Note: Acc. to A. (see p. 118, N. 46) the Arabic text has previously been published at Cairo, Dār al-kādīb al-‘arabī, 1969.

Both the edition (based on the three actually known manuscripts) and the translation appear valuable. A. indicates the correspondent passages between the Poem and Canon, B. I. The introduction consists of a general presentation of I.S.’s famous Poem on Medicine, and of Canon, I.

2. Urdūzā fi ’l-faṣūl al-arba’a (Poem on the Four Seasons) (AN. 118, 115; M. 17)

Edited by BĀBĀ (AL.), M. in his Min mu’allafāt Ibn Sīnā at-ṭibbiyyat. Aleppo, Ma’had al-turāth al-‘ilmī al-‘arabī, 1984, 195-206, under the heading: Urdūzā mansūb ilā Ibn Sīnā fi tadbīr as-ṣāḥa.

This edition is based on the same manuscripts as that of the Poem of Medicine (see supra, Major Medical Works, III). Regarding the final part of the poem, different readings are given by the different mss. Valuable.

3. Urdūzā latīfā fi qadāyā Ihbqāt al-khamās wa l-’ishrīn (Elegant Poem on 25 Sentences of Hippocrates) (AN. 120; M. 19)


The very first edition (based on 3 mss.) and translation of this Poem. In the Introduction, A. presents some technical remarks regarding the manuscripts he uses for this edition as well as some stylistic particularities of the Poem. He also offers a doctrinal outline. Valuable, although A. seems to ignore some manuscripts, referred to by Anawati in his Mu’allafat. Moreover, one may wonder whether the attribution of the Poem of I.S. does not deserve more rigorous investigation?

4. Da’f al-maddār al-kalīliyyat ‘an al-abdān al-insāniyya (Repulsion of General Harms from Human Bodies) (AN. 130; M. 75)

— BĀBĀ (AL.), M., Mu’allafat., (see 2), 1-73.

Based on 4 mss., this edition is the first (semi-) critical edition of this medical treatise by I.S.

Valuable, although open to further refinement.

A rather uncritical edition was published at Beirut, Dār Ihyā ‘al-‘ulūm, 1982 (author unknown), while a reprint of the Cairo, 1888-edition (together with a treatise by Abū Bakr al-Rāzī), was issued at Beirut, Dār al-Sādir, 1975.


5. Siyāsah al-badān wa faḍḍ il-al-sharab (The Conduct of the Body, and the Qualities of Wine) (AN. 133; M. 83)

— Shams al-dīn, 281-284.

6. R. fi ’l-thab (Tr. on Perfume) (AN. 135; M. 87)

— MICHOT, J., L’épître d’Aviceone sur le Parfum, in: Bull. Philos. Méd., 20 (78), 53-57, presents the edition (based on the only known manuscript) as well as a French translation.

Valuable.

7. Al-Qālanj (Colic) (AN. 142; M. 101)


— THĀMARĪ, D. has edited this treatise in: Majallat ma’had al-makhṣūṣat al-arabiyya (New Ser.-Kuwait), 30 (86), 9-17 and 441-501. In the first part (9-17) A. offers a brief general introduction to I.S.’s life and thought, and gives a basic description of the three manuscripts he has consulted for his edition. Unfortunately, no single variant reading is offered in the actual edition (441-493). Moreover, A. is unaware of Hammāmī’s partial edition.
2. R. al-manāmiyya (Tr. concerning Dreams) (AN. 156; 101; M. 47)  
  
- PINES, S., The Arabic Recension of *Parva Naturalia* and the Philosophical Doctrine Concerning Veridical Dreams according to *al-Risāla al-manāmiyya* and other Sources, in: *Israel Or. Stud.*, 4 (74), 104-153; also in Coll. Works, II, see supra, g.8). 96-145 includes the translation of the chapters 6-9, 15, 25 and 39. Moreover, A. offers a paraphrasing summary of ch. 1-5.  
  
A’s translation is clearly superior to that of M. MUIJD KHAN (ch. 1-12 in: *Indo-Iranica*, 9, (56), 15-30). For A., this text is directly based on a Greek source, since it presents several ideas by no means characteristic of the Arabic falsafi (but A. insists that this very fact does not exclude I.S.’s authorship – which he even judges ‘probable’), and, moreover, includes a quotation from De sensu et Sensato, which is definitely Greek in spirit, as is convincingly shown by A. Presenting still other materials, A. concludes that there existed an Arabic version of Aristotle’s *De Divinatione per Somnum*, different from the Greek version, which had its origin most probably in a Hellenistic or perhaps Stoic milieu.  

3. R. ilā al-Barqī (Letter to al-Barqī) (AN. 158; M. 86)  
  
Based on three Istanbul mss., A.’s edition is rather valuable.  

k. Mathematics - Music - Astronomy  

1. Al-ālāt al-rādiyya (Astronomical Instruments) (AN. 164; M. 1)  
- WIEDEMANN, E., Ges. Werke (see supra, c.5), II, 1117-1203, offers the reprint of E. WIEDEMANN and T. JUYNBÖLL, Avicennas Schrifft über ein von ihm ersonnenes Beobachtungsinstrument, in: *Acta Or.*, 5 (27), 81-167 (The Arabic text; together with a German translation is given at pp. 1122-1154, resp. 86-118).
2. *'Ibm šinā‘at al-māsiqī* (Science of the Art of Music) (AN. 165; M. 232)

- Rasa‘il, 285-296 offers the reprint of Majmu‘, Tr. 7.


- Rasa‘il, 441-454 reproduces Jāmi‘, 152-164.

4. R. fī ‘l-hay‘a (Tr. On Astronomy)

Note: Neither Anawati, nor Mahdavi mention this treatise, but it is given by F. SAYYID, *Ibm Sīnā‘. Mū‘allaqātahu wa-sha‘irihā al-mu‘akkaz br-dār al-Kutub al-misriyya* (Ibm Sīnā‘. His Works, and Comments on them, Extant in the National Library of Cairo). Cairo, 1950, p. 29.


Partial Italian translation (starting with the introduction through the very beginnings of § 14), based on a unique manuscript (A. stopped his translation, because of inextricable problems of decipherment, see p. 189, n. 62). At first sight, the translation appears rather valuable (but a definitive judgment cannot be given without a comparison with the original manuscript). Interesting, but a separate examination seems required in order to demonstrate the authenticity of I.S.’s authorship (which is possible, but not evident).

WORKS-EDITIONS AND TRANSLATIONS

I. Metaphysics - Theodicy

1. R. al-tamjid (Tr. of Glorification) (AN. 177, 194; M. 70)

- S. NAFCY’s Bū Sīnā‘… (see General Studies, A17) offers the Arabic text (260-262) as well as the text of an old Persian translation, ascribed to U. Khayyā‘ (263-265).

2. Sirr al-qadar (Secret of Destiny) (AN. 181; M. 4 H)

- ‘Aṣyī‘, 300-305 offers the edition of the Arabic text.

Based on one single manuscript, and 2 printed editions, i.e. Tehran, 1895 and Hayderabad, 1934.

Good, but A. unfortunately ignores Hourani’s edition (see infra).

- Rasa‘il, 237-240 offers the reprint of Majmu‘, tr. 3.


Reprint of BSOAS, 29 (66), 25-48, including a rather critical edition (27-31) (unfortunately these pages have not been reprinted for economical reasons), a critical translation (31-33, repr. 229-231), and a significant comment (33-48, repr. 231-248).

- Arbbery, 38-41.

3. R. al-arshiyya (Tr. of the Throne) (AN. 183; 197; M. 61)


This edition shows a slight improvement on the Hayderabad, 1934-edition, since one more manuscript has been taken into account. Good, but in need of further refinement.
4. R fi 'l-a'fāl wa 'l-inflāt (Tr. On Actions and Passions) (AN. 190; M. 97)

5. Al-Qadā wa l-qadar (Divine Decree and Predestination) (AN. 193; M. 100)

6. R al-mabda wa l-ma'ād (Tr. On the Origin and the Return) (AN. 196; M. 106 B)

7. R al-adhawiyya fi l-ma'ād (Tr. On Return) (AN. 200; M. 30)

This is the first edition of this old Persian translation (based on two known manuscripts).
Very interesting, and valuable.

6. R al-mabda wa l-ma'ād (Tr. On the Origin and the Return) (AN. 196; M. 106 B)

Based on doctrinal grounds, A. convincingly shows that this treatise is not by I.S. himself.

A rather valuable edition.


8. Al-Malāikā (The Angels) (AN. 203; M. 113)

- ʻĀṣī, 289-294 offers what seems to be the first edition of this text (based on 4 mss.). Rather valuable.

9. R. baḍī al-aḍāḍ (Tr. of Some Learned Men) (M. 78)

Note: This treatise is not mentioned by Anawati.

- Rasāʾīl, 455-480 offers the Arabic text, together with a Persian introduction (most probably a reprint of an earlier edition, but it was not identified).

Notes:

1. PUIG, J., El tratado de Zenon el Mayor. Un comentario atribuido a al-Farabi, in: La Ciudad de Dios, 201 (88), 287-321, shows that this treatise is probably by a disciple of I.S., and contains some verbatim citations of I.S.'s treatise al-Urāsh (AN. 184; M. 89). It has to be noted that A. offers a Spanish translation of the Treatise of Zenon (pp. 214-221).
2. SA'DANĪ (AL-), ʻA. has provided an Arabic translation of the spurious Ḥaqqā va-kaṣṣīyyat sīsīla-i mawjūdāt va tasulul adāb va-musahhabāt (M. 159), in: Pensée arabe,... 225-246.

m. Qur'ānic exegesis

The totality of the extant fragments of Qur'ānic exegesis by I.S. (AN. 207-212; M. 50) has been edited by ʻĀṣī, 89-125, together with a comment on the Verse of the Light (Q. 35: 24) (not mentioned in Anawati, nor Mahdavi): ibid., 84-88.

Valuable, but, above all, very meritorious! – although one may wonder whether the Comment on the Verse of the Light is really Avicennian – a basic comparison with his comment on the same verse in the Ishārāt, and in his Proof of Prophecies imposes itself in this respect.

n. Mystics

Note:

In order to avoid unnecessary repetition, here is a general evaluation of all editions by ʻĀṣī. One cannot but stress the very great merits of A. He succeeds in making several texts accessible for the first time (he hereby has sometimes to work on a unicum!). Moreover, he tries to take into account, whenever possible, the existing printed edition(s), always collating them with manuscripts that had not been consulted up till then. However, A. never seems to carry out an exhaustive study of all the known manuscripts with respect to each particular text.

1. Ijābat al-duʿā wa kaṣṣīyyat al-ziyāra (Fulfilment of Prayer, and how to visit Tombī) (AN. 213; M. 4D)

- ʻĀṣī, 281-288.
- Rasāʾīl, 335-338 reprints Jāmī, 32-36.
- Shams al-dīn, 388-391 (Reprints the Tehran, 1313 H.-ed.)
- MEHREN's 1894-edition, together with a French paraphrastic translation has been reprinted in Traité.
2. *Al-dhikr (Invocation of God* (AN. 216, 221; M. 54)
   - 'Āṣf, 310-313.
   - Rasā'il, 281-284 reprints Majmu'a'. Tr. 6.

