

# Principles of European Law

Study Group on a European Civil Code

## Benevolent Intervention in Another's Affairs (PEL Ben. Int.)

prepared by  
**Christian von Bar**

OXFORD

**Principles of European Law**  
Study Group on a European Civil Code

**Benevolent Intervention  
in Another's Affairs  
(PEL Ben. Int.)**

prepared by

Professor **Christian v. Bar**, Osnabrück

Chairman of the Working Team on Extra-contractual Obligations

with advice from the Advisory Council

approved by the Co-ordinating Group

Particular advice on the drafting of the Articles from

Professor **Eric Clive**, Edinburgh, and Dr. **Stephen Swann**, Osnabrück

Translation: Dr. **Stephen Swann** and Dr. **Mary-Rose McGuire**, Osnabrück

**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

© Sellier, European Law Publishers, Munich, together with  
Study Group on a European Civil Code, 2006

The moral rights of the author 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

Printed in Great Britain

on acid-free paper by

Biddles Ltd., King's Lynn

ISBN 0-19-929601-4 978-0-19-929601-9

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

### The Osnabrück Working Team

Begoña Alfonso de la Riva (Spanish Law, August 1999-August 2003), Dr. Erwin Beyesen (Belgian, French and Luxembourgian Law), Dr. Evlalia Eleftheriadou (Greek Law), Silvia Fedrizzi (Italian Law, August 1999-October 2000), Dr. Andreas Fötschl (Austrian Law, August 1999-April 2005), Dr. Caterina Gozzi (Italian Law, since February 2001), Lodewijk Gualthérie van Weezel (Dutch Law, February 2001-August 2002), Annamaria Herpai (Hungarian Law, since October 2003), Dr. Matthias Hünert (German Law), Stefan Kettler (Irish Law, November 1999-August 2001), Ina El Kobbia (Scottish Law; organisation and minutes for the Co-ordinating Group and the Advisory Council), Dr. María Ángeles Martín Vida (Spanish Law, since September 2003), Dr. Mary-Rose McGuire (translation, since May 2004), Franz Nieper (Dutch Law, November 1999-October 2000), Rosalie Koolhoven (Dutch Law, since March 2003), José Carlos de Medeiros Nóbrega (Portuguese Law), Sandra Rohlfing (Working Team rapporteur), Johan Sandstedt (Nordic Laws, since April 2001), Mårten Schultz (Nordic Laws, January 2000-March 2001) and Dr. Stephen Swann (Common Law).

### The Advisory Council on Unjustified Enrichment Law and the Law on Benevolent Intervention in Another's Affairs

Professor Eric Clive (Edinburgh), Professor Júlio Manuel Vieira Gomes (Oporto), Justitierådet Professor Torgny Håstad (Stockholm), Professor Ewan McKendrick (Oxford), Professor Peter Schlechtriem (Freiburg i. Br.) and Dr. Kristina Siig (Aarhus).

### The Co-ordinating Group

Professor Guido Alpa (Genua/Rome), Professor Kaspars Balodis (Riga, since December 2004), Professor Christian v. Bar (Osnabrück), Professor Maurits Barendrecht (Tilburg), Professor Hugh Beale (London), Professor Michael Joachim Bonell (Rome), Professor Mifsud G. Bonnici (Valetta, since December 2004), Professor Carlo Castronovo (Milan), Professor Eric Clive (Edinburgh), Professor Ulrich Drobnig (Hamburg), Professor Bénédicte Fauvarque-Cosson (Paris), Professor Marcel Fontaine (Leuven, until December 2003), Professor Andreas Furrer (Luzern, since December 2003), Professor Jacques Ghestin (Paris), Professor Sir Roy Goode (Oxford, until December 2002), Professor Viggo Hagstrøm (Oslo, since June 2002), Professor Arthur Hartkamp (The Hague), Justitierådet Professor Torgny Håstad (Stockholm), Professor Johnny Herre (Stockholm), Professor Martijn Hesselink (Amsterdam), Professor Ewoud Hondius (Utrecht), Professor Giovanni Iudica (Milan, since June 2004), Professor Konstantinos Kerameus (Athens), Professor Ole Lando (Copenhagen), Professor Kåre Lilleholt (Bergen, since June 2003), Professor Brigitta Lurger (Graz), Professor Hector MacQueen (Edinburgh), Professor Denis Mazeaud (Paris, since June 2005), Professor Ewan McKendrick (Oxford), Professor Valentinas Mikelenas (Vilnius, since December 2004), Dr. Niamh Moloney (Belfast, since December 2003), Professor Eoin O'Dell (Dublin), Professor Edgar du Perron (Amsterdam), Professor Denis Philippe (Leuven, since June 2004), Professor Johannes Rainer (Salzburg), Professor Jerzy Rajski (Warsaw), Professor Christina Ramberg (Gothenburg), Professor Philippe Rémy (Poitiers), Judge Professor Encarna Roca y Trias (Madrid/Barcelona), Professor Peter Schlechtriem (Freiburg i. Br.), Professor Martin Schmidt-Kessel (Osnabrück, since December 2004), Professor Jorge Sinde Monteiro (Coimbra), Professor Lena Sisula-Tulokas (Helsinki), Professor Sophie Stijns (Leuven), Professor Matthias Storme (Leuven), Professor Jan Svidron (Trnava, since June 2005), Dr. Stephen Swann (Osnabrück),

