The World–City Paradigm and the Macrocosmic Theory in Maimonides' *Guide*

Diana Di Segni

1

The limited circulation of stoic and cynic philosophy in the Middle Ages in general,[1] and more specifically within Arabic and Jewish medieval philosophy,[2] explains the lack of a direct reception of the world-city model among medieval authors, as this was developed in ancient Greek sources, such as Diogenes, Zeno and in Roman Stoicism [3] After Philo of Alexandria's elaboration of the cosmopolitan paradigm in antiquity, [4] Jewish medieval thought, which inherited its core philosophical material from Arabic translations and commentaries, did not have first-hand access to cynic and stoic sources. These were only available through collections of *dicta* and opinions, in which the figure of Diogenes was sometimes even assimilated to that of Socrates. [5] Scholarship has also referred to the problematic notion of "voie diffuse"—that is, the oral transmission of ideas—to explain the presence of doctrines for which there were apparently no sources available in Arabic.[6] It has indeed been demonstrated by Gad Freudenthal that some stoic physical concepts were known to Jewish medieval authors.[7]

Although the relationship between cosmos and city might not have been treated as lengthily as in Philo, the topic of the city received considerable attention by Jewish medieval philosophy, mostly following the path traced by AlFarabi's political speculation.[8] Political thought, understood as the science of good governance, is directly related to the organization of the city, which plays a fundamental role in the constitution of society. In Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed*, the city represents the condition for human beings to entirely fulfill their nature, by fully expressing their

---

[1] For an overview of the presence of stoic philosophy in the Middle Ages, see Verbeke 1983; Colish 1985; Lapidge 1988; Bray 2018. For cynic philosophy, see Matton 1996.

[2] For an overview of ancient sources (other than Aristotelian and Platonic ones) available in Arabic, see Jadaane 1968; Gutas 2016.

[3] See the contributions in this volume by Mecci and Widelberg. See also Schofield 1991; Moles 1993; Sellars 2007.

[4] See the contributions in this volume by Calabi and De Luca.

[5] See Gutas 2016, 4959–4962.

[6] See, for instance, Jadaane 1968, 45. Gutas 2016, 4945–4949 elaborately discusses the problems raised by the notion of "voie diffuse."

[7] See Freudenthal 1996; Freudenthal 1997.

[8] For Maimonides, see Strauss 2013, 275–313.

rational character.[9] On the one hand, society allows humans to reach their perfection; on the other, it is a necessary prerequisite for their survival. Food and housing require the mastery of different arts and instruments, as well as a collaboration between citizens—both conditions can only be reached through thinking.[10] To secure the survival of such a social community, rules defining the city's structure need to be established. To ensure order and the continued existence of a society, instating a ruler is necessary, since this is considered the prerequisite for mutual collaboration. Governance is only possible through the rational faculty, which is the precondition for administrating the city, in the same way as it is the principle allowing to rule over the parts of the body.[11] The notion of governance is therefore applied at two levels: in the macro structure, with respect to society, and in the micro perspective, regarding the individual. Such a concept of power, possible only through the rational faculty, embodies the bond between the city and the human beings. Indeed, the fundament for the analogy between the universe and the human being is exactly the power of dominating over inferior beings, and it is precisely because of this faculty—Maimonides writes—that the human being is called a microcosm.[12]

In the following, I therefore suggest to broaden the paradigm of the relationship between city and world beyond its original ancient Greek context, and to adopt it to describe the correlation between the individual and the cosmos within the macro-microcosmic theory, as it was developed in Maimonides' *Guide* and its sources.

2

The well-known image of the relationship between macrocosm and microcosm circulated among Jewish medieval philosophers, even if, after Maimonides, it was not a major theme of interest.[13] Mostly inspired by the *Encyclopedia of the Brethrenof Purity*,[14] the topic was treated at length in

[9] Cf. Maimonides 1963, i.72, 191. For Maimonides' political thought, see Strauss 2013, 399–416.
[10] Maimonides 1963, i.72, 191.
[11] Maimonides 1963, i.72, 186.
[12] Maimonides 1963, i.72, 190.
[13] On the micro-macrocosm theory, see Meyer 1900; Conger 1922; Allers 1944; d'Alverny 1976; Finckh 1999. For the reception in Jewish medieval philosophy, see Altmann 1963; Almog 1966; Krinis 2016.
[14] On the topic of macro-microcosm in the *Encyclopedia of the Brethren of Purity*, see Widengren 1980; Maukola 2009; Nokso-Koivisto 2011; Nokso-Koivisto 2014.

