For A., I.S. was not only a theoretical systematizer of the medical knowledge of his time, but undoubtedly also a practicing physician. Acc. to A., I.S.'s extensive and detailed observations on surgical interventions constitute a very decisive proof of his having been a regular 'practicus'. In fact, such major interest in the very topic of surgery was rather uncommon in the 11th C. A., however quite objectively remarks that I.S.'s attitude towards surgery was rather reserved (it was just an ultimate therapeutical mean), and furthermore that I.S. in the spirit of the "Ancients", considered medicine (and its practice) to be part of a universal science. In the main part of the paper, A. offers a very systematic and very detailed survey of a wide variety of (minor and major) surgical interventions (using many passages of Canon, b. III, but also using some material from b. II). Several times he points to possible historical sources (mostly Greek, but sometimes also Indian) for some particular items, presented by I.S. He also mentions some important lacunae in I.S.'s treatment of the matter. In his final conclusion, A. discusses the reasons for the great success of the Canon in the history of medicine. Acc. to him, I.S.’s success finds its major explanation in the didactic character of the Canon, in its being a homogeneous medico-philosophical system and in its revaluation of ophthalmology. A highly informative, most valuable paper, although one may regret that A. does not indicate more explicitly which elements of I.S.'s doctrine are undoubtedly practice-based (and eventually may be considered to be original).


See also: S. 4.

II. TRAUMATOLOGY


O. Obstetrics


See also: R. 8.
P. Pharmacology

A. discusses particularly the philosophical ideas underlying I.S.’s classification of drugs. A. pays special attention to I.S.’s theory of “cells” - claiming that I.S. presents for the first time in history the idea of living and non-living cells (but A. concedes that I.S. does not explain that idea in the same terms as present cell-theory).
Reasonable, but one may wonder whether A. does not interpret I.S. too exclusively in the light of contemporary Unani-medicine, of which he himself is an adept?

This paper completes 1. It offers the complete list of drugs for cardiac ailments, mentioned by I.S. in his B. on Cardiac Drugs and in his Canon (however A. establishes no real comparison). In an appendix, A. tries to fix the botanical names of all these drugs (he hereby expresses sometimes his personal doubts).
Good, but rather of a preparatory kind - clearly in need of further development.

(3) AROUA, A., Scientific Methods for the Knowledge of Single Drugs in Ibn Sinâ, in: Al-turâth al-arabî, 2, 6 (81), 123-129; also in: Al-shaykh al-ru’is, 227-234 (Ar).
Based on the Canon, A. describes six methodological ways, used by I.S. in his classification and description of single drugs. However, A. limits himself to citing the most relevant texts (although he does not offer any precise reference!). At most introductory - for a more significant study in this respect, see 12.

Acc. to S., an analysis is given of I.S.’s opinion about opium (based on the Canon) comparing it to the point of view of modern medicine.


In the first part of the paper, I.S.’s passion for classification is stressed - authors pointing to I.S.’s arrangement of the drugs in a tabular form. I.S. recognized the characteristics of a drug in two ways: through inductive reasoning and through actual experimentation. Authors detect in I.S.’s description of the action of drugs a “modern note”, but they also criticize him because of his too casual approach regarding the occurrence and habitat of medicinal plants. In the second part of the paper, authors discuss a few concrete examples of drug taxonomy and therapy, as described by I.S.
A valuable paper - offering a serious basis for further investigation.


(9) KHAN, M., Ibn Sinâ’s Treatise on Drugs for the Treatment of Cardiac Diseases, in: Isl. Q., 22 (85), 49-56.
After a few general remarks on the B. of Cardiac Drugs regarding its title, authenticity, editions and translations, A. states that the first part of this work is medico-philosophical in character. Acc. to A., the philosopher in I.S. always predominates over the physician. At the basis of the second part of the treatise, which is completely devoted to the prescription of simple and compound drugs for the treatment of heart diseases, A. detects the Galenic concept of the four humours (but A. notes that I.S. also uses the works of his famous Arabic predecessors in medicine). For A., I.S.’s originality lies in his presentation of personal clinical notes, and, above all, in his discussion of the relation between pulse, heart and medicine. But A. does not fail to mention also some obvious demerits of I.S.’s tract, i.e. a too great dependence upon Galen, impressions, incompleteness, etc.
A valuable study - especially with respect to a general critical evaluation of I.S.’s doctrine on cardiac drugs (and in some ways even on medicine in general).