3. *Fi māhīyyat al-huzn (On the Nature of Sorrow* (AN. 217; M. 59)
   - 'Āṣf, 314-317.
   - Shams al-dīn, 386-387.

4. *Hayy ibn Yaqzān* (AN. 219; M. 65)
   - 'Āṣf, 321-335.
   - Rasā'il, 131-142 reprints Jāmi', 91-113.
   - MEHREN's 1889-edition has been reprinted in Traité.
   - CORBIN's 1954-edition of the old Persian translation (with comments) of Ḥāyī, ascribed to al-Jāzārī, has been reprinted at Tehran, Presses Universitaires, 1987 (together with a Persian translation) of ch. 3 of his Avicenne et le récit visionnaire.
   - Pirūzinoma, 45-62.

5. *Al-du'ā (Prayer of Supplication)* (AN. 222; M. 74)
   - 'Āṣf, 295-299.

6. *Daf' al-hamm 'inda waqā'ī al-mawt (Delivrance of Death-fear* (AN. 224; M. 168)

   Note: This text is not by L.S., but part of Miskawayh's *Tahhīb al-akhlaq* (see MICHTOT, Destion, XXX).
   - 'Āṣf, 270-280.
   - Rasā'il, 339-346 reprints Jāmi', 36-43.
   - MEHREN's 1894-edition, together with a French paraphrase, has been reprinted in Traité.

7. *Māhīyyat al-ṣalāt (The Quiddity of Prayer)* (AN. 227; M. 85)
   - 'Āṣf, 203-222.
   - Rasā'il, 297-310 reprints Jāmi', 2-14.
   - MEHREN's 1894-edition, together with a French paraphrastic summary, has been reprinted in Traité.
   - ARBERRY, 50-63.
8. Al-Ṭāyr (The Bird) (AN. 229; M. 88)

- ʿÂṣr, 336-343.
- Rasāʾīl, 399-406 reprints Jāmiʿ, 114-119.
- MEHREN’s 1891-edition, together with a French translation (somewhat paraphrastic) has been reprinted in Traité des.
- CHEIKHO, L., Traité inédits..., 65-70 (reprint, cfr. supra, 6).
- CORBIN, H., Avicenne et le récit visionnaire, 215-222 (see Religious Themes and Mysticism, C7), includes a French translation.
- Pirâznîma, 35-44.

9. R. fl l-ʾishq (Tr. On Love) (AN. 230; M. 90)

- ʿÂṣr, 241-269.
- Rasāʾīl, 373-397 reprints Jāmiʿ, 68-91.
- MEHREN’s 1894-edition has been reprinted in Traité des (together with a French paraphrastic summary).

This same edition has also been reprinted, together with a Russian translation in SEREBRYAKOV, S., Traktat Ibn Sînî o lyâbî. Tîflîs, 1976.


The Persian translation is good, but very dependent upon Atesh’ edition.


After a general introduction, in which A. states that I.S.’s treatise is a typical scholastic product, A. makes some pertinent observations on the different classical editions, resp. Atesh’s (A. hereby leans on M. SORETH, Text- und Quellenkritische Bemerkungen zu Ibn Sinâ’s Risalât fl l-ʾisq, in: Orient, 17 (64), 118-131). Hereafter, A. shows I.S.’s sources, chapter by chapter in a sumptuous fashion (based on E. FACKENHEIM’s indications in his famous 1945-translation (Medieval Stud., 7 (45), 211-228). Then A. offers an English translation of ch. I (p. 52-55). Finally, A. discusses in detail some aspects of the translation – paying special attention to basic concepts (esp. in the fields of emanation, perfection and love).

Very innovative and interesting, although some of A’s opinions are quite questionable.

The second part of this study (announced by A.) has not been located and perhaps never published.

10. Al-ʾilm al-laduni (Mystic Knowledge) (AN. 231; M. 187)

Note: The attribution of this work to I.S. is very doubtful. Mahdavi ascribes it to al-Ghazzâlî, but that attribution also has been attacked by several authors who instead believe it to be written by an unknown later author.


11. Al-ʾahd (The Fact) (AN. 232, 82; M. 92)

- Tîs’, 111-114.

- Shams al-dîn, 419-420 (reprints the Tehran, 1313 H.-ed., which is substantially different from that of tîs’).

12. Al-firdaws fi maḥiyya al-insân (Paradise with Respect to the Human Nature) (AN. 233, 95; M. 192)

Note: This work is identical with the Fuṣûṣ al-ḥikma (Gemsstones of Wisdom), traditionally attributed to al-Fârâbî, but PINES, S., Ibn Sinâ et l’auteur de la Risalât al-Fuṣûṣ fl l Hikma, in: Revue des Études
Islamiques, 19 (51), 121-124 has presented some arguments in favour of its attribution to I.S. However, a more extensive and systematic research on this important, but very delicate topic is required. It has to be noted that AN. 95 does not give the complete text, but that AN. 95 has circulated in an independent manner.

- ‘Āšī, 126-147.
- Tis’, 55-62 (only the text of AN. 95).

13. Salāmān wa-Abīsāl (Salāmān and Abīsāl) (AN. 235; M. 204)
- Tis’, 125-139.
- Pirāzīm, 63-72.

14. Kalimāt as-suṣīyya (Sufistic Sayings) (AN. 236; M. 209)

Note: This text is by Sohravardī.


Having at his disposal one more manuscript (i.e. Raghib, 1480), A. provides an improved edition. At the same time, A. recognizes in the introduction (139-145) that this work has to be ascribed to Sohravardī (a fact, already stated by Maladov).

15. Al-mu’jizāt wa l-kaṣāyāt (Miracles and Prodigies) (AN. 238, 157; M. 172, 226)

Note: This text is by Ibn Saḥlān al-Sāwājī.

- ‘Āšī, 223-240.

16. Al-mawā’iz (Exhortations) (AN. 240, 243; M. 102)
- ‘Āšī, 306-309.
- Shams al-dīn, 396-397.

17. Al-ṣawr al-’.azām (The Most Important Prayer) (AN. 244; M. 128)
- ‘Āšī, 318-320.


0. Ethics - Politics - Prophecy

1. Iḥbāt al-nabuwwa (Proof of Prophecies) (AN. 245; M. 3)
- Tis’, 95-104.
- Shams al-dīn, 298-309 (reprints the Cairo, 1908-ed).
- MARMURA, M. has published an English translation, in: Medieval Political Philosophy. 112-121.

2. Al-Akḥāq (Ethics) (AN. 246; M. 13)
- Tis’, 115-124.
- Shams al-dīn, 369-377 (mainly based on the Tehran, 1313 H.-ed.).
3. Tadbîr al-musâfrîn (Directory for Travellers) (AN. 251; M. 45)

- Shams al-dîn, 281-294.
The first edition of this text (based on a unicum). A. stresses that the contents of this treatise is of a medical nature.

4. Tadbîr manzîl al-'askar (Preparation of the Camp Site of the Army) (AN. 252; M. 46)

- Shams al-dîn, 280 (first edition, based on 2 mss.).

5. Al-siyâsa (Politics) (AN. 253; M. 82)

The introduction is of a very general nature. Regarding the edition, one gets the impression that it is a slightly improved version of P. MA‘LOUF’s, in: Al-Machreq, 9 (1906), 2-17.

A valuable edition, although open to further refinement.


- Shams al-dîn, 295-297.
The contents of this treatise is of an outspoken medical nature, as is indicated by A.

p. Personal Letters


Note: For the relationship between the different numbers of Anawati, see MICHOT, Destinée, XXI.
3. Majmūʿ Ibn Sināʾ al-kubrā (Compendium of Ibn Sināʾ "The Older") (M. 127)

Note: This work is not mentioned by Anawati. Mahdavi is inclined to ascribe it to Sahravardi.

— N.N., Kitāb al-kanz al-muaffa... Cairo, al-Azhār, (ca. 1972), offers this text (uncritical edition).
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(3) AKMAL AYYUBI, N., Some Unknown Scientific Works of Avicenna Preserved in Turkey, in Indo-Iranica, 35,4 (82), 64-68. A. presents a few minor treatises of I.S. (AN. 172, 162, 51, 154 and 133), which, according to his view, are not well known to scholars, and for which the manuscript evidence seems to be limited to Istanbul libraries. But A. neither deals with these manuscripts, nor does he examine the authenticity of the attribution of these works to I.S. He only offers a very rough presentation of their contents. Of almost no value.

(4) ALLAN, N., Un manuscrito arabo: al-Qânûn di Ibn Sînâ (Wellcome Orient. Ms. 155), in: KOS, 19 (84), 21-22. Acc. to A., the WMS. Or. 155 (17th C.) is one of the most beautiful manuscripts of the Canon. In this respect, A. briefly describes one illustration (reproduced on p. 23). A. also offers general information on I.S. Of very limited value.

(5) ANAWATI, G.C., Bibliographie de la philosophie médiévale en terre d'Islam pour les années 1959-1969, in: Bull. Philos. Méd., 10-12 (68-70), 316-369: Avicenne, 343-349. A. offers a very significant list of the text-editions of Avicennian works, as well as of studies on Ibn Sînâ published during the period. Notwithstanding a few (almost inevitable) omissions, or faults, A. has delivered a remarkable piece of work, which has certainly contributed to the progress of the Avicennian studies.


(8) ID., La tradition manuscrite orientale de l’œuvre d’Aviceenne, in: Etudes de philosophie musulmane (see supra, 7), 229-262.
Reprint of Revue Thomiste, 51 (51), 407-440.
(9) BARI, A., see: HAMEED, A.
A. surveys the 1980 Millennium celebrations of I.S. in Tajikistan, as well as in Uzbekistan. But above all he points to a great number of publications (both books and papers), published at this occasion. However, one wonders whether all the mentioned publications deserve scholarly attention? Moreover, A’s references are not always very precise (for many papers, no exact number of pages is given).
Good, useful as a primary survey of the incredibly high number of publications in the mentioned area and period.
A. briefly presents 25 manuscripts, extant in K. Marx University at Leipzig, and containing works by I.S., or commentaries on them. The majority of these manuscripts are taken from Latin manuscripts of the 14th-15th centuries, which deal with medical topics (esp. the Canon, extracts of it, or commentaries on it by Italian physicians). In view of the large use made of the Canon in the medical teaching at the Leipzig University in the 16th C (A. indicates that there already existed lectures on the Canon in the first half of the 15th C), this prevalence of medical manuscripts is not a surprise. However, the special preoccupation with b. III of the Canon in that period, can neither be deduced from, nor explained by the actual collection. Therefore, A. supposes that a manuscript, containing the text of book III of the Canon was lost (a loss, which may have occurred a long time ago).
Valuable, at least as far as it concerns the medical manuscripts.
collection of the Dīr al-Kutub in Cairo. This manuscript was copied by a third
generation student of I.S., ‘Abd-al-Razzāq as-Sīghnākī from texts originally
present in I.S.’s library. So, the manuscript is very old, and it probably has to be
dated in the first half of the 12th C. With respect to its scribe, ‘Abd-al-Razzāq, A.
carefully examines Bayhaqī’s information about him. A. also provides minute
details about the manuscript itself, more specifically about its codological and
palaeographical characteristics, its orthographic peculiarities, its owners and its
copies (A. limits himself to a description of the (rather recent) copies made in the
Khedival Library itself). As to the proper contents of the manuscript, A. carefully
identifies its different parts, and gives its publication record (which he most
critically evaluates).

