The World and the Kingdom of Heaven: An Orthodox Perspective on Migration

Sergey TROSTYANSKIY

Marist College, New York, USA
Personal e-mail: Sergey.Trostyanskiy@marist.edu

The World and the Kingdom of Heaven: An Orthodox Perspective on Migration

Abstract: This article aims to explore the subject of migration within the horizons of imperial unicity by reviewing the historical roots and modern modifications of cosmopolitan ideology. It intends to detect its theoretical foundations and test them against the Orthodox missionary goal to become a citizen of the kingdom of heaven.
Keywords: migration, imperial unicity, cosmopolitanism, missionary, Orthodox Church

Citation suggestion: Trostyanskiy, Sergey. "The World and the Kingdom of Heaven: An Orthodox Perspective on Migration". *Transilvania*, no. 10 (2021): 26-33.
https://doi.org/10.51391/trva.2021.10.05.

The existence of modern society is marked off by the constant migration of the population from and to different parts of the world. The phenomenon of migration is not new. We could see examples of this phenomenon, i.e., people traveling from place to place and thus gradually detaching themselves from the ties of their own culture, history and tradition, across history. Such people can be marginalized due to various constrains imposed upon them by new living conditions (language, culture, religion, etc.) or, on the contrary, they can successfully utilize social lifts thus significantly improving their social and economic status. This, indeed, varies. Some adapt better to the circumstances and some never make it. And all expect hospitality. Important is the fact that they overstep the boundaries of their localities and customs. The proverb states that they become citizens of the world. At times, even the natives and citizens of a particular city or country feel alienated having been ostracized or somehow pushed to the margins of their own society. They also overstep the boundaries of their own society and have to extend the horizons of their existence.

This situation reminds us of some ancient ideals and historical occurrences. Diogenes, "the dog," a great Cynic philosopher, once asked where he came from, replied – "I am a citizen of the world."[1] The agenda of converting local polis into something new, extending the boundaries of one's own horizon to the whole world,[2] required adjustments of a Cynic sage. Firstly, the goal of "defacing [or falsifying the political] currency"[3] comes about. The story behind it is that Diogenes' father or Diogenes himself defaced or falsified the state coinage, perhaps, having being guided by the oracle but, at first, confusing the meaning of the message and instead of falsifying political currency (i.e., overthrowing customs) defaced the coins. This phrase, however, was then taken by Diogenes as his own motto. The story as it goes captures the ambiguity associated with the terms "money" (*nomisma*) and "custom" (*nomos*) as but can signify the same thing.

The most generic significance attached to the phrase (of falsifying the currency) is the denial of customs. However, scholars, in general, seems to not agree upon what precisely this falsifying may entail. In particular, the degree of denial of local customs (ethos and nomos) and social arrangements varied among the Cynic sages. This attitude towards the polis associated with falsifying customs may have had a mere negative implication; however, it could also be expressive of a constructive criticism of society, aiming not to merely overturn customs but offering an alternative to the existing but imperfect or even evil social orders.[4] Indeed, within the ancient city state or even modern states or imperial units, this entails tension within the already existing social orders which are historically and culturally grounded and situated within particular intellectual, religious, economic, etc. horizons.

All existing socio-political orders exhibit inequality. This mainly concerns the issues of distribution of wealth and access to power. The foreigners who travel to new lands experience this unequal and uneven attitude and thus suffer from inequality first and foremost. Yet, all excess, luxury, and

power of the rulers (and of those who receive primary share of the assets of a polis), which is as desirable and unattainable for a stranger, is a big illusion. It thus must be set aside. Even more so, ethos and local custom along with religious beliefs of the new locality confront a stranger right at the outset. It is interesting to learn how the ancients having been challenged by local customs handled the situation. The Cynic philosophy was one particular and historically conditioned response to the issue. It is appropriate to briefly review their principles so that we may compare and contrast them with the early Christian and modern approaches to the issue at hand.

