

# JOLCEL

JOURNAL OF LATIN COSMOPOLITANISM AND  
EUROPEAN LITERATURES.

## CURRENT CONTRIBUTION

Helena Bodin, “From Adam to Tsar’ Kosmos: Cosmopolitanism in Byzantine Tradition,” JOLCEL 5 (2021): 28–51. DOI: [10.21825/jolcel.v5i0.11455](https://doi.org/10.21825/jolcel.v5i0.11455).

\*

## NOTE

This contribution is part of a larger dialogue of three articles and one responding piece that form the current issue of JOLCEL. The other contributions are “Latin Cosmopolitanism and the Roman Empire” by Christoph Pieper (pp. 1–26) and “The Classics at World’s End. A VOC Secretary Reframes the Cape Khoi” by Tycho Maas (pp. 53–71). The response piece is “Thinking about Cosmopolitanism” by Theo D’haen (pp. 73–79).

\*

# From Adam to Tsar' Kosmos: Cosmopolitanism in the Byzantine Tradition

HELENA BODIN

*Stockholm University*

## ABSTRACT

Setting out from the short dialogue in which the Cynic philosopher Diogenes of Sinope, upon being asked “Where are you from?” replied “I am a citizen of the world” (a cosmopolitan), the purpose of this article is to explore cosmopolitanism in Byzantine tradition, which surpasses the actual empire in both space and time and includes even later Orthodox Christian practices. This is done by considering its significance for literary world-making within the framework of languages used in Byzantine tradition, most importantly Greek. Textual examples from the first centuries AD, of importance for later discussions in Byzantium, present Adam, Moses and Christian believers as citizens of the world (cosmopolitans). In subsequent examples from the twelfth century, Orthodox Christian monks are instead called citizens of heaven (ouranopolitans), and the Constantinopolitan writer John Tzetzes records the many languages of the capital of the empire, which often has been described as a cosmopolitan city. Furthermore, examples of hymnography, homilies, and icons from the Orthodox Christian celebration of Pentecost are examined. The Pentecostal miracle offers a multilingual event which unites and enlightens *kosmos* in contrast to the confusion of tongues in Babel. As a whole, the article is inspired by discussions of cosmopolitanism as a travelling concept and as a controversial concept that encompasses both unity and plurality. It is proposed that cosmopolitanism in Byzantine tradition borders between homogenising (monolingual) and heterogenising (multilingual) modes.

\*\*\*

The question “Where are you from?” marks the beginning of the conceptual history of cosmopolitanism. We know it from Diogenes Laertius' *Lives of Eminent Philosophers* (around AD 200), where he narrates the life of Diogenes of Sinope,

the Cynic.<sup>1</sup> Through his clever reply, “I am a citizen of the world [*kosmopolitēs*],” that is, a cosmopolitan, the Cynic avoided being associated with exile and created a new context of belonging that was larger than all thitherto imaginable communities, which at that time consisted of Greek *poleis* (cities or city-states).

The purpose of this article is to explore and discuss functions and meanings of cosmopolitanism in Byzantine tradition. My argument is inspired by Diogenes’ miniature dialogue with its single question and single reply, a dialogue which nevertheless covers a wide span of time. When the question was posed to Diogenes of Sinope in the fourth century BCE, it was already old. It echoes the somewhat longer enquiry, “Who are you and where are you from?,” which Odysseus—the traveller and trickster, regarded as a stranger—was repeatedly asked, and it functions like an epic question, one which arouses expectations of a narrative. Its reply is still viable at the turn of the third millennium, when Julia Kristeva, for example, declares “I am a cosmopolitan,” or when Kwame Anthony Appiah writes “we cosmopolitans” in his book on ethics in a world of strangers.<sup>2</sup> The question “Where are you from?” will therefore reoccur in several of the texts on which this article focuses. As will be demonstrated, the dialogue oscillates between two strategies, involving homogenising and monolingual as well as heterogenising and multilingual modes of cosmopolitan practices.

In the following exploration of cosmopolitanism, Byzantine tradition signifies not only the historical Byzantine Empire (325–1453) but, moreover, a tradition which is embraced by the whole so-called Byzantine Commonwealth.<sup>3</sup> It surpasses the actual empire in both space and time and includes even later Orthodox Christian practices. The discussion will be expanded from theoretical and historical perspectives which are grounded in world literature studies and involve recent theories on cosmopolitanism and literary world-making, necessarily including linguistic practices.<sup>4</sup> My particular intent is to consider the issue of cosmopolitanism within the framework of languages used in Byzantine tradition. Among them, Greek will be paramount, though Church Slavonic is also considered. The Greek examples referring to cosmopolitans primarily derive from a small number of Jewish-Hellene and Early Christian texts, dating back to the first centuries AD, which are listed in the digital library of Greek literature, *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. In addition, a few texts from the Middle Byzantine period are used as examples, and the Orthodox Christian celebration of Pentecost, with its festal icon and hymns, plays a particular role. In this way, various communicative situations and contexts

<sup>1</sup> “Asked where he came from, he said, ‘I am a citizen of the world’.” Diogenes Laertius, *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, Book 6, 63.3, 64–5.

<sup>2</sup> Kristeva, *Nations Without Nationalism*, 15; Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*, 63 and 144.

<sup>3</sup> The expression “the Byzantine Commonwealth” refers to Dimitri Obolensky’s seminal work *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe 500–1453*. For an updated discussion of Obolensky’s view, see Shepard, “The Byzantine Commonwealth 1000–1500,” with further references. On the Byzantine Commonwealth and Byzantine cosmopolitanism, focusing on Thessalonica, see Russell, *Literature and Culture in Late Byzantine Thessalonica*, 11–14.

<sup>4</sup> See the online presentation at [worldlit.se](http://worldlit.se) of the Swedish research programme “World Literatures: Cosmopolitan and Vernacular Dynamics” (2016–2021), in which I am a participant. This article benefits from the theoretical groundings of my ongoing sub-project on Constantinople around 1900 as a literary world, as well as from my earlier research on the reception of Byzantine culture.

involving potential cosmopolitans as well as mono- or multilingual practices will be more important for this exploration than the abstract ‘-ism’.<sup>5</sup> As the selected texts exemplify conceptions of the world—the Byzantine *kosmos*—they are important for the significance of cosmopolitanism, and thereby for the immanent world-making of these texts as well.

This means that I will not address cosmopolitanism as it is known in Europe from the Early Modern period, the Enlightenment, the Grand Tour, or the nationalism of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, this article involves philosophical as well as theological aspects, based on established etymological and philological definitions of *kosmos*, cosmopolitan, cosmopolitanism, and world. From the point of view of conceptual history, Rebecka Lettevall and Kristian Petrov discuss cosmopolitanism as “a controversial concept that dialectically indicates as well as constructs the world,” treating it “not only as an empirical concept but also as an analytical tool.”<sup>6</sup> In a similar way, the RELICS research network has decided to consider cosmopolitanism as a *travelling concept*, that is, a concept which not only travels between academic discourses but which has the ability to change the very objects it analyses.<sup>7</sup> Against this background, this article proposes that cosmopolitanism may be operationalised not only as a travelling concept but furthermore as a concept without fixed values, one that *borders on* homogenising and monolingual modes, on the one hand, and heterogenising and multilingual modes, as these are practiced in Byzantine tradition, on the other hand.<sup>8</sup>

## 1 Historical and Byzantine approaches to cosmopolitanism

What does it mean, then, to declare oneself a cosmopolitan, as Diogenes of Sinope did? Considering what cosmopolitanism indicates and constructs, and how it changes in its capacity as a travelling concept, it could hardly mean the same to him or his namesake Diogenes Laertius, some five hundred years later, as it does to us today. In what ways does it matter which *kosmos* one refers to, in which *polis* one is a citizen, in which time one lives, what language one speaks?<sup>9</sup> Since there are a multitude of potential worlds and citizenships throughout the history of

<sup>5</sup> Due to my intention to discuss occurrences and uses of certain words and notions as examples of various conceptions of cosmopolitanism, texts in Greek will be quoted in English translations with insertions of the individual important words in transliterated Greek. Aside from the texts listed in *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>, some of the selected texts are part of consistent liturgical practices within the Orthodox Church. In these cases, as well, I quote English translations, often easily accessed on the internet, and references to editions of the source texts in Greek are always presented in the footnotes. See n. 61.

