an alliance of Gallic or Celtic tribes in what is now France and in north Italy.

Thus the Greek world, even in the monarchical phase of its development, was reverting to the conditions of the fourth century B.C., that is, to extreme sub-division of political and military strength. Now, as then, war was the rule, not peace. Not a single one of the Hellenistic governments of this period possessed either a great extent of territory or a strong army. Egypt, under the weak and incompetent kings of the second century B.C., had lost nearly all her foreign possessions. Syria was crippled by constant internal commotions. Macedonia was perpetually at war with her Greek vassals and allies, especially with the Aetolian and Achaean Leagues. Nor did individual states enjoy peace at home. The strife of parties and classes was perhaps smothered in monarchies by the absolute power of the ruler, and came to the surface only in revolts of the natives against Greek rule; but it burned all the more fiercely in the Greek city-states. In most of them the same struggle of classes which marked the domestic politics of the fourth century B.C. was equally rife two centuries later.
THE GREEK WORLD AFTER ALEXANDER:

POLITICS, SOCIETY, AND ECONOMICS

After the death of Alexander the chief political powers in the Greek world were the so-called Hellenistic monarchies, which, with the exception of Macedonia, had once formed parts of the ancient kingdom of Persia. All these were ruled by kings of Macedonian birth and Greek culture, relying upon mercenary troops, who were either Macedonians or Greeks or Hellenized "barbarians". These men were recruited by agents in the great markets for mercenary soldiers in Greece and Macedonia, or among the Thracian and Celtic tribes which inhabited Asia Minor and the north of the Balkan peninsula. The kingdoms of Asia and Egypt found support also in the numbers of foreign settlers whom they attracted to their dominions. A medley of races—Macedonians, Greeks, Jews, Syrians, Persians, and others—the immigrants soon became Greek in their mode of life and civilization. They formed a privileged class, comprising the well-to-do citizens and the numerous officials of the kingdom.

Though these upstart Eastern dynasties were entirely strange to the natives over whom they ruled, yet they had reason to believe that their position was secure. Their chief security was in the economic prosperity of their subjects: they made it possible to use the natural wealth of the country and the labour of the inhabitants, both natives and settlers upon a wider scale and with more system. This methodical exploitation of natural re-
sources increased the revenue and so made it possible for the king to maintain a large army and fleet, by means of which he could control his subjects at home and also stick fast to a foreign policy of his own. Hence, in the sphere of domestic affairs, the Hellenistic kings gave special attention to two points—the development of the country's resources and the taxable capacity of their subjects. In this matter they relied upon the tradition inherited by them from the Persian or native kings who had preceded them, and also upon the theory, created by themselves, of their own power.

This power they regarded as the power of a conqueror, to whom, by right of conquest, the country and its population belonged. As the heirs of Alexander they claimed divine origin also, and a supernatural sanction for their rule. They were assisted by finding a similar view of government and kingly power firmly believed by their subjects already. Throughout the East down to the time of the Macedonian conquest, government was based upon the unlimited and divine power of the king, who, in virtue of this power, had full right to dispose of the country and its inhabitants as he pleased. The Hellenistic kings of the different Eastern empires, following here also the example of Alexander, declared themselves the lawful successors of the native kings, and the heirs of their rights and privileges. Thus their power had a double aspect: to the Macedonians and Greeks they were successors of Alexander, but to the native populations they were the heirs of the extinct Eastern dynasties.

As master and owner of his kingdom the Hellenistic monarch exercised unlimited power in dealing with his own property, and considered the interests of the people as less important than those of the government, which he identified with his own personal interests and those of his dynasty. The prosperity of the people was a means, not an end, in his view. And this point of view concurs, in general, with the Greek feeling also about the state. That feeling required of the citizen complete submission to the state, unquestioning service, and sacrifice of his personal inter-
ests. The only difference was this—that in the monarchies the state was identified with a single person, whose will was law, whereas in a democracy a majority of the population belonging to a city-state were the government.