How did a Cynic sage handle the challenge? We may observe that Cynic *atuphia* guarded the sage from all illusions to which he may succumb.[5] The Cynic ideal of *apatheia*, on the other hand, was meant to assure that a sage is free from being acted upon by external circumstances.[6] A citizen of the world must thus deny the illusion of social stratification and stay calm within unjustly ordered societal schemas. Such schemas often do not assure pleasant or even satisfactory conditions to the outsiders. And yet, the Cynics did not seem to implore their disciples to withdraw from the polis so as to become totally asocial. While being unaffected by its deceptive charms and abusive practices, the sage, at the same time, was a careful observer of all things in society (i.e., in the polis where the sage is currently situated) and practiced *parrisia*, the freedom of speech so as to ensure that the truth is not hidden behind the curtains of deception.[7]

Important in this context is the notion of ultimate finitude and incompleteness of all local and finite forms of custom and government. The multiplicity of customs, constitutions and governments was consequently juxtaposed with the unicity of natural conditions (*fusis*) or even divinely established natural conditions.[8] The Cynics found the principles of ethos in nature and not in custom. Moreover, they argued that even in a marginalized state, a human being can preserve dignity and exhibit human perfection or excellence, i.e., be virtuous. Indeed, the theory of virtue had to also be reconceptualized. What used to be considered by local conventions shameful and thus subject of blame, now turned into a genuine expression of human natural excellence thus becoming the subject of praise. On the other hand, some of what was understood as virtuous, i.e., as a genuine expression of human excellence, had to be degraded to something either indifferent or neutral or even vicious. Diogenes Laertes gives us a colorful depiction of the Cynic practices of begging, sharing wives, touching the flesh, etc.

Meantime, the presence of complexity and diversity of customs, coupled with the extreme Cynic individualism premised upon the idea of absolute personal freedom, by and large determined a very particular moral attitude and moved the Cynics towards the ethical ideals of frugality, asceticism and self-sufficiency. The Stoic theory also propagated this same cause. This radical reevaluation of ethos was rejected right upfront by many of their contemporaries. However, it was also welcomed by the many. It will gain even larger popularity in the later times.

Meantime, within the horizons of inequality and domination of local customs, a Cynic sage must have freed himself from all illusion and liberate himself from being a passive recipient of the ever-changing forms of social life. This was the frame allowing the Cynic to sustain the whims of fate. And fate is not generous to those who find themselves strangers in the polis. Even more so, it may hit hard those who rely solely on nature which is also capricious in some ways. The rigidity of moral precepts of the Cynics was meant to guard them of everything capable of jeopardizing their individual freedom. Diogenes "claimed that to fortune he could oppose courage, to convention nature, to passion reason."[9] However, the sage, according to Diogenes, must always be ready to confront the unpredictable side of nature and even the excess of reason. As a result, the Cynics denied the necessity of education, arts, etc.

Consequently, the Cynics had to lift up virtue (in its new, Cynic form) as the only source of happiness and thought of pleasure as unnecessary for true well-being. Antisthenes' "I'd rather be mad that feel pleasure" perfectly captures this attitude.[10] In addition, pleasure, if understood as the outcome of sensual indulgency, was considered an obstacle as it requires an effort and necessitates labor. Yet, only certain labors (*ponoi*) were considered appropriate to the sage.[11] However, if looked from a different perspective, a Cynic sage may be fully immersed in hedonism of a particular kind, one premised on self-sufficiency and capacity to enjoy the minimal and easily accessible goods. (2019) Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé's works testify to this cause.[12] Even more so, Diogenes tells us that the despise of pleasure in its ordinary sense can itself be pleasurable if we are habituated to it.[13] In any case, the notion of pleasure seemed to be reconceptualized and tied with the states of inner calmness, joy, etc. and not immediately with the outcome of sensible relaxation, the removal of tension in the body, the fulfillments of desires through the possessions of an object, etc.

Epictetus in his *Discourses* portrays the sage as totally free from desire, being impassionate and liberated from all illusion. He thus guards himself from the fortune and avoids anything that can make him unfortunate or misfortunate.[14] However, this is attained at a high price. The depiction of the Cynic life seems to raise the eyebrows of the interlocutor. Indeed, "how is it possible for a man who has nothing, who is naked, without home or hearth, in squalor, without a slave, without a city, to live serenely?"[15] The answer was that it is, indeed, possible.

> "Look at me, he says, I am without a home, without a city, without property, without a slave; sleep on the ground; I have neither wife nor children, no miserable governor's mansion, but only earth, and sky, and one rough cloak. Yet what do I lack? Am I not free from pain and fear, am I not free?"[16]

The sage thus attains happiness even at this cost and shows the pass to well-being to all. How can a sage who is so self-centered and individualistic overcome this chasm between the individualistic and cosmic so as to create a bond with the whole society and the people so trapped in the net of illusion?

