This agreement had been honored. But the Persian Viceroy in Asia Minor, Cyrus "the Younger," had been friendly to the Greeks, not only because of his admiration for Greek culture (and his Ionian mistress), but also because he wanted Greek support for an attempt to overthrow his elder brother, the Great King. He encouraged the Greek coastal cities to revolt from their satraps and put themselves under his protection. Sparta contributed seven hundred hoplites to his army; beside these he was able to raise over twelve thousand Greek troops, mostly mercenaries. With these and his oriental forces he marched into Babylonia and was killed in battle. (His Greek troops refused to surrender and marched up the Tigris and across Armenia to the Black Sea; of the 13,000, 8,600 survived, among them Xenophon, another follower of Socrates, whose account of the expedition in his Anabasis is a masterpiece of war reporting.) After Cyrus' death the Persian authorities in Asia Minor tried to reconquer the Greek cities and these appealed to Sparta. Sparta, which had been alienated from the Great King by her support of Cyrus, now saw the opportunity to acquire an empire. This involved a war in Asia Minor, where her commanders distinguished themselves in looting, but failed to build any stable domain.

Persia retaliated by financing the resistance to Sparta in Greece, and soon had Sparta involved in war with Thebes, Athens, and Corinth. Things went so badly for the Spartans that they had to recall most of their forces from Asia Minor in 394, and in that same year a Persian fleet under an Athenian admiral destroyed the Spartan fleet. This encouraged many coastal and island cities to drive out their Spartan overseers. Next the long walls of Athens, which had been destroyed in 404, were rebuilt
with Persian help in 393, and the city was strengthened by the return of some of its colonies.

Athens no sooner began to regain its power than it tried to rebuild its alliances with the Ionian cities and re-establish its control over the entrance to the Black Sea. Also it supported a Greek Cypriote king named Evagoras, who had revolted against the Persians. This determined the Persians to help Sparta against Athens. Presently both sides wearied of the war, and in 386 the Great King was able to dictate a peace by which Persia got Cyprus and the mainland cities of Ionia, but the remaining cities of Greece, except for three Athenian colonies, were to be autonomous. Thus the Greek cities got their liberty—as a gift from the Great King and at the price of (1) the abandonment of Ionia and Cyprus, (2) the disintegration of political order in Greece above the city-state level, and (3) the continuance of the Spartan hegemony.

Items (2) and (3) of this bill were implied by autonomy: so long as each city could determine its own policies, no powerful league could be formed. Local antipathies were such everywhere that some states in any area would certainly refuse to join; domestic conflicts were such in many cities that if one party voted to join the other would certainly oppose, and as soon as the local government changed hands the league would lose a member. But so long as no powerful league could be formed, Sparta was expected to remain the dominant power in Greece.

So matters stood for eight years (387–379), during which Sparta violated the peace on several occasions by interfering in the domestic affairs of smaller states. The most conspicuous violation occurred in Thebes, where a Spartan general took the citadel by surprise and installed
a garrison and a government of quislings. In 379 Theban conspirators arranged an intimate party for the chief officials of the government; when the servants were dismissed and the women brought in they turned out to be not women, but Theban patriots in disguise. After the murder of the officials, the political prisoners were set free and the garrison forced to surrender. Thereupon Sparta went to war with Thebes.

Thebes found an ally in Athens, which had spent the past eight years making alliances with individual Aegean cities and took this opportunity to transform them into a new league, made acceptable to the minor allies by constitutional provisions which they thought would prevent the re-establishment of an Athenian tyranny. They were mistaken. Once Athens regained her power she began to neglect these provisions, and all that saved the minor states from a renewal of her rule was her final inability to impose it on them. For the present, however, the affairs of the allies went well. A naval victory over the Spartans enabled Athens to renew her connections with western Greece. The Thebans were even more successful. A body of shock troops, "the Sacred Band," composed of a hundred and fifty pairs of lovers, was organized; the Spartans were repeatedly defeated, and the cities of Boeotia were united in a league of which Thebes was in control. These Theban triumphs convinced the Athenians that they might soon have more to fear from Thebes than from Sparta; accordingly they made a separate peace with the Spartans in 371.