(11) LÖRINCZNE CSPA, E., see: HEGEDÜS, L.


Ḥunayn ibn Isḥāq, in his Questions and Answers on Medicine for Scholars, mentioned eight rules for testing the faculties of single drugs, while I.S. formulated seven rules for the same purpose. A. establishes a systematic comparison between both lists, and shows that they are strikingly similar. But, at the same time, A. detects in both catalogues of rules, the very same spirit as that which prevails in Bacon’s idea of the necessity of both continuity and diversity in experimentation (cf. esp. Nova Organum, b. II, Aph. 13). Moreover, for A., some of the expressed rules correspond almost verbatim to Mill’s agreement rule, disagreement (difference) rule, and concomitant variance-rule.

An interesting paper - and A.’s interpretation of Ḥunayn and I.S. not too much influenced by his knowledge of Bacon and Mill?


A. outlines some basic ideas on the Lotus Flower in Arabic pharmacology. Of no great value.

(14) NURALIEV, Y., see: DENISENKO, P.

(15) SANMILLAN, M., see: VALVERDE, J.


A. presents in this paper eleven drugs, to which I.S. had ascribed cardiotonic properties. Acc. to A., the modern scientific findings always support I.S.’s claims. With respect to 14 other drugs, A. observes that the actual use of them differs from I.S.’s (but none of them really contradicts the fundamental observation by I.S.).

A. clearly overemphasizes the perspicacity of I.S. Of no great value.


A. paraphrases book II of the Canon. A. considers it necessary to reconstruct the tables of drugs (established by I.S. in the 2nd chapter) by scanning and gathering together the actions and properties from the descriptions of all single drugs I.S. has dealt with in the first chapter, and to correlate them with each class. At the end of his paper, A. gives a detailed account of a few significant drugs.

A valuable introduction, both to b. II of the Canon and to I.S.’s general conception of single drugs.

(18) TEKOL, Y., Codex and Pharmacology in Avicenna’s Medicine, in: Kayseri Kongr., 131-134 (Tu).

Acc. to A., ṣarnab is identical with Taxus baccata L. (Engl. Yew) (A. herefore invokes Indian sources). Then, A. concentrates on actual chemical and pharmacological research on this later substance. A. concludes that I.S. is an early forerunner of the use of drugs inhibiting Iₐ and Iₐ, A. completely ignores the medieval context of I.S.’s pharmacology.

(19) ÜÇER, M., Concerning Drugs made of Honey and Harma in the Canon of Avicenna, in: Ulusal I.S. Sempo., 323-331 (Tu); 331 (Engl. Abstract).

Acc. to Abstract, A. surveys the drugs made of honey and of harma in the Canon. Moreover, A. considers their effect on contemporary folk medicine, as well as their importance for modern medicine.

(20) VALVERDE, J. and SANMILLAN, M., Concepto del medicamento a través de la traducción latina del Canon de Avicena, realizada por Gerardo de Cremona, in: Bol. Soc. Esp. Hist. Farm., 25 (74), 147-152.

Authors first outline the general philosophical framework underlying I.S.’s theory of drugs, i.e. I.S.’s doctrine on health and disease, and, even more fundamental, his doctrine on matter and form (authors seem to follow Bloch’s materialistic interpretation of I.S.’s metaphysics). Acc. to authors, human health is defined by I.S. in terms of the equilibrium of two contraries - a drug restoring the actuality of a lost equilibrium. Moreover, induction and experimentation were used by I.S. as the only two valid ways for defining the properties of medicinal substances.

