

The Shakespeare Wars: Clashing Scholars, Public Fiascoes, Palace Coups

By Ron Rosenbaum

Random House, New York, NY, 2006. 610 pages, \$35.00.

REVIEWED BY CHRISTOPHER C. FAILLE

Ron Rosenbaum writes like a lawyer, and I mean that in a good way. His take on Shakespeare turns out to be replete with the sorts of arguments a probate lawyer might make about a contested will—arguments over the authenticity of the decedent’s signature or other crucial handwriting samples, arguments that require the close reading of words and phrases, arguments about the context of specific words within the rest of the document, and arguments about the context of the creation of the document within the decedent’s life. Out of all these arguments and all the required sorting of evidence should come ... what? A proper distribution of the estate, in the one case, and an ever-deepening understanding of those literary qualities we intuitively understand and react to as “Shakespearean,” in the other.

Those are qualities that aren’t merely literary, but are theatrical as well. And it is their theatrical character that lets Rosenbaum, in his lawyer-like way, evoke a chain of precedents—the development of a tradition of performances forged link by link and handed down from one generation of actors to the next.

Or, perhaps, it’s the forging not of a chain but of a sword. In the middle of this book, Rosenbaum tells a wonderful story about Lord Byron’s sword. Byron went to the theater one night and saw the great Edmund Kean performing in a Shakespeare play. (Rosenbaum’s source is a little vague about which one, but it “might have been” *Othello*.) Byron was so impressed, even awed, that he had a sword made and inscribed so that he could present it as a gift to Kean. When Kean died, the sword was auctioned off.

The story of the sword might have

ended there, except that in 1935 an antiques dealer saw John Gielgud playing Hamlet. The dealer, like Byron before him, was astounded and delighted. He presented the sword to Gielgud.

About 15 years later, Gielgud saw Laurence Olivier playing Richard III. Gielgud decided that this was it. Olivier was his (and by implication Kean’s) rightful heir as the bearer of Byron’s sword. The gift was offered and accepted in that spirit, Olivier agreeing that he would pass it on to a younger Shakespearean actor when the time came.

The time seems never to have come. When Olivier was dying in 1989, his wife (Joan Plowright) asked him about the sword. He had seen many Shakespearean performances by many talented actors, but in the end he couldn’t decide upon anyone who should become the next bearer of Byron’s sword. He died with the sword in his possession.

Where is the sword now? Rosenbaum’s story tails off there, so I can’t tell you that. Perhaps it is again in the commercial world, awaiting the day when a discerning dealer will attend a Shakespeare play and be spellbound by an actor’s performance.

The story of Byron’s sword is a marvelous parable. No generation can assume that the next generation will value what it values most, or that it will put forth outstanding champions for those values—whether of the rule of law or of a magical theatrical performance. Those values have to be advanced, and the next link in the chain has to be forged; accordingly, champions have to be nurtured, or there will be gaps—periods when the sword will have to wait before anybody new and worthy picks it up.

But for most of the book, Rosenbaum’s focus is more on Shakespearean scholarship than on performance. The focus is also, it must be said, at times a bit too much on Rosenbaum. He explains to us at some length, for example, why he gave up a possible literary-academic career. He was a graduate student in Yale University’s Department of English Literature, and

in that capacity, in 1968, he attended a seminar on Chaucer’s love-vision poetry, such as *The Parliament of Fowles*. A “wunderkind scholar” presented a paper about “the way in which the narrators of Chaucer’s dream visions consciously re-envision their visions as poetry. Something like that.”

Rosenbaum asked the scholar a question. “I forgot exactly what the offending question I asked was, something along the lines of whether love was more than human delusion in Chaucer’s work. ... With a wan, disdainful smile and dismissive wave of his nicotine-stained fingers, the wunderkind scholar informed me that ‘Love is such an *uninteresting* question.’ The truly interesting questions raised by the love-vision poems, he said, were not about love but about the ‘making of poetry.’ This meta-poetical question ... was far more significant than something as trivial as the nature of love.”

This, and the reaction of the other budding scholars in the room who sided with the wunderkind and chuckled at Rosenbaum’s naiveté, did a good deal to push him out of the academic life and into journalism. After all, it was 1968! Revolutions were occurring everywhere—in Prague, Paris, and Chicago, to name a few. Rosenbaum asked himself why he should sit in musty seminar rooms when he could cover stories like that!