A very fine study, of great importance for further editions of Avicennian texts, as
well as for a critical evaluation of already existing editions.

(18) HAMEED, A. and BARI, A., Impact of Ibn Sīnā’s Medical Works
The authors present several lists, dealing with the medical works of I.S. (esp.
Canon and Tract on Cardiac Drugs), their translations (into Urdu, Persian or
English), and commentaries (or super-commentaries) on them (and their
translations), provided that they either have been edited in India (or, at least, by
a scholar who had some links with India), or are actually extant in India in
manuscript-form, at least as far as public collections are concerned.
A well-documented pioneering study, but one cannot but regret that the majority
of the references are rather vague (the precise location, i.e. number of a book or a
manuscript in a well-defined library, is never given).

(19) KHAIROULLAYEV, M., Some Treatises and Epistles of Ibn Sīnā,
in : Ind. J. Hist. Sc., 21 (86), 244-250.
A. describes the contents of a few manuscripts, extant in the Institute of Oriental
Studies of the Uzbek Academy. Among them, A. mentions a Treatise on the
Classification of the Existing Objects (not mentioned in the current
bibliographies-acc. to A., this manuscript is the only known which contains
this treatise).
Interesting, but regrettable that A. does not give the precise location of the
manuscripts.

(20) KHAN, M.S., Soviet Publications on Ibn Sīnā. A Select
57-68.
A. offers an almost exhaustive overview of twenty years of Russian scholarship
on I.S.
A. valuable piece of information for those, who want to deal with the Russian
publications on I.S.

(21) KHIREFIX (AL)-, S., Manuscrits d’Avicennien Works in the
National Library al-Zāhiriyah, in: Al-turāth al-arabī, 2,56 (81),
Appendix, 91-112 (Ar).
A. offers a basic description of 56 manuscripts (or parts of manuscripts), extant
in the National Library at Damascus, which contain (medical or philological) texts
by I.S. (or Commentaries on them). Anawati, in his famous Mu’allaqat Ibn Sīnā,
Cairo, 1950, App. 2, 430-431, had already identified some of them, but without
any precise description. A. not only fills this lacuna, but also presents new
materials.
This paper seems to constitute a valuable complement to the ‘classical’ I.S.-
bibliographies of Anawati, Mahdavi and Ergin.

(22) KOTTKE, S., METZGER, M. and METZGER, TH., Manuscrits
Med., II, 739-745.
Authors present in detail 5 decorated manuscripts, which are part of the Hebrew
translation of the Canon, with special attention to the famous Ms. Bologna 2197
(authors present an interesting interpretation of some of its major illustrations).
In an addendum, authors mention four more illustrated Hebrew ms. of the
Canon.
Very valuable.

(23) LEBEDEV, V., Ibn Sīnā’s Works, and their Use in the Manuscript-
Funds Gosudarstvennoj of the State Library M.E. Saltykov-Shedrīna,
in : Ibn Sīnā. k-1000 letiuj,... 243-248 (Ru).
A. presents the contents of a few manuscripts which concern I.S., available in the
Gosudarstvennoj collection.

(24) LUNIN, B., Life and Works of Ibn Sīnā in Soviet Scholarship, in :
Ibn Sīnā. k-1000 letiuj., 212-243 (Ru).
A. gives an overview of Soviet publications on I.S. published between 1950 and
1980, classified according to their topics.

(25) MĂRZA, I., see : PORA, A.

(26) MEMÜN (AL)-, M., Two Periods of Avicennien Writings in the
Inoculation of Medieval Teaching in the Medieval “Maghreb”, in : Al-
turāth al-arabī, 2,56 (81), 130-159; also in : Pensée arabe..., 451-483
(Ar).
A. points out the existence of a lively interest in I.S.’s medical ideas in the
Maghreb (i.e. Andalusia and the African Maghreb) in the 12th-13th centuries.
He cites both direct and indirect testimonies and provides precise manuscript
evidence for the most important ones. In the 16th-18th C. African Maghreb, he
identifies a second wave of interest in I.S.'s medical teachings, pointing once more to the major testimoni, and available manuscript evidence. In the appendix, A. presents four text-fragments of these "medieval Maghrebi medical writers": i.e.: Ibn Mahâni (2 fragments), Abû 3-Qasim al-'Azâfi and Ahmad ibn 'Ali al-Tasîlî.

A valuable study, both with respect to the history of I.S.'s medical influence (clarifying a rather unknown part of it) and with respect to the presentation of a good number of manuscripts, containing (direct or indirect) comments on I.S.'s medical texts (esp. Canon and Poem of Medicine).

(27) MEITZGER, M., see: KOTTEK, S.

(28) MEITZGER, TH., see: KOTTEK, S.

A. offers a very brief list of 9 papers on I.S. in Arabic, published on the occasion of the 1988-Millenary festivities.
Of almost no value.

A. gives a rather detailed list of editions, translations, or abridgments of the Canon, as well as comments, or super-comments on it. He also presents a lot of information about the other medical works of I.S. (but one discovers a few mistakes, e.g. his placing al-Tishq, On Love among I.S.'s medical works (?), or important omissions, e.g. Alpago's translation of the Canon).
Useful in some respects, but to be handled with caution.

Authors briefly describe four 16th C. printed editions of medical writings by I.S., edited by Venice Presses, and extant in libraries in Transylvania.
Good, but of no great significance.

A. has spared no effort in trying to establish as complete a list as possible of all of the existing manuscripts of Hebrew translations of the Canon, or parts of it, presenting their basic descriptions.
A significant paper with respect to the Hebraic tradition of the Canon, although Tamani (infra), 88-89, N. 20 indicates an omission.

In the Oriental (Arabic) collection of the Gottha Library, one finds 38 codices, including texts of I.S. (24 works), or comments on his writings (23 works). They are part of what one may call the Skeitzen-collection. Mostly of them were acquired by Skeitzen in Aleppo, or in Cairo, as shown by A. They deal with medical, philosophical and theological topics. A. gives a more or less basic description of all of them (concentrating on contents and dating). Of course, A. relies on W. Pertz's famous 3-volume catalogue, published between 1877 and 1892, but he does not hesitate to propose a few relevant corrections, or to indicate some doubtful cases, which deserve further research.
A valuable paper, although one may regret that A. only refers to Brockelmann, when he tries to identify a disputed work.

(34) SABRI, F., Bibliography of Ibn Sinâ, in: Al-turâth al-'arabî, 2, 3-6 (81), App, 51-90 (Ar).
A. lists all the works by I.S. (with reference to Brockelmann, AnaWati and Mahdawi), and tries to distinguish between the authentic works and the spurious (in this respect, A. seems to be in complete agreement with Mahdavi, the only relevant, but also highly questionable exception being: The Soul and Resurrection (AN, 293)). A. also mentions some printed editions, but her references are very incomplete.
Good, but not really innovative.

A. offers a very detailed description of this famous manuscript (many coloured illustrations). A. observes that the origin of the illustrations cannot be traced exactly. It is worth mentioning that A. presents a very detailed analysis of the studies on this manuscript (but that he overlooks the study by Koteck and Metzger M. and T., see 22).
Although quite complete somewhat superficial in its analysis.


A revised edition of the 1950-work of S. MIRZAEE, published under the same title.
(38) WILK, D., One Thousandth Anniversary of the Birth of Ibn Sinā, in: Koroth, 8:2 (81), 91-95.
A. concentrates on an early printing of a Hebrew translation of I.S.’s Canon, as well as two old Hebrew into Latin translations.
Useful, but (too?) brief, especially as far as the Hebraic tradition of the Canon is concerned.

Notes

(1) DAIBER, H., New Manuscript Findings from Indian Libraries, in: Manuscripts of the Middle East, 1 (86), 26-48, gives several important references to I.S.
A. shows the importance of the Arabic (and Persian) manuscript collection in Indian libraries. Regarding I.S., he offers a valuable complement to the bibliographies of Anawati, Mahdavi and Ergin.

(2) Khuda Baksh Library Journal (ns. 29-31) deals exclusively with all Arabic and Persian medical manuscripts extant in the libraries of India and Pakistan (communicated to the author by M.S. Khan).

(3) SEZGIN, F., Geschichte des arabischen Schriftums. Leiden, Brill, 1967 ff. (already 9 volumes published) contains some bibliographical information on I.S.
For the major information on I.S., one has to await the publication of the volume on Philosophy. However, in the already published volumes, one finds several remarks on I.S., most of the time of a bibliographical nature. See esp. vol. VI, 276-280 (on I.S.’s astronomical works) and vol. VII, 292-302 (on I.S.’s meteorological writings). Regarding the doctrinal analysis, see Sciences, C 11 and E 6.

Chapter III

Biography

See also:
V, C 32
XVII, 25

A. presents I.S. as a real "encyclopaedist", whose work splendidly reflects the cosmopolitan character of the Samanide-civilisation (I.S. clearly defended the Samanides, despite their obvious loss of power). Central Asia in I.S.'s time was far from being purely Islamic (hence, the interest of I.S.'s family (and of himself??) in the Brethren of Purity and in the Ismaîlite movement). In fact, Central Asia was open to many influences, not the least of which were Indian and Chinese (Herein, A. agrees with Lüling (see infra, 12) regarding a possible Chinese origin for I.S.). One looks in vain for substantial justification of each of A.'s claims.


The sources, dealing with I.S.'s biography, are classified by A. into four categories: 1. The autobiography/biography complex by Juzjânî, and its recensions and derivatives; 2. Private writings by I.S. and his disciples; 3. Historical works; and 4. Legendary and hagiographic stories. A. emphasizes that the autobiography presents above all a concrete illustration of I.S.'s epistemological theory, especially his theory of hadîs, i.e. the capacity to arrive spontaneously upon the middle terms of syllogisms, hence to establish truth by independent verification. Therefore, it appears a model *curriculum vitae* in the Peripatetic program. A. also points out such facts as the uncertainty of I.S.'s date of birth, the probably political circumstances which led I.S. to move to other places and the almost total conflation of I.S., the person, and I.S., the brilliant mind.
A very stimulating contribution, no doubt, of great importance.

