

ADDITIONS, INTEGRATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND SUPPLEMENTS  
TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF ARNOLD JOSEPH TOYNBEE\*

by Teodoro Tagliaferri (University of Naples Federico II)

No. 250  
(August 8, 2023)

Additions to Part I, Works by Arnold J. Toynbee

Item 992 in S.F. Morton's *Bibliography* (Arnold J. Toynbee – Francis Sydney Marvin, *Alexander and Hellenism*, in *The Evolution of World-Peace*, Essays arranged and edited by F.S. Marvin, London, Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press [The Unity Series, IV], 1921, Chapter II, pp. 15-24) was reprinted with significant modifications in the second edition of the volume, published in 1933. See Marvin's *Preface to Second Edition*, p. 3: «In this new edition, besides Professor Murray's Epilogue, there have been added some considerable improvements to Chapter II for which the Editor tenders his best thanks to Professor Toynbee, who was abroad and out of reach when the first edition appeared».

NOTE

«This book contains the lectures [...] delivered at the fourth of the "Unity Schools" held at Woodbrooke in August 1920. The course was arranged in conjunction with the League of Nations Union and forms a sort of historical introduction to the League. It was felt by those who organized it that a knowledge of those aspects of history which are treated here is indispensable if we are to have an enlightened public knowledge in support of the League. The book may therefore be found of use in study circles connected either with the League of Nations or with the Historical Association» (F.S. Marvin, *Preface*, in *The Evolution of World-Peace*, first edition, p. 3).

---

\* *A Bibliography of Arnold J. Toynbee*, compiled by S. Fiona Morton, with a Foreword by Veronica M. Toynbee, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1980.

## Alexander and Hellenism\*

by Arnold J. Toynbee (with F.S. Marvin)

The Greek approach to world-unity will suggest to the mind two distinct points of view. We may regard the work of the Greeks mainly on its intellectual or spiritual side as a force pervading the world since their time, through the Romans and<sup>1</sup> through the Christian Church<sup>2</sup>, and, since the Renaissance, through all the leading ideas in art, philosophy, and science<sup>3</sup>. In this sense their spirits rule us from the tomb, and their influence, more than any other force in the world, tends in the end to peace, for world-peace must ultimately rest on intellectual agreement, and this is the goal of philosophy and science.

But in a second sense the historian will consider the actual efforts at world-unity made by the Greeks themselves when, in the person of Alexander, they marched eastward and imposed for a time a certain form of their ideas<sup>4</sup> upon the Middle East. The work of Alexander was in fact the first attempt<sup>5</sup> in history to impose a progressive civilization upon neighbouring societies by force of arms. As such it is the prototype of the Roman incorporation of the West, and has stood out ever since as an example for warning and instruction to all would-be conquerors of the world in a superior spirit.

This enterprise of Hellenism under Alexander brings into prominence for the first time<sup>6</sup> the self-consciousness of a civilized society as distinct from and superior to the rest of mankind. The Greeks are the first nation in history who present, in a form which we can study, the problem of a self-conscious civilization face to face with barbarism<sup>7</sup>. We have to

---

\* I give here the text of the first edition of 1921, indicating in the notes the modifications made by Toynbee in the second edition of 1933.

<sup>1</sup> through the Romans and [through the Romans,

<sup>2</sup> through the Christian Church [through the Christian Church, through the elements of Greek thought in Islam, through the transmission of the Aristotelian philosophy from the Islamic to the Western Schoolmen,

<sup>3</sup> and science [and science in our Western World.

<sup>4</sup> of their ideas [of their institutions and ideas

<sup>5</sup> the first attempt [one of the outstanding attempts

<sup>6</sup> brings into prominence for the first time [brings into prominence

<sup>7</sup> barbarism ["barbarism"

ask what this contrast implies. It is not simply the feeling of superior beings towards savages; it includes also the consciousness of difference in civilizations generally. The "barbaros" is not the mere inferior; he is the man of another language, of other beliefs, of other social and religious practices, though no doubt there is a strong tinge of superiority in the feeling with which he is regarded. He is an outsider.