<sup>6</sup> Lettevall and Petrov, “Toward a Critique of Cosmopolitan Reason,” 9 and 6.

<sup>7</sup> See the abstract for the workshop “Mapping Cosmopolitanism” at Ghent University, arranged by RELICS in May 2018, 2020, <https://relicsresearch.com/events/mapping-cosmopolitanism/>. The article is based on my lecture at this workshop. For “travelling concept”, see Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide* and Neumann, Nünning and Horn, *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*.

<sup>8</sup> For a presentation and thorough exploration of several border concepts and their intersections in aesthetic studies, see Schimanski and Wolfe, *Border Aesthetics: Concepts and Intersections*, especially the introduction by Rosello and Wolfe, 1–24, and the conclusion by the editors, 147–70, with further references.

<sup>9</sup> Similar questions are posed by Lettevall and Petrov, “Toward a Critique of Cosmopolitan Reason,” 3.

cosmopolitanism, there is reason to speak about several different cosmopolitanisms—in the plural—, as literary scholars Bruce Robbins and Paulo Lemos Horta do in their volume on contemporary cosmopolitanisms, even when studying historical examples of texts.<sup>10</sup>

Popular presentations of the Byzantine Empire like to describe it as cosmopolitan, perhaps as a means to emphasise such features as are easily shared with contemporary, western readers. Judith Herrin has dedicated a whole chapter of her widely translated book on Byzantium to the question of “A Cosmopolitan Society.”<sup>11</sup> Due to the empire’s many diverse ethnic groups in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, she highlights its cosmopolitan mixing and emphasises that Byzantium was always an empire rather than a nation: to be a Byzantine citizen was to pay taxes and benefit from the empire’s protection and its law.<sup>12</sup> As is well-known, the citizens of the Byzantine (or Eastern Roman) Empire regarded themselves as Romans, as heirs to the Roman Empire, though their language was mainly Greek—thus, they were *Romaioi*.<sup>13</sup>

Herrin particularly mentions the cosmopolitan character of the empire’s capital, Constantinople.<sup>14</sup> Other scholars have described Constantinople similarly: in the medieval period, it was “the largest and the richest city known to Europeans; it was the city *par excellence*, ten times more populous than any Western rival, a cosmopolitan city.”<sup>15</sup> The many special names Constantinople was given in different languages testify to its cosmopolitan character as well. A few examples are *Kostantiniyye* in Arabo-Persian and Ottoman Turkish, *Tsar’grad* (Царьград) in Slavonic, and *Miklagarðr* in Old Norse. An exploration of Byzantine Constantinople, with its many spoken languages, seems therefore to resonate with what Stephanos Stephanides and Stavros Karayanni describe as the ambition of their edited volume *Vernacular Worlds, Cosmopolitan Imagination* (2015): “to view the vernacular and the cosmopolitan as unstable overlapping categories located within the specificity of place.”<sup>16</sup> As we will see, cosmopolitanism in the Byzantine (and Constantinopolitan) case borders on different linguistic practices.

John Tzetzes, a twelfth-century Byzantine writer of Georgian origin, demonstrates his skill in the many languages of the city in one part of the epilogue to his *Theogony*, written in Greek and dedicated to a royal lady, the *sebastokratissa* Eirene.<sup>17</sup> Though there is no explicit mention of cosmopolitanism in this text, it is intriguing that the question that once was directed to Diogenes of Sinope—

<sup>10</sup> Robbins and Horta, *Cosmopolitanisms*.

<sup>11</sup> Herrin, *Byzantium*, 242–51.

<sup>12</sup> Herrin, *Byzantium*, 251.

<sup>13</sup> The name Byzantium was itself not used as long as the empire existed and is therefore a retronym and an exonym, a later Western designation for the empire, see further Bodin, “Whose Byzantinism—Ours or Theirs?”, 17.

<sup>14</sup> Herrin, *Byzantium*, 250.

<sup>15</sup> Melling, “Constantinople,” 127. See also Magdalino, “Byzantium = Constantinople,” 43–54.

<sup>16</sup> Stephanides and Karayanni, “Introduction: Vernacular Worlds, Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Intimate Estrangement of Homecoming,” xiii.

<sup>17</sup> Agapitos, “John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners,” 36–38. The epilogue is rendered in Greek as well as in English translation at pp. 39–48. For earlier editions and translations, see Agapitos’ rich footnotes at p. 39.

where are you from?—is the same one as Tzetzes activates to show off (and sell) his multilingual skills.<sup>18</sup> The languages he uses may be characterised as foreign, but in the context of this exploration of Byzantine cosmopolitanism and its linguistic practices, the point is rather that they were all spoken in Constantinople. Tzetzes seems to be friendly, or perhaps unctuous, to everyone he meets:

You will find me to be a Scythian among Scythians, a Latin among Latins,  
and among all other nations being like one of their race.

[...]

The Latin I address according to the Latin language:

[...]

*"From where are you and from what province have you come?"*

Unde es et de quale provincia venesti?<sup>19</sup>

Tzetzes also directs his question—where are you from?—to the groups he calls Persians (Seljuks) and Alans (speaking Old Ossetian), each "according to their language":

To the Persians in Persian I speak thus:

*"Good day to you my brother, where are you going, from where are you, friend?"*

Asan khais kuruparza khaneazar kharandasi [garu barsa? Xanta(n) ä(r)sär? garindaš]?

[...]

To the Alans I speak according to their language:

*"Good day, my master, my lady, from where are you?"*

Tapankhas mesfili khsina korthi kanda, and the rest.<sup>20</sup>

To the Arabs as well, Tzetzes speaks "Arabically" to ask the repeated question "where are you from", and he welcomes even Russians in their own language.<sup>21</sup> Jews are the only ones he insults—in an ironically "fitting" way, that is, in Hebrew—according to standard medieval anti-Semitism.<sup>22</sup> Finally, Tzetzes boasts about his proficiency: "In this manner I address everyone with useful and appropriate words, / knowing this to be the work of the best disposition."<sup>23</sup> If Tzetzes' epilogue is regarded against the background of the short dialogue in which Diogenes of Sinope once replied that he was a cosmopolitan, the difference between them appears clearly. While the earlier dialogue was pursued in Greek, without any change of language, Tzetzes works instead within a cosmopolitan, multilingual

<sup>18</sup> For an analysis of Tzetzes' self-presenting, self-legitimising and self-protecting practices, see Pizzone, "The *Historiai* of John Tzetzes: a Byzantine 'Book of Memory'?"

<sup>19</sup> Agapitos, "John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners," 45 (lines 765–66, 774, 777–78). "Scythian" refers to Cuman, a Turkish language, see p. 39. While Agapitos' translation renders the foreign languages in Greek letters, exactly as in the manuscript, I have instead chosen to quote these lines in Roman letters from the transcription in the translation by Kazhdan and Wharton Epstein, *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*, 259.

<sup>20</sup> Agapitos, "John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners," 45 (lines 771–73, 783–85). For Seljuk and Old Ossetian, see p. 39.

<sup>21</sup> Agapitos, "John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners," 45 (lines 788–89 and 791–93). In this case, "Russians" refer to the Rus (living in Rus and speaking a Slavonic language), as in the Greek text at p. 42.

<sup>22</sup> Agapitos, "John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners," 45 (lines 794–98).