(6) ID., Avicenna's *Madhab*, with an Appendix on the Question of his Date of Birth, in: *Quaderni di Studi Arabi*, 5-6 (87), 323-336. Having evoked two major historical distortions regarding the question of I.S.'s *madhab*, or formal affiliation with an Islamic legal rite, i.e.: Ba'laqâ's linking I.S. with the Brethren of Purity and Shushtar's claim that I.S. was in fact a duodecimal shî'î, A. convincingly demonstrates that I.S. was a sunni-Hanafi.
BIOGRAPHY

al-Muntasir, the last prince of the Samanides until his final fall. It has to be noted that A. critically refers to Nizami’s Chahar Maqala, Four Treatises. Further on, A. almost exclusively deals with the problem of I.S.’s origin. He states that I.S.’s father was governor of Khumran, A. judiciously points out the fact that this city was a regional ‘capital’ and had been a Buddhist centre. Moreover, it is quite conceivable that I.S.’s name as such signifies: “Son of a Buddhist Sage”. Finally, A. detects in the Samanide dynasty an outspoken adherence to the Buddhist tradition (A. identifies Saman with the royal Chinese city of Sînân). In some respects a very perspicacious study, but in other respects open to question.


Having presented the reader with some wrong formulations of I.S.’s name, A. indicates the different possible origins one may attribute to the name ‘Sinâ’. A. himself believes that the word ‘Sinâ’ is linked with one of the two ancient branches of the Aryan language, and, more specifically, A. seems to be inclined to accept an Indian-Buddhist origin. Further, after a few minor remarks, A. concentrates on the adherence of I.S.’s father (as well as I.S.’s younger brother) to the Isma’ili claims, not adhered to by I.S. himself. For A., I.S.’s steadfastness in his resistance to the Isma’ili missionaries was due to the excellent religious training he received from his Hanafi Jurist-teachers, as e.g. Ismâ‘il al-Zâhid (for the latter’s identification as a Hanafi-scholar, A. explicitly relies on the same sources as those of 6), or Abû Bakr al-Baraqi. Finally, A. poses the problem of I.S.’s date of birth (in view of the unquestionable date of death of Abû Bakr al-Baraqi, i.e. 986), and proposes a date as early as 353 A.H. (based on a verse by an unknown Persian poet).

A very valuable paper, offering an excellent basis for further investigation.


A. claims a Tabijki-origin for I.S. He praises the accomplishments of the Tabijki people of I.S.’s time (in this respect, A. mentions major developments in the sciences of that period).

In the appendix of the Arabic version, the two authors stress that fundamentally I.S. belongs to the Arabo-Islamic tradition (I.S.’s being a Tabijki is only a secondary determination).

Both paper and appendix are highly questionable in their basic assumptions.


Biography

He points inter alia to the fact that Ismâ‘il al-Zâhid, I.S.’s teacher of iqlîf, was a prominent Hanafi scholar (as testified by the standard Hanafi biographical dictionaries) as also was Abû Bakr al-Baraqi, to whom I.S. devoted two of his earlier works (and who most probably was I.S.’s own teacher). The very fact that I.S., when he was staying in Gurganj at the court of ‘Abî ibn Ma‘nîn, practiced law in order to earn his living, offers further evidence of his being a sunni- Hanafi. In the appendix, A. raises a serious question about I.S.’s date of birth (based on I.S.’s remarks about Abû Bakr al-Baraqi, A. inclines to place it as early as 964).

A very valuable complement to 5, compare also to 13, which A. seems to be unaware of.


A. French Abstract of A.’s lecture. The Abstract only affirms that the name : Ibn Sinâ is of Persian origin, and that the name : Avicenna is derived from I.S.’s place of birth, Ašharan (sic).


A. French Abstract of A.’s lecture. The Abstract only affirms that the name : Ibn Sinâ is of Persian origin, and that the name : Avicenna is derived from I.S.’s place of birth, Ašharan (sic).


(10) KUZGUN, Ş., Lifetime and Nationality of Ibn Sinâ, in: Kayseri Kongr.., 17-32 (Tu).


Based on R. Sellheim’s famous C.R. of Ergin’s Avicenna-Bibliography (Published in: Orientis, 11 (52), 231-239). A. examines a few critical questions regarding I.S.’s biography. He first concentrates on I.S.’s “lights”. A. indicates political circumstances as their basic motive, i.e.: I.S.’s unconditional fidelity to
A. concentrates on the Sasanian kingdom of Bukhara. Acc. to him, it imitates the Sasanian system. It may be noted that A. gives a vivid picture on the teaching system of that period. A basically Marxist analysis.

A. presents I.S.'s life in the form of a novel, while taking into account different old sources. However, A. gives the same credibility to these older sources, which inevitably leads to serious distortions. Somewhat similar to 20, although less "romantic".

A. adopts a rather unusual style for the presentation of I.S.'s life, e.g. by giving poetical titles to the different chapters. Regarding I.S.'s youth, his outline is conventional, but with respect to I.S.'s later life, he shows a clear tendency to introduce tales (the historical value of which is very questionable) in order to emphasize the extraordinary genius of I.S.
Good, but not really critical.

A. points out the difficulties being present in the classical "Tabâqât", i.e. Biographical Literature. In view of illustrating these difficulties, A. refers to the problem of a possible meeting between al-Birûnî and I.S., and of al-Birûnî's calling I.S. his "youngster". Acc. to A., the earliest acceptable date of birth for I.S. is 363 H., so, that I.S. is anyhow younger than al-Birûnî's (hereby A. summarizes the main arguments of his famous CR, of Ergân's Bibliography on I.S., published in: *Oriens, 11 (58), 232-239*). Regarding a possible meeting between al-Birûnî and I.S., A. convincingly shows that, if it took place at all, it has to be situated in the cavalry of Nîhâbân Manûr (before I.S.'s move to Gurgân). Useful, but limited in scope.

Only three autobiographies by classical Islamic thinkers seem to have survived, i.e. those of I.S., al-Ghazzâlî and Ibn Hâlîfî, Acc. to A., a basic comparison shows the almost complete absence of subjective elements, although A. sees an element of a rather childish pride in I.S.'s character. Moreover, for A., I.S.'s status, and his activity in the public sphere, were based on his being a practising physician (a strong conclusion, exclusively based on the autobiography). Finally, A. believes that I.S.'s evolution from Aristotelianism to a belief in Oriental wisdom had no other than socio-political grounds, more specifically the decline of the dynastic power (which implied that statehood became the protector of orthodoxy, and hence pushed the Muslim intelligentsia towards sufiism as the true path of salvation).
A Marxist-inspired, but, above all, oversimplified interpretation of I.S.'s autobiography.

A. brings together several historical accounts of I.S.'s life (many without a scientific value). The result is a kind of novel, which may amuse the reader, but which is almost of no significance for a critical approach of I.S.'s life.

(21) SIRAZHDINOV, S. and AKHMEDOV, A., From the Biography of Ibn Sînâ, in: *Matematika, 3-15 (Rus).*


A. insists that Dûrî was the colloquial language in the area of Bukhara, at least at the time of I.S.'s birth. Acc. to A., the names of I.S.'s parents are Farsi forms of Middle Persian terms. Moreover, A. points out that Farsi was already a literary language in the century before I.S., but I.S. was the very first author to write a philosophical work of great significance in Persian.

A classical defense of I.S.'s Persian origin, and of the importance of the modern Persian language in his time. Of limited value.

A. first focuses on Juzjânî's Introduction to the Shîfâ, the Cure, both in its original version and in its medieval Latin translation (A. also brings to the fore the particular significance of the "Avicenna Latinus" as an independent testimony for the plausibility of Juzjânî's affirmations). In the second part of her paper, A. briefly outlines the autobiography/biography-complex, and concentrates on its remarks about the Shîfâ. A. concludes that this latter version
probably constitutes a "doublet", and, therefore, has been written after the *Introduction to the Cure*. However, A. also remarks that the critical biography of I.S. is still to be made (A. formulates interesting suggestions in this respect). A limited, but valuable piece of information for further research on I.S.'s biography.

A. depicts a broad outline of the major political movements, which more or less conditioned the specific framework of I.S.'s lifetime (A. starts with the decline of the Abbasids, and further focuses on the Samanids, the Ghaznavides and the Bayids, but without almost any specific reference to I.S.). In view of the few curt notes, it is almost impossible to determine A.'s sources. Of no great value.

The first part of this work is clearly devoted to I.S.'s biography, while the second part contains a bibliographical list of I.S.'s works, as well as lists of both Russian and non-Russian studies on I.S.

Chapter IV

Unesco-Millenary

A. MONOGRAPHS AND SPECIAL ISSUES OF JOURNALS

B. PAPERS

C. COLLECTIVE WORKS
(Other than Millenary Publications)
A. Monographs and Special Issues of Journals

Note: By declaration in 1978, UNESCO invited all countries to celebrate the onethousandth anniversary of Ibn Sīnā's birth in 1980 (according to the Christian calendar). Consequently, many celebrations took place that year. The following concentrates exclusively on the official publications, arranged by country. No critical evaluation is given here.

(1) UNESCO

The October-issue of Unesco Courier (80) was devoted to Avicenna.

(2) AFGHANISTAN

A collection of a few papers, together with the Treatise on Love (both Arabic text and Persian translation), was edited by G. FARMAND under the heading: Ibn-Sīnā and Sufism. Kabul, Afghanistan Ac. of Sciences, 1980 (Persian), 62 + 30 pp.

The journal Kabul, 1980, seems to have been specially devoted to I.S.

Not consulted by Janssens, but see Bečka, Bibliography, 11, 247, N. 26.

(3) (EAST)-GERMANY

A major meeting took place at Halle-Wittenberg in February 1980 (see Brembaj's report in: Persica, (81), 234-235). Its proceedings were published:
GH. HANNA, Commemoration at Berlin East (sic!) in 1980, in: Aš-warih al-
'arabî, 2 (82), 222-223 presents the table of contents in Arabic.
A special pamphlet seems to have been edited by E. WEHLER:

(4) FRANCE

JOLIVET, J. and RASHED, R. (Eds.), Études sur Avicenne (Coll. Sciences
et Philosophie). Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1984, 151 pp., may be
considered as a late fruit of the Millenary celebrations, although it did
not result from any particular meeting on that occasion.

(5) HUNGARY

Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae, 29 (81), 1-80
contains a large number of contributions on I.S. (resulting from a
meeting at Budapest).

(6) INDIA

A major celebration was held at New Delhi in November 1981. The
papers, presented there, have been published (five years later) in: Ind.
J. Hist. Sc., 21 (86), 207-282 and 297-382.
A regional seminar was held at Hyderabad in September 1981 (for its
planning, organisation and program, see: Bulletin of the Indian
Institute of History of Medicine, 11 (81), 49-58). Part of it, i.e. those
papers which concern I.S. as a physician, were published in the Bulletin
of the Indian Institute of History of Medicine, 11 (81), 59-160.
Another meeting seems to have been held in October 1981 (organized
by the Indian National Science Academy in conjunction with the
Asian Society) (see NARAYAN SARKAR, Gen. Stud., C-51, p. 41,
ote). No comprehensive publication has been discovered.
Two journals paid special attention to I.S.:
1. Indo-Iranica, 34 (81) (almost totally devoted to I.S.);
2. Studies in the History of Medicine, 5 (81), 243-317.