They should have despised "the many." Could a sage establish kinship even with his fellow ascetic acquaintances who belong to the same Cynic sect? The idea of universal equality and natural rights, so to say, was offered as a cure of societal evils so that a proper due can be given to each citizen of the world not based on origins, wealth, or merit but, rather, on account of nature, we may assume. It postulated universal kinship of all. William Desmond spoke of this Cynic attitude to humanity in the terms of universal human brotherhood, *philantropia* and even *leitourgia*, i.e., "service to the people."[17] Hence, a severe critique and disdain of ordinary people' ignorance (and the juxtaposition of a free and self-sufficient sage with those who are enslaved and trapped in illusion) was supplemented by a more affirmative and friendly attitude to "the many." The Cynic love for the people made manifest in the service to the people. To serve the people is to give them an example of life, to show them a way of life that can help people remove their bondages and free themselves of all that is abusive or irrelevant.

All people are equal, according to Cynicism. What can we then make of social and economic inequality, of unjust practices? It seems that the Cynic proposal was that both, the distributive and the corrective justices should have been equalized. All distinctions based on gender, social role, etc. must be also abolished so as to prevent conflict of interest, contest and war altogether. The agenda of equalizing all things may have had more or less far-reaching political implications, some Cynics being more and some less friendly predisposed to the idea of wealth and power, some overthrowing the notions of property and government, and some (especially during the Roman period) sticking with the ideal of good monarchy, to the extent of presenting the sage as a king of his own kind and utilizing the language of royal power in discourse.

The main ramification of this Cynic way of thinking was that all people should receive proper accommodation and hospitality. Thus, the idea of equality is supplemented by the theory of accommodation, especially the accommodation of foreigners, i.e., *xenia*.[18] The conditions of such a citizenship have not yet been created at the time of Diogenes. However, his philosophy foreshadowed new political and social conditions and coexisted with Alexander's conquest of the world.

> "Alexander's expedition turned the Greeks' traditional perception of themselves as citizens of a given city upside down. Once the benchmark of the city as a political community had been weakened or even destroyed, the need for self-affirmation through a heightened individual- ism became greater and greater. At the same time, on a collective scale, the idea that the traditional distinction between Greeks and Barbarians was no longer meaningful provided an occasion to rethink the traditional value system."[19]

We find an interesting passage in Plutarch about Zeno's *Republic* which Zeno composed "on the dog's tail,"[20] thus owing its origins to his teacher Crates and the Cynic theory in general. It concerns the existing chasm between Zeno's theoretical speculations and reality as it was bridged by Alexander the Great:

> "the much-admired *Republic* of Zeno, the founder of the Stoic sect, may be summed up in this one main principle: that all the inhabitants of this world of ours should not live differentiated by their respective rules of justice into separate cities and communities, but that we should consider all men to be of one community and one polity, and that we should have a common life and an order common to us all, even as a herd that feeds together and shares the pasturage of a common field. This Zeno wrote, giving shape to a dream or, as it were, shadowy picture of a well-ordered and philosophic commonwealth; but it was Alexander who gave effect to the idea....as he believed that he came as a heaven-sent governor to all, and as a mediator for the whole world, those whom he could not persuade to unite with him, he conquered by force of arms, and he brought together into one body all men everywhere, uniting and mixing in one great loving-cup, as it were, men's lives, their characters, their marriages, their very habits of life."[21]

The Cynic sage himself then turned into a friend of humanity and the mediator between the gods and the human beings who are trapped in illusion and enslaved by ignorance. He is the councilor and reconciler of all things. The utopian universalism of the Cynics, which wipes out all distinctions and makes things even, has ceased to be a mere unapproachable ideal and acquired some real features. On what foundation has it been grounded? On the foundation of removing all distinctions, assuming one imperial model and making all comply to it. Most of the people of the conquered lands gained access to one unified system of culture, received new economic privileges and rights. The Roman imperial power will further equalize the existing conditions.

The Christian philosophy was also established upon the similar foundations to the extent that many modern scholars argued for the presence of a certain historical continuity and direct lineage which ties Christians with the Cynic ascetics of the time. (2019) Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé's work offers a careful analysis of conceptual ties which linked ancient and late antique Cynicism with the Christian tradition. She even argued that "when seen from the outside by pagans, Cynics and Christians could be confused with one another."[22] Some modern speculations on the theme of two layers of the Gospel stories and even two Jesuses, one a Cynic philosopher and another one an eschatological king, indeed, move beyond what is reasonable.[23] However, the fact of various similarities found in Scripture and in various early Christian ascetics are beyond doubt.[24]

Indeed, it seems difficult to reconcile Diogenes' denial of official forms of religion with the Christian doctrine and missionary spirit. However, there were also Cynic sages who exhibited softer attitude to religion. Some late antique scholars even reinterpreted Diogenes' own mission within religious context. The example of Julian the Apostate's reassessment

of the religious roots of Cynic philosophy is remarkable.[25] Moreover, the Cynic asceticism, frugality and self-sufficiency along with their denial of vanity and illusion and their refusal to be passive recipients of some external cause was reconcilable with the Christian ethos which propagated similar ethical precepts. Their extreme individualism, indeed, must have been given a more communal touch in Christian thought, linking all the people together so that they can become one body in Christ and conceptualizing them as being intrinsically united by the works of the Spirit.