Joseph ibn Tzaddik's *Book of the Microcosm*, written in 12th-century Spain.[15]

The exposition on the analogy between macrocosm and microcosm is to be understood in relation with the biblical context of *Gen*. 1, 26, which raised the exegetical problem of establishing a similarity between human and divine, while complying with the prohibition of anthropomorphic representations of God. Micro-macrocosm theories attempt to solve this conceptual contradiction. The basis of the idea according to which the human constitution reproduces the image of the divine is the correspondence between the parts of the small and the parts of the large, that is, the relationship that connects microcosm and macrocosm. From this perspective, the value of the individual consists in being an image of the whole world, as each part of the human corresponds to a macro-part of creation.

In the epistle addressed to the Hebrew translator of the *Guide of the Perplexed*, Maimonides mentions favorably Joseph ibn Tzaddik's *Sefer ha-olam katan*—the *Book of the Microcosm*—, although he admits not having read it, and makes an explicit reference to the *Encyclopedia of the Brethren of Purity* as its source.[16] In spite of Maimonides' judgment, the *Book of the Microcosm*, and in general the macro-microcosmic theory, did not have a large circulation in the Middle Ages, probably because of the Neoplatonic framework behind this model—indeed, in the same epistle, Maimonides expresses harsh criticism towards Plato and his opinions.[17] Nonetheless, the analogy between the universe and the human being appears, even if not as a main topic, in *Guide* i, 72. The macro-microcosm scheme, apart from ibn Tzaddik and the Brethren of Purity, has a long tradition within rabbinical writings as well as in mystical literature, its sources being associated with numerous *midrashim*, which possibly played a role in Maimonides' speculation.

3

In traditional medieval Jewish literature, macro-microcosm theories are mainly based on mystical writings, such as the *Sefer Yetzirah*, the *Book of*

[15] For the text, see: Ibn Tzaddik 1903. For the English translation, see Ibn Tzaddik 2003. On ibn Tzaddik's theory of microcosm, see Bertola 1984; Di Segni 2018.

[16] See Maimonides 1988, vol. 2, 552. This passage, especially the opinion on ibn Tzaddik and the reference to the *Encyclopedia of the Brethren of Purity*, has been discussed by scholars; see Stroumsa 1990, part ii, 33–38 [hebrew] and Langermann 1991, 144–145.

[17] On the implications over the later circulation of authors mentioned in the epistle, see Harvey 1992.

Creation, but also on some passages of the *Talmud* and the *Midrash*.[18] Both rabbinical literature and mystical writings focus on a comparison between physical human aspects and the natural world.

The expression "olam katan", small world, is attested in *midrashic* literature.

A specific section of the collection *Otzar Midrashim* is even entitled *Agadat Olam katan*.[19] In this text, the entire creation is compared to the body; for instance, the sun and the moon correspond to the eyes, and constellations represent corporeal features.[20] In general, the *Midrash Olam katan* features a long series of analogies between the body and the natural world. [21] In another *midrashic* account, the *MidrashTanḥuma*, the expression "olam katan" is linked to the tabernacle, which is compared to

---

[18] For an overview of the occurrences, see Almog 1966, 51–88.

[19] *Otzar ha-Midrashim*, ed. Eisenstein, 1915.

[20] *Otzar ha-Midrashim*, *Olam katan*, i.3–4: "The masters taught: The creation of the world was like the creation of mankind, for everything that God created in the world was also created in the human being. The heavens are the head of mankind, the sun and moon are the human eyes, the stars are the hair on the human head […] Aries—as he is shorn every year and his hair grows, so do humans cut their own hair and grow. Taurus—man's neck, as the bull carries a load on his neck, so human beings carry a load on their necks […] Gemini—two shoulders of man. Cancer—man's hands and fingers, because the ram pulls out his hands and feet from each other. Leo—the heart of man which is called the lion's heart.Virgo—[…] so the stomach of man is filled with all the delights of the world. Libra—man's arms and legs go up from here and down from there. Scorpio—man's anger […] Sagittarius—man's justice […] Capricorn—as a goat sees the grass and does not see the fence, so human beings see what they do and do not know what is born there. Aquarius— sometimes full sometimes empty, so humans are sometimes full and sometimes empty. Pisces—just as fish travel from one end of the sea to the other, so humans go from one end of the world to the other."

