
PREFACE

This book is a biography of an idea. It addresses the question of how English contract law came to contain the doctrine of mistake that it does. This is a matter of not only antiquarian interest but also current concern. I hope that I have addressed the question in such a way as to not only provide some insight into the development of the modern law of contract but also to provide a basis upon which others can undertake a reform of the law in this area.

How to explain mistakes in contract law? I have argued that the English doctrine of contractual mistake is itself a mistake. The doctrine arose as a result of the efforts of the scientific treatise writers of the late-nineteenth century who borrowed civilian inspired forms of mistake. They blended these theories of mistake with those cases in which courts of equity had provided relief where a mistake had occurred. As the common law slowly moved towards an unwitting acceptance of sorts of the theories of mistake proposed by the treatise writers, little concern was given as to how this new doctrine would fit within the existing structure of the common law of contract. Further mistakes were made at this point in the formation of the law. When mistake was given recognition by the House of Lords in *Bell v Lever Brothers*, it was thought of as forms of mistake which either negated or nullified consent. The area has been one which has presented conceptual and practical problems ever since; yet another mistake. For all of these reasons, the doctrine of contractual mistake is best thought of as a series of 'mistakes in contract law'.

I have incurred many debts of gratitude in preparing this work and I am delighted to be able to thank the people and institutions who have helped me. I first discussed how best to approach the problem of mistake in contract law with my friend, the late John Yelland. His comments and insights led me to think of a project with an historical approach; I think he would have found the final result interesting. Many other colleagues gave me helpful comments and support at various points in the preparation of this work: Victor Tunkel, Stephen Waddams, Ian Yeats, Margot Horspool and Wayne Morrison. JoAnne Sweeny has helped me to tidy up certain of the chapters. Jo Murkens provided me not only with invaluable translations into English of various parts of Savigny's *System of Modern Roman Law* but also with his insights into Savigny's scholarship. Andrew Lewis kindly read a draft chapter on Roman law and gently corrected more than one error. I am particularly grateful to Michael Lobban who has not only listened to more than one tentative hypothesis but has also read several draft chapters and commented thoroughly upon them. My tutorial students have rendered invaluable assistance in commenting on various arguments. I have also benefitted from the comments given by audience members following the presentation of mistake papers at the

Preface

Current Legal Issues Session (University College London, 2002), the Society of Legal Scholars Conference (Oxford, 2003), the Second Biennial Conference on the Law of Obligations (Melbourne, 2004), and the Institute for Advanced Legal Studies (London, 2007). All remaining mistakes in this work are my responsibility alone.

A number of institutions and libraries have greatly assisted me with searches. I would like to thank Unilever for allowing me access to their historical archives and for the assistance of their staff, the staff at the Parliamentary Archives for their help and also the staff at the Beckenham Public Library and the archives at Kingston upon Thames. I am particularly grateful to the librarians at the Institute for Advanced Legal Studies library for their help and their unfailing assistance in retrieving volume after volume for me.

Last, but by no means least, I must thank my family for their patience, understanding and encouragement as this work was prepared. My family has, so to speak, had to live with the mistakes of others for some time. My initial suspicion that this research had formed a part of family life when my daughter Margaret wrote a school assignment on the topic 'what I did on my holidays' by explaining that she had spent them looking for Mr Bell was confirmed when my son Henry, having been asked to prepare a project on his local neighbourhood, explained (having spent a week in Beckenham researching war damage) where the bombs had landed in our neighbourhood during the war and the ensuing shortage of housing.

I dedicate this book to my mother, and in memory of my father. Without their optimism and support none of this would have been possible.

