Distribution Agreement

In presenting this thesis as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for a degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter now, including display on the World Wide Web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis.

Jonathan D. Adams April 11, 2016

From Victorian to Modern: The Transformation of Ancient Greek History in the Work of Jane Ellen Harrison and W.W. Tarn

by

Jonathan Adams

Dr. Cynthia Patterson
Adviser

History

Dr. Cynthia Patterson

Adviser

Dr. Patrick Allitt

Committee Member

Dr. Barbara Lawatsch-Melton

Committee Member

2016

From Victorian to Modern: The Transformation of Ancient Greek History in the Work of Jane Ellen Harrison and W.W. Tarn

By

Jonathan Adams

Dr. Cynthia Patterson

Adviser

An abstract of
a thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

History

2016

Abstract

From Victorian to Modern: The Transformation of Ancient Greek History in the Work of Jane Ellen Harrison and W.W. Tarn
By Jonathan Adams

This thesis examines the changes in the study of the classics in Britain during the early twentieth century by examining the work of two scholars from this period: Jane Ellen Harrison and William Woodthorpe (W. W.) Tarn. As the study of the classics became more specialized, previous views of the ancient world began to be reexamined. Chapter 1 discusses how the classics were studied in Britain until to Harrison's and Tarn's generation. Chapters 2 and 3 examine the works of Harrison and Tarn. Chapter 4 compares the work and conclusions of Harrison and Tarn and briefly ends on how they have been received.

From Victorian to Modern: The Transformation of Ancient Greek History in the Work of Jane Ellen Harrison and W.W. Tarn

By

Jonathan Adams

Dr. Cynthia Patterson

Adviser

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Emory College of Arts and Sciences
of Emory University in partial fulfillment
of the requirements of the degree of
Bachelor of Arts with Honors

Department of History

2016

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Dr. Patterson for encouraging me to enter the Honors Program and for giving me further guidance and encouragement throughout the last year, especially near the end. Thank you to Dr. Patrick Allitt and Dr. Barbara Lawatsch-Melton for your help and for meeting for my thesis defense on such short notice.

Thank you to Becky Herring and everyone else in the History department for their encouragement.

Thank you to my family for prayers and for encouraging me to continue with the Honors Program.

Thank you to God and all the saints I prayed to for help with this thesis. In particular, I would like to thank Mary, Mother of God, and St. Jude Thaddeus.

Table of Contents

Introduction

> We Hellenists were, in truth, a "people who sat in darkness," but we were soon to see a great light… Classics were turning in their long sleep.[1]
>
> -Jane Ellen Harrison, 1926

Background

This thesis focuses on the shift in the study of ancient Greece in Britain from the Victorian era into the Modern era as seen in the work of two writers, W.W. Tarn (1869-1957) and Jane Ellen Harrison (1850-1928). In his article "Culture and Discipline: Classics and Society in Victorian England," Christopher A Stray describes this shift as follows:

> Between 1870 and 1920 classics changed in content, organization, and recruitment. The amateur practice of gentlemen gave way to the methodical and disciplined pursuit of knowledge by professional scholars… the field of enquiry was extended beyond literary texts into history and archeology, while scholarship became more specialized… [and] girls and women began to penetrate the male preserves of classical learning.[2]

The two British scholars of ancient Greece I discuss in this thesis, W.W. Tarn and Jane Ellen Harrison, illuminate and support Stray's statement. These two figures in particular are appropriate for this discussion in that they were both highly influential in their fields of study during and after this transitional period, and they both represent both the extension of "classical" scholarship into non-traditional areas — and, in the case of Harrison, the entry of women into the traditionally male academic world. Jane Ellen Harrison focused much of her writing on early Greek religion. Her work had an enormous influence on European, particularly English and French, interpretation of Greek religion. According to Gilbert Murray in 1955, "while few people

---

[1] Jane Ellen Harrison, "Reminiscences of a Student's Life." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1965): 343. Accessed April 4, 2016 http://www.jstor.org/stable/20162959

[2] Christopher Stray, "Culture and Discipline: Classics and Society in Victorian England," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3, no. 1 (1996): 81-82, accessed April 4, 2016, http://www.jstor.org/stable/30222253.

would accept the whole of her conclusions nobody could write about Greek religion without being influenced by her work continues to be true."[3] William Woodthorpe (W.W.) Tarn was a historian who helped create the field of post-Classical, Hellenistic history.[4] Tarn and his works have provoked — and to a degree continue to provoke — wildly different responses from his various readers.[5]

The Historical Context

Harrison and Tarn were brought up in an educational environment that placed a heavy emphasis on "the classics" and on the era of Classical Greece, the era of the Parthenon and Athenian democracy. This emphasis reflected a British belief in the relevance of Classical Greece to 19th century democratic Britain. Frank M. Turner describes the period that these scholars were brought up in the following way:

> there existed virtually no Victorian interest in the classics for their own sake… To the Victorians, the Greeks… were no longer the 'Ancients' whose work was to be emulated or surpassed. Rather the Ancients had become new contemporaries whose remains provided vehicles for modern self-contemplation and self-criticism.[6]

Since the ancient Greeks (primarily those who lived during the Classical era) were considered "contemporaries," British universities considered it of vital importance to ensure that their graduates, "[who] were expected to participate in public life of the nation… at a very high

---

[3] Hugh Lloyd-Jones, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2007), "Harrison, Jane Ellen (1850–1928)," accessed April 11, 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33734.

[4] For the invention and meaning of the term "Hellenistic" see Erskine, Companion to the Hellenistic World , Chapter 1.
F. E. Adcock, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Revised by K. D. Reynolds (Oxford University Press, 2004), "Tarn, Sir William Woodthorpe (1869–1957)," accessed April 11, 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/36416.

[5] Richard A. Todd, "W. W. Tarn and the Alexander Ideal," *Historian* 27, no. 1 (November 1964): 55, Accessed December 2, 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.1964.tb00274.x.

[6] Frank Miller Turner, "Antiquity in Victorian Contexts," *Browning Institute Studies* 10 (1982): 5, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/25057717.

level,"[7] would have a basic knowledge of the classics. It was the hope of British academia that, in the words of the Cambridge philosopher John Grote, the knowledge of the classics would establish and nurture among the British elite a "bond of intellectual communion."[8] That is, knowledge of the classics was to provide students with a common set of "symbols, metaphors, and vehicles [to use for] the consideration of modern issues."[9] According to Turner, the two British universities that perfected this "Victorian Hellenism" in the late-19th century were Oxford and Cambridge, whose graduates were meant to form the elite in Britain's public life. Jane Harrison was a graduate of Newnham College, Cambridge,[10] and W.W Tarn was a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge.[11]

As Stray notes, the period between 1870 and 1920, which coincided with the suffrage movement, saw many women enter the field of classical study.[12] While Harrison did not directly protest in favor of suffrage, she supported the women's suffrage movement in her writings. In her work *Alpha and Omega*, she states:

> The attempt… to confine man or woman within the limits of sex… is, I think, dangerous and disastrous to the individual, dangerous and disastrous to the society of which he or she is a unit… The whole Woman's Movement is, to my mind, just the learning of that lesson… it is simply the demand that in the life of man, space and liberty shall be found for a thing bigger than either manhood or womanhood—for humanity.[13]

This thesis examines the writings of Harrison and Tarn in order to discover what they believed was lacking in previous studies of ancient Greek and what they believed was important in the study of Greece. In addition, the reviews of Harrison's and Tarn's work are considered in

---

[7] Ibid, 9.
[8] Quoted in Ibid, 8.
[9] Ibid, 9.
[10] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[11] Adcock, "Tarn."
[12] Christopher Stray, "Culture and Discipline," 81-82.
[13] Jane Ellen Harrison, *Alpha and Omega* (New York: AMS Press, 1973), 84-85.

order to find how their contemporaries viewed their work: how were Harrison and Tarn seen as breaking or continuing from previous trends in classical scholarship?

Before discussing the scholarship of Harrison, and Tarn, however, I will briefly examine the major schools of classical studies that preceded Harrison's and Tarn's generation. I look briefly at the history of Augustan Britain, German philhellenism, and then return to a discussion of "Victorian Hellenism." The chapter concludes with a discussion of classical studies during Harrison's and Tarn's young adulthood.

1. Background

Augustan Britain

Before the 19th century, British classical scholars did not focus primarily on ancient Greece for a source of "symbols, metaphors, and vehicles"[14] with which to view their contemporary society. Instead, before the period of "Victorian Hellenism" ancient Rome was seen as providing the most useful analogies to British society. The apex of this interest in the Roman Empire was in the late 17th century. Based upon surveys of the early uses of the term "Augustan," James William Johnson in his article, "The Meaning of Augustan," states that "Augustan" refers to the idea shared by the classical scholars of late 17th to early 18th Britain that "the time of Augustus was the point at which Roman literature attained its fullest expression."[15] As Johnson states:

> [I]t is sufficient here merely to note that allusions to Roman political history were instinctive among men brought up on the classics. Comparisons between the rulers of… Rome and whoever happened to be in the public limelight at the time in England were frequent and haphazard in both poetry and prose.[16]

This appropriation of the ancient world in order to examine their own contemporary period would become a major trend in classical scholarship in Britain after the "Augustan" period, though it would be subtler than these poets' search for Augustus in the likes of George II, Cromwell, et al. [17] Like the "Victorian Hellenism" that would come after, the classicists of Augustan Rome "imposed their own categories, [and] values"[18] on to the early Roman Empire.

---

[14] Turner, "Antiquity" 9.
[15] James William Johnson. "The Meaning of 'Augustan'" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19, no. 4 (October 1958): 507. Accessed November 8, 2015. doi:10.2307/2707920.

[16] Ibid," 512.
[17] Ibid," 512-513.
[18] Turner, "Antiquity" 4.

