CONTENTS

VOLUME ONE

PART SIX:
ARCHAEOLOGY, HERITAGE AND IDEOLOGY

PREFACE

This volume derives from a conference that was held at the University of Wales Gregynog in November 2001. On that occasion, more than sixty delegates from twelve different countries met together to discuss Hasluck and issues connected with his life and work. Heritage and archaeology in the Balkans; nationalism, culture and ideology; the Schools abroad; continuities and causality in the cultural record; religious syncretism; western travellers in Turkey; conversion; the ethnography of the Alevi-Bektashis were but some of the themes addressed. The event was marked by a scholarly effervescence that was as exciting as it was reassuring. However difficult our contemporary conditions, something of the British university tradition clearly still survives. For this we must be surprised and grateful.

The events of 11 September meant that some colleagues who would have like to have taken part in the initial discussions were impeded from doing so. Others, though, have joined in, and the publication offered here has gradually evolved since the conference. It consists now of two volumes divided into six parts, with contributions offered from a distinguished group of scholars whose membership crosses national as well as disciplinary boundaries.

If considered in the light of the introduction, the chapters that follow may be read as a commentary on the work of Hasluck and its possible ramifications. The respective sections, in turn, group together papers on similar themes: syncretism, for example, and the relationship between heritage, archaeology and nationalism are found in Volume Two, whilst various of the personalities associated with the schools abroad, descriptions of those schools themselves, ethnographic essays on the Alevi-Bektashis (the group in whom Hasluck specialised), and more detailed summations of Hasluck's life are found in Volume One.

Each chapter is, of course, an essay in its own right, in each case offering pointers where further work may be undertaken. To take only the four plenary speakers at the conference, all of whom who have offered chapters here: Salmeri's immensely suggestive comments on Ridgeway, antiquarianism and the Cambridge of the early 1900s; Mélikoff's comparison

between the Bektashis, the Hurufis, and the Bogomils; Meeker's pioneering work on the transition from empire to nation on the Black Sea Coast; and Hopwood's exploration of cultural interaction on the Byzantine/Turkish frontier are all areas where further study would be as stimulating as it would be rewarding.

From the point of view of the disciplinary history of anthropology and archaeology, it is hoped that the story of Hasluck's life will shed some light on that puzzling separation between archaeology and anthropology in this country, a phenomenon that has still not been properly explained. Taken more theoretically, the contributions encourage speculation on the complex interrelations that obtain at the point of transitions between societies and peoples, whether in time or space, and are a sharp antidote to that contemporary tendency to see cultures as occupying distinct, discrete political spaces.

The two volumes conclude with a brief chronology of the lives of Hasluck and his wife (née Margaret Hardie), and also a preliminary bibliography of their respective publications provided by David Gill. In the case of Margaret Hardie in particular, we hope that it will be possible in the future to provide a more detailed study. Here, Roderick Bailey has very kindly offered a short piece by her (Chapter 5) that has not otherwise been published. He also generously made available the photograph of Mrs Hasluck that acts as a frontispiece to Volume Two.

In future gatherings, we hope both to look at these issues further in the context of the differing religious and cultural traditions of south-east Europe and Anatolia, and to explore specific topics and figures. Amongst these last may be found the more general study of the place of the foreign schools of archaeology and anthropology abroad, ethnographic studies of interaction between Muslim and Christian communities in the region, and a more detailed evaluation of the redoubtable Ramsay than we have been able to offer here. The editor would naturally be delighted to receive comments or suggestions of further questions that it is felt should be taken into account.

David Shankland, Bristol.
D.P.Shankland@bristol.ac.uk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work's first debt is to the British School at Athens, and I am most grateful for initial leave to consult their London office archives, and for subsequent permission to publish extracts from them. Sadly, during the project the whole relevant archive was transferred to Greece by the School in spite of my pleas that the project was ongoing. This naturally can have nothing to do with the fact that the archive contradicts sharply the information provided in the School's official history. Nevertheless, it does seem unfortunate that a major unstudied academic resource for our understanding of the development of British intellectual life should be moved abroad to such a distant location, particularly whilst it was in use, and without consultation with the wider scholarly community. One can only hope that this action will be reversed.

Other than this mishap, the project has received a very great deal of help and assistance. A grant from the UK Economic and Social Research Council was essential in enabling me to devote time to the project, and I would like to place once more on record the extraordinarily understanding way in which the Council supports social science research.

The original conference 'Archaeology, Anthropology and Heritage: the life and times of F. W. Hasluck, 1878-1920' took place at the University of Wales Gregynog, 5-7 November 2001. The impeccably friendly and efficient staff at Gregynog did a great deal to make the occasion enjoyable and memorable.

The event was organised jointly by a committee consisting of Keith Hopwood, Stephen Mitchell and David Shankland, and supported by a number of different bodies. We would like to acknowledge and to thank the British Academy and its Secretary Peter Brown; the University of Wales Colloquium Fund; the University of Wales Centre for the Study of Southeast Europe; the University of Wales, Lampeter and its Vice-Chancellor, Professor Keith Robbins.

The production of the publication has been a joint effort in every sense. However, I should like to thank the Director and Staff of the Isis Press, Istanbul for the highly efficient way that they handled the manuscript. I would also like to acknowledge, with gratitude, the Vice-Chancellor's Fund of the University of Bristol, for its generous assistance whilst taking the project to its conclusion.

Finally, I should acknowledge, many years later than I should have liked, the advice of the late Professor Ahmet Edip Uysal, of Ankara University, himself a pioneering folklorist. It was he who emphasised to me in Turkey in the 1980s the significance of Hasluck's researches, and who encouraged me to find archival evidence concerning his life.

1. THE LIFE AND TIMES OF F. W. HASLUCK (1878-1920)

David SHANKLAND[1]

Deceptively laconic, lucid, highly original, wide-ranging and sceptical, the work of F.W. Hasluck has been almost entirely ignored by the generations of scholars who have followed him. As a re
known outside a small number of devotees but also the inner currents of his life and thought are as yet scarcely established. One of our aims in this volume is to begin to redress this balance.

In part, the reasons for Hasluck being so comparatively overlooked are clear. He died young, at the age of forty-two. Whilst he wrote a great deal in article form, he published only one monograph during his lifetime,[2] leaving his wife, (née Margaret Hardie), to edit, collect and publish his remains. Much of what he wrote is sharply in contrast to the then prevailing intellectual tenor and contains scant doffing of his cap to the established leaders. Whilst he enjoyed his working life, he was not particularly good at institutional politics. This facilitated his dismissal as Assistant Director from the British School at Athens, a rejection that he took quietly, and with scarce a murmur of complaint. He achieved therefore a self-reinforcing obscurity; his work was too modernist to be immediately accessible or comprehensible to even his closest colleagues, and at the time of his death he had no professional position that might have offered his posthumous reputation an easy legitimacy. Dying of consumption unemployed in Switzerland was, whilst perhaps romantic, not a recipe for fame in a field crowded with some very good, and very ambitious, minds.

Yet, speaking as a professional anthropologist, my feeling is that he anticipated some of the most important insights of the Malinowski school nearly two decades before they became apparent to the wider world of

[1] Whilst this introduction owes a great deal to many friends and colleagues, I would like to thank David Barchard, Richard Clogg, Nigel Morley, Lucia Nixon, and Giovanni Salmeri in particular for their most helpful comments.

[2] Hasluck (1910).

scholarship. Doing so, indeed, contributed toward the intellectual insouciance of his elders toward him, and his toward them. Not just this, he made further research contributions across a very wide field: to classics, ethnography, ancient and modern history, folklore, archaeology, numismatics and indeed librarianship. His work's *leitmotif*, the complex cultural interaction between Christianity and Islam in the Balkans and Anatolia, could hardly be more relevant in today's troubled world. These are compelling reasons to pause, and to reconsider his life and works afresh.

King's and the Cambridge influence

Hasluck was one of that brilliant generation of scholars brought up in the intellectual strong-house of King's College Cambridge before the Great War, arriving there from the Leys School on a scholarship.[1] Whilst the current mania for keeping student records was at that point hardly conceived, a few points are at least immediately clear from their respective records: at the Leys School Hasluck gained the School Higher Certificate with distinction in French, Latin and Greek. He became a prefect, and more significantly perhaps, editor of the school newspaper, *The Leys Fortnightly,* in 1897.[2] It is too early to judge very much from that school experience, but there are signs that in certain respects his later orientation may be anticipated: he is thanked for donating a coin cabinet to the school library, and wins an occasional prize.[3] It is also possible — and detailed exploration of this theme will have to wait until further archival material has been unearthed — that the particular background of high Methodism upon which the Leys School was founded gave him exactly that curious combination of character traits that we see later in his life: that is, the self-confidence of a well-educated person of good family but without any corresponding need to feel part of the country's governing ethos.[4] This thought, albeit intriguing, is for later exploration. What is clear is that the school, in order to mark the achievement of its pupils in winning Oxbridge scholarships, declared a day's holiday.[5]

---

[1] King's College, Meeting Book, 2 December 1896 lists four scholars as receiving scholarships for that year and ranks them accordingly: 'Order of Scholars: AGREED that the order of Scholars now elected be:- Grace, Meredith, Hasluck, Monteath'.

[2] I am most grateful to Mr Houghton, archivist of the Leys School, for his kindness in bringing these references to Hasluck to my attention.

[3] For the coin cabinet: *Leys School Fortnightly*, Vol XXI 1897, page 159; for prizes, pages 175, 280.

[4] On the history and background of the Leys School, see Houghton and Houghton (2000).

[5] *The Leys Fortnightly*, Vol. 21, 26 February 1887; 179.

At King's, he took a first in both parts of the Classics Tripos, and also won the Brown Medal for Latin epigrams.[1] He built upon this success by being elected a fellow in 1904. Whilst we do know precisely what impulse led him to the British School of Athens, Salmeri's fascinating analysis in this volume gives persuasive food for thinking that his later theoretical toughness was profoundly honed by the precociousness of that Cambridge milieu. As Salmeri also suggests, it is highly likely that it is possible to discern the more specific influence of Ridgeway's eclectic antiquarianism and the innovative flexibility of the late nineteenth century classical tripos.

Just why this background should be important for the intellectual history of anthropology is, upon reflection, obvious. British Social Anthropology is a misnomer in as much as it took its modern form (a form that is only today beginning to lose its shape) through a foreign import. Malinowski's distinct methodological insistence on individual fieldwork and historical scepticism combined with his acumen and sharp instinct for institutional leadership did indeed revolutionise that branch of scholarship. His model produced not just a strong disciplinary ethos but also some of the best ethnography published anywhere.

Seeking the ideological roots of this combination, Gellner and others have turned to Malinowski's past; his doctorate in empiricist philosophy of science from Krakow, his experience of eastern European nationalism, and his work in non-literate societies.[2] Yet the example of Hasluck shows that a similar result could have been generated in a slightly different way: through the Cambridge scepticism of Russell and the Apostles combined with equally brilliant scholarship generated through the classical tradition, drawing upon an ethnographic area, south-east Europe, that Herzfeld many years, and several generations later, was so notably to lament as having been forcibly neglected by the vigour of the Malinowskian impulse to work in the Commonwealth.[3]

To realise that there could be such other paths is not to belittle Malinowski. Indeed, Hasluck's unavailing pleas to his employers for permission to live with his wife at the School show how admirably strong Malinowski must have been to cope with similar institutional obstacles that he met with such remarkable élan.[4] The current implosion of British Social

---

[1] See Hasluck's obituary paragraph in the *King's College Annual Report*, 20 November 1920; 2.
[2] See, for instance, Gellner (1995, 1998).
[3] Herzfeld (1987).
[4] On Malinowski's (and early social anthropology's) institutional background, see Goody (1995).

Anthropology in its immediate form, does however, mean that the search for alternatives will continue apace. What, for example, if anthropology in this country had not separated off from archaeology so forcefully? What if it had taken further the model of foreign schools abroad and remained with it for longer than it actually did? What, indeed, if it had not distanced itself so markedly from the group ethos that dominates primary research activity within archaeology (and indeed did also the early Haddon expedition to the Torres straits), and worked in teams in more sustained fashion than it later came to do? Hasluck's cruel misfortunes provide ammunition, it is true, for those who argue that social anthropology must have been right to strike out for such independence, if only to avoid being crushed at source. The utter brilliance of Hasluck's material, with its seamless use of textual, archaeological and anthropological data, material that now acts as a unique source quarried by specialists on the Balkans and Anatolia, argues that it might have been otherwise.

Hasluck's works

Though he wrote widely, Hasluck's intellectual focus may be regarded as the investigation of the successive cultures of the Balkans and Anatolia emphasising the while both their respective comparative setting and points of historical transition between them. His approach differs clearly from his immediate colleagues twice over. He shows scant regard, even scorn for any presumption that one culture may 'survive' into another over time in any straightforward way, and at the same time insists that the causal basis for any cultural continuity must be set in the way present factors selectively shape the past. This scepticism toward survivalism characterises much of his work and letters. He writes to his friend Dawkins in October 1915 for instance, 'Every one is so eager to believe in picturesque survivals. Even X saw the other day S. Spyridon must be (why?) a survival of Alchinus: ie. that every cult in a given radius *must* be a survival of every other in that radius. This is, well –'. Then, in November 1917 even more bluntly, 'In all survivals the first man ignores the chronological gap in his theory & the public doesn't know there is one'.[1]

This general orientation comes most sharply into focus in his writings in an explicit battle with the famous Victorian Professor Sir William Ramsay. Himself a most interesting man, William Ramsay might be

[1] Hasluck (1926; 13, 54).

regarded, not altogether flippantly, as an itinerant theologian: itinerant in that in the latter part of the nineteenth, and early twentieth century he conducted extremely extensive survey work in Anatolia into later classical and early Christian remains. Theologian in that he wrote widely on the historical basis of the scriptures, attempting to use his field findings to illustrate the literal truth of the Bible. Possessed of a forceful character, he was an early example of an international academic star, attending conferences, going to America on lecture tours, and publishing too his reflections on modern Turkey and the Young Turk revolution.[1]

During the course of these presentations, he on several occasions outlines a startlingly clear continuity thesis. He claims that sites held to be sacred by the contemporary cultures of Anatolia, such as streams, graves, trees, tombs, mountains, streams or rocks, are always evidence of continuity from an earlier stage of religious life. Or, to put it another way, when a site comes to be regarded as holy by a particular group, it somehow always remains so, retaining its *numen* for the later incomers to that spot.

