

VARIEDADES

New evidence and considerations on the origins and genealogy of the Banū Ruṣd

Nuevos datos y consideraciones sobre los orígenes y genealogía de los Banū Ruṣd

Delfina Serrano Ruano

ILC, CCHS-CSIC

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-1155-9267>

This article revisits the question of the genealogical origins of the Cordoban Mālikī jurist and Ash‘arī theologian Ibn Ruṣd al-Jadd (d. 520/1126) – not to be confused with his renowned grandson, Ibn Ruṣd al-Ḥafīd or Averroes (d. 595/1198). New evidence is provided in support of the arguments put forward in my “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion: Judaism, Forced Conversion and the Genealogy of the Banū Ruṣd” published by *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies* in 2010. There, the family’s genealogy was explored in the context of the Almohads’ treatment of the *dhimmīs*, Averroes’ fall from grace with the caliph and his subsequent confinement to Lucena.

Key words: Ibn Ruṣd al-Jadd (d. 520/1126), conversion, genealogy.

Este artículo retoma la cuestión de los orígenes genealógicos del jurista mālikī y teólogo aš‘arī Ibn Ruṣd al-Ŷadd (m. 520/1126) —al que no hay que confundir con su famoso nieto, Ibn Ruṣd al-Ḥafīd o Averroes (m. 595/1198). Se aportan nuevas evidencias en apoyo de los argumentos presentados en mi “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion: Judaism, Forced Conversion and the Genealogy of the Banū Ruṣd” aparecido en *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies* (2010), trabajo en el que examinaba la genealogía de la familia a la luz del trato dado a los *ḡimmīs* por parte de los almohades, de la caída en desgracia con ellos de Averroes y su posterior confinamiento en Lucena.

Palabras clave: Ibn Ruṣd al-Ŷadd (m. 520/1126), conversión, genealogía.

Early in 2006, while I was preparing a study on the life and works of the Cordoban Mālikī jurist and Ash‘arī theologian Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Ruṣd al-Jadd (450/1058-

520/1126)¹ I fell upon an issue with the list of ancestors provided by his biographers which, to my knowledge, nobody else had noticed before. My “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion: Judaism, Forced Conversion and the Genealogy of the Banū Rushd” explored the problem further in the context of the Almohads’ treatment of the *dhimmi*s and Averroes’ fall from grace with the caliph and his subsequent confinement to Lucena². The association of Lucena with the Jewish community who had owned the town in the past is made explicit by Ibn Abī ‘Uṣaybi’a when referring to the destination of Averroes’ exile³.

Though focused on Averroes’ disgrace, the latter article pays special attention to a third member of the family: Ibn Rushd al-Jadd’s father (i.e. Averroes’ great grandfather). Our knowledge of this figure is mainly due to Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī (d. 703/1303) who devotes a short entry to him in his biographical dictionary on the religious scholars of the Islamic West titled *al-Dhayl wa-l-takmila li-kitābay al-Mawṣūl wa-l-Ṣila*. To the best of my knowledge, al-Marrākushī was the first biographer to tell us about this thus far unknown member of the family despite the long chronological distance between the latter, who in al-Marrākushī’s own words was still alive in 482/1089, and al-Marrākushī himself. The new entry in question tells us very little of substance about its object with the exception of a rather detailed chain of ancestors (to wit, Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Rushd) and the already mentioned *post quem* death date.

Those facts are a bit odd, yet there would be nothing strange or intriguing had al-Marrākushī’s bid to trace back the origins of the Banū Rushd relied on new information provided to him by Averroes’ sons,

¹ He was nicknamed al-Jadd (“The Grandfather”) to distinguish him from his famous grandson Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd “al-Ḥafīd”, better known in the Latin West as Averroes (d. 595/1198). Two different versions of this research were published in both Spanish and English: see respectively Serrano Ruano, “Ibn Ruṣd al-Īadd”, n° 1007, pp. 617-626; Serrano Ruano “Ibn Rushd al-Jadd”, pp. 295-322.

² Published in *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 2/2 (2010), pp. 217-233, special issue on “Religious minorities under the Almohads”. The issue includes a number of contributions presented at an International Workshop on “Inter-Faith Relations in Islam: Religious Minorities under the Almohads” organized by Amira K. Bennison and María Ángeles Gallego and held at the Department of Middle Eastern Studies of Cambridge University (U.K) on 15-16 December 2008.