[21] *Otzar ha-Midrashim*, *Olam katan*, i.9: "On the earth there are mountains and hills, fields, forests, trees and animals, small and large, and everything was created inside the man. When [the man] sits, he resembles to the hills; when he stands, he resembles to the mountain; when he lies down, he resembles to the fields. The hair of his head and his beard resemble to the forest of trees […] On the earth, there are rivers and water, salt water, hot water, cold water, fresh water, and all this is created inside the man: the sea—man's lung; the rivers—man's esophagus, the rivers that go to the sea and are not filled, so the esophagus eats and drinks and the lung is not filled. Salt water comes out of man's eyes, cold water out of his mouth, bitter water out of his ears, fresh water out of his mouth. On the earth, there is cold and heat, winds, desert and settlements, and all this is created inside the man. Hot and cold winds, when he opens his nostrils and blows, cold winds come out, when he opens his mouth and blows, hot winds come out."

a small world, and the various ritual objects of the tabernacle represent astronomical elements as well as organs of the human body.[22]

Moreover, the *Talmud* provides numerous analogies between nature and individuals. In addition to the abovementioned similarities between corporeal parts and natural elements, such as woods, rivers, wind and so on, in the minor treatise *Derekh Eretz Zuta*, a correlation is drawn between the cosmos and the human eye.[23]

A detailed exposition of macro-microcosm theory is found in the haggadic writing *Avot de-Rabbi Natan*, a commentary on the *Pirkei Avot*.[24] The parallel between the human body and the universe involves several elements: forests correspond to hair, wind to breath, horses to legs, salty waters to tears, streams to blood.[25] It is noteworthy that analogies include elements that are not really natural, such as house walls resembling lips and doors resembling teeth; even work tools—for instance, millstones, pestle, mortar, mills—have a corporeal equivalent, namely the stomach, joints and spleen.

A fundamental contribution to the macro-microcosm theory is provided by mystical and kabbalistic literature. For instance, in the *Sefer Yetzirah*, the world's creation through the letters of the alphabet constitutes the bond between the macrocosm and the microcosm: the "mother" letters forming air, water and fire correspond to the head, the stomach and the chest;[26] the double letters forming the seven planets are related to the seven orifices;[27] and the twelve single letters represent the constellations as well as the organs.[28] Consequently, the macrocosm topic is treated in commentaries on the *Sefer Yetzirah*, such as Saadia Gaon's *Commentary to the Sefer Yetzirah* and Shabbethai Donnolo's *Sefer Ḥakhmoni*.[29] In both these commentaries, elements of the created world correspond to the human body, even if a few variations with respect to the *Sefer Yetzirah* are found.

---

[22] *Midrash Tanḥuma*, *Pekudei*, 3: "This teaches us that the tabernacle was like the whole world and the human embryo, which is a microcosm." The analogy with the Tabernacle is found also in *Midrash Tadshe* (in *Bet ha-Midrash*, iii, ed. Jellinek, 1855, 164–193). Other references to analogies between the world and the human body are found in the collection of *midrashim Pesikta Haddata* (in *Bet ha-Midrash*, vi, ed. Jellinek, 1887, 36).

[23] *Derekh Eretz Zuta*, 9: "The world resembles the eye: the ocean surrounding the earth is like the white of the eye, the dry land is the iris, Jerusalem the pupil, and the Temple the image mirrored in the pupil of the eye."

[24] *Avot de-Rabbi Natan*, ed. Becker and Berner, 2006.

[25] *Avot de-Rabbi Natan*, 31.

[26] *Sefer Yeṣira*, ed. Hayman, 2004, iii.5.

[27] *Sefer Yeṣira*, iv.6.

[28] *Sefer Yeṣira*, v.4.

[29] See *Commentary to Sefer Yesira Attributed to R. Saadia Gaon*, ed. Ben Schachar, 2015; and Donnolo 2010.

Before Maimonides' account, the macro-microcosm theory represented a widely spread theme within numerous philosophical texts, especially in the context of a general Neoplatonic current in Jewish medieval philosophy. Starting of course with Philo of Alexandria,[30] the topic was treated by authors such as Bahya ibn Paquda,[31] Solomon ibn Gabirol,[32] Moshe ibn Ezra,[33] Yehuda haLevi,[34] Abraham ibn Ezra[35] and Abraham ibn Daud.[36]

As already mentioned, the most comprehensive account of the macromicrocosmic theory is found in Joseph ibn Tzaddik's *Book of the microcosm*.[37] In this work, the emphasis lies on physical similarities between individuals and the cosmos, the human body being the replication of the entire physical world. However, arguments pertaining to the physical domain also serve to demonstrate the possibility of human knowledge: it is only through self-knowledge that man reaches knowledge of the cosmos.[38] The macro-microcosmic view therefore has a gnoseological and cosmological character, but also a theological one: if the world is similar to God, insofar as the effect is similar to its cause, then human beings, through self-knowledge, achieve not only knowledge of the cosmos, but also of the divine.[39]

As acknowledged in Maimonides' epistle, the source for a thorough exposition of the macro-microcosm theme is found in the *Encyclopedia of the Brethren of Purity*.[40] The Neoplatonic philosophical background, which conceives the cosmos as a living being endowed with a soul that penetrates the universe and spreads in all its parts, represents the fundament for analogies between the human dimension and the order of the universe. Yet, although the idea of a continuous relation between micro and macro aspects permeates the whole writing, specifically epistles xxvi and xxxiv—entitled *Man as microcosm* and *World as the big man*—are dedicated to this topic.