Professor *Luboš Tichý* (Prague, since June 2005), Professor *Verica Trstenjak* (Maribor), Professor *Paul Varul* (Tartu, since June 2003), Professor *Lajos Vékás* (Budapest), Professor *Anna Veneziano* (Rome).

#### **Further Members of the Study Group's Advisory Councils**

Professor *John W. Blackie* (Strathclyde, Tort Law), Professor *Michael G. Bridge* (London, Property Law and Securities), Professor *Angel Carrasco* (Toledo, Securities), Professor *Pierre Crocq* (Paris, Securities), Dr. *Eugenie Dacoronia* (Athens, Tort Law and Renting Contracts), Professor *Marie Goré* (Paris, Structure), Professor *Helmut Grothe* (Berlin, Renting Contracts), Professor *Jérôme Huet* (Paris, Sales, Services, Agency, Franchise and Distribution Contracts), Professor *Jan Kleineman* (Stockholm, Tort Law), Docent Dr. *Irene Kull* (Tartu, Renting Contracts), Professor *Guillermo Palao Moreno* (Valencia, Tort Law), Professor *Antoni Vaquer Aloy* (Lleida, Renting Contracts), Professor *Alain Verbeke* (Leuven, Renting Contracts), Professor *Anders Victorin* (Stockholm, Renting Contracts), Professor *Sarah Worthington* (London, Renting Contracts).

## Volume 1

To be cited as: PEL/*von Bar*, Ben Int, Introduction, A, 1

PEL/*von Bar*, Ben Int, Chapter I, Article 1: 101, Comments, A, 1

PEL/*von Bar*, Ben Int, Chapter I, Article 1: 101, Notes, I, 1

## Foreword

The Study Group on a European Civil Code has taken upon itself the task of drafting common European principles for the most important aspects of the law of obligations and for certain parts of the law of property in movables which are especially relevant for the functioning of the common market. It was founded in 1999 as a successor body to the Commission on European Contract Law, on whose work the Study Group is building.

The two groups pursue identical aims. However, the Study Group has a more far-reaching focus in terms of subject-matter and as an ultimate goal it aspires to a consolidated composite text of the material worked out by itself and the Commission on European Contract Law. Both groups have undertaken to ascertain and formulate European standards of 'patrimonial' law for the Member States of the European Union. The Commission on European Contract has already achieved this for the field of general contract law (*Lando and Beale* [eds.], *Principles of European Contract Law*, Parts I and II combined and revised, The Hague, 2000; *Lando/Clive/Prüm/Zimmermann* [eds.], *Principles of European Contract Law Part III*, The Hague, 2003). These Principles of European Contract Law (PECL) are being adopted by the Study Group on a European Civil Code with adjustments taking account of new developments and input from its research partners. The Study Group is dovetailing its principles with those of the PECL, extending their encapsulation of standards of patrimonial law in three directions: (i) by developing rules for specific types of contracts; (ii) by developing rules for extra-contractual obligations, i. e. the law of tort/delict, the law of unjustified enrichment, and the law of benevolent intervention in another's affairs (*negotiorum gestio*); and (iii) by developing rules for fundamental questions in the law on mobile assets – in particular transfer of ownership and security for credit.