³ See ‘*Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā’*, pp. 132-133.

disciples and acquaintances⁴. However, if he had any, al-Marrākushī does not disclose his sources. By that time, Averroes' descendants might even have no longer been in the Almohad realm. It is true that the short entry Ibn al-‘Abbār devoted to one of Averroes' sons, Abū l-Qāsim Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd [sic], reads that he was a disciple of his father and of Ibn Bashkuwāl -the author of the *Kitāb al-ṣila-*, that he died in Cordoba in Ramaḍān 622/September 1225 and that he was buried in “the tomb of his ancestors” in Cordoba’s cemetery of Ibn ‘Abbās. This appears to be identical with the “‘Abbās cemetery” located at the Eastern part of the city where Ibn Rushd al-Jadd’s disciple Ibn al-Wazzān says his master was buried “in a separate graveyard in which the remains of his ancestors had also been placed (*bi-rawḍat al-munḥāza la-hum madfan salafi-him raḥima-hum Allāh*)”⁵. Yet Charles Burnett has argued that the story transmitted by Giles de Rome (d. 1316 C.E.) in his *Quodlibeta*, according to which the sons of Averroes stayed at Emperor Frederick II Hohenstaufen’s (1194-1250) court and the likelihood that they took part in the translation of some of Averroes’ philosophical works, should be taken seriously⁶. To judge by Ibn al-Abbār’s testimony, Abū l-Qāsim Aḥmad, whatever trips he did, returned to Cordoba before his death. However, similar evidence is not available regarding his brother Abū Muḥammad ‘Abd Allāh and other relatives⁷.

⁴ Similar cases abound in Arab biographical literature. For example Ibn al-Zubayr’s biography of Muḥammad, the son of the famous Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ, draws on information provided directly to him by Muḥammad’s descendants (See Serrano Ruano, “Los Banū ‘Iyāḍ (de la caída del imperio almorávid a la instauración de la dinastía nazari)”, p. 356) whereas the *Dhayl*’s entry on Ibn Farḥ al-Qurṭubī brings in data provided to Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī by Ibn al-Zubayr, who received permission to transmit Qurṭubī’s works from the master himself (see Serrano Ruano, “Al-Qurṭubī”, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1875-3922_q3_EQCOM_050504> First published online: 2016, p. 4).

⁵ See Delfina Serrano, “Ibn Ruṣd al-Īyād”, pp. 612-622.

⁶ Burnett, “The ‘Sons of Averroes with the Emperor Frederick””, pp. 259-299. I thank Gregor Schwarb for pointing this out to me. Ibn al-‘Abbār’s biography of Averroes’ son in the *Takmila* is reproduced and translated into English by Burnett in “The sons of Averroes”, p. 278.

⁷ According to Ibn Abī ‘Uṣaybi‘a, who is the main source for this second son, Averroes “left behind other sons who engaged in jurisprudence and served as provincial judges” whereas Leo Africanus refers to the existence of two daughters of Averroes along with the already mentioned sons. See Burnett, “The ‘Sons of Averroes with the Emperor Frederick””, pp. 277-279.

In my view, the entry on Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's father is less neutral a contribution on the part of al-Marrākushī than appears at first glance. The likelihood that Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's father was, as al-Marrākushī puts it, a pious and learned Muslim still alive in 482/1089 is very high. The information provided by Ibn al-Wazzān would confirm that at least he and his father, that is to say, the two Aḥmads named in Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's genealogical chain, and even "Rushd" himself, were buried in Cordoba and that by Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's death, the family had become important enough to afford a separate space (*rawḍa*) in the cemetery. Yet the motivations to devote a short biography to someone who had thus far remained in the shadows despite the prominence reached by his progeny and the physical and temporal closeness of certain biographers, themselves direct disciples of his reputed son like Ibn al-Wazzān, Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ, or Ibn Bashkuwāl, are open to interpretation. Ibn al-Wazzān took care of compiling the fatwas issued by his master while the strong impact of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's teachings is evidenced in the many legal assessments 'Iyāḍ requested from his reputed master during his tenure as qāḍī of Ceuta and Granada⁸. Another ground for caution is the singularity of al-Marrākushī's treatment of Averroes whose fall into disgrace he addressed explicitly and empathetically, in sharp contrast with the attitude of other biographers like al-Bunnāhī. Last, but not least, Averroes' confinement to the symbolic city of Lucena is explained by the author of *al-Dhayl* in terms of a rumor that he was a descendant of Jews lacking any connections with the Arab tribes of al-Andalus.