In the *Encyclopedia of the Brethren of Purity*, there is an abundance of analogies pertaining to the cosmological domain—just as the heavens are

---

[30] See the contributions in this volume by Calabi and De Luca.
[31] Cf. Ibn Pakuda 2004, 158; 161.
[32] Cf. Ibn Gabirol 1902, 32; Ibn Gabirol 1892–1895, iii.2, 77.
[33] Cf. Ibn Ezra, *Maqalat al-hadiqa fi ma'na al majaz wa'l haqiqa*, Jerusalem, The National Library of Israel Ms. 80 5701, 19–21, quoted in Fenton 1996, 71–83.
[34] Cf. Ha-Levi 1905, 209.
[35] Ibn Ezra 1997–2006, *Commentary to Genesis*, 1.26; *Commentary to Exodus*, 25.40.
[36] Cf. *Ibn Daud* 1986, 199b, 235.
[37] See *supra*, n. 15.
[38] Ibn Tzaddik 1903, 21.
[39] Ibid.
[40] See *supra*, n. 14.

composed of nine concentric layers, nine substances are found in the body, one within the other: marrow is enveloped by bones, veins are surrounded by flesh, blood is enclosed by veins, etc.[41] Moreover, the twelve signs of the zodiac correspond to twelve holes in the human body—six in the right side and six in the left side, as zodiac signs are divided into six southern and six northern signs.[42] The seven planets (including the Sun and the Moon) with their respective powers are analogous to the seven bodily powers—which are the attractive, the retentive, the digestive, the expulsive, the nutritive, the augmentative and the formative power—as well as to the seven spiritual powers—that is, the five senses, the faculty of speech and the intellectual faculty.[43] Furthermore, each planet corresponds to an organ: Jupiter to the eyes, Mercury to the ears, Mars to the nostrils, Venus to the sinuses, Saturn to the channels of excretion, the Sun to the mouth and the Moon to the navel.[44]

In addition, comparisons regarding the sublunar world include the four elements—fire corresponds to the head, air to the chest, water to the stomach and earth to the abdomen[45]—, but also other natural elements, such as mountains being equivalent to bones, minerals to marrow, rivers to intestines, canals to veins, vegetation to hair.[46] Finally, a parallel is drawn between some human characteristics and animals: courage is related to the lion, shyness to the hare, generosity to the cock, stinginess to the dog.[47]

4

Most of the abovementioned theories focus on physical analogies between individuals and the cosmos, thus valorizing human corporeality, which is generally considered a problematic issue because of the prohibition of anthropomorphically depicting divinity. Indeed, in his interpretation of *Gn*. 1, 26, Maimonides emphasizes that the resemblance with God embraces intellectual and speculative aspects, excluding bodily ones.[48] Creation in the image of God refers to the specific form, namely human intellectual apprehension, while creation after likeness of God indicates the conjunction between human apprehension and divine intellect.

---

[41] Ikhwān al-Ṣafā' 1983, ii.26, 463, transl. Maukola 2009, 243.
[42] Ibid.
[43] *Rasā'il* ii.26, 464, transl. Maukola 2014, 148.
[44] *Rasā'il* ii.26, 463–465, Maukola 2009, 243.
[45] *Rasā'il* ii.26, 466, transl. Maukola 2014, 137.
[46] *Rasā'il* ii.26, 466–467, transl. Maukola 2009, 242.
[47] *Rasā'il* ii.26, 474–475, transl. Maukola 2009, 239.
[48] Maimonides 1963, i.1, 22.

Within this conceptual framework, the topic of micro-macrocosm in the *Guide of the perplexed* serves the cosmological demonstration of the unity of the being—the particular being as well as the universal being. The bond between the micro—the individual being—and the macro—the universal being—is represented by the rational faculty. From a cosmological perspective, all that exists should be conceived as an individual, as an analogy to express the ontological unity of the universe. On the contrary, multiplicity, both in the individual and in the cosmos, concerns the internal constitution of the being, but not its ontological structure. Different substances within the spheres are comparable to the different organs of a body, so that the universal existence in itself can be considered absolutely one.[49]

