

Francis Bowen, “War of Races in Hungary,” and a Lost Harvard Professorship,

Or a Tempest in a Boston Tea Pot¹

On February 6, 1851, the Board of Overseers of Harvard University voted against confirming Francis Bowen as McLean Professor of Ancient and Modern History, a post he had occupied since May the year before. Bowen had, for the past year, received much negative press concerning two anti-Hungarian articles he had written for the *North American Review*, the leading literary journal in the United States at that time, a journal that he edited. The focus of this paper is how two articles about a country most Americans knew very little about led to a professor being denied tenure at Harvard.

The American press followed the wars and revolutions in Europe in 1848–49 with great interest and sympathy. They viewed these events as a continuation of the American and French revolutions, the throwing off of kings and nobility, and the inevitable march toward a republican form of government. As the events unfolded, and the uprisings in France, Italy, and Germany were suppressed, Hungary became the focus of press attention as the last man standing, so to speak. The American press carried stories (although not always accurate) of Hungary’s victories and defeats, and news of the surrender of the Hungarian army at Világos was received with great disappointment when it arrived in the US in September 1849. Then Senator Daniel Webster summed up the national mood in a speech in Boston in November when he said that “[w]e have all had our sympathies much enlisted in the Hungarian effort for liberty. We have all wept at its failure. We thought we saw a more rational hope of establishing free government in Hungary than in any other part of Europe.”²

Against this general tide of sympathy for Hungary stood several editors of prominent newspapers and journals. The common theme of these publications was their opposition to the Hungarian cause, although they were dissimilar in their focus. *Brownson’s Quarterly Review*, edited by Orestes Brownson, staunch Catholic and cultural critic, attacked Lajos Kossuth as an enemy of the Catholic Church and of one of its strongest supporters, the Habsburg dynasty.³ James Watson Webb, editor of the *New York Courier and Enquirer*, attacked the Hungarian cause because he believed that sympathy for it in the United States Senate derailed his nomination to be United States Charge d’Affaires

1 Library of Congress. Ideas and opinions expressed here are the author’s own and not that of the Library of Congress or the United States Government.

2 “Festival of the Sons of New Hampshire” [Speech delivered on November 7, 1849, in Boston, MA], in *Works of Daniel Webster*, Vol. 2 (Boston: Little, Brown, 1864), 514.

3 Kenneth Nyirady, “Orestes Brownson and Catholic Opposition to Kossuth in the U.S.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Hungarian Educators’ Association, Pittsburgh, PA, May 8–10, 2008.

to Vienna in 1850.⁴ Discussed here will be the case of Francis Bowen, editor of the *North American Review*, the leading literary journal in the United States. Bowen was also an instructor in history at Harvard University. In January 1850 and again in April, Bowen published articles in his journal highly critical of Hungary and its war of independence, in which he claimed Austria to be the force of progress and Hungary the force of reaction in that struggle. These two articles provoked a controversy that carried over into the Boston newspapers, the *New-York Daily Tribune*, and other newspapers and journals around the nation, eventually costing Bowen a professorship at Harvard.

Francis Bowen, despite his attainments, was not a member of the Boston elite. Born in 1811 into a family of modest means, he attended Phillips Exeter Academy but was obliged to hold a job to support himself there. Nevertheless, he graduated from Harvard in 1833 at the head of his class,⁵ and was invited back two years later to teach. He visited Paris in 1839 and spent several years in France, returning to the US and becoming editor of the *North American Review* in 1843. He has been described as a “professional literary man” credited with reviving a dull journal, a “[g]ood critic, better journalist and editor”; and he did not shrink from controversy. According to one historian of literary criticism, “Bowen was that rare and beautiful specimen, a political reactionary with a turn for literary and moral radicalism.”⁶ A history of the journal, published in 1935, described him as a “man of broad learning and varied interests; but he was prejudiced, belligerent, and far too unmindful of his audience.”⁷

While tutoring and teaching at Harvard, he was appointed McLean Professor of Ancient and Modern History on May 25, 1850, and lectured on English constitutional, modern European and Greek history. However, appointment was only the first step in the hiring process; confirmation by the state legislature was the second, and as Harvard’s by-laws required the state legislature to be in session for confirmation, it would have to wait until the following February. For Francis Bowen those would be eight long and agonizing months.

The controversy concerning Bowen’s opinions about Hungary did not begin with the publication of his articles but rather with a lecture he delivered in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in the fall of 1849. Bowen based his lecture on an article he was writing for

4 Kenneth Nyirady, “Yet Another American Editor Opposes Kossuth: James Watson Webb.” Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Hungarian Educators’ Association, Kolozsvár/Cluj, Romania, July 9–11, 2015.

5 Samuel Eliot Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636–1936* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1936), 291.

6 George E. DeMille, “The Birth of the Brahmins,” *Sewanee Review* 37.2 (Apr. 1929), 183–184.

7 F. L. Mott, “One Hundred Twenty Years,” *North American Review* 240.1 (June 1935), 158. It should be pointed out that even before the Hungarian controversy, Bowen had his detractors. In a letter dated October 24, 1849, published in the *Springfield Republican* and extracted in the *Salem Register* on November 1, it was noted that Bowen was one of two possible candidates for the soon-to-be vacated McLean Professorship at Harvard, but that he “has made himself obnoxious to many of the friends of the College by several severe attacks, which he has made upon its management, and his chance is therefore a poor one.”

the forthcoming issue of the *North American Review*, an article highly critical of Hungary and its War of Independence that had recently concluded. Word of this lecture reached the Boston newspapers and provoked a negative response. One letter to the *Daily Evening Transcript* even called for subscribers to the *North American Review* to cancel their subscriptions. Bowen expressed dismay at the "gross personal abuse" he was experiencing, especially as no part of the lecture had appeared in print. He suspected that none of the newspaper editors of the offending papers had actually attended his presentation.⁸

In fact, that article was a book review. "The War of Races in Hungary,"⁹ reviewed *De l'esprit public en Hongrie depuis la révolution française*, by Auguste De Gérando (Paris: 1848). De Gérando was married to Emma Teleki, had lived on the Teleki estate in Transylvania, and was generally sympathetic to the Hungarian cause. Bowen early in this review noted that he also drew information from a series of articles by Hippolyte Desprez and Emilie de Langsdorff in the French journal *Revue des deux Mondes*.

