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The works of Christian intellectuals in the early Islamic period are marked by a notable quality which commentators often fail to highlight in what they write about them. This notable quality is the high level of what one might call the ‘inculturation’, or the integration of Christian thinking into the Islamic Arabic idiom of what in the ninth and tenth centuries was the intellectual culture of the ‘Islamic commonwealth’ aborning. For it is at this time that a unified Islamic world comes into view historically. Albert Hourani describes it evocatively in the following passage:

By the third and fourth Islamic centuries (the ninth or tenth century AD) something which was recognizably an ‘Islamic world’ had emerged. A traveller around the world would have been able to tell, by what he saw and heard, whether a land was ruled and peopled by Muslims. . . . The great buildings above all were the external symbols of the ‘world of Islam’. . . . By the tenth century, the men and women in the Near East and the Maghrib lived in a universe which was defined in terms of Islam. . . . Time was marked by the five daily prayers, the weekly sermon in the mosque, the annual fast in the month of Ramadan and pilgrimage to Mecca, and the Muslim calendar.

Much of the literature composed in Arabic by Christians in this time-frame represents a conscious effort on their part to think Christianity into this new intellectual world of Islam. More often than not one must observe the process in somewhat abstruse discussions of topics such as the doctrines of the Trinity and the Incarnation. But there are occasionally issues and ideas in connection with which one can observe the mechanism of acculturation at work in a more concrete way. A case in point is a series of at least three Arabic treatises written by Christians from the late ninth to the early eleventh century on the general theme of ‘the dissipation of sorrows’, all arguably inspired by a sympathetic intellectual vibration with ideas first expressed in Arabic by the ‘Philosopher of

the Arabs,' Ya'qūb ibn Ishaq al-Kindī (c. 800–c. 867), in his influential work, Risālah fī l-ḥīlah ʿi dafʿ al-ahzān. 

Al-Kindī on the Dissipation of Sorrows

Al-Kindī's work needs no extensive discussion here since there have been a number of recent scholarly studies of it, several of which rehearse its contents in detail. Suffice it to say for the present purpose that al-Kindī's *The art of dispelling sorrows* is in the literary form of a letter to an unnamed friend who has asked the philosopher to set down some remarks (*aqāwīl*) to counteract sorrows, to point out their deficiencies, and to immunize one against the pain of being in their grip. Most commentators agree that the work has an introduction and three principal parts. In the introduction al-Kindī defines sorrow as 'a pain of the soul occurring from the loss of things loved or from having things sought to elude us'. Then in the first part of the treatise he argues that sorrows are not pains which afflict us by nature but are painful voluntary attitudes of habit and convention. And he cites examples from common experience, as well as well-known stories such as that of the letter of the dying philosopher/king Alexander to his mother, bidding her to summon to the celebration of his memory only those who have known no sorrow. Al-Kindī's purpose is to point out that 'sense perceptible things are repugnant or desirable not by nature, but merely by habit or practice', and that one should direct himself away from objects of sense perception to concentrate on objects in the world of the intellect. In the second part he offers what he calls easy remedies for the pain of sorrow. These consist largely of recommendations from common sense and practice for attitudinal adjustments in regard to the sorrows that plague one. The text is in a popular, even anecdotal style, full of examples from everyday life. The third and final part offers what are styled difficult remedies, and they consist of strategies designed summarily to extirpate desire for external possessions and to cultivate a habit of detachment from...
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material things, including physical life itself. In this part al-Kindī also cites early models, like Socrates, and he engages in an extended allegory about passengers on a sea voyage, all of whom exemplify the attitudes he means to portray.

Al-Kindī's treatise is very much in the spirit of the Greek thought he customarily expresses in Arabic. Some scholars have tried to search out his sources, some even supposing that his work is a virtual translation of an unidentified Greek original. Others point out its unreconciled Stoic and Neoplatonic features. On the one hand he portrays joy, the antidote to sorrow, as a voluntary, internal attitude which makes one content with what is, while on the other hand he suggests that happiness seems to consist in the objective possession of spiritual goods such as virtues. But there is no overtly religious dimension to al-Kindī's suggestions here. As Charles Butterworth has pointed out, even when he speaks of the Creator, 'he does so on the basis of common opinion rather than on the basis of any divinely revealed texts'. And Thérèse-Anne Druart thinks that 'The Art of Dispelling Sorrows is an instance of prephilosophical ethics leading to the liberation of the mind from passions and for philosophy'. It may even have been the case that al-Kindī thought that philosophical humanism in an Islamic milieu prepared the mind on a natural level for the acceptance of divine revelation. However that might be, it is clear that for at least three Christian writers in Arabic, his Art of dispelling sorrows provided the occasion to suggest that Christian and biblical faith could best address the issues so provocatively and popularly raised by the philosopher. In short, al-Kindī's treatise provided an apologetical opportunity for three Christian writers of theology in Arabic, one a Copt, and the other two members of the Church of the East. They are Elias al-Jawharī, Severus ibn al-Muqaffa', and Elias bar Sinaya of Nisibis, all of whom wrote treatises in part modelled on that by al-Kindī. It is the purpose of the present study briefly to describe these three intriguing texts and to discuss their place in Arab Christian literature.

