

1990

Review of Bench and Bureaucracy: The Public Career of Sir Julius Caesar

William Hamilton Bryson
University of Richmond, hbryson@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/law-faculty-publications>

 Part of the [Legal History Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

W. Hamilton Bryson, *Bench and Bureaucracy: The Public Career of Sir Julius Caesar*, 34 *Am. J. Legal Hist.* 413 (1990) (book review).

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Law Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

characteristics often took forms that served elite interests. The Revolution sparked the development of an "Americanized" legal system, buttressed by a dual, at times contradictory, emphasis on popular will and fundamental principles.

Federalist-Jeffersonian conflict over the proper relationship between law and politics led to the nineteenth-century legal system's particular responsiveness to economic issues. Here Hall modifies Morton Horwitz's argument that the transformation of American law served the wealthy by subsidizing the costs of economic expansion. Clearly the judiciary facilitated development through legal instrumentalism, but judges also protected public rights and accepted popular authority. Further, Hall maintains, Horwitz and others have underestimated the extent to which the citizenry accepted the new rules of law, including the elevation of judicial power. Still, Hall accepts the conclusion that these changes made possible the late nineteenth-century judiciary's embrace of a more explicit class-based exposition of law.

Hall's discussion of nineteenth-century law is enlightening and persuasive, although scholars may disagree with his periodization and arrangement of topics. For example, chapters on the law of personal status, domestic relations and criminal justice—all covering the entire century—separate the chapters on early and late nineteenth-century economic law. Similarly, a chapter on the professionalization of legal culture interrupts the allied chapters on law in the industrial state. But these are minor quibbles because Hall consistently draws connecting threads to materials from different sections of the book.

The twentieth century is, on the whole, addressed in broader strokes, with Hall following a more traditional chronological arrangement and focusing more consistently on the federal government and Supreme Court. But Hall does not neglect private law, nor does he abandon his strategy of relating legal and political culture. His conclusions become more cautious, although this is hardly a fault for a historian whose primary interest has been in an earlier century. Certainly, *The Magic Mirror* represents a great advance over Friedman's *History of American Law*, a work that dismisses the twentieth century in a few pages.

Kermit Hall deserves much praise for this major work. Not only has he convincingly synthesized a large and complex scholarship, but he has related it to the broad themes of American history in a way that makes legal history accessible to colleagues in other fields. We are all in his debt.

DAVID J. BODENHAMER

Indiana University-Purdue University at Indianapolis

Lamar M. Hill, *Bench and Bureaucracy: The Public Career of Sir Julius Caesar, 1580-1636*. Stanford, Cal.: Stanford University Press, 1988. xv, 316 pp. \$37.50.

Lamar Hill's biography of Sir Julius Caesar presents the life and career of a person active in English politics during the last years of Queen Elizabeth I and the reign of James I. Sir Julius Caesar's father was an Italian immigrant to England, who served as personal physician to Queen Mary. In this capacity, he was personally known at court, and the theme of this biography of his son is the use of personal connections, patronage, as a means of personal, family, and professional advancement.

Caesar began his career as a judge of the High Court of Admiralty. His academic preparation for this position included study at Oxford University, Clement's Inn, and the University of Paris. He was a member of the Inner Temple as well as Doctors' Commons. Hill's description of the politics and the administrative workings of the Court of Admiralty during the end of the sixteenth century is very good. Caesar is shown as a skillful bureaucrat defending his court from the political pressures from the laymen of the privy council and from the lawmen of the courts of Westminster. He made a good fight even though he was not successful in achieving his own high aspirations for the court. The Court of Admiralty declined greatly in importance during the reign of James I; this was due partly to the attacks of the common lawyers, but more it was the result of naturally scanty business for the court in times of peace.

After becoming firmly established in the Admiralty, Caesar negotiated his way into the Court of Requests, an equity court for small claims. As one of the judges of this court, Caesar had an entrée to the royal court, and Hill explains the political importance of this position and its skillful use by Caesar. This judgeship led to the chancellorship of the exchequer and a greater role in Parliament. The chancellor of the exchequer could sit in the Court of Exchequer when equity cases were being considered, but Hill does not mention whether Caesar ever did sit in this court or not. However, there are lucid and lengthy treatments of the financial organization of the Exchequer and the related debate in Parliament over the doomed Great Contract.

Sir Julius Caesar ended his career on a high note being made the master of the rolls in 1614. As such, Caesar became the second most important equity judge in England. Hill describes at length the administrative parts of the Chancery and how Caesar attempted to cope with them. Even though he sat on the seat of justice as master of the rolls from 1614 until his death in 1636, very little is said about the jurisdiction, substantive law, or the procedures of the High Court of Chancery. This is characteristic, though, of this entire book. It is a book about the bureaucracy of this period of English history and about one of its members, who also was a judge. This is a work of political and social history which is tangential to legal history. Not much is said about the legal doctrines and procedures of the courts in which Caesar sat because this was not the intention of the author. It is noted only because the readers of this Journal are interested in the legal scope of the book. It is also to be noted that the author overlooks a good University of Cambridge doctoral dissertation by D. A. Knox on the Court of Requests in the reign of Edward VI though Hill notes on page 71 an older outdated M.A. thesis.

This excellent biography concludes with a detailed treatment of Sir Julius Caesar's family and wealth. This book gives the reader an interesting view of an interesting time through the eyes of a middle ranking bureaucrat, who was in the middle of the important matters of his day. The author skillfully places his subject in time and place, neither exaggerating nor denigrating his significance. In the epilogue, on page 258, Caesar is thus aptly summarized as "a lawyer, judge, minister, and minor courtier [who] made his place and amassed a fortune that he invested in country properties, which he gave to his children."

This book is the result of careful historical research, and it is well written. It is recommended to anyone interested in Tudor-Stuart English history.

W. H. BRYSON
University of Richmond
School of Law