(7) IRAN

Iranian scholars met at Tehran in Isfand 1359 H.S. (1980). The
contributions to this meeting were published in: Majmû'a-i maqâlât
wa sukhannâni-hâyi hazzârâ-i Ibn-i Sinâ (Collections of the Discourses
and Eloquencies of Ibn Sinâ's Millenary Celebration). Tehran, UNESCO,

(8) ISRAEL

A symposium was held in November 1980 at the School of Medicine of
the Hebrew University (in collaboration with the Van Leer
Foundation).
The eighth volume of Koroth (81-82) includes 4 studies on I.S.

(9) KUWAIT

During the First International Conference on Islamic Medicine (Pro-
ceedings, 127-162) a special seminar on I.S. was organised.

(10) LEBANON

A colloquium was held at Beirut in December 1980. Its lectures
appeared in: Al-dhikr al-affîya li-mawlid al-shaykh al-ra'iš... Ibn Sinâ
(Fr title: Millénaire d'Avicenne). Beirut, Naufal Group, 1981, VIII +
174 pp.
Attention to this colloquium is paid by M. SHARI'î. The Lebanese
UNESCO and the Remembrance of the Millenary of Birth of Ibn Sinâ,
in: Sua'în 'arab., 22 (81), 302-305 (Ar).
(11) MOROCCO


(12) POLAND

A book was published on the Occasion of the Millenary, i.e., Awicenna i sredniowieczna filozofia arabska (Ibn Sinā and Medieval Arabic Philosophy). Warszawa, AK. Teol. Kat., 1982, 1983, 367 pp. (only the 2nd part is devoted to I.S., pp. 191ff.).

(13) ROMANIA


(14) RUSSIA

The major celebration of I.S.’s millenary took place at Dushanbe in September 1980. It was directly followed by another meeting at Buchara. At least six collective works were published:


(15) SOUTH-EAST ASIA (MALAYSIA)

A millenary celebration was held at Kuala Lumpur in June-July 1981. No comprehensive publication of the lectures of this symposium exists. However, a non-official collection does exist, see Khan (Gen. Stud., C-44, p. 122, N. 19 and 22).

(16) SPAIN


(17) SYRIA

Ibn Sīnā’s Millenary was celebrated at Damas in 1980 with the organisation of an international meeting. Its contributions were published in: Al-shaykh al-ra’īs... Ibn Sīnā bi-munābat al-dhikra ‘l-alfiyya li-mawlidihī (Ibn Sīnā in Connection with the Commemoration of the Thousandth Anniversary of his Birth). Damas, M. al-Kāthib al-‘arabī, 1981, 268 pp. The majority of these contributions have been published (together with a few other papers) in a special I.S.-issue of Alturāth al-‘arabī, 246 (81) (together with an appendix). The Journal for the History of Arabic Science, 4 (80) also honoured I.S. by offering two English and two Arabic contributions.

(18) TUNISIA

‘AMMAR, S., Avicenne. Plaquette commémorative éditée par la Faculté de Médecine à l’occasion du Millénaire de la naissance du ‘Prince de la Médecine’. Tunis, Imprim. Off. de la République, 1980, 62 pp (Fr) + 54 pp (Ar) results from a celebration at the Medical Faculty of Tunis-Univ.

A colloquium seems to have been held in Hammamat: Colloque International Ibn Sīnā-Colomb (Hammamat, Tunisie). Le Corps en psychiatrie. Paris, New York, Masson, 1982. (N.C.)

(19) TURKEY

(1) N.N., Thousandth Anniversary of the Birth of Ibn Sinā, in: Zh. Nevropat. psikhiatr., 80 (80), 1221-1228 (Ru).


(4) BRENTJES, B., Das Tausendjahrtubjilium Avicennas in der USSR, in: Persica, 10 (82), 297-299.
A. describes succinctly some major meetings in the USSR on the occasion of the 1980-millenary festivities. A. also gives a brief list of Russian publications which appeared that year.

(5) CHUŠKINA, E., see: GRIBANOV, E.

(6) EGERMONT, P., Further Notes on Avicenna’s Millenary, in: Persica, 10 (82), 300-301.
A. points out the contribution of East-Germany to I.S.'s millenary. Moreover, he mentions the Avicenna Latinus-project in Belgium. (He mistakenly states that its lexica are prepared by M.-Ch. d’Alverny. In fact, M.-Ch. Lambrecht, in collaboration with S. Van Riet, prepared them.)


(9) KINIKLI, O., Ibn Sinā. On the Occasion of the Thousandth Anniversary of his Birth and the 944th Anniversary of his Death, in: Sanat Bilim ve Kültürde Orkun, 1 (81), 14-17 (Tu).

(10) ONGAN, A., A Speech in Remembrance of the Thousandth Anniversary of the Birth of Ibn Sinā, in: Toplum ve Hekim, 28 (80), 12-13 (Tu).


A. reports the severe disputes, which took place between Russian and Western scholars at the Millenary meeting of Paris in 1980.

(13) SARTON, G. (?), Milenario del nacimiento de Avicena, in: Med. Trad. (Mexico), 26 (80), 5-8 (N.C.).


C. Collective Works
(Other than Millenary Publications)

(1) *Ibn Sina (980-1037)* (Ibn Sina Kongresi Kayseri 1984), Kayseri, Erciyes Univ. Matbaası, s.d. (Tu), XV + 393 pp.


Chapter V

General Studies
(Philosophy)

A. MONOGRAPHS

B. PHILOSOPHICAL ENCyclopaedical ARTICLES, OR CONTRIBUTIONS IN HISTORIES OF ARABIC PHILOSOPHY

C. PAPERS
A. Monographs


Marxist-materialist interpretation. For the parts on I.S. as scientist, and as
physician, see Sciences, A 7 and Medicine, A 9.

(8) CARRA DE VAUX, B. Avicenne, 980-1037 (Ibn Sīnā). Paris, 1900,
302 pp. + Index. Repr. Amsterdam, Philo Press, 1974; also in Arabic

(9) FIRDOUNI LIBRARY, Olim va mutafakkiri barjestai Šāraq (An

A rather general, and almost conventional exposition of I.S.'s major ideas, mainly
based on secondary sources. The work offers no new ideas. Nevertheless, it may
be used as an introduction to the "classical" interpretation of I.S.

(11) GOICHON, A.-M., La philosophie d'Avicenne, et son influence en
Maisonneuve, 1979, also in English translation: The Philosophy of
Avicenna, and its Influence on Medieval Europe, with notes, ann.

(12) HASAN, M., Ibn Sīnā: abgarā al-falsafā wa 'l-ābū wa-'l-ilm al-nafṣ
wa 'l-sh'rī wa 'l-mādīya (Ibn Sīnā. A Genius of Philosophy, Medicine,
A general introduction to the various aspects of I.S.'s thought. Of almost no
value.

(13) HOŠIM, R., Ibn Sīnā. Muchasate dar bora darvoni zindagi, sharhi
hel va osorās (Ibn Sīnā. A Concise Treatise on the Time of his Life,

(14) JIRŁADZE, G., Systemy Avicenny (The Avicennian System).
Tbilisi, Metsniereba, 1986.

A. presents a general introduction to the various aspects of I.S.'s life and
thought, although the usual major topics, such as metaphysics, psychology and
(to a lesser degree) medicine are almost absent. Instead, mystics receives heavy
emphasis, and A. discusses I.S.'s views on Physics, Poetry, Linguistics and
Music. However, A. limits himself by citing fragments of Avicennian texts
dealing with a particular topic (in so doing, A. always uses existing (old or new)
Persian translations). Moreover, A. (over-)emphasizes the Iranian environment,
in which I.S. lived. It has to be noted that a well-documented bibliography of
Iranian publications, on I.S. (Editions of his Persian texts, Persian translations
of his Arabic texts, and studies on him) is given at the end.
Very introductory. However, the bibliography is of great use.

(Ar).
After a rather long introduction about I.S.'s time and life, A. focuses on I.S.'s
main doctrines. Each topic is followed by a limited choice of text-fragments.
Sometimes, A. is very (too?) dependent upon secondary sources especially in the
chapter on the natural sciences. Moreover, he clearly adopts a (moderate)
Marxist-materialist interpretation (which particularly guides his analysis of I.S.'s
metaphysics and politics). Finally, he overrates I.S.'s originality, in all fields, he
attributes almost all contemporary insights to I.S.
At most introductory (even if one accepts a materialistic interpretation of I.S.).

Of no value. A.'s presentation is very superficial, and sometimes imprecise.

(18) NAFICY, S., Bā Sīnā. Zindagī, wa-kār, wa-andishah, wa-rāzgār

(19) PETROV, B., Ibn Sīnā (Avicenna), 980-1037. Moscow, Meditsina,
1980 (Ru); also: Budapest, Medicine, 1982 (Hung Transl.), 171 pp.

(20) QUMAYR, Y., Ibn Sīnā (Falāsīfāt al-'Arāb) (Ibn Sīnā (The
This edition seems to be an abbreviated version of A.'s original publication,
issued in 2 vol. at Beirut in 1935-36 (same title, same series).

(21) RAHMAṬULLAEV, N., Filosofiye vzglyady Ibn Sīnū v knige
"Ukazaniya i nosstavleniya" (The Philosophical Opinion of Ibn Sīnū
in his work "Remarks and Admonitions"). Dushanbe, Donish, 1980, 92
pp.

(22) SABĀN, A., Ibn Sīnā fi dawwār al-ma'ārif al-`arabiyya wa
'A'lamiyya (Ibn Sīnā in Islamic and Mundial Encyclopaedias). Damas,
A. presents a selection of the classical Arabic biographical sources on I.S., together with an amalgam of contemporary Occidental encyclopaedic articles, also on I.S. (translated by A. into Arabic). A.'s choices seem to have been determined by the sources which were available to him, but which are not always relevant to conducting research on I.S., esp. in the West. One also wonders why A. adds an appendix on the history of medicine in Andalusia?

The title of the book suggests only a part of its contents: besides physical problems, A. also discusses psychological, physiological and medical items. With respect to pure physics, A. summarizes I.S.'s theories of movement, causality and time. Acc. to A., these theories prefigure modern dynamics. In the psychological field, A. largely deals with the idea of psychosomtics, which he considers to be a key-concept in I.S. (For A., the origin of this idea lies in the old Iranian religion). Moreover, A. pays attention to some of I.S.'s particular physiological and medical ideas (A. offers a few basic elements for a medical bibliography on I.S.). Finally, it has to be noted that A. often makes use of manuscripts when citing (or paraphrasing) fragments of I.S.'s work in Italian translation (for his complete translation of the Tr. on the Pulse, see Works, C-18).

Valuable, especially insofar as A. uses lesser known materials, but some of his interpretations are rather open to question.