But in spite of this autocratic power, which was not contested by any one in the Hellenistic monarchies, the kings were forced to comply with tradition in their treatment both of the Hellenized settlers in their realms and of the native inhabitants. Their relations were different towards these two sections of the population. The latter section knew nothing of self-government and had no aspirations towards any form of it: they were accustomed to obey the officials appointed by the king. The Greeks, however, and other foreign settlers, such as the Jews, had their own idioms, synagogues and their own customs; and, above all, they were accustomed to a certain measure of self-government. This the monarchs were obliged to reckon with. For this reason, wherever a Hellenistic monarch, part of whose territory belonged to Greek city-states, was at the head of a government, he, like the Persian kings, respected the self-governing power of these communities; he merely deprived them of political independence and obliged them to pay part of their revenue into the royal treasury. Since a steady stream of Greek settlers quickened the economic life of the country and swelled the royal revenues, and since these settlers were a support to the power of the king, who secured to the Greeks financial prosperity in return, therefore the majority of the Hellenistic monarchs, especially the Seleucidae and the kings of Asia Minor, welcomed the appearance of new Greek cities in their dominions, and recognized their right of self-government.

The Ptolemies were an exception to this rule. Except Alexandria, founded by Alexander, and ancient Naucratis, and Ptolemais in south Egypt, founded by Ptolemy Soter, there were no cities in the whole kingdom which had Greek institutions and a predominantly Greek population. For the above-mentioned cities, however, the Ptolemies were forced to recognize the right of self-government; but this right was strictly controlled by the
Plate XXXI  HELLENISTIC ROYAL PORTRAITS

1. A bronze bust, probably of Seleucus I of Syria. It is the best Hellenistic royal portrait in existence. This copy, probably made from an original by Lysippus, shows the indomitable will, intellectual power, and unlimited ambition of the king. Naples Museum.

2. Head of a marble statue, presumably Berenice II, wife of Ptolemy III Euergetes. Some extant traces of gold make it probable that the hair was gilded. The blonde hair of Berenice was celebrated by Callimachus in a poem (part of which has been rediscovered) which, in a Latin adaptation by Catullus (The Hair of Berenice), became a part of world literature. Museum, Bengasi, Libya.
sovereign, and no new Greek cities were permitted. The Greeks who came to settle were distributed among the larger and smaller centres of the population. But there also the Greeks and other foreigners, e.g. the Jews and Persians, formed small associations, within which they led their peculiar life. The Ptolemies were forced to concede certain rights to them, and to recognize them as corporations possessing elective representatives and a limited measure of internal self-government.

In all these matters Macedonia differed from the Eastern monarchies. The position of the king was still just what it had been in Philip's time: he was a national monarch, recognized as such by the nation. The army consisted of soldiers recruited within the kingdom. The kings laid no claim to divinity, and abstained from introducing worship of themselves as part of the official religion. The Greek cities situated in Macedonia and Thessaly, while politically subject to the kings, kept their self-government. The attitude of Macedonia to the cities of central Greece and the Peloponnesse was determined from time to time by the actual strength of the rival parties: they were not permitted to have a foreign policy of their own, but their powers of self-government were seldom interfered with. Many of them, indeed, won by arms the power to pursue for a time their own foreign policy. In practice the Macedonian kings ruled only in those cities where they maintained a garrison of their own.

The economic conditions created by the Greek city-states were inherited by the Hellenistic monarchies. As early as the fifth century B.C. Greek trade predominated in the Mediterranean, and the Semitic traders of Carthage had to yield pride of place except to the west of Sicily. Even the Phoenician ports of Tyre and Sidon came by degrees under the influence of Greek traders, and dealt largely in wares produced in Greece. After the death of Alexander Greece is queen of the Mediterranean market and supplies nearly all the goods required by customers in the East and West in exchange for food-stuffs and raw material, and, to some extent, for luxuries, such as ivory, valuable woods, precious
stones, and spices, imported from South Africa, Arabia, India, and China; but many of these luxuries were imported in the form of raw material to be manufactured in Greek workshops.

But Athens now loses her position as the chief market of the world; and Alexandria, as the port of transit for all Egyptian produce, such as grain, flax, glass, and papyrus, and for all produce exported from central Africa and the Red Sea harbours, becomes a centre, not only of trade on a great scale, but also of manufacture, where the native products and imported raw material are worked up with all the technical skill of the Egyptians. Alexandria becomes not only one of the chief markets which supply the world with grain, but also a great manufacturing centre, exporting throughout the Mediterranean a number of articles not produced elsewhere, such as paper, glass and flax, and also jewellery and cosmetics.