What social conditions went to create this social self-consciousness, either among the Greeks or in any other society which possessed it? It implies most clearly the mastery of their fate, in some measure and for some considerable period of time, by the self-conscious people. They have learned to dominate their environment, as in the Aegean world, or in Egypt or Mesopotamia<sup>8</sup>. In the second place, it implies<sup>9</sup> the successful formation of their own social organization. The self-conscious people have achieved<sup>10</sup> something that fulfils the needs and purposes of its individual members. But beyond this<sup>11</sup>, it involves, in the third place, a contact with, an aggression against, surrounding communities<sup>12</sup>. Some measure of expansion seems to be an essential characteristic of the self-conscious civilized community. History is full of varied examples of how this may be done, mostly to the grave loss or even the extermination of the assailed and feebler organization. There is, of course, clear loss to civilization on both sides of such contact, if brutality to the less advanced populations damages the morals of the conquerors.<sup>13</sup> But the ultimate problem of estimating the total result to the civilization and happiness of mankind surpasses our powers of calculation. The contact, however, may be between different civilizations, each able to defend itself, such as we see in China or in Russia at the present time<sup>14</sup>. Such vast problems, as well as the

---

<sup>8</sup> as in the Aegean world, or in Egypt or Mesopotamia [but this had been done before by other civilizations in the Aegean world, or in Egypt or Mesopotamia.

<sup>9</sup> it implies [the self-consciousness implies

<sup>10</sup> have achieved [has achieved

<sup>11</sup> beyond this, [beyond this

<sup>12</sup> surrounding communities [surrounding societies

<sup>13</sup> damages the morals of the conquerors [damages the morals of the conquerors and throws them out of their own course of development.

<sup>14</sup> such as we see in China or in Russia at the present time [such as we see in the contact of our modern Western civilization with China or with Russia at the present time.

necessary control of the dominant power<sup>15</sup>, when conquest is effected, call for the growth of a world-conscience, perhaps of a world-authority to enforce that conscience.

The expansion of ancient Greece in this latter sense turned towards the Middle East. They covered<sup>16</sup>, under the leadership of Alexander, the lands which Islam has since absorbed, Egypt, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia<sup>17</sup>. There is a special historical interest in this case, for it was a far more radical attempt at forcible unity than Western Europe had seen before or has seen since. A unity was imposed in political institutions, in language and literature; and even in religion a certain unity supervened. Moreover, we know the whole story. Nine hundred and sixty-seven years elapsed between the crossing of the Hellespont by Alexander and the Arab attack on Syria, and more than thirteen centuries from the first Greek penetration of the Middle East in the seventh century B.C. to the final transmutation of the Greek spirit in Arab hands in the eighth century A.D. We find the inscriptions of Greek mercenaries on statues of Memnon<sup>18</sup> in Upper Egypt dating from the seventh century before Christ, and John of Damascus, the eminent doctor of the Eastern Church in the eighth century, gives the later limit.

Greek culture before this contact with the Middle East<sup>19</sup> had covered a period of about eight centuries. It had developed maritime city states around and in the Aegean. It had spread round the Mediterranean and had begun the process of penetration which Alexander was to carry to its farthest limits. This penetration had been going on for two or three centuries before the critical contact with the Persian Empire. At Marathon and at Salamis the Hellenic world had repulsed this attempt at unity<sup>20</sup> by the Middle East acting westward. Their success<sup>21</sup> on this occasion was the greatest event in the building-up of their national self-consciousness. Then came the failure of their own internal efforts at unity, the Athenian

---

<sup>15</sup> the necessary control of the dominant power [the necessary control over the dominant power.

<sup>16</sup> They covered [It submerged

<sup>17</sup> the lands which Islam has since absorbed, Egypt, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia [the lands which Islam has since absorbed: Asia Minor, Syria, Egypt, Mesopotamia, and Iran.

<sup>18</sup> on statues of Memnon [on statues of "Memnon"

<sup>19</sup> Greek culture before this contact with the Middle East [Before the generation of Alexander, the history of Greek culture

<sup>20</sup> this attempt at unity [an attempt at unity

<sup>21</sup> Their success [The Greek success

Empire baulked by Sparta in the Peloponnesian war. The catastrophe of 431 B.C. was followed by a century of woe<sup>22</sup>. The internecine struggles of the city states left the way open for the Macedonian conquerors, Philip and Alexander, who put themselves at the head of the Hellenic world. The conquering house then led the Greek advance on its crusade to the Middle East<sup>23</sup>.