What then caused Rome to fall out of favor as the British Empire's spiritual predecessor? According to Christopher Stray:

> the shift from Augustan classicism focused on Rome to the Hellenism of Victorian England between 1750 and 1850… can be related to the appropriation of Roman themes [the Phrygian cap, the Republic, appeals to Roman writers, etc.] by radical groups from the 1760s on. To put it crudely, Rome was hijacked by the left. Moral alarm at the secular rationalism and materialism of revolutionary France encouraged the use German romanticism as a counterweight. This brought with it a romantic nationalism, which both valorized the English past and reinforced the Hellenic, in opposition to the latinising imperialism of France. [19]

German Philhellenism

As the same time that British classical scholars were distancing themselves from ancient Rome, German classical scholarship was becoming heavily involved in the study of ancient Greece. This important topic is discussed at length by Suzanne Marchand in her book *Down from Olympus*. According to Marchand:

> The first German philhellenes borrowed their ideals — self-cultivation, disinterested contemplation of the beautiful, good, and true, admiration of the ancients — from aristocratic models; but the incorporation of nineteenth century philhellenism into the founding ideals of Prussia's new research universities, secondary schools, museums, and art academies after 1810 universalized these values… After the Napoleonic Wars, the Romantic generation's cultural successes… were clearly evident in the entrenchment of philhellenism in state-sponsored education and cultural institutions… As the century progressed, philhellenism became more and more… inextricably linked to the academy and state bureaucracy.[20]

This "link to the academy and state bureaucracy" would ultimately result in the transformation of German philhellenism from a politically liberal movement to a more politically conservative scholarly movement. This in turn would make Greece an appealing model to study

[19] Stray, "Culture and Discipline," 78-79.
[20] Suzanne L Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003), XIIIV-XIX, accessed December 2, 2015, ACLS Humaities E-book.

for British intellectuals after Roman analogies became too associated with the French Revolution and the radical left. According to Turner, the year 1840 "saw the first real impact of critical German scholarship [with] the English publication of K. O. Muller's *History of Greek Literature* before it appeared in German."[21]

Victorian Hellenism

Turner continues to list reasons why the British by the late-19th century began to identify with Classical Athens:

> British interest in the character of Athenian democracy [grew] in the wake of the American Revolution and the Yorkshire Association Movement, and then closely paralleled the emergence of liberal democracy in nineteenth-century British politics. The democratic experience of Athens held the relevance for Victorian commentators that the quarrels among the demise of the Roman republican oligarchy had held for eighteenth-century political polemicists.[22]

Showing how far British classicists took the idea of Classical Greece as an analogy for British society, Turner provides an example of George Grote's writings on Athens that remolded all of the characters and institutions of Classical Greece into an image that reflected contemporary political concerns:

> Grote persuaded his fellow countrymen that the Athenian democracy epitomized the achievement of "constitutional morality," which was to say government by peaceful discussion and due process. He presented Pericles as the Prime Minister, Cleon not as a vile demagogue but as an outspoken leader of the political opposition… The Athenian Assembly itself was divided between a party of movement and one of opposition. Grote told his readers that were Athens has failed politically it had done so not because it possessed democratic institutions but rather because those institutions were insufficiently democratic.[23]

---

[21] Turner, "Antiquity," 7.
[22] Ibid, 4.
[23] Ibid, 11.

This trend of seeing contemporary politics in the ancient past was important for how Tarn and Harrison's work would be perceived by their contemporaries.

2. Jane Ellen Harrison (1850-1928)

Life and Views

Harrison was born on September 9th 1850 at Cottingham, near Hull, Yorkshire. She was born into an upper-middle-class family[24] the third daughter of Charles Harrison, a timber merchant, and his first wife, Elizabeth Hawksley Nelson. Her mother died soon after she was born, and her father then remarried.[25] According to Harrison in her memoir "Reminiscences of a Student's Life," Harrison's education, "was in the hands of a rather rapid succession of governesses"[26] one of whom introduced her to German, Latin, Hebrew, and New Testament Greek.[27] Despite her early exposure to ancient language and her use of sixteen languages by the time she died, "she never managed to learn Greek with the accuracy that would have come with a strict classical education."[28] Later in life, Harrison once stated that she felt that, "Greek literature as a specialism I early felt was barred to me."[29] While she was actually complaining about how Cambridge in her youth was only focused on "textual criticism," the quote can also be used to describe how she was also impeded in her advancement in academia, as will be examined.

Harrison's religious upbringing, in her words, "was oddly mixed."[30] While her father was quietly agnostic and, "incapable of forming a conviction," concerning religion, her stepmother's religion, "was of the fervent semi-revivalist type… Her main doctrines were that we must be

---

[24] K. J. Philips, "Jane Harrison and Modernism." *Journal of Modern Literature* 17, no. 4 (Spring 1991): 466. Accessed November 8, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3831358.
[25] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[26] Harrison, "Reminisces," 315.
[27] Ibid, 317.
[28] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[29] Harrison, "Reminisces," 343.
[30] Ibid, 315.

born 'again' and that 'God would have our whole hearts or nothing'."[31] Her stepmother's religious instruction failed to instill in Harrison a strong Christian identity, as she states that she remained far more passionate about learning foreign languages than about God.[32] However, Harrison's religious instruction instilled in her at an early age an interest in what she termed the, "apparatus of religion,"[33] which would continue into her adulthood and career.

After attending Ladies' College, Cheltenham, Harrison attended Newnham College, Cambridge in 1874.[34] While her time at Newnham College gave her the opportunity to further pursue her growing interest in ancient Greece, "[i]n the tripos[35] she obtained second-class marks"[36] and failed to receive a lectureship in classics that Newnham advertised in 1879.[37] Despite this, Philips states that, "[f]rom 1880—1897, [she] studied Greek art and archaeology at the British Museum in London, also traveling extensively to archaeological sites and museums. She gave public lectures at the British Museum and in the provinces."[38] Her travels to archaeological sites and museums introduced her to eminent German classicists and archeologists[39] including Wilhelm Klein, Wilhelm Dörpfeld, Ernst Curtius, and Heinrich Brunn.[40] According to Harrison, "[a]ll my archeology was taught to me by Germans"[41] and she referred to Dörpfeld in particular as, "my most honored master."[42]

---

[31] Ibid, 316.
[32] Ibid.
[33] Ibid.
[34] Philips, "Jane Harrison and Modernism," 466
[35] Examinations on classical Greece and Rome
[36] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[37] Ibid.
[38] Philips, "Jane Harrison and Modernism." 466
[39] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[40] Harrison, "Reminisces," 335.
[41] Ibid.
[42] Ibid.

During this period, she published *The Odyssey in Art and Literature* and *Introductory Studies in Greek Art* in 1882 and 1885 respectively. According to Hugh Lloyd-Jones, these works were well written but "of no great scientific value."[43] Later, she was denied the Yates chair of archaeology at London University in 1888 and 1896. Shelly Arlen in her article "'For Love of an Idea': Jane Ellen Harrison, Heretic and Humanist," discusses why Harrison was denied the Yates chair, first in 1888 and later in 1896:

> Twice [Harrison] applied for the Yates Professorship of Archaeology at University College. London. Though among the final two candidates in each instance, she was not chosen. At the same time many believed her disqualification was her femaleness. In the 1888 search, two search committee members signed a minority report stating it "undesirable that any teaching in University College be conducted by a woman." The 1896 all-male committee recognized that Harrison "had not enjoyed the same opportunities for a thorough scholarly grounding the details of various branches" as had her male competitor. Nevertheless, they appeared on the verge of electing Harrison when committee member W. M. Flinders Petrie put in a good word for the other candidate, his ex-student Ernest Gardner, and "that carried the day" for Harrison had no such mentor on the committee.[44]

In 1888, Harrison visited Greece with D. S. MacColl, after emerging from a severe depression.[45] MacColl, a well-read scholar, painter and later museum administrator,[46] sought to develop Harrison's lecturing style as well as her views on classical art during his time with Harrison. It was this period with MacColl that served as a turning point in Harrison's career. Lloyd-Jones states, "she began to examine objects of Greek art more exactly and more objectively, and to pay attention to things which earlier she might have despised as 'primitive'… [and] she came away with a strong sense of the cults that lay behind the myths"[47] Her two 1890

---

[43] *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography,* "Harrison."
[44] Shelly Arlen, "'For Love of an Idea': Jane Ellen Harrison, Heretic and Humanist," *Women's History Review* 5, no. 2 (1996): 168, accessed April 4, 2016, http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09612029600200114.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Grimsditch, H. B. *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Revised by Robert Upstone. Oxford University Press, 2004. Accessed April 11, 2016. http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34687.
[47] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."

works *Manual of Mythology in Relation to Greek Art* and *Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens* served to begin Harrison's foray into primitive Greece. In the preface of the latter work she states that, "in many, even in the large majority of cases, *ritual practice misunderstood* explains the elaboration of myth."[48]

In 1898, Newnham College made Harrison a Fellow, which allowed Harrison to continue her research into her developing theories of Greek ritual.[49] The following few years, she came into contact with Gilbert Murray and Francis Macdonald Cornford, who shared her views concerning Greek religion and ritual. Harrison, Murray, and Cornford became the primary members of the Cambridge Ritualists, who "on the basis of the comparative anthropological study of 'primitive' religion, concluded that the structure of Greek drama originated in prehistoric magical fertility rituals."[50]

It was in the early 1900s that Harrison began writing the major works that would relate her theories of ancient Greek religion's ritual basis. In 1903, she published the first edition of her *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, which further expanded her ideas by analyzing the differences between early and classical Greek religion as well as the positing the archetype of dying and rising gods.[51] While Lloyd-Jones states that *Prolegomena* had several weaknesses, he holds that, "its use of art as well as literature to explain religion… lends it a special quality; and, building on the German work of the preceding century, it introduced its English readers to a side of Greek religion of which few of them could previously have had much notion."[52]

---

[48] Quoted in Ibid.
[49] Philips, "Jane Harrison and Modernism," 466.
[50] Robert Ackerman, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press), "Cambridge Ritualists (act. 1900–1914)," accessed April 11, 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/theme/95519.
[51] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[52] Ibid.

