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**Summary**

Unfair terms control is a landmark of contemporary European contract laws. How we talk about it is important to our general understanding of contract law – and arguably beyond that. Over the past decades, a very prominent debate has emerged around the so-called Unfair Terms Directive of 1993, which has harmonised the control of *non-negotiated terms in consumer contracts* across the European Union. Much attention in this context has been devoted to the *justifications* of unfair terms control. This discussion has gradually turned away from the various national paths of doctrinal discussion and has focussed on the *regulatory* features of judicial control: the elimination of market failures and, less convincingly, the advancement of social justice or consumer interests have become staple arguments and benchmarks for criticism or normative contributions. This broad engagement with ultra-individual effects has been termed regulatory *rationality*: a matter of questions asked, not of answers given. The *question* of what basic contractual justice requires between the parties involved in the concerned exchanges has lost centrality, increasingly to the advantage of arguments apparently unconcerned with justice writ large.

This dissertation attempts to partially refocus the debate on unfair terms control, exploring the contribution that the emergence of unfair terms control in employment contracts in two legal systems can make to articulating the respective positions of judicial control, regulation and justice in contract law. By reconstructing the developments preceding the adoption of rules allowing judicial control of non-negotiated employment contracts in France and Germany, the book focusses on judicial control as a response to *contractualisation* of employment relations. Such contractualisation – in itself a combination of broad trends in labour law, doctrinal developments and, increasingly, HR practices – is paralleled to the movements which, at the outset of the 20th century, gave rise to the notion of *contrat d’adhésion*. Employers have good reasons to use the contract as a tool: to customise the contents of the employment relationship, to include elements of flexibilisation and to put in place dispute-management procedures. This increases the saliency of contracts, and contract law, in employment relations. Such success of contract law as a means of managing unequal relations calls for a reconsideration of its basic tenets, and in particular of what corrective justice means between the parties concerned.

In the book’s two parts, both case-law of the EU Court of Justice and salient adjudication on “unfair” terms in employment contracts are scrutinized with a view to assessing the extent to which regulatory and “justice” rationales are reflected in the way judicial control is shaped. While the EU case law (perhaps
unsurprisingly) displays a remarkable degree of regulatory ambition, both case studies show the crucial role of “contractual” or corrective justice concerns in making sense of judicial and interpretive practices. Interestingly, the case of Germany shows how the more recent legislative regulation of unfair terms control has increased the regulatory features of a judicial scrutiny that had been established by labour courts already decades earlier. This shift is particularly visible in the field of the consequences of unfairness – albeit with less far-reaching and less unsettling consequences than the similar rule put in place by the Court of Justice in the only apparently far apart field of consumer contracts. In both countries, furthermore, exclusive focus on non-negotiated or standardised terms is also a novelty brought about by legislative intervention: a very important distinction to the ends of certain doctrinal accounts and one that is crucial to the purchase of regulatory arguments, but perhaps not a very useful one in court disputes where lack of (meaningful) negotiation could easily be assumed. Rather than letting this distinction over-determine our analysis, thus, the story invites us to once again reconsider the idea that standardisation justifies exceptions from non-intervention and perhaps rather ask at what conditions principled non-intervention is justified. The little clog on the book’s cover reminds us of injustice lingering when the law abides by arbitrary will under the vestige of contract.
Samenvatting

De regulering van oneerlijke bedingen is een centraal en actueel thema in het Europese contractenrecht. De manier waarop dit thema wordt benaderd en besproken heeft invloed op ons begrip van het contractenrecht – en wellicht nog breder: op ons begrip van het privaatrecht in het algemeen. In de afgelopen decennia is een belangrijke discussie ontstaan over de zogeheten Richtlijn oneerlijke bedingen (1993), die de rechterlijke toetsing van niet-onderhandelde bedingen in consumentenovereenkomsten in de Europese Unie heeft geharmoniseerd. Hierbij is veel aandacht besteed aan de rechtvaardiging van de rechterlijke toetsing van oneerlijke bedingen. De focus van dit debat is geleidelijk verschoven van de verschillende, soms ambigue argumenten in de oorspronkelijke nationale discussies naar de regulering aspecten van rechterlijke toetsing. Het tegengaan van marktfalen en, controversiëler, het bevorderen van sociale rechtvaardigheid of consumentenbelangen zijn tegenwoordig standaardargumenten en -uitgangspunten voor kritiek of normatieve bijdragen geworden. De nadruk die daarbij wordt gelegd op zaakoverstijgende effecten wordt de regulering rationaliteit genoemd: “rationaliteit” in die zin dat het geen antwoorden of uitkomsten voorschrijft, maar eerder bepaalt welke vragen relevant worden geacht. Juist de vraag wat contractuele rechtvaardigheid in de basis vereist tussen de betrokken partijen is buiten beeld geraakt, in toenemende mate ten gunste van argumenten die schijnbaar niets van doen hebben met rechtvaardigheid in brede zin.