The practical consequences of this approach for his survey work are very convenient. Much of his work takes place amongst the Muslim villages of Asia Minor. His argument divides their religious life into two. Mosque-going activities are genuinely Islamic. Any other are not Muslim.

> In regard to their religious ideas, we begin by setting aside all that belongs strictly to Mohammedanism, all that necessarily arises from the fact that a number of Mohammedans, who live together in a particular town or village, are bound to carry out in common the ritual of their religion, *ie.* to erect a proper building, and to perform certain acts and prayers at regular intervals. Anything that can be sufficiently accounted for on that ground has no bearing on the present purpose. All that is beyond this is, strictly speaking, a deviation from, and even a violation of, the Mohammedan religion ... But the actual belief of the peasantry of Asia Minor attaches sanctity to a vast number of localities, and to these our attention is now directed. Without laying down any universal principle, it will appear easily that in many cases the attachment of religious veneration to particular localities in Asia Minor has continued through all changes in the dominant religion of the country.[2]

Whilst this puritanical interpretation of what is 'truly' Islamic would please the most reformist Wahabbi cleric today, it leads immediately to the vast proportion of the religious activity of an Anatolian village being regarded a

---

[1] Ramsay (1909).
[2] Ramsay (1906; 167).

mere relic. Indeed, saints' tombs, graves, streams, holy trees, places of worship, with which the countryside is dotted, suddenly become not just 'non-Islamic' but also likely direct and convenient entry points facilitating time-travel into just that past world that Ramsay wishes to study.

Ramsay's question is not an empty one: in an area which has seen the intermingling, conquering, reconquering and ultimately separation of empires and nations, as well as dozens of different smaller, but often at least partially distinct peoples overlapping and co-existing with each other, the question of what happens to the successive material remains, and the extent to which society may leave a cultural influence on the next, is indeed crucial to our wider understanding of humanity. Nevertheless, his answer is astoundingly static. His perspective requires successive cultures to be frozen out of almost any possibility of social creativity by their predecessors, who have somehow imbued the landscape, and their culture, with permanent sacred meaning. It also immediately leads to an infinite regress, because if a sacred tradition is by definition a relic of a previous past, it can in turn only be explained by a previous tradition, and so on.

Hasluck was so important not just because he was sceptical (he can hardly have been the only such sceptic) but more specifically that, by virtue of his extensive fieldwork, he marshalled ample material to rebut Ramsay decisively. In doing so, he arrived at a dynamic theory of culture which implies that the past is continuously reinterpreted by the present, an idea that both solves the logical regress, and is one that researchers within modern anthropology, and Malinowski himself, would certainly find much more congenial than Ramsay's survivalism.

The briefest way to demonstrate the efficiency of Hasluck's counter-argument is perhaps to look at his most sustained and explicit attack on Ramsay. This longer piece consists of the first section, totalling 118 pages, of *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*. Its intent, though carefully and politely phrased, is clear from the introductory, opening page.

> Professor Sir William Ramsay has in repeated articles laid stress on the tenacity of local religious traditions in Asia Minor ... My own conclusion derived, I hope, impartially from the evidence, is that a survival of religious tradition is so far from inevitable that it is only possible under favourable conditions.[1]

[1] Hasluck (1929; 3).

In order to demonstrate his point, Hasluck considers a very wide range of religious phenomena from across the Balkans and Anatolia, dividing up his material in terms of the type of building or locality in question. To imply the idea of a sense of sanctity continuing from one culture to the next he uses the word 'transference'. Thus he considers the successful 'transference' of sacred buildings, or where such an attempt to transfer such a sense of the sacred has failed. He considers churches that have fallen into disuse. He considers those areas, both in the countryside and in the towns, where Islamic communities have respected Christian places of worship, and vice versa. He discusses the possible transference of 'natural' spirituality, ie. cases where it appears that a mountain, or a stream has a long sacred tradition attached to it that passes from one culture to the next.

Hasluck's conclusions are directly opposed to those of Ramsay; he concludes that there is simply no precise or predictable way that one sacred monument is treated so in the following culture. He is not concerned to deny that a 'transference' might sometimes occur, for example, in such buildings as Ayasofya in Istanbul, or lesser known churches such as those in Konya, or even that there are rural continuities whereby a stream held sacred by Christians might also be held to be so by an Islamic village. What he is questioning is the *inevitability* of such a 'transference', the causal mechanism by which it might take place. Hasluck maintains that responsibility must lie with the social conditions that obtain at that time within the contemporary community, that only if they are appropriate will the past become reflected in the present. Thus:

> The continuance of ... religious centres depends directly on the continuance of their population ... An isolated sanctuary, if on a frequented route especially the great pilgrim road to Mecca, stands a greater chance of wide popularity than one remote from it: if the road becomes less populous, the sanctuary suffers with it...[1]

> ... it is apparent that many sites of extraordinary sanctity both in ancient and in Christian times have at the present day lost all tradition of that sanctity. Ephesus ... seems never to have passed on its religious traditions to Islam. ... At ... Corycian ... a Christian church was built on the very site of the pagan temple. The nomad Turks who now inhabit the district use the cave itself as a stable for camels, and scout the idea of anything supernatural about it.[2]

---

[1] Hasluck (1929; 113).
[2] Hasluck (1929; 115-116).

> The religious awe attaching to ancient places of worship thus dwindles or dies where it is not continuously reinforced by organization. It is human organization in the end which was responsible for all the widely reputed sanctuaries ... All owed their extended vogue either to the external organization of politics, or commerce, or the internal organization of an astute or even learned priestly caste dealing in cures, oracles or mysteries. .... For every dying cult...one [can] point to a hundred dead, and new ones daily grow up to take their place and satisfy the religious needs of a varying population.[1]

Finally, his closing lines sum up:

> (My) inference is that changes in political and religious conditions, especially change of population, of which Asia Minor has seen so much, can and do obliterate the most ancient local religious traditions, and, consequently, that our pretensions to accuracy in delineating local religious history must largely depend on our knowledge of these changes. Without this knowledge, which we seldom or never have, the assumption too often made on the ground of some accidental similarity that one half-known cult had supplanted another is picturesque but unprofitable guesswork.[2]

These scattered quotations hardly do justice to the wealth of detail that Hasluck offers. They do, however, illustrate the fullness of the jump in vision has taken place. Humans, their thought processes, and the wider political and economic events along with all the uncertainty that this must entail have replaced the bare presumption of the primacy of the archaeological or textual record and its straightforward adoption into a fixed cultural or historical scale. In so positing such a shifting dynamic between material culture, environment and society, Hasluck reaches a position that is rightly held to be quite central, even integral, to the modern practice of anthropology, and of its founding revolution.

Early research

'Transferences' is Hasluck's final major piece, one that he reworked extensively whilst he was ill, and circulated before his death to Ridgeway for comment. It represents therefore his careful thought over the previous two decades of research. Nevertheless, even in his earliest work, certain pre-occupations may be discerned that act as stepping stones toward his mature position. One of the most important of these is the question of what is more

[1] Hasluck (1929; 117).
[2] Hasluck (1929; 118).

generally called today cultural relativism. The excesses of the self-acclaimed post-modernists within the social sciences have rightly made scholars highly suspicious of the pernicious effects of such nomenclature. Nevertheless, that approach contains an important insight: there is often in practice a link between refusing to give any one culture priority over any other and overcoming the tendency to offer causal precedence to any one particular civilisation in our depiction of the past. In other words, even though there may be no logical or necessary link between a private belief that Ancient Greece or Egypt or wherever is the summit of civilisation and giving that culture causal precedence in one's intellectual analysis, in practice such a connection is extremely difficult to discount.

Ramsay, the butt of Hasluck's attack, is a case in point. Whilst he wrote and travelled widely, he assumes that the underlying aim of archaeology in the Near East is to illuminate the scriptures, and more particularly the life of St Paul. This leads him to a marked inclination to favour the Christian communities of the Middle East, and to a scorn for the Ottoman Empire, and indeed for the Turkish language, that grates rather on modern sensibilities. Indeed, whilst there is still no biography of Ramsay, in any attempt at writing one it would hardly be possible to disentangle his Gladstonian approach to the Near Eastern question from his wider writings on the civilisations of Asia Minor. For example:

> The tree nearest the spring is hung with patches of rag, fastened to it by modern devotees. In the contrast between the ancient sculpture and the modern tree [at this spot] you have, in miniature, the difference between Asia Minor as it was 2,700 years ago, and Asia Minor as it is under the Turk. The peasants' language is as poor as their ritual ...[1]

To suggest that the richness and complexity of rural Turkish is 'poor' — an assertion that Ramsay repeats over the subsequent two pages — is absurd, all the more so as Ramsay evidently spoke no more than a few words of what is sometimes known today in Turkey as 'archaeology Turkish': that is, a few phrases picked up sufficient for basic purposes when travelling in Anatolia but with respect for neither grammar nor style.

The Ramsian emphasis on the idea that archaeological research exists to supplement sacred texts has never quite faded away, nor was it in Hasluck's day unimportant. It may be seen, for example, still in the substantial volume edited by Hogarth, himself Director of the British School at Athens between

[1]Ramsay (1906; 173).

1896 and 1898 (and subsequently Keeper of the Ashmolean), that appeared in 1899.[1] Nevertheless, in style it already appears a little old-fashioned at the end of the nineteenth century, harking back to the work of Layard, and even those early travellers who assumed that the point of journeying in the Near East was to visit the Seven Churches of Asia Minor. Rather, the men who founded the British School at Athens were influenced by the romantic revival that had long started to replace Christian allusions with the spirit of classicism, and above all by the Hellenic spirit of Dodwell, Stuart, Byron and Hobhouse. This was represented perfectly in Hasluck's day by George Macmillan, its long-serving Chairman in London, and its first Director, Penrose, who measured the columns of the Parthenon.

It was the custom of the School to offer an annual studentship in alternate years to Oxford and Cambridge in return for the support that they offered it through subscriptions. The Vice-Chancellor had nominated Hasluck for the 1901-1902 season. When he arrived, there appears no obvious reason to suppose that he would differ sharply from this prevailing ethos. As usual, he was expected to pursue a certain course of study, and he achieved this by joining in with an expedition led by Bosanquet (who was the School's Director at that time) to Cyzicus, the ancient city on the peninsular of the Dardanelles. The hope was that Cyzicus would be excavated, and therefore Hasluck become acquainted with digging techniques in practical fashion through working on the site. Digging permission from the Ottoman authorities, however, was not forthcoming, though he was able to visit in spring 1902, and with remarkable promptness, published his first academic paper (albeit brief) on the site in the British School at Athens *Annual* for that year.[2]

Though permission still did not arrive, Hasluck continued to visit the region each year until 1906. Whilst publishing subsequent articles on the site, he turned his survey material into a successful Fellowship dissertation for King's — indeed judging from the notes of that meeting, he appears to have received the most votes of all the candidates.[3] The dissertation, unfortunately, appears to be lost but his researches were ultimately published as part of the Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series, with the rather

---

[1] Hogarth (1899).

[2] Hasluck (1902).

[3] King's College Meeting book, 12 March, 1904: 'At a meeting of the Electors to Fellowships .... the Electors voted for each candidate separately, votes being given as follows: for Mr Hasluck 15 votes, Barger 13 votes, Temperley 12 votes, Tilon, none. Mr Hasluck and Mr Barger were declared provisionally elected...'.

cumbersome title *Cyzicus: Being some account of the history and antiquities of that city, and of the district adjacent to it, with the towns of Apollinia ad Rhyndacum, Miletupolis, Hadrianutherae, Pirapus, Zelia, etc.*[1] In fact, far more auspicious than this title appears at first sight, Hasluck has written a neat and pleasant account of the area from the diachronic and the synchronic point of view, covering the site on the one hand from its earliest known period (the 'Milesian') until the Turkish conquest, and on the other considers questions of its present-day comparative religion and government in a most suggestive way.

At this stage of my researches, I cannot claim an intimate knowledge of the development of classical scholarship at the turn of the last century. However, both Professor Salmeri and Mr Hopwood have kindly discussed the place of this monograph in its field with me, and they reinforce the impression that a casual glance may give in that it is highly original in the flexibility with which it treats its subject. Rather than regard the only significant part of the settlement as being its place at the height of classical antiquity, Hasluck has self-consciously included far more than would be then usual in such an explicitly classical work on other periods, and indeed far more detail on present-day customs gained from travelling in the locality. He notes, for example, a series of different cases of 'incubation': that is, Greek, and occasionally Turkish, seekers who are prepared to sleep at the tomb of a saint in order to gain miraculous intercession (see also Stewart's contribution in this work). He also comments extensively on the islands, ports and settlements around the site of Cyzicus itself, giving a sense of their present prosperity and activity.

Whilst the *longue durée* has now become something to which in principle we are accustomed, this refreshing presentation of historical sequence, scholarly detail and field research combined in a single text is even today sometimes lacking in archaeological survey volumes on Anatolia, facilitating an aridity that is as off-putting as it is artificial. Monuments and remains in the landscape, unless they are bereft entirely of any human contact, always have some relationship with the living societies around them, and it is to Hasluck's credit that he realised this and even in his earliest major work did not attempt to exclude such social context from his account.[2] At the same

[1] Hasluck (1910).

[2] On this point, it is also worth glancing at Hasluck's annotations to the architectural survey conducted by Jewell of the 'Church of our Lady of the Hundred Gates (Panagia Hekatontapyliani)' in Paros, (Jewell and Hasluck 1920).

time, it is clear, even in this first monograph that he has no interest whatsoever in illuminating a specifically glorious classical past.