Side by side with Alexandria, some cities of Asia Minor are still important in commerce. Thus Miletus, Ephesus, and Pergamum take the lead in the production and exportation of woollen fabrics; while Cyzicus, Byzantium, Sinope, and especially Rhodes, become important as harbours of transit and vast exchanges, where the wares exposed are grain, hides, tar, hemp, building-wood, woollen materials, and slaves. These goods are supplied by the north coast of the Black Sea, with the Bosporan kingdom for a centre, by the Caucasus and Transcaucasia, by Asia Minor, Macedonia, Thrace, Syria, and Egypt. Delos, the island sacred to Apollo, rivals Rhodes as an international exchange. This importance of Rhodes and Delos is due to their geographical position: they lie on the routes which connect the north and south-east with Greece and Italy.

Phoenicia and the Syrian coast continue to be important centres of export and import, and admit to the sea the great caravan routes which connect the Mediterranean with central Asia, India, and Arabia. The caravan trade with Arabia finds an important centre in Petra, and the trade with Hither and central Asia centres at Palmyra. The sea-route from India goes either to
Plate XXXII WAR AND HUNTING

1. Stone bullets used for ancient artillery. They are of different sizes and weights. Similar stone bullets have been found in many ancient cities. The bullets were projected by catapults and attained velocities as high as 200 feet per second. The normal effective range was about 1,500 feet. This artillery was sometimes used on the battle field, but it was most effectively used as a weapon at the time of siege.
2. A hunting scene in Ptolemaic Palestine. The horseman is represented killing a leopardsess with his long Macedonian lance. As the inscription says, the beast is already wounded by a dart. Two dogs are helping the hunter. The horse is covered by a saddle-cloth of Greek style. The hunter wears a short chiton and high-laced shoes, the Macedonian military dress. The painted inscription over his head is almost effaced. It seems that his (Semitic) name was Ananos. The horseman is followed by a trumpeter. The painting decorated a tomb, built in the 3rd century B.C. at Marissa in Idumaea.
Plate XXXIII  HELLENISTIC SCULPTURE

1. Marble head of a Galatian warrior. It belongs to the figure of the Galatian who, preferring death to captivity, killed himself after killing his wife. The original, a votive offering (in bronze) of Attalus I, once stood in the court of the temple of Athena at Pergamum. The so-called 'Dying Galatian' (see Pl. XXXVII) was probably a part of the same monument of Attalus, which celebrated his triumphs over the dreaded Gauls. A Roman copy is now in the Museo Nazionale delle Terme Diocleziane.

2. Bronze portrait head of one of the Levantine residents at Delos found in the ancient palaestra. The eyes are inlaid. The statue was probably made around 100 B.C. Both heads on this plate illustrate the emotional quality of Hellenistic art. National Museum, Athens.
the Arabian ports and thence to Egypt through the ports of the Red Sea, or through the Persian Gulf to the mouth of the Tigris, where stands the great commercial city of Seleucia, or Ctesiphon, the successor of Babylon in commercial importance. Antioch, on the river Orontes, becomes the capital of the Seleucidae, and attains the position of a great industrial city, where the raw material imported from Asia and India is worked up into the finished article.

In short, the Hellenistic world becomes one great market controlled by the Greek or Hellenized merchant and the Greek manufacturer. Most of the monarchies and cities retain Alexander's (that is, the Attic) standard of coinage (1 drachma = about 4.3 grams of silver). The Ptolemies, on the other hand, use the standard of their Phoenician cities (1 drachma = about 3.5 grams of silver) and, in this way, the Ptolemaic Empire forms an economically separate unit. The prevailing mood of the Eastern Greeks of early Hellenistic times is one of confidence in the unlimited capabilities of man and his reason. Aggressiveness and daring are evident. The Greeks in their new eastern homes are mainly concerned with securing for themselves a life of material prosperity and, if possible, of social prominence. To attain this they work hard and with enthusiasm. The manufacturer adopts and improves all the processes of skilled manufacture peculiar to the East, and adapts his wares to the taste of his customers. The Hellenistic trader becomes acquainted with the development of business life in the East, takes part in it, and elaborates it still further. Business methods are improved; credit and banking become increasingly important. All commercial transactions are based on credit and on abundance of coined metal. It is an immense convenience for exchange all the world over, when Greek, the universal language of civilization, also becomes by degrees the language for conducting business in the East. In all departments of life—in the form of the central government, in the system of administration, in the organization of the law courts, in taxation, and especially in business—local peculiarities fade away
Plate XXXIV  COINS OF THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