<sup>23</sup> Agapitos, "John Tzetzes and the blemish examiners," 45 (lines 799–800).

setting in which the question is posed in numerous languages, all of them used in Constantinople.<sup>24</sup>

As Herrin puts it, the Byzantine imperial structure “could accommodate much diversity, provided it was loyal,” thanks to its confidence in its own political and social organization.<sup>25</sup> In a note that takes us back to the Homeric *Odyssey* and its epic question about origins, she writes that “Byzantium never lost its Homeric world-view of migration and hospitality to strangers.”<sup>26</sup> Herrin’s characterisation of Byzantium as a cosmopolitan society, because of its imperial features, seems to tie in with the view of the editors of *Cosmopolitanism and Empire* (2016). Myles Lavan, Richard E. Payne, and John Weisweiler write in their introduction that the practice of cosmopolitanism “translated the fundamental problem of distance and difference into assets, by facilitating the exploitation of ever larger populations and territories.”<sup>27</sup> Their subsequent critical reflections are still more helpful for the study of cosmopolitanism from historical and literary perspectives, as they remark that the term cosmopolitan “performs little analytical work in ancient historiography” and describes it as a problematic instance of presentism:

The label tends to characterise the openness of a culture to the commodities and ideas of outsiders, or simply its comparative diversity. It is almost always a compliment, a sign that a particular ancient society practiced the same values we—the implied readers of such studies—espouse.<sup>28</sup>

For purposes of historical analysis, therefore, they suggest a “more rigorous use of the term.”<sup>29</sup> Their proposed definition, which I find productive, is that cosmopolitanism is “theoretical universalism in practice”: “Cosmopolitanism designates a complex of practices and ideals that enabled certain individuals not only to cross cultural boundaries but also to establish an enduring normative framework across them.”<sup>30</sup>

There is a striking similarity between this definition, intended to be valid for historical analyses of cosmopolitanism, and Appiah’s current, ethically grounded definition of the notion, which reads “universality plus difference”—“in a slogan,” as he puts it.<sup>31</sup> Needless to say, such a combination of universality and difference is not a contested explication of cosmopolitanism. It is also presented in dictionaries, where it is said that ‘cosmopolitan’ and its derivative cosmopolitanism may include people from many different countries or be associated with travel and a mixture of cultures. The concept thus contains aspects of both unity and plurality,

<sup>24</sup> Even after its conquest by the Ottomans in 1453, Constantinople remained what Philip Mansel, in his famous book *Constantinople: City of the World’s Desire, 1453–1924*, has described as “a world city” (p. 7). He dubs it the “only multinational capital in Europe,” “a city which defied nationalism” (p. 20). It remained multilingual until the language reform of the Turkish Republic in 1928. For Constantinople around 1900 as a multilingual literary world, see Bodin, “The clamour of Babel, in all the tongues of the Levant’.”

<sup>25</sup> Herrin, *Byzantium*, 248.

<sup>26</sup> Herrin, *Byzantium*, 251.

<sup>27</sup> Lavan, Payne, and Weisweiler, “Cosmopolitan Politics,” 28.

<sup>28</sup> Lavan, Payne, and Weisweiler, “Cosmopolitan Politics,” 9.

<sup>29</sup> Lavan, Payne, and Weisweiler, “Cosmopolitan Politics,” 10.

<sup>30</sup> Lavan, Payne, and Weisweiler, “Cosmopolitan Politics,” 10.

<sup>31</sup> Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*, 151.

aspects that will prove productive to examine yet further in Byzantine tradition, in particular with respect to their interrelation with different linguistic practices.

In his study *An Ecology of World Literature* (2015), which spans from antiquity to the present day, Alexander Beecroft describes and discusses the history and conditions of world literature in terms of ecologies, setting out from the precondition that literature is necessarily made out of language.<sup>32</sup> He calls one such ecology cosmopolitan and declares that it is found "wherever a single literary language is used over a large territorial range and through a long period of time."<sup>33</sup> Greek is one of the languages that Beecroft considers to be cosmopolitan, in the Hellenistic culture (under Roman rule) as well as in Constantinople (within the Byzantine Empire).<sup>34</sup>

However, Greek was not just the language of Byzantine literature but also one of the languages in which poetic texts for liturgical use were produced within the Eastern and Orthodox churches. They comprise an enormous and variegated corpus which, as a salient part of Byzantine tradition, specifically its cultural and literary heritage, cannot be neglected. Due to the imaginative, performative, and expressive features of these texts, they may be regarded as "workly" texts.<sup>35</sup> Within the Eastern and Orthodox churches, however, there was never any single language that functioned like Latin in the Western, Roman Catholic Church. Thus for liturgical use, Greek has never been equivalent to Latin as the preferred or single church language. Instead, besides koine Greek, different regional languages such as Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, Georgian, and Slavonic were used for liturgical purposes—that is, for all kinds of liturgical texts such as prayers, hymns and homilies, as well as for translations of the Bible texts. Over several hundred years, however, these languages have hardened into fixed church languages, which for contemporary users today are perhaps reminiscent of a particular holy dialect or solemn linguistic variety, one exclusively associated with liturgical celebration according to received tradition.

By regarding Greek as a cosmopolitan language and literature, and by explicitly mentioning Byzantine Constantinople, Beecroft completes and corrects both Pascale Casanova's and Sheldon Pollock's earlier studies on similar themes.<sup>36</sup> I agree with Beecroft on Greek as a third cosmopolitan language for literary use, but since the situation in Byzantium and in the Eastern Churches was not monolingual but multilingual, I would like to emphasise that Greek influenced a much larger area than where it was spoken. This was done by means of translations, which often and typically were calques, and cultural transfers all over the so-called Byzantine Commonwealth. In this respect one could say that Greek as a cosmopolitan language, rather than being "single," as Beecroft puts it, was one that multiplied its effects in translations.

<sup>32</sup> Beecroft, *An Ecology of World Literature*, 3.

<sup>33</sup> Beecroft, *An Ecology of World Literature*, 34.

<sup>34</sup> Beecroft, *An Ecology of World Literature*, 101–144.

<sup>35</sup> For such "workly" texts, see Pollock, *The Language of Gods in the World of Men*, 3, 283, et passim (drawing on Heidegger); see also Beecroft, *An Ecology of World Literature*, 105.

<sup>36</sup> Casanova, *The World Republic of Letters*, and Pollock, *The Language of Gods in the World of Men*.



## 2 World-making with words

Returning to Lettevall's and Petrov's introductory question, which cosmos did the Byzantine version of cosmopolitanism imply, and how big was it? Which meanings were evoked by the words for 'world' in two of the major Orthodox Christian languages, Greek and Slavonic? As we will see, both the Greek and Slavonic words provide holistic models for gaining a purchase on the world.

*Kosmos* was the word for world in Greek, while *oikoumenē* signified the totality of the known, inhabited world and *gē* designated the earth. *Kosmos* was conceived as the universe, comprising both heaven and earth, as was visually depicted in the famous illuminated manuscripts of Kosmas Indikopleustes' *Christian Topography* (6th c.).<sup>37</sup> Most importantly, *kosmos* included man and God. Both the Ancient Greek and the Christian *kosmos* were a world with human beings and gods or God, respectively, as its precondition. *Kosmos* signified good order or good behaviour, sharing its linguistic root with 'cosmetics' as adornment and a means of beautification. The world named *kosmos* was therefore viewed as a reality of unity, harmony and beauty.<sup>38</sup> In this respect, *kosmos* was also the opposite of *chaos*.<sup>39</sup> In the Septuagint translation from Hebrew to Greek (3rd–2nd c. BCE) the word *kosmos* was accordingly chosen to designate the wholeness of the fulfilled creation of heaven and earth by God (Gen 2:1).<sup>40</sup> *Kosmos* is also what the totality of the created world is called when John the Evangelist tells its new beginning in his prologue on Christ as Logos (John 1). Furthermore, it is used whenever the creation of the world is mentioned in the New Testament, when Christ says he is the light of the world (John 8:12), and in the Great Commission, where Christ sends forth the disciples by saying: "Go into all the world and proclaim the good news to the whole of creation" (Mark 16:15). Also, as we will see below, when celebrating Pentecost in the Orthodox Church, the seasonal hymns say that it is *kosmos* which is enlightened by the Holy Spirit's light.

The Slavic peoples, who lived in the area of today's Bulgaria, Belarus, Ukraine and Russia, in the region named *Rus'*, were Christianised in the late tenth century from Byzantium and received their Cyrillic alphabet as an adaptation of the Greek one. To match the new Christian vocabulary, many translations were required. An already existing Slavonic word, *mir*, was picked as the translation of *kosmos*, while the alternative word for world in Greek, *oikoumenē* (the inhabited world), was translated into Slavonic as *vselennaya* by means of a neologism, calqued on both parts of the Greek word. The word for world in Slavonic, *mir*, is indistinguishable in pronunciation from the word for peace. *Mir* is the created world but also what

<sup>37</sup> See further Kominko, *The World of Kosmas*, and Anderson, *Cosmos and Community in Early Medieval Art*, 107–149. For conceptions and representations of *kosmos* in Rus', see Caudano, "Let There Be Lights in the Firmament of Heaven."