After the publication of *Prolegomena*, Harrison was introduced to Henri Bergson's L'évolution créatrice in 1907, and Sigmund Freud's *Totem and Taboo*. Concerning Bergson's L'évolution créatrice, Harrison states in her memoir *Reminiscences of a Student's Life*, "[o]ff and on I had read philosophy all my life… feeling that I got nothing new… and then suddenly it seemed this new Moses struck the rock and streams gushed forth in the desert."[53] Concerning Freud's *Totem and Taboo,* Harrison states that while reading, "I felt again a sense of release. Here was a big constructive imagination… a mere doctor laying bare the origins of Greek drama as no classical scholar had done, teaching the anthropologist what was really meant by his *totem and taboo*, probing the mysteries of sin, of sanctity, of sacrament."[54]

According to Lloyd-Jones, the work of Bergson, Freud, and Émile Durkheim influenced Harrison's next major work *Themis*, first published in 1912.[55] Lloyd-Jones states:

> the book derived its initial impetus from the discovery at Palaicastro in eastern Crete of a stone inscribed with a Greek hymn… The hymn is addressed to Zeus, but this Zeus is very different from the classical Greek Zeus; he is a fertility god, who has disappeared during the winter months, and is now urged to return and to leap into flocks, houses, cities, ships, citizens, and into Themis. This encouraged Miss Harrison to believe that all Greek gods had started as fertility spirits.[56]

After writing *Themis*, Harrison's work on primitive religion was interrupted by the First World War. In the preface of the second edition of *Themis*, published in 1927, she "wrote that for ten years she had never opened a Greek book, and she destroyed many of her papers, including all Gilbert Murray's letters." [57] Rather than pursue further study of ancient Greece, Harrison

---

[53] Harrison, "Reminisces," 342.
[54] Ibid.
[55] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."
[56] Ibid.
[57] Ibid.

instead sought to "thr[o]w herself into work designed to alleviate the sufferings of Russians" [58] Finally in 1921, she published her last major work in the field of Greek religion, *Epilegomena to Greek Religion*, the aim of which was in her words to, "to summarize as briefly as possible the results of many years' work on the origins of Greek religion, and to indicate the bearing of these results on religious questions of today." [59]

After publishing the first edition of *Epilegomena*, Harrison left Cambridge and began living with Hope Mirrlees, her favorite pupil, in Paris beginning in 1922. According to Harrison, she left Cambridge because she, "began to feel that I had lived too long the strait Academic life with my mind intently focused on the solution of a few problems [and] wanted before the end came to see things more freely and widely, and, above all, to get the new focus of another civilization."[60] During her time in Paris, she stayed at the American Women's Club and contacted various French and Russian intellectuals. They returned to London three years later. Harrison died on April 15th 1928 and was buried four days later in St Marylebone cemetery, East Finchley. [61]

Various authors and Harrison herself have written a great deal on her personal views on a variety of subjects including: politics, religion, and society. Concerning religion Harrison writes in the last chapter of her *Epilegomena*:

> Primitive ritual, the ritual of Totemism, of King-Gods, of Initiation Ceremonies, of Fertility Dramas… has been driven out inch by inch by science… The ritual even of sacrifice that once played so large a part in man's life is dead and even the custom of praying for material goods languishes. In like fashion primitive deities, daimons of the year, have died with the rites that begot them, and divinities of the "Olympian" type are

[58] Ibid.
[59] Ibid.
[60] Harrison, "Reminisces," 346.
[61] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."

> losing their hold. They are seen for what they are, *objets d'art*, creations of man's imagination, they no longer are incumbent on man's life, imposing an obligation of obedience… they can no longer compel worship… Is this the end? Is our twentieth century religion only an "enlightened consciousness of the impulse that makes for species continuity," and as such is rechristened Science?[62]

Harrison is not satisfied with this conception of "twentieth century religion." Instead of simply leaving the question of the future of religion here, she looks to the rituals of primitive religion to inform the basis for a modern "religion without a theology."[63] She looks to the primitive rituals of old to inform her "Immanentist" religion stating, "For the new Immanentist, creeds have become all but insignificant, they are to him not living expressions of truth apprehended but ancient barriers… The whole center of gravity has shifted from authority to experience. The new Immanence is nearer akin to the old daimon-dance than to any ordered Olympian ritual of prayer and sacrifice."[64]

She goes into more detail what kind of "experience" she is speaking of in the essay "Unanimism and Conversion" included in *Alpha and Omega*. According to Harrison, the essence of all religion is "Conversion," that is "the sudden, crude, and rather violent form of what is known as the mystical state."[65] During the "Mystical State" one goes through several stages according to Harrison:

> 1. There is a time of depression, a sense of loneliness, of failure, disaster, often amounting to complete desolation and positive despair. Life is felt to be not worth living…
>
> 2. This depression is succeeded by a time of extraordinary exaltation, of peace and joy unutterable… The relation of the whole of things is seen, or rather, perhaps, felt, directly, intuitively. There is a new and marvelously illuminating focus, and the old focus is only

---

[62] Jane Ellen Harrison, *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, and Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion.* (New Hyde Park, N.Y.: University Books, 1962), li.
[63] Ibid, xliii.
[64] Ibid, lii.
[65] Harrison, *Alpha and* Omega, 60.

> with difficulty reseized. Morally and emotionally this takes the form of a sensation of oneness. Individuality seems somehow submerged, partitions are broken down, there is a boundless sense of escape and emancipation from self…
>
> 3. Last… It is involuntary, is no work of Conscious Will. You cannot convert yourself. If you are a theologian, it is the work of the Spirit… If you are a psychologist, knowing that some of your best work is done unconsciously, and often in your sleep, you begin to wonder if your subconscious self has something to say to it, and what is going on among your synapses.[66]

The reason Harrison looks to primitive religion and ritual in order to examine the "Mystical State" of "Conversion" is because:

> Anthropology has taught us that the notion of the New Birth is practically as old as society itself. When among savages a young boy is initiated, he is often said to be born again, reborn…
>
> Now, what does all this initiation amount to? In understanding this we grasp, I think, the secret — of Conversion.[67]

This is because, as Harrison argues, "[t]he rhythm of Initiation… is precisely the same as that of Conversion; it is at first depression… then exaltation and ecstasy… Conversion… in its primary essence is nothing else than this: the individual spirit is socialized [as in primitive rites including initiation]. The self is thereby submerged" [68] For Harrison, all theology, whether Pagan, Catholic, or Protestant, is therefore useless and at best consists of "after the event explanations."[69] At its worst, theology for Harrison can be a potential source of immense shame and fear. To emphasize this point, Harrison recounts in "Unanimism and Conversion" her stepmother's "grim and awful" instruction on eternal damnation and her mild surprise looking back that she still "emerged into

[66] Harrison, *Alpha and* Omega, 62-64.
[67] Ibid, 64.
[68] Ibid, 65.
[69] Ibid, 61.

even tolerable sanity… [despite carrying] always the scars" [70] of her stepmother's intense revivalist instruction.

The events of the First World War would shake Harrison's optimistic belief in collective mystical experience. According to K. J. Philips:

> [i]t is only at the outbreak of World War I, in fact, that she detects dangerous side-effects to the "collectivism" and "purgation through primal emotions" which she has "preached."[71] She is shocked that her colleagues sign up for war "not reluctantly, but with positive alacrity… Into the seething cauldron they stepped as though some healing angel, and not some devil, had troubled the waters, and the cure they found was just the bond of a common fellowship" Whereas she earlier had thought that "the gregarious, or, as sociologists pleasantly term it, the 'herd' instinct" could find safe outlets in "Peace Societies, in Socialism, even in Strikes, in each and every form of human Co-operation," she now castigates the dangerous side of "the small, combative herd-emotions." She regrets "how soon—how almost inevitably—a noble collectivism passes over into an ignoble imperialism."[72]

In *Epilegomena*, Harrison further explains her conception of an Immanenist religion and seems to temper the collectivist ideals of primitive religion. According to Harrison, "[p]rimitive religion aimed at impulsion and conservation of life; the religion of to-day aims at the bettering of life, by the exercise of the function of choice and practice of asceticism."[73] While "primitive religion" likewise included asceticism, it was based on "[t]abu" which "was imposed by the group in the interests of the group."[74] In contrast, the new Immanenist religion will have asceticism "imposed by the individual in the interests of his own spiritual life."[75] Harrison describes the practicing of asceticism as a "conflict" that "cannot be avoided,"[76] because as Harrison puts it, "religion means a way of life possible because we are… human animals; it

---

[70] Ibid, 59.
[71] K. J. Philips is quoting Harrison in this excerpt from a different edition of Alpha and Omega.
[72] Philips, "Jane Harrison and Modernism," 471.
[73] Harrison, *Epilegomena an*d *Themis*, lii.
[74] Ibid. liii
[75] Ibid.
[76] Ibid.

means the sense that you and I are good but that we can and mean to be better, and that in order to be better we will… [have to] practice asceticism, suffer sharp pain and desolation in the crucifixion of animal desires."[77]

Contrasting the old concept of asceticism and shame with her new conception of these values, Harrison states, "[b]ut, thank Heaven, asceticism is not all or chiefly that depressing thing, negation. The negations of the Decalogue died… died that is as religious impulses. The new Immanence is vital, creative it says… 'whatsoever thy hand findth to do it with thy might" [78] Harrison uses the Christian model of philanthropy as an example of one of these dying "religious impulses" that is to be replaced:

> In the old days most religiously minded people were troubled by the thought that they were not "devoting themselves to others"; *self-sacrifice was felt to be incumbent, the only road to peace. Hence the constant itch for philanthropy*. Now religion says all things are possible and permissible, only remember that there is a better as well as a good. The instincts… [and t]he personal emotions are good, *yet in the exercise of these you but strengthen your selfhood. But in science… in art… you lose yourself in something bigger and more permanent and these henceforth rank as the highest religious value.*[79]
> [emphasis added]

For Harrison, the role of asceticism is not to simply attain peace, whether that be temporal or eternal, but rather to fully lose oneself in some "bigger and more permanent" undertaking. It is for this reason Harrison emphasizes asceticism as "not only the resistance to the descending wave, it is also the rising upward wave" reminding her readers that "[t]o the Greek asceticism is 'the attuning of an instrument,' not the mortification of the flesh." [80]

Influences on Work

---

[77] Ibid. liv
[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid. liv-lv
[80] Ibid. lv

As mentioned earlier, Harrison was a member of the Cambridge Ritualists who collaborated together between 1900 and the start of World War I.[81] According to Robert Ackerman in the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, "[t]he immediate intellectual context for the Cambridge Ritualists was the burst of evolutionary theorizing that took place in the last quarter of the nineteenth century." [82] Ackerman further states that "Darwin's casual remark in the antepenultimate paragraph of *The Origin of Species* that 'Much light will be thrown [by evolution] on the origin of man and his history' to offer a sweeping evolutionary discussion of the major social institutions, including religion and mythology."[83] As Harrison puts it in her essay "Darwinism and Religion" included in *Alpha and Omega*, "The study of primitive religions… has been made possible, and even inevitable, by the theory of Evolution."[84] This is because the societal implications of the theory of Evolution, which Darwin alludes to, directly challenged the idea that religions began as unchanged mythology or theology.[85]

In Harrison's words, the "old view was that religion was a doctrine, a body of supposed truths… Ritual was scarcely considered at all, and, when considered, it was held to be a form in which beliefs, already defined and fixed as dogma, found a natural mode of expression."[86] In contrast, the new view that emerged, "[w]hen the religion of the primitive peoples came to be examined, it was speedily seen that, though vague beliefs necessarily abound, *definite creeds are practically nonexistent. Ritual is dominant…* [emphasis added]."[87]

---

[81] Ackerman. "Cambridge Ritualists."
[82] Ibid.
[83] Ibid.
[84] Harrison, *Alpha and* Omega, 151.
[85] At least this was the case for revealed religion (i.e. Christianity and Judaism). As Harrison notes, earlier Christian scholars on primitive religion held that the Jews and later Christians held "original revelation" and that the beliefs of pagan religions were based on a long and gradual "degradation" of that "original revelation." This explained any similarities between pagan and Judeo-Christian religion. For more see: Jane Ellen Harrison, *Alpha and Omega*,146.
[86] Ibid,144.
[87] Ibid, 151.