As far as can be derived from the Arabic summary of this book, presented by T. SALÚM, On the Vastness of the Avicennian Thought, in: Al-Azhar, 40 (81), 108-129, A. mainly discusses philosophical topics, esp. metaphysics. Although A. admits the existence of idealistic elements in I.S.'s system, he seems to adhere to a pantheistic-materialistic interpretation of I.S.


Of no value.
B. Philosophical Encyclopaedical Articles, or Contributions in Histories of Arabic Philosophy

Note: Limited to publications in Western European languages.

(1) ARNALDEZ, R., art. Avicenne, in: D. HUISMAN (Ed.), Dictionnaire des Philosophes. 2 vol., Paris, PUF, 1984, I, 167-175. A. starts with a rather conventional bio-bibliographical survey. However, he stresses that I.S. always interprets the data of experience by theoretical means both in his function as a physician and as a scientist. But A. is above all concerned with I.S.'s metaphysical ideas. He states that for I.S., contrary to Ibn Rushd, one can talk about Being without referring to the ten categories. Moreover, substance does not appear in I.S. as the first 'anologue' of Being and, notwithstanding the negation of an analogy of attribution, one finds in I.S. an analogy of Being (characterized by A. as an analogy of proportionality). Further, A. insists that there is no real distinction in I.S. between essence and existence, insomuch as there is no existence of the essence as such. Finally, A. detects in I.S.'s notion of jad, liberality, the expression of the scholastic bonum diffusum aet. A. hereby categorically rejects a pantheistic-emanationist interpretation of I.S.'s theory of creation. As to I.S.'s psychological doctrines, A. states that I.S. opens the door to a theory of the resurrection of the body by emphasizing the dependence of each soul upon a particular body, and that I.S.'s flying man-argument is original, while he borrows the rest of his theory of the intellect from al-Khazini and al-Farabi. In his general conclusion, A. brings to the fore that I.S.'s philosophy is always related to religion. Very valuable, especially in the metaphysical field, one finds some original and stimulating ideas.

(2) BADAWI, A., Avicenne (Ibn Sina), in: BADAWI, Histoire, II, 595-695. A.'s work is primarily an analysis of translations of large extracts from I.S.'s major philosophical works, i.e.: Shifa (The Cure), Nafis (Reflection), Isdili (Remarks and Admonitions) and Dahnath-Namah (Book of Science) (some of the translations A. prepared, but he also makes extensive use of existing translations). From a doctrinal point of view, A. stresses that I.S. always remained a Peripatetic philosopher (his so-called Oriental philosophy was in no way intended as a new kind of philosophy), Acc. to A., I.S. introduced no innovation whatsoever in the logical field. I.S.'s metaphysical and psychological doctrines, on the contrary, seem to be judged to be worthy of closer attention by

GENERAL STUDIES (PHILOSOPHY)

A. In the metaphysical domain, A. develops the following items: I.S.'s theory of Being (A. relies heavily on Goichon in his interpretation of this topic), his critique of the Platonic Ideas (main source: Shifa, Met., VIII, 2-3), his concept of God (based on citations from the four mentioned major works), his proofs for God's existence (A. detects a kind of ontological argument in the Isdili), his theory of emanation (major source: Shifa, Met., IX, 4), his idea of divine providence (A. does correct Goichon's translation of I.S.'s definition of divine providence in the Isdili, but does accept her translation of this definition in the Isdili, although this translation seems to be even more questionable) and his treatment of evil and future life (main source: Shifa, Met., IX, 6-7). A. adds a brief consideration on I.S.'s mysticism, which he qualifies as intellectualistic, and which he estimates to be in contradiction with the in his opinion main rationalistic current of I.S.'s thought. With respect to I.S.'s psychological doctrines, A. discusses the usual topics: the proof for the existence of the soul ("the flying man"-argument); the soul's substantiality, immortality, spirituality; the origin and the immortality of the soul; and, the theory of the intellect, and its divisions (A.'s major basic text for this psychological part is very obviously the De Animae of the Isdili). In his conclusion, A. presents I.S. as a rationalistic thinker, who above all was a synthesizer of earlier major philosophical currents. A. brings together important basic texts, but one looks in vain for a real synthesis.

(3) ID., Avicenna (985-1036), in: Iranzamin, 1 (81), 45-48. This paper is the translation into German of A.'s contribution to F. CHATELET (Ed.), Histoire de la Philosophie. T. II. La philosophie médiévale. Paris, Hachette, 1972, 133-140. In such a general history of philosophy, it is normal that only a brief account of a few basic ideas is given.


(5) CRUZ HERNANDEZ, M., Ibn Sina (Avicena), in: Historia del pensamiento en el mundo islámico. 2 vol. (AU-T, 28-29). Madrid, Alianza Ed., 1981, I, 205-249. A. starts with a brief, but significant bio-bibliographical survey on I.S. Then he concentrates on the question of I.S.'s authentic philosophy (he judiciously remarks that the solution of this question is mainly influenced by each interpreter's own ideology). A. seriously examines I.S.'s statements about his Oriental philosophy, and concludes that there is no single reason to accept a fundamental difference between I.S.'s major philosophical encyclopaedias and his so-called esoteric writings. Hereafter, A. presents a serious basic outline of I.S.'s major philosophical ideas in the different fields of logic (A. believes that I.S.'s logic brings no real innovation) and psychology (A. presents a very clear
basic description of I.S.'s concepts of the soul and the intellect, morality and
politics (these latter two presented by A. in a rather conventional way), but A.'s
major contribution lies in his analysis of I.S.'s metaphysical ideas, e.g.
1. The acceptance by I.S. of an analogy of Being, although I.S. himself never
specifies which kind of analogy he defended (but for A. it is obvious that one has
to exclude a purely logical or essentialistic interpretation);
2. The absence of a real distinction between essence and existence in I.S., at least
in its usual scholastic form, since existence has no constitutive function in I.S.,
and is therefore comparable to an accident (although no identification with an
accident is allowed);
3. I.S.'s proof for God's existence in the Ishbârât, Remarks and Admonitions, is
not really a version of the ontological proof, but may be characterized as a proof
a simulacrum (whoever understands the notion of necessary Being, has to accept
the necessary existence of such a Being);
4. The idea of a creatio ex nihilo sui is really present in I.S., but one may
seriously doubt whether the idea of creatio ex nihilo subjecti is also defended by
him.
A very fine, and interesting (esp. in the metaphysical domain) contribution.

1987), 126-162; Fr. Transl.: Histoire de la philosophie islamique. Paris,
A. considers I.S. to be a major figure of Arab Neo-Platonism. In fact, I.S. was
much indebted to al-Fârâbî, who inaugurated that current of thought (the
Epistles of the Brethren of Purity were another important source of
interpretation for I.S.). Basically, A. defends the homogeneity of I.S.'s thought,
and categorically rejects any kind of alleged bipolarity in I.S.'s works. With
respect to the proper development of I.S.'s main philosophical theories, A. most
of the time only summarizes one of I.S.'s texts (while sometimes adding a few
remarks about I.S.'s relationship with Greek philosophy, or with al-Fârâbî). So,
he exclusively uses the Najât, Salvation for his description of I.S.'s logic,
and psychology, the Abîd al-maf'dûh, States of the soul: ch. 13-15, for the
presentation of I.S.'s theories of prophecy and resurrection, and Shîdû.
Metaphysics for his basic outline of I.S.'s metaphysics. In the final part of his
work, A. concentrates on the mystical strain, which reveals itself in the Ishbârât,
Remarks and Admonitions, and in I.S.'s mystical treatises. A. stresses the sudden
change in idiom which occurs in comparison with I.S.'s "classical writings". For
A., this very fact reveals I.S.'s obvious preoccupation with the problem of
philosophical expression (as was already the case in Plato).
A valuable basic outline of I.S.'s philosophical ideas, although one may regret
that A. does not present a more synthetic approach, based on a wider range of
works.

(7) GOHLMAN, W., art. Ibn Sinâ, in: The Encyclopedia of Religion,
1982, 568-571.
A very basic description of I.S.'s life, thought (esp. his cosmological ideas, and
the involved problems of the relationship between God and man, and of the
higher intelligences), and his influence both on the East and the West. A.
basically characterizes I.S.'s philosophy as a synthesis between Aristotle's
philosophy, Neo-Platonism, Islamic religion and some Zoroastrian concepts (A.
appears to be highly dependent on Morewedge's interpretation. See:
Metaphysics, 42).
Good. Some valuable ideas, but too limited in scope, some of A.'s statements
(e.g. I.S.'s principle of the primacy of existence) are open to question.

965-972.
A. one of the leading I.S.-scholars in the West of this century, presents a slightly
reworked version of her article, entitled: Avicenna e Avicennismo, originally
There occurs no fundamental change in A.'s basic interpretation of I.S.'s
thought. She always presents I.S. as a rational-scientific thinker.
Note: IBN SINâ, Al-Qâdîn, Beirut, 1987 (sec: Works, B 1), I, pp. 107,
ook, offers the translation into Arabic (by 'A. ZAYYOUR) of part 3 of this
article (pp. 969-970), i.e. the part regarding I.S.'s influence on the West,
and of A.-M. GOICHIČ, Ibn Alciume et son influence en Occident, in:
Encyclopédie mensuelle de la France d'Outre-Mer, sept. 1952, 257-
261.

(9) JANSSENS, J., Ibn Sinâ's Ideas of Ultimate Reality and Meaning.
Neo-Platonism and the Qur'ân as Problem-Solving Paradigms in the
Avicennian System, in: URAM, 10 (87), 252-271.
A. first offers a brief, rather conventional bio-bibliographical outline. Then, he
discusses the major influences on I.S.'s thought. Acc. to A., I.S. appears as a
proto-scholasticus, although he, like his predecessor al-Fârâbî, clearly rejected
the idea of philosophy as ancilla theologica. (However, on the relation between
philosophy and religion, A. points out a significant difference between I.S. and
al-Fârâbî). In the main part of the paper, A. concerns himself with two ultimate
ideas in I.S.: the ultimate 'humanity' of the human Beings, and the ultimacy of
God. Concerning humanity, A. presents a basic outline of I.S.'s theory of the
soul. A. stresses that man is his soul, hence, the presence of an irreducible
dualism in I.S.'s concept of man, as well as man's need for the Agent Intellect,
and A. generally deals with I.S.'s theory on the eternal survival of each human
soul. A. accepts the possibility of a resurrection of the body, but interpreted by
I.S. as taking place on the imaginary (or better: imaginally - as Corbin interprets
it) level. Moreover, A. insists that I.S. never neglects the requirements of
practical life, although he gives absolute priority to the intellectual life.
Concerning the ultimacy of God, A. analyzes some of the most important names, which I.S. attributes to God, i.e.: al-wujūd al-wujūdi, the Necessary Being (probably the result of a fusion between the notions of ontoos on and ente); Allāh (a religious notion, but wich carries with it a philosophical reinterpretation); al-‘ālā ‘al-‘ālī. The First Cause (probably derived from I.S.’s Arabic Proclus-source, where it means a monothestic and creationistic correction of the original Neo-Platonic view); Mūlahhīh al-‘ashāri. Causing causes (a term derived from Islamic mysticism, and by which I.S. combines God’s transcendence with His imminence); Mālākī. Creator out of Nothing (once more in the line of the Proclus Arabus); al-Haqq. The Truth (Qur’ānic, although I.S. resorts to a more Neo-Platonic usage).