Rather unsignificant - somehow too general (esp. in view of the title).


(23) ZUBAIRY, H., see: HABIB, K.
Q. Neurology

Note: Because of the vagueness of the Russian titles, the two works dealing with this topic were placed under a separate heading.


R. Sources (and Contemporary Physicians)


(2) DARDUB, E., Measles from al-Râzî to Ibn Sinâ, in: RAA DAMAS, 57 (84), 690-701 (Ar).
Al-Râzî, al-Majûdî and I.S. are the three major representatives of classical Arabic medicine. A. offers a summary of their respective descriptions of the disease of measles, as well as their observations regarding its treatment. In each case, A. also presents a critical evaluation. For him, the superiority of al-Râzî over the two others is evident. With respect to I.S., A. stresses his adherence to a rather logico-philosophical approach of the medical matter. It has to be noted that A. rejects unambiguously the opinion that Arabic medicine is no more than a copy of Greek medicine (cf. also infra, 3).
An interesting paper - illustrating the existence of different currents in classical Arabic medicine, but for a still better approach, see 5-6.

(3) ID., Medical Philosophy from Hippocrates to Ibn Sinâ, in: Al-turâf al-arâbi, 2, 5-8 (81), 204-212; also in: Al-shaykh al-ra’î, 259-270 (Ar).
A. first outlines the fundamental (logical) basis on which Greek medicine was based, i.e. the acceptance of four elements, and mixtures of them (paralleled in the living being by the acceptance of four humours, and their blending). Then he affirms that the classical Arabic physicians were not slavish followers of the Greek medical tradition, although they inherited much from their Greek predecessors. Finally, A. discusses original contributions by the three great Arabic physicians of the classical period: al-Râzî, al-Majûdî and I.S. - his major attention going to al-Râzî (whom he presents as an almost present-day physician). For A., the originality of the Arabs consists in the introduction of a scientific, experimental methodology. However, one finds this kind of approach in I.S. only in some of his particular observations. Somehow in the same line as 2 - but A.’s (exaggerated?) admiration for al-Râzî is still more pronounced (cf. also this time 5-6).

A. examines whether the manuscript WMS Or. 123 really contains the final
redaction by al-Rāzī himself of the first four books of his *K. al-Hāwī*. The assumption that this was indeed the case formed the very basis of Liskander's affirmation (in his *A catalogue of Arabic Manuscripts on Medicine and Science*. London, 1967, 1-32) that I.S.‘s *Canon* largely plagiarizes the *K. al-Hāwī*. A rather convincingly shows that this manuscript most probably includes a later reworking of the *Canon*, and cannot be identified with the *K. al-Hāwī* of al-Rāzī. A very important paper in so far as WMS Or. 123 is concerned, but it leaves the fundamental question of a possible dependence of I.S. on al-Rāzī unanswered.

Authors first outline the existence of two great currents in ancient Greek medicine, i.e. a cerebro-centered current (shown by Plato, Galen and the Galen-Alexandrian tradition) and a heart-centered current (shown by Aristotle, the Hippocratic School of Sicilia and the Aristotelian-Anthiologic tradition) as far as the fundamental seat of life and the soul are concerned. In classical Arabic medicine there also arose two currents, i.e. one of the *medicos* (Ibn Ridwān, Ibn Zahr and Hāli Abbas being its major representatives) and another of the *philosophers* (whose major adherents were Ibn Bujīn, Rhazes and aversees). Acc. to authors, I.S. tried to link both traditions, although he always subordinated the former to the latter, as becomes evident in his cardio-centricism. However, I.S. linked his cardio-centricism the Galenic doctrine of the three principal organs and their specific virtues - hereby giving a dynamical aspect to his theory on the tripartition of the ‘spirit’ (Authors pay in this respect special attention to I.S.’s description of the spirit in his *De viribus cordis*).
A very valuable and stimulating paper, esp. when taken together with 6.