In the *Guide*, the analogy between the microcosm and the macrocosm covers few physical aspects, particularly the relationship among organs. According to an anatomical argument, a distinction is established between organs that dominate over others and organs that are dominated; for instance, the heart, which is in constant motion, gives the impulse for the movements of the limbs. As the heart dominates over the body, so the heaven that envelops everything governs the sublunar world by infusing power through its constant motion. If the governing principle was absent or its motion stopped, then the existence would cease as well, just as a body dies when the heart stops beating. It is precisely this governing principle that makes the human being a microcosm.[50]

Moreover, the analogy involves other aspects connected to the organs: as they cannot exist separately from the rest of the body, the parts of the universe cannot exist without one another, since they, as well as the organs, are connected by a power. The same power that ensures the generation and subsistence of a being is also responsible for its corruption, the causes for generation being the same as for corruption, regarding both the individual being and the universal existence. A lack of balance between the powers is considered to provoke diseases in the human body and catastrophes in nature.[51]

The corporeal structure reflects the configuration of the world, as what is closer to the dominant organ is nobler and more excellent than organs that are distant from the heart, and this is the case for the cosmos as well. Bodies closer to the center are turbid, thick, dark and opaque; their movement is difficult, as they are far from the excellent body, which is bright, transparent, subtle and simple.[52]

---

[49] Ibid., i.72, 184.
[50] Ibid., i.72, 186–187.
[51] Ibid., i.72, 187–188.
[52] Ibid., i.72, 192.

Individual and universal existence are compared with respect to the stability of certain features; some characters are stable, such as the size of the liver, which does not vary greatly in different bodies, while other qualities are variable, for instance, the presence and color of hair. Similarly, within the universal existence, some species are stable, since they are the intentional outcome of generation, while other species are accidents of generation and corruption, such as worms in mold and everything that originates from spontaneous generation. Moreover, stability is denoted in the individual existence by the fundamental organs and in the universal existence by the fifth body, while other features survive only as species, such as the four humors in the body and the four elements in the world.[53]

The entire argument is based on the principle of resemblance between the human and the divine represented by the rational faculty, which is the dominant element within individuals. It is only because of the presence of a dominant form that human beings can be called microcosms. The relationship between micro and macro is valid only for human beings and, not without irony, Maimonides specifies that no one heard from the ancients that a donkey or a horse could be defined as a microcosm. Through that, Maimonides also clearly connects the doctrine exposed in *Guide* i, 72 with the teaching of the "ancients", possibly referring to the *Brethren of Purity*, as in the epistle to his translator.

However, the correspondence between the small and the large is not valid with respect to three aspects: first, in the individual existence, the heart benefits from other organs, while in the universal existence, this is not the case. The heaven indeed does not profit from the governed things; on the contrary, it gives freely as a noble benefactor and, in this sense, is assimilable to divinity. Second, the heart is in the middle of the body, while the other organs surround it to help and protect it; in the cosmos, it is the other way round: the most noble envelops the less noble, since the first heaven cannot be affected by any other thing. Third, if the rational faculty is the bond between human and divine, it is nonetheless a corporeal and inseparable faculty; on the contrary, divinity is separated from the parts of the world.

5

In sum, in *Guide* i, 72, the comparison between the microcosm and macrocosm serves as a cosmological model for understanding the unity of divinity, which is separate from matter and whose existence is proven by the signs of its government and providence over sublunar beings. This

[53] Ibid., i.72, 189.

governance, reflected in both the cosmos and the individual, parallels the rational organization required in the city—the archetype of human rule. Therefore, in line with Al-Farabi's description of the virtuous society, the city can be conceived as a microcosm of the world, integrating cosmopolitan ideals into political philosophy. In this context, the city symbolizes the harmonious order and rational power necessary for both individual and collective flourishing, echoing the cosmopolitan doctrine of interconnectedness between human beings and the universe.

As has been shown, previous formulations of the micro-macrocosm theory insist on physical aspects, while in Maimonides' text, the image experiences a rationalization. The negative conception of matter relegates bodily perfection to a lower degree, while the most perfect state is achieved through the speculative faculty. The unity of the existence, from the viewpoint of the individual and of the universal existence, is based on the idea of dominance over lower beings, which is only possible through the rational faculty.