What do we know of the Middle East before its contact with Alexander's advance? and in what state was it prepared to meet it? Our knowledge here, though less intimate, is far more extensive; it reaches from the fourth millennium to the fourth century B.C., i.e. for more than four times as long as our knowledge of the Greek world. And the civilization itself was of much longer date than the Greek. These eastern civilizations had conquered and occupied the great river-basins in the earlier part of their long evolution. This had been accomplished by the beginning of the second millennium B.C.<sup>24</sup>. In this phase the Egyptian and the Mesopotamian basins were separate unities<sup>25</sup>. In the second millennium, and for a period of more than a thousand years after, these two unities<sup>26</sup> had come into contact with disastrous shocks. The Assyrian wars<sup>27</sup> were the culmination. The Greeks could look on, *tertii gaudentes*. In the interval that passed before Alexander's advance the Persians had succeeded easily in uniting the Middle East, but the Greeks, as yet unable<sup>28</sup> to permeate Asia Minor themselves, resisted the Persian fusion. The Middle East lay torpid<sup>29</sup>, awaiting the Greek expansion as Persia decayed.

Let it be noted that at the time of the Greek expansion under Alexander both the attacking<sup>30</sup> and the attacked were past their zenith. But the Greeks, though they had just experienced their first grave catastrophe in the Peloponnesian war, were still full of energy and initiative. The war had not destroyed the national vigour which produced a Thucydides

---

<sup>22</sup> by a century of woe [by a century of affliction.

<sup>23</sup> on its crusade to the Middle East [on its "crusade" against the Middle East.

<sup>24</sup> by the beginning of the second millennium B.C. [by the beginning of the third millennium B.C.

<sup>25</sup> separate unities [the homes of separate civilizations

<sup>26</sup> these two unities [these two entities

<sup>27</sup> The Assyrian wars [The Assyrian wars of the first millennium

<sup>28</sup> as yet unable [while as yet unable

<sup>29</sup> The Middle East lay torpid [Thereafter the Middle East lay torpid

<sup>30</sup> the attacking [the attackers

and a Plato. The training in warfare prepared Philip and Alexander for their work. On the other hand the civilization of the Middle East was passive and inert. It seemed bound to run out to the end of the course set by an earlier initiative, unless deflected by an outside force. It had been rising for two millennia and had then passed through more than one thousand years of catastrophe and conflict. It now lay ready for attack and absorption by the more vigorous Greeks; and Greek civilization was to recover itself by assimilating this fresh material, and to move forward again with renewed strength.

There were many factors in the situation, for and against successful fusion. It was a favourable factor that the oriental had an older religious experience than the Greek. In the East was wisdom<sup>31</sup> born of sorrow. Hebrew prophets had been expressing in the eighth and seventh centuries what Greeks began to feel in the fifth and fourth. This is the source and explanation of that long religious penetration proceeding from the East to Greece, the cults of Cybele and Isis<sup>32</sup>, and the later religion of Mithra and of Hermes. Christianity itself<sup>33</sup> shows abundant traces of the communion of the Greek mind with the East. Another favourable factor was the superiority and vigour of the city state contrasted with the mass society and centralized organization of the Oriental powers. Antioch and the cities founded by Seleucus and his house bear witness to the vitality of this development. They contain the agora, the theatre of the old Greek world<sup>34</sup>, they nourished schools of rhetoric and philosophy which had continued life down to the advent of Islam<sup>35</sup>.

But there were other feelings and forces which made against fusion.

There is a certain natural antipathy between Greek and Oriental, a different outlook, a different rhythm of life. How the Persians felt about one aspect of Greek life was pointedly expressed by Cyrus to the Spartan herald who brought him the warning and defiance from their city. Never yet, he said, did he fear men such as these, who had a place appointed in

---

<sup>31</sup> was wisdom [there was wisdom

<sup>32</sup> the cults of Cybele and Isis [the cults of Cybele and Isis and the Starry Firmament

<sup>33</sup> Christianity itself [Christianity itself, which defeated Mithraism in the final competition to determine which of the Oriental religions should conquer the Hellenic World,

<sup>34</sup> the agora, the theatre of the old Greek world, [the agora and the theatre of the old Greek world;

<sup>35</sup> which had continued life down to the advent of Islam [which had continued life down to the advent of Islam and which, through a Syriac Christian medium, profoundly affected Arabic Islamic thought.

the midst of their city where they gathered together and deceived one another by false oaths. «These words Cyrus threw out scornfully with reference to the Hellenes in general, because they got for themselves markets<sup>36</sup> and practised buying and selling there; for the Persians themselves are not wont<sup>37</sup> to use markets, nor have they any market place<sup>38</sup> at all» (Herodotus I, 153). The absence of the "agora", the talking-shop, the Parliament of the West, is a significant mark of the old theocratic order. These free-speaking, free-thinking Greeks had lost most of that old religious prejudice which led the Egyptians (Herodotus II, 39) to cast into the river the head of their sacrificial beast like a scapegoat with its imprecations. If, we are told, they found a Hellene at hand they would sell it to him and despised<sup>39</sup> him into the bargain. And was not the «Abomination of Desolation», spoken of by Daniel the prophet, «standing where it ought not»<sup>40</sup>, only an altar of Zeus Ouranios?