Athens' withdrawal left Sparta free to deal with Thebes. But a Theban general, Epaminondas, devised a new military formation: instead of a line of uniform depth to meet the enemy's line, he thinned out the right and center
and massed his best troops, with the Sacred Band in front, on his left wing. With these he could smash the enemy's right, then turn and take their remaining troops on the unprotected side, since shields were worn on the left. He thus defeated the Spartan army which invaded Boeotia in 371, and his victory touched off a series of revolutions in which the pro-Spartan oligarchies of Peloponnesian cities were overthrown. These changes gave the cities of Arcadia courage to form a league for mutual protection against Sparta, and next year Epaminondas invaded the Peloponnesian to support them. The territory of Sparta was ravaged; a capital city for the league—Megalopolis—was founded just over the northwest boundary of Sparta; Messenia was liberated and a city, Messene, built to be its center. The Spartan hegemony in Greece was ended forever.

But Epaminondas could no more build a stable political structure than the Spartans could before him. So long as most Greeks would be loyal to nothing larger than their own city-states, the predominance of any one state was a signal for the others to unite against it in defense of their own liberty. No sooner had Thebes established the Arcadian League than the Arcadians began to look for support against Thebes. They found it in Athens. But Athens had already entered the war on the side of Sparta. So by 366 Arcadia was allied both to Athens and to Thebes, which were at war with each other, and Athens both to Arcadia and to Sparta, which were at war with each other. Thebes wasted itself in the fighting engendered by such combinations and lost its hegemony at the death of Epaminondas in 362.

By this time mainland Greece was in such disorder that the insignificant district of Phocis, bordering on Delphi,
was able to become a major power in the years after 356 simply by seizing the treasures of the shrine and hiring some ten thousand mercenaries. Border wars flickered off and on for another ten years and finally laid the country open to the intervention of King Philip II of Macedon.

Characteristic of the fourth century was the development of a new kind of state, larger than a city, more civilized and more complex than a tribal kingdom, but smaller than the ancient empires. These new states developed around the periphery of the Greek world and were sometimes ruled by Greeks, sometimes by natives, but were always largely Greek in culture and native in population. They represent the second stage in the hellenization of the western world. The first had been the dissemination of Greek artifacts and customs through trade and colonization. By the fourth century, however, the Greeks had become rulers of the natives or the natives had learned the art of rule from the Greeks. In either event provincial concentrations of power were developed with the new political and economic skill.

In south Russia, at the entrance to the Sea of Azov, the Milesian colony of Panticapaeum became the center of a kingdom which included both Greek cities and native subjects, and prospered not only by export of grain and fish to the Aegean cities but also as middleman for Greek trade with the Scythians of the steppes.

In the southwest corner of Asia Minor the Carians, under their dynast Mausolus, won virtual independence from Persia, conquered a number of Greek cities along the coast, won over several Aegean islands in the 350’s, and stopped Athens’ attempt to reconstitute her empire in that region. (The tomb of Mausolus and his wife was decorated by
outstanding Greek sculptors; its fame lives on in the word "mausoleum."

In Cyprus, Evagoras, a king of one of the Greek cities, managed with Athenian support to get control of almost the whole island in the 380's. We saw above that this caused Persia to shift her support in Greece from Athens back to Sparta. By the peace of 386 Athens was required to abandon Evagoras, and then the Persians by a long war succeeded in reducing his territory to his original city.

In Sicily, Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse, defeated a Carthaginian attempt to conquer the island and almost succeeded in driving the Carthaginians out. When he died in 367 he was ruler of most of Sicily, the toe and heel of Italy, and territories along the coast of the Adriatic. Although his court had been a center of Greek culture, his territories contained a large non-Greek population of Sicilians and Italians, and his rule rested partially on their support, sometimes against the Greeks.