One of the works that heavily would heavily influence the Cambridge Ritualists, and in particular Harrison, was Sir James George Frazer's *The Golden Bough*. According to Ackerman, "The nominal subject of *The Golden Bough* is an explanation of a strange rite that took place from time to time in Nemi, outside ancient Rome."[88] In order to analyze this rite, Frazer develops a theory of "sacred kingship… in which the priest–king impersonates the god who embodies the spirit of vegetation; the latter dies in the autumn only to revive in the spring."[89] Frazer after "scour[ing] the world's religions and myths, ancient and contemporary, for innumerable examples of analogous belief and practice"[90] that this pattern is universal among religions, which in turn proves that religion, "is a necessary stage in mental evolution," that is the, "struggle towards an understanding of itself and the world." [91]

Harrison speaks highly of the effect of *The Golden Bough* on classical scholars, such as herself, in her memoirs "Reminiscences of a Student's Life," stating that, "[a]mong my own contemporaries was J.G. Frazer, who was soon to light the dark wood of savage superstition with a gleam from *The Golden Bough*… at the mere sound of… "Golden Bough" the scales fell…"[92] Furthermore, the result of *The Golden Bough* was that classical scholars came to see, "in comparative anthropology a serious subject actually capable of elucidating a Greek or Latin text."[93]

The last statement Harrison makes concerning *The Golden Bough* echoes the Introduction to her first major work on Greek religion, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*. In her

---

[88] Robert Ackerman, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (Oxford University Press, 2004), "Frazer, Sir James George (1854–1941)," accessed April 11, 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/33258.
[89] Ibid.
[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Harrison, "Reminisces," 343.
[93] Ibid.

Introduction, Harrison states that her purpose in studying primitive Greek ritual is to, "come to a better understanding of Greek poetry."[94] Explaining herself, Harrison states, "[r]eligious conviction compelled the tragic poets to draw their plots from traditional mythology, from stories whose religious content and motive were already in Homer's days obsolete."[95] She explains that one cannot simply study classical literature by itself without knowledge of ancient Greek ritual, because even some of the oldest of Greek literature such as, "Homer presents, not a starting-point, but a culmination…. Beneath the splendid surface lies a stratum of religious conceptions, ideas of evil, of purification, of atonement, ignored or suppressed by Homer, but reappearing in later poets…"[96]

One example of when knowledge of primitive, in this case pre-Greek, ritual is necessary to fully understand Greek literature can be found in Chapter VII of *Prolegomena*. Harrison gives the example of Homer having Zeus, king of the gods, refer to the figure Aigisthos, once dead, as, "the Blameless One." The reason that this is puzzling is that Aigisthos, while alive, is depicted as a "traitor, seducer, murderer, [and] craven."[97] Harrison provides the possibility that this epithet is, based on the text, simply "euphemistic"[98] However, Harrison then asks, "[b]ut was [Aigisthos] bad in the eyes of those who first made the epithet,"[99] explaining to readers that, "the story of Aigisthos is told *by the mouth of the conquerors*. Aigisthos is of the old order, of the primitive population, there before the coming of the family of Agamemnon."[100] Although Harrison admits that we have no record of any pre-Greek cult to Aigisthos, she is adamant that, "

[94] Jane Ellen Harrison, *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* (New York: Meridian Books, 1955), *viii.*
[95] Ibid.
[96] Ibid, vii.
[97] Ibid, 334.
[98] Ibid.
[99] Ibid, 335.
[100] Ibid.

'the Blameless One' had his meed of service at Argos, and the epithet itself remains as eternal witness."[101] Harrison's argument on the matter is such:

> We may take it then that the 'euphemistic' epithets were applied at first in all simplicity and faith to heroes and underworld gods that worshiped them. The devotees of the new Achaean religion naturally regarded the heroes and saints of old as demons… All activities that were uncongenial, all the black side of things, were carefully made over by the Olympians to the divinities they superseded. Only here and there the unconscious use of a crystalized epithet like 'Blameless' lets out the real truth. The ritual prescription that heroes should be worshipped by night, their sacrifice consumed before dawn, no doubt helped the conviction that as they loved the night their deeds were evil.[102]

Returning to the Cambridge Ritualists, what is somewhat surprising about their work is that they go against what Ackerman calls, "idealization of the ancients, especially the Greeks, that had been an article of cultural faith in Europe for centuries."[103] This is because they were arguing that at the heart of Greek civilization despite, "its undoubted intellectual achievements notwithstanding, was essentially primitive and could thus be illuminated by comparisons with that of 'savages'."[104] This novel comparison was made possible by the rise European Empires in the late-19th century that, "produced a large and growing mass of ethnographic and linguistic information about the 'primitive' peoples reached by missionaries, soldiers, and traders that had accumulated in the imperial capitals by the end of the century."[105] Therefore, "much more data was now available than had [ever previously] existed," was available for the Cambridge Ritualists and others similarly, "inclined to make comparisons between cultures."[106]

In the fifth chapter of *Themis*, Harrison examines, the concept of totemism, "a habit of collective thinking based on collective emotion," which can be experienced in various rituals in

---

[101] Ibid.
[102] Ibid, 337.
[103] Ackerman, "Cambridge Ritualists."
[104] Ibid.
[105] Ibid.
[106] Ibid.

which members of a group identify with a totem, a sacred and/or forbidden plant or animal. The main example of totemistic ritual that Harrison uses in the chapter is that of Central American tribes, in particular one tribe that engages in a ritual meant to increase the number of emu birds.[107] Harrison then asks the question, "[a]re there in Greek mythology or Greek cultus definite traces of totemistic unification?"[108] Her answer is yes, and she uses the example of Dionysus stating, "[o]ne secret of the thrill of the Bacchae is that the god is always shifting his shape. Dionysus is a human youth, lovely, with curled hair, but in a moment he is Snake, a Lion, a Wild Bull, a Burning Flame,"[109] which can all be interpreted as totems. This equivalency of Greek religion with "savage" religion, in Ackerman's words, "had the power to shock" European readers who had previously viewed the Greeks as their direct predecessors, a rational people similar to themselves.

Comtemporary Reaction

In the preface to a 1962 joint edition of *Epilegomena* and *Themis*, John C. Wilson writes approvingly of Harrison's work. Looking back at the contemporary reaction, Wilson finds that it was negative overall, at least among many of her colleagues. Wilson goes as far to state that:

> many of her colleagues were utterly bewildered and angered by her. They took it out in attempts, sometimes successful, to impugn her accuracy in some details, her carelessness in citations, above all her unfounded theories and generalizations. They could not understand why a lecturer in Classics dragged in archaeology and anthropology and, even worse, psychoanalysis, both Freud and Jung, and the untranslated "less well known writings of the greatest of Russian philosophers, Vladimir Soloviov." What a way to teach Classics! Imagine if every teacher of Classics had to know these things![110]

[107] Harrison, *Epilegomena an*d *Themis*, 128.
[108] Ibid,128.
[109] Ibid, 129.
[110]Harrison*, Epilegomena and Themis*, x.

Wilson also notes the curious fact that the 1962 combined edition of *Epilegomena* and *Themis* includes the first edition of *Themis* published since 1927 and that, at the time of his writing, "the last edition of *Prolegomena* published by Cambridge University Press was in 1927."[111] Based on Wilson's preface, it seems that Cambridge University was trying in some small way to disown her. While Wilson admits that, "some of her successors have been busy trying to bury her,"[112] Wilson holds that there is a bigger issue at play. Wilson argues the following concerning the lack of reprints of her work:

> We still live, in England and America, in a Christian society. Jane Harrison gave no comfort to this society. What she unearthed about Greek religion applied also to the traditional churches of her day and ours. She represented no vested interest. No vested interest was interested in reprinting her. If this sounds too simplistic, the reader should seek to ascertain where publishers tend to make the bulk of there money: in publishing for the school market, a market run by Church and State.[113]

Although this explanation is compelling, there were other reasons reviewers and readers would at times criticize Harrison's work. While Harrison's great synthesis of many disparate thinkers is on hand a strength of her work in general, in certain cases her tendency to, as one scholar put it, "reduce other thinkers to her needs—molding [their ideas] as much as accepting them," caused her to be not greatly accepted by as many in her time. For example, Lloyd-Jones notes how Harrison's *Themis* was, "not welcomed by the school of Durkheim" despite the fact that, "Durkheim's theory of totemism… [and] his opinion that belief in supernatural beings was a comparatively late development"[114] were central elements of *Themis'* argument. Lloyd-Jones explains that Durkheim' s followers did not appreciate Harrison's incorporating Henri Bergson's ideas as much as she did.

---

[111] Ibid.
[112] Ibid.
[113] Ibid.
[114] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."

Another issue, possibly the main issue, that prevented her contemporaries from accepting her work was the fact she was a female scholar. Shelly describes such backlash to Harrison:

> Steeped in the tradition of androcentric positivism, male scholars had ready arsenal of criticism to fling at an unconventional woman: a woman could be wrong, simply by virtue of being a creature with stereotypically 'female' (i.e. 'undesirable') attributes. The positivist attitude that required investigation to be dispassionate and disinterested, likewise eschewed such 'female' qualities as subjectivity, emotionalism, and willfulness. These gender-bound concepts rendered women by nature as anti-rationalist.
>
> Many critics reacted to Harrison in just such manner. Tags such as "subjective," "excess of sympathy," "propagandistic," and "willful" riddled the formal reviews of her work.[115]

Later Reaction

While Harrison may have had a great deal of negative reaction to her work due to the reasons stated in the previous section, her work found much more acceptance in the decades following her death. For example, John C. Wilson mentioned above speaks highly of her work while writing in the early 60s. In his preface to the combined edition of *Epilegomena* and *Themis*, Wilson states that:

> *She was the first to make Greek religion come alive*… Jane Harrison made a revolution in Greek studies. She understood as no one did before her, that in spite of their great intellectual achievements the Greeks belonged in the main to the world of primitive religion and primitive theology… She brings everything she knows in archaeology and anthropology to bear on Greek religion.[116] [emphasis added]

According to Lloyd-Jones writing his piece on Harrison in 2004, Harrison became more popular, "during the 1960s [when] scholars renewed the attempt to understand the early stages of Greek religion."[117] Lloyd-Jones explains, "Walter Burkert in *Homo Necans* (1972; English translation,

[115] Arlen, "For Love of an Idea," 172
[116] Harrison, *Epilegomena and Themis*, ix.
[117] Lloyd-Jones, "Harrison."