Al-Kindī's Arab Christian Readers
(a) Elias al-Jawharī

Elias al-Jawharī is a little known figure from the Church of the East in the late ninth century. From all that we can know or deduce about him from the scant documentation remaining, he must have
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flourished in the generation just after the lifetime of the philosopher al-Kindī. He seems first to have served as the bishop for the Church of the East in Jerusalem, under the name of Elias ibn ʿUbayd, before being raised to the metropolitanate of Damascus on 15 July 893. Three works attributed to him survive in the manuscript tradition. They are a treatise on the consensus of the deposit of the faith (ijtimaʿ al-amanah), in which the author sets out the confessional formulas of the Church of the East, the ‘Jacobites’, and the ‘Melkites’ in their agreements and disagreements; a collection of the canons of ‘the fathers of the east’; and a treatise called ‘the Consolation of sorrows (tasliyat al-ahzān)’. \(^1\) The present concern is with the last named work, which was published and translated into Italian by Giorgio Levi Della Vida in 1964, and briefly studied by ʿAbdurrahman Badawi in 1972, but which has since for the most part gone undiscussed by scholars. \(^2\)

One can tell already from the title of the Consolation of sorrows that the work is likely to have something in common with al-Kindī’s treatise of much the same name, and indeed examination shows that Elias al-Jawharī did in fact quote whole passages from the philosopher’s text. \(^3\) But that is not all. Al-Jawharī brings the whole discussion under the wing of Christian theology and includes extensive references to the Bible in his text. In this dress the work must have enjoyed a considerable popularity in medieval Christian communities, since Levi Della Vida has found parts of it preserved in some half dozen manuscripts, in addition to the text of the fourteenth century, Vatican Arabic MS 1492, from which he published most of the work, but which lacks the first leaf, and Paris Arabic MS 206, from which he took the last third of it. \(^4\) But just as a number of modern scholars were disappointed with al-Kindī’s work because they judged it to be ‘popular’ and not rigorously philosophical, so both of the modern commentators on al-Jawharī’s essay find it, in Badawi’s word, ‘of little philosophical interest’. \(^5\) But as a text which commends a certain point of view among Christians living under the rule of Islam, it is of considerable interest.

Like al-Kindī’s The art of dispelling sorrows, so is The consolation of sorrows a letter-treatise, a common literary genre among Syriac and Arabic writers of the period. \(^6\) Elias al-Jawharī addressed it to a
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Christian friend, who, together with two others named in the text as Abū Ayyūb and Abū l-Qāsim respectively, had fallen into disgrace and had presumably been sacked from a high position. Levi Della Vida associated these named persons with the known father and son, Sulaymān ibn Wahb Abū Ayyūb and 'Ubayd Allāh Abū l-Qāsim, who had held the position of vizir in the caliphal government in Baghdad and who had been arrested and disenfranchised by al-Muwaffaq, the brother of the Caliph al-Mu'tamīd (870–92) in the year 878/79. Levi Della Vida further supposed that these officials belonged to that group of Christians from the Church of the East who in the ninth and tenth centuries had insinuated themselves into positions of power and influence through calculated and duplicitous conversions to Islam. As a matter of fact both Muslim and Christian texts of the period do complain about such people. But the date of the arrest of these two men (878/79) suggested to Levi Della Vida that al-Jawharī must then have composed his treatise before his elevation to the bishopric in the year 893, and perhaps even at a time when he himself might have been an apprentice-monk and student in the environs of Baghdad. While this suggestion is not utterly implausible, it is also worth keeping in mind the possibility that Elias al-Jawharī purposefully may have taken literary advantage of the well known fate of the two vizirs from the Church of the East to compose a work in the spirit of al-Kindī which would pointedly commend an appropriately Christian attitude to the vicissitudes of life under the Muslims, especially as they affected those who found a way to better their social prospects by collaboration with their political masters.

