

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	vii
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	xi
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xxiii

Introduction	1
---------------------------	---

PART I. FOUNDATIONS

Chapter 1. Method	13
1. Comparative Private International Law in the European Union	14
1.1. Comparative Private International Law	14
1.2. Comparative Law in the European Union	17
1.2.1. European Legal Scholarship: Comparative Scholarship	17
1.2.1.1. The Example of the US-American Common Law	19
1.2.1.2. <i>Ius Commune</i>	19
1.2.2. The European Union Courts as Comparative Institutions	23
2. The Comparative Approach in Detail	26
2.1. The Four Steps of a Traditional Comparative Analysis	26
2.2. The Steps Undertaken in this Book	28
2.2.1. The Research Question and the Legal Systems at Issue	28
2.2.1.1. A Focus on Concepts (but still Functionalism)	28
2.2.1.2. Inclusion of All Member States	30
2.2.2. The Descriptive Stage	31
2.2.3. Establishment of a Framework	31
2.2.4. External Standards of Law and Policy	32
3. Potential Pitfalls	32
3.1. "Post-Modern" Challenges to Traditional Comparative Law	33
3.1.1. Western Focus	34
3.1.2. Bias	34
3.1.3. "Legocentrism"	36

3.2.	Functionalism and Unification.....	36
3.3.	The Availability and Reliability of Primary and Secondary Sources.....	37
3.4.	The Choice of the English Language.....	38
Chapter 2. Material.....		41
1.	Domestic Private International Law.....	41
1.1.	Scope of the Overview.....	41
1.1.1.	A (Limited) Reliance on Words.....	42
1.1.2.	National Private International Law as an Object of Analysis.....	43
1.1.2.1.	The Continuing Relevance of National Law.....	43
1.1.2.2.	Denmark, Ireland, and the UK.....	45
1.1.2.3.	The Relevance of National Law for Present Purposes.....	46
1.2.	Member States without Private International Law “Codes”.....	46
1.2.1.	Common Law Countries.....	46
1.2.2.	France.....	51
1.2.3.	Luxembourg.....	53
1.2.4.	The Nordic Member States.....	53
1.3.	Member States with Private International Law Codes.....	55
1.3.1.	Stand-Alone Codes of Private International Law Only.....	56
1.3.2.	Private International Law as Part of a Member State’s Civil Code.....	58
1.3.2.1.	“General Provisions” with a Formal Section of Their Own.....	58
1.3.2.2.	“General Provisions” without a Formal Section of Their Own.....	66
1.3.3.	Codes on Both Private International Law and Procedural Issues.....	68
1.4.	Provisional Summary.....	74
1.4.1.	Private International Law Codes: A Majority Position.....	74
1.4.2.	Jurisdiction and Effects of Foreign Decisions.....	75
1.4.3.	A Formally Separate Section for General Provisions (in Most Cases).....	76
1.4.4.	Placement of General Provisions.....	77
1.4.5.	The Newer, the Bigger.....	77
1.4.6.	“New” Issues Tackled.....	77
1.4.7.	A Tendency of Uniformity Regarding the Scope.....	78

2. European Union Private International Law	78
2.1. Legislation	78
2.1.1. Conceptual Observations	78
2.1.2. Resulting Problems	80
2.1.2.1. Redundancy: The Public Policy Exception	81
2.1.2.2. Legal Uncertainty Through Divergence: Overriding Mandatory Provisions	82
2.1.2.3. Legal Uncertainty Through Silence: Incidental Questions	82
2.2. European Union Private International Law Scholarship	83
2.3. Provisional Summary	85

PART II. APPROACHES

Chapter 3. The Formal Approach	89
1. Developing the Formal Approach	90
1.1. "Formally General" vs. "Formally General in the Strict Sense"	90
1.2. The Tripartite Structure of Conflicts Rules	90
1.3. Overview	92
2. The Subject Matter	93
2.1. The Mandatory Application of Conflicts Rules	93
2.1.1. Member States	94
2.1.2. European Union	94
2.1.2.1. European Union Limitations on National Rules of Procedure	94
2.1.2.2. The Mandatory Nature of European Union Private International Law	97
2.1.2.3. Conclusion	102
2.2. The Scope of Application	102
2.2.1. Requirement of an International Element?	103
2.2.2. Scope of Application <i>Ratione Materiae</i>	108
2.2.3. Scope of Application <i>Ratione Temporis</i> /Change in the Applicable Conflicts Rules	109
2.2.4. Scope of Application <i>Ratione Personae</i>	110
2.3. The Hierarchy of Instruments of Private International Law	111
2.4. Characterisation	113
2.5. The Incidental Question	121
2.5.1. Terminology: The Preferability of "Incidental" Question	121
2.5.2. A Formally General Question of the Subject Matter	122