<sup>38</sup> Karl-Heinz Uthemann, "Cosmos," 537.

<sup>39</sup> Lettevall and Petrov, "Toward a Critique of Cosmopolitan Reason," 3.

<sup>40</sup> See Runia's comment on Philo of Alexandria, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, viz. that Philo translates this passage as "when the heaven and earth and all their adornment [*kosmos*] were completed" (183). See also Runia's comment on the Septuagint's use of *kosmos* as "adornment applied to [the world's] parts" (266), and his emphasis that the relation between "adornment, order, rationality, and beauty is fundamental for Greek cosmology" (199).

the congregation hears when a Russian Orthodox priest says the blessing "*Mir vam*" ("Peace be with you"). Thus—at least for listeners—*mir* may cover the same meaning as *kosmos* in Greek: simultaneously world and peace, a world in order and harmony.

This wholeness of the world, implied by *kosmos* in Greek and *mir* in Slavonic, is further complicated by their equivalent in English, the word *world*, at least when its etymology is considered. The Latinate and Germanic origin of 'world' makes it also include the dimension of time, centred on man.<sup>41</sup> Since English is the working language of the present and many other discussions on cosmopolitanism, as well as on world literature and its world-making capacity, it does matter that the English word designates the world as the age of man, as the place where man and time coincide, thereby always implying a certain view-point.<sup>42</sup>

In this case, I rely on one of several holistic models deployed in literary and cultural studies (e.g., cultural semiotics, translation studies, world literature studies), presented and applied by Eric Hayot in *On Literary Worlds* (2012). When Hayot operationalises the word 'world' as an analytical tool, he sets out from Heidegger's *Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes* (*The Origin of the Work of Art*) but also from the English word's etymology, as noted above. Indeed, there is *the* world, comprising its supposed and singular whole, but—because of the coincidence of man and time in every single world—there are simultaneously also various worlds, in the plural, such as 'Homer's world,' 'the Byzantine world,' or 'our modern world.' 'World' signifies in this respect both the whole and its parts. When 'world' is operationalised for any kind of literary or cultural analysis, its inherent doubleness may be criticised for its indisputable ambiguity or vagueness, but, at the same time, this very quality may just as well be considered as an analytic resource. According to Hayot, the literary (or aesthetic) world—that is, the immanent world of a literary work—can be analysed, measured and described in relation to other, surrounding worlds, in order to gain knowledge about its potential particularity or generality. In this way, a certain literary world may deviate from or connect to literature from other epochs as well as relate in various ways to the un-narrated 'real' world which frames it, and where its readers live.<sup>43</sup>

In addition, I would like to emphasise that the peculiar holism of words for 'world' is first and foremost a phenomenon grounded in language, deeply immersed in the various languages engaging in literary world-making. The exploration of cosmopolitanism in Byzantine tradition has thereby gained yet another motive for examining its monolingual as well as multilingual modes. In the next section, our focus will be on homogenising and monolingual qualities of cosmopolitanism, before the following section on the many tongues of Pentecost turns to a more heterogenising literary world, comprising multilingual cosmopolitan practices.

<sup>41</sup> See Spira, "World': An Exploration of the Relationship between Conceptual History and Etymology," 27–39; for the etymology of the English word 'world,' see p. 32.

<sup>42</sup> Hayot, *On Literary Worlds*, 53.

<sup>43</sup> Hayot, *On Literary Worlds*, 42–47.

### 3 Adam, Moses, and Christians as cosmopolitans

Who, then, was a cosmopolitan in the Byzantine world conceived as a Greek *kosmos*—holistic, ordered, of beauty and harmony—and created as good by the one and only God, as both Jewish and Christian traditions have it? As we will see, in the Byzantine, Orthodox Christian tradition, Adam and Moses were suggested as cosmopolitans, as models for Christians, before there emerged in the Middle Byzantine period a distinction between citizens of the world and citizens of heaven.

Even though modern discussions on cosmopolitanism, such as those by Appiah or Martha Nussbaum,<sup>44</sup> tend to go back to the Stoics and sometimes involve even Socrates, it is only through source texts from later periods that we have any knowledge of their writings. Diogenes of Sinope's famous reply was reported by Diogenes Laertius as late as around AD 200. Mentions of cosmopolitans by the Hellenistic Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria are, however, somewhat earlier, dating from the first decades AD.

In Philo's books on *The Special Laws*, all virtues associated with the Stoics seem to be fulfilled by the cosmopolitans, who are "schooled to hold things indifferent as indeed indifferent" and who live close to nature in many different respects. Being "true 'cosmopolitans,'" they have "recognized the world [*kosmos*] to be a city having for its citizens the associates of wisdom."<sup>45</sup> In accordance with leading Stoic ideas about "living according to nature" and the "world-citizen," Philo also underlines the importance of the law. This is done from the very beginning of his *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, in which he engages with the first chapter of Genesis. The translator, David T. Runia, has in this case rendered the Greek word *kosmos* as the English *cosmos*: "[T]he man who observes the law is at once a citizen of the cosmos, directing his actions in relation to the rational purpose of nature, in accordance with which the entire cosmos also is administered."<sup>46</sup> Philo's first example of such a life is the creation of Adam:

If we describe that original ancestor not only as the first human being, but also as the only real citizen of the cosmos, we shall be telling the absolute truth. The cosmos was his home and city [...]. He resided in the cosmos [...] like in his native land [...].<sup>47</sup>

Philo's view of Adam as a cosmopolitan should, however, be regarded as original, rather than as a quotation from earlier Stoics.<sup>48</sup>

The cosmopolitan and his adherence to the law return in Philo's two books *On the Life of Moses*, in which he says that the good man "is a world citizen

<sup>44</sup> Appiah, *Cosmopolitanism*; Nussbaum, "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism."

<sup>45</sup> Philo, *The Special Laws*, Book II, XII–XIII, section 45–46, 336–37.

<sup>46</sup> Philo, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, ch.1, §3 (p. 47). Runia emphasises in his commentary that Philo uses *kosmopolitēs* positively (p. 103).

<sup>47</sup> Philo, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, ch. 19, §142 (p. 84). See also Runia's comment about the cosmopolitan ideals as fulfilled by Adam (p. 339).

<sup>48</sup> Passages in Philo of Alexandria which have been attributed to the Stoic Chrysippus (3rd c. BCE) are probably incorrect, according to Martens, *One God, One Law*, 137: When "Philo's discussion of Adam is attracted to the Stoic ideal of the first man, the cosmopolitan", this "connection between Adam and the Stoic sage must have been made first by Philo or some other Jewish writer, not by Chrysippus."

[*kosmopolitēs*], and therefore not on the roll of any city of men's habitation, rightly so because he has received no mere piece of land but the whole world [*kosmos*] as his portion."<sup>49</sup> In another treatise, *On the Confusion of Tongues*, Philo explicitly presents Moses as one "who in virtue of his larger citizenship [*kosmopolitēs*] took the world [*kosmos*] for his township and country."<sup>50</sup>

The concept of Adam, the first man, and Moses, the law-giver, as cosmopolitans was thus established on Stoic grounds from early on in the Christian era by the Hellenistic Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, who was later widely studied in Byzantium.<sup>51</sup> Both Jews and early Christians could gain an understanding of their "original ancestor" Adam as a cosmopolitan, because before the Fall Adam was good, virtuous and wise, living close to nature—in short, he was behaving like an early Stoic. However, in the continued Christian tradition the role played by Adam changed, since according to allegorical interpretations of the Bible he also functions as a *typos* or *figura* of Christ. This broadens the view of who a cosmopolitan is. According to the Stoics, cosmopolitanism could "only include a few virtuous wise friends,"<sup>52</sup> but after the resurrection of Christ, Paul writes in the Epistle to the Ephesians (2:11, 19) that people of all nations, including those who were Gentiles by birth, can become "fellow citizens with the saints."