At the very beginning of the text al-Jawharī says that he will be offering consolation in the form of 'counsels from the demonstrations of reason and from the testimonies of revelation and exegesis, and by way of calling to mind the accounts of those of God's friends who have been put to the test'. Accordingly the text has two major parts, just about evenly divided in terms of space, in the first of which the author reasons with his reader, and in the second of which he calls to mind the trials of a long list of biblical personalities who underwent trials and tribulations in the service of God. The biblical quotations and allusions are quite freely rendered,
as if from memory, and some of them are actually impossible to find as cited in the Bible. They include references to the stories of Adam, Cain and Abel, Noah, Abraham and the sacrifice of his son Isaac, Jacob and Esau, Jacob and his son Joseph, a long re-telling of the story of Job, Moses, David, Elijah, Elisha, Micah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and assorted sayings from the Psalms, Proverbs, and other biblical books which commend patience and long-suffering in adversity. While there is no reference to the Qur'ān or to Muslims, one notices that almost all the figures are such as could easily appear in the abundant Islamic qīṣāṣ al-anbiyāʾ literature.

It is in the first part of the work that one finds the extracts from al-Kindī’s *The art of dispelling sorrows*, but without any mention of the philosopher’s name. They are interwoven with al-Jawhārī’s more theological reflections, and they are almost all more or less literal quotations of passages in which the philosopher is re-phrasing his definition of sorrow as ‘a pain of the soul occurring from the loss of things loved or from having things sought for elude us’. 21 In addition, following al-Kindī’s lead, al-Jawhārī includes a long account of Alexander’s letter to his mother, and reference not only to Aristotle, ‘the philosopher’, but to al-Kindī’s own paragon of virtue, Socrates.

Al-Jawhārī’s reasoning is not abstruse or complicated. He suggests that God has allowed the disgraced Christians to suffer adversities for their own good. He reminds them that the benefits they had enjoyed had been freely allowed by God, and as freely disallowed. A number of times he compares God’s dispositions in these matters to the seemingly harsh treatments physicians sometimes mete out to their patients. One will suffer only so much sorrow as is required to remedy one’s spiritual ills. The essence of al-Jawhārī’s thought on the subject of sorrow in this life is expressed in the following passage, the first part of which actually echoes al-Kindī. He says

*The cure of our souls is a lighter burden than the care of our bodies, because the cure of the soul is not by means of a medicine to be drunk, or of enduring the pain of cauterization, or of the cut of a knife. Rather, it is by means of a strong resolution, and knowledge of past events in times gone by. A strong resolution, together with reflection on this world, the reason for which it was created, its condition, and the condition of its people in it, would facilitate for us the endurance of the anguish of existence, and the acquisition of solace for losses, and the benefit of the things we love, and would induce us to accept with joy God’s testing and His discipline, and would prevent us from abhorring it and from despair about it, and would remind us that God’s discipline and testing are more advantageous for us than the honors of the world and its favors. . . . He, mighty and praised be He, loves to put the patience of His friends to the test, and to prove their good intention, and the firmness of their resolutions. . . . Whoever resents God’s*
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discipline and His testing, and this is the way of the two of them [i.e., of Abū Ayyūb and Abū l-Qāsim], commits a sin and invites the anger of his Lord.22

Although al-Jawhari has taken advantage of the currency of al-Kindī’s treatise to put forward his own ideas about current events in the lives of members of his own Christian community, it is clear from this passage that he has thoroughly theologized the contents. What is more, with the pointed reference to the two disgraced vizirs, he applies his theological lesson precisely to the circumstances of the Christian community in the world of Islam of his time. It is a time of God’s disciplining and testing of his people, al-Jawhari seems to say, and it should be gladly accepted by Christians as such.

(b) Severus ibn al-Muqaffā’
As is the case with so many of the writers of the early Islamic period, not much is known about the biography of Severus beyond what can be gleaned from his surviving works, and from brief references to him in other texts. Only two dates are known with precision. A note at the end of one of his works mentions the year ‘six hundred and seventy-two of the era of Diocletian’,23 that is, 955 CE, as the year in which he composed the text. In the other instance, Severus’s name is mentioned in a letter written in the year 987 CE by the Coptic patriarch Philotheus (979–1003) to the Syrian Orthodox patriarch of Antioch, Athanasius V (987–1003).24
For the rest, dates in his life must be deduced from references in his works to the patriarch said to be reigning at a particular time.