According to Bowen, Americans were misled by the press, which republished reports from the French and German papers, whose purpose was to gain sympathy for the Magyars (Bowen distinguishes between Magyars, the ethnic group, and Hungarians, the inhabitants of the country.) These foreign papers exaggerated reports of Magyar victories and distorted the causes and aims of the war. Bowen's main point was that the Hungarian war was not a war for national independence or for establishing a republic but rather a civil war between the Magyars, who constituted only one-third of the population of Hungary, and what he called their "subject races," that is, the Croats, Serbs, Romanians, Slovaks, and Germans. Bowen insisted that the Magyars only declared independence when the Habsburgs enacted a "liberal" constitution in March 1849 that granted equality of all peoples in the empire. The Magyars then fought to retain their ancient rights, that is, domination over and subjugation of the non-Magyars in Hungary. Bowen argued that if the Magyars had renounced their "enormous and unjust privileges" and "the insolent supremacy of their race" and granted "confederation and equality of political rights" to the non-Magyars, they could have destroyed the Austrian Empire and prevented a Russian invasion.¹⁰

It would be one thing if Bowen's article were merely a reinterpretation of the Hungarian War of Independence; but, as his critics will point out below, his article was filled with errors and distortions of fact. A few will be mentioned here as a general illustration. Bowen claimed that the nobility of Hungary was exclusively Magyar, that every Magyar nobleman owned land, that the Magyar peasant formed the higher stratum of the peasantry, and, of course, the one that persists even to this day, that Kossuth was not a Mag-

8 Letter to the editor, *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), Dec. 1, 1849; Francis Bowen, letter to the editor, *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 6, 1849.

9 Francis Bowen, "The War of Races in Hungary," review of *De l'Esprit Public en Hongrie, depuis la Révolution Française* by A. Degerando, *North American Review* 70.146 (Jan. 1850): 78–136.

10 Bowen, "The War of Races," 82, 100.

yar but actually a “Magyarized Slowack lawyer.”¹¹ In one place Bowen equated this alleged Magyar overlordship of the “present” [Jan. 1850] to that of the Normans in England in the years following the conquest, i.e., brutal subjection of the conquered people. Yet in another he weakened his own argument by admitting that these things were true only if one overlooked “the changes which have been made within the last ten years...”¹² And those changes of 1848–49, as any student of Hungarian history knows, were revolutionary.

Bowen concluded by criticizing Austria’s treatment of the vanquished Magyars, calling it both cruel and imprudent. The executions and retributions have forever alienated the Magyars and Hungary in the future will be a source of instability and insecurity for Austria, as Ireland became for England after the suppression of the Irish rebellion in 1798.¹³

The press reaction to Bowen’s first article was swift. For example, the *Boston Daily Evening Transcript* already in January republished an article from the *Philadelphia Ledger*, and commented on an article in the *Washington Republic*, both pointing out what they perceived as the obvious errors in Bowen’s analysis; the *Republic* contrasting the testimony of the Hungarian émigrés already in Washington with the assertions of “a review editor, who confessedly draws all his knowledge, on the subject of which he treats, from a book, which book may or not possess any weight or authority.”¹⁴ The editor of the journal *Ladies’ Repository*, Benjamin Tefft, called Bowen’s article “libelous and false in every part of it,” that every paragraph “contains a misstatement of facts,” and even accused Bowen of being the anonymous author of “several” articles opposing the revolutions of 1848 that appeared in the English journal *Blackwood’s Edinburgh Magazine*.¹⁵

Bowen’s second article concerning Hungary appeared in April 1850, in which he reviewed four books: two British, one French, and one published in the United States. “The Politics of Europe”¹⁶ opened by discussing the revolutionary movements in Europe

11 Bowen, “The War of Races,” 88–89; see Istvan Deak, *The Lawful Revolution: Louis Kossuth and the Hungarians 1848–1849* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1979), 9–10, for a more nuanced discussion of the Kossuth family origins.

12 Bowen, “The War of Races,” 88–90.

13 Bowen, “The War of Races,” 135–136.

14 *Boston Daily Evening Transcript*, Jan. 21, 1850; Jan. 31, 1850.

15 “Editors Table,” *Ladies’ Repository* 10.3 (March 1850), 103. The articles in question from *Blackwood’s*, which Tefft does not enumerate, are all signed “Ernest”; the first two are entitled “American Thoughts on European Revolutions,” dated Boston, May 1848 (*Blackwood’s*, July 1848, 31–39); the second dated Boston, December 1848 (*Blackwood’s*, Feb. 1849, 190–201); and the third, “The Reaction, or Foreign Conservatism,” dated Boston, Feb. 1849 (*Blackwood’s*, May 1849, 529–541).

16 Francis Bowen, “The Politics of Europe,” Review of 1. *Les Guerre d’Idiome et de Nationalité: Tableaux, Esquisses, et Souvenirs d’Histoire Contemporaine*, by Paul de Bourgoing, Ancien Ministre de France en Russie et en Allemagne; 2. *Austria*, by Edward P. Thompson; 3. *The Annual Register, or a View of the History and Politics of the Year 1848*; 4. *A Brief Explanatory Report as to the Termination of the Hungarian Struggle, the Capitulation of the Fortress of*

in 1848–49. Bowen observed how the public's sympathy shifted according to the fortunes of the parties at war, and how humiliating it was "to look back upon changes of opinion so frequent and violent"; and lamented that public opinion had been "lavished upon demagogues, savage fanatics, or disguised supporters of despotism, the admiration which was intended for the brave, enlightened, and disinterested champions of human freedom and defenders of their country's rights." Bowen, quoting one of the sources in his review, called the revolutionary movements primarily a "war of races, in which different nationalities, speaking different languages, came in contact with each other by seeking to vindicate or preserve a superior relative position." He observed that "[t]he principle of the division of nationalities by their languages thus appears to be in truth the ruling political idea of our times. [...] Hence, when wars break out in which these questions of language and race are concerned, it is difficult to get at the merits of the case, or to certain which party is in the right." Bowen's disapproval was not limited to the Magyars. He harshly criticized Giuseppe Mazzini and Giuseppe Garibaldi, calling the former "a veteran conspirator" and the latter "a brigand and the leader of brigands."¹⁷

Bowen was convinced that Americans were deceived about the aims of the revolutions in Europe, and too quickly jumped to the conclusion, "that a revolution in a monarchy necessarily tended to the establishment of a republic; and that, of two parties in a war, the one which had the misfortune to obtain the assistance either of Austria or Russia was unquestionably in the wrong." Bowen noted the Magyars were not fighting to establish a republic, despite the prevailing public opinion to the contrary. But the enthusiasm for the refugees and support for Hungary in the United States had been artificially kept alive by the press, "the only despotic power which exists in this country..."¹⁸ Bowen, obviously, was smarting under the attacks he had just received from the press.