Islam and Christianity

A self-conscious readiness to study history as a multiple, dynamic process is certainly essential to Hasluck's reworking of Ramsay's survivalism, and indeed to his escaping from the dominant classical tradition. Also important though is his readiness to work with the lived experience of religion, with its quirky side as much as its orthodoxies. Thus, rather than dismiss all non mosque-going religious activities, as does Ramsay, to some sort of folklore, he assumes that they constitute an integral part of life within the Islamic communities of Anatolia. His work benefits profoundly from this even-handed approach. It means that he is able to look systematically at what is sometimes known as the 'saintly' tradition in Islam; that is, the readiness of the Muslim Balkans to embrace mystical inspiration, tombs, and brotherhoods within daily life, however frowned upon by orthodox-inclined *imam*s. It leads him too to treat the relationship between Islam and Christianity in Anatolia and the Balkans as a reciprocal interaction, one in which both sides may be affected in different ways by each other without prejudice as to their priority.

Both these themes are explored in some detail in *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*. However, it should not be forgotten that these essays are, in effect, his collected works, often prepared originally for periodical or, in the case of the opening essay on 'transferences', separate publication. His style was already rather concise, and the effect of such varied offerings pressed cheek by jowl against one another can sometimes be rather off-putting. This, combined with the fact that Margaret Hasluck, his posthumous editor, pressed yet more matter into the already extensive footnotes makes it difficult simply to sit down and read each section consecutively as one would a monograph. Instead, though, any single chapter may be treated as a concentrated snapshot, a way into a specific problem that Hasluck has highlighted by drawing upon his diverse sources — his fieldwork, his modern reading in Greek, or of the older literary, travel, or classical sources. Later, he referred to this habit of unearthing some interesting aspect of social or religious history as 'truffling', and hoped that his comments would be starting points for further research.

This hope appears to be justified in as much as his writings, though so condensed, are often extremely suggestive. For instance, there appeared in the *British School at Athens Annual* a piece called 'Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konya', reprinted in the second volume of *Christianity and Islam*.[1] It is a brief treatment of Konya in the Seljuk period, when that city was the capital of their empire. Choosing to eschew political history for a more nuanced, explicitly social consideration of life at that time, Hasluck stresses that the emergence of Rumi, who was the inspiration for the Mevlevi Dervishes, as a great mystical leader may be seen within the context of a pluralistic society in which both Christian and Islamic traditions could celebrate and venerate such a holy figure. The essay is, just as he points out, a preliminary effort. Yet, this train of thought is immensely suggestive. Hopwood, for example, in this volume uses it as the starting point for a fascinating analysis of the social background of the Turkish conquest of Anatolia. It also lends itself to more ahistorical generalization, for instance the thought that, when Christian and Muslim communities are found alongside one another, though they may achieve, naturally, many different types of accommodation (see for example, the chapters here by Balivet, Kieser or by Shukurov), mutual religious respect is shown often through reciprocal worship or sacrifice in the name of the other's saints and at saintly tombs rather than through potentially more formal contact between mosque and church.

This implies straight away that inter-faith contact may occur most frequently precisely through those 'folkloric' aspects of the Muslim faith that Ramsay had dismissed as being irrelevant. More than this, however, it helps to identify the way in which social relations between communities may spiral into a self-reinforcing cycle of distance and confrontation during times of mutual difficulty. Albeit, starkly and over-simply put, the argument would go like this: heightened inter-communal tension often leads to an emphasis on religious orthodoxy. However, through worship being concentrated more purely on church and mosque, each community is drawn further into itself from the sociological point of view — into their respective sacred buildings — and away from just that form of more informal religious practice during shrine and saints' festivals that appears to admit, during normal times, a much greater degree of interaction and tolerance.

[1] Hasluck (1913), reprinted in Hasluck (1929; 370-79).

Part of my own work on the Konya Plain led, to my great surprise, to a parallel constellation of ideas. The problem that faced me was how to trace the interaction between the present day, Sunni Muslim Turkish community, and the archaeological remains (mostly in the form of mounds) that are found in their territory.[1] The situation is potentially made much more complex by other factors, such as the large international excavation team that is investigating one particular prehistoric mound named Çatalhöyük, a site that is already well-known. Nevertheless, it appears that, rather than ascertaining explicitly whether the mounds that dot their territory derive *ipso facto* from Muslim, Christian, or other civilisations, the local villagers stress the possibility that saintly influence may continue to emanate from them by virtue of the persons that may be buried there, whatever their epoch. If asked, they maintain the idea that individuals may be favoured by the Divine in many different times, saying for example, 'Every age may have its prophets'. This readiness to extend the sacred to historical periods other than those discernibly Islamic is at odds with a significant tendency in the international Islamist political movement, which is both markedly more orthodox in its dislike of the idea that a person may maintain an earthly presence after their death, and typically shows much less tolerance toward the remains of other cultures. The existence of the Talibani and their destruction of Buddhist statues in Afghanistan, discussed in Nixon's suggestive article in this volume, is a case in point.

This is just one instance of the way Hasluck's work, and his emphasis on the shifting, changing interaction between cultures, may be taken further. There are others in this volume: Shukurov, for instance, looks at the way that Muslim minorities may have been absorbed into the Byzantine Empire during the years of its slow decline. Building on the idea 'Crypto-Christians', discussed by Hasluck in a remarkably influential article of no more than a few pages, Simonian looks at the question of early conversion in the Black Sea Coast. Valtchinova follows up Hasluck's repeated insistence that it is communities who create saints through their collective attribution of sanctity by tracing the changing fortunes of Saint Therapon. Stewart writes on the phenomenon of 'incubation', a habit that both Muslim and Christian in the Balkans display of sleeping within a saint's tomb in the search for inspirational or healing dreams. Often the same tomb may serve both communities, a phenomenon that Hasluck noted at the outset of his studies at Cyzicus, and is still occasionally to be found today.

[1] A preliminary essay appears in Shankland (1999), see also my chapter in this volume.

Field-work

However valuable Hasluck's lead, it might be remarked that, in spite of his readiness to take into account the idiosyncrasies of living societies, he was no field-worker in the Malinowskian, modern anthropological sense. This is not strictly fair. His appointment in Athens led him to reside for more than a decade in the heart of the Balkans, and it is clear that he avoided being sucked into the diplomatic, or into what today would be called the ex-patriot community. There is no doubt too that he spoke, read and wrote first class, idiomatic modern Greek (an attribute that not all anthropologists who specialise in that region today could in all conscience claim). Further whilst he does not appear to have read Ottoman texts systematically as part of his studies, he does appear to have had at least some spoken Turkish.

He was too, a ferocious traveller, even by the standards of the British School at that time. He spent a great deal of his time simply out journeying from one part of the Balkans to another, and possessed an intimate knowledge of more than one region. Amongst these are Cyzicus near Istanbul, the place of his first, and repeated research; Smyrna (today's Izmir) in the west, upon which (as Salmeri outlines) he had intended to write a longitudinal history; Konya, where he researched the Seljuks; the Orthodox monasteries at Athos, upon which he wrote a monograph, published posthumously, and Albania, where he researched the Bektashi lodges. We need to take into account too the various and frequent journeys that he undertook for professional purposes for the School, his visits to archaeological sites, and (albeit this time not obviously for scholarly purposes) a sabbatical spent travelling around in India. Evidence for these trips survives not just in his writings and letters, but the extensive photographic material that he sent regularly to the Hellenic Society archives in London.[1]

Even more important is the theoretical approach that Hasluck adopted during these journeys. Whilst many of the ethnographic researches that took place at that time at the school are still, even today, of great interest, the underlying tendency was still to regard fieldwork as being potentially a way into the past. This is true, for example, of Dawkins' research into language and folktales, Wace's excursions amongst the Vlach, and Halliday's various articles on folklore. Hasluck, in contrast, was much more interested in the

[1] Several of these illustrations were used by Ferriman (with due acknowledgement) in his work *Turkey and the Turks* (1911). I am most grateful to Mr Barchard for drawing these to my attention.

way that societies fitted together. He does not appear to have drawn on any explicit functionalist analogy such was later adopted by Radcliffe-Brown, but he does assume that social organisation is, in itself, a question of prime importance, one that needs some sort of explanation. This leads him to a much more comparative perspective than his fellows typically embraced, and it is this that appears to have led him to realise that society, religion and ideology can be seen as intertwined in a causal way. For instance, his monograph on the monasteries at Athos (published posthumously, but completed whilst he was still in Athens) is offered, modestly, as a guide.[1] In fact, however, he offers initially a scrupulous account of the history, organisation and changing finances of each monastery. Then, anticipating an anthropological presumption that came only very much later, one indeed that Forbess develops most suggestively in her contribution to this work, he asserts that the disputed past of each monastery changes according to the approach of whichever particular nationalist ideology wishes to lay claim over it:

> The whole question of national claims to a monastery is exceedingly complicated ...
>
> ... *De jure* they must be based on the nationality of the founders ... *de facto* nationality depends merely on the predominance (not necessarily numerical) of one nationality in the council of the monastery ...
>
> Russian action in regard to Athos has been instigated by politico-religious motives, the idea being that the premier Orthodox state should logically predominate in ecclesiastical affairs over the Orthodox area.[2]

Albania, the Bektashis and the 'Qızılbash'

That same preoccupation with the relationship between authority, religion and society underlies a much more ambitious project with which Hasluck was preoccupied throughout the later years of his research. This was an investigation into the Bektashi brotherhood or *Tarikat*, and the *Kızılbaş*, now known often as the 'Alevis'. Broadly speaking, the Alevis are a heterodox minority in today's Anatolia who, until very recently occupied almost entirely rural regions of the country. They are often loosely affiliated with the Bektashis, a moderate brotherhood that is based still today at the shrine of Hacı Bektash, in central Anatolia, but at that time also extremely widespread in the Balkans.

---

[1] Hasluck (1924).
[2] Hasluck (1924; 61-63).

Hasluck's illness intervened before he was able to write up his final monograph. However, enough remained of his prepared notes and articles to illustrate that he regarded this a major project. The Balkan state above all in which the Bektashis were prevalent was Albania, and he made frequent trips to Bektashi lodges and figures there, sometimes in extremely arduous conditions. He also collected the vernacular literature, and undertook his usual meticulous searches through the earlier literature, the results of which are largely republished in *Christianity and Islam.*[1]

It is always difficult to discuss writers whose work, whilst it may appear prescient, does not appear to have directly influenced later writers in their field. The *Kızılbaş* had long been known to travellers as a tribal people in eastern Turkey — Morier, for example, describes a 'Qızılbash' chief in his early nineteenth century novel *Aysha.*[2] More solid information had begun to emerge too through missionaries based in the region, whose reports were published in the *Missionary Herald* throughout the late nineteenth century, reports that are meticulously analysed in this volume by Karakaya-Stump. It is safe, however, to assert that Hasluck's broad research work in this topic was not matched in anthropological terms until the publication, some seventy years later of the monograph on an Alevi group in the west of Turkey by Altan Gökalp.[3] Since then, there have been a number of further works, but Hasluck's comparative survey is still of substantive use today, all the more so because such a project has not, even today a century later, been attempted rigorously in Anatolia.

His profoundly important insight is discussed in more detail in the masterly summary of Hasluck's work in this area by Professor Mélikoff in this volume. However, it is worth dwelling upon a little. In concentrating on the lived unorthodoxies of Anatolian religious life; the saints, the Bektashi babas, the Mevlevi dervishes, the Hurufis, and the *Kızılbaş*, he is immediately avoiding that problem that dogs so much scholarship on the Middle East even today where concentration on the orthodox dogmas leads to a profound misunderstanding of the way every day life in Muslim countries is subject to an enormous degree of negotiation within that framework of ostensibly orthodox doctrine. It opened too an enormous field of research, whether through the minute study of travellers' accounts or through the more practical, everyday exploration of the multi-faith contemporary situation in which he found himself living.

---

[1] Hasluck (1929 *passim*, but esp. 121-174, 500-596).
[2] Morier (1834).
[3] Gökalp (1980).

Hasluck also approached his study with a strikingly modern question in mind. What puzzled him throughout his researches on the Bektashis is their social organisation in the context of their cultural interaction with the hitherto Christian communities of the Balkans. His answer, in which he suggested that it was the ability of the Bektashi priests to appear ambiguous figures in the light of their uncertain position vis-à-vis the two main religious traditions, has hardly been bettered to this day. Toward the end of this life, he was coming to grips too with the idea that a loose network of holy figures linked together by hierarchy or kinship to a central lodge could fan out and maintain social links over a very wide area, an aspect of Islamic society that became famous within anthropology after the work of Evans-Pritchard, and more recently Gellner.[1]

Hasluck does not appear to have been known to these later researchers in the anthropology of Islam. This is a pity in a number of ways: he offers a geographical counter-point to the Maghrebian emphasis of so much of subsequent fieldwork, and he develops a sophisticated model of how Christian and Muslim societies interact, something that was often lacking from that later work. Again, from the point of view of comparative ethnography, the Alevi-Bektashis exemplify a gap in the wider schema developed by Gellner in that they illustrate the way that in certain circumstances the rumbustious tribal, nomadic ethos so emphasised by him, may give way to a more sedentary, mystical version of social life, one still largely independent of the state with regard to its internal affairs but quiescent as to the wider scheme of things.[2]

Hasluck, Anthropology and the 'way in'

Throughout this piece, I have examined in particular Hasluck's contribution from the point of view of modern social anthropology: that is, anthropology as it developed in the United Kingdom in the years subsequent to the Great War. It is perhaps worthwhile noting explicitly, however, that I would not regard Hasluck as a 'proto-anthropologist'. Indeed, quite the opposite. My understanding of Hasluck's life and works is that he remained throughout his life immersed in the classical tradition, even though he was attempting to

[1] Gellner (1981), Evans-Pritchard (1949).