1983) wrote that after Miss Harrison he had introduced functionalism to the study of Greek religion… Both he and the French school of Jean-Pierre Vernant and Pierre Vidal-Naquet look back at Miss Harrison as an honoured predecessor…"[118] It seems that despite the controversy and disagree concerning Harrison's writings, her work came to be widely appreciated.

What is distinctive about Harrison being a female scholar is that it not only placed numerous barriers in her advancement in academia, but that it left Harrison with two options in how to carry out her scholarship. She could as Shelly puts it, "[i]n the face of such unbearding scrutiny… succum[b] to a silent timidity, not daring to critique publicly the status quo, and stifl[e her] intellectual questioning."[119] Instead of stifling her ideas in the face of great resistance, Harrison chose to fully embrace the title "heretic" and in her words to "act swiftly, all together, all but automatically"[120] in defending and promoting her "unconventional" views of the ancient world. While this doomed her to ignominy during her time, later scholars, who like Harrison came to reject the "conventional" views of her time would come to appreciate her work. In contrast the following chapter will show how the Tarn's work would receive great praise during his time, but would later receive criticism similar to that raised against Harrison's work by her contemporaries.

[118] Ibid.
[119] Arlen, "For Love of an Idea," 166
[120] Quoted in Arlen, "For Love of an Idea"

3. William Woodthorpe Tarn (1869-1957)

Life and Views

According to Frank Adcock's account the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*,[121] Tarn was born, "on 26 February, 1869, the eldest son of two sons and one daughter of William Tarn, [a successful] silk merchant, and his wife Frances Arthy." Tarn's father provided him with "a privileged childhood" as evidenced by the fact that his family, "kept eight servants at their London house."[122] After attending Eton College and leaving as "king's scholar and captain of the school,"[123] he attended Trinity College at Cambridge University.

Tarn's attendance at Cambridge planted the seeds for his later interest in Greek antiquity and ancient history. As noted in Chapter 1, Cambridge along with Oxford University were at the forefront of promoting what Turner refers to as "Victorian classicism"[124] or the Victorian study and interpretation of the classical works from Rome and, in the 19th century, primarily Classical Greece.[125] Although his father desired that he train to become a lawyer, during his time at Trinity College Tarn studied Greek philosophy extensively under the famous classical scholar Henry Jackson, [126] whose work examined the philosophy and works of Plato and Aristotle, and later took honors examinations in the classics in 1891 and 1892.[127] Despite his intense interest in the classics, Tarn never received a degree in the classics nor did he technically ever become a "'professional' historian"[128] with a degree in history. Instead, Tarn continued to train as a lawyer

[121] Revised by K. D. Reynolds for the 2004 edition
[122] Adcock, "Tarn."
[123] Ibid.
[124] Turner, "Antiquity," 8.
[125] Ibid. 1, 8
[126] John Platt, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, ed. Richard Smali (Oxford University Press, 2005), "Jackson, Henry (1839–1921)," accessed April 11, 2016, http://www.oxforddnb.com/view/article/34133.
[127] Adcock, "Tarn."
[128] Todd, "Alexander Ideal," 48

at Inner Temple after attending Trinity College. According to Adcock Tarn was "called to the bar in June 1894 and began to make a name for himself as a chancery barrister." At this point in Tarn's life, his study of Greek philosophy and antiquity was, "subservient to another occupation [and] professional calling,"[129] as it was for many of his contemporaries. Although, as Adcock states, Tarn "never lost interest [in Greek antiquity],"[130] his work in law prevented him from returning to an in-depth study of Greek antiquity.

It was his marriage to Flora Macdonald in 1896 that inadvertently brought Tarn back to the study of Greek antiquity. Although the marriage itself was a happy one according to Adcock, Flora for a time suffered from a, "long and dangerous illness"[131] that put a great deal of stress on Tarn (he gives neither the specifics of what illness Flora Tarn had nor how she reacted to her illness). According to Adcock, the stress resulted in a mental breakdown in 1905. Adcock does not give any other details or descriptions of Tarn's stress induced breakdown other than Tarn' was "serious"[132] and that it prompted Tarn to leave the practice of law. It was during his recovery from his mental breakdown that Tarn began to once again return to the study of Greek antiquity, and in particular the newly established field of Hellenistic Greece, in his new home in Scotland.[133] Adcock notes in his 1958 article "Sir William Tarn" that Tarn relied on his family's wealth in order to continue his study of Greek antiquity and did not need to seek "a high position in the University," despite giving up his legal profession.[134] This would make Tarn, like Harrison, an outsider in his field of scholarship, albeit for a very different reason. While,

---

[129] Turner, "Antiquity," 9
[130] F. E. Adcock, "Sir William Tarn," *Gnomon* 30, no. 4 (1958): 317, http://www.jstor.org/stable/27681817.

[131] Adcock, "Tarn."
[132] Ibid.
[133] Adcock, "Sir William Tarn," 317.
[134] Ibid, 317-318.

Harrison had to "act swiftly, all together, all but automatically"[135] in order to fight off the at times intense opposition to her work, Tarn freely chose to instead pursue "[t]he amateur practice of gentlemen" mixed with input from his professional colleagues.

After his recovery, Tarn produced his first work in the field of Greek history *Antigonas Gonatas* in 1913. According to his preface, Tarn chose this subject because a fellow historian from Germany, "Dr. Beloch… pointed out the omission [of a work on any of the Antigonids] and the opportunity."[136] Despite the increasing specialization that Stray notes was occurring during this period, the fact that Tarn was not a professional historian did not greatly affect the opinions of those reviewing his work, as will be discussed later.[137]

When World War I broke out in 1914 Tarn attempted to join the British army, but was refused because of his poor eyesight.[138] Despite this, Tarn moved to London in order to join the British War Office, which would indirectly affect his work even after the War. According to Adcock, Tarn made it habit during and after his time in the War Office to "spend much of the winter [in London], accumulating material for his [historical] work… [and later] return to the Highlands and work at leisure and after mature thought."[139] Unlike Harrison who traveled extensively throughout the Mediterranean in order to investigate Greek and pre-Greek civilization, Tarn never travelled to the locations on which his scholarship focused (Greece, Bactria, or even Rome). Instead, Tarn was completely dependent on a network of professional

---

[135] Quoted in Arlen, "For Love of an Idea"

[136] Neither Adcock nor Tarn himself discuss how Tarn came into contact with Dr. Julius Beloch or the details of Tarn's and Beloch's professional relationship. However, Tarn in the preface to *Antigonas Gonatas* also states that volume III of Dr. Beloch's history *Griechische Geschichte* long with Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Mollendorff's *Antigonos von Karystos* served as the "two works in particular" that influenced his own *Antigonas Gonatas*. See Tarn, *Antigonas Gonatas*, vii. See William Woodthorpe Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), v.

[137] Christopher Stray, "Culture and Discipline:" 81-82.

[138] Adcock, "Tarn."

[139] Adcock, "Sir William Tarn," 318.

historian and archeologists who related to him the latest findings, and it would be in London that Tarn would "accumulat[e] material," such as the information and examinations on Bactrian coins he discusses in *the Greeks in Bactria*. Even during the time of Tarn's scholarship, however, this was considered, at least to some degree, an unsatisfactory way to study ancient history as Tarn stated later in his preface to the first edition of the *Greeks in Bactria*:

> I am aware that it is very reprehensible to write a book where you have to depend in part on second-hand information, as I have had to do on the Oriental side. But it is time that somebody with some knowledge of the Hellenistic world tried to get the more important Greek side into order, for one sees how often the Orientalist is hampered by not knowing what there is; and it is no use waiting for a scholar who shall have a proper and *critical* knowledge of both sides, or rather of all the sides, for he has not been born.[140]

After the publication of his children's book *The Treasure of the Isle of Mist* in 1919, Tarn began what Adcock calls his "most productive period… between the two Great Wars."[141] It was during this period that Tarn wrote his contributions to the "Cambridge Ancient History" which included a discussion of the rise of the Hellenistic World and the life of Alexander the Great.[142] The latter narrative on Alexander formed the basis of volume 1 of his work *Alexander the Great* published two decades later in 1948. During this same period, Tarn also wrote and published *Hellenistic Civilization* in 1927 and gave a series of lectures at his Alma Mater, Trinity College, which were later published as *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments* in 1930.[143] Finally in 1938, he finished his pioneering work *The Greeks in Bactria and India* that explored the world of Hellenistic India, a topic largely unexplored by earlier writers.[144] His other works after this

[140] William Woodthorpe Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria & India.* (Cambridge: University Press, 1951), xiii.
[141] Adcock, "Sir William Tarn," 318.
[142] Ibid, 318.
[143] Adcock, "Tarn."
[144] Adcock, "Sir William Tarn," 319.

period include his contribution to the composite work *The European Inheritance*, which focused on Greek and Roman history.[145]

After the death of his wife in 1937, the remaining twenty years of Tarn's life were lived in relative seclusion. His contact with people was limited to occasional visits from friends or family, yearly visits to his daughter and his grandchildren in Skye, and giving advice to fellow classical scholars who sought his opinions.[146] He died in 1957 in his home after having receiving various awards and honors for his contributions to classical scholarship including being made an honorary English Doctor of Laws by Edinburg University in 1933 an honorary fellow of Trinity College in 1939. He was knighted in 1952.[147] It should be recalled that Harrison, a professional lecturer who worked at Cambridge till 1922, received no such honor for her work.