Bowen denigrated the reforms of the Hungarian government of 1848–49, stating that they actually began with Széchenyi, and the Batthyány–Kossuth government "only reluctantly" went along with them. He cited John Paget's book *Hungary and Transylvania*¹⁹ concerning the brutal treatment of the Hungarian peasantry, but failed to realize that by noting that Paget lived in Hungary in 1835 Bowen admitted that Paget's observations preceded the reforms regarding the serfs by a dozen years.²⁰

Despite his harsh criticism of the Magyars, Bowen insisted he was not defending Austria. He would have welcomed, he said, "the dethronement of the House of Hapsburg, whose very name is a byword in history for perfidy, cruelty, and oppression." More-

Comorn, and the Objects, Probable Extent, and Other Circumstances of the Hungarian Emigration, *North American Review* 70: 147, 473–520.

17 Bowen, "The Politics of Europe," 474, 476, 478, 483.

18 Bowen, "The Politics of Europe," 485, 496–498, 500.

19 John Paget, *Hungary and Transylvania; with Remarks on Their Condition, Social, Political and Economical* (London: J. Murray, 1839), 2 vols.

20 Bowen, "The Politics of Europe," 516–517.

over, the United States should welcome the Hungarian refugees as it welcomed refugees of all political opinions, with open arms and grant them land to settle.²¹

Soon after Bowen's second article appeared in the April issue of the *North American Review*, another journal, the *Christian Examiner*, published a 45-page article under the title "Hungary and Austria" written by an author with the initials M.L.P. The article was a straightforward, rather complimentary history of Hungary, emphasizing its relations with the Habsburgs until 1848, did not mention Bowen by name, and gave no hint of the later battle that would develop between these two authors.²²

M.L.P. was none other than Mary Lowell Putnam (1810–1898), who came from a distinguished Boston family.²³ Her brother, James Russell Lowell, was already an established poet, and her mother was said to be "a woman of 'remarkable mind,' and gifted with an extraordinary facility of acquiring languages."²⁴ This facility she passed on to her daughter. The number of languages Mary Lowell Putnam herself mastered varies, according to the source, but Robert Carter, a close family friend, declared that she knew Greek, Latin, Hebrew, French, Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, German, Swedish, Danish, Hungarian, Polish, Russian, Turkish, Sanskrit, and "several other European and Asiatic languages which [he is] not able to designate with accuracy."²⁵ She had lived in Poland and Hungary, and later spent six years in France and Germany.²⁶ She also had acquired some literary fame for her 1844 translation from Swedish of Fredrika Bremer's novel, *The Bondmaid*, and she used her knowledge of Hungarian to pen a review of the six-volume collected works of Károly Kisfaludy,²⁷ ironically in the same issue of the *North American Review* that Francis Bowen published his second attack on the Hungarians. Lowell Putnam also later contributed approximately 44 pages of material relating to Hungary to Elizabeth Peabody's 1852 book *Crimes of the House of Austria against Mankind*.²⁸

21 Bowen, "The Politics of Europe," 500–501.

22 M.L.P. [Mary Lowell Putnam], "Hungary and Austria," *Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany* 48 (May 1850), 444–498.

23 The social standing of the Lowells in Boston was well stated in a verse by John Collins Bossidy (1860–1928), as part of a toast at the Holy Cross Alumni Dinner in 1919: "And this is good old Boston, / The home of the bean and the cod / Where the Lowells talk to the Cabots / And the Cabots talk only to God" (John Bartlett, *Bartlett's Familiar Quotations: a Collection of Passages, Phrases, and Proverbs Traced to their Sources in Ancient and Modern Literature*, 18th ed. [New York: Little, Brown, 2012], 577).

24 *Homes of American Authors; Comprising Anecdotal, Personal, and Descriptive Sketches, by Various Writers* (New York: G.P. Lowell Putnam, 1853), 359.

25 Robert Carter, "Mr. Bowen's Attack on Mrs. Lowell Putnam," *Boston Daily Atlas*, Dec. 23, 1850.

26 Joseph Adelman, *Famous Women, an Outline of Feminine Achievement through the Ages with Life Stories of Five Hundred Noted Women* (New York: Ellis M. Lonow, [c1926]), 177.

27 Mary Lowell Putnam, "Review of *Kisfaludi Kisfaludy Károly's Minden Munkái*. Pestén. 1843–4 (The Complete Works of Charles Kisfaludy, of Kisfalud. Pest)," *North American Review* 70.147 (Apr. 1850): 289–330.

28 Elizabeth P. Peabody, *Crimes of the House of Austria against Mankind* (New-York: R. Garrigue, 1852).

In "Hungary and Austria," Lowell Putnam compared the similarities between the Hungarian War of Independence 1848–49 with Rákóczi's War of Independence of 1703–11, both the result of the Habsburgs refusal to honor their coronation oaths as kings of Hungary. She lamented the falsehoods appearing in the "German" [i.e. Austrian] press about a semi-barbarian Hungary resisting the enlightened reforms of Austria. She disparaged the *Revue des deux Mondes*, the main source of Bowen's first article, considering Desprez one of those who "discuss subjects with which they are only half acquainted," whereas de Langsdorff was merely "one of the least unjust, and not the most ignorant" of the writers of the *Revue*. She refuted many of Bowen's points without naming Bowen himself. In her opinion, the Hungarians placed great weight on law and legal agreements, and that the Habsburgs had broken such agreements in an attempt to turn Hungary into just another province in the Austrian domains. Even when Napoleon offered independence to the Hungarians, they would not break their oath to their king to accept it. She observed that reforms in Hungary came about through the initiative of the nobles and not a reaction to peasant uprisings. What took blood and turmoil in France and Italy came about peacefully in Hungary on March 15, 1848. Clearly, the events in Hungary were not as Bowen had described them.²⁹

This author is unaware of anything that transpired between Lowell Putnam and Bowen from May through the early fall of 1850. But in November Lowell Putnam published a seventy-page article with the innocuous title "The *North American Review* on Hungary," an article devoted to a point-by-point refutation of Bowen's arguments, dismantling each in a logical and systematic fashion.³⁰

