

The Comte de Paris' History.

(Continued from page 17.)

THE GENERAL OF THE WAR OF THE REBELLION

Of the numerous personal allusion which these interesting volumes contain we have left room for only an occasional reference. Of McDowell, the leader at Bull Run, a most favorable opinion is formed. He possessed, we are told, "as much experience of military affairs as it was possible for any American officer to have acquired; he was well acquainted with his profession, and had too much good sense to share the delusions entertained by those around him, regarding the qualities of his soldiers. Partly educated in France and perfectly acquainted with our literature, he had thoroughly studied the military profession, and, since the Mexican campaign, had shown excellent administrative talents on General Scott's staff. Possessed of indefatigable energy, his creative mind made up, to a certain extent, for the inefficiency of the instruments he had to handle, and the plan he had formed for attacking the Confederates at Bull Run, shows, despite the results of that disastrous campaign, the correctness of this military coup d'oeil."

He displayed great energy and self-possession in the terrible emergency that arose, and his only error "consisted in having relied too much on the perseverance of his soldiers and the promises of General Scott. He would, in fact, have achieved a certain victory if, as he believed, he had only to contend with Beauregard's army."

Rosecrans, we are told, "although he may have been to blame for his dilatory movements at Rich Mountain, was a distinguished soldier, who knew what he could exact from his troops, and was beloved by them. If he was not gifted with great quickness of perception, he possessed the art of combining his operations judiciously, and his adversaries rendered justice both to his talents and to his humanity towards the vanquished." General Halleck is described as "a wise officer, with fine organizing abilities, but who was accused of too frequently thwarting the designs of his subordinates, and of leaving them afterwards to carry out in presence of the enemy the plans of campaign he had elaborated in his office." Buell "was a strict and methodical officer, admirably fitted for training young soldiers, but too slow to handle them successfully in an active campaign." De Trobriand was "a brave and able chief."

Of Sherman's first entanglement with the Department of War we are told that "the comprehensive mind of this true soldier enabled him to understand at a glance how greatly above the resources at his disposal was the task imposed upon him, and he refused to undertake a partisan warfare (*petite guerre*) which could be productive of no results. He expressed his convictions with his usual precision, and without any regard for those illusions in which he did not participate." At Shiloh "his truly warlike instinct made him discover at a glance the points most easy to defend, and his indomitable courage rallied once more the dismayed soldiers, who would no longer listen to the voice of any other leader. Those who knew this officer best, generally so chary of his words and sharp in discussion, looked upon him as a new man. Danger had revealed the qualities of the great general, quick in his decisions, clear in his orders, imparting to all, by a word, a gesture, or a look, the ardor which fired his own breast. In the midst of this hand to hand conflict, the most terrible he said himself to the au-

thor that he has witnessed during his whole career, he soon became the soul of resistance. Whenever he passed along, his tall form overshadowing all disordered groups, the ranks were reformed and the fighting was renewed. McClelland himself, who, a few days before, had quarrelled with him regarding the command of the Army during Grant's absence, felt the power of his influence at this trying moment, deferentially followed all the counsels of his colleague."

Of McClelland our author speaks with all the enthusiasm of a young soldier for the chief under whom he served. And McClelland's difficulties with the authorities at Washington are set forth at some length, and always from the point of view of the Headquarters of the Army of the Potomac, though with candor it is shown that at the beginning, "the great nation which looked to him for safety thought of nothing but to aid him in his efforts, and to place in his hands the most powerful means of action, without embarrassing, by a single criticism of a solitary word of impatience, the work of organization to which he had entirely devoted himself."

General Butler comes in for a complimentary notice in the shape of a reminder of the fact that he "found himself by a singular coincidence the chief in command at Big Bethel, and at the first attack on Fort Fisher, and was thus both the first and the last general beaten by the Confederates."