A few centuries later, the idea of Adam as a cosmopolitan resounded in *The Constitutions of the Holy Apostles*, a work of Syriac origin from the late fourth century. In various contexts, it describes man as the citizen of the world, for example when the creation of the world is retold in praise of God in a liturgical setting: "Thou hast not only created the world [*kosmos*] itself, but hast also made man for a citizen of the world [*kosmopolitēs*], exhibiting him as the ornament of the world [*kosmos*]."<sup>53</sup> The creation of man as a cosmopolitan is also recalled in prayers for the deceased: "And let the bishop say: O Thou [...] who didst make man a rational creature, the citizen of this world [*kosmopolitēs*]."<sup>54</sup> Similar phrasings are found in instructions before baptism: "Let him [the baptismal candidate] be instructed why the world [*kosmos*] was made, and why man was appointed to be a citizen [*kosmopolitēs*] therein; let him also know his own nature, of what sort it is."<sup>55</sup> Though these texts have mainly didactic and liturgical purposes, they nevertheless build up a literary world specifically characterised by the fact that man was appointed a cosmopolitan in the *kosmos* created by God, whose intention was not only to make him a citizen of the world but, with a wordplay on the cosmetic aspects of *kosmos*, to shape him "as the ornament of the world."

<sup>49</sup> Philo, *On the Life of Moses*, Book I, XXVIII, section 157, 356–7.

<sup>50</sup> Philo, *On the Confusion of Tongues*, XXII, section 106, 66–67.

<sup>51</sup> See Runia's commentary to Philo, *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*, "Excursus one: Law, cosmos, and nature", 106–7.

<sup>52</sup> Mitsis, "A Stoic Critique of Cosmopolitanism," 187.

<sup>53</sup> *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles: Book VIII. Concerning Gifts, and Ordinations, and the Ecclesiastical Canons*, ch. 12, section 16, in Roberts, Donaldson, and Coxe, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, 487. Greek text: *Les constitutions apostoliques. T. 3, Livres VII et VIII*, 184.

<sup>54</sup> *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles: Book VIII*, ch. 41, section 4, 497. Greek text: *Les constitutions apostoliques. T. 3, Livres VII et VIII*, 256.

<sup>55</sup> *Constitutions of the Holy Apostles: Book VII. Concerning the Christian Life, and the Eucharist, and the Initiation into Christ*, ch. 39, section 2, 475–6. Greek text: *Les constitutions apostoliques. T. 3, Livres VII et VIII*, 92.

Early Christians could however identify themselves as cosmopolitans from an existential point of view as well, that is, as strangers. Patristic sources within the Orthodox Christian tradition say that Christians are simultaneously citizens *and* strangers—they are guests on earth, travellers only staying overnight. A well-known example is the early Christian so-called *Epistle to Diognetus* (2nd c.):

[The Christians] live in their own homelands, but as resident aliens; they participate in all things as citizens, but endure all things as strangers. Every foreign country is their homeland but every homeland is a foreign country.<sup>56</sup>

It seems to be this understanding of the world as worldly, together with the striving for estrangement from the world, which later gains ground in Byzantine tradition, as Orthodox Christians saw the cosmos as doubled, perceiving its “external, material, eschatologically or ontologically transient character in contrast to the inner, spiritual, eternal life yet to come.”<sup>57</sup> When in the twelfth century the Byzantine scholar and Archbishop Eustathios of Thessalonike writes a treatise on the life of the monks, he apostrophises the monks and hermits as citizens of heaven (*ouranopolitēs*)—a Greek designation which perhaps could be Anglicised as *ouranopolitans*—thereby contrasting them with cosmopolitans as citizens of the world.<sup>58</sup> The monks had already chosen sides in life, so to speak, and no longer belonged to the worldly life. Thus Christians were not only living in the world as cosmopolitan strangers—as citizens of heaven, or *ouranopolitans*, they hearkened to a special address.

Here we can note a certain tendency to use the words *kosmos* and ‘cosmopolitan’ in another sense than in the earlier cases of Diogenes of Sinope, Adam, and Moses, in which it had been the narrow, local world that was opposed to the wholeness of the created, surrounding, wider world, which included heaven and was understood as the *kosmos* of the cosmopolitans. Henceforth it is instead the secular world, where cosmopolitans live and Christians reside as aliens and strangers, which is contrasted to the religious world, where the *ouranopolitans* live, as “fellow citizens with the saints.”<sup>59</sup> The topic of language(s) in connection to these cosmopolitans seems so far to be a non-issue, but if we turn to the *kosmos* that is engaged in at the celebration of Pentecost, various issues of languages and their rhetorical use instead form the main theme.

#### 4 The many tongues of Pentecost

*Kosmos* conceived as a worldly world, as opposed to the heavenly world, is a world with a multitude of languages. This aspect is thematised in the liturgical hymns and icons for the Orthodox Christian celebration of Pentecost. After the

<sup>56</sup> Dunning, *Aliens and Sojourners*, 65. Greek text: “Epistle to Diognetus”, ch. 5, section 5, in *The Apostolic Fathers, Volume II*, 139–40.

<sup>57</sup> Uthemann, “Cosmos,” 537.

<sup>58</sup> Eustathios of Thessalonike, *Eustathii Thessalonicensis De emendanda vita monachica*, 1.9 (p. 6); 130.1 (p. 146).

<sup>59</sup> Kleingeld and Brown, “Cosmopolitanism.”

confusion of tongues at the Tower of Babel, as narrated in Genesis 11, the Pentecostal miracle in Jerusalem meant the rehabilitation of the use of many different languages among the disciples gathered in the service of God:

Divided tongues, as of fire, appeared among them, and a tongue rested on each of them. All of them were filled with the Holy Spirit and began to speak in other languages, as the Spirit gave them ability.

Now there were devout Jews from every nation under heaven living in Jerusalem. And at this sound the crowd gathered and was bewildered, because each one heard them speaking in the native language of each. Amazed and astonished, they asked, "Are not all these who are speaking Galileans? And how is it that we hear, each of us, in our own native language? Parthians, Medes, Elamites, and residents of Mesopotamia, Judea and Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia, Egypt and the parts of Libya belonging to Cyrene, and visitors from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabs—in our own languages we hear them speaking about God's deeds of power."<sup>60</sup>

One of the liturgical hymns, a canon sung at matins of Pentecost, explicitly mentions the "strange tongues" spoken on this occasion, and further hymns for the celebration of Pentecost proclaim that the world—*kosmos*—is illumined by the light of the Holy Spirit (the Advocate): "The light of the Advocate has come and enlightened the world [*kosmos*]."<sup>61</sup>

This enlightening of the world constitutes yet one of the topics in an influential homily by John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople in the fourth century. He says that Peter's voice is like "a great light shining out in the dark," and that Peter with his voice "scattered the mist and darkness of the whole world [*oikoumenē*]."<sup>62</sup> Further, this elaborated comparison between enlightenment and darkness also addresses the difference between on the one hand the apostles, in particular Peter, who "utters his voice everywhere," and on the other Plato, who talked in the past but now is silent:

[...] without experience, without skill of the tongue, and in the condition of quite ordinary men, matched against juggling conjurors, against impostors, against the whole throng of sophists, of rhetoricians, of philosophers grown mouldy in the Academy and the walks of the Peripatetics, against all these they [the Apostles] fought the battle out. And the man [Peter] whose occupation had been about lakes, so mastered them, as if it cost him not so much ado as even a contest with dumb fishes: for just as if the opponents he had to outwit were indeed more mute than fishes, so easily did he get the better of them! And Plato, that talked a deal of nonsense in his day, is silent now, while this man utters his voice everywhere; not among his own countrymen alone, but also among Parthians, and Medes, and Elamites, and in India, and in every part of the earth [*gē*], and to the extremities of the world [*oikoumenē*]. Where now is Greece, with her big pretensions? Where the name of Athens? Where the ravings of

<sup>60</sup> Acts 2:3–11.