It is interesting to observe that, according to some late antique and modern scholars, the Cynic philosophy at the time could have been considered not doctrinally, not as philosophy proper but, rather, as a way of life, *bios*.[26] In that sense, the Cynic practices along with their ethical precepts could have been easily incorporated into the practices of other philosophical sects. Even to the extent that some Christian fathers did not see it contradictory when the instances of Christian ascetics practicing Cynic way of life appeared in the historical horizon. St. Basil's words clearly capture this: "It is his [i.e., ascetic's] duty, moreover, to encourage the faint-hearted, minister to the sick, wash the feet of the saints and be mindful of the duties of hospitality and fraternal charity."[27]

Basil's ascetic attitude to life, if disassociated from his Christian mission, could have been considered totally reasonable and complying with the model of life acceptable to a Cynic sage. I may assume that even his Christian mission could have been maintained as a good cause by a Cynic, at least as far as its rules of conducts are concerned. As far as the idea of universal equality is concerned, Cynicism and Christianity appear to uphold the same principles. Their ascetic orientation is also quite similar, along with the aspiration towards frugality and a dispassionate state. However, their cosmopolitan orientation differs in certain respects.

There is something truly attractive and disturbing in the idea of world citizenship. What is the underlying theoretical framework that can accommodate all and be acceptable to all? Modern theories diverge far from the original Cynic frame. They also estrange themselves from their Christian roots. The modern idea of cosmopolitanism is multiphase. It incorporates diverging conceptual leanings. One of them places ultimate value in the extension of leaving associated with nature, i.e., farming, earth-centered lifestyle. In this case, people's cosmopolitan nature is made manifest in their union with earth, water, plants, animals, etc. (i.e., parts of nature everywhere present), being either homogeneous (like-parted like earth and water, i.e., the same in all parts of the globe) or heterogenous but constituting our natural endowment which is of absolute value. Others include more urban attitude and think of their citizenship as founded upon free travel and employment. Some of these facets are established upon the solid grounds of abundance, pleasure, prosperity, common economic advantages, etc. Some others endorse the Cynic ideals of asceticism, frugality, self-sufficiency, freedom from vanity and illusion, etc. What kind of political and ideological frame can sustain all these facets of modern cosmopolitanism?

There is no direct and straightforward answer to this question. However, it is clear that, if one is to push the agenda of cosmopolitanism just beyond the limits of a mere allegory, one must assert that all the limited or finite customs, practices, etc. must be eliminated. One must impose one form of government so as to achieve the goal of making all the people citizens of one and the single polis. What can this be? A global empire? The examples of Alexander the Great's empire and its successor, the Roman imperial body, has been attractive to many political forces in the Middle Ages and Early Modern times. Perhaps, in our day and age the imperial ideals fell out of favor having been replaced by a kind of system of allegiances between sovereign but somehow collaborating states that can allow all to equally participate in their open-ended systems. The main issue here, again, is the presence of multiple boundaries and customs that prevent all from being true members of these states and societies. They have different social, economic, religious, etc. traditions and customs. How can they be equalized so as to arrive at one single and unified system which can give an overarching framework to a cosmopolitan way of life so that each can feel at home at different localities?

It is interesting to observe that modern discussions on the issue at hand are premised on a larger phenomenon of cultural and natural fluidity. The idea of fluidity so widespread in our day and age and propagated by various public intellectuals from different corners of the earth has become attractive. It concerns all the parameters of social and physical constitution, starting with localities and culture and extending its domain to gender (which is now defined as a social construct thus allowing people to choose their gender identity, switch from one gender to another, etc.), intellect (whose natural or divine constitution is proclaimed not to be self-sufficient and receptive of AI and thus various admixtures with human made), etc.

On the other hand, the idea of dual (or even triple or quadruple) religious belonging seems to satisfy conditions for religious inclusivity. This idea seems to offer a unifying framework for all current and future attempts to adjust to new religious circumstances, celebrating bar mitzvah, receiving communion and practicing Vipassana meditation simultaneously. The phenomenon of fluidity, at least as observed within the American cultural horizons, combined with religious inclusivity (or, we may even use one politically incorrect word – religious eclecticism) and supported by the neo-imperial net of allegiances (as its overarching political framework, e.g., G 7, NATO, etc.), can, indeed, equalize and unify all.