Catharine MacMillan
London
December 2009

CONTENTS

<i>Preface</i>	vii
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xiii
<i>Table of Statutes</i>	xxv
1. Introduction	1
2. Contractual Mistake in Roman Law: From Justinian to the Natural Lawyers	10
The Law of the Romans	10
Roman Contract Law	12
Roman Contract Law and Mistake	14
Mistakes as to the Identity of a Contracting party: <i>Error in persona</i>	17
Mistakes as to the Price to be Paid: <i>Error in pretio</i>	17
Mistakes as to the Subject Matter of the Contract	18
Medieval Roman Law	26
3. Contractual Mistake in English Law: Mistake in Equity before 1875	38
The Jurisdiction and Procedures of Chancery	39
Reasons for the Intervention of Equity	44
An Unconscientious Advantage Obtained by Mistake	45
Agreement did not Conform to Parties' Intentions	45
Instances Short of Fraud	47
Protection of a Weaker Party	47
The Limits of Equitable Intervention	48
Forms of Equitable Relief for Mistake	53
Rectification	54
Specific Performance	56
Rescission	61
Conclusions	68
4. The Lack of Contractual Mistake at Common Law and the Nineteenth-century Transformation of Procedure	69
Pleading	71
Equitable Defences	82
Evidence and the Pre-trial Discovery of Facts	86
Pre-trial Discovery	86
Witnesses	89
Matters of Law rather than Fact	91
Conclusions	94

Contents

5. Pothier and the Development of Mistake in English Contract Law	96
Pothier and the <i>Traité des Obligations</i>	96
Pothier and English Contract Law	104
Early Contract Treatise Writers	106
Colebrooke and Contract Law	107
Macpherson and the Indian Contract Act 1872	108
Leake: The First Scientific Treatise Writer of Contract Law	112
Judah Benjamin—The Living Transplant	123
Conclusions	133
6. Von Savigny and the Development of Mistake in English Contract Law	136
Von Savigny and German Legal Development	136
Von Savigny and Contract	140
Von Savigny and Mistake	141
Sir Frederick Pollock	143
Pollock's <i>Principles of Contract</i>	145
Pollock as Will Theorist	148
Pollock and Mistake	150
The Changes in Pollock's <i>Principles</i>	162
Sir William Anson and the Principles of the English Law of Contract	169
Anson and Mistake	171
Anson Modifies his Treatment of Mistake	174
Conclusions	178
7. The Creation of Contractual Mistake in Nineteenth-century Common Law	181
An Absence of Subject Matter: <i>Couturier v Hastie</i> (1856)	181
Mistake which Prevents Agreement— <i>Raffles v Wichelhaus</i> (1864)	186
Mistake as to a Quality of the Subject Matter— <i>Kennedy v The Panama, New Zealand, and Australian Royal Mail Company (Limited)</i> (1867)	190
Unilateral Mistake rarely renders a Contract Void— <i>Smith v Hughes</i> (1871)	207
Conclusions	213
8. Mistake of Identity	216
An Absence of Mistake of Identity in English Law	216
Identity Frauds: Criminal Law and the Law of Obligations	218
<i>Hardman v Booth</i> : A Turning Point	224
<i>Cundy v Lindsay</i> : The Beginning of Mistake of Identity	230
The Treatise Writers and the Development of Mistake of Identity	236
New Legislation and a Changed Judicial Approach	238
Conclusions	242

Contents

9. Mistake after Fusion	245
The Judicature Act 1873	245
Equitable Mistake in the Chancery Division of the High Court	246
The Impact of Procedural Unity upon Substantive Law	247
Reform and Perform	248
The Growing Necessity for the Mistake to be Bilateral	250
The Increasing Rigidity of Equitable Relief	252
Substantive Fusion of Mistake	254
A Reduced Ambit for Mistake in Equity	256
Common Law Mistake in the High Court	257
The Importance of <i>Bell v Lever Brothers</i>	259
The Court of Appeal	265
The House of Lords	270
The Importance of <i>Solle v Butcher</i>	278
Conclusions	290
10. Summary and Conclusions	292
Summary	292
Conclusions	299
Common Law Legal Development	299
Transplants	304
Contractual Mistake in Modern law	311
<i>Index</i>	319