Like the Commission on European Contract Law's Principles of European Contract Law, the results of the research conducted by the Study Group on a European Civil Code seek to advance the process of Europeanisation of private law. We have undertaken this endeavour on our own personal initiative and merely present the results of a pan-European research project. It is a study in comparative law in so far as we have always taken care to identify the legal position in the Member States of the European Union and to set out the results of this research in the introductions and notes. That of course does not mean that we have only been concerned with documenting the pool of shared legal values or that we simply adopted the majority position among the legal systems where common ground was missing. Rather we have consistently striven to draw up "sound and fitting" principles, that is to say, we have also recurrently developed proposals and concepts for the further development of private law in Europe.

The working methods of the Commission on European Contract Law and the Study Group on a European Civil Code are or were likewise quite similar. The Study Group, however, has had the benefit of Working (or Research) Teams – groups of younger legal scholars under the supervision of a senior member of the Group (a Team Leader) which undertook the basic comparative legal research, developed the drafts for discussion and

assembled the extensive material required for the notes. Furthermore, to each Working Team was allocated a consultative body – an Advisory Council. These bodies – deliberately kept small in the interests of efficiency – were formed from leading experts in the relevant field of law who are representative of the major European legal systems. The proposals drafted by the Working Teams and critically scrutinised and improved in a series of meetings by the respective Advisory Council were submitted for discussion on a revolving basis to the actual decision-making body of the Study Group on a European Civil Code, the Co-ordinating Group. Until June 2004 the Co-ordinating Group consisted of representatives from all the jurisdictions belonging to the EU immediately prior to its enlargement in Spring 2004 and in addition legal scholars from Estonia, Hungary, Norway, Poland, Slovenia and Switzerland. Representatives from the Czech Republic, Malta, Latvia, Lithuania and the Slovak Republic joined us after the June meeting 2004 in Warsaw. However, due to reasons of time and capacity, it was only occasionally possible to summarise in the notes the current legal position in the new Member States of the EU. We are keen to fill the outstanding gaps (of which we are only too painfully aware) at a later point in time.

Besides its permanent members, other participants in the Co-ordinating Group with voting rights included all the Team Leaders and – when the relevant material was up for discussion – the members of the Advisory Council concerned. The results of the deliberations during the week-long sitting of the Co-ordinating Group were incorporated into the text of the articles and the commentaries which returned to the agenda for the next meeting of the Co-ordinating Group (or the next but one depending on the work load of the the Group and the Team affected). Each part of the project was the subject of debate on manifold occasions, some stretching over many years. Where a unanimous opinion could not be achieved, majority votes were taken. As far as possible the Articles drafted in English were translated into the other languages either by members of the Team or third parties commissioned for the purpose. The number of languages into which the Articles could be translated admittedly varies considerably from volume to volume. That is in part a consequence of the fact that not all Working Teams were equipped with the same measure of financial support. We also had to resign ourselves to the absence of a perfectly uniform editorial style. Our editing guidelines provided a common basis for scholarly publication, but at the margin had to accommodate preferences of individual teams. However, this should not cause the reader any problems in comprehension.

Work on these Principles had begun long before the European Commission published its Communication on European Contract Law (in 2001), its Action Plan for a more coherent European contract law (in 2003), and its follow-up Communication “European Contract Law and the revision of the *acquis*: the way forward” (in 2004). (All of these documents concerning European contract law are available on the Commission’s website: [http://europe.eu.int/comm/consumers/cons\\_int/safe\\_shop/fair\\_bus\\_pract/cont\\_law/index\\_en.htm](http://europe.eu.int/comm/consumers/cons_int/safe_shop/fair_bus_pract/cont_law/index_en.htm)). These documents for their part were published before we formed the Network of Excellence, together with other European research groups and institutions, which will collaborate in the preparation of an academic Common Frame of Reference with the support of funds from the European Community’s Sixth Framework Programme. The texts laid before the public by the Study Group on a European Civil Code are therefore not necessarily identical with those which the Network of Excellence will propose to the European Commission for adoption in the



Common Frame of Reference. Rather they represent for the time being texts which the Study Group considers should serve as the starting point for the comprehensive process of discussion and consultation envisaged for the coming years. Whether that process will require any changes to our texts (and, if so, which changes) is something which will have to be weighed up carefully in a spirit of academic independence after a review of the arguments. The political domain can then determine at a later date which of our proposals, if any, it wishes to take up.