The point, I gather, is that Rosenbaum has now come full circle and is writing about academics talking about Shakespeare—and about some of them, at any rate, who do so along much the same theoretical line as the one his old Chaucerian nemesis invoked in 1968.

Personally, although I found *The Shakespeare Wars* to contain more autobiography than it had to, I can’t regret Rosenbaum’s decision to structure the book as the history of his recent inquiries into Shakespeare among the cognoscenti and to give us some information about himself, the inquirer, along the way. This approach helps to humanize him and his quest. At times he is not so much the expert on pro-

REVIEWS *continued on page 68*

bate law writing a dry brief about a will as he is the impassioned trial lawyer making the case for his client in front of a jury in stark emotional terms.

That is as it should be, for Rosenbaum wants to answer his own old question, transferred now from Chaucer to Shakespeare: Is love more than a human delusion in his work? Regan and Goneril profess to love their father, Lear, in the opening scene of his tragedy. They love him, “beyond what can be valued, rich or rare.” Is no love better founded than were those protestations? And, if there is a love that is more real—a love like Cordelia’s—must it always be as doomed as Cordelia was?

I understand Rosenbaum in the end to offer, on Shakespeare’s behalf, the following answers to those two questions: yes and maybe. **TFL**

Christopher Faille is a financial correspondent for an Internet-based news service and is a member of the Connecticut bar. He maintains a blog, “Pragmatism Refreshed,” at cfaille.blog-city.com.

The Money Lawyers: The No-Holds-Barred World of Today’s Richest and Most Powerful Lawyers

By Joseph C. Goulden

Truman Talley Books, St. Martin’s Press, New York, NY, 2006. 428 pages, \$27.95.

REVIEWED BY ELIZABETH KELLEY

Many times, as I was reading *The Money Lawyers*, I thought: Why am I reading yet another person trashing lawyers? But, as angry as I became, I could not put the book down. *The Money Lawyers* is chock-full of great war stories, and is not only entertaining but also contains valuable lessons.

Joseph Goulden is a prolific author whose works include *The Superlawyers*, which was a bestseller in the 1970s. In *The Money Lawyers*, he disdains lawyers for all the reasons those who are not lawyers disdain us: we make too much money, we care more about win-

ning than about justice, we are ruthless, etc., etc., etc. Goulden does, however, make a few grudging concessions, such as that lawyers helped found the republic. But, whatever his disdain for lawyers, Goulden shows flair for picking the subjects and stories that fill *The Money Lawyers*.

The book’s six chapters profile lawyers—including David Boies, Al Gore’s attorney during the Florida recount, and Thomas Hale Boggs Jr., the son of former House Speaker Hale Boggs and a powerful Washington lobbyist—and they relate legal dramas, such as litigation involving breast implants and diet pills, the schism between securities litigators Melvyn Weiss and William Lerach, and the unceremonious firing of lawyers at the Wall Street firm of Cadwalader, Wickersham & Taft.

In doing his research for the book, Goulden traveled across the country, conducting scores of interviews. Without bogging the reader down with detail, he does a masterful job of giving historical background; for example, he contrasts the relatively simple workings of Washington during the tenure of Speaker Boggs in the 1950s with the complex waters of money, lobbyists, and power that his son Tommy navigates today. Goulden is a painterly writer and cuts right to the quick. Consider this description of David Boies’ office:

But going into Boies’ office was akin to taking a stroll through a city dump. Discarded fast food containers under his desk and most everywhere else. Disorderly heaps of paper, both on his desk and the credenzas and the floor. Empty pop cans, a half-empty bag of pretzels, even a small bar of hotel soap. Someone else in the firm had told me, with a sad shake of his head, that among other foibles Boies was a dice freak who loved to take long weekends in the Las Vegas casinos, a most un-Gravath hobby which he went out of his way to flaunt. Gambling junk was scattered about in messy profusion—a miniature dice table and pack-

ets of casino chips. My hand went to my face to hide a smile when I realized that the desk itself was an old poker table.