[2] This train of thought is taken further in the final chapter of Shankland (2003). It is possible that this point could be widened to suggest that overall Gellner failed to take into account the so-called *ghulat* (quietist mystical Shi'ite) groups that are found in many Islamic countries. For an interesting introduction to the *ghulat* sects, see Moosa (1987).

apply the wide learning gained through his training to a variety of problems that are characteristic of human societies more generally. What I would argue, rather, is that the particular issues and the particular way that he argued them was rejected by the classical tradition that produced him, and it was left to anthropologists to take them over (or rediscover them) and extend them in later generations. From one point of view, then, Hasluck represents a cul-de-sac, a direction in studies that, quite literally, at least until very near the time of his death, his peers regarded as going nowhere, however much they may have paid the occasional polite compliment in the direction of his considerable output.

Later, of course, and especially toward the end of the twentieth century, classics became again interested in wider ideas of society, and has embraced anthropology vigorously. Just as in archaeology, however, this reintroduction has been acutely painful. It tends even today to divide both archaeology and classics internally between the empiricists (who work self-consciously with as little theory as possible) and the theorists (who sometimes doubt that data may exist at all). Thus, the rejection or expulsion of Hasluck from the British School at Athens offers indirect evidence for the necessity of founding a separate institutional base for an explicitly social anthropology. That base, protected by its own departments and professional organisations, was able to explore in peace the consequences for social theory when it was released from the 'time machine' approach that so often assumed that history affects the present a causal way, either through our being part of an unfolding tapestry of evolutionary progress or simply through survivals within an overtly Hellenist tradition.

In short, classics begat Hasluck through the extraordinarily high standards of rigour and scholarship that it demanded, but was unable to cope or digest the ideas that he came up with when he applied that rigour to its own material. Neither at the time of his expulsion from the school nor since has the British School at Athens shown the slightest interest in following up a scholar who may easily be regarded as touched with genius, a star in their scholarly record. Malinowski, on the other hand, coming from outside Britain, was able to build a distinct profile for himself without the weight of an existing place within our system. He was, it is true, far more ruthless than Hasluck, but he was all the more easily able to exercise that quality for being an outsider.

There are, nevertheless, profound parallels between Malinowski's and Hasluck's career. Both he and Hasluck fought their sharpest rhetorical battle with a weighty opponent over similar themes. Though Hasluck's opponent Ramsay was a survivalist, and Malinowski's rival Elliot Smith a diffusionist, both were accused by their more junior colleagues of neglecting the role of the present in creating the past, and both Hasluck and Malinowski were scarcely able to contain their impatience with a cumbersome model that was transparently too simplistic to account for the variety of the social and ethnographic record.

Space precludes a sustained pursuit of this striking parallel in more detail. It is worth noting, however, that once more, in their respective jousts, Malinowski was by far the more fortunate or perhaps perspicacious from the political point of view. Whilst a senior man, Grafton Smith held a Chair in Anatomy at University College London, and could therefore pose little threat to Malinowski's academic ambitions at the London School of Economics. Ramsay, on the other hand, was a towering figure in Anatolian studies, a founding member of the British Academy, an active member of the Hellenic Society and the British School at Athens, active too as an anti-Ottoman liberal in current affairs. He was the teacher or acquaintance of all those in classical studies who were to rule over Hasluck's fate, such as Hogarth (who was markedly lukewarm in his support of Hasluck, a fact that is puzzling unless it is recalled that he was a co-author and fellow traveller of Ramsay in Turkey). This courageous, albeit perhaps too risky criticism of his own working institutional and intellectual background at the School, a background far less forgiving of brilliance than the King's, and indeed the Cambridge, ambience to which he was accustomed, was to cost Hasluck dear. It is to the story of this gradual fall from grace that we now turn.

Life at the School

Hasluck's arrival at the school coincided with a high point of its fortunes. The School had succeeded in gaining a direct grant from the Treasury (a grant that they receive until this day), and interest in their activities was strong. The Managing Committee in London was chaired by George Macmillan, a man of transparent integrity, who through his profession as a publisher was often in a position to help materially with that side of the School's activities. As is usual, the Committee changed its composition on occasion, but it was fortunate on those it was able to draw. Hogarth was one. But amongst others

were Jane Harrison, the pioneering Cambridge classicist and Arthur Evans, the excavator of Knossos. They were also, naturally able to consult their broader scholarly constituency, and the range of their contacts, as evinced from the attendance at their meetings and the diverse names that crop up in their office correspondence, was wide.

The day-to-day running of the School also proceeded well. They were fortunate in attracting a number of young men of approximately similar age, who appear to have worked together over a number of years through applying to be registered as 'students' at Athens. Toynbee, for example, spent a season at the school. Amongst others were Peet, Leaf, Dickins, Droop, Tod — adventurous, good at their work, and extremely well trained.[1] Hasluck appeared to fit into this life well. He travelled mightily, bargained for sufficient time off to do research in the field, and wrote steadily. His letters are full of whit, and he gained a reputation in Athens of a person worth seeing. Dawkins, who became Director in 1906, and Hasluck got along well together, and gradually a correspondence developed between them. Hasluck's correspondence with the London secretary, Penoyre, is also affectionate, and he refers to Hasluck often by the nickname, 'Tophet'. During this period, then, missives from Hasluck are frequent, cheerful and meticulous. They indicate someone happy in his chosen situation, and getting on with life in a creative way.

The Managing Committee reciprocated, applauding Hasluck's work, rewarding him at steady intervals. He had arrived in 1901. He became Librarian in 1904, and then Assistant Director in 1906, chosen to become so over a field that included Wace. He developed the library with great panache, buying cheaply and well in a number of fields, but particularly travel and Greek vernacular material. Finally, he was asked to become Acting Director in 1912, to cover for Dawkins, who had seemingly taken a sabbatical in Wales to care for his unwell sister.

In retrospect, this was the height of his good fortune. Within two years, the atmosphere had changed. The Committee, seemingly step by step less sure of their man, hesitated to consider him for Director, awarding the position to Wace. With his wife, Hasluck was then forced to leave the School premises and live out. He was then placed on six months notice on either side, whereas his position had previously been regarded as continuous.[2] Finally,

[1] See Waterhouse (1986) for an account of life at the School.

[2] That is, in today's language, his terms of employment were altered from 'permanent' to his being placed on a rolling contract with the possibility of six month's notice at any time

after a growing period of uncertainty, Wace asked the Committee to dismiss him, a request to which they acquiesced. Something, clearly, had gone very wrong indeed.

It is difficult to piece together the emotions and flow of a complicated administrative situation that occurred now nearly a century ago. Even though the correspondence in the London archive is occasionally extremely detailed, it is rare that all parts of an exchange are present, meaning that one is constantly seeking to piece together social relationships through the occasional snapshot, however revealing. There is also a tantalising tendency to outline most of a case in writing and but hint at the remainder, or in exceptional cases to suggest that the recipient burn an enclosure that is no longer present. Nevertheless, it is possible to see in retrospect from this archival material certain factors that appear to have weakened his position materially. One is that Hasluck occasionally appears a little detached, and he clearly had difficulty in dealing with hierarchies. He was also sometimes perhaps a little casual: Penoyre, his close friend in London, an almost avuncular figure, occasionally addresses him a note reminding him to thank Macmillan, the Chair, for some favour. As things became difficult, he found himself in an impasse when dealing with authority, alternating between being rather too self-effacing but occasionally allowing his feelings to show too transparently.

British Schools abroad

In order to illustrate why such comparatively slight issues should grow to be of such significance, it may help to enlarge a little on the background and the administration of the British schools abroad. Whilst several western countries maintain academic institutions in order to pursue archaeological research in what might be called the classical archaeology 'zone': that is places such as Turkey, Egypt, Syria, Italy and Spain, each is slightly different in its ethos, orientation and funding. The Germans, for example, have a separate archaeological service, with a secretariat in Berlin and branches in the respective host countries, including Greece and Turkey. This means that their organisation is established, and though government funding can be on occasion squeezed, they have the merit of stability and an established career structure. The American schools, on the other hand, work on an entirely private basis. Dependant on universities opting in as corporate members, and upon generous private donations, they can enjoy great wealth, though this is naturally linked to their enjoying good and close relations with their funders

over a period of time. This means that they have never developed and worked together as the German schools have, but being entirely devolved, can often operate very informally and flexibly.

The British schools fall somewhat in between these two extremes. They are founded as private learned societies, and their subscribing members are drawn from the professions and interested private individuals. The Athens school, just as this model implies, is just such a private organisation, proposed by the Hellenic society who felt that a society of learned men could be set up in order to administer a building and research base in Greece. It was followed by the British School at Rome.[1] They in turn provided the model for the Ankara Institute (described by David Barchard in this volume), where I was based in the early 1990s, as Assistant and then Acting Director. Unlike the American model, it has been the case in Britain that such schools abroad have successfully appealed to the Treasury for direct, regular government subvention on the grounds that there is little chance to maintain an adequate research programme without a basic grant to cover running costs. Today, the British Academy acts as an umbrella organisation to administer, channel and oversee this government funding. Nevertheless, the individual school committees themselves decide their budget and how the institution will be run with the funds at their disposal.

This pattern was already established at the time when Hasluck came to join the School in Athens. Whilst in some respects it can work extremely well, it also rather dictates the school's ethos. The members of the committee serve without reward or stipend, and whilst they may take their duties very seriously, share their many other professional commitments with its demands. Whilst holding absolute executive power, they can only meet formally at intervals, and have to come to decisions at these meetings that can have a profound affect on the way the school, many miles away, is run. Whilst naturally they welcome and solicit money for their school when they are able, the regular stipend from the government means that the bulk of the various amounts of time that they are able to spare to the school is devoted to administering its daily activities according to the budget that they have at their disposal. In these circumstances, they are often extremely reliant upon a

[1] See the splendid history of the Rome School by Wallace-Hadrill (2001). In some respects the story that emerges from the BSA archives parallels that of the Rome School. As the individuals concerned are sometimes similar (Penoyre for instance was Secretary to both Schools), and as the Schools were set up with similar organising structures and overlapping aims, this is perhaps not too surprising. Nevertheless there are differences in their respective institutional personalities. See also the article by Elliot in this volume on the putative Italian School in Turkey.

salaried full or half-time secretary employed in the London office, who may act as a conduit for information between it and their base in the field, and thereby have crucial role in the way administrative decisions are made by the managing committee.

In the light of this background it is not surprising that the committees tend to possess certain desiderata. They dislike unpredictability intensely. They place enormous emphasis on the smooth running of the distant school, and deplore any hint of unevenness in their daily running. Faced with limited sources of information, they seek to reconcile any apparent disruption as quickly as possible, even if the long-term costs or consequences may be high. Intellectually, they tend to be conservative; not in the sense that they seek to impose any one line on the research that is done, but more because their over-riding criterion is to maintain the adequate administration of the Treasury budget, intellectual creativity is not uppermost in their minds when they consider the tasks with which they are faced.

Hasluck both fitted into this pattern and he did not. He fitted in well in as much as he worked hard, wrote meticulous reports, was sociable, and very careful not to incur extraneous expenditure. He was also an extremely gifted librarian, a fact that his Committee appreciated greatly. However, his difficulty in striking exactly the right tone when dealing with the Committee affected him adversely, and as indeed did his reluctance to play a social part in the activities of the British Legation in Athens. On one occasion, for example, he appears to have avoided a dinner to celebrate Christmas at the Embassy and was held to have almost precipitated a terrible social gaffe in doing so.

Intellectually, too, he did not quite fit in. The Committee sought in their director a good scholar prepared also to take on a major excavation, an excavation for which the Committee would then endeavour to provide support. They did not always achieve this; permits were not always forthcoming, and directors themselves did not always find digging and heading the School at the same time a congenial long-term combination of activities. Nevertheless, this was the ideal. Hasluck did not find excavation attractive, and rather than working in one place he travelled very widely upon different themes. His emphasis on the interaction between cultures and his preference for Byzantine and later periods (rather than the classical) found at best a limited answering chord with the Committee. Indeed, such references that are found to his scholarly work are usually polite but slightly disparaging. Further, the only

consistently successful negotiations that he conducted with the Committee involved his insisting that he be permitted to research for a fixed period each year, if necessary away from Athens. This, albeit not exactly against the inclination of the Committee, did not show that he was giving absolute priority to the school. Their usual orientation toward him is, therefore, of slightly bemused tolerance toward a character they regarded as yet youthful. Pleased with him in general, but not convinced that he is quite the right stuff. It is highly doubtful that many of them read his work.

The fall

This background may seem a little too detailed: after all a combination of scholarly foundation and government grant is a frequent funding pattern in England, and there must be similar committees with similar inclinations. What makes the diversion so important, however, is that fact that the above sketch covers what might be called the normal state of affairs, a relationship that covered much of Hasluck's first decade working for the school. Whatever tensions that then existed, they were manageable, and it is in this decade that Hasluck laid thoroughly, industriously and seemingly entirely peaceably the foundation of his intellectual heritage. The subsequent breakdown of relations, which was followed by Hasluck's exclusion from residence at the school, dismissal, and premature death, can therefore only be understood in the light of the way this steady state of affairs came gradually to be disturbed. Curiously enough, this takes us directly to the vexed question of the relationship between the sexes, and the legitimacy or otherwise of women integrating with institutions created and administered by men.

The London Committee and the question of women

The prime task of the London Committee was, and is, the administration of the School in Athens. However, its members were also conscious of their responsibilities to the wider academic and scholarly constituency within Britain, and much of its activities concerned interaction with their various supporters and subscribers. Thus, we see them negotiating with the Treasury for the maintenance of their grant, with printers for the publication of the *Annual*, and with similar scholarly institutions and figures in Europe.