Acc. to authors, in the classical Arabic period one may distinguish between two currents of criticism against Galen. The first current had an empirical basis, and found his major defender in al-Rāzī; the second trend was logically and biologically orientated (reflecting an Aristotelian inspiration) - al-Fārābī being its most important representative. I.S. agreed with this latter current. Such becomes already evident in his rejection of an intermediary state between health and disease, and hence of a three-fold division of theoretical medicine (as was always the case in the Galenic-Alexandrian tradition). Moreover, medicine is for I.S. basically *technē*, not *epistēme* (the physician has to know the principles of natural philosophy, before he can start his medical praxis) - a thesis directly derived from the Aristotelian-Anthiologic tradition.
As 5, a very stimulating paper, and a useful complement to it.

(7) HAMMĀMĪ, M., Colic between al-Rāzī and Ibn Sinā, in: M. HAMMĀMĪ, *K. al-qālijān*... (see Minor Works, i 7), 177-201 (Ar).

MEDICINE

A, points out some similarities and dissimilarities between al-Rāzī and I.S., as becomes evident from their respective theories on colic. A states that both physicians defended a two-fold basic division of colic, although not in precisely the same terms. Moreover, they both were unaware of many nowadays well known facts. Finally, as to both’s methodological approach a fundamental difference reveals itself: al-Rāzī based himself with the analysis of the individual case, whereas I.S. paid much more attention to the description of the general causes and symptoms of the disease.
A valuable case-study.


Through a critical analysis of the Arabic terminology, A. shows that I.S.’s description of female genita is based on Galen. In some sense, this is also true for I.S.’s embryological theory - although I.S. reinterprets the Galenic doctrine in an Aristotelian perspective. So, A. ascribes a ‘theoretical-scholastic’ attitude to I.S.
A valuable case-study - but does it suffice in order to substantiate the general conclusion?

See also:
A: 8, 9, 23, 32, 48;
C-1: 2, 4;
D: 10, 11;
G: 3;
H: 1, 5, 6, 7, 8;
I-1: 2, 3, 6;
K: 3;
L-III: 4, 6;
P: 9, 12;
S: 16
S. Historical Influences

(1) ASIL, E., The Influence of Avicenna on Ottoman Medicine and Pharmacy, in: Ulusl. İ. S. Şemp., 317-321 (Tu); 322 (Engl S.).
Acc. to S., A. discusses the impact of I.S. on pharmacological works of the Ottoman-era, and also mentions translations of the Canon in the same period.

(2) BIRALTAN, G., Avicenna’s Canon and European Medicine, in: Orvostört. Közl., n. 89-91 (80), 25-43 (Hung; Germ Abstr.).


A. points to the fact that Ch. Read deals with the problem of how to ligate an abundantly bloody wound in almost the same manner as I.S. Therefore, one may suppose an historical influence, although there is no strong evidence for it. Therefore, one cannot exclude the possibility of a pure coincidence.
A good case-study.

Authors outline I.S.'s basic observations on the examination of the pulse. They mention the introduction of pulse-examination and of some materia medica, i.e. opium and mercury, in Ayurvedic medicine. Finally, they state that the origin of these later introductions lies in I.S.‘s Graeco-Arabic medicine.
Interesting, but clearly in need of more substantial development.


In preparing the edition of Arezzo’s Liber mitis, A. discovered that I.S. functioned not only as one of the most explicitly cited authors, but that he also constituted the implicit greatest authority. Arezzo gathered together many citations of I.S.‘s Canon, but in a very critical way - a fact well illustrated by A. through a systematic comparison between Canon, I, 4, 3 and Liber mitis, I, 20.
A. concludes that Arezzo did know the Canon before the school of Salerno, and discovered new medical ideas unknown to the physicians of his time (A. believes that Arezzo did write the Liber mitis around 1170 A.D.).
An interesting case-study, but one may wonder whether the early datation of the Liber mitis is correct?

(8) GÖKAY, F., The Place of Ibn Sinâ in Turkish and World-wide Literature, in: Ulusl. İ. S. Şemp., 167-172 (Tu).