First, she noted that after the war "slandorous tales" started coming out of Europe, impugning the motives and actions of the Hungarians. Francis Bowen, being unfamiliar with the history and politics of Hungary, had not the background to evaluate the validity of these stories. Lowell Putnam was concerned that Bowen's misrepresentations, coming from the authoritative *North American Review*, would not only damage the reputation of the New England literary community, but would also turn public opinion against the Hungarian émigrés who, flowing into the United States, depended on the generosity of others to survive. As the business community, the likely source of this generosity, lacked the leisure to study the question, it was most likely to base its opinions on such "constituted authorities" as the *North American Review*. Some had hoped the author would revise his opinions in his second article but instead he strongly repeated his original assertions.³¹

Lowell Putnam then put forth her main point: while she wished to avoid "severity of comment," she must plainly and openly state that no part of Bowen's "War of the Races" was accurate. "We do not exaggerate, and we believe that all these persons who have an acquaintance with the history of Hungary, and who have read the article in the

29 M.L.P., "Hungary and Austria," 445, 447–448, 455, 472, 493.

30 M.L.P. [Mary Lowell Putnam], "The *North American Review* on Hungary," *Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany* 49 (Nov. 1850), 417–481.

31 M.L.P., "The *North American Review*," 418–422.

North American, will sustain us when we say, that there is hardly a sentence in this article in which an error is not either expressed or implied; in many portions of it, error is so interwoven with error, that the baffled critic turns from the task of refutation as from the entrance to an inextricable labyrinth." Lowell Putnam believed that nobody had written a detailed refutation of Bowen's article so far because a thorough refutation would require "Herculean labor" to correct all the errors.³²

For example, Lowell Putnam pointed out that although Bowen's first article was supposed to be a review of De Gérando's *De l'esprit public en Hongrie depuis la révolution française*, there is not a single instance where Bowen actually cites De Gérando; instead he relied on highly biased, anti-Hungarian French sources, and then selectively edited out any references that might throw a good light on the Hungarians. Lowell Putnam acknowledged that De Gérando contained "full and accurate accounts" of the political and social institutions of the country, but only through 1847, as the book was published in 1848. Therefore, it did not cover the sweeping social changes that took place in that year, beginning with the April Laws.³³

Lowell Putnam then proceeded to refute, in great detail, all the errors in Bowen's articles, both concerning his historical facts as well as in his analysis of modern Hungarian society and politics. It would take an article as long as Lowell Putnam's to fully describe the details of the arguments, but in summary, she demonstrated that Bowen's review concerned a book he never cited, he got his historical and demographic facts wrong, he truncated quotations in order to leave out information contrary to his conclusions and favorable to the Magyars, as well as a host of other sins. She dismantled Bowen's arguments in a workman-like fashion, one-by-one, correcting error upon error.

Concerning the historical facts (persons and dates), Lowell Putnam argued that if Bowen could not get the details right, how could he be correct about the larger themes? For example, Bowen asserted that all the nobility in Hungary were Magyar, and all owned land. Lowell Putnam provided statistical data to show that in one northern county there were 2,200 nobles yet only 200 Magyar inhabitants, and in another county with no Magyars there were 638 nobles. She also provided instances to demonstrate that some nobles were poorer than the well-to-do peasants!³⁴

Despite the national reach of the *North American Review* and the *Christian Examiner*, both were Boston publications and it could be said that this polemic was mainly a local affair. But then the *New-York Daily Tribune* reviewed Lowell Putnam's *Christian Examiner* article and published a summary of it in its November 13, 1850 issue. Although unsigned, the reviewer was also a Bostonian and Harvard graduate, George Ripley, now employed by Horace Greeley's *Tribune*. Lowell Putnam refuted Bowen, Ripley observed, "with great suavity of manner, but with a deadly purpose to effect his demolition. [...]"

32 M.L.P., "The *North American Review*," 428; see also Heléna Tóth, *An Exiled Generation: German and Hungarian Refugees of Revolution, 1848–1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 124–128.

33 M.L.P., "The *North American Review*," 423–424.

34 M.L.P., "The *North American Review*," 438.

Mr. Bowen's blunders, inconsistencies and false reasonings are so unrelentingly exposed, as to deprive his statements, when supported only by his own assertions, of all validity for the future." Ripley repeated Lowell Putnam's main arguments, and added that "[i]t will not appease the mortification of the erudite Professor to know that he has experienced such a summary defeat at the hands of a lady. [...] She writes with the graceful facility of one who is entirely at home on the subject, conversant from long familiarity with its leading points, and possessing a large surplus of information. [...] She conducts the argument with an almost legal precision. [...] Such a fine specimen of historical discussion is rare from any pen, though we are not among those who are astonished at high intellectual production from a woman." Ripley then questioned Bowen's fitness to be editor of the *North American Review* and a professor of history at Harvard. He concluded that "[i]n the attempt to prejudice the brave and martyred heroes of Hungary, he [Bowen] has ruined his own reputation forever."³⁵ A week later, this story was republished on page one of the Boston newspaper *Emancipator & Republican*.³⁶

Bowen soon counterattacked with a letter that appeared in the November 28 issue of the *Boston Daily Advertiser*. He claimed to be weary of the topic. "It is now more than a year," he wrote, "since some evil genius prompted me to give the leisure of a few weeks to an investigation of the causes and nature of the war which was then raging in Hungary." He complained of nearly 12 months of attacks: "these attempts to ostracize me, to hold me up to public reprobation as a monarchist, an Austro-Russian professor, and a blasphemer of God and liberty, – to muzzle me, so that I should not be able to utter a word in my defense, – to destroy my property by taking away the circulation of the *Review*, to deprive me of my office in the University, with which I have been connected in various relations for more than ten years, and at last to make me the object of mob-law?" Bowen observed that none of the "respectable newspapers" in Boston had joined in on the attack; most come from that "curious triad," the *Boston Evening Transcript*, the *Boston Daily Times*, and the *New-York Daily Tribune*. He attributed the *Transcript's* hostility to a poor review he had given to a book of poetry³⁷ published by its editor; while the reviewer of the *Tribune*, George Ripley, he dismissed as "a former clergyman of Boston, who long ago abandoned his profession and his faith, to wander in the wilds of infidel socialism." Why was he being accused, Bowen asked, of being pro-Austrian and pro-absolutism based on only two articles about Hungary, "a country upon the eastern confines

35 "Bowen and His Blunders – The *North American Review* Reviewed. *The Christian Examiner*. Nov.," *New-York Daily Tribune* (Nov. 13, 1850): 5.