(a) Tetradrachm of Ptolemy II Philadelphus of Egypt. Head of Ptolemy I r. Rev. Eagle on thunderbolt l. Name of the king, 284–247 B.C.
(b) Tetradrachm of Antiochus II Theos (the God). Head of the king r. Rev. Apollo seated on the ‘omphalos’ (the umbilicus, the centre of the earth) l. with arrow and bow. Name of the king, 261–246 B.C.
(c) Tetradrachm of Eumenes II of Pergamum. Head of the founder of the dynasty Philetairos r. Rev. Athena seated l. Name of Philetairos, 197–159 B.C.
(d) Tetradrachm of Prusias II of Bithynia. Head of the king r. Rev. Zeus standing l. Name of the king, 180–149 B.C.
(e) Tetradrachm of Perseus of Macedonia. Head of the king r. Rev. Eagle on thunderbolt in an oak-wreath l. Name of the king, 178–168 B.C.
(f) Tetradrachm of Euthydemos of Bactria. Head of the king r. Rev. Heracles seated on a rock l. Name of the king, About 220 B.C.
(g) Tetradrachm of Mithridates I of Parthia. Head of Arseses, the founder of the dynasty r. Rev. Heracles walking l. Name of the king Arseses, 171–138 B.C.
(h) Silver Chitophorus (3/4 of an Attic tetradrachm) of Ephesus. The chitophoroi were first issued by Ephesus at about 200 B.C. as a kind of federal coin for Asia Minor; they were adopted and spread by the kingdom of Pergamum and later by the Romans. Cista mys-
tica (the mystic basket of the Dionysiac mysteries) with serpent
issuing from it in an ivy wreath. Rev. Bow in bow-case between two
serpents; r. the sacred stag of Artemis of Ephesus and l. the two first
letters of the name of the city of Ephesus, 1st century B.C.
(i) Tetradrachm of Athens, struck by King Mithradates VI of Pon-
tus and his factotum Aristion at Athens. Head of Athena r. Rev.
Owl on an olive-oil amphora. Names of the city, of King Mithradates
and of Aristion. In an olive wreath. 88 B.C.
All these coins are in the British Museum.
and acute angles become obtuse. Business life and life in general settle down everywhere on similar lines, familiar and customary all the world over, as free from local variations as the koine, the dialect spoken by all the Greeks of that age. Mobility becomes a salient characteristic of Greek life. Not only merchants but also artisans and technicians, physicians and artists are constantly moving. Royal officials easily pass into the service of another king. The Greek element is predominant in this new state of society and gives a unity and homogeneity to the entire Hellenistic world. The Eastern world is Hellenized by degrees. In many places, no doubt, this Hellenism is superficial, and Hellenic culture no more than a thin veneer.

The growth of the old Greek cities in Greece proper, Macedonia, Asia Minor, and Syria, the foundation by the Hellenistic monarchs of new Greek cities in Macedonia, Asia Minor, Syria, and even in Egypt, and the great development, founded mainly on slave labour, of trade and industry in these cities, led to an increase in the number of persons who were merely consumers, and not producers, of the means of subsistence. To these must be added the mercenary troops, the sailors who manned the fleets for war and commerce, and the steadily increasing swarm of government officials. Hence the problem of providing the cities with food, especially with bread, salt fish, cheese, wine, and vegetable oils, became more and more acute.