Penoyre, the principle secretary during this period, discharged his tasks urbanely and politely, and we see him throughout his correspondence answering efficiently and quickly the points that were brought to his attention. In May 1911, however, he received an approach that gave him cause for anxiety. It was from Jane Harrison, the Cambridge Classicist. He writes on that same day to Macmillan, the Chairman of the Committee;

> I have had a disquieting letter from Miss Harrison from which it appears that the presence of the ladies at Melos has been a failure. She does not tell me much but remarks that the situation will have to be 'thoroughly gone into'. I want to write to her in the sense that that is last thing that we should do: Dawkins' attitude is spoken of most warmly by both sides, and we had very much better let the thing blow over than make ourselves ridiculous by anything like an enquiry. I think you know my own view on this whole point. It is that I am not enthusiastic about the presence of ladies but I foresee that in the long run it is bound to come, and I think every case should be met as it turns up, and that no public utterance should be made, no legislation and no enquiry.[1]

We never quite know from the correspondence exactly what went wrong when the heady mixture of young men and women were placed together in the field at Melos. In any case, further question of such involvement was effectually buried by the failure of the School's proposed plan to dig at Datcha, in the south-west of Anatolia, because of the increasingly uneasy international situation.

The Oxbridge Studentship

Harrison's reference to the difficulties of integration in the field, however, turns out to be by way of a preliminary skirmish. Her more immediate aim was to admit a woman student to the School, an issue upon which she was prepared to battle directly. Her chosen path was the regular Oxbridge scholarship, offered to each university in turn to their respective Vice-Chancellors, a scholarship that until then had been awarded only to men, one of whom had been Hasluck.

> *Dear Mr Penoyre,*
>
> A student of mine who is going in for the archaeological section of Pt 2 Classical Tripos, wants to apply for the studentship for which this year the nomination is made by Cambridge. I can find nothing in our rules about it. Ought she to apply to the School direct through you, or to the Vice-

[1] Penoyre to Macmillan, 29 May 1911 (BSA).

> Chancellor here. I am asking this rather early because immediately after the examination (ie. June 1st) she has to go off the Asia Minor to join Professor Ramsay and I must see to matters in her absence, but I imagine the application ought to come from her direct. Should it be accompanied by testimonials or is this matter left to the Vice-Chancellor? I should be grateful if you would kindly tell me the right routine for her to follow.
>
> Yours very sincerely
>
> Jane Ellen Harrison[1]

Penoyre writes to Macmillan on 15 May 1911, once more full of trepidation:

> Dear Macmillan,
>
> Will you look at the enclosed? It is all very well but we must have a fair field and no favour. If Miss Harrison can produce a young lady better than any of the men eligible, well and good, but she must not be allowed to corner an ignorant Vice Chancellor in advance.
>
> I am quite willing, with your concurrence to offer the nomination to the Vice-Chancellor without waiting for a School Committee to authorises [sic] the act. There is a precedent for this ... [2]

Macmillan appears to have concurred. Penoyre accordingly wrote to the Vice-Chancellor quite correctly, drawing his attention to the fact that the School left the decision as to who would be nominated to him as Vice-Chancellor, sending a copy to Harrison. He also wrote to Harrison separately saying 'I saw Mr Macmillan and we considered that you would be quite in order in approaching the Vice Chancellor in favour of any student whom you had in your mind ...', [3] to which she replies:

> Dear Mr Penoyre
>
> Thank you for your two letters. I was waiting to write till we have decided about the application. Our principal asked the Vice-Chancellor and finding it was all in order Miss Hardie has sent her application to him. There will be a man student applying as well, Mr Tillyard. Neither I should say are certain 'distinctions', but [rather] good first class students.
>
> Miss Hardie is a very good student, not exactly brilliant but a thorough worker. She has had two years for archaeology here, one term of which she spent on my advice in Berlin. Immediately after her examination she joins Prof. Ramsay in Asia Minor for the summer. She is already at work on Turkish so she will, if she goes on, come to Athens with good training and experience ... [4]

---

[1] Harrison to Penoyre, 13 May 1911 (BSA).
[2] Penoyre to Macmillan, 15 May 1911 (BSA).
[3] Penoyre to Harrison, 26 May 1911 (BSA).
[4] Harrison to Penoyre, 27 May 1911 (BSA).

The speed with which Harrison acted in order to obtain the nomination for Miss Hardie turns out to have fully justified the men's fears. Even though Penoyre had seemingly hoped to alert the Vice-Chancellor to his duty, she did indeed obtain the nomination for her protégée through her pre-emptive action. Faced with a *fait accompli,* the remaining men on the Committee accepted with the best grace they could muster the innovation of a woman student obtaining the grant to go to Athens from the School's funds, and arranged for Hardie to proceed accordingly.

Further controversies

Throughout 1912, the matter gradually assumed greater and greater importance. There was clearly resistance from senior supporters of the school to women scholars and, formally speaking, it turned out that the wording with which the studentship was offered the University appeared to preclude the possibility of a women because, at that time, women were not matriculated students of the university. It is not precisely clear from the correspondence in the archive how or when the anomaly was noted (though it is perhaps suggestive that Leaf, and Gardner, a former Director of the School, should have been minuted as supporters of Macmillan's position) but it appears that the School's Managing Committee, of which Harrison was a member, was not prepared to adjust the wording in order to remove the ambiguity. Harrison appears then to have accused them of going back on their established position, in that she already had been given permission to approach the Vice-Chancellor with a women candidate in mind, and threatened to call a full meeting of the subscribers. The note of the meeting, held on 16 July 1912, reads as follows:

> Miss Harrison regretted the use in the letter to the Vice-Chancellor of the phrase "a duly qualified member of the university" which would exclude women from the Studentship. The Universities examined women and she considered that it should be open to such women also. The Chairman gave the history of the studentship which was in effect an acknowledgement to the two Universities of the grants made by them to the School. The view of the Committee had therefore always been that this Studentship was open only to "Members of the University". ... Dr Leaf and Prof. Ernest Gardner *concurred.* Miss Harrison would consider her position carefully, but felt it right to notify the Committee that she might feel it her duty to bring the matter before a General Meeting of the Subscribers ... [1]

[1] Minute Book, 16 July 1912 (BSA).

Around this time, poor Penoyre is clearly very distressed. Some of the problem at least appears to be that in his worry he had forgotten the initial correspondence that he had held with Harrison the previous year, that which had led Miss Hardie being accepted as the School student. He therefore slowly begins to realise that he had unwittingly been the precipitate of the crisis, because the School Committee now had no wish to endorse Harrison's nomination of women on a regular basis. He therefore had recopied all forgotten letters and sent the bundle to Macmillan for his consideration. Acutely conscious of the difficulty of the situation, he wrote a covering note in his own hand full of portent, a carbon copy of which is in the London office archive.

> Dear Macmillan,
>
> Through all our ins and outs of many years you have faced with such courage patience and decision that I believe you will feel less perturbation than I do at a really difficult situation that lies before us.
>
> I beg that you will read this letter to the end and bear in mind that whatever muddle we have drifted into we have both a perfectly good conscience of right intention and fair dealing.
>
> Well it concerns this question of Miss Harrison and the lady "School Student". When we were talking the other day I felt a little restless and uneasy when you reminded me of that interchange of words with her at Burlington House (I think at a Hellenic meeting) in which she asked and you answered affirmatively the question whether lady students could come to the school. It seemed to me then that that was not all the dealings we had had with her. However, my memory for 1911 is (owing to causes you know of) not reliable: you spoke very convincingly and I persuaded myself that if there had been anything else if was some muddle of my own making.
>
> I talked a little with Miss Hutton and she rather thought the same — that the committee's line had never been departed from, but Miss Harrison was in a minority of one, and that no good purpose would be served by digging up exactly what I had said to Miss Harrison.
>
> Well I thought over this a good deal but finally sent Wise for all my letters to and from Miss H. in 1911 and all my letters to and from you for the same year. This I did this afternoon.
>
> Well, to make a long story short it is clear from these [enclosures] — that she gave us good warning: that we consulted together that we told her that the source she proposed was in order & that I sent you the draft of the letter to the Vice Chancellor for approval.

> This exceeded immeasurably my anticipation of what I should find. But it explains at once what mystified me the other day, you may remember, her sound allegation that we had gone back on a decision. The committee haven't but we have. ...[1]

From the Minute Book, it is clear that Macmillan wrote a letter in apology to Miss Harrison.[2] However, the point remained that the Committee of the School itself had not authorised her to nominate a woman to the Vice-Chancellor, only Macmillan and Penoyre. At this point, there appears in the file a very wise albeit lengthy letter from Waldstein (Professor of Classics at Cambridge) to Macmillan, which evidently anticipates the subsequent crucial committee meetings where the matter will be revisited. His letter is long, but appears worth giving here in full. It is worth recalling that, before the Great War, the question of women's rights and the Suffragette movement was one of the most important and divisive social issues of the day. Not just politics and public life more broadly, but also the universities had gone through upheaval. Waldstein's revealing letter bears the hall marks of one who has thought long and hard over the issue, and even himself now become wearied of the fight.

Newton Hall
Newton
Cambridge

26th August 1912

My dear Macmillan,

I am very sorry, if not distressed, at my inability to attend the Committee Meeting tomorrow. I feel the importance and gravity of the question to be discussed, and I should make every effort to be present. Unfortunately it is impossible for me to leave tomorrow, as it has been arranged months ago that we were to receive and entertain the female portion of the Mathematical Congress now assembled at Cambridge at our house tomorrow afternoon. You, and the other, members of the Committee will realise that I cannot absent myself on that occasion. Though there will be other male representatives of the Congress here I, as host, cannot possibly be away.

On the other hand, I have studied the whole question from every side, as far as I could ascertain the facts, and I realise, with all of you, the gravity of the crisis. We can not afford to diminish the support for our School and our work, so much needed, by the loss of a portion of those subscribers who hold definite views upon the position of women, if we can reconcile our action with the main principles of our administration and with the best

[1] Penoyre to Macmillan, nd [1912], BSA.
[2] Minute Book, 27 August 1912, BSA.

interests of the School. The chief point seems to me to consist in our avoiding, as far as possible, our being drawn into a general discussion of the much-vexed question of women's rights, which we need not and cannot solve in our case, having such very definite/other objects for which we exist. We must at all costs avoid such a general discussion of so wide a question and must not be drawn into it when we have such definite objects that are not essentially concerned with that question. It is quite an honest policy to avoid such an issue coming to a head, and, as far as possible, to evade these complications. What I should like to impress, as forcibly as possible, upon the members of the Committee present at the meeting is:

1. That the questions before us should in no way be decided, or allowed to be put as a general question of the rights of women versus those of men.
2. The ground of their exclusion from the hostel should be so stated that it can not possibly be put as an expression of our views on the general rights, or disqualifications, of women. I should, therefore, advise avoiding the negative form of settling that point and not say that women are not allowed to use the hostel; but I should say, positively, that women members of the school *will be* [orig emph.] allowed to reside on the School premises as a soon as a separate hostel is erected and endowed for them.
3. As regards the presence of women at excavations, I should again pass no resolution excluding them from participation in our excavations. But I should — as is but just and right — put the authority for choosing the students who are to participate in excavations entirely into the hands of the director or head of the excavations. He would have to use his judgement as to their physical and other qualifications; and it might well be that he would as a matter of fact exclude women. I can speak with authority on this matter, as in two excavations directed by me women were present, namely, the wives of two of my assistants. It was on the ground of the indispensable utility of these male assistants, whose wives — it so happened — could not be left alone without them in Athens, that I consented to their presence. My experience was that they did give trouble. Under ordinary circumstances I should not have admitted them. Considering the numerous difficulties and complications already existing in the organisation and prosecution of such excavations, I doubt whether it will be advisable or possible to admit a mixed body as regards sex within excavating staff. I may say that excavations carried on under the direction of a woman might well have a staff of women assistants. I may also add that I found it necessary to reject some men, students of the School, on physical and personal grounds; and I do not think that it is reasonable, all things considered, not to entrust the director of excavations with full and absolute rights in the choice of his staff.

   Adopting this line, which is just and reasonable, the thorny question of women's rights in their relation to our School can be avoided, and I would again urge strongly upon you not to admit of the question being so put as to involve a general decision on the general question.

4. Lastly, I come to the question of the studentship. I need not remind you, and the other members of the Committee, that we have fought out the question of women's degrees here in Cambridge in an open battle ending in the victory of those opposed to the women. I desire that you do not consider what my own position in this question has been, nor am I considering it myself. But I feel that policy and duty go together in enjoining upon the Committee strictly to avoid any possible reference, direct or indirect, to this main question of principle. It is for the University and not for us to decide whether a prize or studentship, the disposal of which is in their hands, can go to women or not, and it is our best policy, and the straightest and fairest mode of action on our part to turn this responsibility towards the University and to leave it with them. Perhaps it was a mistake on our part to leave to the University the authority to select and appoint studentships to the School. But, having done so, we must leave to the University the authority to select and appoint studentships to the School. I therefore hope that no resolution will be passed by us reflecting on the past, or communicating our action and policy in the future, as regards the appointment of women students.

I hope that what I have written, which I beg you to impress upon the meeting as the well-considered opinion of one who had the good of the School at heart, the necessity of great circumspection in the action they may take, and I repeat my advice that, whilst thus settling the question of the hostel, and putting the authority for the selection of assistants into the hands of the director, and, finally, transferring the responsibility as regards studentships to the University, the Committee would avoid any definite expression of a difference in the rights and qualifications of men and women of our School.

Believe me,
Yours sincerely

[signed]
Charles Waldstein[1]

Waldstein was surely right that the situation was potentially extremely volatile. By and large, the members of the Committee were careful and scrupulous in their dealings. Each decision is carefully weighed and measured, and attempts made quietly to ensure that the business of the School is adequately maintained. Where women are involved, however, this level-headedness simply disappears. The question of women and their role had clearly become politicised, and provided an opportunity for open conflict and exacerbation of existing tensions and strains. At the same time, the majority opinion appears to have been first that women should be kept away from the

[1] Waldstein to Macmillan 26 August 1912 (BSA).