Unlike Harrison who wrote extensively on her personal views, there is little known about Tarn's personal views. Those who discuss his works, including Adcock and Todd, describe him on the basis of his works as "bear[ing] the imprint of a late-Victorian British ideal of gentlemanly imperialism."[148] Todd describes him as having an "idealism" evidenced not only from his work on Alexander, but on his fairy tale *The Treasure of the Isle of Mist* in which according to Todd, "the treasure which the girl Fiona (named for his own daughter) seeks is not a material one but rather apprehension of his own high idealism… [the treasure of the work] is the joy of forgiving one's enemies."[149] What is striking about *The Treasure* is that this highly optimistic work was written and published just after World War I and Tarn's service in the War Office, during which he most likely heard and reported to his superiors the various horrors of the

[145] Ibid.
[146] Adcock, "Tarn."
[147] Ibid.
[148] Ibid.
[149] Todd, "Alexander Ideal," 54.

war. That Tarn chose to compose this escapist work after the war shows the intense strength of Tarn's optimistic idealism that in Todd's words, "look[ed] for brotherhood and unity wherever he may find it."[150]

Considered against the idealistic themes of forgiveness and reconciliation in *The Treasure*, Tarn's idealizing of Alexander as the planting the seeds for a "unity of mankind" is unsurprising. In his discussion on Alexander's "Policy of Fusion," Tarn states that Alexander sought first, as evidenced by his speech at Opis to the Macedoians and Persian officials present, to first unify his Macedonians with the Persians and furthermore that:

> there is certainly a line descent from [Alexander's] prayer at Opis, through the Stoics and one portion of the Christian ideal, to that brotherhood of all men which was proclaimed, though only proclaimed, in the French Revolution.[151]

However, Tarn's optimistic hope that this "unity of mankind" could be more than simply "proclaimed" was dashed by the horrors of World War II and the mid-20th century as evidenced by his famous footnote to the words just quoted:

> I have left the latter part of this paragraph substantially as written in 1926. *Since then we have seen new and monstrous births*, and still moving in a world not realized; and I do not know how to rewrite it [emphasis added].[152]

While Harrison continued to place hope in her new conception of religion even after World War I, it seems that World War II largely ended Tarn's drive to further defend his notion of the coming "unity of mankind" supposedly started by Alexander and nurtured by many of his Hellenistic successors. While he continued to work on reprints of his work after 1938 and

---

[150] Ibid.
[151] William Woodthorpe Tarn, "Policy of Fusion," in *Alexander the Great: A Reader*, Edited by Ian Worthington (London: Routledge, 2003), 207.
[152] Ibid.

contributed to collections such as *The European Inheritance* mentioned earlier, he wrote no more major works after World War II.[153]

Influences on Work

Despite the fact that his works examine topics, such as the Hellenistic era, which were largely unexplored in his day, it is evident from Tarn's work that he was influenced by earlier views of Greek antiquity. As stated in chapter 1, during the 19th century with the emergence of the liberal democratic movement in Britain, the major focus of Victorian Classicism in Britain was on Classical Greece, Athenian democracy, and ethics as these topics "seemed most immediately useful to them."[154] In contrast British intellectuals largely ignored Hellenistic Greece, as it seemed to have no institutions easily comparable to British democratic institutions as did Classical Greece; furthermore its kings and queens, who declared themselves gods and goddesses, offended the sensibilities of both Christian and secular intellectuals. Due to these attitudes, the study of post-Alexander Greece in British academia before Tarn was relegated to a volume or chapter of larger works on Greek History[155] such as in Connop Thirlwall's *History of Greece*.[156]

Rather than challenge the long held view that the ancients are applicable to the modern world as Harrison did, Tarn's work on the Hellenistic period stemmed from his belief that this later era had significance for his modern world. This is evident in his introduction to *Antigonas Gonatas*: "No part of Greek history should come to us like the third century B.C. It is the only

---

[153] Adcock, "Tarn."
[154] Turner, "Antiquity," 4, 7, 11.
[155] Turner, "Antiquity," 11.
[156] Christopher A. Hagerman, "In the Footsteps of the 'Macedonian Conqueror": Alexander the Great and British India," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 16, no. 3/4 (November/December 2009): 371, http://www.jstor.org/stable/40388969.

period that we can in the least compare with our own; *indeed, in some ways it is quite modern* [emphasis added]… Men may think as they please, speak as they please, believe as they please. An astronomer who proclaims that the earth goes round the sun risks nothing worse from the orthodox than a few harsh words."[157] Turner suggests that in this introduction to his biography of the Hellenistic ruler, Tarn justifies his work by "impos[ing his] own categories, [and] values" on to the Hellenistic era, just as "Victorian classicists" had earlier "impos[ed] their own categories [and] values"[158] on to the politics, culture, and historical figures of Classical Greece.

Another major trend that influenced Tarn's work was the emergence of "textual criticism" in the 19th century German scholarship, which was first resisted by British intellectuals as it undermined previous views of ancient documents such as the *Odyssey* and the *Illiad*[159] as well as the Bible.[160] By the time Tarn attended Cambridge University, however, source criticism of ancient sources was accepted, and he could and did draw upon this critical approach when exploring the world of Alexander and his successors.

Source criticism plays a large part in Tarn' discussion in *The Greeks in Bactria*, a topic for which Tarn admits remaining written sources are, "very scrappy." Tarn asserts though that, "they were not always scrappy. There was once a Greek history that covered the Far East

---

[157] Tarn, *Antigonas Gonatas*, 1.
[158] Turner, "Antiquity," 4.
[159] According to Turner, source criticism in terms of classical scholarship emerged in Germany at the beginning of the 19th century with the work of Frederich August Wolf who argued that the *Odyssey* and *Illiad* were composed of earlier disconnected works that were arranged together into a whole. For a while this view was opposed and resisted by British scholars in the 19th century as it not only directly challenged the long held view that Homer's views described a real, historical Trojan War, but also had implications for the composition of the Bible. However, by, "the last quarter of the century… higher criticism had come to be more or less freely applied to the Bible in British [which resulted in] free and critical consideration of the Homeric texts" and in 1907 Murray published his work on Homer which argued that the Homeric works known today were composed from an earlier body of work that included "morally repugnant material") that was eventually expunged overtime by various editing which began with Homer. See Turner, *The Greek Heritage*, 6, 145, 151.
[160] Frank Miller Turner, *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain* (New Haven, Conn.: New Haven, Conn. : Yale University Press, 1981), 145.

generally, apparently down to 87 B.C., and there was another Greek history that also dealt with the Farther East, though seemingly only as an appendage to the history of Parthia… the scraps tend to combine into an outline of a whole."[161] When Tarn discusses this "Greek history"[162] he proposes that it was, "the source used by [the Roman era author] Trogus Pompeius for [his history concerning] Parthia and the Farther East."[163]

The reasons Tarn gives for his belief that there was a single "primary source" behind the various histories of the Greek Far East include the fact that the Western sources that dealt with events in the third century B.C. were shown to be linked to "a great lost historian, Hieronymus of Cardia"[164] and thus, "similarly there must have once been in the East [a single Greek source analogous to Hieronymus of Cardia]."[165] Secondly, Tarn argues, "it is… a canon of historical method in dealing with ancient historical method in dealing with ancient history that sources are not to be multiplied beyond necessity; and this is especially true of the Farther East, where one cannot postulate many Greek historians."[166] Tarn even goes as far as to suggest the kind of life this historian lived, arguing based on the details found in what he terms the "Farther East tradition" that "[h]e had traveled widely; he seen and admired the first Parthian capital… and he had spent some considerable time in India."[167] While Tarn's argument establishes a plausible case for the existence of Greek "primary source" for the sources dealing with the Farther East,[168] his argument is tinged with optimistic idealism in his confident assertion of his conclusion, despite the lack of sources, including even details of this supposed historian's life.

---

[161] Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria*, xxi.

[162] Ibid, xxi.
[163] Ibid, 45.
[164] Ibid, 46.
[165] Ibid.
[166] Ibid.
[167] Ibid.
[168] Ibid, xxi.

Tarn's views on Alexander the Great, for which he is most remembered, including his views concerning Alexander's goals for a "unity of mankind," are anticipated in the works of earlier 19th century British writers on Alexander the Great. According to Christopher Hagerman, the classical scholar Connop Thirlwall's, *History of Greece*, published in 1847, provided "the definitive 19th-century character sketch of the visionary, civilizing Alexander – at least for British audiences."[169] Thirlwall saw Alexander's goal as providing that:

> the language, arts, and manner, *the whole genius of Greece* would radiate through the adjacent regions, and *would gradually enlighten, civili[z]e, and transform [Asia's] population* [emphasis added]. [170]

Later writers including Percy Gardiner adopted this perspective referring to Alexander in his article in the *Quarterly Review* as "the instructor of all mankind" and "the spreader of civil and civilized life over the known world." [171] The only major Victorian author on Greek antiquity who opposed this view was George Grote who wrote in his 1846 *A History of Greece* that Alexander:

> [caused] the extinction of Grecian political freedom and self-action, but also the decay of productive genius and the debasement of that consummate literary and rhetorical excellence which the forth century B.C. had seen in Plato and Demosthenes… [Alexander was simply a n]on-Hellenic conqueror into whose vast possessions the Greeks were absorbed, with their intellectual brightness bedimmed, their spirit broken, and half their virtue taken away.[172]

Hagerman further notes that while Grote's *History* was highly successful, his negative view of Alexander was criticized by his contemporaries. W.B. Donne writing his review of Grote's

[169] Hagerman, "In the Footsteps," 371.
[170] Quoted in Ibid, 372.
[171] Quoted in Ibid, 374.
[172] Quoted in Ibid, 370.

History in the *National Review* states that Grote's description of Alexander, "forgoe[s] his judicial impartiality."[173]

The influence of these civilizing visions of Alexander can be found in Tarn's chapter on Alexander's "Policy of Fusion", in which he discusses Alexander's supposed hopes for the "unity of mankind." In Tarn's words Alexander:

> lifted the civilized world out of one groove and set it in another, he started a new epoch… He greatly enlarged the bounds of knowledge and of human endeavor, and gave to Greek science and Greek civilization a scope and an opportunity such as they had never yet possessed. Particularism was replaced by the idea of the 'inhabited world', the common possession of civilized men.[174]

Tarn states that Alexander brought about this "new epoch" by "transcend[ing] the national State; and to transcend the national States meant to transcend national cults."[175] The immediate result was then the rise of supranational cults, such as that of the Roman emperor, which Tarn argues were directly inspired by Alexander. This in turn resulted in a desire for "spiritual unity."[176] among men as evidenced by the words and works of men such as Zeno, and Seneca who viewed Greeks and non-Greeks and slaves and non-slaves as the same.[177] What should be noted from this analysis of Tarn's work is that he is essentially accepting earlier "orthodox" views of the ancient world: that the situations of the ancients are applicable to today, that Alexander transformed Greece for the better, etc. At most, Tarn is attempting to modify these views via the use of archaeology and source criticism while still leaving the essence of these views intact: it is the Hellenistic period rather than the Classical period that Britain should look to; Alexander did not merely aim to spread Greek culture to Asia, but he had a hope for a "unity of mankind." This

[173] Quoted in Ibid, 370.
[174] Tarn, "Policy of Fusion," 205-206.
[175] Ibid. 206
[176] Ibid.
[177] Ibid.

championing of long-held views may partially explain the largely positive response to Tarn's work in contrast to how Harrison was received.