South Russia exported as before considerable quantities of corn, fish, hides, and other raw material, chiefly from part of the Crimea, the valley of the Kuban, the coast of the Sea of Azov, and the lower waters of the Don and Dnieper. In the first half of the third century B.C., the Scythian kingdom in the steppes of south Russia was broken up by the Sarmatians, a new Iranian stock coming from the East, and by Celtic and Thracian invaders from the West. But after a short period of decline and anarchy, the country was once more prosperous and engaged in active trade relations with Greece.
Elsewhere, Italy and Sicily were passing through a difficult period, full of wars and acute conflict, while Rome was unifying the country under her own supremacy; and this period was followed by the prolonged warfare between Rome and Carthage. Thus the economic life of the West was crippled for a time, and the export of food-stuffs and raw material ceased almost entirely. The Greek world depended more and more on Egypt and Asia Minor for sustenance. The prominence of Egypt in politics and her influence on other parts of the Hellenistic world were due to this, that she had the largest supplies of grain to dispose of. The kingdom of Pergamum also began to play the same part, and was one of the chief sources of corn-supply at the end of the third century B.C. Then and in the second century the African corn, grown in the territory of Carthage and the Nubian kingdom, came into the market. Such conditions as these in the production of food-stuffs led to fluctuating prices and financial instability in the Greek cities; they also opened a field for speculation, and a class of capitalists who speculated on a great scale was created. In many cases the Hellenistic kings themselves embarked on these speculations, making use of their economic advantages to gain political ends.

This state of things induced the kings of Egypt and Asia Minor and Hiero II in Sicily to give serious attention to the problem of increasing the productive powers of the lands over which they ruled. The systematic Greek genius came to their aid. Greek botany and Greek zoology now found a practical application in agriculture and stock-raising. Greek science collected the observations of practical farmers and breeders, combined them into a system, and made the first attempt to set the management of land on a scientific basis. Handbook after handbook on the subject appeared, dealing with the needs and peculiarities of different countries, and were regularly consulted by those landowners who managed their land on a capitalistic basis. It is a notable fact that among the authors of these manuals we find
the kings of two of the monarchies mentioned above—Perga-
mum and Sicily. Another manual on the same subject written
by Mago, a Carthaginian noble, was very famous.

This endeavour to increase the productivity of the land
shows itself also in new and improved methods applied to the
cultivation of cereals; such were regular manuring of the soil,
rotation of crops, and improvements in artificial irrigation. But
special attention was paid to the scientific management of vine-
yards and olive trees; and novelties, in the way of fruit trees,
vegetables, and grasses for fodder, were introduced into agricul-
ture; while stock was improved by introducing new breeds and
crossing them with the local strains. Improvements in agricul-
tural science brought about a rapid transformation: primitive
methods of tilling the soil gave place to a capitalistic system in
which slave labour played a principal part. The same process is
visible also in the domain of industry: here, too, kings set the
example; here, too, slave labour and the large factory squeeze
out more and more the independent artisan and domestic manu-
ufacture.

Connected with this is the extensive encouragement given by
the kings to the enterprise of the Greeks settled in their domin-
ions. We have seen already that trade was concentrated in
Greek hands, and the same nation by degrees took the lead in
agriculture and industry. The kings distributed large estates
among their favourites, who were not owners but tenants under
an obligation to introduce scientific methods of cultivation on
these lands. A large amount of land belonging to the state was
transferred to the hands of soldiers, who formed in Egypt a new
class of foreign landholders, and created in Asia Minor and Syria
new urban settlements. Great numbers of emigrants who were
not soldiers were also attracted in order to develop the resources
of the soil. Large territories in Asia Minor and Syria were allotted
to settlers from Greece, and new Greek cities grew up there. In
Egypt the settlers helped the king to organize the government
of the country and its internal trade on the most satisfactory
methods. The money which they gained these settlers invested chiefly in land.

In this way there grew up everywhere, both in town and country, a new middle class, containing both rich and poor. This class consisted, more often than not, of foreigners; and the native population were in general subservient to them and economically dependent upon them. Since all the territory of the realm belonged to the king, and the principle of private ownership applied only to districts bestowed upon Greeks and other settlers, and even in their case was limited, therefore the king could dispose of it all as he pleased. The native population, having cultivated the land from time immemorial, continued to cultivate it, not for themselves but for the king who owned it, and for those to whom the king had granted a part of it, together with its inhabitants, to enjoy for a term or in perpetuity. As before, the population remained bound to the soil, and their labour was exploited by the sovereign. Nor did the native population enjoy any more independence in their relation to the settlers. The latter seldom cultivated the lands bestowed on them; the usual practice was to leave the former tenants in possession and exact from them part of the produce. Wherever improvements in cultivation and reclamation of waste lands were undertaken by the king, or his favourites, or the settlers, this was carried out, almost invariably, by slaves or hirelings, and also by forced labour on the part of the native inhabitants.