In order to leave no room for misunderstanding, it is important to stress that these Principles have been prepared by impartial and independent-minded scholars whose sole interest has been a devotion to the subject-matter. None of us have been rewarded for taking part or mandated to do so. None of us would want to give the impression that we claim any political legitimisation for promoting harmonisation of the law. Our legitimisation is confined to curiosity and an interest in Europe. In other words, the volumes in this series are to be understood exclusively as the results of scholarly legal research within large international teams. Like every other scholarly legal work, they restate the current law and introduce possible models for its further development; no less, but also no more. We are not a homogenous group whose every member is an advocate of the idea of a European Civil Code. We are, after all, only a *Study Group*. The question whether a European Civil Code is or is not desirable is a political one to which each member can only express an individual view.

Osnabrück, November 2005

*Christian v. Bar*

## Our Sponsors

The project of the Study Group on a European Civil Code represents a research endeavour in legal science of extraordinary magnitude. Without the generous financial support of many organisations its realisation would not have been possible.

Our thanks go first of all to the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft* (DFG), which has supplied the lion's share of the financing including the salaries of the Working Teams based in Germany and the direct travel costs for the meetings of the Coordinating Group and the numerous Advisory Councils. The work of the Dutch Working Teams was financed by the *Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* (NWO) and by the *Universiteit van Amsterdam*. Further personnel costs were met by the Flemish *Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek-Vlaanderen* (FWO), the Onassis-Foundation, the Austrian *Fonds zur Förderung der wissenschaftlichen Forschung* and the *Fundação Calouste Gulbenkian*.

In addition we have consistently been able to fall back on funds made available to the respective organisers of the week long sittings of the Coordinating Group by the relevant university or other sources within the country concerned. It is therefore with the deepest gratitude that I must also mention the *Consiglio nazionale forense* (Rome) and the *Istituto di diritto privato* of the *Università di Roma La Sapienza*, which co-financed the meeting in Rome (June 2000). The session in Salzburg (December 2000) was supported by the Austrian *Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft und Kultur*, the *Universität Salzburg* and the *Institut für Rechtspolitik* of the *Universität Salzburg*. The discussions in Stockholm (June 2001) were assisted by the *Department of Law, Stockholm University*, the *Supreme Court Justice Edward Cassel's Foundation* and *Stiftelsen Juridisk Fakultetslitteratur* (SJF). The meeting in Oxford (December 2001) had the support of *Shearman & Sterling*, the *Hulme Trust*, *Berwin Leighton Paisner* and the *Oxford University Press* (OUP). The session in Valencia (June 2002) was made possible by the *Asociación Nacional de Registradores de la Propiedad, Mercantil y Bienes Muebles*, the *Universitat de València*, the *Ministerio Español de Ciencia y Tecnología*, the *Facultad de Derecho* of the *Universitat de València*, the *Departamento de Derecho Internacional*, *Departamento de Derecho Civil* and the *Departamento de Derecho Mercantil "Manuel Broseta Pont"* of the *Universitat de València*, the law firm *Cuatrecasas*, the *Generalitat Valenciana*, the *Corts Valencianes*, the *Diputació Provincial de Valencia*, the *Ayuntamiento de Valencia*, the *Colegio de Abogados de Valencia* and *Aranzadi Publishing Company*. The subsequent meeting in Oporto (December 2002) was substantially assisted by the *Universidade Católica Portuguesa – Centro Regional do Porto*. For the week long session in Helsinki (June 2003) we were able to rely on funds from *Suomen Kulttuurirahasto* (Finnish Cultural Foundation), the *Niilo Helanderin Säätiö* (Niilo Helander Foundation), the *Suomalainen Lakimeisyydistys* (Finnish Lawyers Association), the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry for Foreign Affairs, the *Nordea Bank*, *Roschier Holmberg Attorneys Ltd.*, *Hannes Snellman Attorneys Ltd.*, the *Department of Private Law* and the *Institute of International Commercial Law* (KATTI) of Helsinki University. The session in Leuven (December 2003) was supported by *Katholieke Universiteit Leuven*, *Faculteit Rechtsgeleerdheid*, and the FWO

*Vlaanderen Fonds voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek* (Flanders Scientific Research Fund). The meeting of the Group in Warsaw (June 2004) was substantially assisted by the *Fundacja Fundusz Wspolpracy* (The Cooperation Fund) and the Faculty of Law and Administration of Warsaw University. The meeting in Milan (December 2004) was supported by the *Università Bocconi* and its *Istituto di diritto comparato*, by the *Milan Camera di Commercio*, by the *Associazione Civilisti Italiani* and by the *Comune di Milano*. The meeting in Berlin (June 2005) was made possible by *PricewaterhouseCoopers Deutschland AG*, Frankfurt/Berlin, *Sievert AG & Co.*, Osnabrück, by *Deutscher Sparkassen- und Giroverband*, Berlin, and by *Verband deutscher Hypothekenbanken e. V.*, Berlin. We thank all of these organisations and institutions for the funds which they made available to us and for the extraordinary warmth of hospitality with which our hosts received us.