School as much as possible, and secondly that where there is a man who is capable of doing the task in question, then women should be excluded — a neat reversal of today's positive discrimination. Thus, Macmillan writes as follows just before the meeting is to be held:

> April 20 1913
>
> My dear Penoyre,
>
> We only got home last night when I found your letters of April 16 with the copy of your letter to Miss Harrison which I quite approve. You may count on my attendance on Tuesday April 22, not May 22 as in your letter to me.
>
> The Cambridge situation must be faced. I trust that Ernest Gardner will come as you may remember that he gave formal notice that he would move that the Studentship should be offered to the V.C. for his nomination *in consultation with the Craven Committee*. I thought this a good suggestion as they would no be likely to nominate a woman unless she were exceptionally well qualified and there were no good men available. I am sorry to hear that male candidates are likely to be so short. I wonder what this means ... [1]

Whatever Macmillan may have felt in private, ultimately Waldstein's, or similar counsels appear to have obtained. The Committee agreed to amend the working of the studentship sufficiently to permit at least in theory, the possibility of a woman student, though at the same time making clear their distaste. After the meeting, 1913, they came up with a revised proposed letter to the Vice-Chancellor which opens in the following manner:

> Dear Sir,
>
> I am instructed by the Managing Committee of the British School at Athens to offer for your nomination in consultation with the managers of the Craven Fund, a Studentship of the value of £100 for the session of 1912-1914. The conditions of this Studentship are as follows:-
>
> (1) The student so nominated should be either a duly qualified member of the University or a duly qualified student of Girton or Newnham College, preference being given to a duly qualified member of the University ... [2]

Harrison was not quite satisfied, but sufficiently mollified to withdraw her threat. She writes on 27 June 1913 a tough letter, but one that makes it clear that the Committee has done just enough to withdraw from the brink of open confrontation.

---

[1] Macmillan to Penoyre, 20 April 1913.
[2] Minute Book, 22 April 1913 (BSA).

Dear Mr Penoyre

I am so glad to be able to tell you that — after careful enquiry and consultation — I shall *not* feel it necessary to bring the matter of the new 'preference' clause before a General Meeting.

We took pains to ascertain privately the interpretation put by the Vice-Chancellor on the clause, after full explanation to him of the circumstances under which it had been framed, and we find that interpretation was satisfactory, i.e. that the clause would apply only in the case of *exact equality*. Otherwise, there would be no prejudice to a woman student .... Of course the working of the clause, and indeed its existence at all is not and cannot be quite satisfactory to me, but I do earnestly desire peace and I do not think I am bound to contend about a disability that will probably always remain verbal and theoretical ...

Equally of course I shall have to watch each nomination of either Vice-Chancellor and to see that he is fully informed on the whole matter. This is troublesome and I regret the necessity imposed on my by the Committee's action, but is not painful, as any criticism of my own Committee's action before the General Meeting would be. Should any Vice-Chancellor interpret the clause in a way to us less satisfactory the whole question would of course have to be reraised.

May I just point out — which no doubt you have already noted — that our present form of letter with its mention of Girton and Newnham only, must necessarily be modified next year in view of the Oxford Colleges for women. The necessary modification can of course easily be made next strong, but for fear of oversight will you let me know that you have noted this point?

Will you kindly read this letter in full at the next meeting of the Committee so that the position I adopt with reference to the new clause may be perfectly clear. Thanking you for the kind way in which you have kept me informed during unavoidable absences.

I am

Yours very sincerely[1]

Whilst this, at least, meant that the situation in Britain was resolved, albeit uneasily, it still let that in Greece in play. Even as this extra-ordinary situation was developing in London, Miss Hardie was in Athens at the School's student. To the enormous irritation of at least some at the London end, within a year she was married to Hasluck.

[1] Harrison to Penoyre, June 27 1913 (BSA).

Margaret Hardie (Mrs F. W. Hasluck)

Miss Harrison's student, Margaret Hardie, is beginning to attract attention in her own right as a highly interesting, even formidable figure. Indeed, the outline of her life is clearer in some ways than her husband's, courtesy of a chapter on her life by Marc Clark which appeared in the well-known collection *Black Lambs & Grey Falcons.*[1] Margaret Masson Hardie was born in Scotland, of a farming family on 18 June 1885. At the University of Aberdeen, she became the pupil of Ramsay, who had moved back to Scotland having held a Fellowship in Cambridge. There, he appears to have encouraged Hardie to move down to Cambridge, where (as is the case on occasion even today) she entered into that system by taking the undergraduate Tripos, even though she had graduated from another university with a first degree.

Having left Cambridge with a First, and become a student of the School, she appears to have been guided in her choice of topic by Hasluck. We do not have, sadly, an abundance of letters from Hardie, but Hasluck writes to Miss Hutton (who was standing in for Penoyre at the London end of the School) of her work briefly as follows:

> ... I have advised Miss Hardie (as she is by no means sure of going again with Ramsay) to study Smyrna. There is no good book on it, and it is the only place in A[sia] M[inor] where a girl wd have a chance of doing anything alone if the worst came to the worst. If she does go with Ramsay, it will be always useful to have done the epigraphy part, which I suggest she should begin on ... [2]

He writes to Dawkins in similar vein, clearly warming to Hardie's company:

> Miss Hardie gets on very well with us all and can do things without offence that the other young women couldn't. She has the good old-fashioned feminine quality of blarney, which an excellent lubricant, and is really admirable. I don't think she is lonely ... [3]

Then on 24 May;

> My dear Director
>
> I am writing to say that Miss Hardie has promised to marry me so she will not want to come to Datcha next year. I am not half good enough for her, but apparently this does not matter in such cases. I have written to Miss Hutton for the Committee's views as to my continuing this job if married. Put in a good word for me if you think fit. I should hate to give up the school or to let it down ... [4]

---

[1] *Clark (2000).*
[2] Hasluck to Hutton, January 15 1911 (BSA).
[3] Hasluck to Dawkins 13 January 1912 (TIO).
[4] Hasluck to Dawkins 24 May 1912 (TIO).

In Athens, they lived the first part of their married life with Dawkins in the Director's house. As Dawkins was a bachelor, and in any case the closest friend of Hasluck, this appears to have worked very well. Dawkins, though, decided to resign from the Directorship. In this, Dawkins appears to have been influenced by a desire to look after his ill sister, but it meant that at one stroke Hasluck was threatened with the loss of a close confident and protector, and his marital abode at the school.

The obvious remedy, from Hasluck's point of view, might have been to become Director but he does not appear to have canvassed at all for this, though given that he had gratified to be the Acting Director, there is no reason to think that he would have refused the job. What did worry him, however, was the difficulty surrounding the question of where they might live, and he did his utmost to persuade the Committee to permit his wife and himself to remain in residence at the school. To this end, he prepared a 'memorandum' dated 30 March 1914, addressed to the Committee:

> For the past two years, by a private and personal arrangement with Mr Dawkins, my wife and I have been sharing with him the Director's house. This arrangement naturally terminates with Mr Dawkins's resignation of the Directorship. As both my wife and I are reluctant to sever our connection with the School and with Athens, we have had to consider the question of residence elsewhere.
>
> The alternatives at our disposal are: -
>
> 1) To rent a house or flat as near the School or 2) to take rooms in a hotel.
>
> Both these alternatives involve serious difficulties. ... it is obviously bad economics to rent a house & keep up an establishment for twelve months when the session consists of eight months of which two are spent in travel. Rents are high and furnishing expensive.
>
> I therefore beg to submit for your consideration as a possible solution of the difficulty a project which I have discussed with the Director for our residence in the hostel. The question of principle involved, ie. the advisability of the admission of married persons to the Hostel which was designed for unmarried students, it is not for me to discuss.
>
> As to practical details, the upper floor of the hostel contains ten rooms ... we should require three ... but of the eight [bedrooms] one would normally be occupied by an unmarried librarian, so that the practical reduction is from seven to six. ... Your consent to the scheme, or to a year's trial of it, would be welcomed by my wife and myself ... I need hardly say that an unfavourable decision will be loyally accepted. In either event we should be glad of an answer as soon as possible in order to make such arrangements as are necessary for the coming season.[1]

[1] Hasluck, memorandum to the Committee, 30 March 1914 (BSA).

This memorandum resulted in a rapid informal response from Penoyre that indicated the Committee were likely to be against the proposal. In turn, Hasluck sent in a number of alternative proposals, all of which were refused. The Committee were absolutely obdurate. They refused to consider, or even to entertain, the possibility of such an event, even as Hasluck's suggestions came flooding in. The relevant note in the minute book reads as follows:

> To avoid keeping him waiting longer than necessary for an answer, the chairman and Secretary had consulted with other members of the Committee, in London and had told Mr Hasluck that so far as they could foresee, the Committee would be unlikely to grant his request. Mr Hasluck had then asked whether this negative would be given on principle or on practical grounds, and the Secretary had replied that so far as he could divine, the negative answer would be on principle .... Laid on the Table 'plan A' representing the top floor of the hostel ... The Committee considered ... objections to the scheme ...[1]

Their final argument was so carefully laden with sophistry as to make it quite specious yet difficult to refute because of its vagueness. One cannot help but feel that Waldstein's careful advice to avoid confrontation on the general issue of women, but always regret the lack of present facilities was being adopted here. Here is Penoyre's letter, sent on behalf of the Committee:

> My dear Hasluck,
>
> I am glad I sent you a forecast of what the Committee's decision on your living in the hostel was likely to be, as I hope that by that means your very natural disappointment in the ultimate issue may be a little lessened.
>
> They met yesterday, having received a special whip beforehand and by consent gave their whole time and thought to the matter in hand. At the end of the meeting the following resolutions were carried unanimously:-
>
> (1) That the Committee having given careful consideration to Mr Hasluck's original memorandum on the question of his residence at the hostel, and also the other plans submitted to them having the same object in view regret that they feel unable to give their consent.
>
> (2) That in the event of Mr Hasluck deciding to continue his appointment and live outside they were prepared to consider favourably a suggestion for an increase to his salary.
>
> You will not expect me to recapitulate the lengthy discussions by which these decisions were made. But I think I can put for you in one paragraph the essential point.

[1] Minute Book, 12 May 1914 (BSA).

> They would consider no scheme that fell short of providing really fitting and adequate marital quarters for you. But the execution of these would envolve heavy initial outlay and probably increased annual expenditure. Now it is in the highest degree unlikely that our secondary job at Athens will ever be on a financial footing to make it worthwhile for a married man to put in for it. Hence if we built for you we should, when you left, be very likely to have quarters which we do not need left on our hands.
>
> It is a matter of general and outspoken regret on the Committee that we cannot meet your wishes on a point we know you have at heart. To these regrets, though I quite subscribe to the arguments outlined above, I must add an expression of my personal sorrow.
>
> Yours affect[ionately]
>
> John Baker Penoyre
>
> Secr[etary][1]

The full minute of the meeting is rather more free in the different arguments that are employed against Hardie and Hasluck. As well as the point about the possibility of an Assistant Director in the future not needing accommodation, they stress that the space is sometimes needed in the hostel, that occasionally students are ill, that the 'whole character' of the hostel would be changed, that 'the men would feel less comfortable than that had hitherto', that 'the scheme did not take into consideration the point of an Assistant Director having a family' and finally, 'the personal element could not quite be disregarded, as the position would require great tact on the part of both Director and Assistant Director.'[2]

The couple were therefore faced with no alternatives other than to leave the School's employment altogether, or move to the (at that point in time) distant Athens centre, away from the comparatively healthy conditions that obtained at the School itself. Hasluck's letters, after this point, take upon a rather different tone. His forced exclusion, I think, affected him far more than did his not becoming Director, and from that point on, he appears almost to have been resigned to being unable to influence the London Committee. He did though clearly give Penoyre his opinion of the Committee's action next time he visited London. This, whilst understandable, is a pity because Penoyre was genuinely immensely fond of him, moving him to write in exasperation to Macmillan:

---

[1] Penoyre to Hasluck, May 13 1914 (BSA).
[2] Minute Book, 12 May 1914 (BSA).

Dear Macmillan,

Hasluck is in one of his states, but he quietened down after talking and I send I would let out conversation do instead of a letter from him. I think I had better record the result for a record:-

1) He will return for this session and no longer.
2) He will accept £50 in lieu of residence for this session.

I would rather have had it in writing from him but this seemed the best way. Really, I am glad he is going, he is so unimaginative and self-deceptive.

Yours ever,[1]

Whilst other than this outburst, Hasluck does not appear to have complained, Hardie certainly did, and she very quickly fell out with Wace who was now Director in place of Dawkins. One such quarrel appears in the London archives, sparked by a request by Wace that she surrender her latch-key to the library now that her official time as the School's stipendiary student had come to an end. This letter is sad, perhaps, in its reflection of a quarrel now long passed, but her reference to her thesis being delayed does help us to note that point at which a conventional academic career appears no longer available to her;

Grand Hotel
Place de la Constitution
Athens
13th October 1915

Dear Mr Penoyre,

Your letter of Sep 24 arrived a few days ago. I enclose you my key to the Library. Mr Wace's first letter was rude and bullying, and his second was a threat. You will therefore understand that it is impossible for me to hand the key to him.

Please do not trouble to send me a key when a fresh set is made: it will then be [illegible] too late for me to attempt to finish my thesis on time.

Yours sincerely

M.M. Hasluck[2]

---

1 Penoyre to Macmillan, 22 July 1914.
2 Hasluck (née Hardie) to Penoyre, 13 October 1915.

In retrospect, it is reasonable to assume I think that Hardie and Hasluck were in part at least the unwitting butt of the Committee's anger at Miss Harrison and the suffragette movement: in effect, she had forced a women student upon them through her active approach to the Vice-Chancellor, who seems to have been considerably more liberal in his approach than they. That student had then arrived in Athens, and promptly married their Acting Director. When they were offered the opportunity to exclude the cuckoo from the nest, they took it with a vengeance, and the fact that in doing so they damaged Hasluck appears to have been entirely incidental. He had, after all, made what was from their point of view a disastrous marriage, one that brought neither connection nor fortune.

These arguments over residence and the place of women in society took place largely between 1912 and 1914. They were soon overshadowed by the Great War, and from the couple's personal point of view, Hasluck's dismissal from his post. Following this, Hasluck carried on his work in counter-intelligence until the continuing deterioration in his health led them to seek a cure in the sanatoriums of Europe. They travelled together, first to France and then to Switzerland, where Hasluck died in 1920.