In dit proefschrift wordt een aanzet gedaan voor een gedeeltelijke heroriëntatie van het debat over oneerlijke bedingen. Hierbij wordt verkend welke bijdrage de ontwikkeling van rechterlijke toetsing van oneerlijke bedingen in arbeidsovereenkomsten – zoals onderzocht in twee rechtsstelsels: Duitsland en Frankrijk – kan leveren aan het verduidelijken van de rol van rechterlijke toetsing, regulering en rechtvaardigheid in het contractenrecht. Aan de hand van een reconstructie van de ontwikkelingen die voorafgingen aan de implementatie van wetgeving die rechterlijke toetsing van niet-onderhandelde arbeidsovereenkomsten in Frankrijk en Duitsland mogelijk heeft gemaakt, schetst dit boek een beeld van rechterlijke toetsing als antwoord op de contractualisering van de arbeidsverhouding. Die contractualisering kan worden gezien als een combinatie van brede tendensen in het arbeidsrecht, de juridische doctrine en, in toenemende mate, hr-praktijken, die parallel loopt aan de ontwikkelingen die aan het begin van de twintigste eeuw hebben geleid tot de opkomst van het begrip ‘contrat d’adhésion’. Voor werkgevers zijn er goede redenen om het contract als instrument te gebruiken: om de inhoud van de arbeidsrelatie te specificeren, om elementen van flexibilisering op te nemen en om procedures voor
geschillenbeslechting in te voeren. Dit verhoogt de relevantie van contracten en het contractenrecht in arbeidsrelaties. Het geconstateerde succes van het contractenrecht als middel om ongelijke verhoudingen te beheersen vraagt om een herdefiniëring van de belangrijkste aspecten van het contractenrecht – met name wat de vraag betreft naar de betekenis van correctieve rechtvaardigheid voor de betrokken partijen.

In de twee delen van dit boek worden zowel de jurisprudentie van het Europese Hof van Justitie over de Richtlijn oneerlijke bedingen als relevante uitspraken over "oneerlijke" bedingen in arbeidsovereenkomsten op nationaal niveau geanalyseerd, om te onderzoeken in hoeverre grondgedachten op het gebied van regulering en "rechtvaardigheid" tot uiting komen in de wijze waarop rechterlijke toetsing is vormgegeven. Terwijl de jurisprudentie van het Hof van Justitie (wellicht niet verrassend) een aanzienlijke mate van reguleringsambitie laat zien, tonen beide casestudies aan dat "contractuele" of correctieve rechtvaardigheid van cruciale betekenis is voor een meer volledig begrip van rechterlijke interpretaties en uitspraken. In het geval van Duitsland laat de analyse zien hoe de meer recente wettelijke regulering van oneerlijke bedingen de regulerende kenmerken heeft vergroot van een rechterlijke toetsing die al tientallen jaren eerder door de arbeidsrechtbanken was geïntroduceerd. Deze verschuiving naar een meer "regulerende" aanpak is vooral zichtbaar ten aanzien van de gevolgen van oneerlijkheid – zij het met minder verstrekkende en ingrijpende gevolgen dan de vergelijkbare regel die het Hof van Justitie heeft ingevoerd op het gebied van consumentenovereenkomsten. Verder is in beide landen de exclusieve aandacht voor niet-onderhandelde of gestandaardiseerde bedingen bovendien een vernieuwing die door wetgevend optreden tot stand is gebracht. Het onderscheid tussen gestandaardiseerde en onderhandelde bedingen is zeer belangrijk vanuit het perspectief van bepaalde doctrines en mogelijk cruciaal voor de overtuigingskracht van reguleringsargumenten, maar misschien een minder onderscheidend criterium in een concrete rechtszaak, waar het ontbreken van (zinvolle) onderhandelingen relatief snel zal kunnen worden aangenomen. In plaats van te veel waarde te hechten aan dit onderscheid, nodigt deze waarneming ons uit om het idee dat standaardisatie uitzonderingen op non-interventie rechtvaardigt nog eens te heroverwegen en ons eerder af te vragen onder welke voorwaarden principiële non-interventie gerechtvaardigd is. Het klompje op de omslag van het boek herinnert ons aan het onrecht dat dreigt wanneer de wet vasthoudt aan de willekeur van het contract.
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is substance, a crucial aesthetical but also critical tool (even though one which we must also subject to critique!). We may not always be in touch as much as we’d like to, but you are always with me. [Elia e Andrea, baciotti]

Talking of extended families above should not detract from more conventional constellations. Teresa (zia Teresa!) has been the first in her family to get a PhD – and also in ours. Luckily (for your nephews and their parents) you are also very good at ball games, videogame calls and many other things, but I directly enjoy your conversation skills the most I must say. Carlo’s parents, Lucio and Lucia, and the rest of the Veneto crowd – Alessandra, Ivana and Renzo – have been putting up with distance and worries about our meanderings with remarkable steadiness and regularly offered wonderful prosecco and culinary escapes. Next to, more recently, being a great uncle to Leo and Dario, Davide has given us a reason and excuse to travel back since short after moving away from Italy. Unbelievable how big you have got! Big hug.

Whether I was waiting for a bus under the rain, getting a piercing or wondering whether I should totally change career plans, I knew someone in Fondi had my back. Maria Nives, Raniero, Marta and Marco, if love had to be expressed in food it would have to be olive oil and artichokes travelling across Europe in a glass jar. Extra thanks, by the way, to talented Marta for designing the book’s cover and her patience in complying with my obsessive suggestions re colours, lines, text orientation and spacing. Mario e Sara, here is the book we have been talking about for years – not as fun as Murakami, but it’s done at last. Rossella, thanks for always insisting that we stay sane and grounded.

The book is for my parents, Ester and Massimo – somewhat ironically, since they disagree on almost everything but have always both insisted that my study and career choices should be for me and not for them. As a grown-up person and as an academic, I will never be grateful enough for the combination of empowerment and consciousness that this has endowed me with. I would, however, likely not have become the kind of person who actually finishes a book without my partner Carlo, who every day dares me to be a more decent, more reflexive human and my two sons, Leo and Dario, who give me endless happiness even though I can’t seem to learn how to play.