He offers this description of William Lerach’s appearance:

Enter Lerach, at the hurried pace I have learned to associate with busy lawyers, his pumping arms seemingly trying to coax more speed from his feet. He was dressed ... well, let me say it this way: Lerach was dressed unlike any big-city trial lawyer I have encountered on a workday, a study in casual white, from cotton shirt to cotton slacks, the monochrome broken only by the brown of his Topsiders. ... Lerach is a stocky fellow in his mid-fifties, his hair (also well on the way to being white) swept up in what seems an Afro slightly modified by a barber from the styling school that developed former President Bill Clinton’s distinctive tonsorial style.

As the book’s subtitle says, *The Money Lawyers* purports to profile “today’s richest and most powerful lawyers.” Certainly, a subtitle that refers to lawyers who do the right thing but who don’t make gobs of money would not be as arresting. But, even though larger-than-life lawyers such as David Boies cause readers to pick up the book and draw them in, Goulden also devotes attention to—and, one senses, admires—lawyers such as Nancy Hersh of San Francisco, who tried the first breast implant case before a jury and received a relative pittance in fees, and Kipp Petroff of Dallas, who conducted the initial investigation into the manufacture of the combination of diet pills known as fen-phen and took the first fen-phen case to a jury. Goulden tells of these two plaintiffs’ attorneys, who were not afraid to take on the manufacturers of the products that had injured their clients—and did so long before such litigation became profitable.

Although *The Money Lawyers* concerns securities fraud and other subjects

in addition to litigation related to product liability, tort reform is the primary focus of Goulden's conclusion, entitled "What's to Be Done?" This chapter was a huge letdown, not only because its emphasis on tort reform is disproportionate, but also because it consists of only nine pages of a book of almost 400 pages. More important, some of Goulden's "solutions" are unsupported. (And, frankly, the book doesn't seem to present "problems" as much as it spotlights idiosyncrasies and realities endemic to the legal profession.) For example, Goulden proposes that the requirements of continuing legal education should be strengthened. But nowhere in the book does he point to any problems caused by attorneys who lack substantive knowledge of the law. Instead, as an example of how empty the requirement of continuing legal education has become, Goulden cites some CLE course titles that he considers whacky, such as "Strategies for Handling Cravings: Pizza, Potato Chips, Nuts, Ice Cream and Candy," which are from California, of course. Maybe Ohio and the Sixth Circuit, where I practice, are exceptions, but I have never seen an advertisement for a frivolous CLE class; moreover, the subject of lawyer burnout and substance abuse by lawyers (food can be an addiction) is deadly serious.

So, other than reading great war stories, what is the point of reading *The Money Lawyers*, especially when it seems, in substantial part, to criticize our profession? I believe that the book is valuable for two reasons. First, it is valuable to know what others are saying about us. After all, books like this help form the public's perception of the profession, and Goulden's opinions are probably the rule, not the exception. The effect is a bit like the public's experience with the O.J. Simpson trial, which, for better or for worse, forms the basis of what many people know and feel about our criminal justice system.

A second reason that *The Money Lawyers* is worth reading is that we can learn lessons from the attorneys the book profiles and the stories it tells. All the attorneys are testaments to hard work and single-minded devotion to their practice. Tommy Boggs under-

scored the power of networking and possessing a winning personality. David Boies has made a success of swimming against the current. Nancy Hersh and Kip Petroff care passionately about their clients. The downsizing of Caldwell, Wickersham & Taft is a warning about betrayal.

In *The Money Lawyers*, Joseph Goulden quotes from the novel *The Godfather*: "One lawyer with a briefcase can cause more damage than a hundred men with guns." *The Money Lawyers* frequently characterizes what our colleagues do as "damage," and sometimes this is an accurate description, but at other times it is an exaggeration. Our challenge as lawyers, in the face of books such as Goulden's, is to show the world that much of what we do is the opposite of "damage," and, indeed, is good and essential work. **TFL**

Elizabeth Kelley is a criminal defense attorney in Ohio, who has a special commitment to representing individuals suffering from mental illness and mental retardation. She frequently provides legal commentary for Court TV and can be contacted at Zealous Advocacy@aol.com.

Rumpole and the Reign of Terror

By John Mortimer

Viking, New York, NY, 2006. 184 pages, \$23.95.

