
CONTENTS

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>Table of Cases</i>	xi
<i>Table of Legislation</i>	ix
1 Introduction	1
I Enrichment Liability in the Civilian Tradition	1
II Enrichment Liability in South African Law	4
III A Law of Unjustified Enrichment?	7
IV Unjust Enrichment: the Reanalysis of Enrichment by Transfer	9
V Beyond the <i>Conditiones</i>	15
VI Plan of Action	19
Part I Mistake	21
2 Mistake: Nineteenth Century	23
I Introduction	23
II <i>Condictio Indebiti</i>	25
A The Civilian Tradition	25
B Nineteenth-century South African Law	28
(i) <i>Rooth v The State</i>	28
(ii) <i>Divisional Council of Aliwal North v De Wet</i>	30
C Conclusion	33
III <i>Restitutio in Integrum</i> on Grounds of <i>Iustus Error</i>	34
A The Civilian Tradition	34
B Nineteenth-century South African Law	36
IV Restitution of Contractual Performance on Grounds of <i>Iustus Error</i>	39
A The Civilian Tradition	39
B Nineteenth-century English Law	41
(i) Mistake at Common Law	42
(ii) Mistake in Equity	43
C Nineteenth-century South African Law	46
(i) <i>Restitutio in Integrum</i> on Grounds of <i>Iustus Error</i>	46
(ii) Substantive <i>Iustus Error</i> Doctrine	51
D Modern South African Law	52
V Conclusion	54

3	Mistake Continued: Twentieth Century and Beyond	56
I	Introduction	56
II	Twentieth Century: Excusable Mistake of Fact	57
A	‘Neither Negligent nor Studied’ as a Rule of Evidence	57
B	‘Neither Negligent nor Studied’ as a Substantive Requirement	59
C	Conclusion	62
III	<i>Willis Faber Enthoven (Pty) Ltd v Receiver of Revenue</i>	62
A	Abolition of the Mistake of Law Rule	63
B	Recognition of a Universal Excusable Mistake Requirement	64
IV	Twenty-first Century: Excusable Mistake	66
V	Analysis: Excusable Mistake in South African Law	68
A	Excusable Mistake and <i>Iustus Error</i>	68
B	Two Senses of Equity	69
C	A Defence of Careless Mistake	72
	Part II Compulsion and Incapacity	77
	Introduction: Taking Stock	79
4	Compulsion	83
I	Introduction	83
II	Historical Background	84
A	Restitution of Compelled Transfers in Roman Law	84
(i)	Praetorian Remedies for <i>Metus: Restitutio in Integrum</i>	84
(ii)	<i>Condictio</i>	87
B	Restitution of Compelled Transfers in Roman-Dutch Law	89
(i)	<i>Restitutio in Integrum</i>	89
(ii)	<i>Condictio Indebiti</i> and <i>Condictio ob Turpem vel Iniustam Causam</i>	91
III	Restitution of Compelled Transfers: Nineteenth Century	92
A	<i>White Bros v Treasurer-General</i>	93
B	1883–1915	97
(i)	Clarification of the Compulsion and Protest Requirements	97
(ii)	<i>Restitutio in Integrum</i> of Contractual Performance: a Unified Approach	99
IV	Restitution of Compelled Transfers: Twentieth Century	101
A	<i>Union Government v Gowar</i>	101
(i)	Wessels AJA	102
(ii)	Innes CJ	103
(iii)	De Villiers AJA	105
(iv)	Conclusion	107
C	Impact of <i>Union Government v Gowar</i>	108

D	Mid-twentieth Century	112
E	<i>Commissioner for Inland Revenue v First National Industrial Bank Ltd</i>	115
(i)	Nienaber AJA	116
(ii)	Nicholas AJA	118
F	Restitution of Performance Tendered under Compelled Contracts	119
V	Analysis	121
A	Modern Position	121
B	Influence of <i>Restitutio in Integrum</i>	122
C	Unjust Factors and Legal Grounds	125
5	Incapacity: Minority and the Doctrine of Ultra Vires	129
I	Introduction	129
II	Historical background	131
A	Introduction	131
B	Restitution of Minors' Transfers in Roman Law	133
C	Restitution of Minors' Transfers in Roman-Dutch Law	135
D	Benefit Theory	137
III	Restitution of Minors' Transfers in South African Law	141
A	Restitution of Performance Rendered under Voidable Contracts	141
B	Restitution of Performance Rendered under Void Contracts	142
C	Analysis	149
IV	Restitution of Ultra Vires Transfers	151
A	Introduction	151
B	Twentieth Century	151
(i)	Obligation Invalid Because Ultra Vires, Transfer Effective	151
(ii)	Obligation Valid, Transfer Ineffective Because Ultra Vires	153
C	<i>Bowman, De Wet and Du Plessis NNO v Fidelity Bank Ltd</i>	156
D	Analysis	160
V	Conclusion	160
Part III	Theory	163
6	Theory: Unjust Factors or Absence of Legal Ground?	165
I	Introduction	165
II	Unjust Factors Analysis in English Law	166
III	Absence of Legal Ground Analysis	170
A	German Law	170
B	Professor Birks' Analysis	172
IV	Civilian Critique of the Unjust Factors Analysis	176
A	Contractual Performance	176

B	Extra-contractual Transfers	180
(i)	Unjust Factors Analysis Does Not Reflect the True Reasons for Restitution	180
(ii)	Duplication of Grounds of Invalidity by Unjust Factors is Uneconomical and Unnecessary	183
V	The Case for Unjust Factors	184
A	Contractual Performance	184
B	Extra-contractual Transfers	188
(i)	Deficiencies in the Objective Analysis of the <i>Leistungskondition</i>	188
(ii)	Deficiencies in the Subjective Analysis of the <i>Leistungskondition</i>	191
(iii)	Substantiation of the <i>Leistungskondition</i> Necessarily Relies on Unjust Factors	195
(iv)	Grounds of Invalidity and Unjust Factors Can Co-exist	196
VI	Unjust Factors and the Common Law Method	198
VII	A Mixed Approach	201
7	Conclusion	204
I	Unjust Enrichment in South African Law	204
A	Mistake	204
B	Compulsion	205
C	Incapacity	206
D	The Importance of Unjust Factors	206
II	In Defence of the Unjust Factors Analysis	207
III	Unjust Enrichment: the Future	208
	<i>Principal Pre-Nineteenth Century Sources</i>	213
	<i>Bibliography</i>	215
	<i>Index</i>	223