In central Italy Rome had already adopted elements of Greek civilization and was gradually conquering its neighbors and uniting them to itself.

In northern Greece, finally, was Macedon, a wild country of semi-Greek population ruled in Homeric fashion by kings who had acquired a non-Homeric taste for the culture of the city-states. They imported Greek artists, writers, and scholars to ornament their court and took advantage of Greek economic, military, and technical innovations to strengthen themselves against their vassal chieftains.

Philip II, King of the Macedonians, followed this policy with particular success. As a youth he had been a hostage in Thebes and had observed Epaminondas. When the army
gave him the Macedonian crown in 359 he immediately set about remodeling the army. To Epaminondas' use of heavy formations led by a corps of shock troops, now "the Foot Companions" of the King, he added a larger role for his cavalry, "the Companions." After testing his work by the subjugation of his inland vassals, he attacked Amphipolis: the gold mines were essential for his ambitions. Amphipolis appealed to Athens, but Philip made a treaty with Athens by which he undertook to conquer Amphipolis and give it to Athens in return for Pydna. He took Amphipolis in 357, Pydna in 356, and kept both. Athens was busy with the revolt of the eastern Aegean islands, instigated by Mausolus of Caria, and did nothing. By the time she had lost her war (355), Philip was preparing for further advances: three years later he took Thessaly, next he subjugated Thrace, next he took Chalcidice, city by city, in 350-348. Athens sent help to the Chalcidian cities, but too little and too late. Philip paused to organize his conquests and resubjugate Thrace. Then in 346 he made peace with Athens and immediately struck at central Greece, crushed Phocis, got control of Delphi, proclaimed a general peace, and began preparations for war against the Illyrians. It took him three years to secure his western and northwestern frontiers and reorganize Thessaly, then he was ready to annex Thrace completely and conquer the Greek cities along the entrance to the Black Sea, especially Byzantium. The Black Sea was Athens' granary, and she had colonies and allies among the cities along the entrance. Therefore, when Philip attacked Byzantium in 340, she declared war and sent her forces to protect Byzantium, but took no effective steps to protect herself. Before she knew it Philip had passed Thermopylae. She allied with Thebes and a
number of minor states in a last-minute attempt to stop him. The allies were defeated at Chaironea in 338; a campaign in the Peloponnese completed the subjugation of Greece, Macedonian garrisons were established in Thebes, Corinth, and Chalcis, and the Greek cities were organized in a league under Macedonian control. Philip proclaimed a general peace and put the league to work in preparation for war against Persia. In 336 he was assassinated by a man of no position, reportedly because he had refused to right a wrong done by one of his generals.

The political disintegration of Greece in the fourth century was accompanied by economic decline. The constant wars devastated the countryside; travel and trade were interrupted, crops and buildings burned, trees and vines cut down, wells filled in. Not a few cities were captured and looted, some were destroyed. For the remaining cities, even worse than war were the consequences of the continuing social conflict, sharpened by the increase of poverty and the frequent changes of the political situation. Every decisive battle was followed by revolutions deposing the governments which had depended on the support of the defeated power. Every revolution meant fighting, destruction, a legacy of hatred within the city and interruption of its trade abroad.

Overseas trade was also diminished by the wars, by the growth of piracy, resulting from the lack of any strong naval power to police the seas, and especially by the disturbed conditions in countries which had been among the principal markets of Greece. Asia Minor and the Phoenician coasts were torn by repeated rebellions of satraps. Egypt broke away from Persia at the beginning of the century and was chronically at war until reconquered in 343. In
Sicily the Carthaginian invasions and the wars of Dionysius I at the beginning of the century destroyed almost all the Greek cities except Syracuse; what rebuilding Dionysius did was largely destroyed in the long civil wars which broke out in 357, ten years after his death. The Greek cities of south Italy suffered much from Dionysius, but more from the pressure of Italian tribes; they had to appeal repeatedly for help from Greece.