Governance plays a fundamental role in Maimonides' conception of political philosophy. In his only thorough treatment of political philosophy, which is found in the *Treatise on logic*, political wisdom is divided into four categories, all of them related through the notion of governance.[54] The first category is more properly an ethical instance, since it concerns the self-governance of humans, while the other three categories pertain, in the strict sense, to the political sphere, but differ regarding the dimensions of the social community to administrate, namely the household, the city and the great nation or nations.[55] The notion of command represents the expression of the rational instance in the political perspective and fulfills a pivotal function within the conception of politics. The *Treatise on logic*, an early work composed during Maimonides' youth, is structured as a sort of lexicon to introduce the study of different branches of philosophy, and in the section devoted to political philosophy, the terms "command" and "rule" are central.[56] The choice of these words displays the conceptual configuration of the political philosophy elaborated by Maimonides, in which a ruler—the prophet—is considered necessary in order to structure society and, more specifically, to organize the city.[57]

Of the three categories that more properly pertain to political philosophy, the governance of the city appears to be preferred within Maimonides' examination. Its central function is certainly influenced by Al-Farabi's

[54] See Efros 1938, 63.
[55] For the discussion of the meaning of "great nation or nations", see Strauss 2013, 116–122.
[56] See Efros 1938, 63–65.
[57] See Maimonides 1963, ii.40, 382–385.

speculation, who also referred to the city rather than to the nation.[58] Its significance is not surprising in the framework of Al-Farabi's Platonizing political philosophy: the idea's core of the administration of the *polis* lies in Plato's *Republic*, which in Farabi's interpretation is modified to include, as a first chief, the imam, prophet or legislator playing the role of the philosopher king.[59] In the same way, Maimonides refers to the political function of the prophet as the ruler of society.

The organization of the city reflects cosmopolitanism's ideal of universal order, where different elements—whether individuals in society or parts of the cosmos—are harmonized through law and reason. Just as the divine control of the macrocosm ensures cosmic order, the rational institution of the city ensures the unity and cooperation required for a functional and ethical society. In this sense, the city becomes a reflection of the cosmopolitan principle that the particular (microcosm) is inextricably linked to the broader cosmos (macrocosm). The oversight of the city is therefore central, since only through an orderly organized community can the individual reach happiness. The purpose of the ruler is to provide the conditions for human beings to attain their ends. Happiness does thus not pertain to the first category of political wisdom, namely the governance of the self, and passes from an ethical dimension to a more properly political one. Maimonides again adopts a Farabian idea here, according to which only in the city the achievement of happiness is possible.[60]

To make society work, the ruler must harmonize differences; as opposed to animals, among which, in the same species, differences are rarely observable, human beings are extremely diverse from one another.[61] This dissimilarity challenges the possibility of establishing a functioning society and can only be regularized by the action of a ruler. In the same way as different parts need to be harmonized in society, in order to fulfill their proper ends, so is the cosmos the perfect organization of different substances, related to one another. Just as the universe is composed of diverse elements that work together under divine power, society mirrors this diversity by uniting individuals under rational laws that reflect cosmopolitan values of governance, and differences among human beings are harmonized for the common good.

Ultimately, the city represents more than a political and ethical unit; it serves as a microcosmic representation of cosmopolitan ideals. It embodies the interconnectedness and governance that the cosmopolitan doctrine advocates, where individuals, through rationality and cooperation, contribute to the universal order. The city thus becomes a manifestation of

---

[58] See Strauss 2013, 10.
[59] See Galston 1990, 146–179.
[60] Ibid., 55–94.
[61] See Maimonides 1963, ii.40, 381.

the cosmopolitan belief in unity through diversity, providing the framework in which flourishing and ethical living are possible.

In conclusion, behind the analogy between macrocosm and microcosm in the *Guide*, key aspects of the cosmopolitan doctrine can be found, such as governance, order, cosmos, city—all of which are traditionally associated with Neoplatonic models in medieval philosophy. Both levels are governed by rational principles that seek harmony through the unification of diverse elements.The city, as a microcosm, represents cosmopolitanism in action—where humans beings, though different, are united through rational organization for the common good. This interconnectedness between the individual, the city, and the cosmos is central to Maimonides' vision of political philosophy, where rationality and ethical instances ensure order at both the micro and macro levels.

Acknowledgement

This research was funded by the Department of Philosophy "Piero Martinetti" of the University of Milan under the Project "Departments of Excellence 2023– 2027" awarded by the Ministry of University and Research (MUR).

Bibliography

Allers, Rudolf. 1944. "Microcosmos. From Anaximandros to Paracelsus." *Traditio* 2: 319– 407.

Almog, Zvi. 1966. *Critical edition of Moses ibn Tibbon's Olam Katan with an Essay on the History of Microcosm in Medieval Jewish Philosophy*. Philadelphia: Dropsie University.

Altmann, Alexander. 1963. "The Delphic Maxime in Medieval Islam and Judaism." In *Biblical and other Studies*, edited by Alexander Altmann, 196–232. Cambridge (MA):
Harvard University Press.

d'Alverny, Marie-Thèrese. 1976. "L'homme comme symbole. Le Microcosme." In *Simboli e simbologia nell'Alto Medioevo. Atti della xxiii settimana di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo*, vol. i, 123–183. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'Alto Medioevo.