(9) ISHAKOV, I., see: TADJEËV, V.

A. focuses on the reception of I.S. ‘s Canon in the universities of Montpellier and Paris in the 13th-14th C. A. mentions such names as Arnold of Villanova (pro-Galen, anti-I.S.), Bernard of Gordon, Petrus Hispanus, Gerardus Bituricensis, John of St. Amand and P. Gas (the former two belonging to the medical school of Montpellier, while the others were members of the Paris’ university). Acc. to A., one probably started the study of the Canon somewhat earlier in Paris than in Montpellier. However, Galen always remained the fundamental authority - I.S. being only used for some practical information. Only in the 14th C. I.S. himself became a major authority (in the name of the very same Galenism! - I.S. being more and more perceived as an important mediator between Aristotle and Galen).
A valuable case-study.


(12) MANSUROV, K., Medical Inheritance of Ibn Sinâ, and Current Clinical Medicine, in: Ter. Arkh., 52, 1 (80), 149-151 (Ru).

(14) RHIA, O., Vom ‘Canon’ Avicennas zur Bildbeischrift des Wundenmanns, in: Sudhoff’s Archiv, 73 (89), 45-54. The major object of A’s study is the medieval German “Ars-literature” (O. von Baierland’s “Arzneibuch” being chosen as a typical example). I.S.’s Canon is only mentioned in a very secondary way, i.e. as one of the many sources used by these medieval German compilations. Certainly valuable for the study of medieval German medicine, but almost without significance for the study of I.S.

(15) SINGH, K., see: CHATUVERDI, G.

(16) SIRASI, N., Avicenna in Renaissance Italy. The Canon and Medical Teaching in Italian Universities after 1500. Princeton, New Jersey, Princeton Univ. Press, 1987, XII + 410 pp. A focuses on the reception, and the use of I.S.’s Canon in 16th and early 17th C. Italy - a most interesting as well as a most exciting period (involving the rise of humanism, new discoveries [inter alia in the anatomical field], etc.). A., very accurately and in much detail, describes this general background (stresssing the strikingly different approach towards I.S.’s ideas in these later commentaries from the common attitude in those of the 14th and 15th C). Even in more detail, she presents all the physicians of this period (and in many respects also of the two preceding centuries) who tried to improve the Latin translation of the Canon, or who wrote commentaries on it (paying extreme attention to all comments on B. I, 1) - to cite only a few names: Alpago, Pseudo, Corti, Oddi, Da Monte, Cardano, Santorio, Morgagni (a fairly incomplete list compared to the factual list of Renaissance-authors discussed by A.). In two separate indices, A. enumerates the complete list of the Latin Editions of the Canon published after 1500, and also surveys the Latin Commentaries on the Canon of the same period (both manuscripts and printed editions). Among A.’s multiple observations, we may - by way of example - cite:
- Her [supported] rejection of the thesis that the use of I.S.’s Canon in Renaissance Europe symbolized an extreme conservatism;
- Her characterization of I.S.’s Canon as a synthesis between Aristotelian natural philosophy and Galenic physiology;
- The general preference given by later commentators to Gerard of Cremona’s translation over Alpago’s (although the former was the older);
- Her remark that the Canon-commentaries were neither isolated, nor idiosyncratic with respect to the whole range of Renaissance medical commentaries;
- The common accepted idea in that time that philosophy formed a necessary preliminary in the training of the optimus medicus (there being detectable a

(17) ID., Renaissance Commentaries on Avicenna’s Canon, b. I, Part I, and the Teaching of Medical Theory in the Italian Universities, in: Hist. of Univ., 4 (84), 47-97. This paper may be considered to be a kind of preliminary study for 16.


(20) TERZIOGLU, A., Ibn Sinā’s Medicine, and Its Influence on Europe, in: Ibn Sinā. Doğumunun... 41-66 (with several plates L-XI) (Tu).