In an article published in *Al-Qanṭara* 2017, Maribel Fierro argues against my interpretation of the above mentioned facts. In her view, there is nothing relevant in them that should call the attention of a researcher or require a clarification. According to her, all is normal and can be explained in well-known conventions characteristic of the craft of medieval Muslim biographers⁹. At most, she claims, Ibn 'Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī's treatment of the confinement to Lucena should

⁸ See Serrano Ruano, "Ibn Ruṣḍ al-Ŷadd", pp. 612-622; Serrano Ruano, "Ibn Rushd al-Jadd", p. 309; Serrano Ruano, "Los Banū 'Iyāḍ (de la caída del imperio almorávid a la instauración de la dinastía nazarí)", pp. 358-372; Serrano Ruano, "Ibn 'Iyāḍ al-Sabfī, Abū 'Abd Allāh", n° 661, pp. 542-544.

⁹ See Fierro, "Ibn Rushd al-Ḥafīd (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena: Jewish ancestry, genealogy and forced conversion". Though an active member of the editorial board of *Al-Qanṭara*, given the title of Fierro's submission I voluntarily kept away from the review and publication process of this article to avoid a conflict of interest and guarantee due objectivity.

be seen in a context of forced conversions to Islam and religious dissidence which she strives to expand.

Since this is not the first time I get to know about her discrepancy, I'm glad to see her arguments and the impressive volume of evidence she has been collecting in their connection finally published. Written arguments can be objectified and better dealt with than objections expressed orally.¹⁰ Yet I am concerned that the way she synthesizes my arguments may lead to confusion. Fierro is a figurehead in the study of Andalusī scholars and she is in a vantage point to assess new contributions to this field. For these reasons I would like to clarify the following¹¹:

According to Fierro,

“Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī – the scholar who in the entry devoted to Averroes registered the rumour that the Banū Rushd had Jewish ancestry – provided also data about their genealogy in the entries he devoted to other members of Averroes’ family in the same biographical dictionary. This information was recently analyzed by Delfina Serrano. She points out that in the case of Averroes’ grandfather (Ibn Rushd al-Jadd) what we find is a short *nasab* (genealogical chain): Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd al-Qurṭubī (d. 520/1126). In the case of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd’s father (who was alive in 482/1089) we find a long *nasab*: Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. ‘Abd Allāh b. Rushd. According to this *nasab* and taking into account what has been established about the generational reproduction for al-Andalus, the first Rushd for whom we have information must have lived in the first half of the 4th/10th century. Serrano concludes regarding the short *nasab*: “The reader is thus led to think that this scholar [Ibn Rushd al-Jadd, d. 520/1126] was the first member of his family to have gained public relevance and that his ancestors’ conversion to Islam might have been relatively recent (early fifth/eleventh century?).” Regarding the long *nasab* she states that “[it] projects the genealogy of the Banū Rushd about one century and a half

¹⁰ During the International Workshop on “Inter-Faith Relations in Islam: Religious Minorities under the Almohads” mentioned in note 2 and in which she also took part, she made public her disagreement with my treatment of the genealogy of the Banū Rushd. She also objected to my labelling the wave of forced conversions brought about by the Almohads as “abolition of the *dhimma* pact”. Yet section 2 of her contribution to the same *JMIS* 2010 issue on “Religious minorities under the Almohads” in which my article was included reads “The abolition of the *dhimma* pact” to refer to that very same policy. See Fierro, “Conversion, ancestry and universal religion: the case of the Almohads in the Islamic West (sixth/twelfth-seven/thirteenth centuries)”. The latter contribution differs from Fierro’s presentation at the Workshop which dealt with “‘Abd al-Mu’min’s religious policies”. See http://cchs.csic.es/sites/default/files/content/event/2008/almohades_programa.pdf.

¹¹ For the sake of clarity, the following excerpts are reproduced without the original footnotes, with a single exception. The actual references may be checked through the corresponding volumes of *JMIS* and *Al-Qanṭara*.

backwards, to the end of ninth or beginning of the tenth century, when the majority of the indigenous population of al-Andalus converted to Islam.” Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī would have recorded both *nasab*-s, Serrano concludes, because he wanted to rebuke the rumour that Averroes had Jewish ancestors and instead of making an explicit refutation of such accusation he opted for a “more subtle strategy” consisting in mentioning a “then unknown [sic]” early member of the family and fabricating for them a genealogy that – according to her – “undermined the claim that the Banū Rushd were Jews with no affiliation with any of the Arab-Muslim lineages of al-Andalus and who had converted to Islam late enough to be remembered during Averroes’ lifetime, all this posing an unexpected threat to Averroes’ social and religious standing”.