<sup>61</sup> *Pentecostarion*, Matins of Pentecost, the canon by "Kyr John Arklas", tone 4, ode 4, troparion, and sessional hymn, tone 4. See also, from the same service, the canon by the Monk Kosmas, tone 7, ode 1, troparion: "As you promised your Disciples of old, you have sent forth the Advocate Spirit in deed, O Christ, and shed light on the world [*kosmos*], O Lover of mankind." The hymns quoted from the celebration of Pentecost are found in the *Pentecostarion*, available online in Greek (Πεντηκοστήριον). English translations by Archimandrite Ephrem are quoted from the *Pentecostarion* at his website Anastasis.

<sup>62</sup> John Chrysostom, "Homily IV (Acts 2:1–2);" Greek text in Migne, vol. LX, col. 47.

the philosophers? He of Galilee, he of Bethsaida, he, the uncouth rustic, has overcome them all.<sup>63</sup>

While *kosmos* was the word used to signify the totality upon which the Holy Spirit shed light in the Pentecostal hymn quoted earlier, the homily uses instead the designations *oikoumenē* (the inhabited world) and *gē* (the earth) to describe the more delimited outreach of Peter's voice. According to John Chrysostom, the Pentecost miracle concerned not only the use of various native languages, but also a new distribution of the "skill of the tongue," so that Greek sophists, rhetoricians and philosophers were overcome by the voices of ordinary men, of fishermen from Galilee without rhetorical experience but speaking other languages. Such a comparison between the eloquence of the apostles and the silence of Plato and other philosophers later becomes a favoured topic which recurs in several liturgical hymns.

One elaborate example is the kontakion on Pentecost by Romanos the Melodist, first performed in Constantinople in the first half of the sixth century as a sung sermon with a recurring refrain (rendered in italics, below). Its *prooimion*, which presents the feast's theme and is still sung today at matins of Pentecost, underlines the effect of unity, accomplished by the many tongues, in which the apostles are paradoxically speaking with one voice, and contrasts it with the earlier confusion of tongues in Babel:

When the Most High came down he confused the tongues, divided the nations; but when he parted the tongues of fire, he called all to unity, and with one voice we glorify *the All-Holy Spirit*.<sup>64</sup>

In a wordplay on fish, fishermen and webs which elaborates further on the contrasts developed by John Chrysostom in his homily, the disciples, being unlearned fishermen, are then portrayed by Romanos the Melodist as orators. It is now the former fishermen who, having overcome the Greek philosophers and rhetoricians, "unravel the webs of orators." Next, the famous Greeks—among them Plato, Demosthenes, Homer, and Pythagoras—are outplayed by the simplicity of the fishermen, who "overcome all through the tongues they speak":

Now those who before were fishermen have become skilled  
speakers. Now those who once  
stood by the shores of lakes are orators, and clear ones.  
Those who previously used to mend their nets  
now unravel the webs of orators and make them worthless with  
simpler utterances.  
For they speak one Word, instead of many,  
they proclaim one God, not one of many.  
The One as one they worship, a Father beyond understanding,  
a Son consubstantial and inseparable, and like to them

<sup>63</sup> John Chrysostom, "Homily IV (Acts 2:1–2)," 29.

<sup>64</sup> *Pentecostarion*, Matins of Pentecost, kontakion.

*the All-Holy Spirit.*

Was it not then given them to overcome all through the tongues  
they speak?

And why do the fools outside strive for victory?

Why do the Greeks puff and buzz?

Why are they deceived by Aratos the thrice accursed? Why err like  
wandering planets to Plato?

Why do they love debilitated Demosthenes?

Why do they not consider Homer a chimera?

Why do they go on about Pythagoras, who were better muzzled?

Why do they not run believing to those to whom has appeared  
*the All-Holy Spirit.*<sup>65</sup>

If Romanos the Melodist in this case considers Homer a chimera, another illusion is that any Byzantine preacher or singer—be he the Archbishop of Constantinople or the Melodist himself—could have managed without “the Greeks” and their sophisticated eloquence. In the hands of the Cappadocian Fathers in the fourth century, the Greek language became a rhetorically sharpened tool for confessional Christian texts, as well. The paradox which made it possible for preachers and hymnographers to misrepresent and leave “the Greeks” behind while continuing to write and speak in Greek is that Pentecost caused “one Word”—the *Logos* as Christ—to be spoken consistently, though in many different languages. If the narration and praise of the Pentecostal miracle in the Acts, hymns and homilies are read as parts of one single literary world, that world would to a great extent be characterised by its issue with the Greek language and education, resulting in the praise—though, ironically, still in Greek—of unskilled tongues speaking “one Word” in a multitude of languages.

*Kosmos* and the many languages of Pentecost are also present in the iconography of Pentecost, as it receives a new design in the Middle Byzantine period. From early on, it depicted the Virgin or the *Theotokos* (the God-bearer or Mother of God) sitting surrounded by the disciples (according to Acts 1:14), and there were also examples where people from the nations mentioned (such as “Parthians, Medes, Elamites,” Acts 2:9) were present. But from the ninth and tenth century the *Theotokos* is replaced, or supplemented, by a new character, an old man who is set in the darkness below the group of apostles.<sup>66</sup> He is dressed and crowned like a Byzantine noble, and his name, inscribed in Greek, is *Kosmos*.

The traditional Greek manual for icon painters, the *Hermeneia* by Dionysius of Fourni (1730–1734), which instructs on how to paint standard iconographies, describes the whole scene of the icon as “the descent of the Holy Spirit”, including the old man and his name:

<sup>65</sup> Romanos the Melodist, “Kontakion on Pentecost,” oikos 16–17 (p. 215). Greek text: Romanos le Mélode, “XLIX. La Pentecôte,” 202–6.

<sup>66</sup> Réau, “La Pentecôte,” for “Le cosmos,” see 595; Ouspensky, “Quelques considérations au sujet de l’iconographie de la Pentecôte,” 57–59; Grabar, “Le schéma iconographique de la Pentecôte”; Ouspensky and Lossky, “The Descent of the Holy Spirit,” 206–8.



A house; the twelve apostles are sitting in a circle. Below them is a small chamber in which an old man holds before him in his hands, which are covered by the veil, twelve rolled scrolls; he wears a crown on his head, and over him these words are written: The World. Above the house is the Holy Spirit in the form of a dove; a great light surrounds it, and twelve tongues of flame come down from it and rest on each of the apostles.<sup>67</sup>



Figure 1: Contours of the Pentecost iconography. Source: Phōtēs Kontoglou, *Ekphrasis tēs orthodoxou eikonographias. T. 1, Technologikon kai eikonographikon* (Athēnai: Astēr 1960), 184.

In this iconography of the descent of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, the old man named *Kosmos* is clearly an allegorical personification of the world. As Leonid

<sup>67</sup> Dionysius of Fournā, *The 'Painter's Manual' of Dionysius of Fournā*, 40. The commentary (p. 103) says that the twelve scrolls correspond to the preaching of the twelve apostles. For a fuller theological interpretation of the Pentecost iconography, see Lemopoulos, "The Icon of Pentecost: A Liturgical Bible Study on Acts 2:1–4," 92–97.



Figure 2: Russian Pentecost icon, c. 1497. Kirillo-Belozersky Monastery. Public domain: [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Pentecost\\_\(Kirillo-Belozersk\).jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Pentecost_(Kirillo-Belozersk).jpg).

Ouspensky remarks, because of the liturgical and theological content of the icon, the world’s wholeness cannot in this case be sufficiently represented by its parts—the various peoples and nations as mentioned in the Acts — and it is therefore better expressed by an allegory.<sup>68</sup> Since the twelve scrolls that the old man *Kosmos* holds traditionally represent the coming preaching of the apostles, the many languages of the world, of the enlightened *kosmos*, are also depicted in the icon.

It is tempting to speculate as to what languages they are written in, since their script is not visible, but Romanos the Melodist mentions several of them in his kontakion on Pentecost, which in this respect brings to mind John Tzetzes’ greetings in the many languages of Constantinople several hundred years later. According to Romanos, elaborating on the passage from the Acts, the apostles speak:

to the Romans not as foreigners, to the Parthians like themselves and to the Medes as their own. To the Elamites they appeared to be speaking well and clearly, to the

<sup>68</sup> Ouspensky, “Quelques considérations,” 83. For a detailed description of the Kosmos-figure, see Ouspensky and Lossky, *The Meaning of Icons*, 208, quoting Pokrovsky (1892).