This new model of equalizing and unifying all under some kind of neo-imperial auspices and in accord with the ideals of inclusivity and fluidity, perhaps, temporarily lacks perfect instantiation due to various covid restrictions at this historical moment. However, we may expect it to reach its high peak soon. Some intellectuals, indeed, assert that it is also possible that the observable phenomena represent a mere apparent unicity, a kind of an inertia movement towards unification.

However, they argue, this movement has lost its cause in American and European political and economic powers which are in decline. Having being thus deprived of its efficacy and power and experiencing fatigue this movement can no-longer sustain the polity of unification. What can then keep the ball moving? These issues, indeed, present a problem. It is not at all easy to arrive at an answer that can solve the puzzle of unicity within diversity.

Another interesting aspect of this general discussion about the possibility of a truly cosmopolitan society is how it corresponds with the Orthodox ethos and canon. In general, Orthodox priests and laity can travel across the globe, make pilgrimages to holy places. However, the main precept for all is that we need to carry on mission to all people and all places, unless they are already included in the jurisdiction of some local Orthodox ecclesiastical communities (i.e., churches or missions). This missionary goal is all-embracing and constitutes the core of Orthodoxy. On the other hand, the main aspiration of a Christian is not to become a citizen of the world but, rather, a citizen of the heavenly realm:

> "Thus when Matthew asks, 'What does it profit a man to gain the world, if he lose his own soul?' (16:26), his word for 'world' is cosmos. For Augustine, 'our heart is restless, Lord, until it rest in Thee' (Conf. 1.1), and for later medieval Christianity, the human being is a pilgrim journeying towards a heavenly home. Like Plato's Socrates, the pilgrim is not fully at home here. By contrast, Cynics such as Diogenes do claim to be at home here, in this sunshine."[28]

Hence, the Church is not of this world. However, this statement is also ambiguous. As far as world is taken to signify nature, such a world wound not be considered alien to the Orthodox. Perhaps, it is the world of the rulers, of social and economic stratification, of the polis (i.e., of powers, dominions and principalities), and ultimately – of the empire that is considered alien and to an Orthodox Christian? "For we wrestle not against flesh and blood, but against principalities, against powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places."[29]

This is an iconic expression which juxtaposes the kingdom of this world with that of Christ and, at the same time, removes blame from the material nature. There were, however, even stronger, Gnostic influenced sentiments in the Church which included the world's material constitution in the list of evils. These sentiments were rejected by Orthodoxy. However, the ever-existing tension with the powers and principalities of the world seemed to permeate Orthodox discourse since the very beginning of Christian history. It is well expressed in the words of one of the greatest "modern" Orthodox hierarchs, Patriarch Tichon. In his "Farewell Sermon" St. Tichon makes the following affirmations:

> "It is not a coincidence that the Church is likened to a ship, sailing amidst a ferocious, stormy sea that is ready to drown it in its waves. And the further the ship sails, the harder the waves slam against it, the fiercer they attack it! But the harder the waves hit the ship, the further they are thrown away and rejoin the abyss and disappear in it, and the ship continues its triumphant sailing as before... The Church of Christ is the kingdom not of this world. It does not possess any of the attractions of the earthly world. It is persecuted and slandered. Yet it not only avoids perishing in the world but grows and defeats the world!"[30]

Here the tension between the two realms is vivid and the chasm which separates the two presented as almost unbridgeable. The two worlds do not mix with each other. One cannot replace the other.

However, St. Tichon tells us in another treatise that we must take all forms of government as divinely ordained. They are often unjust. They can even be evil. And yet, they all are works of divine providence, perhaps, representing special challenges and temptations which we must encounter and contest. Hence, he implores the priests to obey the rulers:

> "the ministers of the Church, who by their rank should stand above and beyond any political interests, should remember the canonical rules of the Holy Church, by which she forbids her servants to interfere in the political life of the country, belong to any political parties, and even more so to make liturgical rites and sacred rites an instrument of political demonstrations.
> Remember, fathers and brothers, both the canonical rules and the covenant of the Holy Apostle: "Guard yourself from those who create strife and discord," avoid participating in political parties and speeches, "obey every human authority" in worldly affairs (1 Peter 11:13), do not give any reasons justifying the suspicion of the Soviet government, obey its commands, since they do not contradict faith and piety, "for God," according to the apostolic instruction, "must be obeyed more than people" (Acts.4:19; Galat.1:10)."[31]