36 "Bowen and His Blunders – The *North American Review* Reviewed," *Emancipator & Republican* (Boston) (Nov. 21, 1850): 1.

37 Francis Bowen, review of 1. *Poems*, by R. W. Emerson; 2. *Poems*, by William Ellery Channing; 3. *Schiller's Homage of the Arts, with Miscellaneous Pieces from Rückert, Freiligrath, and other German Poets*, by Charles T. Brooks; 4. *Poems*, by William W. Story; 5. *Poems*, by Thomas Buchanan Read; 6. *The Island Bride and other Poems*, by James F. Colman; 7. *Poems*, by Frances Elizabeth Browne; 8. *Songs of the Sea, with other Poems*, by Epes Sargent; 9. *Shells from the Strand of the Sea of Genius*, by Harriet Farley, *North American Review*, 64:135 (Apr. 1847), 402–435; particularly 433.

of Europe, inhabited for the most part by half-civilized races..." As editor of the "oldest literary periodicals in America" for seven years, widely read in the United States and in Europe, his opinions were well-known. He was completing a course of twelve lectures at the Lowell Institute about political economy and social philosophy to audiences of 500-to-1,000 people. He lectured almost daily to 150 students at Harvard about English history. Bowen insisted that he had never "maligned those who were fighting for freedom" nor, "defended the cause of their oppressors." This was the first time in the history of Massachusetts where the voters have been asked to throw out a professor because of "obnoxious opinions about the affairs of a distant country in Europe" with no other fault found.³⁸

Bowen's second letter to the *Advertiser*, published two days later, dealt with the specifics of Lowell Putnam's article. He admitted that he read it "with astonishment and profound regret. It is not merely written in a sneering and offensive tone throughout, but its apparent object is, not so much to defend the Hungarians, as to damage the character of the Reviewer." "Of course," he added, "I immediately formed the opinion [...] that it was not written by the person whose initials it bears, and who has unwarily lent the sanction of a highly respectable name to statements and language furnished by another."³⁹

One can only speculate why Bowen decided to publicly dispute the authorship of Lowell Putnam's article. Most likely he did not wish to appear attacking a woman of high social standing, one from one of the leading families of Boston. Yet his statement that the article appeared to have "been prepared by one who had a profound knowledge of the Magyar language, and a profound ignorance of history" indicated that he knew Lowell Putnam was the author but decided to insult her anyway. Again, Bowen returned to the theme that the article aimed to damage his reputation and remove him from his position. He asked if the prominent historians he cited could be discounted merely because they are unfamiliar with the Magyar language? Bowen again returned to the disputed historical facts and accuses the author of the *Examiner* article of being "grossly ignorant of the most historical facts stated by the most common historians, or it has deliberately forged historical statements in order to damage my reputation, and deprive me of my office..." He repeated this charge again later in his letter.⁴⁰

Two weeks later, Horace Greeley, the editor of the *New-York Daily Tribune*, devoted an editorial that reviewed the history of Hungary, its constant struggle with the Habsburgs to maintain its constitutional rights, the War of 1848–49, and its brutal aftermath. Greeley accused the Habsburgs of fomenting the "War of Races in Hungary," and then turned his attention to Bowen, whose article attempted "to make the Hungarian fugitives odious to our people." Noting that Bowen was a candidate for "a lucrative professorship" at Harvard, Greeley wondered "[h]ow any sincere lover of Liberty can vote to

38 Francis Bowen, "Hungary Again," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Nov. 28, 1850.

39 Francis Bowen, "Hungary – No. 2," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Nov. 30, 1850.

40 Bowen, "Hungary – No. 2."

confirm him as Professor of *History* we cannot perceive." Bowen claimed that his opponents are trying to take away his family's bread, but he should remember that the fugitives from Hungary in our country, whom he has slandered, do not have "Review Editorships, nor Harvard tutorships, nor Lowell lectures to fall back on."⁴¹ The Boston *Emancipator & Republican* republished part of Greeley's editorial, then alerted its New York cousin: "We can assure the *Tribune* that his fate is sealed. He will be rejected, and branded with the disgrace and infamy he deserves."⁴²

The Hungarian controversy⁴³ was not winding down; it was in fact escalating. Bowen soon received a broadside in the form of two letters each from two voices so far unheard in this controversy: that of James Russell Lowell, the poet, brother of Mary Lowell Putnam, and Robert Carter, friend and literary collaborator with Lowell, and, at that time, the private secretary to the historian William H. Prescott. Lowell's letters appeared in the *Advertiser* and Carter's in the *Atlas* over the span of late December through early February. Lowell claimed that he did not see Carter's first letter until his own was nearly completed, but published it anyway as he wanted to reach the same audience that had read Bowen's letters a month before.

Lowell was furious.⁴⁴ Bowen had accused his sister Mary of ignorance at best, and untruth at worst. His dislike of Bowen went back to his Harvard days, when Bowen was a teacher and Lowell the student;⁴⁵ and Lowell may have had disparaged Bowen in Lowell's long poem "A Fable for Critics."⁴⁶

Lowell's letter, published on December 28 in the *Boston Daily Advertiser*, did not mix words. He called Bowen a "fallacious reasoner," "when at a loss for argument, resorts to such gross charges as those of falsehood and forgery," accusations "coupled with imputations of private malice and covert attempts at personal injury." Lowell reminded his readers that the "original question was whether the Editor of the *N[orth] A[merican] Review* was right in the view which he took of the causes and conduct of the late struggle in Hungary, and not whether Mr. Bowen was a competent person to fulfil the duties of

41 Horace Greeley, "The Cause of Hungary and Its Foes – Francis Bowen," *New-York Daily Tribune* (Dec. 12, 1850).

42 "The Cause of Hungary and its Foes – Francis Bowen," *Emancipator & Republican* (Boston) (Dec. 19, 1850).

43 A term Robert Carter later used to entitle his 1852 book on this controversy.

44 "The suggestion of the latter that his sister was either ignorant or had misrepresented her sources made Lowell [...] more angry than he had ever been at Webster or even at John C. Calhoun. The rhetorical self-portrait of the learned father of a family being damaged by malicious persecution was sufficiently artificial to destroy any humane feeling Lowell might have held toward the person who drew it. He set out to tear up the picture by wrecking Bowen's claim to learning, satirizing the professor who would hide his ignorance behind his wife and children, and challenging the honesty of a man who would use the prestige of his professorial chair to support his errors as a journalist" (Leon Howard, *Victorian Knight-Er-rant; a Study of the Early Literary Career of James Russell Lowell* [Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1971], 303–304).