Most commentators date the birth of Severus between the years 910 and 915. Since he is known to have been an octogenarian, and the year 987 is the latest recorded in reference to him, they put the time of his death somewhere around the beginning of the eleventh century. Early in his life, as we learn from a number of scribal notes included in the transmission of his works, Severus went under the name of Abu 1-Bishr and served as a katib in government service. This circumstance presumably explains the facility he acquired in the Arabic language. At a now unknown date prior to the middle of the tenth century he underwent a religious conversion and entered the monastic life. It was at this point in his career that he adopted the name ‘Severus’. As for the sobriquet, Ibn al-Muqaffa’ (son of the shrivelled, or crippled one), which unfailingly accompanies Severus’s name in the manuscripts, one no longer knows to just what circumstance in his life it refers.

23 Sévère ibn al-Moqaffa, évêque d’Aschmounain, Histoire des Conciles (second livre) ed. L. Leroy (PO 6, 1911), 590 [126].
It was Patriarch Theophane (953-56) who chose Severus to become the bishop of al-Ashmunayn, the ancient Hermopolis Magna in the district of Antinoopolis in Egypt. Today the city is reduced to a small village in the district of al-Roqah in the province of Asyut, not far south of modern Minia. It was in his capacity as bishop of this city that Severus achieved his fame, not only as a writer but as a Christian controversialist.

An event in Severus' life which the historical sources report with pride is the occasion in the reign of the Fatimid caliph al-Mu'izz (969-75), when Severus is said to have gone to the caliph's majlis in the company of the Patriarch Ephraem ibn Zur'ah (975-79), for the purpose of engaging in a debate with a Jew whom the texts call Mūsā, a protégé of the caliph's vizir of Jewish origin, Ya'qūb ibn Killis (930-91). Bernard Lewis has shown that this Mūsā was none other than the caliph's Jewish physician, Mūsā ibn El'āzār, who had accompanied al-Mu'izz from North Africa to Egypt, and whose identity had been masked under the name Palṭiel in medieval Jewish sources. As for the vizir, he was in fact himself a noted host of debates in his own majlis, which on one occasion at least featured Karaites and Rabbanites arguing with one another while the vizir and his Muslim attendants ridiculed Jewish prayers and beliefs.

Apart from the History of the patriarchs of Alexandria, which is often wrongly attributed to him, medieval bibliographers assign more than twenty different titles to Severus. Of these, and more which have come to light in modern times, only a few, less than a quarter of the total, have been edited and published. Among them is Severus's most popular work, which survives in some sixty manuscripts. It has been titled by its modern editor, Kitāb ad durr ath-thammīn fī ʿiddāh ad-dīn. It is a long presentation of the principal doctrines of the Christian religion in its Coptic form, and in an Arabic idiom which echoes the Islamic milieu within which it was written. Unfortunately, this work has never been translated into a western language, nor has it received any critical study. What is more, it carries the same title, in part, as another work by Severus, which has been only partially published, the Kitāb ad durr ath-thamīn fī ʿiddāh al-iʿtiqād fī d-dīn. This book is a lengthy christol-
logical *florilegium*, which presents patristic texts in Arabic translation which support the theology of the doctrine of the Incarnation as it is presented in the Coptic Church. The confusion of titles is symptomatic of one of the major problems facing scholars who study the works of Severus; not only do the titles vary in the manuscripts, but Severus himself often refers to his own books under different titles.

Other published texts of works by Severus include a refutation of his Melkite adversary, Sa‘īd ibn Bāṭriq, Eutychius of Alexandria (d. 940),\(^{31}\) a commentary on the Creed which, like the refutation of Eutychius, also goes under the title of the *History of the Councils*,\(^ {32} \) and a sketch of Coptic theology in Arabic, entitled *Kitāb Miṣbah al-‘Aql*.\(^ {33}\) Finally, there is the intriguing work entitled by its modern editors, *Affliction’s physic and the cure of sorrow*.\(^ {34}\)

Both Michael of Tannās and Abū 1-Barakāt ibn Kabar, the two medieval writers who have left lists of works attributed to Severus, mention a treatise called *Tibb al-ghamm wa shifā’ al-huzn*. It has survived in at least eight known manuscripts.\(^ {35}\) In modern times the work attracted the attention of the Syrian Orthodox patriarch Ignatius Ephraem I Barṣawm (1933–57), who published long extracts from the first three chapters of the text as it is preserved in a manuscript of uncertain date kept in St Mark’s Monastery in Jerusalem.\(^ {36}\) And now R.Y. Ebied and M.J.L. Young have published an edition of the whole text, together with an English translation, based on three of the eight manuscripts known to contain the work.\(^ {37}\)