But the Greeks also had feelings which made against fusion. They were intensely attached to their ancient homes, and this home-sickness showed itself even in the lives of the most distinguished and successful members of the Seleucid house. Seleucus himself was on his way back from Asia to his old Macedonian home when he met his death by the hand of Ptolemy Ceraunus. Antiochus Epiphanes preferred to build temples at Athens rather than at his own city of Antioch. All through, in fact, Hellenistic politics continued to cluster round the homeland of Greece.

Starting from 334 B.C. we may distinguish five periods in the development of the contact, five scenes in the plot.

1. There was first, 334-275, the period of complete military conquest. The collapse of the old empires of the Middle East, a period of anarchy and invasion.
2. The second period, from 275-201, was a time of reconstruction, a rally of the new powers. It may be compared with the state of sixteenth-century Europe, when kingdoms<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> they got for themselves markets [they made markets for themselves

<sup>37</sup> are not wont [are not accustomed

<sup>38</sup> nor have they any market place [and indeed they have not any market-place

<sup>39</sup> despised [despise

<sup>40</sup> the «Abomination of Desolation», spoken of by Daniel the prophet, «standing where it ought not» [the «Abomination of Desolation» spoken of by Daniel the prophet, standing where it ought not»

<sup>41</sup> kingdoms [new dynastic states

were built up from a previous state of confusion and chaos. But in the Hellenistic world it is worthy of note that the new powers arose not on the site of the old, not in already populous areas, but in new places, such as Antioch and Alexandria, specially selected by the conquerors. Such was the case in North Syria, Trans-Jordania<sup>42</sup>, and Bactria.

3. On this there followed a third period, 201-64 B.C., when a second inter-state struggle took place in the Greek world. At this time the Roman Conquest of the Eastern world was beginning to spread<sup>43</sup>. In 189 the Romans had forced a treaty, on Brest-Litovsk lines, upon the Seleucids; in 133 Mesopotamia was lost to the Parthians.

4. In the fourth period, 64 B.C. to A.D. 633, this process was carried to its logical conclusion. The Middle East had been partitioned territorially between the Roman Empire and the leading non-Greek claimant of Middle-Eastern power, first Parthia and then Persia. The Romans had fully succeeded to the heritage of the Greeks in Europe<sup>44</sup>, they were now the Greco-Roman power, unifying the Mediterranean world. The result of this division between the two great fragments of the Middle East was that the parts west of the Roman frontier remained Hellenized for seven centuries longer than the parts to the East. The Hellenized portion struggled constantly to reunite the whole, and its struggles led to frontier wars with Parthians and Sassanides; but in the part which remained nominally Roman the conquered Hellene ruled his new masters in spirit.

It is interesting to follow, just at the boundary line between the Hellenized and the Eastern parts<sup>45</sup> of the Middle East, the fluctuations and conflicts between pro-Greek and anti-Greek sympathies. Syria and Egypt became Christian between A.D. 250 and 450, and remained<sup>46</sup> generally Hellenic in sympathy. Nisibis, in A.D. 363, refused to be ceded to Persia<sup>47</sup>. The

---

<sup>42</sup> Trans-Jordania [Trans-Jordan

<sup>43</sup> the Roman Conquest of the Eastern world was beginning to spread [the Roman Conquest of the Macedonian Monarchies was carried through; and this internecine warfare between the Western Great Powers was the Orientals' opportunity.

<sup>44</sup> in Europe, [in the regions west of Euphrates;

<sup>45</sup> the Eastern parts [the de-Hellenized parts

<sup>46</sup> became Christian between A.D. 250 and 450, and remained [became Christian between A.D. 250 and 450 without ceasing to be

<sup>47</sup> refused to be ceded to Persia [rebelled against being ceded to Persia; and Nisibis was at the extreme verge of the Empire in North-Eastern Mesopotamia.