Thus the immense majority of the natives in the Hellenistic monarchies were despised and impoverished; and this led to grave social and economic results. Wealth was concentrated in the cities. City dwellers, government officials, and the army, were almost the only customers for the products of industry. The rural population and the slaves, labouring for the benefit of others, have not the means to acquire anything whatever outside the limits of their most urgent needs. Whatever they must have, they try to produce for themselves. Hence industry is carried on to supply the needs of a comparatively small number;
workshops are not converted into regular factories; ingenuity is not employed to discover means of mass production; machinery does not take the place of manual labour. And this depressed condition of the people gives rise to hostile relations between the higher and lower classes, both in town and country. This hostility takes the form of strikes, and bursts forth from time to time in revolts of the native populations—revolts often headed by priests. Such revolts were especially common in Egypt, but were, of course, put down by means of the mercenary troops.

This system by which the native population was exploited and ground down was carried through with exceptional thoroughness in Egypt. All the economic life of the country was based upon government control, which embraced all agriculture, all industry, and all trade. The middlemen between the toiling millions and the government were sometimes officials and sometimes tax-farmers, but generally both together. The tax-farmers, who collected the taxes, also directed the labour of the workshops and even domestic manufacture, which produced goods for sale, not for purposes of the household; and the same class had a monopoly in the sale of certain commodities in specified parts of the kingdom. Of course, all this business was done under the supervision, and with the assistance, of the officials, who included the police.

The Hellenistic kings failed to establish a reasonable mode of co-existence between the Greeks, who were the associates of the ruler, and the natives, the economic backbone of the realm. They could not settle the conflict between the Greek and the Oriental forms of life, between the Greeks and the natives, between the Greek economic system, based on private initiative, and the state economy of the East. They were faced with the gulf between the 'haves' and the 'have-nots', the proprietors and the working classes. The co-operation of the powers was made impossible by the ceaseless struggles for political hegemony. The wars absorbed an enormous quantity of human energy, encouraged the destruc-
tive spirit, and created an ever-increasing sense of uncertainty, which induced apathy.

Greece, particularly Athens, rapidly recovered from the economic crisis of the late fourth century. Greece derived a great advance in prosperity from several sources—the immense booty thrown on the market by the conquest of the Persian Empire, new opportunities of employment in the armies and administration of Alexander and his successors, emigration to the newly founded Greek cities and settlements in Asia and Egypt, and the new markets for Greek products in the East. The rapid increase in the demand for Greek goods inflated the prices of all commodities and also raised the price of labour. The New Comedy illustrates the life of a new, powerful, and wealthy middle class.

However, after the period of large migration to the East came to an end, the economic difficulties and the social unrest increased. The constantly recurring wars and concomitant civil strike caused by the struggle of Hellenistic kings for Greece led to a gradual decline of the middle class. The slow but steady emancipation of the East from dependence on Greece for industrial goods which were made for mass consumption decreased the demand for these Greek manufactures. The importance of free labour rapidly declined. The bourgeoisie shaped the life of the city according to its own interests and ideas. But politically, workers enjoyed the rights of full citizens and the proletariat constantly strove, by using its political force, to realize the reforms it most coveted: cancellation of debts and redistribution of land.

In the end the conditions of life became burdensome and unstable in almost all Greek cities. The rift between rich and poor, the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, grew wider. The strife was carried on by political and social revolutions which ended in the victory of one class or the other and the extermination of their rivals, while the property of the vanquished was confiscated.
and distributed. The article which Athens inserted in the civic oath after the Peloponnesian war, providing that no citizen should propose division of land or cancellation of debt, appeared now in the constitutions of many city-states. The Corinthian League of Greek communities, founded by Philip and renewed subsequently by Alexander, Demetrius Poliorcetes, and Antigonus Gonatas, was partly political and partly social in its aims; and one of its main objects was to suppress social revolution. But the League was unsuccessful; and the Achaean and Aetolian Leagues, the two largest in Greece, failed also, in spite of their rigid and systematic principles in favour of property. Social revolution burst out repeatedly, now here and now there, and steadily undermined the prosperity of Greece and the islands. The Hellenistic kings were powerless to cure this cancer of Greek life, and no city ever seriously attempted to solve the social problem. The problem of wealth and poverty was regarded by philosophers as a question of personal morals.