However, the longer *nasab* does not undermine the claim that the Banū Rushd were Jews, it only projects a century back the conversion of the eponym of the family, the man called Rushd who appears at the end of the *nasab*. This Rushd is a non Arab both in the short and the long *nasab*, the extension of the *nasab* being irrelevant for the ethnic and/or religious adscription of the oldest known ancestor. That he converted in the fifth/eleventh century or in the fourth/tenth century has no bearing whatsoever on the possibility of his having been a Jew. The long *nasab* of the Banū Rushd cannot be understood as any ‘subtle’ attempt by Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī to show ‘compassion’ for the ‘cruelty’ of the accusation... Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī’s shortening or elongating *nasab*-s in entries devoted to members of the same family can be explained in a simple way, one that fully belongs to the craft of the authors of biographical dictionaries (*ṭabaqāt*). In fact, there are many examples of similar procedures being followed in *ṭabaqāt* works when recording biographies of members of the same family, i.e., recording in some of them *nasab*-s longer or more complete than those that appear in some other biographies”.¹²

However, the examples she selects to illustrate her latter point refer to scholars whose *nasabs* were shortened by al-Marrākushī. None of them helps at documenting the contrary.¹³ In addition, her overall claim implies a reconsideration of her former refusal to lend any credibility to the rumour about Averroes’ family.

Actually the *nasabs* of the Banū Rushd were not cut or lengthened by al-Marrākushī whatsoever as might be inferred from the above excerpt of Fierro’s article. He simply reproduced the chains of ancestors provided by earlier biographers, with no additions or elisions of any kind. All he did in this connection was provide a biography of an, until then, unknown ancestor of the family.¹⁴ Writing about Ibn Rushd al-

¹² See Fierro, “Ibn Rushd al-Hafid (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena”, pp. 141-142.

¹³ See Fierro, “Ibn Rushd al-Hafid (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena”, pp. 142-143.

¹⁴ That is to say, unknown to earlier authors of biographical dictionaries. I’m not claiming that the man was not known but rather, that mentioning him did not become relevant before al-Marrākushī’s times, or put another way, after Averroes’ disgrace and death.

Jadd and following the steps already taken by al-Marrākushī, a later author, al-Maqqarī (d. 1041/1632), presented the Cordoban scholar with a *nasab* longer than that provided by his predecessors drawing on the list of thus far unknown ancestors of the family mentioned by al-Marrākushī in connection with Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's father. Eventually, then, about five centuries after his death, *Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Rushd al-Jadd* became *Abū l-Walīd Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Aḥmad b. Abd Allāh b. Rushd al-Jadd*.

To be more precise, my claim was that Averroes' exile to Lucena subsequent to his falling into disgrace with the caliph Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr:

“is explained by the historian Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī on the grounds of a rumour that ‘Averroes had Jewish roots and that no origin in any of the [Arab] tribes of al-Andalus was known of him’. The veracity of the rumour that Averroes’ ancestors were Jews has been rejected by a number of modern scholars from Shlomo Munk to Jorge Lirola. In contrast, such a relevant student of his figure as Dominique Urvoy does not discuss the rumour *per se* but seems to accept that Averroes’ alleged Jewish roots played a significant role in the decision to banish him to Lucena and in rendering it a particularly cruel form of punishment”.¹⁵

Before proceeding further, it's important to remember that neither Munk, Lirola or Urvoy took into account that first mention of Averroes' great-grandfather in a biographical dictionary occurred about two centuries after his death by the pen of an author who was well aware of Averroes' disgrace and the accusation of crypto-Judaism implicit in his confinement to Lucena.

“The available data does not allow us to prove the veracity of the rumour, but it does not remove the possibility of its being true either. No author apart from Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī suggests that Averroes came from a family whose members had professed Judaism before becoming Muslims. But it must be noted that the biographies of both Averroes' father and grandfather reveal that the family's rise to notoriety was due to the Almoravids and that their main card for social promotion was intellectual merit, not ancestry, wealth or military services. They thus fit into a well known pattern of families whose integration in the world of the religious scholars is bound to the emergence of a ruling dynasty, a process that is often linked to conversion to Islam.”¹⁶

¹⁵ See Serrano Ruano, “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion”, p. 220.

¹⁶ See Serrano Ruano, “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion”, p. 220.