Nestorian heresy<sup>48</sup>, which flourished at Nisibis and farther East, was an Oriental reaction against Greek influences and resisted all attempts to incorporate it in the Western system. The Montanists of Asia Minor, also largely Eastern in aspiration, had their Western and their Eastern branches, the former mainly Catholic in tone and practice, the latter less amenable to Western influence<sup>49</sup>.

5. In the fifth period, A.D. 633-750, the Moslem<sup>50</sup> conquest rolled back the Western invasion, and we see a repetition in that part of the world of the events of the sixth century B.C. The new Eastern conquerors seemed to take up again the work of the Persian. Their advance was equally sudden, it was equally directed against the Greeks, though now they were Greeks of the decadence and not of the prime, and the new Moslem<sup>51</sup> conqueror, like the Persians of old, succeeded in reuniting the Middle East against the Greeks and against the whole West, which was beginning a new evolution on other lines.

This new break in the attempted unity of Greek and Middle-Eastern civilization seemed to leave the gulf between the two sections wider than before Alexander's advance. There was on each side a deepening of internal unity, an increase in the intensity of the self-consciousness of the separate civilizations, a hostile attitude which created the Crusades<sup>52</sup> and is far from being extinguished in our own day. Instead of Greece and the Persian Empire face to face from the fifth century B.C. and onward<sup>53</sup> we have now from the Middle Ages to our own time Christendom and Islam, each based on a deeper religious sentiment and a stronger consciousness of difference. Yet though this consciousness of difference and separation has become greater, the period of contact left behind it objective common elements in Western and Islamic culture which may assist their fusion in the future. Of all its definite results the most important was probably the fact that Christianity, when later it was

---

<sup>48</sup> The Nestorian heresy [On the other hand,

<sup>49</sup> to Western influence [to Western influence. The later Monophysite heresy maintained itself in Egypt and Syria and Armenia, as an anti-Hellenic force, by basing itself upon the vernacular languages. These anti-Hellenic movements among the submerged Oriental Christians were the harbingers of Islam.

<sup>50</sup> Moslem [Muslim

<sup>51</sup> Moslem [Muslim

<sup>52</sup> which created the Crusades [which was responsible for the Jihad and the Crusades

<sup>53</sup> face to face from the fifth century B.C. and onward [face to face,

born on Semitic soil<sup>54</sup>, found at once a Western, European civilization in which to spread. St. Paul wrote and spoke in Greek and was a citizen of Rome, and all the apostles began at once to teach in what was in effect a part of Europe. Then, when the centres of Christian authority were established, they were at Rome and Constantinople, and not in Asia<sup>55</sup>.

The work of Alexander, the greatest definite effort at world-incorporation made by the Greeks, broke down, however, by its inherent weaknesses; but it became a model of such action for subsequent conquerors, action by a stronger and more civilized people upon the weaker and less well organized, from above and by force. The Romans, absorbing their ideas<sup>56</sup> and carrying them out in a more connected and permanent way<sup>57</sup>, gave us the nucleus of Western civilization. But in a more indirect and impalpable way<sup>58</sup> the Greek spirit lived on, and as the spirit of reason it makes everywhere and always for world-peace; for this must be based on reason, controlling and co-ordinating the diverse and often rebellious elements of human life. Reason, applied to the phenomena of the world, produced, starting from the Greeks, the fabric of more and more unified science. Reason, in the sphere of government, pointed to some possible reconciliation of human passions and interests under the aegis of international law. Reason, pointing to the ideal, proclaimed that only by common action and community of thought could the growing variety and richness of human life be developed towards its natural end, which the Greek philosophers were the first to discern.

#### FOR REFERENCE

Holm, *History of Greece*, vol. IV.

Mahaffy, *Greek Life and Thought*, ad fin.

Bevan, *History of the House of Seleucus*<sup>59</sup>.

---

<sup>54</sup> when later it was born on Semitic soil [when it was born on Oriental soil

<sup>55</sup> and not in Asia [as well as at Antioch, Jerusalem, and Alexandria.

<sup>56</sup> their ideas [Greek ideas

<sup>57</sup> in a more connected and permanent way [in a cruder way

<sup>58</sup> in a more indirect and impalpable way [in an indirect and impalpable way

<sup>59</sup> In 1933 Toynbee added «Tarn, *Hellenistic Civilisation*» and «Bevan, *History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*».

