

The Papers of James Madison, Volume 3, 3 March 1781—31 December 1781. Edited by William T. Hutchinson and William M.E. Rachal. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1963. Pp. xxv, 381. Illustrations, notes, chronology, index. \$10.00.)

The third volume of *The Papers of James Madison* spans a year of near-despair and climactic military victory at Yorktown. As reflected in the private letters, reports, and memoranda of Madison and his correspondents, most of them Virginians, 1781 was a year of great weariness, of deep anxiety over British naval and military strength as Cornwallis and Arnold pressed their campaign into Virginia, and of growing concern lest the "perpetual union" shatter on the jagged edges of chaotic finance and state particularism. These 174 documents, 76 of them Madison's personal communications, convey a sense of just what confederation, rather than national solidarity, meant. They also reveal clearly why it was that Madison, proud Virginian though he was, had become a Nationalist by the time of Cornwallis' surrender.

Madison counseled Virginia officers to surrender nothing to the claims of Connecticut and New York in the squabble over western lands, and he showed marked concern for the future of Mississippi navigation and the future of the Kentucky country; yet his anguish over lack of cooperation between the states in military affairs, his awareness that sectional rivalry was leading to fiscal ruin, and his steady support of attempts to adopt the Impost mark him by 1781 as a Virginian who was prepared to embrace much of the program advocated by Robert Morris and his associates. To what degree Madison and his correspondents were moved toward this position as a result of the pillaging of their native state is problematical, but if there is one dominant theme that runs through this volume it is the war effort and the growing realization of the helplessness of American arms without the shield of French men-of-war. After reading this volume, it is not difficult to comprehend the Francophilism of southern Republicanism which developed in the 1790's.

While it is no fault of the editors, whose meticulous research is evidenced in a wealth of footnotes, Madison as a personality is scarcely recognizable. How much more alive to us John Adams and Thomas Jefferson become as we read the contemporary editions of their papers. Not so in the case of Madison, who is entirely admirable in his devotion to duty, clearheaded in his analysis of events, but scarcely arresting. Entirely lacking is the passion and vehemence of Adams or the wide-ranging fascination with life in all its variety that Jefferson showed from youth to old age. At times, too, the thoroughness of the editors in choosing to publish everything that Madison wrote unnecessarily burdens the reader with repetition or with such useless items as a weekly report of the Virginia delegation to Governor Thomas Nelson saying only that there is nothing to report (p. 232).

Scholars will be delighted, however, to find the confusion of being unable to identify a correspondent or his relation to events being discussed a thing of the past so far as this edition is concerned. Gaillard Hunt would surely be astounded by the depth of research which goes into the post-Boyd manuscript editions. The speed with which dissertations may now be completed because of this quarrying should be obvious to sharp-eyed graduate students.

Wabash College

Stephen G. Kurtz