“... Mentioning the rumor of the Jewish ancestors seems to be justified in al-Marrākushī’s intention to reject it. But instead of making an explicit refutation, he opted for the more subtle strategy of listing a number of (then unknown) Muslim ancestors of Averroes. However, this was a double-edged strategy. On the one hand, it allowed him to “grab the bull by its horns” but it also betrayed his uncertainty about Averroes’ actual ethnic origins, which he was unable to establish more assertively, rejecting the rumor in direct and explicit terms.”¹⁷

The idea that the accusation of crypto-Judaism against Averroes might be connected with political and ideological dissidence rather than with actual ethnic origins or religious affiliation was already addressed in my article, following the thread of a remark made by one of *JMIS*’ anonymous reviewers:

“Nevertheless, and given that two of his opponents were followers of Ash‘arism, we can speculate whether Averroes’ position towards certain theological questions had any relation with the scheme of his punishment. As a matter of fact, a connection can be established between the extreme abhorrence of anthropomorphism that is so characteristic of Almohad theological thought and the association between holding such a conception of God and Judaism, as defended by some Ash‘arī theologians of al-Andalus in the Almoravid period, such as Abū Bakr Ibn al-‘Arabī (d. ca. 543/1148). Certainly, Averroes cannot be held liable of anthropomorphism, but, as Marc Geoffroy has shown, in the first draft of his book on discursive theology [*kalām*] entitled *Kitāb al-Kashf ‘an manāhij al-adilla [Exposition of the methods of proof]*, on which Averroes worked in 575/1180, he held a position concerning anthropomorphism that stands in ‘obvious divergence with Ibn Tūmart’s doctrine.’ According to Ibn Tūmart, ‘it is strictly forbidden for the believer to conceive of God in such a way that He is assigned any characteristic that might assimilate Him to the created things.’ This prohibition, as M. Geoffroy reminds us, was not restricted to the Almohad intellectual elite. On the contrary, it was addressed to all the believers and was consequently formulated in the *‘Aqīda*, a text containing a version of the Almohad creed addressed to the masses that all Almohad subjects were obliged to learn by heart. Averroes departs from this stance and holds that, given that humans differ in their intellectual capacities, ‘it is dangerous to impose upon a simple mind a belief that, its truth notwithstanding, he is unable to grasp. In the absence of a truth that can only be accessed through philosophy, the descriptions of God in anthropomorphic terms contained in the Koran provide the believer with an image of the truth on which he can rely to get a representation of God that is appropriate to his mental capacities.’ For this reason, according to Averroes, certain people will never go beyond the stage of religious literalism... it is best not to concern oneself with the question of whether or not the

¹⁷ See Serrano Ruano, “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion”, pp. 227-228.

sacred texts ... declare that God is a body. However, if need be, the believer cannot but state that the Koran does contain anthropomorphic descriptions of God: the sacred book is thus closer to the affirmation of God's corporeality than to its negation. Therefore, the anthropomorphic conceptions of God held by so many Muslims are understandable and, to a certain degree, also legitimate. What's more, he declares it pernicious to force the common believer to trespass the stage of literalism towards transcendent views for different reasons... the common believer is unable to grasp the truth in itself, which, in the end, will discourage him from believing in anything at all.

According to Geoffroy, those words implied that Averroes was warning the guardians of Almohad creed –and by extension, Ibn Tūmart himself- to go too far in their theological rigor and to be overly intransigent. Geoffroy wonders whether this 'reprimand' might have been tolerated by those to whom it was addressed notwithstanding that it was made in their best interest... As Geoffroy has disclosed, Averroes seems to have been obliged to retract –the order having been issued by 'the summit of the Almohad state'- and to draft a second version of the *Kashf* in which he adopts a far less conciliatory attitude towards theological literalism. In this new version, he adopted the Almohad assimilation between anthropomorphism and infidelity [*kufir*].¹⁸

Maribel Fierro has recently pointed out to the possibility that the above-mentioned events, which Geoffroy places between 575/1180 and the date of Abū Ya'qūb Yūsuf's death in 580/1190, influenced Averroes' 'disgrace' and banishment [but not the accusation of crypto-Judaism]. In the lack of further evidence, however, it is not possible to assert that Averroes' doctrines concerning anthropomorphism were taken as grounds to accuse him of practising Judaism clandestinely and to banish him to Lucena. In fact, being 'like the Jews' was not the only anathema levelled against theological literalists, 'infidel' [*kāfir*] being the most serious disqualification let out in this regard. Infidelity is, in fact, one of the decisive terms employed against Averroes and his companions in the caliphs' decree of condemnation of the philosophers. We do know about other Muslims who were actually accused of anthropomorphism by the Almohads, namely the Almoravids, without implying that they were to be assimilated with the Jews. Moreover, accusations of anthropomorphism used to involve the sin of idolatry as well, a concept also applied to Christians. Finally, even if we came to accept that Averroes was accused of being 'like a Jew' for holding a tolerant position towards anthropomorphism, we should still find a plausible explanation for al-Marrākushī's words. That is, we should be able to find a justification for the connection that Ibn 'Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī made between Averroes' banishment to Lucena and the rumour of his alleged Jewish ancestry".¹⁹

