

1978

Review on The First Hundred Years: A Short History of the School of Law of the University of Virginia for the Period 1826-1926

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 Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

W. Hamilton Bryson, *The First Hundred Years: A Short History of the School of Law of the University of Virginia for the Period 1826-1926*, 22 *Am. J. Legal Hist.* 333 (1978) (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.

and catholic historical researcher will take up the task Professor Cramer has only begun. On the other hand, he or she must avoid Cramer's interpretative errors, generated no doubt by his lack of broad knowledge in the field of legal history. For example, early legal education (which did not really need to be discussed in this volume) was not the sole province of Professor George Wythe at William and Mary, and Tapping Reeve at Litchfield (p. 10); Professor James Wilson at the University of Pennsylvania was a contemporary of Wythe, and Peter Van Schaack ran a competing law school at Kinderhook, New York. Colonial historians will marvel at Professor Cramer's observation (p. 108) that criminal justice in Tidewater Virginia is the same today as it was in the seventeenth century; surely if a number of court reorganizations left the system untouched, the abolition of slavery must have made some difference. One would also like some statistical proof of Professor Cramer's comment (p. 82) that head law librarians do not have law degrees and are denied faculty status; that may have been true in 1967, although I doubt it; it is certainly not the case today.

A nice little book about a very interesting law school; read it with care and hope for something better.

HERBERT A. JOHNSON
Professor of History & Law
University of South Carolina

John Ritchie, *The First Hundred Years: A Short History of the School of Law of the University of Virginia for the Period 1826-1926*. Charlottesville, Virginia. University Press of Virginia, 1978. xv, 127 pp. \$9.95.

Although the author describes his book as an "informal history" of the first century of the University of Virginia Law School, it is far more than promotional material for the alumni office. This book will be very useful to historians of legal education in that it chronicles in detail the faculty, curriculum, texts, teaching philosophies, library, and the quarters of one of the oldest university law schools in the United States. The esoteric details of legal education are interspersed with anecdotes of the personalities of the faculty; this makes the book not only instructive but delightful to read.

The law school at Charlottesville was one of the original departments of the University of Virginia as planned by Jefferson. Dean Ritchie's book begins with a survey of legal education during the period 1775 to 1825 to show the background of Jefferson's ideas on the subject. There follows a chronological discussion of the personalities and contributions of the many eminent legal scholars who taught there from 1826 to 1926. We are told of the murder of Prof. J. A. G. Davis during a student riot, of the tenure of the eminent Judge Henry St. George Tucker, of the fifty-year professorship of John B. Minor whose *Institutes* dominated Virginia practice for a good fifty years after his death. It is interesting to learn that the first summer law school session in the United States was operated

by Prof. Minor beginning in 1870 and that when the law school admitted women in 1920 it was one of the first to do so.

The case method of legal education was not received in Charlottesville until the 1930s; Dean Lile's eloquent criticism of the Langdell theory is reprinted on pages 56-58. It was A. M. Dobie, who did an S.J.D. at Harvard in 1922, who brought the case method to the University of Virginia. It was felt that the Socratic method of teaching was not practical. Dean Lile and all of his predecessors believed that lectures supplemented with required moot court exercises were superior. It appears that during the first hundred years some form of moot court, trial court, or legal forensics was required of all students. This was not so much appellate argument but was trial tactics, drafting, and argument which has become fashionable today under the term clinical education.

The disappointments with this book are minor. There is no index, and the footnotes have been hidden at the end of the book. The proof-reading was not very carefully done; for example *Stephen on Pleading* is spelled "Steven" on p. 19, "Stephens" on p. 27, and "Stephen" on p. 37; there are other examples, but this is enough to show that I have read the book and not just the publisher's blurb.

This book is an excellent one, and it well justifies the pride that the law alumni of the University of Virginia have in their institution. But in addition, this book is a significant contribution to the history of legal education. The University of Virginia is fortunate that this book was written, and all legal historians would be well served if every American law school were so fortunate. I am aware of histories of the law schools at Harvard, Virginia, Richmond, Columbia, Yale, and Litchfield, Northwestern, and Chicago. One of William and Mary is in the works. Since there is one of the law schools that I attended and one of my employer, my conscience is clear, is yours?

W. HAMILTON BRYSON
Associate Professor of Law
University of Richmond

E. M. Elvey, Editor, *The Courts of the Archdeaconry of Buckingham, 1483-1523*. Buckinghamshire Record Society, No. 19, 1975. xxx, 449 pp. £15.

Waldo E. L. Smith, Editor, *The Register of Richard Clifford Bishop of Worcester, 1401-1407*. Toronto, Canada. Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1976. 235 pp. \$13.00.

The first of these two volumes contains a full Latin transcription of the surviving court records of an English ecclesiastical court of first instance. The second is a calendar, in English, of a medieval bishop's register, with a few documents of special interest printed *in extenso* in an appendix. Although neither is a work of strictly legal history, both will be useful to students of the legal and administrative history of the English Church.

The Buckinghamshire volume is the weightier of the two; appropri-