But even in areas not seriously damaged by war, Greek trade declined, because of the spread of hellenization: local manufacturers now turned out imitations of Greek wares which undersold the genuine articles. The vine and olive had been transplanted to the colonies and colonial wine and oil diminished the demand for the Greek products.

The decline of foreign trade, together with the destruction of property and interruption of production at home, caused a depression in Greece which lasted from the fall of Athens to the Macedonian conquest. The sufferings occasioned by this depression were made more severe by the consequences of overpopulation.

One thing war did not make scarce was people. (Greek wars were not usually very destructive of life: the victims had to be chased on foot and killed by hand, and it was more economical to sell them.) Therefore the fourth century saw an increase in the practice of abandoning newborn children, especially girls. Nevertheless, the population declined only slowly. In 336 the population of Athens was still perhaps one half of what it had been at its peak in 431. For Athens without her empire this was too much. Overpopulation and depression together caused a constant shortage of food, sometimes approaching famine for several
years on end. Athenian legislation regulating the grain trade was accordingly severe: transactions which made profiteering possible were punishable by death.

In these circumstances the Greek city was forced further toward the welfare state. The political strength of the urban poor was increased as they were joined in the city by the small farmers whose lands had been devastated by the incessant wars. This required an extension of public services, especially the maintenance of gymasia and public doctors. Moreover, the unemployed had to be fed. Their need exacerbated the social conflicts of which we have already seen the pattern established in the fifth century. That Athens got through the fourth century without direct and violent class warfare shows not only her citizens’ loyalty to the democratic tradition and abomination for the memory of the “thirty tyrants,” but also their success in maintaining their trading connections even when their empire was lost. Besides trade, Athens profited greatly from the development of commercial banking, which advanced rapidly in this century and of which she was the center. Income from trade and banking may be supposed to have been important among the factors which enabled her to introduce pay for all citizens who attended the assembly. Pay for service in the court continued as usual. Besides this, any surplus revenue was used for the fund to pay for attendance at the theaters. The board which managed this fund became the most influential body in the state, and the most important political consideration was to keep the payments high. This limited the amounts available for military expenditure and made impossible the reconstitution of the Athenian empire and effective resistance to Macedon.

But the welfare state provided only a minimum. Between
those who wanted more, competition was intense. Once again great numbers of Greeks began to go abroad to make their fortunes, but now they rarely went as colonies, usually as individuals hoping to find employment. Greek artists, doctors, and men of science entered the service of the Great King and his satraps and of the Pharaoh of Egypt; Greek merchants and prostitutes settled in their cities; Greek soldiers served as mercenaries in their armies. The ten thousand who marched with Cyrus the Younger were only the most famous. Greek mercenaries often formed the bodyguards of the satraps; they were among the chief supports of the independent government of Egypt; when the satraps revolted or the Great King attempted to reconquer Egypt they were employed by the tens of thousands on both sides.