## Preface to this volume

The following text on the law of (justified) benevolent intervention in another's affairs, hereby presented to the interested public, has been deliberated by the Co-ordinating Group of the Study Group on a European Civil Code during its week-long meetings in Utrecht (December 1999), Rome (June 2000), Stockholm (June 2001) and finally in Valencia (June 2002). (Whereas the meetings in Salzburg (December 2000) and Oxford (December 2001) were not dedicated to this matter). In preparation of the respective meetings thorough deliberations with the Advisory Council of the Working Team have taken place. This Working Team in turn has under my supervision composed the first draft of these Principles and has integrated the amendments which had been proposed by the different councils and in some instances had been decided by vote. On this basis I have drawn up the comparative introduction, the comments and the notes. The material for this work again had been provided by the Members of the Osnabrück Working Team. They have carried the main burden of this research endeavour; without their contribution this Book could not have been realized.

Perhaps it may not appear as the most fortunate choice that one of the first publications of the Study Group on a European Civil Code of all subjects is dedicated to the law of benevolent intervention in another's affairs (*negotiorum gestio*). For it concerns a subject matter which accounts for a comparatively small area of law and which in addition from a systematic viewpoint is not even recognised as a separate private law concept under the Common Law. However, the work on this project could be concluded earlier than that of others and it did not seem appropriate to artificially hold back the results until all other parts of the project similarly have reached a stage for publication.

Legislation, case law and doctrine have been stated as of January 2005. Shortly before publication this text was circulated to stakeholders under the CFR net exercise as part of the European Commission's contract law programme.

Osnabrück, November 2005

Christian v. Bar

## Short Table of Contents

Text of Articles	3
Principles of European Law on Benevolent Intervention in Another's Affairs	
Introduction	53
<b>Chapter 1: Scope of Application</b>	
Article 1:101: Intervention to Benefit Another	101
Article 1:102: Intervention to Perform Another's Duty	173
Article 1:103: Exclusions	186
<b>Chapter 2: Duties of Intervener</b>	
Article 2:101: Duties during Intervention	211
Article 2:102: Duties after Intervention	229
Article 2:103: Reparation for Damage Caused by Breach of Duty	242
<b>Chapter 3: Rights and Authority of Intervener</b>	
Article 3:101: Right to Indemnification or Reimbursement	257
Article 3:102: Right to Remuneration	268
Article 3:103: Right to Reparation	276
Article 3:104: Reduction or Exclusion of Intervener's Rights	284
Article 3:105: Obligation of Third Party to Indemnify or Reimburse the Principal	294
Article 3:106: Authority of Intervener to Act in the Name of the Principal	297
Annexes	309

## Table of Contents

Foreword	IX
Our Sponsors	XIII
Preface to this volume	XV
Text of Articles	
English <b>Benevolent Intervention in Another's Affairs</b>	3
Danish <b>Godgørende indgriben i en andens anliggender</b>	6
Dutch <b>Zaakwaarneming</b>	9
Estonian <b>Käsundita Asjaajamine</b>	12
Finnish <b>Asiainhuolto</b>	15
French <b>Gestion d'affaires d'autrui</b>	18
German <b>Besorgung fremder Angelegenheiten</b>	21
Greek <b>Διοίκηση αλλοτρίων</b>	24
Hungarian <b>Megbízás nélküli ügyvitel</b>	27
Italian <b>Gestione d'Affari Altrui</b>	30

Latvian	33
Neuzdota lietvedība	
Lithuanian	36
Kito Asmens Reikalų Tvarkymas to Asmens Interesais	
Portuguese	39
Gestão de Assuntos Alheios	
Slovenian	42
Poslovodstvo Tujih Zadev	
Spanish	45
Gestión De Asuntos Ajenos	
Swedish	48
Tjänster Utan Uppdrag	