REVIEWED BY JON M. SANDS

Horace Rumpole is back. John Mortimer's veritable British barrister returns from reminiscing about his half-century-old great win, described in *Rumpole and the Penge Bungalow Murders* (reviewed in the September 2005 issue of *The Federal Lawyer*), to confront a modern menace—terrorism with a capital "T." The occasion is the charging of a Pakistani doctor with fomenting a terrorist plot, and Rumpole, as is his wont, dons his frayed robe and yellowing wig to defend the underdog.

Rumpole is an acquired taste. In this, the 15th book of the series, Rumpole continues to be his sardonic, sarcastic self. A professed Old Bailey hack, he earns his living defending ne'er-dowells, especially the Timson clan of

grifters and burglars. Yet, in matters of law and love, Rumpole is a romantic at heart. Always delightful in his defense of the accused, Rumpole truly and ardently believes that everyone is presumed innocent and deserving of spirited representation.

In the latest book, *Rumpole and the Reign of Terror*, British authorities believe that a resident-alien Pakistani doctor, Mahood Kahn, has been plotting terrorist activities. Rumpole is assigned the case through a convoluted contrivance and is led into the morass of the British Special Immigration Appeals Commission (think of America's military tribunals), where suspects can be held without trial or, in an affront to Rumpole's sense of decency and due process, without ever being advised of the charges against them. Rumpole battles the Star Chamber aspects of the proceedings, indulges in a little out-of-court persuasion, and manages to get the doctor his day in court. Things look hopeless until, as one expects, Rumpole deftly—though unbelievably—exposes the government's machinations and private vendettas and secures the release of his client.

This portrayal, of course, is legal fantasy. Rumpole's trials and tribulations have never been rooted in the gritty realism of modern courtroom procedure. Rumpole, rather, is a quixotic defender, set comfortably within the Old Bailey. This is not to say that Rumpole, like Don Quixote, is behind the times. He may be anachronistic in his use of fountain pen and notepads, but Rumpole's world is populated with judges using word processors and with diverse juries from London's multiethnic mix (Indian, Caribbean, African, and Asian, amongst representatives of the old John Bull merchant class). Rumpole has no aversion to using the latest forensic evidence in the service of his clients.

He is even willing to forgo his favorite literary allusions in an effort to get his point across. Addressing a jury that is a generation—well, maybe two generations—younger than he is, Rumpole compares warring criminal clans to the Montagues and the Capulets. Then, thinking that the young jurors

REVIEWS *continued on page 70*

may not recall the families from *Romeo and Juliet* as readily as he does, Rumpole substitutes the Arsenal and the Spurs—two rival London soccer clubs whose antipathy toward each other is more familiar to the jurors than that of the Verona families. Rumpole makes the switch without condescension, and it is a telling moment. Rumpole is an idealist, but he is also pragmatic—he wants to win.

Mortimer usually presents Rumpole in a series of short stories, each dealing with different legal issues, clients, and problems. *Rumpole and the Reign of Terror*, by contrast, is a full-length work, although, at fewer than 200 pages, it is might be classified as a novella. As with books that are part of a series, present concerns are more pressing than past consistency. In past stories, Rumpole's archnemesis, Judge Billingsford, had retired, but he is back in this book and is being elevated to a high court. Moreover, and unbelievably, Billingsford is wooing Rumpole's wife, Hilda, who is aptly known as "She Who Must be Obeyed." This subplot of Hilda's assignations with Billingsford, and alternating chapters that consist of Hilda's memoirs, is out of place. Apart from being unbelievable, Mortimer's use of Hilda's voice interrupts Horace Rumpole's wit and weary sensibility. Mortimer depicts Rumpole's voice brilliantly, but Hilda's leaves something to be desired. Moreover, the world of the Old Bailey should be seen solely through Rumpole's eyes.