(21) TUNJI (AL-), M., Ibn Sinā and Arab Medicine in China, in: Al-’arabī, 297 (83), 154-159. Having evoked the general historical circumstances which contributed to the introduction of Arabic ideas into China (and Mongolia), A. concentrates on the specific influence of classical Arabic medicine in China, with some particular attention to I.S. (in order to show that even in modern China there still exists an interest in I.S.). A. stresses the very fact that there was a millennium-celebration of I.S. in China in 1922). To substantiate this Arabic influence on Chinese medicine, A. refers to some technical terms in Chinese medicine, clearly Arabic- or Persian-derived, as well as to some ‘medieval’ Chinese texts (mainly 13th C.), directly related to classical Arabic medicine. A valuable primary outline, but in need of further development.

(22) UPADHYAYA, S., see: CHATUVERDI, G.


A. mentions a famous commentators on I.S.'s *Canon* (or parts of it) in the Arabic world, and also in 18th C. India. Thereafter, he gives lists with the names of such commentators (but without any further references - even the precise title of the commentaries is not mentioned!), as well as a brief survey of translations of the *Canon* in various languages (but also in this case, there is a total lack of precise references).

Of no value.


A. first affirms that a precise assessment of I.S.'s impact on the rise of scientific medicine in the West is yet not possible (because of the lack of systematic studies, and of catalogues regarding the mea. or printed editions of the Latin translations or of commentaries on I.S.'s *Canon* - however, see now 16-18). Hereafter, A. notes that the 12th century-Latin translation of the *Canon* by the Toledo school met the needs of the new scholastic medicine well, mainly because of its immense wealth of information, its systematization of every subject, and its linking the medicine of Galen to the natural philosophy of Aristotle. Then A. surveys the reception of the *Canon* as a textbook for university courses, especially during the 14th C. Hereby A. offers a selective list of commentators and of printed editions of the *Canon* as well as of the *De virtutibus Cordis* and the *De Canonica.* Further, she pays special attention to later efforts to improve the medieval version, but observes, at the same time (in the very same period, i.e. 16th C.) a growing rejection of I.S.'s authority (although the *Canon* remained a textbook, there was a clear move towards a purely historical interest in it, esp. during the 17th C.).

A valuable paper, but for a probably more precise evaluation of the significance of the *Canon* in the 16th C., see 16.

See also:

1-1: 4.

A. enumerates the major contributions of the famous Turkish book: “*Büyük Türk ve Tib Ustadı Ibnı Sina...*”, published in 1937. Although no one doubts the exceptional merits of this publication, one may wonder whether its actual value is still as great as suggested by A?


(6) BAYAT, A., Tales and Reflections on Ibn Sinâ in the Turkish-Muslim Societies, in: *Ulus. I.S. Semp.*, 575-585 (Tu).


(10) DODALISHOEV, J., see: ALIMARDONOV, A.
Although Lessing does not mention I.S. in his major works, and only cites his name two times in his *collectanea* (but in a rather insignificant way), A., who explicitly recognizes all these facts, still believes that Lessing had some knowledge of I.S., and indicates in this respect Lessing’s partial translation of Abū al-Majdīy’s *Histoire des Arabes*. A. offers no convincing proof of any serious knowledge by Lessing of I.S.


A. gives a survey of the issue of postage stamps on I.S. in different countries during the period 1948-1974.

A booklet for children, including several drawings.
Of no significant value.

A. summarizes contemporary Soviet scholarship on I.S., according to some thematic lines. A. hereby enumerates a lot of names, without giving precise references (the few references given are written in Russian characters). However, A. ‘s presentation shows clearly that the materialistic and/or intellectualistic elements of I.S. ‘s philosophy are particularly undervalued in Soviet research.
Of limited value.

A novel, in which I.S. plays an important role. It has to be noted that this novel has been translated into several languages.