A. received the URAM Award for Excellence in Creative Scholarly Writing in 1989 for this paper.


A. deals with a few Avicennian doctrines, i.e. possibility-necessity; causality; the Active Intellect and the soul; God’s knowledge of particulars. A. then offers a few remarkable, or rather: surprising ideas, such as:

1. Contingent things are obligatory before they come into existence in a kind of metaphysical limbo which is entirely independent of God’s will;
2. Aristotle’s ‘principle of plentitude’ (I. Hanūkka) lies at the heart of I.S.’s theory of possibility as ‘necessity through another’;
3. Action is logically entailed by something’s nature;
4. Prime matter is brought about by the Active Intellect;
5. God’s knowledge is in fact all-encompassing, because His knowledge is the cause of the universe being one way rather than another.

These ideas are not necessarily wrong, but neither are they evident. Therefore, textual evidence is required in order to prove their correctness!


C. Papers

Note: Since these are general-introductory papers the annotation is brief.

(1) ADUSZKIEWICZ, A., Life and Work of I.S., in: Avicenna... (see IV, A 12), 191-195 (Pol).

Very laudatory, of almost no value.

(3) AKA, I., The Historical Importance of Ibn Siná, in: Kayseri Kongr., 10-16 (Tu).

(4) AKHMEDOV, B., The Time and Thought of Ibn Siná, in: Fepso Q., 3(80), 41-77 (Ru).

(5) 'ALÁ AL-DÍN, M., Thousand Years after the Birthday of A.A. Ibn Siná, in: Al-turāth al-'arabî, 3(83), 127-134 (Ar).
General, A. deals with various aspects of I.S.'s thought, paying special attention to a few elements of Soviet investigations in I.S.

Introductory, but A. pays some special attention to I.S.'s medical works and ideas.

Good - Introductory.

(8) ID., The Importance of the Life of Ibn Siná, and of his Cultivation, in: Maj. 'arab. ill-shaqīfa, 2, (82), 213-223 (Ar).


(10) ASHUROV, G., Ibn Siná, A Distinguished Medieval Scholar, in: Ibn Siná..., 5-9 (Ru).

(11) ĀŠIK, M., The Great Turkish Scholar Ibn Siná, in: Konerî, Sept. 83, 16-17 (Tu).

A. adheres to a Marxist-inspired interpretation, but recognizes the presence of idealistic elements in I.S.


Very laudatory, rather uncritical.


Almost verbatim the same as the last part of 17. A. states that I.S. is a humanist.

A brief presentation of I.S.'s bio-bibliography (for the biography A. makes largely use of old Persian sources), and a basic outline of I.S.'s philosophical and medical ideas. A. states that I.S.'s ontology is idealistic in its principles, but that materialistic tendencies prevail in his epistemology. Regarding medicine, A.
stresses the presence of many novelties in I.S.’s *Canon*, based on experience and observation.

Some interesting ideas, but overemphasizing I.S.’s innovations. Basically Marxist in inspiration.


The same as, or an extended version of 19?


A pays some special attention to I.S.’s political ideas.


Valuable, although written for a large public.

(24) ÇUBUKCU, I., Ibn Sinā, in: *Stămerbank*, 15 (76), 33-36 (Tu); also (or another version?) in: *Butim ve Teknik*, 14 (June 81), 11-13, and: *Sifilis Kücüler Dergisi*, 102 (Dec. 83), 81-84 (Tu).

(25) ID., La philosophie d’Ibn Sinā, in: *Ulusal I.S. Sempo.*, 93-98 (Tu), 99-100 (Fr S.); also (?) in: *Kuyuvari Kongr.*, 231-234 (Tu).

Acc. to S, very superficial.


(27) CUMBUR, M., Some Important Notes on Ibn Sinā, in: *Milli Kultur*, 41 (83), 5-6 (Tu).


A somewhat confused paper. A tries to explain I.S.’s originality by the latter’s doctrine that prophecy is the ultimate of human perfection. But, at the same time, A. affirms that I.S. is a religious philosopher in the very same way as al-Fārābī.


(30) DOĞRAMICI, I., Ibn Sinā. Some Facets of his Life and Work, in: *Ulusal I.S. Sempo.*, 77-84 (Tu); 85-92 (Eng); also in: *Proc. 1. Int. Conf. Isl. Med.*, 137-137 (Eng).

A rather confused paper, presenting various aspects of I.S.’s thought, but without any cohesion, of no great value.

(31) ESIN, E., Ibn Sinā and Turkish Culture, in: *Ulusal I.S. Sempo.*, 531-552 (Tu), 552 (Eng S.); 553-562 (plates).

Acc. to S, A. tries to demonstrate that there existed elements of Turkish culture in Bukhārā at the time of I.S.’s birth. Therefore I.S. underwent Turkish influences.


A. evokes in some detail the life, and life-circumstances of I.S. according to the ancient Arabic sources, especially al-Qifî. Moreover, A. presents I.S. as a *homo universalis*, and a main representative of Islamic philosophy and medicine (in rather general terms), stressing I.S.’s genius. A. also insists on the specificity of I.S.’s “Oriental philosophy”.

The paper contains valuable information, especially from the biographical point of view.


A. offers a classical outline of I.S.’s life, and presents I.S. as an extraordinary genius both in the medical and in the philosophical fields. A.’s choice of items in both areas is rather arbitrary, and, in some cases, even questionable (e.g. in the case of I.S.’s so-called psychosomatic healings).

At most, a very introductory paper. A. shows a clear tendency to approach I.S.'s thought exclusively from the point of view of the Latin Middle Ages.

(37) JOHNN, F., Ibn Sinā in the Commemoration of the Millenary, in: *Al-mawqif al-'arabī,* nr. 119 (81), 144-160 (Ar).
A good, but rather conventional description of I.S.'s life, works (with some special attention to his major works) and influence, both in the East and the West (philosophical and medical). A. also deals with elements of the Unesco-Millenary.

(38) ID., The Place of Ibn Sinā in the Actual History of the Arabs and of Humanity, in: *Al-ma'rifā,* 19 (nr. 228) (81), 184-186 (Ar).
After a brief survey of some major contemporary publications on I.S., A. mentions the classical sources for I.S.'s biography (in a rather conventional way), and enumerates a few remarkable scientific and philosophical ideas of I.S. (clearly based on secondary sources).

(39) KACHANI, M., La science d'Ibn Sinā en dehors de la Médecine, in: *Avicenne,* 45-47 (Ar).
Very introductory.

(40) KAHYĀ, E., Ibnī Sinā, in: *Mili Kultur,* 41 (83), 2-4 (Tu).

Introductory, mainly based on secondary sources. A. himself affirms that the paper does not claim any new findings on I.S.'s life or works.

(42) KEKLIK, N., Avicenna as a Doctor and a Judge, in: *Kayseri Kongr.,* 313-333 (Tu).

(43) ID., The Turkish-Muslim Philosopher Ibn Sinā, his Life and his Works, in: *Felhexe Arkivi,* 22/23 (81), 1-53 (Tu).

A. characterizes I.S. as a rationalistic philosopher, while adopting the rationalism and the scientific method of the Greeks, also attempted to bring about a reconciliation between reason and revelation. A. hereby briefly mentions I.S.'s relationship with Aristotle and with Greek logic, I.S.'s rejection of alchemy and astrology, I.S.'s attitude as a physician, and I.S.'s opinions on creation and resurrection.

A good introductory study, based on a wide range of secondary sources, although sometimes somewhat outdated.

An "orthodox" Marxist-materialistic analysis of the significance of I.S.'s thought, which is characterized as materialistic, humanistic, and even democratic (sic!). Nevertheless, one may find some interesting ideas, e.g. the observation that I.S. clearly distinguished between the concept, solely existing in the soul and the concept, which corresponds to something in outer reality.

The same basic Marxist approach as in 46, but now emphasizing the naturalistic foundation of I.S.'s philosophical and scientific system.

A very brief description of some of I.S.'s major ideas, rather questionable at times in his use of language (e.g. I.S. was eager for practical knowledge of the illnesses he had studied).

(49) MAULA, E., Un médiateur entre trois cultures, in: *Cultures,* 74 (80), 188-193.
A popularized account portraying I.S. as a mediator between the Greek, Islamic and Christian cultures.

(50) MONTEIL, V., Ibn Sinā et l'avicennisme, in: *Cultures,* 74 (80), 194-207.
A. discusses the 'Peripateticism' of I.S. as well as his "Oriental philosophy", mainly on the basis of such classical authorities as Garett, Corbin, Massignon, etc. Moreover, A. gives primary consideration to I.S.'s *Canon.*
(51) NARAYAN SARKAR, J., A Layman’s Homage to Avicenna, in: Indo-Iranica, 34 (81-82), 41-56.
A very general survey of I.S.’s life and works, his sources, his original ideas and his historical influence. A pays special attention to the Indian contributions.

This journal was not identified.

(53) ID., Une philosophie prophétique, in: Cultures, 74 (80), 171-187.
A first stresses that I.S. underwent influences of almost all the currents of thought of his time, including those he severely criticized, e.g. the kalam. Then he distinguishes between I.S.’s “Peripatetic” works and his “Oriental” works, but he insists that there is no real evolution in I.S.’s thought. The Oriental philosophy constitutes rather another intellectual dimension of his Peripatetic philosophy. Hereafter, A. describes the basic ideas of I.S.’s ontology, cosmology and theory of knowledge. A. categorically rejects the interpretation that for I.S. existence is an accident. He also briefly, but significantly mentions I.S.’s influence, both in the East and in the West.
A valuable paper, notwithstanding its introductory character.

Acq. to S., A enumerates and discusses what he considers to be I.S.’s most original ideas in different domains, e.g. geology, physics, physiology, medicine, etc., as well as in philosophy.


A. accuses the West of having neglected the scientific tradition of Asia, as e.g. in the case of I.S. (self). Of almost no value.


Introductory, special attention to I.S.’s medical ideas.


(61) SURÜF (AL-), A., A Scientific Meeting with Ibn Sinâ, in: Al-majalla al-arabiyya (Riadh), 43 (80), 74-77 (Ar).
Very general, laudatory. No single citation is specified!

(62) TERZIOĞLU, A., Ibn Sinâ, in: Bilem ve Teknik, 16 (March 1983), 32-33; also in: Millî Kültür, 41 (83), 13-14 (Tu).


(64) TUNÇ, Ç., Ibn Sinâ, in: Kayseri Kongr., 181-182 (Tu).

Acq. to S., A. defends an analytical (in the sense of the Anglo-Saxon “analytical philosophy”) approach of I.S.’s thought, and therefore requires a translation of all I.S.’s works into Turkish.