2.5.3.	Similar Phenomena.	123
2.5.4.	Member States.	124
2.5.5.	European Union.	126
2.5.5.1.	Terminological Confusion.	126
2.5.5.2.	A Uniform Solution Through Interpretation?	127
2.6.	The Collateral Question.	130
2.7.	Addendum: <i>Dépeçage</i>	132
2.8.	Specific Conflicts Rules.	134
2.9.	Special Conflicts Rules: Overriding Mandatory Provisions.	135
2.9.1.	“Special”, Not Necessarily “Specific”.	138
2.9.2.	A Formally General Issue of the Subject Matter.	139
2.9.2.1.	Overriding Mandatory Provisions as an Escape Device?	140
2.9.2.2.	Overriding Mandatory Provisions as an Issue of Public Policy?	141
2.9.2.3.	Substantive Solutions as a Counterargument?	143
2.9.2.4.	Conclusion.	143
2.9.3.	Preliminary Inferences from the Nature of the Problem.	144
2.9.3.1.	Overriding Mandatory Provisions by the Private International Law Legislator.	144
2.9.3.2.	Overriding Mandatory Provisions by Another Legislator.	144
2.9.3.3.	Overriding Mandatory Provisions and Party Autonomy.	146
2.9.3.4.	A “Victory for Unilateralism”?	147
2.9.3.5.	Establishing Overriding Mandatory Provisions.	149
2.9.4.	Member States.	149
2.9.5.	European Union.	151
2.9.5.1.	Rome I.	151
2.9.5.2.	Rome II.	152
2.9.5.3.	Rome III.	153
2.9.5.4.	The Succession Regulation.	157
2.9.5.5.	The M-Property Regulation and the RP-Property Regulation.	158
2.9.5.6.	Who Makes the Conflicts Decision?	158
2.9.5.7.	Application of Overriding Mandatory Provisions of the European Union.	161
2.9.5.8.	No Obligation to Apply Overriding Mandatory Provisions of Other Member States.	163

2.10. Subsidiary Conflicts Rules	165
2.10.1. Member States	165
2.10.2. European Union	166
3. The Special Case of Evasion of the Law	169
3.1. Terminology	169
3.2. An Issue Concerning the Subject Matter or the Connecting Factor	170
3.3. Further Questions of the Correct Definition	172
3.4. Evasion of the Law and Public Policy	173
3.5. "Evasion" and "Abuse"	174
3.6. Prevention of Evasion of the Law	175
3.7. Member States	176
3.7.1. Pertinent Provisions in the Member States	176
3.7.2. Further Positions on Evasion of the Law	178
3.8. European Union	180
4. The Connecting Factor	182
4.1. The Existence of a More Appropriate Connecting Factor	183
4.2. Change of the Connecting Factor (Change of the Applicable Law, <i>Conflit Mobile</i>)	187
4.2.1. Member States	189
4.2.2. European Union	190
4.2.2.1. Rome I	190
4.2.2.2. Rome II	191
4.2.2.3. The Other Four Regulations	193
4.2.2.4. Summary	194
4.3. Party Autonomy	194
4.3.1. The Rise of Party Autonomy	194
4.3.2. Party Autonomy as a Formally General Issue	197
4.3.3. Member States	199
4.3.4. European Union	200
4.3.5. Party Autonomy and <i>Renvoi</i> : An Issue of Limitation	202
4.3.6. Party Autonomy and Non-Unified Legal Systems: Another Issue of Limitation	203
4.4. Nationality	204
4.4.1. Member States	204
4.4.1.1. The Determination of Nationality	204
4.4.1.2. Multiple Nationalities	206
4.4.1.3. Statelessness	212
4.4.1.4. Refugees	213
4.4.1.5. The Common Law Tradition and the French Tradition	215