The editors of Severus’s work on dispelling sorrows venture the opinion that since it resembles al-Kindī’s *Risālah* at a number of points, ‘this suggests that the Coptic Bishop may have drawn inspiration from the work of the Muslim philosopher’.\(^ {38}\) As we shall see, there are in fact a number of ideas the two works share, but, as one would suspect, the bishop’s concerns are of another order than
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The text unfolds in four chapters. In the first one, in virtually the first sentence, Severus lays it down that 'sorrow (al-ḥuzn) is a grave disease, and an infectious illness', echoing somewhat the thought of al-Kindī. And he proposes to set forth a remedy to combat it in the treatise. He says

We shall employ in our discourse three methods of attaining to knowledge: the first is knowledge acquired through the senses, the second is drawing inferences by means of the intellect and ratiocination, and the third is by the Word of Blessed God Most High, revealed for reflection and meditation. To this we shall append a fourth chapter to acquaint thee with accounts of the men of old time, and what befell the chosen, elect ones.

We can see already in this programmatic statement how Severus's purpose differs from al-Kindī's; the bishop will seek a remedy in the Bible. And even when he refers to Aristotle, he explains what the philosopher means with biblical quotations. But first he must identify the origin of grief and sorrow in a world and among human beings whom God had created good and perfect originally. Predictably, Severus finds the cause in Adam's sin: 'He had believed, out of ignorance, that the weak, created, deficient servant could become a god, a lord, a deity and one who is glorified'. Severus, the Copt, then immediately assigns this view as well to 'Nestorius and his two teachers Theodore and Diodore, and before them the mad Arius'.

In chapter II, Severus says, 'Having now explained the origin of Sorrow from the Books of God Most Blessed and High, we may also mention how sorrow is treated in the doctrines of the philosophers'. But he does not deliver on this promise. Rather, he goes on simply to mention that the teachers of the church (mu'allimi al-bTah) had ably disposed of Mani's teaching regarding the origins of evil and sorrow, to the effect that Satan was their cause. And Severus says that one can do no better than to accept the teachers' doctrine. But then he repeats what he says is their definition of sorrow. He writes, 'Sorrow, according to their principles, is a sickness which befalls the soul at the loss of something loved or in consequence of something wanted'. One notices immediately the almost literal compatibility of this definition with the one given by
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al-Kindī, viz., sorrow is ‘a pain of the soul occurring from the loss of things loved or from having things sought for elude us’. \(^{45}\) One could almost conclude that Severus is here in fact quoting al-Kindī’s definition from memory, and attributing it to ‘the teachers of the church’. This is literally to adopt the words of the Muslim philosopher as a suitable idiom for the statement of what he presents as Christian teaching. Severus then goes on to explain that sorrow in this sense comes about because a human being ‘for the most part inclines towards that which conforms with the sensual part of the soul’, \(^{46}\) and that because of the punishment God visited upon Adam in consequence of his sin of disobedience.

In chapter III Severus then states his conclusion that ‘sorrow only afflicts man inasmuch as he brings it upon himself’. \(^{47}\) And given the dual nature of human beings, composed of spirit and matter, he says, ‘it is then incumbent upon persons of intellect to persevere in activities which will bring them to this [rational] abode, and will cause them to achieve this status’. \(^{48}\) He cites the views of Hermes Trismegistus, St Matthew, Aristotle, Galen and others, to the effect that ‘in our present state we are afflicted with a great error in desiring to enjoy the conditions of the world of immortality and permanence in the world of generation and decay’. \(^{49}\) Rather, we must engage in the pursuit of true philosophy commended by Gregory of Nyssa, Antony, Makarios, Pachomius, Basil and John Chrysostom. Severus says, ‘All of this elucidates the merit of the person who philosophizes, for he does not grieve, nor is he sorrowful, nor have regrets, nor repines, since he has seen things as they really are, and conceives of them in their [true] form, and their nature is not hidden from him, and he is not subject to delusion as to their true character’. \(^{50}\) But this is not the philosophy of al-Kindī; it is the ‘philosophy’ of the desert fathers.

