

his men, had the common touch, and possessed the intangible quality of leadership. Hence, he gained the flawless fighting performance of his soldiers that, along with his flawless battle plan, wrought the miracle of Cowpens. Indeed, it is not Greene but Morgan who emerges as the model and hero of the book. Not only is the Cowpens episode vividly related, but Mrs. Treacy's fresh and persuasive explanation of why Morgan fought *where* and *when* he did is perhaps the most important contribution of the book. Rather than give it away here, let the reader himself turn to pages 89-90 of *Prelude to Yorktown*.

Although there are many penetrating insights as Mrs. Treacy follows the Greene campaign to Guilford Courthouse, the treatment of the strategic factor is uneven and not up to the literary quality or the feeling for the human element that are notable features of the book. To the understanding of strategic matters the author makes scant contribution except to underline the partisan nature of the campaign and to dwell on the leadership aspect. It is unfortunate also that Mrs. Treacy uses her bibliography to cast aspersions on the work of several able and reputable historians, since, although solid and professional, her own research is not perfect and does reveal some surprising omissions—e.g., Edward McCrady's monumental *History of South Carolina in the Revolution* (2 vols., 1901-1902) and Anne King Gregorie's nearly definitive *Thomas Sumter* (1931).

Rutgers University

Richard Maxwell Brown

The Papers of John C. Calhoun. Volume II, 1817-1818. Edited by W. Edwin Hemphill. (Columbia: University of South Carolina Press, for the South Caroliniana Society, 1963. Pp. xciv, 513. Illustration, notes, bibliography, index. \$10.00.)

Few Americans have had as extensive an experience in government as had John C. Calhoun, congressman, secretary of war, vice-president for two terms, senator, secretary of state, and perennial but ever unsuccessful candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination. He served his nation in an official capacity for four decades—from his election to the House of Representatives as a War Hawk in 1810 (after a brief tenure in the South Carolina legislature) until his death in 1850 shortly before the Senate passed the great compromise of that year. Richard Crallé edited six volumes of Calhoun's works soon after his death, and as long ago as 1900 the American Historical Association published two volumes of letters to and from him. The current project of the South Caroliniana Society is a full-dress publication of Calhoun papers the bulk of which have long been in print.

The late Robert L. Meriwether edited the first volume which includes one-hundred-and-fifty-nine documents and some abstracts covering a sixteen-year period. Edwin Hemphill now has edited the second volume for a short eight-month period when Calhoun became secretary of war, from December, 1817, to July, 1818. Three thousand of his papers are summarized; two hundred are printed in full, but only a dozen written by Calhoun and personally signed by him are included.

At this rate, instead of the original estimate of a total of fifteen volumes the project will require twice that number.

Scholars will always quibble about the proper method of editing the papers of a prominent figure, but many roads lead to Rome. This volume actually tells little about the man, but it is a detailed study of the department he administered. Documents already published are simply summarized, and two out of three of the letters printed here are often inconsequential and routine epistles addressed to him. The text is preceded by an excellent, incisive one-hundred-page introduction describing Calhoun's conduct of his department and the political ramifications thereof. Many historians will agree that an analysis of an important executive department in such a crucial era is worth the effort. William E. Dodd pronounced Calhoun the best secretary of war until Franklin Pierce appointed Jefferson Davis to that post in mid-century. William Lowndes in 1819 wrote from England that his South Carolina friend was much superior to Lord Palmerston, then serving in the same capacity in the British cabinet. This period in Calhoun's career, when he was an archnationalist, has often been neglected by his biographers.

Even the informed reader will find most of the contents of this book dull. Calhoun as secretary of war was a vigorous bureaucrat in an important post—he regarded the Treaty of Ghent as only a truce in a critical struggle with England certain to be resumed at any moment. It is obvious that he was an eager beaver and that he was a man doing a job he thought had to be done; but the Calhoun papers of this period reveal little of that intriguing ambivalence of personality with which he was endowed.

In general I would question the value to the historical profession of the current re-editing of the works of Thomas Jefferson, Benjamin Franklin, and Calhoun, particularly in view of the fact that such work has already been adequately done. In my opinion, little that is significant has been added by the tomes now pouring from the presses. The papers of important figures like Thomas Hart Benton, Martin Van Buren, and Stephen A. Douglas, were they made available, would be of far more service. Nor do these new editions shed much additional light on the fundamental question in regard to their subjects, namely "what is he to Hecuba or Hecuba to him?"

Tulane University

Gerald M. Capers

The Larkin Papers: Personal, Business, and Official Correspondence of Thomas Oliver Larkin, Merchant and United States Consul in California. Volume VIII, 1848-1851. Edited by George P. Hammond. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1962. Pp. xxix, 420. Illustrations, notes. \$10.00.)

It was just over ten years ago when George P. Hammond's first volume of *The Larkin Papers* was published. New England-born Thomas Oliver Larkin arrived at the tiny village of Yerba Buena on San Francisco Bay in 1832. The following year he moved to Monterey, the