One episode of the kind is especially well known to us—the prolonged war of classes at Sparta. There the social question was exceptionally acute. We have seen how the predominance of Sparta after the Peloponnesian war brought wealth to the country and to many individual Spartans. On the other hand, the loss of Messenia, which followed on the blows inflicted by Boeotia, ruined a number of the Spartiates, while their failures in foreign policy and heavy casualties in war reduced to a minimum the number of Spartiates enjoying full rights. Thus there grew up among the Spartiates themselves, to say nothing of the Perioeci and Helots, a sharp division between the aristocracy and the proletariat, the rich and the poor. The growth of communistic and socialistic ideas, the conviction that Sparta had once been a land where the ideal of communism had been fully realized, and also an ardent patriotism which refused to put up with the political insignificance of the country—such were the motives which drove the young king, Agis IV, to enter on the path of social and economic reform. About 244 B.C. circumstances hap-
pened to be favourable, and he endeavoured to carry out his plan. All debts were to be cancelled; the land was to be confiscated and divided up among 4,500 Spartiates and 15,000 Perioeci. Some of the large landholders, whose property was mortgaged, supported the first item of this programme, and it was carried; but the endeavour to realize the second proved fatal to Agis. His opponents, led by the other king, Leonidas, put him to death in 241 B.C.

Thirteen years later the attempt was renewed by Cleomenes III, the son of Leonidas. In order to carry out his designs Cleomenes did not stop short of violence. By banishing some and executing others he strengthened his personal position and apparently carried out the whole programme of Agis. Then at the head of a regenerated Sparta he tried to seize power in the Peloponnese and throughout Greece. At first he was supported by the proletariat in all the cities. But in the end, in order to preserve the existing system of society and to prevent the unification of Greece round Sparta, Antigonus Doson, king of Macedonia, declared war against Cleomenes and inflicted a decisive defeat on him at Sellasia. Thus the reforms of Cleomenes were brought to naught. The attempt was renewed once again in 207 B.C. by Nabis, who had seized power at Sparta. But by that time Rome was beginning to assert her authority in Greece. After the death of Nabis the Achaean League put an end, not only to his projects of social reform but also to the political importance of Sparta in general.

In consequence partly of the social disorder in Greece, from which Athens alone was free, and partly of the prosperity of the East, which had now become the centre of economic life, the marked progress which Greece had made at the beginning of the third century B.C. began to flag and fail more and more at the end of that century and in the next. Population and wealth began to leave Greece; and her ruin was completed by Rome.
XVII

GREEK CIVILIZATION IN THE THIRD
AND SECOND CENTURIES B.C.

It is usual to regard the period which followed the death of Alexander as a period when the civilization of Greece mingled with that of the East, to form a new civilization which became the property of all men who were civilized at all. But this view is not supported by the facts. Above all, there was no real fusion of nationalities in the Graeco-Oriental monarchies ruled by Alexander’s successors. Considerable numbers of Greeks or Hellenized barbarians were diffused over the surface of the Eastern world, collecting mainly in the cities, and admitted to their ranks certain members of the native population, preferring those who were highest in station. As I have pointed out already, these Greeks and Hellenized barbarians formed the highest class in the new Hellenistic kingdoms: they spoke Greek, and had a common manner of life, and shared the same interests and the same education and upbringing. But they remained merely a minority and foreigners to the great mass of the inhabitants. The latter continued to live their own life, to speak their native tongues, and to believe in their own gods. Greek culture found hardly any access to their midst. It remained an urban culture, and these Eastern cities were a mere superstructure, independent of the native population. The kings never wanted the Greeks to become amalgamated with the natives. To say nothing of India, central Asia, Syria, Palestine, and Arabia, even in Asia Minor
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