In addition, the plot is creaky. Mortimer frequently runs two intertwining strands through the Rumpole books, and he does it here with a clash between the Timsons and the Malloys. The rivalry between these two criminal families has been the impetus for many past plots, with the Malloys always attempting to frame the Timsons. The Timsons, as ordinary, decent criminals, show the prejudices of the populace and decide to sack Rumpole for representing a "Paki" who, in their eyes, is a terrorist, simply because the government said he is—after all, patriotism takes priority over the presumption of innocence. The plot groans under the strain of the rivalry between the Tim-

sons and Malloys, the rivalry between two Pakistani families, and even a deep secret concerning the home minister, which Rumpole naturally uncovers. Too much goes on in this tale, even for a Rumpole story. Mortimer might have been better off concentrating on the terrorist plot and perhaps having Rumpole wrestle with either a client who is guilty (as was the case in other Rumpole stories) or one who is sympathetic to Islamic radicalism. Rumpole's reactions to representing these clients would have been intriguing.

Is there such a thing as a bad Rumpole book? The answer is no. *Rumpole and the Reign of Terror* is not one of the most endearing Rumpole tales, but it nonetheless offers insights that speak the truth, such as Rumpole's definition of "judgeitis": "a ridiculous inflation of self-importance, with increased intolerance, a fatal tendency to suck up to juries, to interfere with the cross-examinations by defending counsel, and doing your best to find all the customers in the dock guilty." (This affliction is known on our side of the pond as "robe-itis.") Mortimer's background as a practicing barrister comes through with keen observations, such as his assessment that a case is really bad not when the jurors look in horror at the defendant but when "they turn their faces away and refuse to look at him at all." Mortimer is sloppy, though, in his courtroom technique; he actually has Rumpole ask an open-ended question on cross-examination! And, of course, Rumpole is good for references to Runnymede, the Magna Carta, and the Bill of Rights, as he expresses his affront to special legislation that does away with the right to confrontation, the right to be advised of the charges one faces, and even the right to a trial at all. Rumpole's high dudgeon at the sacrifice of these ancient rights in return for alleged national security is worth the read.

But Rumpole's observation that everyone tends to believe that the defendant is guilty simply because the government says so is a truth we live with. And, in real life, as in *Rumpole and the Reign of Terror*, people disappear, and it is only because lawyers with Rumpole's spirit fight for them that they

are exonerated. One has only to look at the recent awarding of damages to Brandon Mayfield, the Muslim lawyer who had been connected to the Madrid bombings by fingerprints that the FBI mistakenly said were his. Rumpole may be derided by the Queen's Counsel for being hopelessly behind the times, but his idealism and faith in the law are what we need in these trying times. TFL

Jon Sands is the federal public defender for the District of Arizona.

Caesar: Life of a Colossus

By Adrian Goldsworthy

Yale University Press, New Haven, CT, 2006.
583 pages, \$35.00.

REVIEWED BY HENRY S. COHN

Marcus Tullius Cicero, always concerned with his social standing, once remarked: "Yet what would history say of me in six hundred years time? For that is a thing which I fear more than the idle chatter of men alive today." Adrian Goldsworthy's comprehensive biography of Julius Caesar reflects on the life of the most famous Roman, not after 600 years, but after more than 2,000 years. Goldsworthy is an Oxford-trained historian, an expert in ancient warfare, and a frequent commentator on the BBC. For this fresh and readable biography, he has drawn on the works of Suetonius, Plutarch, and Cicero, as well as on Julius Caesar's multiple writings. Goldsworthy uses his sources skillfully, separating fact from legend. But even the legends are worth reading about.

Goldsworthy illustrates the mighty panorama of Caesar's life. Born with epilepsy (but not by cesarean section) in 100 B.C., he overcame personal hardships, including the sudden death of his father, to obtain an important post in the Roman priesthood at the age of 16. Two years later, Caesar found that his life was in danger. His father's family was allied with Marius, who was feuding with Sulla for control of the republic. Sulla's forces systemati-

cally murdered the Marians, including uncles of Caesar. In 81 B.C., Caesar fled from Italy to avoid Sulla's threat. Caesar's mother and her relatives, whose relations with Sulla were better than Caesar's, smoothed out her son's difficulties with Sulla, and Caesar was able to return to Rome.

On his return, he prosecuted legal cases against corrupt military officers on behalf of friends, thereby improving his political standing. Caesar was not an attorney as we understand the term today; the Roman legal system allowed a private citizen to appear in court in a capacity comparable to our concept of a private attorney general. Although Caesar did not win his cases, the surviving records indicate that he was an accomplished advocate and that, from time to time, he was asked to serve as a state prosecutor and as a judge.