We must leave through all possible forms of government and still pursue the agenda of reaching our true destination, i.e., the kingdom of heaven. We must embrace all forms of constitutions and government, leave within all possible forms of custom and laws. Meantime, the Church, according to St. Tichon, "does not tie itself to any particular form of [secular] government, as such a form is a mere historical contingency."[32]

The main point is that an Orthodox Christian is not a carrier of some finite local religious custom, but of the universal truth. This truth cannot be confined within the boundaries of a mere critique of some particular societal forms marked off by the presence of injustice and inequality. This truth must be fully expressed through mission so that we may contribute to the agenda of building the kingdom of heaven; so that we may become and help other people who to become the citizens of the heavenly kingdom. This entails an active duty of going all across the globe to preach the Word of God, not only to our former compatriots but to all. St. Tichon's words perfectly express the essential core of mission:

> "it is not enough, brethren, only to celebrate 'The Triumph of Orthodoxy'. It is necessary for us personally to promote and contribute to this triumph. And for this we must reverently preserve the Orthodox Faith, standing firm in it in spite of the fact that we live in a non-Orthodox country, and not pleading as an excuse for our apostasy that 'it is not the old land here but America, a free country, and therefore it is impossible to follow everything that the Church requires'. As if the word of Christ is only suitable for the old land and not for the entire world! As if the Church of Christ is not 'catholic'! As if the Orthodox Faith did not 'establish the universe'!"[33]

Moreover, the sole principle of unity in Orthodoxy is communion. This is a perfect model of unity in diversity which does not require political, economic, cultural, etc. unification. It functions on the premises of our heavenly citizenship, one that does not place trust in any political historical contingency.

Now, the ideological frame of the modern west is tolerance and due to the guilt of the colonial past, multiculturalism, etc. It does no longer accept mission, that being seen as alien to true humanity and the sign of cultural abuse. This situation is in some ways similar with the conditions which the early Christians had encountered in the first century AD while carrying on mission and converting the nations to true faith. However, there are some new nuances associated with the modern attitude to mission. The postcolonial cultural legacy is the new variable which affects our cultural horizons. In late antique times the agenda of religious diversification of the Roman empire, launched by the authorities in the light of a continuous conquest of new territories, aimed to assure imperial unity. However, it soon faded away with the ascent of Christianity having been replaced in the fourth century by a new religious policy associated with religious unification of the whole empire under the auspices of Christianity. Meantime, mission and the goal of spreading the true faith and proselytizing met the expectations of the authorities under both agendas (i.e., religious diversification and unification).

Nowadays, however, the issue of proselytism has acquired a new rendering and extended its limits. The notion of proselytism extends to any missionary endeavors to convert people from their local, even if non-Christian, religious faiths. It is seen as violating the rights of the natives, as a kind of religious imperialism. In Orthodoxy the term proselytism traditionally signified a mere overstepping of jurisdictions when a local Christian church preaching the Word of God and providing pastoral care for the area has been challenged by some other Christian groups who intrude in the canonical territory of a local church thus breaking canonical rules. A typical example is the Roman Catholic proselytism in the Slavic countries. However, in this day and age we encounter negative attitude to mission, this term having been reconceptualized into offensive proselytizing campaign against any, even non-Christian, religions and belief systems. The term mission has been removed from the public sphere. All missionary libraries and houses in America had to rename themselves so as to remove this apparently abusive proselytizing appellation. In general, the main aspiration of the true faith to assume heavenly membership to all is found unacceptable by the powers and principalities. This, indeed, creates tension.

The same attitude to mission significantly affects all aspects of modern *xenia* or *philoxenia*, which turns into hospitality purged of religion and cultural assimilation. What can we do about it? The dominions and principalities see the Lord as an obstacle to economic and social development. Should we proceed in accord with the canons (i.e., Orthodox polity)? In this context I would like to offer two proposals, i.e., the minimal accommodation rule and the maximal assimilation to right faith rule. The minimal goal of Orthodoxy is thus to assure hospitality and accommodation of the strangers (and expect to receive the same accommodation while traveling in foreign lands). This is basically the same practice as the pagan hospitality in its best form, one propagated by the Cynics and Stoics, etc. As such, it is a preliminary step to assure "human conditions" to all the people, make all feel home, secure "world citizenship to all." Our most generic cosmopolitan attitude then is made manifest in this minimal accommodation. In the light of a major migration crisis in Europe and America, even this minimal proposal represents a stumbling block to many Orthodox Christians who are afraid of the foreigners, feel culturally threatened, and develop xenophobic sentiments as a result.