Arabs they were immediately their kin. To Asians and Phrygians they spoke clearly and distinctly and to all the nations they were speaking [...]<sup>69</sup>

When this image of the personified *kosmos* with the many scrolls spread in the Byzantine Commonwealth in the Middle Byzantine period, the Byzantine noble retained his Greek name in the Russian Orthodox context, as well. Although it is neither translated, nor rendered in Greek in any inscription in the Russian icons, he may be mentioned as *Tsar' Kosmos*, that is, in a mix of Slavonic and Greek.<sup>70</sup>

The Orthodox Christian celebration of Pentecost in hymns, homilies and icons offers in this way a rich material for reflections on the linguistic aspects of Byzantine cosmopolitanism. It has been a long way from Adam and Moses as cosmopolitans, fulfilling Stoic ideals, to *Tsar' Kosmos* dressed as a Byzantine noble, placed in the darkness of the world and prepared with the old-fashioned scrolls of the apostles' preachings in various languages. Yet, all of them—Adam, Moses, and *Tsar' Kosmos*—co-exist within this one single literary world, which is characterised by its issues with and misrepresentations of learned Greek as well as its favouring of a multitude of languages due to the Pentecostal miracle.

## 5 Cosmopolitan strategies bordering between universality and difference

The worlds of the cosmopolitans mentioned in this article are available to us today only by means of written words making up literary worlds, and as such they depend not only on philosophy, politics, or theology, but also on language(s) and language skills. As this exploration of cosmopolitanism in Byzantine tradition has demonstrated, there is no particular period, single ideology or political view with set values that may be regarded as *the* Byzantine cosmopolitanism, as a fixed characteristic of Byzantine tradition over time. Instead, two strategies involving different cosmopolitan and linguistic practices may be identified. Referring once more to Appiah's short, slogan-like definition of cosmopolitanism, what matters in this case is whether it is universality or difference—alternatively, unity or plurality—that is accentuated. To conclude, these two strategies will be discussed as to how they can be reflected in the miniature dialogue related by Diogenes Laertius with its single question, "Where are you from?" and single reply, "I am a cosmopolitan."

The first strategy prioritises universality and unity with norms that are inspired by Stoicism in the Jewish-Hellene and early Christian holistic *kosmos*. This strategy claims cosmopolitanism (or a cosmopolitan identity) as worldwide and universal in a cosmopolitan language, in this particular case Greek. It depends on monolingualism and insists on mutual understanding without interlingual translations and intercultural transfers. This is the homogenising kind of cosmopolitanism, applied in narratives where the Jewish and Christian God institutes man as a cosmopolitan in the created world. It is the cosmopolitanism of Adam, the

<sup>69</sup> Romanos the Melodist, "Kontakion on Pentecost," oikos 14 (p. 214). Greek text: Romanos le Méléde, "XLIX. La Pentecôte."

<sup>70</sup> See, e.g., Trubetskoi, *Tri ocherka o russkoi ikone*, 42, and Antonova and Mneva, *Gosudarstvennaia Tret'iakovskaia gallereia*, 242.

first man, referring to *kosmos* as the motherland and loyalty of man; it unites heaven and earth in one holistic *kosmos* or universe while opposing the local to the worldwide. Though Diogenes of Sinope spoke from an outsider's position, the dialogue he was involved in presupposes a shared understanding within a monolingual paradigm. Thus this cosmopolitan strategy constitutes the replying part of the dialogue, where "I am a cosmopolitan" is said in a language that is accepted worldwide, in the whole *kosmos*.

The other strategy prioritises difference and plurality and is characterised by a split between the worldly world and the heavenly world, which follow different norms. It does not engage in the opposition between the local and the worldwide but opposes instead earth and heaven, thus separating the secular from the heavenly, and cosmopolitans from *ouranopolitans*. This strategy operates in the worldly world of a multitude of languages, ethnicities and religions. It represents the heterogenising kind of cosmopolitanism, grounded in multilingual experiences of extensive processes of translations and transfers between languages and cultures, as John Tzetzes demonstrated in the epilogue of his *Theogony*. It involves the *kosmos* of the Pentecostal miracle, a *kosmos* which Orthodox Christians praise as enlightened by the Holy Spirit so that the disciples can proclaim the gospel in different languages. Furthermore, this *kosmos* of many languages is the one which is depicted allegorically in the shape of a crowned Byzantine noble, the so-called *Tsar' Kosmos*, in later iconographies of Pentecost. The cosmopolitans of the worldly world have, in this way, adapted to its multilingual standards. Thus this strategy reflects the questioning part of the dialogue. It asks "Where are you from?" in as many languages as are needed to receive an answer, as John Tzetzes did, or preaches the Christian gospel in "strange tongues," as the apostles did.

These two strategies show that it is possible to perform the dialogue in various ways, so that it activates a complex understanding of cosmopolitanism. The discussion of cosmopolitanism in Byzantine tradition verifies, therefore, that when studying literary history and its literary worlds, one should avoid presupposing or prioritising either of these two strategies beforehand. As a concept that borders between mono- or multilingual practices, cosmopolitanism may represent homogenising as well as heterogenising tendencies which alternately accentuate universality or difference.

What is more, the questioning part of this dialogue is assigned to us, as readers, scholars and researchers whenever we engage in literary or "workly" texts. To find out more about the various literary worlds of Byzantine tradition, our task is to keep asking: "Where are you from?" Replies may come from citizens in a Greek-speaking *kosmos* of universality and unity, as well as from inhabitants in a multilingual *kosmos* of linguistic difference and plurality.

## References

Agapitos, Panagiotis A. "John Tzetzes and the Blemish

Examiners: A Byzantine Teacher on Schedography, Everyday Language and Writerly Disposition." *Medioevo greco: Rivista di storia e filologia bizantina* 17 (2017): 1–57.

- Anderson, Benjamin. *Cosmos and Community in Early Medieval Art*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2017.
- Anonymous. "Epistle to Diognetus." In *The Apostolic Fathers, Volume II: Epistle of Barnabas. Papias and Quadratus. Epistle to Diognetus. The Shepherd of Hermas*. Edited and translated by Bart D. Ehrman. Loeb Classical Library 25. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2003.
- Antonova, V. I., and N. E. Mneva. *Gosudarstvennaia Tre't'iakovskaia gallereia: Katalog drevnerusskoi zhivopisi*, T. 1. Moskva: Izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1963.
- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. *Cosmopolitanism: Ethics in a World of Strangers*. London: Penguin, 2007.
- Bal, Mieke. *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002.
- Beecroft, Alexander. *An Ecology of World Literature: From Antiquity to the Present Day*. Brooklyn, N.Y.: Verso, 2015.
- Bodin, Helena. "The clamour of Babel, in all the tongues of the Levant': Multivernacular and Multiscriptal Constantinople around 1900 as a Literary World." *Textual Practice* 34, no. 5 (2020): 783–802.
- Bodin, Helena. "Whose Byzantinism—Ours or Theirs?" In *The Reception of Byzantium in European Culture since 1500*, edited by Przemysław Marciniak and Dion Smythe, 11–42. Farnham: Ashgate, 2016.
- Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Translated by M. B. Debevoise. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Caudano, Anne-Laurence. 'Let There Be Lights in the Firmament of Heaven': *Cosmological Depictions in Early Rus*. Cambridge, Mass.: Palaeoslavica, 2006.
- Constitutions of the Holy Apostles: Book VII–VIII. Concerning the Christian Life, and the Eucharist, and the Initiation into Christ*. In *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: Transl. of the Writings of the Fathers down to A.D. 325. Vol. 7, Lactantius, Venantius, Asterius, Victorinus, Dionysius, Apostolic Teaching and Constitutions, Homily, and Liturgies*, edited by Alexander Roberts, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1995 [1886]. Accessed 28 July, 2020. <https://www.ccel.org/ccel/sc/haff/anf07>
- Diogenes Laertius. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. Vol. II, *Books 6–10*. Translated by R. D. Hicks. Loeb Classical Library 185. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.
- Dionysius of Fournà. *The 'Painter's Manual' of Dionysius of Fournà*. Translated by Paul Hetherington.