A. discusses I.S.’s biography, the general historical context, and a summary analysis of I.S.’s major works (based on secondary sources, mainly of Marxist origin). Of almost no value.
Chapter VI

Logic and Epistemology

A. LOGIC
B. NOETICS
C. DIVISION OF THE SCIENCES

See also:
III, 5
V, C 16, 17, 44, 46
IX, 9
XI, B-I, 3; XI, C 11
XII, 6
XIII, 9, 15, 28, 43
XIV, A-I, 10, 19; XIV, A-II, 12;
XIV, A-III, 1, 6, 13; XIV, A-IV, 3
XV, A 3
XVI, A 1, XVI, P 12, 21; XVI, R 6
A. Logic

Acc. to A., the question whether logic is a part of philosophy, or only an introduction to and a tool for philosophy, was meaningless for I.S. - who was convinced of its utility for all of the sciences. As to the proper subject matter of logic, it is formed by the secondary intelligibles. A. notes that the very distinction between primary intelligibles and secondary intelligibles is not original in I.S., but occurs in several writings prior to his. He declares this distinction to be a factual extension and development of the Aristotelian theme concerning the three modes of discourse (written, spoken and mental) - to which I.S. added the dimension of the external thing. Then A. indicates some ambiguity in I.S.’s position with respect to the relationship between logic and language, insofar as I.S. seems to posit that language is not an integral part of logic, but at the same time he seems to defend the particular view that secondary concepts are generated by language. Whatever I.S.’s final position was, one must acknowledge that he paid much attention to the problem of this relationship in his logical inquiry, as becomes clear in his theory of utterances. A. concludes that I.S.’s logical theory is mainly Aristotelian (and Stoic, where it concerns the theory of conditionals), and that it offers a coherent and systematic encyclopaedia of Arabic logic.
A clarifying introduction to some basic ideas and problems of I.S.’s logic.

Acc. to S., Aristotle’s theory of perception was converted by I.S. into a special theory of species.

Having remarked that the Islamic philosophers have developed the poetical syllogism as a response to the claim that all logical disciplines partake in some way in the syllogistic method, A. first observes that for both al-Fārābī and I.S. poetic syllogisms are composed out of imaginative (in its broadest sense) premises. Not absent, but the arousal of various emotions constitute the proper end of the poetic syllogism. However, for I.S. (contrary to al-Fārābī) no scheme of the modalities of the propositions, with which the logical arts are dealing is needed in order to delineate these arts, since both asent and imagination are
forms of acceptance. Acc. to A., I.S.'s rejection of such a modal distinction is based on a kind of metalinguistic distinction between two possible perspectives from which one can then distinguish simple assertoric propositions, i.e. one ontological, and another epistemological. So, both the knower's mode of accepting the conclusion and the epistemological intention of the logician are equally important. But I.S. agrees with al-Fārābī that the basic device by which the imaginative motive is produced in the audience is imitation. A. concludes that the proper poetical syllogism is a species of practical syllogism (based on Aristotle's De Anima, 3, 10, and the Stagirite's al-ratīb-theory in the Nich. Eth.).

A scholarly paper, worth of consideration.

(4) BOLAY, M., La théorie de la quantification du prédicat et les dispositions à prédicat quantifié dans la logique d'Aviceenne, in: Uslul. I.S. Semp., 587-600 (Tu), 601 (Fr S.).

Acc. to S., A. defends the thesis that I.S. did discover the quantification of predicates (long before Hamilton!).

(5) ID., Les propositions modales dans la logique d'Aviceenne et l'application de ces propositions au droit Islamique par Ibn Ḥaẓm, in: Uslul. I.S. Semp., 587-600 (Tu), 601 (Fr S.).

Acc. to S., the five legal categories in Ibn Ḥaẓm would correspond to the five basic logical modalities recognized by I.S.

(6) ID., see: GRÜNSBERG, T.


A. starts with a brief, but relevant presentation of the most important studies (in Western European languages) on I.S.'s logic. Hereafter, he examines the different possible non-Aristotelian sources, which might have influenced I.S.'s logic in one way or another (I.S.'s basic inspiration being without discussion Aristotelian). In this respect, A. detects a most significant example in I.S.'s theory of the expository syllogism (of which A. provides a detailed analysis). A. concludes that I.S. does not introduce many logical innovations, but nevertheless sometimes departs from the pure Aristotelian point of view - using instead of it Stoic ideas (esp. based on Chrysipus), although he adapts these ideas in an original way. A very fine paper, especially as to the historical sources of I.S.'s logic.


In the first part of his introduction, A. describes in some detail the Arabic reception and transmission of the Poetics. In the second part, A. deals more specifically with I.S.'s commentary. A. stresses that I.S.'s perspective is very affective, and audience-oriented. A. observes that I.S. maintains a strong dichotomy between form and content in the first part of his work, although he modifies it later. In this very same context, A. also points out the existence of a double concept of mimēsis in I.S. For A., the second vital aspect of I.S.'s approach to the Poetics consists of his use of (Aristotle's) Rhetoric in order to understand some essential issues of the Poetics (I.S. explains the distinction between these two arts in teleological terms). A. concludes that one may detect in I.S. a shift in emphasis from the imaginative and teleological discussion of poetry (al-Fārābī) to the ethical and social aims of Greek poetry.

A significant introduction, a serious basis for further investigation.


A. offers a classical description of the outline of I.S.'s logic, as well as of its historical background. He also mentions those authors (mostly theologians), who rejected the Avicennian (-Aristotelian) concept of logic. Honest, but conventional.


After a brief historical sketch of the development of logic prior to I.S., A. presents the main lines of thought of I.S.'s logical theory in the Ishkār wa-Tanbīḥ, Remarks and Admonitions. In discussing the subject of logic, he rejects the thesis that I.S. considers logic to be a purely instrumental science, and attempts to show in much detail that I.S. makes language into a basic part of logic. A. presents I.S. hereby as a precursor of some contemporary logical theories.

A meritorious paper, but see 1 for a potentially better and more correct view on this matter.


Having indicated the special significance of I.S.'s Shībū, K. al-Qiyās (The Cure, Book of Syllogism) as the first systematical discussion on logic in Arabic philosophy (A. judiciously adds: in the absence of a complete edition of al-Fārābī's works), A. pays special attention to Shehaby's partial translation of I.S.'s text (see Works, A II), and proposes a list of corrections with respect to the latter (in fact, this paper can be considered as a kind of critical supplement to Shehaby's book). Then A. presents a few characteristics of I.S.'s approach to syllogisms, e.g. the placing of the propositio minor before the propositio minor, the introduction by I.S. of a temporal quantifier for complete statements with respect to hypothetical and disjunctive propositions, etc... Hereafter, A. enters the heart of the matter, and discusses such topics as:

- the division of the syllogistic system (A. pays special attention to al-Fārābī Chrysippus and Theophrastus as possible sources of I.S.);
- hypothetical propositions (A. stresses its great similarity with Boethius’ doctrine, which is clearly based on a common - or perhaps unknown - Greek source);
- disjunctive propositions (A. indicates that I.S. distinguished three modes of disjunction, corresponding to the Greek *dizeugenomen* or *dihairetikon, paradíapeion dizeugenomen* and *paradizeugenomen*, and observes that some confusion exists in I.S. between the latter two);
- exceptive syllogisms (A. presents conclusions very similar to those which he unfortunately is not acquainted with as becomes evident in the selective, but significant, bibliography);
- connective-conditional propositions (A. overviews and critically evaluates some of I.S.’s most important figures in this respect, and presents at the same time some important corrections to Shehaby’s interpretation). In his conclusion, A. concentrates on the *dihairetik* (Shehaby: divided) syllogism. He convincingly shows that it is a part of the connective-conditional propositions, and that it represents an original development in I.S.’s system, which is based on a predominantly Aristotelian concept of logic (although this has direct foundation in tradition).

A most fundamental paper, an essential companion to Shehaby’s translation.


‘Science of Fundamentals’ means in this context a branch of Islamic *fikr, jurisprudence. A. discusses the influence of logic on this science in much detail, without almost any attention to I.S.’s possible contribution to it. Such fundamental questions as, to what extent, and in which manner did I.S.’s logic influence legal matters, are not treated.


Acc. to S., a discussion of I.S.’s theory of modalities in the light of modern symbolic logic.

(14) HADDAVY, H., Avicenna on Style, in: *Alif J. Comp. Poetics (Cairo)*, 1 (81), 21-37 (Ar S., 21-22).

A. first indicates the existence of two basic polarizations in I.S., i.e. 1. between logic (and its demonstrative nature, destined to the elite) and rhetoric (being the way to truth for the masses); and 2. between poetry (expression without reflection) and, once more, rhetoric (expression in search of meaning). A. remarks, moreover, that I.S.’s *Book of Rhetorics* (book 8 of the logical part of the *Shifâ*), while being a commentary on Aristotle differs from Aristotle in organization, idea and emphasis. A. evokes inter alia the very fact that I.S. attributes to style a middle position between the rational proof of demonstration and the irrational imaginative response. He remarks also that I.S.’s tract is much more confused than Aristotle’s, partly due to material reasons, and also partly due to his wish to develop an original view. Out of an analysis of the first three chapters of part five, A. brings to the fore I.S.’s rather reserved attitude towards the use of metaphors in rhetoric; his conception of metaphor as juxtaposition; his interpretation of the classical Arabic ornaments of style in terms of strict Aristotelian functionalism; and, finally, his reducing rhetoric to a tool, albeit a powerful one, for philosophy.

A most valuable study, although one may wonder whether a detailed study of the whole *Book of Rhetorics* is not necessary in order to establish the precise relation between I.S.’s text and Aristotle’s?


I.S.’s theory of single expressions is studied by A. on the basis of its exposition in the *Shifâ, Al-ibâra (De Interpretatione).* A single expression is in I.S.’s framework a single or a separate utterance which has an independent signification, being either a verb or a noun (adjectives are considered by I.S. as nouns). Single (or simple) expressions lie at the very roots of logic, since they represent the basic components of explanatory phrases or proofs, covering the two essential domains of logic: conception and assent. They moreover ‘mirror’ or ‘signify’ single concepts. Now, the logician is concerned with the essential signification or signification by correspondence of single concepts. A. shows by a concrete example how I.S. understands this, and indicates some ambiguity in the latter with respect to expressions having a negative particle as one of their components. A. concludes with a major difficulty in I.S.’s thought: the signification of an expression is sometimes made dependent upon the speaker’s intention, but on other occasions it is posed as conventional. Moreover I.S. does not respond to the question as to how the hearer can determine the speaker’s intention.

A well-documented study of a specific topic in I.S.’s logic—although the (rightly) observed major difficulty calls for further investigation.


Presents some of the basic ideas of 17.


Acc. to A.’s own abstract, the paper is divided into two parts, the first of which examines I.S.’s opinion about poetic imagination and the use he makes of this concept in justifying a ‘poetic syllogism’ which accounts for aesthetic validity. The second part develops his account of the poetic syllogism in order to show that the completeness of the syllogistic argument requires the reader to allow for