45 Howard, 15.

46 Thomas Wentworth Higginson, *Old Cambridge* (Cambridge, MA: Macmillan, 1899), 46–47.

perhaps the most important professorship in our University." "Was it proper for him to bring his private affairs into the controversy and to place his family between him and a purely abstract historical investigation?" Did Bowen ever take into account the financial situation of the authors' families when he wrote highly critical reviews in his *Review*, Lowell asked? In response to Lowell Putnam's pointing out his errors and carelessness, all Bowen could see was an attempt to damage his reputation, which was "neither commendable nor proper to attribute unworthy motives to an antagonist in a historical controversy."⁴⁷

In his January 2 letter, Lowell continued the polemics over the disputed historical facts, but also asked the question: why did Bowen assume that if "there was anything like a war of races, it follows necessarily that the Hungarians were in the wrong. This is a kind of logic which we do not understand." The war, Lowell continued, was forced upon the Hungarians by the deceit of the Austrian government, a deceit which Bowen himself admits. "Would he have had the Hungarians sit still and have their throats cut?" "It is no answer to the *Examiner* to lose his temper and his manners," Lowell continued, "and to attribute the exposure of his want of logic and accuracy to a desire of injuring his reputation as a professor of history and depriving him of office – as if the reputation of a heroic people whom he had maligned, were of less important than that of an individual!" Lowell characterized Bowen's method of historical research in this fashion: "[W]hen the potato was first introduced into Ireland, it is said that some well-meaning persons carefully gathered the tops, leaving the roots underground as worthless. This is very much as Mr. Bowen treats his authorities in making extracts from them." Bowen ought to know that acquiring and analyzing the information on such a complex subject as the Hungarian War cannot be "got up" in the "hasty and desultory manner which will pass muster in an ordinary review article. [...] But if the speculative and hearsay calumnies of pamphleteers often in the interest of despotism are to be taken as better evidence than the public speeches, declarations and acts of the Hungarian leaders, and the proceedings of the Diet for successive years, we have nothing more to say."⁴⁸

In his first letter, Robert Carter praised Lowell Putnam who, despite her household duties and weak eyesight, had impressive literary and linguistic accomplishments. Her article proved that Bowen "pretended to knowledge on the subject which he did not possess, and that he greatly misrepresented the Hungarians and their cause." "Inaccurate, illogical, and unjust," was how Carter summed it up. He did not expect the editor of a critical literary review to be so sensitive himself to criticism, as Bowen was not known for sugarcoating his words in his reviews. Moreover, Bowen had no reason to

47 J. R. L. [James Russell Lowell], "Mr. Bowen and the *Christian Examiner*," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Dec. 28, 1850.

48 J. R. L. [James Russell Lowell], "Mr. Bowen and the *Christian Examiner*, No. II," *Boston Daily Advertiser*, Jan. 2, 1851.

suppose that Lowell Putnam did not write the article as he knew the quality of her contributions to the *Review* and that she would never accept credit for materials written by another.⁴⁹

Before Carter's second letter appeared, Bowen published yet a third article in the *North American Review*, consisting of thirty pages of quotations and then continued with his original theme, calling the "policy even of Austrian despotism was liberal and enlightened" compared with that of the Magyar nobility. Bowen stressed that the controversy showed how dangerous it was to speak the truth, despite Americans' attachment to freedom of speech and the press. Fortunately, this type of "terrorism" he believed was extremely rare.⁵⁰

In his second letter Carter reviewed Bowen's third article, questioning the accuracy and political sympathies of his sources. First, Carter disassembles Bowen's sources. Of the ten English- and German-language books, four were published in Vienna 1849–50 and one in Pressburg (1849) and therefore subject to Habsburg censorship; another two were published anonymously, one was authored by Count Mailath, a "notorious Austrian partisan," and one published eleven years ago. Carter also brought up Bowen's alleged plagiarism in "War of the Races." Of the 60 pages in that article, four to five consisted of "acknowledged quotations" but at least 50 pages consist of text that was taken without acknowledgment from the French *Revue des deux Mondes*, "either by literal translation or by a process of abridgement" and the abridgement often distorted the original meaning of the author.⁵¹

Bowen made one final appeal, published in the *Boston Daily Atlas*, on February 6. He asked the editors of the *Atlas* to grant him a column or two to respond to the "twelve or fourteen" columns in the paper that recently attacked him. Bowen recounted that his first article offended "a few Magyar and Polish⁵² nobles resident in this country." His second article was aimed to put all questions to rest concerning his alleged holding of anti-

49 R.C. [Robert Carter], "Mr. Bowen's Attack on Mrs. Putnam," *Boston Daily Atlas*, Dec. 23, 1850.

50 Francis Bowen, "The Rebellion of the Slavonic, Wallachian and German Hungarians against the Magyars," Review of 1. "The *North American Review* on Hungary"; 2. *The War in Hungary 1848–1849*, by Max Schlesinger; 3. *Hungary: its Constitution and its Catastrophe*, by Corvinus; 4. *Austria*, by Peter E. Turnbull; 5. *Verzeichniss der unter den Insurrectionellen Regierung Ungarns durch Martial-oder Statarialgerichte hingerichteten, oder ohne all Justiz hingsgeschlachteten Individuen*; 6. *Genesis der Revolution in Oesterreich im Jahre 1848*; 7. *Thronfolge und die Pragmatische Sanction in Ungarn; nebst einer Skizzirten Geschichte der neunmonatlichen Ofen-Pester Parteiherrschaft unter ihrer Umtriebe*; 8. *Geschichte des Oestreichischen Kaiserstaates* by Johann Graf Mailath; 9. *Die Letzten zwei Jahre Ungarns. Chronologisches Tagebuch der Magyarischen Revolution*, by J. J. von Adlerstein, *North American Review* 72:150 (Jan. 1851): 205–249.