- London: The Sagittarius Press, 1974.
- Dunning, Benjamin H. *Aliens and Sojourners: Self as Other in Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009.
- Eustathios of Thessalonike. *Eustathii Thessalonicensis De emendanda vita monachica*, edited and translated by Karin Metzler. Berolini: De Gruyter, 2006.
- Grabar, André. "Le schéma iconographique de la Pentecôte." [1928] *L'Art de la fin de l'Antiquité et du Moyen Age*. Vol. 1, 615–27. Paris: Collège de France, 1968.
- Hayot, Eric. *On Literary Worlds*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
- Herrin, Judith. *Byzantium: The Surprising Life of a Medieval Empire*. London: Penguin, 2008.
- John Chrysostom. "Homily IV (Acts 2:1–2)." *Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca*. Vol. LX, edited by Jacques-Paul Migne. Paris, 1862.
- John Chrysostom. "Homily IV (Acts 2:1–2)." In *A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. Ser. 1. Vol. 11, Homilies on the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistle to the Romans*, edited by Philip Schaff. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975 [1889]. Accessed 28 July, 2020. <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf111.vi.iv.html>
- Kazhdan, A. P., and Ann Wharton Epstein. *Change in Byzantine Culture in the Eleventh and Twelfth Centuries*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985.
- Kleingeld, Pauline, and Brown, Eric. "Cosmopolitanism." In *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2019 Edition), edited by Edward N. Zalta. Accessed 28 July, 2020. <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2019/entries/cosmopolitanism/>.
- Kominko, Maja. *The World of Kosmas: Illustrated Byzantine Codices of the Christian Topography*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Kontoglou, Phōtēs. *Ekphrasis tēs orthodoxou eikonographias. T. 1, Technologikon kai eikonographikon*. Athēnai: Astēr 1960.
- Kristeva, Julia. *Nations Without Nationalism*. Translated by Leon S. Roudiez. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.
- Lavan, Myles, Richard E. Payne, and John Weisweiler, "Cosmopolitan Politics: The Assimilation and Subordination of Elite Cultures." In *Cosmopolitanism and Empire: Universal Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*, edited by Myles Lavan, Richard E. Payne, and John Weisweiler. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press, 2016.

- Lemopoulos, George. "The Icon of Pentecost: A Liturgical Bible Study on Acts 2:1–4." *The Ecumenical Review* 42, no. 2 (April 1990): 92–97.
- Lettevall, Rebecka, and Kristian Petrov. "Toward a Critique of Cosmopolitan Reason." In *Critique of Cosmopolitan Reason: Timing and Spacing the Concept of World Citizenship*, edited by Rebecka Lettevall and Kristian Petrov. Bern: Peter Lang, 2014.
- Magdalino, Paul. "Byzantium = Constantinople." In *A Companion to Byzantium*, edited by Liz James, 43–54. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010.
- Mansel, Philip. *Constantinople: City of the World's Desire, 1453–1924*. London: John Murray, 1995.
- Martens, J. W. *One God, One Law: Philo of Alexandria on the Mosaic and Greco-Roman Law*. Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Melling, David J. "Constantinople." In *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity*, edited by Ken Parry, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffith, and John F. Healey, 125–29. Oxford: Blackwell, 1999.
- Metzger, Marcel, ed. *Les constitutions apostoliques. T. 3, Livres VII et VIII*. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1987.
- Mitsis, Philip. "A Stoic Critique of Cosmopolitanism." In *Cosmopolitanisms*, edited by Bruce Robbins and Paulo Lemos Horta, 171–89. New York: New York University Press, 2017.
- Neumann, Birgit, Ansgar Nünning, and Mirjam Horn, eds. *Travelling Concepts for the Study of Culture*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2012.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. "Patriotism and Cosmopolitanism." In *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism*, edited by Joshua Cohen, 2–17. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Obolensky, Dimitri. *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe 500–1453*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1971; new ed. London: Phoenix, 2000.
- Ouspensky, Leonid. "Quelques considérations au sujet de l'iconographie de la Pentecôte." *Messenger l'exarchat du Patriarche Russe en Europe occidentale* 9, no. 33–34 (1960): 45–92.
- Ouspensky, Leonid, and Vladimir Lossky. *The Meaning of Icons*. Translated by G. E. H. Palmer and E. Kadloubovsky. Crestwood, N.Y.: St Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983.
- Pentecostarion*. Translated by Archimandrite Ephrem. Accessed 28 July, 2020. <https://web.archive.org/web/20130730200335/http://www.anastasius.org.uk/PentAll.htm>
- Πεντηκοστάριον. In Greek. Accessed 28 July, 2020. <http://glt.go-arch.org/texts/Pen/p49.html>

- Philo of Alexandria. *On the Confusion of Tongues*. In *On the Confusion of Tongues. On the Migration of Abraham. Who Is the Heir of Divine Things? On Mating with the Preliminary Studies*. Translated by F. H. Colson and G. H. Whitaker. Loeb Classical Library 261. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1932.
- Philo of Alexandria. *On the Life of Moses*. In *On Abraham. On Joseph. On Moses*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 289. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1935.
- Philo of Alexandria. *The Special Laws*. In *On the Decalogue. On the Special Laws, Books 1–3*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Loeb Classical Library 320. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1937.
- Philo of Alexandria. *On the Creation of the Cosmos According to Moses*. Introduction, Translation, and Commentary by David T. Runia. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005.
- Pizzone, Aglae. "The Historiari of John Tzetzes: a Byzantine 'Book of Memory'?" *Byzantine and Modern Greek Studies* 41, no. 2 (2017): 182–207.
- Pollock, Sheldon. *The Language of Gods in the World of Men: Sanskrit, Culture and Power in Pre-modern India*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2006.
- Réau, Louis. *Iconographie de l'art chrétien*. T. 2:II, *Iconographie de la Bible: Nouveau Testament*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1957.
- Robbins, Bruce, and Paulo Lemos Horta, eds. *Cosmopolitanisms*. New York: New York University Press, 2017.
- Romanos the Melodist. *Hymnes*. T. V. Edited and translated by José Grosdidier de Matons. Sources Chrétiennes 283. Paris: Éditions du Cerf, 1981.
- Romanos the Melodist. *On the Life of Christ. Kontakia. Chanted Sermons by the Great Sixth-Century Poet and Singer*. Translated by Archimandrite Ephrem Lash. New York: HarperCollins Publishers, 1994.
- Russell, Eugenia. *Literature and Culture in Late Byzantine Thessalonica*. London: Bloomsbury, 2015.
- Schimanski, Johan, and Stephen F. Wolfe, eds. *Border Aesthetics: Concepts and Intersections*. New York: Berghahn, 2017.
- Shepard, Jonathan. "The Byzantine Commonwealth 1000–1500." In *The Cambridge History of Christianity*. Vol. 5, *Eastern Christianity*, edited by Michael Angold, 3–52. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014 [2006].
- Spira, Ivo. "'World': An Exploration of the Relationship between Conceptual History and Etymology."



In *Conceptualizing the World: An Exploration across Disciplines*, edited by Helge Jordheim and Erling Sandmo, 27–39. New York: Berghahn Books, 2019.

Stephanides, Stephanos, and Stavros Karayanni. “Introduction: Vernacular Worlds, Cosmopolitan Imagination: The Intimate Estrangement of Homecoming.” In *Vernacular Worlds, Cosmopolitan Imagination*, edited by Stephanos Stephanides and Stavros Karayanni. Leiden: Brill Rodopi, 2015.

*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*. Accessed 20 July, 2020. <http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>

Trubetskoi, Evgenii. *Tri ocherka o russkoi ikone: Umozrenie v kraskakh dva mira v drevne-russkoi ikonopisi rossii v ee ikone*. Parizh: YMCA Press, 1965.

Uthemann, Karl-Heinz. “Cosmos.” In *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*. Vol. 1, edited by A. P. Kazhdan, 537–38. New York: Oxford University Press, 1991.