A. convincingly demonstrates that the section on poisons in I.S. ‘s *Canon* had a direct influence on Chaucer’s tale of the *Pardoner*, esp. section VI. C. Therefore, A. believes in the plausibility, or even probability of Chaucer’s familiarity with the *Canon* - at least, as a casual reader. (A. devotes the rest of his paper to the general conception of poison in Chaucer’s time, and to the ambivalence of the Pardoner as serpent.)
A significant paper, insofar as it shows how influential I.S.’s *Canon* was in the West - even outside medical (and philosophical) circles.


Acc. to S., A. offers a detailed description of the skull of I.S., based on a photograph (authentified by A. Terzieoğlu) - for A., this description allows to conclude that I.S. belongs to the type of the *homo alpinus*.

(20) KHANMULLIN, SH., see: ATABEKOVA, YU.

(21) LITTLE, M., Pound and ‘Ye: Bishop Carame’s Translation of Avicenna as Background, in: *Paideuma (E. Pound Scholarship)*, 12, (83), 33-40.
E. Pound, the famous contemporary American poet, had a great admiration for I.S. - he didn’t hesitate to place I.S. in the upper reaches of the *Canons’ Paradise*. Moreover, it is almost certain that Pound underwent some Avicennian influence in his conceptualization of *hyle*, prime matter (most probably by mediation of Carame’s contemporary Latin translation of the *Metaphysics of the Nādīk*, which on one occasion is literally quoted by Pound). A. sees two main reasons for Pound’s interest in I.S.’s idea of *hyle*; i.e.:
1. I.S.’s conception of *hyle* as a potential (the process of actualization permitting a harmonization of Neo-Platonism with a profound concern for the realm);
2. I.S.’s linkage of *hyle* with the Active Intellect (matter acquiring form through an illumination by the *nous pietikos* - the latter denomination deriving from the very same root as ‘poet’).
An interesting paper - showing a lively interest for I.S. in a contemporary American writer, and the concrete way in which the latter used one of the former’s texts.


The work contains a personal poem by A. in honour of I.S.

(25) SAKAOĞLU, S., The Influence of Ebu Ali Sinâ Stories on Turkish Folk Tales, in: Ulusal. I.S. Sem, 501-509 (Tu); 509 (Engl S.); 510-522 (2 concrete examples in Turkish?).
Acc. to S., A. points to the existing similarity in motif between an old story on I.S.'s life, preserved in 4 ms., and (still) told stories in oral tradition, as well as to the disappearance (at least in part) of this resemblance when the latter turned into tales.

Acc. to S., A. mentions different arguments in order to prove the Turkish origin of I.S. A. indicates a series of studies regarding I.S.'s skull, but, most specifically, focuses on a 15th C. painted portrait of I.S. (sic!).

(27) TÜRKMEN, F., Image d'Avicenne (Ibn Sinâ) dans la tradition populaire, in: Ulusal. I.S. Sem, 201-205 (Tu); 205-206 (Fr S.).
Acc. to S., A. summarizes different Turkish folk tales (although he also refers to one Persian publication), in which I.S. is glorified as well on the scientific as on the moral side.