51 R.C. [Robert Carter], "Mr. Bowen's Authorities on Hungary," *Boston Daily Atlas*, Feb. 3, 1851.

52 Bowen here is referring to Count Adam Gurowski, a Polish émigré residing in the United States, who called Bowen's "War of Races" "a thick and dark forest of errors in historical or rather unhistorical quotations, as well as in reasoning. Almost every line requires rectification" ("Mr. Bowen's Authorities on Hungary," Feb. 3, 1851).

republican sympathies. Forced to break silence “only reluctantly” because of recent attempts to discredit his opinions, including his latest [or third] article in the *Review*, where he “summoned into court a crowd of witnesses, English, French, German, and Hungarian,” of all political persuasions, “a string of citations,” telling the story of the Hungarian civil war using the language of others. He explained that he used ellipses not to mislead but to save space; any reader could easily check the originals. To the charge of plagiarism, Bowen responded that he gave “full credit” to his sources. He also quoted an unnamed Hungarian clergyman “of Slavonic decent,” now in the United States, who fully endorsed his first article, calling it a “truthful sketch.”

Summing up, Bowen asked the papers to cease attacking him. He calculated that in December alone about thirty newspaper columns were devoted to the exposure of his “sins and errors.” All he asked for was “to be allowed to eat his bread and read his books in peace and quietness.” All this controversy, he claimed, simply because he published “some few historical facts about an isolated tribe of Tatar origin, who dwell somewhere in the neighborhood of the Black Sea.” Bowen then appealed to the editors:

When the time comes for waging a grand war against all the despotic powers in Europe, I have no doubt you will all be found in the front rank, bravely contending for liberty or death. But will you be kind enough to reserve a portion of your courage and ardor for this great emergency, and not expend them all in crushing a poor book worm. You have now killed me often enough, and there is no need of fighting your battles over again.⁵³

Bowen’s name finally came up before the Board of Overseers of Harvard University on February 6, and was rejected for the McLean professorship, with 33 votes for confirmation to 39 against. Surprisingly, Bowen himself believed he was rejected not because of his articles about Hungary but because of his July 1850 article defending Daniel Webster and the Compromise of 1850, including the Fugitive Slave Law, which was very unpopular in Massachusetts, especially with the newly formed Free Soil Party.⁵⁴ But given

53 Francis Bowen, “The Magyar Nobility and Their Supporters,” *Boston Daily Atlas*, Feb. 6, 1851.

54 Francis Bowen, “The Action of Congress on the California and Territorial Question,” review of 1. Speech of Henry Clay, of Kentucky, on the Resolutions of Compromise offered by him to settle and adjust amicably all Existing Questions of Controversy between the States, arising out of the Institution of Slavery; delivered in the Senate of the United States, February 5th, 1850; 2. Speech of Samuel S. Phelps, of Vermont on the Subject of Slavery; delivered in the Senate, January 23, 1850; 3. Speech of John M. Berrien, of Georgia, on Mr. Clay’s Proposed Compromise; delivered in the Senate, February 11th, 1850; 4. Speech of Solomon U. Downs, of Louisiana, on the Compromise Resolutions of Mr. Clay; delivered in the Senate, February 18th, 1850; 5. Speech of Daniel Webster, of Massachusetts, on Mr. Clay’s Compromise Resolutions; delivered in the Senate, March 7th, 1850. As revised and corrected by Himself (Boston: Redding & Co, [1850]); 6. Speech of Horace Mann, of Massachusetts, on the Subject of Slavery in the Territories, and the Consequences of a Dissolution of the Union; delivered in the House of Representatives of the United States, February 15th, 1850 (Boston: Redding &

the extensive nature of the criticism of his Hungary articles and the weight of his attackers, it is difficult to believe that his published opinions about Hungary were not part of the issue, if not the main issue. He was rejected despite an endorsement by the junior and senior classes of Harvard, presented to the Board by the President of Harvard himself, Edward Everett.⁵⁵ It was also Bowen's bad luck to come up for confirmation during the short-lived Democratic and Free-Soil Party coalition that governed Massachusetts for two brief years. Every Free-Soil and ex-officio member on the Board had voted against him, while the Whigs and nearly every elected member voted for him.⁵⁶

But the controversy continued even after Bowen's rejection. A month later, in March, Mary Lowell Putnam published a second article in the *Christian Examiner*, again examining and refuting Bowen's ideas. An article in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, dated January 9, 1851, suggested that the publication of Lowell Putnam's article had been delayed and that the decision to delay it had not been her decision.⁵⁷ A letter to the *Tribune* published four days later and merely signed "C." provided more detail, suggesting that the article had been "ready for the press," already in January, but that Bowen had asked the editor of the *Christian Examiner* to delay its publication until after his confirmation hearing, as he needed the Harvard salary to support his family. The editor then made the request to Lowell Putnam and she agreed. Bowen then repaid her kindness by continuing his attack on her and Hungary in the January issue of the *North American Review*.⁵⁸

In her second article titled "The *North American Review* on Hungary,"⁵⁹ Lowell Putnam saw a systematic effort by friends of despotism to misrepresent the character of the

Co., 1850); 7. Letter of Hon. Horace Mann to his Constituents on the Slavery Question. Revised and corrected by the Author for the *Evening Traveller*; 8. Report of the Select Committee of Thirteen, of the United States Senate, to whom were referred Various Resolutions respecting California, the Other Territories recently acquired from Mexico, and the Institution of Slavery; together with the Speech of Henry Clay upon the said Report, delivered in the Senate, May 13th, 1850," *North American Review* 71:148 (July 1850): 221–268.

55 "Harvard University," *Boston Daily Atlas*, Feb. 6, 1851; Samuel Eliot Morison, *Three Centuries of Harvard, 1636–1936* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1936), 292–293.

56 Morison noted that the subsequent Act of May 22, 1851, removed the clerics from the board as well as the Council and State Senate, the only ex officio members remaining were the Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, President of the Senate, Speaker of the House, Secretary of the Board of Education, and President and Treasurer of the University. The Act of 1851 removed most of the political members of the board, and Morison asserts that "the sacrifice of Bowen was the price that the University paid to oust the Council and State Senate from its senior Governing Board." Morison sees the whole affair as teaching Harvard that politicians and academic freedom do not mix, and that the University should rely on the public and its own alumni for support, not the state. Cf. Morison, 289, 293.

57 "New Publications," *New-York Daily Tribune*, January 9, 1851.

58 C. "Francis Bowen and Mrs. Lowell Putnam on Hungarian History," *New-York Daily Tribune*, Jan. 13, 1851. "C." claimed to have no connection at all with Mary Lowell Putnam, which, if true, would rule out Robert Carter as the author.

59 M. L. P. [Mary Lowell Putnam], "The *North American Review* on Hungary," *Christian Examiner and Religious Miscellany* 50 (Mar. 1851), 279–352.

