

The Papers of James Madison. Edited by William T. Hutchinson and William M. E. Rachal. Volume 4: *1 January 1782-31 July 1782*; Volume 5: *1 August 1782-31 December 1782.* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1965, 1967. Pp. xxviii, 486; xxx, 520. \$12.50 each.)

These two volumes of the Madison Papers, covering the single year 1782, span a period of the American Revolution that sometimes seems in danger of becoming lost between the climactic military events of 1781 and the final diplomatic settlement of 1783. Their contents provide primarily a record of public business, specifically the affairs of the Confederation Congress, where Madison continued, as he had since March 1780, to serve as a member of the Virginia delegation. There are upwards of forty reports of one kind or another in whose preparation Madison participated, a similar number of motions or resolutions for which he had some responsibility, and a few additional comments and memoranda. Also, Madison's extensive notes on the debates in Congress begin with the session of November 4 and carry through the remainder of the year. The largest part of the contents of the two volumes, however, comprises letters between Madison or the entire Virginia delegation on the one hand and various Virginians, including the governor, treasurer, members of the Council of State, etc., on the other—in a word, the official and quasi-official correspondence between state leaders and the congressional delegation.

The most informative segment of this correspondence is Madison's exchange of letters with Edmund Randolph, who left his seat in Congress in March and returned to Virginia for the remainder of the year. Both wrote almost weekly; and, although at times Madison must surely have missed his colleague's vote in the divided Virginia delegation, their continuous reports of what was happening in Philadelphia and Virginia are invaluable for scholars today. Madison and Edmund Pendleton wrote each other frequently, too, but the number of letters to and from Thomas Jefferson in this year was small. It might seem that "the great collaboration" was not in full operation, although it certainly resumed when Jefferson arrived in Philadelphia at the very end of the year and took up residence for several weeks at Madison's rooming house.

Perhaps two major themes, beyond the general coverage of congressional activity during the year, dominate these volumes. One

concerns the conduct of war and diplomacy, for the British government began the year still committed to pursuing the struggle against America—by naval and commercial warfare and by disrupting the Franco-American entente rather than by military activity—and Congress still did not know when the year closed of the signing of provisional articles of peace on November 30. Here Madison took a consistently strong stand in favor of continued co-operation with France.

The other theme, one that continues to develop from preceding years and earlier volumes of the Papers, is the further shaping of Madison's moderate nationalist views. Madison was, of course, strongly committed in 1782 to maintaining an effective union of states; but, continuing to suffer misgivings about charter of Robert Morris' Bank of North America and working to uphold Virginia's western land claims, he hardly appeared at the center of any incipient nationalist coalition. To be sure, the nature of the record reproduced here, consisting in such large part of his correspondence with state officials, must necessarily put the strongest possible emphasis on his defense of the interests of Virginia. Still, he had finally supported the bank charter at the end of 1781, he was shifting to a position of greater sympathy for making the West a common possession of all the states, and he never hesitated in his concern for the financial independence of the Confederation. He is, then, a nationalist, but, as the editors observe, not an unqualified one. If the record of 1782 fills out more than it enlarges our understanding of Madison's constitutional thought, it is nevertheless a useful reminder of the extent to which that thought was the product of practical political experience—and for some it may be a corrective for the view that Madison was intellectually rigid or excessively doctrinaire.

College of William and Mary

THAD W. TATE