However, conversion and assimilation to the right faith is the proposal that should aspire all Orthodox Christians as the carriers of universal truth. This will unify all under the dread judgment seat of Christ and lead all towards the acquisition of citizenship in the Kingdom of Heaven while still on earth, to the accommodation in the mansions of the righteous. A temporary tension in the west in respect to mission and other future unforeseen historical and political contingencies are of no significance to the Orthodox. The empires, states, etc. come and go but the body of Christ remains forever.

Notes:

1. "ἐρωτηθεὶς πόθεν εἴη, 'κοσμοπολίτης,' ἔφη" Diogenes Laertes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. trans. R.D. Hicks. Vol.2. (London: William Heinemann, 1925), 6.63.3.
2. As "the only true polis was, he said, is that which is as wide as the cosmos." Ibid., 6.72.8-9.
3. Ibid., 6.20.5-6.
4. See John S. Moles, "Cynic Cosmopolitanism" in the Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy, eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-

Odile Goulet-Caze (Berkley: University of California Press,1996), 109. It is interesting to observe that Diogenes Laertius tells us that, according to Diogenes "the dog," "it is impossible for society to exist without law; for without a city no benefit can be derived from that which is civilized" Diogenes, *Lives*, 6.72.4-6. On the other hand, there are various statements of Diogenes "the dog" which appear to overthrow the idea of law and polis altogether. William Desmond, while studying the reception of Cynicism in modern thought, acutely observed that some "modern" anarchists, including Peter Kropotkin, claimed the Cynic philosophy as a predecessor of anarchism. In this case, the anti-political sentiments seem to have far-reaching implications, considering governments as altogether unnecessary. (2008) *Cynics*, 185. It is, indeed, meaningless to investigate whether Kropotkin's interpretation of Diogenes' sayings was historically correct or not since the Cynic sayings seem to be marked off by the apparently intentional ambiguity. Hence, we can find both, affirmative and negative statements in respect to law, polis, etc.