Hungarian war, both as subversive of established order and as the attempts of a dominant race to “usurp unjust dominion” over the subject races. Both accusations, she insisted, were false. The Hungarians did not set out to overthrow the Habsburgs, but only insisted that they honor their coronation oath. The Hungarians did not use the excuse of the revolution in France to desert their monarch, even though at that moment the monarchy was weak. Without pressure from below, the Hungarian nobles relinquished their privileges and expanded voting rights to include all, save for “small property qualifications,” which was not unusual for the times. They wished to make Hungarian citizens out of all the population, regardless of nationality. Lowell Putnam repeated her observation that Bowen’s “War of Races” completely ignored the changes that took place in Hungary in 1848.⁶⁰

Lowell Putnam insisted that the Hungarians fought to maintain their liberties and their constitutional form of government. It was a war of defense. There would have been no war had the Habsburgs not incited the nationalities, had the abdication of Ferdinand and the accession of Franz Joseph been put before the Diet for confirmation, and had Franz Joseph not attempted to incorporate Hungary into the empire as merely another province.⁶¹

Lowell Putnam argued that it was only logical that Hungarian be the language of the new state; Latin was known only to the nobility and the Slavic languages were regional. Bowen’s claim that the Magyars forbade the nationalities to use their own languages was simply untrue. To decree that Hungarian must be taught in all the schools meant that the nationalities would learn the language of the state and therefore have the right to participate in the administration of the state.⁶²

Concerning the Croat supporters of Josip Jellachich,⁶³ Lowell Putnam accused them of wishing to transform the empire from German rule to Slavic. The Hungarians, she noted, made every attempt to reach accommodation with the Croats but were rebuffed. She insisted that Jellachich was acting more as an agent of the Habsburgs than the Croats. Concerning the Romanians, Lowell Putnam noted that their insistence to be corporately recognized in Transylvania would have made sense only before Transylvania was incorporated into Hungary, at a time when only “official” nationalities were recognized. It made no sense in the new Hungary, where corporate rights were abolished and individuals became equal before the law.⁶⁴

Bowen stated that the Magyars did not intend to establish a republic. This may have been true initially, Lowell Putnam admitted, but as the struggle continued the re-

60 M. L. P., “The *North American Review* on Hungary,” 279–282.

61 M. L. P., “The *North American Review* on Hungary,” 307.

62 M. L. P., “The *North American Review* on Hungary,” 289–294.

63 Count Josip Jellachich (Jelačić) was a general in the Habsburg army and also Ban (Viceroy) of Croatia.

64 M. L. P., “The *North American Review* on Hungary,” 296–303, 318–320, 332–333, 350–351.

publican party in the government increasingly became more dominant, to the point where, after March 1849, Kossuth openly revealed "his republican plans."⁶⁵

In the course of her article, Lowell Putnam continued to point out the defects in Bowen's scholarship. For example, she noted that he changed his chronology of events on several occasions between his two articles; e.g. the events of the Croatian crisis in the summer-fall of 1848. He continued to selectively edit sources, omitting that which undermined his arguments. Concluding her article, she admitted that there were many more aspects of Bowen's work she could cover but that she merely wanted to cover the more prominent points subject to dispute.⁶⁶

The final battle in the saga of Francis Bowen and the Hungarian War of Independence was the appearance of Robert Carter's *The Hungarian Controversy: an Exposure of the Falsifications and Perversions of the Slanderers of Hungary*. Carter's preface is dated December 24, 1851, so it was penned at the time when Kossuth was already in the United States as the nation's guest and had already received a tumultuous welcome in New York City. The book itself was published in 1852, presumably during the time when Kossuth was still in the United States, and if it appeared in April it would have been about the time Kossuth was touring New England.⁶⁷

In his preface, Carter described the Hungarian War as "a contest for freedom and democratic institutions, against despotism, usurpation and perfidy." If any held contrary opinions, it was "owing altogether" to the work of Francis Bowen and James Watson Webb (editor of the *New York Courier and Enquirer*). According to Carter, their smears had even reached the United States Senate, and were used by those senators who opposed the Resolution of Welcome to Kossuth.⁶⁸

Carter then reviewed the controversy, beginning with Bowen's articles, Lowell Putnam's response, and the letters to the Boston newspapers. In this work of nearly fifty pages, Carter doggedly picks apart Bowen's arguments, relying on Lowell Putnam and his own published articles. He especially focused on what he called Bowen's "grossly unfair reply to Mrs. Lowell Putnam" and demonstrates that Bowen's own sources proved that he was wrong and she was right. He even critiqued Bowen's final (February 6) letter to the *Boston Daily Atlas*, refuting his opponent point-by-point. Carter devoted a small section of the book to debunking the anti-Hungarian articles of James Watson Webb, whose commercial newspaper reached a wider audience than Bowen's literary journal did.

Toward the end of the work, Carter discussed what he called the "political state of Hungary," in which he reiterated his and Lowell Putnam's ideas about questions of race

65 M. L. P., "The North American Review on Hungary," 320–328.

66 M. L. P., "The North American Review on Hungary," 316, 352.

67 Robert Carter, *The Hungarian Controversy: An Exposure of the Falsifications and Perversions of the Slanderers of Hungary* (Boston: Redding, 1852), [2].

68 *Congressional Globe*, 32nd Cong., 1st sess. 1851, *The Laws of the United States: Public Acts of the Thirty-Second Congress of the United States*, No. 1. "A Resolution of Welcome to Louis Kossuth," xliii.

and social class in Hungary. In the section "The War with Austria," Carter provided evidence that the Hungarians eventually were attempting to establish a republic. And in the final section, "Kossuth in Hungary," he assembled lengthy quotations from Max Schlesinger's *War in Hungary*, praising Kossuth as "not only a man of the loftiest genius, but of the purest and noblest character." Undoubtedly, Carter still felt the need to neutralize what he saw as the damage to the reputation of Hungary and its exiled leader caused by Bowen and Webb.

In the meanwhile, the Whigs reassumed power in Massachusetts. And despite all of the bad press, in 1853 Francis Bowen was nominated for another professorship at Harvard – this time the Alford Professorship of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy, and Civil Polity. He was confirmed by nearly a unanimous vote. A biographer of Lowell later quipped that if "a man is thought unqualified to represent one field, the obvious solution is to allow him to teach three."⁶⁹

Bowen went on to teach 36 years at Harvard.

69 Martin Duberman, *James Russell Lowell* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1966), 413n12.