## Principles of European Law on Benevolent Intervention in Another's Affairs

### Introduction

#### A. General

1. Legal obligations complementary to contract law and tort law	53
2. Traditional Latin nomenclature	53
3. An English term for <i>negotiorum gestio</i>	53
4. Problems of traditional terminology in the other languages of the EU	54
5. The concept of benevolent intervention in another's affairs	54
6. The spread of the concept of <i>negotiorum gestio</i> in the continental jurisdictions of the EU	54
7. Scotland and Scandinavia	55
8. England and Ireland	55
9. <i>Negotiorum gestio</i> and the doctrine of quasi-contracts	55
10. Quasi-contracts and the Common Law	56

#### B. The Sources of Law on Benevolent Intervention in Another's Affairs (*negotiorum gestio*) in the Codified Systems of the EU

11. The sources in overview	56
12. The location of <i>negotiorum gestio</i> within the overall private law system	56
13. The essential content of the rules	57
14. Fixing the scope of application (definition)	57
15. Provisions on the persons brought together in the legal relationship	58
16. Indirect clarifications	58
17. Clarification of the intervener's duties	59

18.	Duty of care	59
19.	Duty to continue the intervention	59
20.	Informing the principal	59
21.	Giving an account and surrender of proceeds	59
22.	Clarification of the intervener's rights	60
23.	Reimbursement of expenditure	60
24.	Further claims which are expressly governed	60
25.	Intervener's power of representation	61
C.	Provisions in the Codifications concerning (i) Benevolent, but Official Intervention and (ii) Management of Another's Affairs for One's Own Benefit	
26.	Restriction of the law on <i>negotiorum gestio</i> to justified management of another's affairs	61
27.	Inclusion of unjustified management of another's affairs	62
28.	Arrogated management of another's affairs	62
29.	Management of another's affair in the mistaken belief it is one's own	63
D.	'Applied' <i>Negotiorum Gestio</i>	
30.	General	64
31.	Manifestations	64
32.	Family and inheritance law	64
33.	Property law	65
34.	Right of recourse	65
35.	Contract law	66
36.	Further examples	67
37.	<i>Convention d'assistance</i>	67
38.	Emergency medical treatment	68
E.	The Range of Activities within the Scope of the Law on <i>negotiorum gestio</i>	
39.	General	68
40.	Juridical acts and mere conduct	69
41.	Conduct for the protection of a person	69
42.	Acts contrary to law or <i>bonos mores</i>	70
43.	Long-term measures and omissions	70
F.	The Position of the Law of Benevolent Intervention within the Legal System	
44.	The subsidiarity of the law of benevolent intervention: general	70
45.	The relationship to contract law	71
46.	The relationship to tort law	71
47.	The relationship to the law of unjustified enrichment	72
G.	The Practical Relevance of the Law of Benevolent Intervention in the Codified Systems of Continental Europe	
48.	Different starting points	73
49.	Empirical material	73
50.	Social relevance	73



H.	Scotland	
51.	<i>Negotiorum gestio</i> a recognised institution	73
52.	Agency of necessity	74
I.	Scandinavia	
53.	General	74
54.	Specific basis and reasoning by analogy	74
55.	Commercial Code Ch. 18 § 10 and Scandinavian consumer protection statutes	75
56.	Further examples of rules which may serve as a basis for analogy	75
57.	Power of representation between spouses	77
J.	England and Ireland	
58.	The lack of a discrete concept of a legal relationship arising from benevolent intervention in another's affair	77
59.	Exceptions from the general rule that expenses incurred for the interest of another are not compensable if there is no underlying duty to perform	78
60.	Statute law	78
61.	Trust law	78
62.	The instruments of Common Law	78
63.	Gratuitous agents	79
64.	The duties of an agent	79
65.	Agency by agreement and agency by ratification	80
66.	Agency of necessity	80
67.	Necessity	81
68.	Restriction of the scope of application to specific categories of cases	82
69.	Matters of carriage	82
70.	Excess of authority	83
71.	Bailment	84
72.	The legal position of the bailee	85
73.	Unjustified enrichment	86
74.	<i>Quantum meruit</i>	86
75.	Relation to the law of <i>negotiorum gestio</i>	86
76.	Money paid to the defendant's use	87
K.	International law and European law	
77.	Admiralty law	88
78.	Salvage	88
79.	General average	88
80.	European Community law	89
L.	The Basic Tenor of the Following Principles	
81.	A unitary approach	89
82.	Necessary amendments of contract and unjustified enrichment law	90
83.	Incentive to act out of neighbourly solidarity	90