Avot de-Rabbi Natan, Synoptische Edition beider Versionen. 2006. Edited by Hans-Jürgen Becker, and Christoph Berner. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Bertola, Ermenegildo. 1984. "La visione del macrocosmo e del microcosmo di Bernardo Silvestre e di Josef ibn Saddiq." *Archivio di Filosofia* 52: 535–590.

Bet ha-Midrash. 1855; 1887. Edited by Adolph Jellinek, vol. iii; vol. vi. Leipzig: Vollrath.
Bray, Nadia. 2018. *La tradizione filosofica stoica nel medioevo. Un approccio dossografico*. Roma: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura.
Colish, Marcia L. 1985. *The Stoic Tradition from Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. ii. Stoicism in Christian Latin Thought*. Leiden: Brill.
Conger, George Perrigo. 1922. *Theories of Macrocosms and Microcosms in the History of Philosophy*. New York: Columbia University Press.
Di Segni, Diana. 2018. "Per un'antropologia della dignità. Il *Microcosmo* di Joseph ibn Tzaddik." In *Per studium et doctrinam. Fonti e testi di filosofia medievale dal xii al xiv secolo*, edited by Alessandra Beccarisi, and Alessandro Palazzo, 19–39. Roma: Aracne.
Donnolo, Shabbethai. 2010. *Sefer Hakhmoni*, transl. Piergabriele Mancuso. LeidenBoston: Brill.
Efros, Israel. 1938. *Maimonides' Treatise on logic (Maḳālah fi-Ṣinā'at Al-Manṭik): The Original Arabic and Three Hebrew Translations*. New York: American Academy for Jewish Research.
Fenton, Paul. 1996. *Philosophie et Exégèse dans le Jardin de la métaphore de Moïse Ibn 'Ezra, Philosophe et Poète Andalou du xiie siècle*. Leiden/Boston: Brill.
Finckh, Ruth. 1999. *Minor mundus homo: Studien zur Mikrokosmos-Idee in der mittelalterlichen Literatur*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
Freudenthal, Gad. 1993. "Clandestine Stoic concepts in mechanical philosophy: The problem of electrical attraction." In *Renaissance and Revolution: Humanists, Scholars, Craftsmen and Natural Philosophers in Early Modern Europe*, edited by J.V. Field, and Frank A.J.L. James, 161–172. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Freudenthal, Gad. 1996. "Stoic Physics in the Writings of R. Saadia Ga'on al-Fayyumi and its Aftermath in Medieval Jewish Mysticism." *Arabic Sciences and Philosophy* 6: 113–136.
Galston, Miriam. 1990. *Politics and Excellence: The Political Philosophy of Alfarabi*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
Gaon, Saadia. 2015. *Commentary to Sefer Yesira Attributed to R. Saadia Gaon*, edited by Na'ama Ben Schachar. Los Angeles: Cherub Press.
Gutas, Dimitri. 2016. "Pre-Plotinian Philosophy in Arabic (Other than Platonism and Aristotelism): A Review of the Sources." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Teil ii, Bd. 36/7, Teilband Philosophie, Wissenschaften, Technik. Philosophie (Systematische Themen; Indirekte Überlieferungen; Allgemeines; Nachträge), edited by Wolfgang Haase, 4939–4973. Berlin/Boston/New York: de Gruyter.
Ha-Levi, Judah. 1905. *Kitab Al Khazari*, transl. Hartwig Hirschfeld. London: Routledge.

Harvey, Steven. 1992. “Did Maimonides’ Letter to Samuel ibn Tibbon determine which Philosophers would be studied by later Jewish Thinkers?.” *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 83: 51–70.

Ibn Gabirol, Solomon. 1902. *The Improvement of Moral Qualities*, edited and transl. by Stephen S. Wise. New York: The Columbia University Press.

Ibn Gabirol, Solomon. 1892–1895. *FonsVitae*, *ex Arabico in Latinum translatus*, ed. Clemens Baeumker. Monasterii: Aschendorff.

Ibn Daud, Abraham. 1986. *The Exalted Faith*, transl. Norbert M. Samuelson, edited by Gershon Weiss. Rutherford/London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press/Associated University Press.

Ibn Ezra, Abraham. 1997–2006. *Commentary to Genesis*; *Commentary to Exodus*. In *Miqra’ot gedolot ha-keter*, edited by Menahem Cohen. Ramat Gan: Bar-Ilan University Press.

Ibn Pakuda, Baḥya Ben Joseph. 2004. *The Book of Direction to the Duties of the Heart*, transl. Menahem Mansoor, Sara Arenson, Shoshana Dannhauser. Oxford/Portland Oregon: The Littman Library of Jewish Civilization.