5. As Rene Brower rightly noted, "*Tuphos* (or *atuphos*, 'lacking *tuphos*') is impossible to translate, where *tuphos* can mean vanity or pride, but also delusion, or craziness." (2014) *The Stoic Sage*, 152. In a footnote he lists translations detected in the works of scholars in respect to the passages of Plato's *Phaedrus*, featuring an impressive range of meanings associated with this word. He then quotes Chryssipus' passage from Diogenes' *Lives* ("ἄτυφόν τε εἶναι τὸν σοφόν· ἴσως γὰρ ἔχειν προς τε τὸ ἔνδοξον καὶ τὸ ἄδοξον" [*Fr*.646.1-3]) as expressive of the Stoic attitude to fame. Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé notes that Antisthenes's definition of it is consistent with Cynic views: "Antisthenes advocated ἀτυφία as the end, meaning the refusal of illusions to which man might be tempted to succumb." (2019) *Cynicism and Christianity in Antiquity*, 72.
6. This word also has multiple meanings attached to it. The meaning of this term in this context seems to be freedom from being acted upon, being a puppet, a passive receiver of some external causes.
7. Indeed, the compresence of the terms ἄπολις, ἄοικος, and κοσμοπολίτης within the same accounts of Diogenes' life makes the whole accounts appear self-contradictory. However, they can be also properly qualified, the idea of being without polis and without home at his current location carrying a ramification that a sage is at home at any place since his home is extended to the whole world and not tied with a particular polis, etc. Another interpretation, offered by Desmond states that the notion extends far beyond the political. Hence, "the Cynics' cosmopolitan ideal may take them well beyond the range of typical political discourse, and may be more properly understood in relation to the philosophical goal of finding a harmony between the individual and nature." *Cynics*, 205.
8. As Goulet-Cazé rightly argued, "Diogenes wanted to strike a new currency, stamping onto the νόμος of his time a new imprint, that of φύσις. This new strike that he proposed to his contemporaries subverted all the customs of the time and their whole manner of living. He was, in a sense, deconstructing civilization in order to impose more effectively the norms of natural law." *Cynicism and Christianity*, 33. Thus, a sage should live in accord with nature, κατὰ φύσιν. This same νόμος can also be apprehended as expressing God's will. This thread is also present in philosophy, arguably in Stoicism and then in Christian thought.
9. "ἔφασκε δ' ἀντιτιθέναι τύχῃ μὲν θάρσος, νόμῳ δὲ φύσιν, πάθει δὲ λόγον" Diogenes, *Lives*, 6.38.7-8.
10. Ibid., 6.3.2.
11. "Some πόνοι were useless, such as the daily exertions of the athlete trying to win a victory in the stadium, the musician straining to acquire artistic virtuosity just to win a musical competition, the careerist seeking glory, or simply the person trying to conform to social norms. But there were also useful πόνοι. These were πόνοι κατὰ φύσιν—that is, the efforts required to live according to nature by meeting only needs that were natural and strictly necessary: drinking water; eating as frugally as possible; sleeping on a hard surface; enduring the cold of winter and the heat of summer; dressing in a very simple way." Goulet-Cazé, *Cynicism and Christianity*, 47.
12. Ibid., 50-1.
13. Thus "just as those accustomed to a life of pleasure feel disgust when they pass over to the opposite experience, so those whose training has been of the opposite kind derive more pleasure from despising pleasure than from the pleasures themselves" Diogenes, *Lives*, 6.71.4-7.
14. Epictetus, *Handbook* 2.
15. Epictetus, *Discourses* 3.22.45-7.
16. Ibid., 3.22.47-8.
17. Desmond, William. *Cynics* (Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited, 2008), 192.
18. See Moles, "Cynic Cosmopolitanism," 111.
19. Goulet-Cazé, *Cynicism and Christianity*, 6.
20. Diogenes, *Lives,* 7.4.2.
21. Plutarch. "On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander." In Plutarch, *Moralia* IV, trans. Frank Cole Babbitt. (Cambridge MA; London: Harvard University Press, 1962) 329A.8-C4.
22. Goulet-Cazé, *Cynicism and Christianity,* 56.
23. In particular, John Dominic Crossan's *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography* (San Francisco: HarperOne, 2009), makes such a claim.
24. Certain Scriptural passages, indeed, exhibit a clear Cynic leaning. Goulet-Cazé lists some few of those: "Blessed are you who are poor, for yours is the kingdom of God"; "Can a blind person guide a blind person?"; "Foxes have holes, and birds of the air have nests; but the Son of Man has nowhere to lay his head"; "For where your treasure is, there your heart will be also;" ..."Love your enemies"; "Do not judge, and you will not be judged"; "Follow me, and let the dead bury their own dead"; "Go on your way; see, I am sending you out like lambs into the midst of wolves"; "Carry no purse, no bag, no sandals, and no staff "; "Do not worry about your life." *Cynicism and Christianity*, 150-1.
25. Julian the Apostate, *Orations* 6-8. trans. Wilmer Cave Wright (Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1913).
26. Diogenes Laertius tells us that the Cynics have rejected physics and logic along with music, geometry, etc. thus solely focusing on a way of life.

27. St. Basil the Great, "A Discourse on Ascetical Discipline," in Sister Monica Wagner, *Saint Basil: Ascetical Works* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1962), 234.
28. Desmond, *Cynics*, 206.
29. *Eph*. 6.12.
30. St. Tichon of Moscow, "Farewell Sermon" (Moscow: *Американский Православный вестник*, 1907) 1975.1.
31. St. Tichon, "Farewell Sermon," 6:96-8.
32. Ibid.
33. St. Tichon, "Farewell," 97.

Bibliography:

Basil the Great. "A Discourse on Ascetical Discipline." In Sister Monica Wagner, *Saint Basil: Ascetical Works*. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1962.

Crossan, John Dominic. *Jesus: A Revolutionary Biography.* San Francisco: Harper One, 2009.

Desmond, William. *Cynics*. Stocksfield: Acumen Publishing Limited, 2008.

Diogenes Laertes. *Lives of Eminent Philosophers*. trans. R.D. Hicks. Vol.2. London: William Heinemann, 1925.

Goulet-Cazé, Marie-Odile. *Cynicism and Christianity in Antiquity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 2019.

Julian the Apostate. *Orations* 6-8. trans. Wilmer Cave Wright. Harvard: Harvard University Press, 1913.

Moles, John S. "Cynic Cosmopolitanism" in eds. R. Bracht Branham and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, The Cynics: The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and its Legacy. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1996.

Plutarch. "On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander." In Plutarch, *Moralia* IV. trans. Frank Cole Babbitt. Cambridge; London: Harvard University Press, 1962.

St. Tichon of Moscow. "Farewell Sermon." *Американский Православный вестник.* 1907.

St. Tichon of Moscow. "Three Epistles." *Вестник Русского христианского движения*. 1975.