Over the next few years, Caesar held a variety of elected positions and consolidated his power, culminating in his assumption of the highest executive office—consul—in 59 B.C. Although repeatedly subjected to parliamentary tricks by Cato and others, Caesar managed to have the Senate adopt significant land reform legislation. When his term as consul was over, he decided to accept the Senate's offer to lead an army into Gaul, whose tribes were threatening Italy's borders. Caesar intended his military campaigns to bring him both fame and wealth.

In Gaul, Caesar achieved the triumph that he desired, and he made sure that his fellow citizens became aware of his accomplishments on the battlefield by publishing his multivolume *Commentaries*. Goldsworthy is a military historian, and almost a third of his book is devoted to Caesar's victories in what is now Switzerland, Belgium, and England. Caesar did not win every skirmish, but he had the ability to correct his mistakes and to command fierce loyalty from his troops.

The year 54 B.C. saw the death of both Caesar's mother, who had been a dominant influence in his life, and his only natural daughter, who, along with her baby, did not survive childbirth. In 49 B.C., Caesar reached a crucial point in his life and had to make his most important career decision. He decided that he was not interested in further

military operations and sought another term as consul in Rome. But Pompey, the current holder of the office, would not tolerate giving Caesar any chance at resuming this position. Pompey rejected Caesar's compromise offer to share the office, and Caesar then started a civil war. Goldsworthy quotes the poet Lucan: "Caesar could not accept a superior, nor Pompey an equal."

At the outset of the conflict, Pompey tactically pulled his forces out of Italy and withdrew to Asia Minor, letting Caesar dominate the Italian Peninsula. But Caesar pursued Pompey into Egypt, where Pompey was murdered by two members of his own staff, though they were not linked to Caesar. Caesar, in fact, had never threatened Pompey's life.

Caesar had won the war, and the Senate recognized him as Roman "dictator"—an emergency post that usually lasted for short periods. A group of 60 senators, however, feared that Caesar would reject the customary term limits, declare himself permanent ruler, and ask to be deified. To "save" the republic, members of the group stabbed him to death on March 15, 44 B.C. For the ancient world, this cataclysmic event was comparable to the assassinations of Abraham Lincoln and John F. Kennedy. Chaos ensued, and the last vestige of control in the aging republic disappeared. Order was re-established only when Caesar's adopted son, Octavian, became Emperor Augustus.

Goldsworthy describes the complete Julius Caesar—his intellect and abilities as well as his vanity regarding his personal appearance and his womanizing. He also portrays Caesar's contemporaries—the two most interesting being, of course, Mark Antony and Cleopatra. Goldsworthy shows not only Antony's devotion to Caesar but also his hot temper, slovenly eating habits, and undisciplined behavior. Caesar chose Cleopatra to be queen of Egypt from among other candidates, and she also became Caesar's lover. In 48 B.C., when she first met Caesar, she was a well-educated 21-year-old living in Alexandria. By 44 B.C., she was residing in Rome and had borne Caesar a child.

Caesar benefits from Goldsworthy's thorough knowledge of ancient society as well as of Caesar himself. In describ-

ing Caesar's wedding to Pompeia after the death of his first wife, Cornelia, Goldsworthy explains the typical Roman wedding ceremony: The bride's attendants carry her across a threshold anointed with oil or animal fat, and the groom carries a torch and a vessel of water, symbolizing his willingness to provide her with the essentials of life. Goldsworthy also presents the available information on childbirth, breastfeeding, and education of the children of aristocratic Romans.

Goldsworthy also traces Caesar's interactions with the ethnic communities in greater Rome. To the west were tribes like the Helvetians, crowded in their ancestral lands and urged by their chiefs to migrate into the more fertile western coast of Gaul. The Romans feared that this migration would disrupt the other tribes in Gaul, and Caesar was determined to prevent this movement. One significant people to the east were the Jews, with whom Caesar had good relations: 3,000 Jews from Palestine had fought on Caesar's side during his Egyptian campaign. As dictator, Caesar banned private associations in Rome, such as trade guilds, but he allowed Jews freedom to worship. Many Jewish community leaders attended the memorial services held after Caesar's assassination.