The first volume of this American translation, just published, includes the first two volumes of the French, and completes the history of the first year of the war. Two other volumes have been published in Paris, the third and fourth, bringing the history down to the end of 1862. These volumes will shortly make their appearance from the press of Messrs. Coates and Co. The first book of the third volume, describes the Peninsula Campaign of McClelland and the Army of the Potomac against Richmond, including the battles of Williamsburg, Fair Oaks, Gaines' Mills, Glendale and Malvern. Book 2, covers the operations of the Mississippi, and along the coast, in which the Navy took part. Book 3, resumes the account of operations in Virginia and Maryland, including the battle of Cedar Mountain, the campaign under Pope in Virginia, the Surrender of Harper's Ferry and the battle of Antietam, with McClelland again in command of the Army of the Potomac. This volume covers the period of the author's service in Virginia, on the staff of General McClelland, and his narrative is colored here, as we have already stated, by a natural partiality for the officers with whom he served. In describing the Yorktown Peninsula, the scene of that early campaign against Richmond, he says: "It was in fact, on the Peninsula, where the soldiers of Washington and of Rochambeau had completed the glorious work of American Emancipation; it was in the vicinity of Yorktown, already celebrated as the scene of capitulation of Lord Cornwallis, that the Army of the Potomac was about to fight its first battles; and—to recall here a personal reflection, if such is permitted to an obscure member of that army—the remembrance of the common victory gained upon the soil by France and America, stirred the pulses of the exiles, so generously welcomed to the protection of the flag of the young Republic." We publish elsewhere in this number of the *Journal*, a letter from General French, with reference to the description of the battle of Gaines' Mills, which appears in this volume.

The fourth volume of the original, and the last thus far published, is divided into four books; the first describing the camp-

aign in Kentucky, the battles of Perryville, Corinth and Prairie Grove, and the operations connected therewith; the second covering the operations on the Mississippi and in Louisiana, the guerrilla operations of Forrest and Morgan, and the measures taken to defeat them, and finally the battle of Murfreesborough and the operations leading thereto. Book III. describes the campaign in Virginia the operations on the Potomac and Appahannock, and the battle of Fredericksburg. Book VI. and last, describes the naval operations and the political situation. The last two chapters are devoted to a description of the efforts to replenish our Army by recruiting, to our financial operations and to the emancipation proclamation, and the causes leading to its issue.

The translation of the Comte de Paris' work, by Mr. Tasiastro, as edited by Professor Coppée, is an excellent one, on the whole, and though somewhat free, it does not misrepresent the book, which loses nothing at the hands of its translators. It was the author's preference that his work should first appear in its English dress on this side of the Atlantic, and this translation bears his express authorization.

This is the third history of our war, more or less elaborate, which has appeared in the French language, the excellent work of the Swiss Colonel Le Comte being the first of these, and the two interesting volumes of Colonel De Trobriand, the second. The present work is the most elaborate and complete of the three, and is, as the *Nation* has said, "the first attempt at a full and corrected military history of the whole war." On this account, as well as because of the position of its author and its own intrinsic value, it well deserves reproduction in English dress. It has taken, and it will hold, a high place among the contemporaneous histories, not because of its original research, but because of the candid, just and painstaking spirit which characterizes it throughout, and which will win for its author the esteem of all who, realizing the magnitude of the task with which he has charged himself, understand how well it has been accomplished, on the whole. No history that passes under the hands of the actors in the scene it describes, can hope to escape the shafts of criticism; this will be no exception. We have preferred to occupy ourselves, however, with giving our readers such ideas as we can, within the compass of a single article, of its spirit, scope and manner, leaving criticism to seek its victim without our aid. An occasional error of statement has been corrected in the foot notes of Prof. Coppée, which are interposed during the volume.

The Cologne Gazette on Standing Armies.

Not very many years have elapsed since the *Cologne Gazette*, which has always enjoyed a high reputation, and has now become indisputably the ablest and most highly regarded journal in Germany, and probably of the Continent, was in deadly opposition to the Prussian Government. Its pronounced Liberalism made it the mark at which many a Ministerial dart was hurled. It was constantly confiscated, warned and mutilated. It has survived to better days, not so much by any change on its own part, as from the fact that feudal Prussia, gathering together the lines of the disjointed Fatherland, has become liberal Germany, and is thus, on almost every occasion, in harmony with the opinions of the *Kölnische Zeitung*. Still we must, in spite of the changed relation of the