In the fourth chapter Severus recalls the stories of the biblical characters who gave an example of the attitude one must assume. This attitude Severus sums up in words reminiscent of al-Kindī. He says, ‘If the Lender has the right to reclaim what He has lent us, how can it be permissible for us to be grieved, and how can it be permissible for us to allow the soul to be sorrowful over the reclaiming from it of something which did not belong to it?’ \(^{51}\) Biblical characters who personified this attitude were: Job, whose story Severus recalls at length, like Elias al-Jawhari, Abraham, Moses, Isaiah, David, Jeremiah and Daniel. Then he says, ‘If we
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were to relate the stories of modern people, as we have related the stories of men of old time, their tribulations would appear small to you, and their trials trivial'. So he cites the life of Christ and his disciples and martyrs: Simeon, James the Just, Paul, Thomas, Mark, Ignatius and Cornelius. Severus even advises his readers to have gratitude for their adversities. ‘For,’ as he says, ‘if God’s chastisement and testing of us is a wholesome guidance, then we should thank him for it, and not resent it’. 

Severus closes his treatise on *Affliction’s physic and the cure of sorrow* by recounting the story of Alexander the Great’s letter to his mother. We have found this work cited in virtually all the texts considered so far. It is a testimony to its great popularity in both Muslim and Christian circles, furnishing yet another example of a cultural plane on which the two faiths could meet.

(c) Elias bar Šināyā of Nisibis

Elias of Nisibis was in fact one of the most prolific and influential of the Christian writers of Arabic in the early Islamic period. His bibliography includes numerous treatises, letters and commentaries on all the major topics of interest to Christians, and most of them enjoyed a wide circulation. Born in the year 975, Elias was ordained a priest in the year 994. After a number of years of study in the monastic communities of northern Mesopotamia, notably in Mosul, he was consecrated bishop of Bet Nuhadra in the year 1002. Then, on 26 December 1008, Elias was nominated the metropolitan of Nisibis for the Church of the East and from this date, until his death on 18 July 1046, he was actively engaged in the task of commending Christian doctrines in Arabic, in response to the challenges of Islam. Undoubtedly Elias’s most notable work in this regard is the one entitled *Kitāb al-majālīs*. It is a compendium of Christian apologetics, cast in the literary form of seven accounts of as many conversations on Christian doctrines between Elias and the vizir Abū l-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Maghribī (981–1027). The sessions are said to have been held in Nisibis in July of the year 1026, with subsequent meetings in December 1026 and June 1027.
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Elias’s work entitled *Kitāb daf al-hamm* is in the form of a booklet of twelve chapters dedicated to the same vizir, Abū l-Qāsim al-Maghribī, with whom the bishop had been in conversation in the sessions reported in the *Kitāb al-majālis*. In the introduction the author explains that, inspired by the work of the Muslim philosopher al-Kindī, he has composed the new treatise in response to the request of the vizir for a book dedicated to the subject of the rational management of human anxieties. He then proceeds to commend to the reader the general attitude of gratitude for all he has received, since gratitude tends to drive away anxiety and to fortify the soul. Next, Elias distinguishes two kinds of anxieties, general and particular, and two kinds of virtues, religious and rational. Then in twelve chapters he shows how the religious virtues, duly distinguished from the corresponding vices, counteract general anxieties, and how the rational virtues can allay particular anxieties. The religious virtues are piety, gratitude, chastity, humility, mercy and repentance; the rational virtues are reasonable action, the habit of taking counsel, good conduct, liberality, justice and clemency. He proceeds on three levels: description of the virtues and vices; anecdotes about the virtues from the traditions of many peoples, including Persian, Muslim and biblical sages; and the suggestion of strategems for acquiring the virtues. Elias explains his procedure as follows:

I will make a book of three parts. I will include in the first part the preliminary description of the virtues, the mention of them, exhortations, sermons, and useful sayings about whatever might help to acquire them. In the second part I will include such stories and tales as may help the one who emulates them to acquire these virtues. In the third part I will include the strategems of the people of grace and knowledge and intelligence, such as will aid the acquisition of [the virtues], taken from various works on the dissipation of sorrows from what the wise Galen and Ya'qūb ibn Ishaq al-Kindī and other scholars have composed.

Elias’s debt to al-Kindī’s way of thinking is evident already in his characterization of the sorrows and anxieties his readers will want to dissipate. He says,

Since anxieties (*al-humūm*) are to the soul as sicknesses are to the body, the concern must be for dispelling anxieties from the soul more than the concern for dispelling sicknesses from the body, due to the nobility of the soul over the body.