On men who remained in Greece, competition imposed specialization. As remarked in the military history, specially trained bands of soldiers were organized and played important roles, notably the Sacred Band at Thebes and the Companions of the Macedonian kings. Even more important was the role of mercenaries who became specialists in the art of fighting (and the art of getting paid for fighting without actually doing it). Such men were the products of the depression and the century’s constant revolutions and exilings. Their influence and numbers reached a peak in the early fifties during the hegemony of Phocis, which rested almost entirely upon them. But they were a major factor in most of the armies of the century, especially the Athenian. The citizen army was ever less able to meet such professional competition, and men were less willing to serve in it as individualism increased and loyalty to the city-state declined.
With the professional army went the professional general, the expert not to be matched by an amateur serving for a year, nor by a politician who had been general for years on end but was unfamiliar with battles. Similarly, the development of advanced banking methods made a career in finance a matter for specialization. And the development of rhetoric and its practice in Athens produced another specialist, the political public speaker. The sophists had taught and practiced public speaking, but had not usually meddled directly with politics, though they had discussed general questions of political theory. Their type did not disappear; its greatest representative in the fourth century was Isocrates of Athens, a professional speech-writer and teacher of speaking, whose school drew students from all parts of the Greek world but whose political activity did not go much beyond advocacy of a pan-hellenic union for an attack on Persia—a dream he saw realized, just before his death, by Philip II of Macedon. In contrast to Isocrates were the political orators of his time, especially Demosthenes, who was constantly urging the people of Athens to take particular actions to stop the advance of Philip. Thus the leadership of the state came to be divided between three groups of specialists: the generals (mostly abroad and out of touch with the people), the financial officials, and the political orators. From time to time the generals had to suspend operations for want of public support, the financiers vetoed necessary actions abroad and spent money at home on military installations which proved useless, and the orators moved the people to adopt policies which they had neither the military strength nor the money to carry out.

Similar specialization appears during the fourth century
in most aspects of Greek life and usually with the same consequences—increased technical skill and diminished understanding of the ramifications of what is done. It is clear, for instance, in the arts and crafts, and especially in the sculpture of Praxiteles, the greatest artist of the age and (to judge from the number of preserved imitations of his works) the most influential artist of antiquity. Earlier sculpture had usually been related to its architectural setting, now the emphasis was on the individual statue. The social setting also was neglected: hitherto cult statues had represented the gods as attending to the worshiper and concerned about his worship, but the gods of Praxiteles were often represented as completely unaware of the onlooker. This has been variously explained. It has been said that they were not intended to be cult statues (objects of worship), but merely votive statues. It has been said that they reflected the new, Epicurean notion of the gods as living in bliss, indifferent to the world of men. It has been said that the artist was indifferent to the religious functions for which his statues might be used and was concerned merely to produce representations of beautiful human bodies, caught in moments of languid movement or repose. The exquisite young man, with one hip thrust out, lounging against a tree trunk, was called Hermes or Apollo or Dionysus; the woman, magnificent in her nakedness, was Aphrodite. These statues, like the orations of Demosthenes, are perfect compositions, calculated to win the admiration of the audience, but they underrate the power they pretend to describe.

Praxiteles’ choice of gods was significant: Aphrodite and her son, Eros, the young god of love, Apollo as god of poetic inspiration, Dionysus as patron of drunkenness, re-
ligious ecstasy, and the hope of individual immortality—these had become the gods of private life and of the individual. As loyalty to the city-state declined, so did the representation of the civic deities and so did their worship (except as prescribed by law and carried out by civic officials as part of their duties). Specialists now appear in the divine realm as well as the human. One of the most successful was Asclepius who specialized in healing. His worshipers were many and sincere.

As the gods specialized, so did the philosophers. Socrates had combined, with dialectic, common sense and concern about moral problems, with indifference to hardship and public opinion, the life of a man about town. His followers took the various sides of this personality by themselves and pushed them to extremes. A school in Megara developed his dialectic to serve an implausible metaphysics drawn from Parmenides. Xenophon saw in him the paragon of common sense and the virtues of the old fashioned gentleman. Antisthenes saw in him the paragon of virtue, but thought that his virtue was manifested by his indifference to hardship and public opinion. Since these are apt to be undermined by concern for pleasure, pleasure is evil. Since pleasure is evil and hardship and ill-repute are matters of indifference, the virtuous man is self-sufficient. Antisthenes, who was poor, paraded his self-sufficiency and his torn clothes. (His teaching lived on to influence Diogenes, who in the 350's developed the notion that man to be happy need only train himself to have as few needs as possible and satisfy them directly and shamelessly. Accordingly, he lived like an animal, was nicknamed "dog"—kyon—and gave his name to the Cynic school which derived from his teachings.) At the opposite extreme from
Antisthenes was Aristippus of Cyrene, another of Socrates’ pupils. Like Xenophon he started from Socrates’ common sense, but with this he combined Socrates’ enjoyment of the pleasures of life about town. This led him to declare happiness the goal of life and pleasure the occasion of happiness. Accordingly he made a fortune as a fashionable sophist and favorite of tyrants. Around these men and their differences grew up a literature of apocryphal anecdotes which testify to the popular interest that seized and oversimplified their teachings: Aristippus going to dinner passed Diogenes washing garlic in a gutter. He said to him, “Poor Diogenes, if you knew how to get on with people you wouldn’t have to live like that.” “Poor Aristippus,” said Diogenes, “if you knew how to live like this you wouldn’t have to get on with people.”