Contemporary Reaction

The immediate scholarly reaction to each of Tarn's primary Hellenistic works, *Antigonas Gonatas*, *The Greeks in Bactria*, and *Alexander the Great*, was generally positive. When reviewing *Anitgonas Gonatas*, both W.S. Ferguson and W.A. Goligher praised Tarn for his scholarship and for expanding the field of Hellenistic study. Ferguson states in his review that:

> Mr. Tarn has met without flinching the most exacting demands of modern scholarship. His mastery of the sources and the secondary literature of his subject is beyond all question… A history of this sort on a period of ancient history unduly neglected in England is worth a dozen well-written volumes on more familiar topics.[178]

Likewise, Goligher praises Tarns for his exhaustive study and use of the available material and states in response to Tarn's statement on how much of his work is "working hypothesis" that, "Mr. Tarn is too pessimistic, both about the evidence and about his own accomplishment."[179]

The main issues reviewers had were with the smaller details found in Tarn's work. For example, Ferguson has some issues with Tarn's dating of certain battles and political events such as the death of Magas, which Tarn states occurred in 248 B.C. instead of 250 B.C.[180] Ferguson also has some issue with Tarn's views of Antigonos II's motivations; he states, "There are some points on which I cannot agree with Mr. Tarn. I am not clear, for example, that the partiality of Antigonus Gonatas for tyrannies was based upon expediency [as Tarn argues] and not upon

---

[178] W. S. Ferguson, "Antigonus Gonatas," *The Classical Review* 27, no. 8 (December 1913): 271, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/700888.
[179] W. A. Goligher, "Antigonos Gonatas by William Woodthorpe Tarn," *Hermathena* 17, no. 39 (1913): 433, http://www.jstor.org/stable/23037056.
[180] Ferguson, "Antigonas," 272.

philosophy."[181] Goligher also has some similar issues with Tarn's dating including the independence of Cyrene, which Goligher says based on Plutarch's and Polybius's accounts occurred no sooner than 247 B.C. while Tarn places it a 253 B.C.[182]

Overall, the character of this criticism shows a gradual movement in 20th century scholarship away from the idealistic notions present in 19th century scholarship, as shown in Ferguson's questioning of Tarn's idealist notion that despite establishing tyrannies Antiogne in fact opposed them philosophically, and his move toward more a scientific ideal of scholarship, exemplified by a heavy importance on correctly deducing the facts of various historical events including dating. This emphasis on the details and facts concerning ancient history shows a great confidence in a sort of "scientific history" that, given enough evidence, allowed scholars to deduce the objective truth of the historical events in question. The emphasis on using scientific methods of analyzing history, ironically blinded Tarn and his contemporaries to the very subjective character of their interpretations.

When *The Greeks in Bactria* was released, it received a similar positive response. Neilson C. Debevoise writing for *The Classical Weekly* stated in the beginning of his review that, "W. W. Tarn… has rescued from oblivion the story of the eastern outposts of Hellenism."[183] Similarly R. Burn in his review of *The Greeks in Bactria* states, "The vivid reconstruction of Bactria at the beginning of its independence is certainly as near the truth as we are likely to get its unless details are revealed by excavation"[184] and later that "[t]he book is thus a practically

---

[181] Ibid.
[182] Goligher, "Antigonas," 437.
[183] Neilson C. Debevoise, "The Greeks in Bactria and India by William W. Tarn," *The Classical Weekly* 32, no. 13 (February 6, 1939): 148, accessed September 18, 2015, doi:10.2307/4340491.
[184] R. Burn, "The Greeks in Bactria and India by William W. Tarn," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, no. 1 (January 1941): 61, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/25221714.

complete guide to the study of the subject and contains much acute criticism."[185] Some of Tarn's views are criticized, such as his explanation of various artifacts and also his views of Asia under Greek rule, that "'under Greek rule the level of Asia was slowly but steadily tending to rise'."[186] Debevoise does not go greatly into his objection but simply states that, "[n]o doubt some of the older families in both Mesopotamia and Iran would have felt some smart [at Tarn's] statement,"[187] implying that from a Persian perspective Alexander's conquest may not in fact have brought about as much prosperity and "civilizing" to Asia as Tarn argues in his book. Finally, reviewers also positively received *Alexander the Great*, with only some criticisms of some of his portrait of Alexander's character. For example, while the military scholar C. B. Welles praises Tarn's analysis of Alexander's battle strategies, he finds some of Tarn's explanations of the negative stories concerning Alexander's character to be unconvincing and states that Tarn's portrait of Alexander:

> [i]s an attractive picture, of an Alexander who was no barbarian, drinking and whoring, with fantastic ideas of his own divinity. Stories of his excesses, of his cheating or lying or massacring, are untrue because they are impossible. No one after Alexander invented good stories about him, so the bad ones must be late… *We may wonder whether Alexander, reading these volumes… w[ould] recognize himself*[188] [emphasis added]

Nonetheless, Tarn's scholarship receives praise. A. R. Burn holds *Alexander* in great regard and even goes as far as to state that, [e]very serious student of Alexander, probably for generations, will have to start from Tarn's analysis of the sources and discussion of the chief problems of the

---

[185] Ibid, 62.
[186] Quoted in Debevoise, "The Greeks in Bactria," 149.
[187] Ibid.
[188] C. B. Welles, "Alexander the Great by William W. Tarn," *Military Affairs* 13, no. 1 (Spring 1949): 60, http://www.jstor.org/stable/1982660.

narrative,"[189] Like Welles, however, he has some disagreements with particular points of Tarn's narrative, such as Tarn's highly negative view of Darius.[190]

Despite Tarn's insistence that he almost always utilized scientific and rational methods to acquire the objective truth concerning his subjects, his work was heavily influenced by the legacy of Victorian thought that influenced how he viewed Greek antiquity and in particular the character and achievement of Alexander in relation to his world. Tarn himself admitted that his work, at least *The Greeks in Bactria*, was not completely objective and states in the Preface to the first edition of *The Greeks in Bactria* concerning possible criticism of his work:

> *I am also aware that history should be written impersonally. But to write this book impersonally was not possible* [emphasis added]; much of it was spade-work, and it had to get written the best it could, other considerations being subordinated to an effort to make the bearings of the rather complex collection of little details clear to the reader.[191]

Though his preface discusses specifically *The Greeks in Bactria*, highly subjective notions of Hellenistic Greek are evident throughout his major works and derive from the legacy of Victorian thought concerning ancient Greece.

Later Reception

In recent decades, however, response to Tarn's work, as exemplified by the Frank Holt, Peter Green, and Pierre Briant, has been much more critical and a view of Alexander and his successors more akin to George Grote's than Connop Thirwall's is common.. Firstly, while Holt in his 1999 book *Thundering Zeus* gives Tarn credit for being one of the first scholars to investigate the history of Bactria, in his 2005 *Into the Land of Bones* he states that Tarn's work

---

[189] A. R. Burn, "Alexander the Great by William. W. Tarn," *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (April 1949): 141, accessed September 18, 2015, http://www.jstor.org/stable/25222300.
[190] Ibid.
[191] Tarn, *The Greek in Bactria*, xiii.

has been "thoroughly challenged."[192] [193] Specifically, Holt states that Tarn's beliefs that Alexander's conquest benefitted the people of Bactria was thoroughly incorrect: "[e]xperts now describe the Hellenistic age as a glass half empty, containing the dregs of a disappointing brew whose taste we know all too well."[194] Instead of the "surprisingly modern" world Tarn describes in which mankind was united happily under a single language, progressing past superstition, and exploring free thought, Holt concludes that the people of the Hellenistic world:

> turned in droves to astrology… and escapism… Greek culture self-consciously (and self-righteously, some would complain) intruded everywhere. The conqueror's language thrust itself even upon cities as ancient as Babylon.[195]

Green's and Briant's views toward Tarn's work on Alexander are even harsher than Holt's. According to Green, Tarn was not merely influenced by the trends in the British study of Greek antiquity, but rather his work on Alexander suffered from serious biases and was driven by a motivation to give Alexander's conquest, "some sort of idealist or missionary creed to underwrite it."[196] In Green's analysis, Tarn's views of the Alexander sources ultimately amounted to the argument that "those traditions which presented Alexander in a morally good light were sound, while hostile testimony could be with confidence dismissed as false propaganda."[197] Briant likewise states that Tarn did not pursue a fully critical approach to his sources but saw Alexander as "a Christlike bringer of peace."[198] Briant also goes further and dismisses Tarn's use of the feast of Opis as proof of Alexander's desire to promote "a

---

[192] Frank Lee Holt, *Into the Land of Bones: Alexander the Great in Afghanistan* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005), 152.
[193] —, *Thundering Zeus: The Making of Hellenistic Bactria* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 26.
[194] —, *Into the Land of Bones*, 153.
[195] Ibid, 154.
[196] Green, Peter. *Alexander of Macedon, 356-323 B.C.: A Historical Biography.* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013), 483.

[197]Ibid, 485.
[198] Briant, Pierre. *Alexander the Great and His Empire: A Short Introduction*. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010), Chapter V.

brotherhood of mankind". Briant states, "there was never any question of universal brotherhood; on the contrary, the collaboration in question was limited expressly to the Macedonians and Persians."[199]

Many of these modern criticisms have merit in that they show how because of his own biases Tarn exaggerated certain aspects of Alexander's conquest and also the character of the rule of his successors (emphasizing the benefit people of the East received from Alexander's invasion). However, some of the harsher criticisms raised by modern authors ignore the great effort Tarn put into his, scholarship. It seems that while Tarn's championing of the Victorian views of the ancient world endeared him to his contemporaries, at the same time Harrison was expelled from the circles of the elite scholarship, his views have doomed his work to being largely ignored and anathemized today, just as Harrison's work was previously. I will return to this in the next and final chapter.

[199] Ibid.

4. Comparisons and Conclusion

Before the late 19th century, the orthodox view of ancient Greece in Britain was that the Greeks (in particular those of the Classical Era) were in many ways the direct predecessors of British society. The primary way the classics were studied was by the study of classical texts. By the late 19th century, developments primarily in Germany saw the application of archaeology, anthropology, etc. to the study of the classics, which began to inform classical studies in Britain beginning with Harrison's and Tarn's generation. In response to these developments, Harrison and Tarn both sought in their work to examine what each thought was lacking in previous study of ancient Greece.

Harrison believed that the main thing lacking in previous study of ancient Greece was an in-depth study of the rituals that ultimately informed Greek myth. She argued that the myths and prose that for centuries had been the focus of devotees of Greece and Rome were simply the end product of a much more interesting and fundamental process of religion emerging from the practice of magic, totemism, and collectivism. For Harrison, this question of the origins of ancient religion was not only important because it shed greater light on well-known Greek texts, such as Homer's work, but also because of the light knowledge of ancient religion could shed on the development of a modern day "Immanentist" religion. Harrison also felt that in order to properly study these primitive origins one needed to look to a variety of emerging disciplines, including anthropology, archaeology, and even psychology — and not just a knowledge of classical texts.