AUTHORS

Abariani, F. (VII, 1)
"Abd al-Latīf, M. (I, C-c5)
Abūl, W. (XI, A 1)
"Abdūhī, M. (I, C-c8; VI, C 1)
Abūl, M. (XIV, A-II, 1)
Abdullāh, A. (XVI, I-1, 1; XVI, R 1)
Abūd, Sh. (VI, A 1)
"Abī Rudyā, M. (XVI, A 1)
Abū shrārānī, R. (XIV, A-III, 1)
Achīrān, M. (I, A-III, 3 (also St.), I C-b)
Aδουσκίους, A. (V, C 1; X, 1)
Afsarn, S. (V, A 1)
Ahrām, F. (I, C-c5)
Ahrām, I. (I, A-II, Ed. 3; IX, 1)
Ahrām, N. (VII, 2)
Ahrām, R. (XVI, P 1-2)
Ahrām, S. (I, B-I, Stad.)
Ahrām, A. (I, A-II, Tr. 1-ch. 1)
Ahrām, V. (VII, 3)
Ahmīr, K. (I, A-III, 9; 11; I, C-f 1)
Ahmīr, L. (XVII, 1)
Afnārī, F. (V, C 2)
Aka, I (V, C 3)
Ardoğan, C. (VI, A 2; XV, D 1)
Arshadov, M. (XVI, A 1)
Arkhimēdov, A. (III, 21; XV, B-4, 1; XV, C 1)
Arkhimēdov, B. (III, 1; V, C 4)
Arzam, Ayyūb, N. (III, 3; XVII, 2)
Arzīn, Y. (VIII, 1; XVII, 3)
"Allāh-al-Dīn, M. (V, C 5)
"Alam, Y. (I, C-e 1)
Ala, S. (I, B 1-Sl)
Almanardov, A. (XVII, 4)
Alān, N. (II, 4)
Altintas, H. (VIII, 2; X, 2)
Altemysi, M.-Th. (I, A II, Av. Lat.; XIV, A-1, 1; XIV, A-III, 2)
"Alā-Yāsīn, J. (V, A 29; VI, A 34)
Amsal, A. (XI, B-I, 1)
"Amār, A. (VII, 4)
"Amār, A. (IV, A 18; V, C 6-8; XVI, A 2-3; XVI, C-I, 1)
Amawī, G. (I, A II, Ed. 2; Te, II, Ch. 1; Te, III, 1-2; I, C-c3, j 1; H, 5-8; IX, 2; X, 3; XI, B II, 1; XI, C 1; XIV, A II, 2-3; XV, A 2-3; XV, F 1)
Aparicio Sáez, M. (X, 4)
"Aqāqād al-a, A. (V, A 2)
Araqī, M. (VIII, 3)
"Arrānī, A. (I, A III, 11; I, C-a2, b, b3, 1 2-3, n7)
Arīfī, A. (XVI, A 4)
Armaner, N. (VII, 4)
Arnaldez, R. (V, B 1; XIV, A-IV, 1; XV, A 4)
Arhoua, A. (XVI, D 1-6; XVI, H 1; XVI, P 3)
Arslan, A. (V, C 9; XIV, A-IV, 2)
Arzumetov, Y. (XVI, A 5; XVI, L-Iv, 1-2)
As'sam (al-a), A. (I, B-I, Ed.; I, C-c5)
As'mūt, U. (XVI, B-I, 1)
Aş Şafā, S. (XI, B-II, 2)
Assηrov, G. (IV, A 1-6; V, C 10)
"Atī, H. (I, C-a 3; 8; 12, 7-8; m; a 1-10, 12, 14-17; XI, B-II, 3-4; XI, C 2)
"Atīk, M. (V, C 11)
Atīl, E. (XVI, S 1)
Asmidov, A. (I A 1, 1; IV, B 2; V, C 12-18; XV, A 5)
Asmidov, M. (XVI, O 1)
Atslan, M. (XVI, F 2)
Atabarev, S. (XVI, D 7)
Ataborev, YU. (XVII, 5)
Atay, H. (X, 5-7; XIII, 1)
Atesh, A. (I, C-c9)
"Atun, F. (VI, B 1)
"Ayān, R. (VII, 5)
Aydogan, M. (IX, 3-4; XI, B-II, 5)
Aziz, M. (I, B II, St. 1)
Azmī, W. (II, Noter 2)
Bakirmaz, A. (I, A II and III; I, C-i 2, 4; XV, H 1)
Babakirdzhayev, N. (XVI, D 7)
Back, A. (X, 8)
Badawi, A. (I, A II, Tr. 2, ch. 4; III, ch. 1; A III, 4-10-12; I, C-b 6, p 1; V, B 2-3; XIII, 2)
Badr, M. (VII, 6)
Bafiz, C. (VI, B 2)
Bag, A. (XV, A 6)
Bakar, O. (XI, C 3)
Bakor, J. (I, A II, Ed.)

