

I of II. Corbin reading

Answer the following questions after having read the law article by Corbin.

1. What does it mean to refer to a written contract as an integration?
2. What does Corbin mean when he says: “The words that [the parties] said were identical; but these words did not say the same thoughts to each other.” Is Corbin claiming that the word ‘say’ here is lexically ambiguous? If so, what would be the two meanings?
3. What is meant by an objective meaning? According to Corbin does the word “chicken” have more than one objective meaning? Explain.
4. In the Frigaliment case the buyer (the Swiss company) was suing the seller (the New York company). Do you think that the judge would have ruled differently had it been the seller who was suing the buyer?

II. Raffles v. Wichelhaus

A. You will need to consult a law dictionary and/or a comprehensive dictionary of the English language to do this homework assignment. (There are dictionaries on the internet.) However, a particular dictionary may not include all the words of this assignment and you may need to consult more than one. Another good place to look for legal terms and explanations is in the online encyclopedia, *Wikipedia*.

Define each of the following legal terms that appear in the case *Raffles v. Wichelhaus*, **Write** your answers and be prepared to discuss them in class.

1. declaration
2. to wit
3. averment
4. breach
5. plea
6. demurrer
7. joinder
8. parol evidence
9. consensus ad idem
10. per curium