Whilst Hardie's precise movements after Hasluck's death do not appear yet ascertained, it is clear that she returned to Britain at some point, where she began the task of publishing Hasluck's remains. This she did efficiently, resulting in his *Athos*, *Letters on Folklore*, and *Christianity and Islam*. She also appears to have been awarded a travelling scholarship from Aberdeen, presumably with Ramsay's help, which enabled her to go visit Albania. There, she settled. She had built a substantial house, and set out to make a sustained study of the Albanian language, and its folklore. When the Second World War began, she became drawn into operational training, a part of her life that Roderick Bailey describes in his excellent chapter in this volume. After a dispute with her employers, she appears to have resigned her position, and later was to die of leukaemia in Ireland on 18 October 1948.

Hardie was a fascinating figure, one of those people who become the more interesting the more that they are studied. There is, as yet, no biography of her life, but it is to be hoped that before too long such a work will be attempted. Nevertheless, certain observations as to the place of her life and work are perhaps immediately relevant. It is sometimes claimed that Hardie was responsible not just for editing but also for writing much of Hasluck's work. This would appear to be quite mistaken: the two had quite different

characters. Hasluck was intellectually incisive, with a mind that could organise and synthesise vast quantities of material, returning to certain pivotal issues that preoccupied him again and again. In contrast, just as Harrison noted in her reference to the School right at the outset, Hardie was hard working rather than intellectually curious, thorough but with none of Hasluck's brilliance or ability to develop a wider picture.

In as much as there may be discerned an intellectual exchange between the two, it flows from Hasluck to Hardie. She, as he did, began in classics. However, under his tuition she turned to history, folklore, and finally to Albania, the area that he was pursuing before his illness, and the war, prevented him from travelling there. In a way, indeed, she is his direct follower in adopting a move from classics to anthropology in the modern sense: her own posthumously published work, *The Unwritten Law in Albania,* is regarded as containing very important ethnography to this day.[1] I make these points not to diminish Hardie, but rather to suggest that to seek her in her husband is to belittle her achievement, and her very great merits. In fact, rather than primarily an academic, she was brave, courageous, loyal, honest and determined: these qualities come out in her extremely difficult journey from Aberdeen, through Cambridge to Athens at a time when women were so explicitly, and so firmly discriminated against. They also emerge in her persistence in gaining original ethnographic material in Albania, and in her diverse experiences during the Second World War.

Here one should record a slight but entirely amicable difference of interpretation from my good friend, Dr Bailey. The incident concerns her leaving the Special Operations Executive. At that point, as Bailey describes in this volume, she had been taken off various tasks: her attempt to recruit agents in war-time Istanbul had been a failure — Hardie had simply been unable to act in sufficiently tactful or delicate a fashion. Further, the SOE, determined to work with the pro-Communist guerrillas against the Axis forces who were occupying Albania, had been criticised by her as mistaken: her position being that Communism was a destructive and dangerous phenomenon. They, on the other hand, felt that it was the most effective way to combat the enemy, and were of course following the War Cabinet's decided policy. Unable to agree, she resigned.

[1] Hann, for instance, mentions it in his work *Teach Yourself Anthropology* (1988), as being a useful source.

In evaluating this part of her life, it seems to me that rather than stressing the difficulty that others had in working with her, it is perhaps more helpful to praise her perspicacity in recognising the consequences of a communist expansion through eastern Europe, and her refusal to give on this point. No doubt, she was influenced by her close ties with the loyalists in Albania, who were opposed to the guerrillas. Nevertheless, her general conclusion was absolutely right: as Popper later famously remarked, the British do indeed have a tendency to overlook totalitarian ideologies. It does not, perhaps, speak volumes for her tact or flexibility that she was unable to sustain her working relationship with the SOE by keeping her differences to herself, but she may be given at least the moral benefit of the doubt as being substantially correct in the accusation that she made.

The Hasluck marriage

There is also occasional speculation about the sort of match that Hasluck and Hardie made. Of course, it is impossible to know what passes exactly between a couple, and it is equally perhaps distasteful to attempt to do so. It is worth noting, though, that even if the Committee regretted Hardie's marriage, there is no indication that she herself, or that Hasluck did so. Certainly, Hasluck's passing references to her in his letters to Dawkins are unfailingly affectionate. If she had married simply for a husband, it is hardly likely that she would have spent the rest of her days defending his reputation and publishing his works so meticulously, let alone paying him the compliment of following his, rather than her, teachers' profession.

This would hardly be worth mentioning other than for a curious aspect of modern day folk-history. Whilst Hardie does have her defenders, she is remembered most often through a series of moderately unflattering anecdotes: that she was a predator looking for a husband, that she struck Wace off her list of suitors only after he had thrown a jug of water over her when she pretended to faint, and so. It is surely unnecessary that the prejudices of a hundred years ago should be sustained in the face of such overwhelming evidence, and on the

subject of one whose life deserves more sustained consideration than such slighting asides.[1]

Politics and Hasluck's fall

To return now to Hasluck, and the final part of his life at the School. In general, his aim was to work as hard as possible, to publish quickly in comparatively short but highly polished articles, to do his job efficiently, and not to politic unduly. This approach is understandable, in that it had seen him successfully through a good school, university, and to the position of Acting Director at the School. It had the great merit that his daily existence was not marred by the tortuous ways of the ambitious. The disadvantage is that it relied upon the perceptions of others as to his merits. It also meant that he was immensely vulnerable should he ever have the disadvantage of making a genuine enemy, who would thereby have the field free to influence others against him. Penoyre, who appears to have taken several periods of leave, is acutely aware of this. He writes to Hasluck's mother in 1911 just before one of these absences, referring to him by his nickname, Tophet:

> It is curious that my last official letter should be written to you ... I feel rather as if I were deserting Tophet, and I did make a suggestion that I might go out and act as his *locum tenens* while he is away. My employers however poured scorn on my suggestion, and said that I might as well work here as go out there and work. There is something in this I suppose ... [2]

Penoyre clearly understood far better than Hasluck the undercurrents that surrounded his position in Athens, and he was quite right to be concerned.

Hasluck appears to have had two enemies in particular: the first was Wise, Penoyre's Assistant, who acted as Secretary during Penoyre's absence. From his correspondence, it may be seen that Wise was much less suave then Penoyre, and much less diplomatic. He also makes passing references to Hasluck that are far from flattering, for instance:

---

[1] Whilst, wishing to establish first the outlines of Hasluck's career, I have deliberately not sought to trace parallels in this essay, the comparative example of the British School at Rome should once again be noted. There too, the question of women's residence was a significant cause of conflict, and there too a triangle (in this case two women and one man rather than two men and one woman) resulted in a significant upheaval (see Wallace-Hadrill 2001). Beard's note of the later neglect of Mrs Strong (who was dismissed as the Rome School's Assistant Director along with its Director) is also highly relevant in the light of the disapproval that still often faces Mrs Hasluck when her name is mentioned today at the British School. One obvious difference however is that the Rome School have reported the difficulties that their school faced in their official history, meaning that the quarrel is a matter of public record, whilst the Athens School did not. I would argue that in terms of our understanding of intellectual history, the cost of such prevarication is extremely high.

[2] Penoyre to Mrs Hasluck (mother), 1 December 1911 (BSA). The reference to Hasluck being away refers to his insistence on continuing with his regular research trips from the school.

> ... It seems to me that the Assistant-Director's engagement is the direct proof of the extreme undesirability of appointing a lady School student, our object is to promote the study of archaeology and not matrimony.
>
> I have not been able to meet with anyone who has seen Miss Harrison since the denouement was announced, but people who know her seem to think that she will not be pleased.[1]

In this cordial dislike of Hasluck he appears to have found a ready ally in A. J. B. Wace. Wace (1885-1965), though a little older than Hasluck was a student at almost the same time. Without actually appearing rivals, they were interviewed, considered for the position of Assistant Director in 1906, and Hasluck was chosen. This decision meant that Hasluck was free to remain at the School. Wace instead appears to have developed interests are the newly founded Rome School, becoming student and librarian there. At the same time, far from cutting his ties with the Athens School after their choosing Hasluck over him, he eventually became a member of the Managing Committee.

Today, a hundred years later, to view another's political manoeuvrings places one in an intensely difficult, almost embarrassing situation. It is also indisputably the case that an archive can only ever show a very partial story, being by definition only what a person was prepared to write down. Nevertheless, it appears at this distance that the technique that Wace used was simple enough: he joined the London Committee in 1909,[2] did his best to repair relations where they had hitherto been a little difficult — he became close friends with Wise, went to see Harrison to convince her of his support for the place of women in academia, and cultivated Macmillan. He also set himself systematically to make sure that any uncertainty connected with Hasluck's position was amplified, so that the Committee became increasingly concerned at what appeared to be a growing possible factor of instability at the school. One way in which this was done was ensure that little things became exaggerated, such as Hasluck avoiding a dinner at the Residence, or his being temporarily arrested by the Ottoman Authorities during an excursion to take photographs of a monument in Thrace. The Committee also, in spite of Hasluck's notes indicating his readiness to work with the School, seem to have been moved by Wace to doubt his future intentions. This resulted in their converting his position from one that was, in effect, automatically renewed each year, to placing him on six month's notice.[3] This also had the effect of causing the Committee to reconsider each year whether or not he was to join the School during that season, something that in previous years had not been open to doubt.

---

1 [Wise] to Yorke, 10 June 1912 (BSA).
2 See BSA *Annual*, Vol XVI, 1909-10; 306.
3 Penoyre to Hasluck, 7 February 1913 (BSA).

When the time came to consider who the new director might be, so effectively had Hasluck fallen from grace that it is clear that they were determined that he should not be seriously considered, even though as a matter of form he appears on their list of candidates circulated to their members. They appear to have hoped firstly that the Oxford classicist Guy Dickins (who was later killed in the Great War) might take the job. When he refused due to personal commitments after the death of his father, they turned to Wace, who accepted. It appears that, at about this time, the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge sent a note enquiring after Hasluck. Penoyre's response on behalf of the Committee was to send him a secret memorandum outlining their reasons for rejecting him, asking the Vice-Chancellor to destroy it when he had read it:

November 19th, 1913

Sir John Sandys
St John's House
Grange Road
Cambridge

Dear Sir John,

Many thanks for your letter. Yesterday the Committee made a unanimous offer of the directorship to Mr Wace. I appreciate what you say of Hasluck, and send for your perusal a little memorandum which embodied the reasons why he was not considered. I do this with complete confidence, only asking you to destroy it when read.

Yours sincerely[1]

Secretary

As this work goes to press, I do not know whether it will be possible to unearth the memorandum. I have not yet been able to trace it. It is tempting though, to suspect that it contains a combination of two main points: the first that Hasluck's commitment was wavering, and that therefore they could not be sure that he would or should take up the post. The second that they doubted that his wife was quite the sort of material that Director's wives were made of — as Hogarth writes in negative fashion to Penoyre, the question in their mind appears to have been, 'What's she like?'.

[1] Penoyre to Sir John Sandys, 19 November 1913 (BSA).

> ... 'Hasluck — well — I really do not know him well enough to judge! I am told he is not *persona grata* with Greeks but have no first-hand knowledge of this. What is *she* like?'[1]

The tale of the dismissal itself is quickly told. After Wace's appointment, Hasluck and his wife sent a note to the Committee declaring their willingness to work with Wace.[2] The Committee expressed their pleasure at this, and Wace took up his duties. Gradually, however, Wace began to express his displeasure with Hasluck, and he finally appears in 1915 to have concluded that he should not be permitted to begin the following season, even assuming to the London Committee that he would be replaced in his planning letters to them. Though they were chagrined at what they regarded his presumption and perhaps not completely clear as to his intent, they did ask him directly whether he wished Hasluck to return the following year.[3] He wrote back, bluntly, asking that Hasluck be sacked.

Just before the meeting, Macmillan writes to Penoyre, who had tried to shield Hasluck by reassuring him that the Committee would renew his appointment,[4] and had received a very cross letter from Wace in return. Macmillan had sent Wace a reprimand for his acerbity, and writes now to Penoyre on Wace's reply.

> 10th June 1915
>
> My dear Penoyre,
>
> I think that you will agree with me that the enclosed reply from Wace to my long letter of May 20 is very much to his credit, and I hope now there is no risk of any further trouble. He admits that he was perhaps unduly sensitive and that his isolated position rather tends to aggravate that tendency. We might add also the effect of the Athenian climate, upon which both Dawkins and Bosanquet dwelt. The curious thing is that he seems to have supposed that his personal letter to you was in its usual friendly tone, but I am very glad that in the circumstances you did not answer it or show it to anyone.

---

1 Hogarth to Penoyre, 13 October 1913 [orig. emp].

2 Note by Hasluck to London office, 24 November 1913 (BSA).

3 Macmillan to Wace, 20 May 1915 (BSA).

4 See here the admirable description in Beard's account of Harrison's early life (2000).[4] Whilst I would like to work further on this issue, I think that it would be a mistake to regard the Committee as being divided into hard and fast factions (and, of course, its membership changed frequently). Broadly speaking, however, it appears that with regard to the question of women (and Hasluck himself) there does appear to be a liberal tendency which consists of Harrison, Penoyre and Dawkins who are in favour of his continuing and indeed of women being permitted to attend the School, and by inclination a more conservative faction consisting of Macmillan (Chair), Gardner (a former Director), Wace himself and Wise. In spite of his rather negative comment about Hasluck quoted above, Hogarth is careful for the most part to remain intelligently neutral. Purely from the political point of view, the second tendency is both more representative of the School's wider constituency than the first, and has at least three seats on the Committee (Macmillan, Wace, Gardner), as opposed to the single vote of Harrison during much of the period discussed here.