Ibn Tzaddik, Joseph. 1903. *Sefer Olam ha-Katan*, ed. Saul Horovitz. Breslau: Jüdischtheologischen Seminar, Fränckel’scher Stiftung.

Ibn Tzaddik, Joseph. 2003. *The Microcosm of Joseph ibn Saddiq*, transl. Jacob Haberman. Madison/London: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press/Associated University Presses.

Ikhwān al-Ṣafā’. 1983. *Rasā’il Ikhwān aṣ-Ṣafā’wa Khillān al-wafā’*, edited by Buṭrus alBustānī. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir.

Jadaane, Fehmi. 1968. *L’influence du stoïcisme sur la pensée musulmane*. Beirut: Dar ElMachreq.

Krinis, Ehud. 2016. “The Philosophical and Theosophical Interpretations of the Microcosm-Macrocosm Analogy in *Ikhwān al-Ṣafā* and Jewish Medieval Writings.” In *L’ésotérisme shi‘ite. Ses racines et ses prolongements*, edited by Mohammad Ali Amir-Moezzi, Maria De Cillis, Daniel De Smet, and Orkhan Mir-Kasimov, 395–409. Turnhout: Bepols.

Lapidge, Michael. 1988. “The Stoic inheritance.” In *A History of Twelfth-Century Western Philosophy*, edited by Peter Dronke, 81–112. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Langermann, Y. Tzvi. 1991. “Maimonides’ Repudiation of Astrology.”*Maimonidean Studies* 2: 123–158.

Maimonides, Moses. 1963. *The Guide of the Perplexed*, trad. Shlomo Pines. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Maimonides, Moses. 1988. *Iggerot ha-Rambam*, ed. I. Shailat. Jerusalem: Ma‘aliyot.

Matton, Sylvain. 1996. “Cynicism and Christianity from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance.” In *The Cynics. The Cynic Movement in Antiquity and Its Legacy*, edited by R. Bracht-Branham, and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé, 240–264. Berkeley/Los Angeles/ London: University of California Press.

Maukola, Inka. 2009. “Creation in miniature: varieties on the microcosm in the *Rasā’il Ikhwān aṣ-Ṣafā’*.” *Studia Orientalia* 107: 229–256.

Meyer, Adolf. 1900. *Wesen und Geschichte der Theorie vom Mikro-und Makrokosmos*. Bern: Sturzenegger.

Moles, John L. 1993. “Le cosmopolitisme cynique.” In *Le cynisme ancien et ses prolongements*. Actes du colloque international du cnrs (Paris 22–25 juillet 1991), ed. MarieOdile Goulet-Cazé, and Richard Goulet, 259–280. Paris: puf.

Nokso-Koivisto, Inka. 2011. “Summarized beauty: The microcosm-macrocosm analogy and Islamic aesthetic.” *Studia Orientalia* 111: 251–269.

Nokso-Koivisto, Inka. 2014. *Microcosm-Macrocosm Analogy in* Rasā’il Ikhwān aṣ-Ṣafā’ *and Certain Related Texts*, PhD Dissertation. University of Helsinki.

Otzar ha-Midrashim. 1915. Edited by Judah David Eisenstein. New York:
J.D. Eisenstein.

Schofield, Malcom. 1991. *The Stoic Idea of the City*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sefer Yeṣira. Edition, translation and text critical commentary. 2004. Edited by A. Peter Hayman. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Sellars, John. 2007. “Stoic Cosmopolitanism and Zeno’s Republic.” *History of Political Thought* 28: 1–29.

Strauss, Leo. 2013. “Some remarks on the Political Science of Maimonides and Farabi.” In *Leo Strauss on Maimonides. The complete writings*, edited by Kenneth Hart Green, 275–313. Chicago/London: University of Chicago Press.

Strauss, Leo. 2013. “Maimonides’ Statement on Political Science.” In *Leo Strauss on Maimonides. The complete writings*, edited by Kenneth Hart Green, 399–416. Chicago/ London: University of Chicago Press.

Stroumsa, Sarah. 1990. “A Note on Maimonides Attitude to Joseph ibn Saddiq.” In *Shlomo Pines Jubilee Volume*, edited by Moshe Idel, Warren Zeev Harvey, and E. Schweid, part ii, 33–38. Jerusalem: Magnes. [Hebrew].

Verbeke, Gerard. 1983. *The presence of Stoicism in Medieval Thought*. Washington D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press.

Widengren, Geo. 1980. “Macrocosmos–Microcosmos Speculation in the *Rasa’il Ikhwan al-Safa* and Some Hurufi Texts.” *Archivio di Filosofia* 1: 297–312.