Above these sectarian followers of Socrates, above the disintegration of the fourth century, above its trivial and tragic history, towers Plato. His work united the various facets of Socratic teaching—argumentation, common sense, concern for the Greek tradition, moral concern, asceticism, and delight in good company, especially that of beautiful young men. To these he added from his own genius the sensitivity of a poet, a literary style of amazing adaptability and power, and a habit of reflection which never let go of an idea, but elicited every consequence, so that a simple question might lead to the most complex problems of metaphysics. Finally, he had been shaped by the history of his city. Born in 429, his youth and young manhood had coincided with the disasters of the Second Peloponnesian War and the terror following. (Critias, the worst of the “thirty tyrants” had been one of his relatives.) In the tragic stupidities of Athens he had found one man whose clear
intelligence had revealed to him the joy of understanding and the beauty of the relationships of the propositions in an argument, a beauty of which music and even mathematics seemed to him mere images. This man had been Socrates. Athenian democracy had condemned him to death in 399, when Plato was thirty. Plato thereupon had left the city for twelve years of travel (he was rich).

From these experiences—and perhaps from his aristocratic family—came his contempt and distrust of the common man. Therefore when he finally came back to the city and started to teach, he did not talk to anybody he met in the street, as Socrates had. Instead he chose a spot near a gymnasium in a pleasant suburb called Academia and established there a select society for the worship of the Muses, the goddesses of music, poetry and the dance. There, except for two short visits to Sicily, he remained until his death in 347. Members of the society went on teaching there until the Christian emperor Justinian suppressed the school in A.D. 529. Such formation of a new center of loyalty, a private religious association apart from the cult of the city, was common at the time, especially for the worship of foreign divinities brought to Athens by trade. But Plato used the common form (and its privileges) for his peculiar purposes.

One purpose of the Academy—as the association and its property came to be called—was to enable Plato to keep his teaching secret. There were some essential points on which he did not think it wise to commit his thoughts to writing. Therefore it is not possible to reconstruct with certainty what he taught in the Academy. But it is by his written works, not by his teaching in the Academy, that he has influenced all subsequent western philosophical and
theological thought. In that influence three major elements are clear:

First there is the method of question and answer, which analyzes every discussion to a structure of specific points, each of which must be established or attacked by definite arguments. This leads both to study of the forms of argument and to systematic treatment of philosophic problems, tendencies of which the consequences will be apparent in Plato's pupil, Aristotle. It also plays a large part in rationalistic criticism of established forms of behavior and common notions of the gods, the destructive side of Plato's thought, which contributed much to the formation of the hellenistic temper and, later, of Jewish and Christian attacks on paganism.