---
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Elias's treatise on the 'Dissipation of sorrow' seems to have been enormously popular; it reportedly survives in at least sixty-six known manuscript copies, scattered throughout the libraries of the East and the West. Earlier in this century there was a lively debate among scholars about its authenticity as a work of Elias of Nisibis. Some wanted to attribute it to the Syrian Orthodox polymath of the thirteenth century, Gregory Abū l-Faraj Bar Hebraeus (1225–86). But it has now been conclusively shown, by references in letters and citations by other writers, that Elias of Nisibis is truly the author of the work.  

Since the one edition of Elias's work is not readily available, and it has never been translated into a Western language, nor has it so far been the subject of an extended scholarly study, one has, per force of these circumstances, to be satisfied for the present purpose with a general description of its contents. But even so, it is clear that while his concern is much the same as that of the philosopher al-Kindī, Elias has a different approach to the problem. Khalil Samir, the modern scholar who has published most on the text, albeit mostly in Arabic, thinks that Elias left it incomplete. Specifically, he thinks that the author meant to include material from al-Kindī's treatise in the third section of the work, the one about strategems for acquiring virtue. But this is only a surmise. At the very least it is clear that he took advantage of the popularity of a line of ethical thinking among Muslim scholars to employ it to commend a Christian way of thinking in Arabic. In short, like the other two Christian writers whose works on this subject we have reviewed, Elias 'theologized' the line of thinking which he found in the popular work of al-Kindī and brought it into the Christian mainstream.

*The Consolation of Philosophy*

Al-Kindī's treatise on the dissipation of sorrows, along with the three Christian tracts which it inspired, are altogether often thought of as belonging to the literary genre of the 'consolation of philosophy', on the order of Boethius's (c. 480–c. 524) famous classic of the same name, *De consolatione philosophiae*. But, as we have seen, only al-Kindī's work can, strictly speaking, be said to commend a line of philosophical, or pre-philosophical thinking as a consolation for sorrow. The Christian works all find consolation in the pages of divine revelation, although it is clear that all three of them owe their inspiration to al-Kindī's popular work.

While all three Arab Christian treatises are very different works on their own terms, they all in some part follow the model of al-
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59 See Khalil Samir, 'Un auteur chrétien', 279–81.
60 See Anicius Manlius Severinus Boethius, *Philosophiae consolatio* (Corpus Christianorum, series Latina, 94; Turnhout: Brepols, 1957).
Kindī’s work. And they very much share the purpose of commending an attitude of long-suffering rather than of engaging in rigorous argument. One wonders to what degree the predicament of Christians in Islamic society might have contributed to the popularity of treatises of this sort. The condition of dhimmitude under which they lived, even at its best, seems always to have left Christians with a sense of not quite fully belonging to the Islamic commonwealth, however much they may have acculturated themselves to it.

Yet even in these circumstances it is interesting to observe that beyond the technical disciplines of translation, medicine and logic, in which scholars from the Church of the East excelled, it was in the realm of moral thought that Arabophone Christian intellectuals seem to have come the closest to a fuller participation in the thought-world of the Muslims, and this in spite of the fact that it was a *topos* in the polemical literature to accuse Islam of moral laxity. One thinks in this connection not only of an enormously popular treatise like Yahyā ibn ‘Adī’s *Tahdhib al-ahlāq*, which is a special case, but of the ‘consolation’ literature as well, in which it is clear that in spite of the fact that the Christian writers introduce the dimension of divine revelation, the leitmotiv of these compositions remains that one set by al-Kindī. Accordingly, it is worth pausing here, briefly to consider Ibn ‘Adī’s famous treatise, and to compare its methodology with that of the three treatises on the dissipation of sorrows.