In contrast, what Tarn believed was lacking in the study of ancient Greece seems more conservative at first glance. Recalling his preface to *Antigonas Gonatas*, he simply argues that

greater emphasis should be placed on the Hellenistic period, because according to his mind the Hellenistic world was in fact more similar to European society, than the Classical Era that Britain was so enamored with. However, like Harrison, Tarn challenges views of the definition of Greek history. He believed that by looking at the Hellenistic period, during which Greek language and culture came to be the common denominator among the distinct peoples, one can see the seeds of a "brotherhood of mankind" that would eventually end the significant cultural and spiritual differences between peoples and nations. In terms of his methods, they were unorthodox for a different reason than with Harrison, as he almost never left home, especially after his wife died, and instead of personally examining the sites that he wrote on he sought the help of his network of colleagues in order to receive the latest findings on Greek and Hellenistic archaeology.

Harrison and Tarn also differ in how their work was treated by their contemporaries and later successors. While Harrison's work was not by any means universally panned, her contemporaries tended to find her methods, which included disciplines far different from the classics, remote from the contemporary character of classical scholarship, and many of her conclusions seemed too contrary to the previous "idealization" of the Ancient Greeks to be taken seriously. Later scholars, such as Wilson, Jean-Pierre Vernant, Pierre Vidal-Naquet, et al. would vindicate her methods by citing her as an important predecessor.

In contrast, Tarn's work was well liked overall by contemporaries, as he did not stray greatly from how his immediate British predecessors viewed topics such as the morality of Alexander the Great and how his conquests shaped the world, supposedly for the better. However, in the later 20th century Tarn's work was heavily criticized, for being overly kind to the likes of Alexander the Great and his Hellenistic successors. None of the modern scholars mentioned in Tarn's section took Tarn as their predecessor.

Harrison and Tarn seemed to have turned away from the Classical Era for similar reasons. Both explain that they are pursuing their subjects because of a dearth of work on their particular subject: Harrison states that no one had done a serious study on Greek ritual, and Tarn's preface in *Antigonas Gonatas* states that simply began the work after being told by a German colleague that no one has done a work on the subject of Hellenistic kings.

Secondly, they each ascribe to their subject-matter the role of being the source for some great change in the future. For Harrison, the study of primitive religion provides one with the knowledge of how one can develop a religion of "Immanence" that no longer has the supposed baggage of orthodox religion. Likewise, Tarn believed that the Hellenistic period began the long march of progress from Alexander's great meeting at Opis, to various philosophers, to Christianity, and then to the French Revolution, and beyond.

In sum, this thesis has shown that:

1) the contemporary world of Harrison and Tarn shaped their views on ancient Greece by providing them with new means of studying and looking at the ancient sources — especially in the case of Harrison who utilized the concepts and ideas found in the emerging fields of archaeology, anthropology, and psychology to great effect. Tarn likewise was inspired by contemporary developments to strive toward a more scientific and precise study of ancient Greece, which can be seen in how he and those reviewing his work argue on specific details such as the precise dating of events and coins. The contemporary world of Harrison and Tarn also shaped their views of ancient Greece by making them look to the ancient world in order to find ways to better their own world as it was engulfed in great conflict. The intense push back Harrison received from her fellow scholars for being a woman show how the elite of Harrison's

and Tarn's day were highly resistant to accepting the great changes that were to come in academia.

2) Harrison's studies on ancient Greek religion related more broadly to scholarship on the ancient world in she was among the first to synthesize different methods and thinkers in order to more fully examine the ancient world from a variety of technical perspectives at once. Tarn's studies on ancient Greek religion related more broadly to scholarship on the ancient world in that he was among the first to not only study in great depth ancient Greece after the end of the Classical Era, but his work on the Hellenistic kings prompted him to examine the societies of ancient India and Afghanistan during this period, which had not been done before to any great extent.

Though they both are outsiders for different reasons and see in ancient Greece the source for future change in the world, Harrison and Tarn essentially react differently to the orthodox view of ancient Greece. Harrison's work utterly rejects the orthodox view that the ancient Greece is in some special way the predecessor to British society and furthermore her work depends much more on the thought of eminent writers such as Freud, Nietzsche, Frazer, et al. than on classical text, which contrasted greatly with earlier study of ancient Greece in Britain. In contrast, Tarn's methods are in many ways the continuation of earlier methods of studying the classics and classical texts, in particular histories, modified by the adoption of some new methods and discoveries, mainly from archaeology. His work was only considered somewhat unorthodox by his contemporaries in that his work, being a non-professional historian, was less methodical and specialized than some of his contemporaries. Likewise, Tarn's conclusions are a modification rather than a serious challenge to the earlier view that the ancient Greece was a direct predecessor to British society.

Ultimately, Tarn's scholarship represents the last attempt to maintain the old Victorian views on the ancient world, by adapting these views in the wake of increasing specialization, new discoveries from archeology, and ultimately a changing world that saw the end of empires and the beginning of women's entrance in academia. In contrast, Harrison's scholarship, and in fact her very presence in academia as a woman represented a direct challenge to the old "dispassionate" way of pursuing scholarship. By the mid-20th century, Tarn and the orthodox views of classical scholarship came to be rejected, even by Tarn himself to some degree. Though Harrison even today has never received the praise and honor that Tarn received in his, it is ultimately her vision of scholarship on the ancient world that is more akin to how the classics are treated today.

Bibliography

Adcock, F. E. "Sir William Tarn." *Gnomon* 30.4 (1958): 317-19. Web.

Bosworth, A. B. *Conquest and Empire: The Reign of Alexander the Great*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Bradley, Mark. *Classics and Imperialism in the British Empire*. Classical Presences. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.

Briant, Pierre. *Alexander the Great and His Empire: A Short Introduction*. kindle ed. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Burn, A. R. Review of *Alexander the Great* by William. W. Tarn. *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 1 (April 1949): 88-89. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25222300.

Burn, R. Review of *The Greeks in Bactria and India* by William W. Tarn." *The Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*, no. 1 (January 1941): 61-68. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25221714.

Burtstein, Stanley M. "Reviewed Work: Myth and Tragedy in Ancient Greece by Jean-Pierre Vernant." *The History Teacher* 19, no. 1 (November 1985): 163-64. Accessed October 17, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/493656.

Debevoise, Neilson C. Review of *The Greeks in Bactria and India* by William W. Tarn. *The Classical Weekly* 32, no. 13 (February 6, 1939): 148-49. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/4340491.

Dentith, Simon. *Epic and Empire in Nineteenth-century Britain*. Cambridge Studies in Nineteenth-century Literature and Culture; 52. Cambridge, UK; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006.

Ferguson, W. S. Review of *Antigonus Gonatas* by William W. Tarn. *The Classical Review* 27, no. 8 (December 1913): 271-72. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/700888.

Goligher, W. A. Review of *Antigonos Gonatas* by William Woodthorpe Tarn. *Hermathena* 17, no. 39 (1913): 433-38. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23037056.

Green, Peter. *Alexander of Macedon, 356-323 B.C.: A Historical Biography.* kindle ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2013.

Harrison, Jane Ellen. *Alpha and Omega*. New York: AMS Press, 1973.

—. *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion, and Themis: A Study of the Social Origins of Greek Religion.* New Hyde Park, N.Y.: University Books, 1962.

—. *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion.* New York: Meridian Books, 1955.

—. "Reminiscences of a Student's Life." *Arion: A Journal of Humanities and the Classics* 4, no. 2 (Summer 1965): 312-46. Accessed September 17, 2015 http://www.jstor.org/stable/20162959.

Hagerman, Christopher A. "In the Footsteps of the 'Macedonian Conqueror": Alexander the Great and British India." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 16, no. 3/4 (September/December 2009): 344-92. Accessed September 18, 2015 http://www.jstor.org/stable/40388969.

Holt, Frank Lee. *Into the Land of Bones: Alexander the Great in Afghanistan*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2005.

—. *Thundering Zeus the Making of Hellenistic Bactria*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999.

James, E. O. Review of *Epilegomena to the Study of Greek Religion and Themis* by Jane E. Harrison." *Folklore* 74, no. 1 (Spring 1963): 351-52. Accessed September 17, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/1258030.

Johnson, James William. "The Meaning of "Augustan"" *Journal of the History of Ideas* 19, no. 4 (October 1958): 507-22. Accessed November 8, 2015. doi:10.2307/2707920.

Mairs, Rachel. *The Hellenistic Far East: Archaeology, Language, and Identity in Greek Central Asia*. Oakland, California: University of California Press, 2014.

Marchand, Suzanne L. *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750-1970*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2003.

McEvilley, Thomas. *The Shape of Ancient Thought: Comparative Studies in Greek and Indian Philosophies*. New York: Allworth Press, 2002.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. online ed., "Cambridge Ritualists (act. 1900–1914)." by Robert Ackerman, Accessed April 11, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/33734.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. online ed., "Frazer, Sir James George (1854–1941)" by Robert Ackerman, Accessed April 11, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/33734.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. online ed., "Harrison, Jane Ellen (1850–1928)." by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, Accessed April 11, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/33734.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. online ed., "Jackson, Henry (1839– 1921)." by J. A. Platt, Accessed April 11, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/34133

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. online ed., " MacColl, Dugald Sutherland (1859–1948)." by H. B. Grimsditch, Accessed April 11, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/33734.

Oxford Dictionary of National Biography. online ed., "Tarn, Sir William Woodthorpe (1869–1957)." by F. E. Adcock, Accessed April 11, 2016. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/ref:odnb/36416.

Philips, K. J. "Jane Harrison and Modernism." *Journal of Modern Literature* 17, no. 4 (Spring 1991): 465-76. Accessed November 8, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3831358.

Shelly, Arlen. "'For Love of an Idea': Jane Ellen Harrison, Heretic and Humanist." *Women's History Review* 5, no. 2 (1996): 165-90. Accessed April 4, 2016. http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09612029600200114.

Stray, Christopher. "Culture and Discipline: Classics and Society in Victorian England." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 3.1 (1996): 77-85. Web. 12 Dec. 2015. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30222253>.

Tarn, William. W. *Alexander the Great.* Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1948.

—. *Antigonos Gonatas*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.

—. *The Greeks in Bactria & India.* Cambridge [Eng.]: University Press, 1951.

—. "Policy of Fusion." in *Alexander the Great: A Reader*, edited by Ian Worthington. London: Routledge, 2003. 205-07.

Thomas, Richard F. *Virgil and the Augustan Reception*. Cambridge, U.K.; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2001.

Todd, Richard A. "W. W. Tarn and the Alexander Ideal." *Historian* 27, no. 1 (November 1964): 48-55. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6563.1964.tb00274.x.

Turner, Frank M. "Antiquity in Victorian Contexts." *Browning Institute Studies* 10 (1982): 1-14. Accessed September 18, 2015. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25057717.

—. *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*. New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1981.

Welles, C. B. Review of *Alexander the Great* by William W. Tarn. *Military Affairs* 13, no. 1 (Spring 1949): 59-60. Accessed September 18, 2015 http://www.jstor.org/stable/1982660.