One tends to forget how much Caesar's life story has become a part of the history of Western civilization. Goldsworthy presents famous quotations associated with him and places them in context. Sulla allowed Caesar to return to Rome, acknowledging his potential power: "In this Caesar there are many Mariuses." When asked why he had not disclosed facts of Pompeia's scandalous behavior but demanded a divorce, Caesar replied, "Caesar's wife must be above suspicion." We remember the line slightly differently today as "Caesar's wife is above suspicion."

High school students have had to memorize the opening line of Caesar's war memoirs: "All Gaul is divided into three parts." (For students of Latin, "Omnia Gallia est divisa in partes tres.") When he crossed the Rubicon to challenge Pompey, Caesar quoted his favorite poet, Menander: "Iacta alea

REVIEWS *continued on page 72*

est.” (The die is cast.) The Rubicon River was a small stream that separated Gaul from Italy proper, and crossing the river symbolized Caesar’s irreversible objectives. Speculation exists as to where the bridge over the Rubicon is today; it is probably in Savignano near a Firestone store.

A swift campaign in 47 B.C. against the king of the Bosphorus led to the famous phrase, “Veni, vidi, vici.” (I came, I saw, I conquered.) A highlight of *Caesar* is Goldsworthy’s description of a lavish parade held in Rome in September 46 B.C. to celebrate Caesar’s triumphs. In the procession, marchers carried placards proclaiming “Veni, vidi, vici.”

Shakespeare’s *Julius Caesar* was shaped by the dramatic events in the life of Caesar and his followers. The play contains the classic lines, “Beware the Ides of March,” “Et tu, Brute,” and Antony’s magnificent funeral oration. Caesar has lent his name to, among other things, the Julian calendar, which is still used by Eastern Orthodox churches today. His name is the source of the Russian “czar” and the German “Kaiser.”

Goldsworthy concludes that Caesar was a great man—a colossus—and who can deny it? He was, as Goldsworthy observes, a fugitive, a politician, an army leader, a legal advocate, a rebel, a renowned lover, and a dictator. Was he a good man? Goldsworthy portrays him as a courteous husband and a devoted father. He also makes the case that Caesar was never cruel to his opponents and may well have been wronged by Pompey and his faction when they denied Caesar the consulship. On the other hand, Caesar was a serial adulterer, and he contributed to the end of a democratic state. Goldsworthy finds an “odd mixture” of virtue and villainy in this man who has fascinated people for 20 centuries. **TFL**

Henry S. Cohn is a judge of the Connecticut Superior Court.

Fundamentals of Bankruptcy Law, 6th Edition

By Richard B. Levin

American Law Institute–American Bar Association, Philadelphia, PA, 2006. 543 pages, \$137.50.

REVIEWED BY JENNIFER STAMAN

As Richard Levin notes in the preface to the sixth edition of *Fundamentals of Bankruptcy Law*, bankruptcy law is a difficult subject. This primer, however, tackles it in a clear and concise manner. Although not intended to be all-encompassing, the book provides helpful and easy-to-understand explanations of the basic issues in bankruptcy law. The book combines a discussion of the U.S. Bankruptcy Code with important judicial developments, both of which are necessary to comprehend how the bankruptcy system actually functions.

The format of the book is unique: it places relevant statutory language on the left-hand (even-numbered) pages and explanatory text on the right-hand (odd-numbered) pages. This format allows for easy comparison of the statutes with the commentary, which aids in understanding complex bankruptcy concepts. The explanatory text is obviously directed to the practitioner of bankruptcy law; it points out key issues to consider in bankruptcy cases.

This new edition covers the significant amendments made to the code by the Bankruptcy Abuse and Consumer Protection Act of 2005 and walks the reader through two types of bankruptcy relief: Chapter 7 (dealing with the liquidation of a debtor’s assets) and Chapter 11 (dealing with business reorganization). The book also includes a discussion of several other topics relating to bankruptcy, including the bankruptcy court system, property and distribution of a bankruptcy estate, principles that apply in the case of partnership bankruptcy, and various taxation issues. *Fundamentals of Bankruptcy Law* is a useful reference for any practitioner in answering bankruptcy law questions. **TFL**

Jennifer Staman is a legislative attorney for the Congressional Research Service in Washington, D.C.