THE PAPERS OF JAMES MADISON. Volume III, 3 MARCH 1781–31 DECEMBER 1781. Edited by *William T. Hutchinson* and *William M. E. Rachal*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1963. Pp. xxv+381. $10.00.

The first two volumes of *The papers of James Madison* were reviewed in the *Journal* (XXXV [1963], 178). The general excellence of the project has been consistently maintained in the third volume, which ends with the Americans anxiously waiting to hear whether the victory at Yorktown will lead to a successful conclusion of peace.

This volume contains 174 papers. Of these, "twenty-six are dispatches signed by [Madison] as a member of the delegation from Virginia in Congress; twenty-eight are letters sent to that delegation; thirty-seven are letters addressed only to Madison; and five are either communications from committees on which he served or motions with which he was closely identified" (p. xvii). For practical purposes his political viewpoint was increasingly nationalistic in this period, but the future was so clouded that he could write to Thomas Jefferson that the states should "presume that the present Union will but little survive the present war" (p. 308).

The editors have placed footnotes at the end of each paper, which is the most convenient place, and have included a wealth of detail which will be useful in many ways. They explain references to complicated national and international problems, trace rumors to their sources whenever possible, correct misinformation that was apparently current at the time, and clarify (though without maps) the marching and countermarching prior to Yorktown through all the historic places that were to become still more historic during the Civil War. They identify in footnotes almost every person who is mentioned and in the index indicate in boldface type the volume and page in which the biographical notes can be found. Occasionally, however, they go overboard—as when they comment on Edmund Pendleton's purely conventional reference to an old

adage: "There are too many relevant adages to permit the confident selection of the one Pendleton had in mind" (p. 311).

Moreover, Madison himself remained obstinately reticent about his personal affairs, so that even one of his correspondents complained; "You never say any Thing of yourself. How do you relish your Business. Does it interfere with riding, &c, for I have heard of a severe Attack" (p. 10). At one point the editors mention an account in a newspaper to the effect that the building in which Madison was living at Market and Fifth Streets in Philadelphia was struck by lightning while he "was probably in his room" (p. 183), but he never mentioned the incident. Perhaps the editors are compensating for this reticence when they discuss in all seriousness whose leather breeches he was asked to pick up at the corner of Market and Fourth on April 3, 1781 (pp. 50-51).

In the light of such meticulous annotation, the present reviewer wonders why Negroes are not identified. David Jameson wrote to Madison, "Seven of my most valuable Negroes went [to the British] some time ago" (p. 215). But there is no editorial speculation as to their identity—as there would be if they had been British, Hessians, Tories, or ordinary traitors. Edmund Pendleton wrote that the British between Williamsburg and York "keep their swarm of Negroes busily employed in intrenching & Fortifying" (p. 252). Perhaps the records are inadequate, and identification of these people (even by first names) is impossible, but it is a sad commentary on American society then and now that the question is not even considered. Would it not be desirable for the editors to give us at least a description of the information that is available and some sort of account of the activities of Negroes in this period, when they are referred to in the documents? There is an indication in one of the footnotes—about a statute in Virginia requiring that slaves brought in from South Carolina and Georgia be registered in the courts (p. 333)—that possibly some records on the subject do exist, if the court records are still available.

If aristocrats like François Joseph Paul, Comte de Grasse, can be referred to in the democratic manner as "Grasse," then why can the democratic principle not be extended to include all classes of society? If scholars are going to adopt such a worshipful attitude toward the Revolutionary generation that they must ponder the founding fathers' every word and every act, then why can they not tell us about others who lived and moved and had their being at the same time? A new generation may well look at this monumental collection, which is so very painstaking and competent in its way, and marvel at this editorial blind spot.

JOHN M. COLEMAN

Lafayette College