> This official letter, with mine to which it is an answer, must of course come before the next Committee, if only because of his clear opinion in regard to the reappointment of Hasluck. I do not see how we can possibly renew that appointment in the face of this opinion from the Director, given at the express invitation of the Committee.
>
> In a personal letter, he explains other matters which would make it quite impossible for him to go on with the present librarian [Hasluck]. These are by no means outside the cognisance of the Committee and of course mainly concern the Lady, who has evidently been taking far too much upon herself in regard both to the Hostel and the Library.
>
> In acknowledging Wace's letter I have taken the opportunity of correcting the phrase "want of judgement" to "misapprehension" in regard to what you did about H.
>
> I am,
> Yours ever
>
> [Macmillan]
>
> P.S. I think, by the way, that you might now write a few friendly lines to W. apropos what he says about you in his official letter.[1]

Their hand forced, the Committee did as Wace requested, though not particularly enthusiastically, dismissing Hasluck formally at a meeting on 22 June 1915. Their resolution reads as follows:

> That Mr Hasluck's appointment as Assistant Director and Librarian be not renewed, but that the Chairman be asked in conveying this decision to Mr Hasluck to express in the name of the Committee their warm appreciation of his long and valuable services to the School.

In its aftermath, Macmillan writes to Wace on 24 June as follows;

> My dear Wace,
>
> ... After referring the matter to you for a direct opinion the Committee felt that they could not but fall in with your view that Hasluck's reappointment was, in present circumstances, not in the best interests of the School. If a senior officer is, for any reason, unable to get on with his subordinate a change must clearly be made with a view to harmonious working, and though the particular points which you mention were comparatively trivial in themselves, their cumulative affect was, I think, sufficient to show that you had grounds for your decision. The other matters touched on in your private letter were not absent from the mind of the Committee, though they would naturally not appear in any record of its proceedings.

[1] Macmillan to Penoyre 10 June 1915 (BSA).

> At the same time I think you will understand that there is a very general feeling in the Committee that Hasluck's work as Librarian has been of immense value, and that it will be very difficult indeed to find anyone else so well qualified in that respect.
>
> On the whole, we think it best not, in the meantime, to take any action for the appointment of a successor. Your idea of an architect who might help in excavations might be well enough for next season when probably there will be again no students and very few visitors to Athens, but it is entirely contrary to the view taken by the Committee as to the function of the Assistant Director, which is to represent the School when the Director is absent in the field and in particular to pay attention to the Library.
>
> You will no doubt let me know when you will be returning to England and what address will find you.
>
> I am,
> Yours very sincerely[1]

Wace now had complete control of the Athens end of the School, but he soon fell out with the Committee in his turn. One aspect they particularly disliked was his habit of continuing to write rather bad-tempered letters to London. Though this can be an effective way to keep a Committee at a distance, it obviously upset Penoyre. Wace compensated for this by communicating where possible directly with Macmillan and carried on in Athens throughout the war, volunteering to work at the Legation. In return, the Ambassador granted him exemption from military service:

> Sir,
>
> In view of the new Military Service Act in the United Kingdom and the urgent need of men for his Majesty's forces and being aware of your desire to serve your country in whatever way your services can be of the greatest use, I enquired of the Foreign Office whether those members of H.M. Legation who are of military age and fit should offer themselves for military service. I have received a reply from the Secretary of State placing on me the responsibility of deciding whether any man at present employed in the Legation can be spared and emphasising the fact that it is my duty to ensure the efficient discharge of the work of the Legation.
>
> I have considered the matter very carefully and have felt obliged to inform Mr Balfour that I could not guarantee the efficient working of the Legation with any fewer men than I have at present and that I therefore take the responsibility of refusing to release you from your present duties
>
> *Signed [Granville]*
>
> A.J.B Wace
> The British Legation[2]

---

[1] Macmillan to Wace 24 June 1915 (BSA).
[2] Granville to Wace, 16 May 1918 (BSA).

After the war, Wace's relations with the London Committee did not improve, and even Macmillan appears to have ceased to support him. Indeed, he learnt of his dismissal in 1922 only in the course of an angry exchange of letters with Macmillan himself, wherein the Chairman informed him that the new Assistant Director had been offered the job on the basis that he would replace Wace as Director.

> ... I told you in my last letter that is was possible that Mr Woodward might be prepared to take the post of Assistant Director and Librarian, but I should now explain that the only ground upon which it seemed likely that he would give up his post at Leeds for an office carrying a much lower salary was the prospect of its leading to the Directorship when your present term of office comes to an end ... after very full consideration he expressed himself willing ... Accordingly ... it was decided that he should be appointed Assistant Director and Librarian for next session and succeed you in your present post at the end of the following session. It will of course be a great advantage to him to have had the year's experience in the subordinate post and we feel sure that you will find him a very useful and congenial Assistant.
>
> ... I think that in the comments you have from to time made in your letters to the Secretary upon other decisions of the Committee you have been inclined to overlook the fact that it does consist of men who have had practical experience in the work of the School, in some cases from its very foundation.
>
> I am,
>
> Yours very sincerely
>
> [Macmillan].[1]

Wace arranged a circular letter signed in his support by Greek scholars in Athens, but the Committee refused to change their mind.[2] He perforce returned to London, where he found a post at the Victoria and Albert Museum, and ultimately a decade later was appointed Laurence Professor of Classical Archaeology in Cambridge.[3] Hasluck of course, was long since dead, and the

---

[1] Macmillan to Wace, 12 January 1922 (BSA), Wace to Macmillan January 25 1922 (BSA), Macmillan to Wace 9 February 1922. The quotation is taken from the last of these letters.

[2] Memorandum in support of Wace dated 24 July 1922 to London office, signed by eight Greek scholars (BSA).

[3] There is a suggestion in MacGillivray (2000) that Sir Arthur Evans led the Managing Committee to take a 'scunner' against Wace because of Wace's opposition to Evan's interpretation of the Minoans. Whilst of course the difference of opinion between these two *men is a matter of record*, there is no evidence in those parts of the archive that I have been able to study that suggests that Macmillan was influenced by the quarrel. Leaving to one side Wace's scholarly attainments, it really does appear as if his particularly brusque choice of style in dealing with opposition exhausted London's patience, as Macmillan notes himself in his letter of dismissal to him.

files contain but scanty reference to him. Penoyre did design a plaque in his memory,[1] and Hasluck himself remembered the School in his will, leaving them £100 for 'improvements to the hostel or garden'.[2] There is also one letter by Casson, then Assistant Director, dated three months after Hasluck's death that reads:

> May 3rd 1920
>
> *Confidential*
> My dear Pen[oyre]
>
> A line to let you know that I have just received your letter of the 23rd re. Hasluck's kit. I have had a letter from Mrs H. asking me to take charge of various things of his and to act generally for her in various matters. All she said about Wace was that she did not want to leave the arrangement of things to him. No attacks or unpleasantness.
>
> I know nothing of the inner history of the tragedy and the quarrels and so forth and I am not particularly keen to know them. I think I can see how differences must have arisen because I can size up most peoples' characters. But I don't think there is as much need for apprehension now as you think. The letters I have received lately from Mrs H. have been remarkably nice and very human. In any case, however, it would be far better if she did not come out here at all, as if I were not here the situation would be rather strained to say the least. I hardly know Mrs H. personally at all but I can well imagine that she is rather on edge. Knowing nothing of the actual causes of the trouble I can give you a very good idea its psychological causes I think. Anyhow I can make any arrangement you like about Hasluck's things. The list of special things you gave me I have checked. Funnily enough, I was in the American School recently and saw the very things in question lying uncared for on the top of a wardrobe .... Let me know how things go and I will fit in to any arrangement you make ....
>
> Yours ever
>
> Signd: Stanley Casson.

Conclusion

In organising the Hasluck conference, my fear was not so much that there would be no interest — this concern was quickly assuaged by the wonderful response from colleagues who found that theme worth pursuing — but rather that Hasluck's academic work would not stand up to the test of so much examination. After three days of intense discussion, this fear too was

[1] It reads, 'In this place worked Frederick William Hasluck: Librarian of the School 1906-1915, who died Feb 22 1920. DESIDERATUS' (BSA *Annual*, Vol. 27, 1920-1921; 233).
[2] BSA *Annual*, Vol. 27, 1920-1921; 232.

assuaged. The meticulous reasoning and scholarship that Hasluck had put into his work stood up to the test. Whilst of course his work is not without flaws, Hasluck's insistence on examining transition, transformation and the boundaries between cultures led him to an innovative exploration of conversion, cultural interaction, and shared religious practices that stands out as a land-mark, a rare example of a fundamental contribution that will not be superseded. Now, at a time when disciplinary boundaries are perhaps more fluid than ever before, there would appear to be no reason why his work should not gain wider currency, and his due place in the history of ideas acknowledged.

The great surprise, however, was the role that institutional and individual politics played in his life and still do. Himself not at all ambitious, he found no answering intellectual chord in the School that employed him and the Committee that ruled over him. Even today, the episode is not represented accurately by the School. In its history, published in 1986, it is written that he resigned — 'Hasluck resigned as Librarian and Assistant Director, and both he and his wife were absorbed into British Government agencies', [1] whereas of course he was dismissed, and the precise wording of that dismissal is recorded clearly in the School's Book of Minutes. Again, whilst this project was in progress the archival material was removed from London to Athens in its entirety, in spite of my repeated pleas that it was still needed. It seems that it is not enough to be intellectually precocious as was Hasluck, nor indeed to work industriously, as he did. The lesson that the sordid end of his life tells us, and indeed its continued tangled aftermath, is that politics matter terribly.

REFERENCES

Archives

Archive Centre, King's College, Cambridge.

Dawkins/Hasluck correspondence, Taylorian Institution Library, Oxford.

Administrative Correspondence, British School at Athens, London [now transferred to BSA, Athens].

Photographic Archive, Hellenic Society, London [now transferred to BSA, Athens].

[1] Waterhouse (1986; 24).

Published

Beard, M. 2000 *The Invention of Jane Harrison*, Cambridge; London; Harvard University Press.

British School at Athens Annual [Periodical], London; British School at Athens.

Clark, M. 2000 'Margaret Masson Hardie' in Allcock, J. and Young, A. (eds), *Black Lambs & Grey Falcons: Women Travellers in the Balkans*, Oxford; Berghahn Books, 128-154.

Evans-Pritchard, E. 1940 *The Sanusi of Cyrenaica*, Oxford; Clarendon Press.

Ferriman, Z. 1911 *Turkey and the Turks*, New York; James Pott & Co.

Gellner, E. 1995 *Anthropology and Politics: Revolutions in the Sacred Grove*, Oxford; Blackwells.

Gellner, E. 1981 *Muslim Society*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Gellner, E. 1988 *Language and solitude: Wittgenstein, Malinowski, and the Habsburg Dilemma*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Gökalp, A. 1980 *Têtes rouges et bouches noires; une confrérie tribale de l'Ouest anatolien*, Recherches sur la Haute Asie; 6, Paris; Société d'ethnographie.

Goody, J. 1995 *The Expansive Moment: the Rise of Social Anthropology in Britain and Africa, 1918*-1970, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Hann, C. 1998 *Social Anthropology*, London; Teach Yourself Books.

Hasluck, F. 1902 'Sculptures from Cyzicus', *British School at Athens Annual 1901-1902*, London; British School at Athens, Vol. 8; 190-196.

Hasluck, F. 1910 *Cyzicus: being some account of the history and antiquities of that city, and of the district adjacent to it, with the towns of Apollonia ad Rhyndacum, Miletupolis, Hadrianutherae, Piapus, Zeleia, etc.* Cambridge; at the University Press.

Hasluck, F. 1913 'Christianity and Islam under the Sultans of Konia', *Annual of the British School at Athens* Vol. 19, pages 191-97.

Hasluck, F. 1924 *Athos and it Monasteries*, London; Kegan Paul.

Hasluck, F. 1926 *Letters on Religion and Folklore*, annotated by Margaret M. Hasluck, London; Luzacs.

Hasluck, F. 1929 *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans*, edited by M. Hasluck, Oxford; Clarendon Press.

Herzfeld, M. 1987 *Anthropology through the Looking-Glass: Critical Ethnography in the Margins of Europe*, Cambridge; Cambridge University Press.

Hogarth, D. (ed.) 1899 *Authority and Archaeology sacred and profane: essays on the relation of monuments to Biblical and Classical Literature*, second. Ed, London; John Murray.

Houghton, G. and P. 2000 *Well-Regulated Minds and Improper Moments: a History of The Leys School*, Cambridge; The Governors of The Leys School.

Jewell, H. and Hasluck, F. 1920 *The Church of Our Lady of the Hundred Gates (Panagia Hekatontapyliani) in Paras*, London; Macmillan and Co (on behalf of the Byzantine Research and Publication Fund).

MacGillivray, J. 2000 *Minotaur: Sir Arthur Evans and the Archaeology of the Minoan Myth*, London; Jonathan Cape.

Mélikoff, I. 1998 *Hadji Bektach: un mythe et ses avatars: genèse et évolution du soufisme populaire en Turquie*, Leiden; Brill.

Moosa, M. 1987 *Extremist Shiites: the Ghulat Sects*, Syracuse; Syracuse University Press.

Morier, J. 1834 *Ayesha, the Maid of Kars*, 3 vols, London; Richard Bentley.

Ramsay, W. 1897 *Impressions of Turkey during twelve years' wanderings*, London; Hodder & Stoughton.

Ramsay, W. 1906 *Pauline and other Studies*, London; Hodder and Stoughton.

Ramsay, W. 1909 *The Revolution in Constantinople and Turkey*, London; Hodder and Stoughton.

Shankland, D. 1999 'Integrating the past: folklore, mounds and people at Çatalhöyük' in Gazin-Schwartz, A. and Holtorf, C. (eds.) *Archaeology and Folklore*, London; Routledge, pages 139-157.

Shankland, D. 2003 *The Alevis in Turkey: the emergence of a secular Islamic Tradition*, London; RoutledgeCurzon.

The Leys Fortnightly [school newspaper], The Leys School, Cambridge.

Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2001 *The British School at Rome; one hundred years*, London; British School at Rome.

Waterhouse, H. 1986 *The British School at Athens: the first hundred years*, London; British School at Athens.