understand his mystic evangelic, anarchic-individualistic bias - so suggestive of early Christianity - causing him to see the historic development as carried along by the few great men. Repeatedly Toynbee propounds that a society is only "an intelligible field of study" and "the common ground between the respective fields of action of a number of individual souls"[40]. In the last analysis, societies, groups, and institutions are reduced to human relations and to human individuals[41]. All attainments and creations, in his opinion, are based upon the work of the few "creative personalities", chiefly the great mystics and saints[42]. Under Bergson's influence, Toynbee proceeds to contrast the so-called creative individual or creative minority with the vast masses, uncreative and imitating. In the case of the martyr, Toynbee nearly carries his own argument to absurdity admitting that even the martyr is generally imitating a preceding martyr and therefore is uncreative. The only creative deed that, in the end, finds recognition is that of the "protomartyr"[43]. As for the mystics and saints, this reasoning would logically lead to the hypothesis that only the "protosaint" and "protomartyr" are genuinely creative. It is fortunate that such excess of speculation finds its check in the scholarly part of Toynbee's self, which strives to discover historic laws of development and is well aware of the historico-social roots of the so-called natural aptitudes[44]. In a number of general statements and exceedingly convincing concrete analyses, the empiricist refutes the metaphysician, describing how creativeness, in its historic appearance, function, and distribution is dependent on the given situation. Here, creative historic achievement is shown to be the product of the society

---

40) Op.cit., Vol.1, p.147; Vol.3, p.222 ff., p.230, p.289; Vol.6, p.175.

41) Ibid., Vol.3, p.223, p.231; Vol.4, p.12.

42) Ibid., Vol.1, p.192, p.426; Vol.3, p.232 ff.,239 ff.,365 Note 1, p.373; Vol.5, p.34 ff., 36 Note 2. In many of his theoretical statements, Toynbee comes dangerously close to Pareto's conception of the elite as being a class supposed to dominate on account of inherited, biological aptitudes, a conception well refuted by Borkenau, op.cit., p.106 ff. If however on p.117 he asserts that, in Toynbee's theory, elites "are not treated as biological entities, but as social factors" he must have neglected Toynbee's theoretical statements under the impact of the rich historical material.

43) Toynbee, op.cit., Vol.5, p.379 ff., Note 3.

44) The extent of Toynbee's confusion in regard to the nature of creativeness is evident from his attitude towards Aristotle's thesis of the natural difference between slaves and freemen (Politics, book 1, chapter 5). Toynbee, op.cit., Vol.3, p.106, rejects this conception. In Note 1 on the same page he quotes "a great Western philosopher" (Bergson) as giving "a certain measure of support" to Aristotle. The quotation itself, however, reveals that for once Bergson contradicts Aristotle by maintaining that most frequently psychic dimorphism makes, at the same time, both masters and subjects of all of us. - For a critique of Bergson's "vagueness" on this point, cf. Coulborn, op.cit., p.136.