The Syrian Orthodox philosopher and theologian Abū Zakariyya Yahyā ibn ‘Adī al-Manṭiqī at-Taqrīṭī was born in Taqrīṭ, Iraq, in 893/94. He went to Baghdad to further his education. In the late ninth and tenth centuries Baghdad was the centre of Syriac and Arabic language studies in logic, largely under the auspices of scholars from the Church of the East. There Yahyā ibn ‘Adī studied with the logician Abū Bishr Mattā ibn Yūnus (c. 870–c. 940), a Christian who belonged to the Church of the East, and also with the Muslim philosopher Abū Nasr al-Farābī (c. 870–950). After al-Farābī’s death, Yahyā ibn ‘Adī became the leading exponent of the Aristotelian school in Baghdad. He attracted numerous disciples, both Christian and Muslim, not a few of whom became eminent scholars in their own turn. Yahyā was also a prolific writer in the areas of philosophy and Christian theology and apologetics. He translated many Greek works of Aristotle and his commentators from Syriac into Arabic. His Muslim contemporary, Ibn an-Nadīm (d. 995), pays tribute to Yahyā ibn ‘Adī for his eminence as a scholar, and draws attention to his atypical religious affiliation for a
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scholar of such employment: 'He was unique during his period. He belonged to the Jacobite Christian sect'. In the milieu of Baghdad, the expectation would have been that Yahya would have belonged to the Church of the East. He died in the year 974 and was buried in the church of St Thomas in Baghdad.

One of the most interesting essays to come from the pen of Yahya ibn 'Adi is the remarkable text, Tahdhib al-ahlāq, a treatise on the 'improvement of morals'. In many ways it is a classical text of moral philosophy, in the sense that it does not have an original doctrine to put forward. Rather, it reflects typical Greek thinking of the late antique period on the subject of virtue, to which the author attributes no other end beyond itself. Virtue itself suffices, he teaches, to attain that happiness of which human nature is capable. He makes no allusions to the hereafter or to any moral principles deriving from divine revelation. He transmits traditional wisdom, encased in sage counsels and fetching examples. There is nothing even to indicate that the author was a Christian. And this universal character of the work is what made it appeal not only to Christians, but to Muslims as well. In fact, it has over the centuries been attributed to such Muslim notables as al-Jāḥiz, Miskawayhī, Ibn 'Arabī and Ibn al-Haytham. It has been only in recent years that it has been shown beyond any reasonable doubt to be a work of Yahya ibn 'Adi.

This popularity of Yahya's moral treatise, known in more than twenty manuscripts, and approaching a dozen printed editions, shows the extent to which a Christian intellectual's work might influence Muslim thought. At the same time, it is clear that he has done so only by leaving out any considerations of divine revelation in his work. Nevertheless, it is also clear that the work represents such a high degree of cultural integration on the part of a Christian writer that a Muslim scholar of modern times could write about the treatise, properly attributed, and without any apparent sense of irony, that 'perhaps the most important feature of Tahdhib al-ahlāq is that it was one of the earliest books on Islamic (sic) ethical

64 For a portrait of Yahya as an intellectual see Joel L. Kraemer, Humanism in the Renaissance of Islam: the cultural revival during the Buyid age (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 104-39
65 There are a number of editions of this work. The most recent ones are: Naji al-Takriti, Yahya ibn 'Adi, a critical edition and study of his Tahdhib al-ahlāq (Beirut: Éditions Oueidat, 1978); Marie-Thérèse Urvoy, Traité d'éthique d'Abū Zakariyyā Yahya ibn 'Adi, introduction, texte et traduction (Paris: Cariscript, 1991); Samir Khalil Kussaim, Yahya ibn 'Adi, Tahdhib al-ahlāq (Beirut and Cairo: CEDRAC/Patristic Center, 1994).
philosophy'. In this regard the contrast with the Arab Christian treatises on the dissipation of sorrows could not be more striking.

Another moment of common interest between Muslim and Christian intellectuals which comes to the fore in Arab Christian treatises on the dissipation of sorrows is the mutual appreciation of the Alexander Romance of late Antiquity, here in the form of Alexander's letter to his mother. This is an instance, along with the philosophical tradition itself, of a pre-Islamic cultural item helping to crystallize an expression of Islamic culture in which both Muslims and Christians cheerfully participated.

While the 'consolation' literature certainly cannot be said to represent high philosophy, it does nevertheless constitute an interesting, if minor, occasion for the modern scholar to observe how Arabophone Christian intellectuals of the early Islamic period could take their cue from developments in the thought-world of Muslims to advance Christian thinking in the world of Islam. And, of course, Christian intellectuals were not the only ones to be attracted to the 'consolation' literature; Muslim writers too continued to contribute to the genre, most notably Ibn Sina/Avicenna (980–1037), but his is another story, for another commentator, on another day. The present purpose has been to show in a particular instance how Christian intellectuals, principally in the Church of the East, insinuated Christian thinking into the cultural world of the Muslims, taking advantage of the wide availability of a work of the ever popular 'Philosopher of the Arabs'.

67 Naji al-Takriti, Yahyā ibn 'Adi, a critical edition and study, 222.