¹⁴ *Bridge*, Sale of Goods, para. 3.01.

§1 Introduction

- 8 If it is correct that sales law is “*in one phase part of the law of contract, in another phase part of the law of property*”,¹⁵ it is notable that the CISG has unified only one part of the equation. In contrast, when national sales laws were codified without simultaneously codifying all aspects of property law, these codifications nevertheless often contained rules on property and its transfer.¹⁶ Also, when commercial law in parts of Africa was unified by the *Acte uniforme relatif au droit commercial général* of 1997 (OHADA Uniform Commercial Law 1997) the interplay with property was explicitly regulated in Articles 283–284.¹⁷
- 9 While, as mentioned above, the interplay between contract and property law under national law has been the subject of detailed research and monographies, with regard to international cases and diverging contract and property laws there is little on the topic.¹⁸ *Stadler’s* work “*Gestaltungsfreiheit und Verkehrsschutz durch Abstraktion*” is an exception and contains a full chapter on collisions between diverging laws in this regard.¹⁹ With regard to unified (sales) contract law such as the Convention relating to a Uniform Law on the International Sale of Goods (ULIS) or the CISG, there is even less on the topic. It is not possible to transplant solutions proposed with regard to national laws: *Stadler*, for example, has suggested that the law applicable to questions of property could follow the applicable contract law to avoid tensions.²⁰ However, since the CISG does not contain rules on the transfer of property and there are no unified property laws that could go hand in hand with the CISG, this would not be a viable option to regulate the interplay and avoid any tensions between the CISG and national property law.
- 10 This study is, therefore, aimed at revealing the interplay and assessing whether tensions exist between the CISG and national property law. What influence does property and its transfer have on the CISG and contractual questions and what influence does the CISG have on national property law?

15 *Llewellyn*, XV NYU Law Quarterly Review (1938), 159.

16 For example, in Switzerland with the Swiss Code of Obligations of 1881 (Arts. 199–209 Swiss Code of Obligations 1881) and the Sale of Goods Act 1893 in the UK (sect. 17–25 SGA 1893), see *Bridge*, Sale of Goods, para. 5.46 stating that “*it is by no means obvious that the Sale of Goods Act was and is the proper place to deal with title disputes involving third parties: there is much to be said for a separate and comprehensive statute dealing with title transfer.*”

17 In the revised version from 2010, these Arts. have been moved to Arts. 275–276 Acte uniforme révisé portant sur le droit commercial général from 2010 (OHADA Uniform Commercial Law 2010). Cf. *Chianale*, Singapore Journal of Legal Studies (2016), 26, 40.

18 But see for example, Fawcett/Harris/Bridge/*Bridge*, para. 18.02; *Torsello*, International Business Law Journal (2000), 939.

19 *Stadler*, Verkehrsschutz durch Abstraktion, pp. 651–697.

20 *Stadler*, Verkehrsschutz durch Abstraktion, p. 680.