4.4.2.	European Union	216
4.4.2.1.	No General Rule in Rome I or Rome II	216
4.4.2.2.	No General Rule in Rome III	217
4.4.2.3.	No General Rule in the M-Property Regulation and the RP-Property Regulation	218
4.4.2.4.	General Rules in the Succession Regulation?	219
4.4.2.5.	Conclusion	220
4.5.	(Habitual) Residence and Domicile.	221
4.5.1.	Member States	221
4.5.2.	European Union	223
4.5.2.1.	Rome I and Rome II	224
4.5.2.2.	The Succession Regulation	225
4.5.2.3.	Rome III, the M-Property Regulation, and the RP-Property Regulation	225
4.5.2.4.	A Definition of Habitual Residence for All Regulations?	226
5.	The Governing Law	228
5.1.	The Ambit of Potentially Applicable Laws/Reciprocity	229
5.2.	Non-Unified Legal Systems.	231
5.3.	The Ascertainment and Application of Foreign Law.	236
5.3.1.	The Questions as Formally General Issues of Private International Law	237
5.3.2.	Member States	239
5.3.2.1.	General Rules	239
5.3.2.2.	Review of the Application of Foreign Law and European Union Law	241
5.3.3.	European Union	242
5.3.3.1.	Ascertainment and Application of Foreign Law: Left to the Member States	242
5.3.3.2.	First Caveat: Equivalence and the Ascertainment of Foreign Law	244
5.3.3.3.	Second Caveat: Effectiveness and the Ascertainment of Foreign Law	245
5.3.3.4.	Third Caveat: Impossibility of the Ascertainment of Foreign Law	245
5.4.	Change of the <i>Lex Causae</i>	247
5.4.1.	A Lack of Formally General <i>Statutory</i> Solutions	247
5.4.2.	The Formally Generally <i>Accepted</i> Solution	248
5.5.	<i>Renvoi</i>	248
5.5.1.	Structural and Terminological Observations	249
5.5.2.	Member States	251
5.5.3.	European Union	251
5.5.4.	Excursus: Four Models of How to Deal with <i>Renvoi</i>	252

1.5.	Competence to Make a (General) Private International Law Regulation	309
1.6.	Competence to Make Provisions on Certain General Issues	309
1.6.1.	The Basic Answer	309
1.6.2.	Special Cases	310
2.	Legislative Procedure	312
2.1.	Two Different Legislative Procedures for Private International Law	312
2.2.	Doubts as to the Usefulness of the Passerelle Clause	313
2.3.	A Hybrid Procedure: Combining Article 81(2) and (3) TFEU	314
2.4.	The Resulting Dilemma – and Possible Remedies	315
2.4.1.	Two Regulations	315
2.4.2.	Reference <i>to</i> , not <i>by</i> the General Regulation	315
2.4.3.	Reference in Part to and in Part by the General Regulation	317
2.4.4.	A Model Regulation	317
3.	Summary	318
	Chapter 6. Policy	319
1.	Legislators, Scholars, Teachers: Another Tripartite Distinction	319
2.	The Legislative Solution	320
2.1.	“General Provisions” vs. “General Part”	320
2.1.1.	The Link to the Idea of Codification	321
2.1.2.	Legislative Techniques: Compilation, Insertion, Repetition	322
2.2.	Compatibility with Domestic Preconceptions about Law	322
2.2.1.	An Alien Structure?	322
2.2.2.	Conceptual Parallels in Criminal Law	323
2.2.3.	Summary	325
2.3.	Clarity, Coherence, and Elimination of Redundancies	325
2.3.1.	Clarity	325
2.3.1.1.	The Critique of Comprehensibility/Accessibility	326
2.3.1.2.	Two Ripostes	326
2.3.2.	Coherence and Legal Certainty	329
2.3.2.1.	<i>De Lege Lata</i>	329
2.3.2.2.	The Critique of “One Size Does Not Fit All”	331
2.3.2.3.	The “Correct” Point in Time	332
2.3.2.4.	Sufficient Coherence Through Interpretation?	334
2.3.2.5.	No Panacea	334
2.3.3.	Elimination of Redundancies	335

2.4.	The “Educational” Function of General Provisions.	336
2.4.1.	The “International Element” in Particular.	337
2.4.2.	General Provisions as a Tool for the Legislator Itself.	337
2.5.	Uniform Legislation and Legal Uniformity	338
2.6.	General Issues as a Suitable Object of Legislative Activity.	339
2.6.1.	The General Objection Refuted	339
2.6.2.	The More Nuanced Objection.	340
2.7.	The European Union as a Suitable Legislator for General Provisions	341
2.7.1.	Systematic Legislation at the Domestic and European Union Levels	342
2.7.2.	Support from Experts.	343
3.	European Union Private International Law without General Provisions.	344
3.1.	No Recourse to General Rules of Domestic Private International Law.	345
3.2.	Judicial Solutions	345
3.2.1.	Common European Case Law?	345
3.2.2.	General Solutions from the Court of Justice?	347
3.2.2.1.	Jurisdiction for the Authoritative Interpretation of EU Private International Law	347
3.2.2.2.	The Scope of Decisions	348
3.2.2.3.	The Quality of Decisions.	349
3.3.	Support by Private Stakeholders.	350
4.	Summary	351
	Conclusion	353
	<i>Bibliography.</i>	<i>365</i>
	<i>Index.</i>	<i>411</i>