Second there is the dualism. For Plato there were two worlds, one of physical objects in constant change, the other of unchanging forms. Change and the changeless were united in every physical object: a river was unchangingly a river because of its form, yet was constantly changing, so that no precise statement as to its volume or shape could ever be true long enough to be made. You could know exactly what "a river" was, because you knew the form; you could never know exactly one particular river, because it did not cease changing while you learned it. Since what is known must be, the world of forms, the knowable world, was also the world of being, the world of the mind, the world of light and beauty, the concern of the philosopher. But the world of physical objects was the world of change, therefore of ignorance and darkness, the world of the body, the concern of the vulgar craftsman. Therefore the philosopher was to train himself to neglect the body and look at the true beauty of forms and their
relationships. Since physical pleasures concentrate our attention on bodies and make us concerned about them, the philosopher was to avoid such pleasures; his life was to be devoted to disengaging himself from the body, to developing his awareness of forms. Here the asceticism already seen in Sparta and in Socrates was justified by a metaphysical system which created an "other world" of eternal forms, quite different from the "other world" of the gods on Mount Olympus. Plato tried to fuse these two realms of better beings, and subsequent attempts appear in such theologies as make some deity at once a form and a person—at once something, like Being or Truth or Love, and Somebody, who is and speaks and loves.

Third there is the literary art and the poetry: much Greek philosophical writing shows influence by Plato's style, notably by his vocabulary and his metaphors, for instance, his description of philosophy as initiation into a mystery. Of his literary devices the dialogue was often used, but even more important were the myths to which he resorted when he would not or could not state his beliefs clearly. In these myths Plato the poet was free to speak. He spoke especially of the immortality of the soul and often drew on Orphic fantasies about an afterlife of rewards and punishments. The incorporation of such material in the works of Plato gave it a prestige and perpetuity it otherwise would never have enjoyed. Akin to the myths are the imaginative creations, notably the ideal state described in the Republic and the figure of Socrates. The ideal state turned out to be a modified Sparta ruled by an idealized Plato. It has been a source of inspiration for political reformers, especially totalitarians, even since. Perhaps Plato's most pernicious contribution to western civilization was the
Disintegration

notion that true freedom is freedom to do what you ought; this enables advocates of almost any restraints to claim they are defending the “true” freedom of their victims. The figure of Socrates created by Plato was basically the real Socrates, but made to teach Platonic metaphysics and perhaps chastened to accord with its teaching. It exercised a wide influence as a moral example, especially through the dialogues dealing with Socrates’ trial, imprisonment, and death, which began the formation of the figure of the martyr, important in Christianity and Judaism.

By the many sides of his genius, Plato stood apart from the specialists characteristic of the fourth century. Yet in his works he continually pleaded for specialization. Dialogue after dialogue contains the argument: if you wanted to know about some physical object you would consult an expert, therefore in moral and philosophical questions you should also consult an expert—a philosopher. But the philosopher, although a specialist, was not yet a professional—Socrates had attempted to separate himself from the sophists by insisting on his amateur standing; Plato’s private fortune enabled him to follow this tradition.

Plato’s pupil Aristotle became the outstanding example of the professional philosopher, and his most important achievement was to lay the basis for what may be called the general theory of specialization. The existence of specialists raises the problem of the relationship of their specialties. The solution to this problem must be a systematic account of all knowledge, an account which leaves the details of the particular fields to specialists, but describes the essential content of each field and its place in the general structure of what is known. In this way the intellectual and cultural disintegration of the fourth cen-
tery led to a new and larger synthesis, as the political dis-
integration led to a new and larger political unit. But in
the intellectual field the progress was slow. Aristotle did
not produce the synthesis needed, but he prepared for it
by his classification of the ways in which objects can differ
(hence, the categories of knowledge), by his study of the
nature of definition and of proof, by his detailed accounts
of a number of fields of knowledge (logic, metaphysics,
physics, zoology, psychology, ethics, political theory, rhet-
oric), and by his creation of much scientific terminology.
His works show the technical development characteristic
of the age; it was doubtless their technicality which limited
their influence. As times grew more troubled, men needed
direct and simple solutions to the problems of life. There-
fore the influence of Aristotle's works was felt chiefly
within a small circle of his students who established a
school in the legal form of a corporation for the worship
of the Muses, on the model of Plato's Academy. The
Aristotelian school, which came to be called the Lyceum,
led a rather obscure existence. Not until the Middle Ages
were Aristotle's classifications to become the blueprints
of the structure of learning.