¹⁸ See Geoffroy, "À propos de l'almoahadisme d'Averroès: l'antropomorphisme (*taḡṣīm*) dans la seconde version du *Kitāb al-kašf 'an manāhiḡ al-adilla*", pp. 871-882.

¹⁹ See Serrano Ruano, "Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion", pp. 224-226. This question is further explored in my "Later Ash'arism in the Islamic West", pp. 522-527. Cf. Fierro, "Ibn Rushd al-Ḥafid (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena", pp. 133-138.

Engaging with another work of mine, Fierro refers to the case of the famous jurist and traditionist Qaḍī ‘Iyāḍ b. Mūsā (Ceuta 476/1083-Marrakech 544/1149) to illustrate her claim that accusations of Judaism were often levelled against religious or political dissidents. To wit, according to a legend, the Almohad caliph ordered ‘Iyāḍ to be killed for practicing Judaism in secret and for opposing al-Ghazālī. In addition, the Egyptian Mālikī jurist Ibn Farḥūn (d. 799/1397) echoed the rumour that ‘Iyāḍ died at the hands of a Jew who poisoned him.²⁰ In this connection, Fierro suggests that the story of the poisoning might have been put into circulation by Ibn Farḥūn to neutralize the accusation of crypto-Judaism against ‘Iyāḍ.²¹ Thus, she is ready to admit, without providing further evidence, the likelihood of one such initiative in the case of Ibn Farḥūn at the same time she rules out that al-Marrākushī may have proceeded in the same way.²² Actually, the cases of Averroes and Qaḍī ‘Iyāḍ differ quite substantially in that the Arab genealogy of the latter was well known and above any doubt. Yet the possibility that Averroes was actually the descendant of Jewish converts to Islam made perfect sense. They might have been Christians as well, that’s true, but the option exists that they were Jews too. Both possibilities make sense without excluding that of their being long-time Muslims either. Another fact that seems to have been overlooked by Fierro with regards to Averroes’ case is that the biographer who made explicit the rumour of the Jewish origins and he who tried to neutralize it the best he could were one and the same person.

Be that as it may, the publication of Fierro’s article has made true some of the predictions with which I closed my contribution to *JMIS* in 2010:

“I am inclined to believe that we will hear about new arguments and explanations in the near future, when other scholars revisit the question of Averroes’ relationship with the Almohads. Someone might even advise doctoral candidates to

²⁰ See Serrano Ruano, “‘Iyāḍ b. Mūsā”, p. 413.

²¹ See Fierro, “Ibn Rushd al-Ḥafīd (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena”, p. 135, note 25.

²² It seems that the circumstances of ‘Iyāḍ’s death are being explored further by Albarrán Iruela; see “Del Occidente islámico a la India: Mālikismo, Ibn Tūmart, al-Gazālī y la muerte de al-Qaḍī ‘Iyāḍ” paper presented at the Jornada Internacional de Estudios Árabes e Islámicos held at the University of Jaen on April, 6th 2018.

devote a dissertation to this topic. And if this virtual re-creation of the future I have just sketched comes to a realization, it will be clear that this paper, regardless of whether or not its results are passed over in silence, has not only revealed the strange increase in Averroes' list of ancestors and stressed certain Muslim historians' sympathy towards the cruel punishment to which he was subjected, but also stirred other students of this individual into reconsidering the reasons for his falling in disgrace.²³

It is true that no pre-doctoral student has been instructed to focus on Averroes' ethnic origins and disgrace as I anticipated²⁴ at least to my knowledge. Yet Farid Bouchiba is paying special attention to the issue of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's family and genealogy in his PhD thesis in progress²⁵. Incidentally, Bouchiba notes that according to an annotation in the margin of manuscript number 1471 of Ibn Bashkuwāl's *Kitāb al-ṣila* preserved in Istanbul's Fayḍ Allāh Library, Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's family came from the area of Zaragoza (baldat Saraḡuṭa [sic]). The information provided in both this and the next marginal annotation is attributed to 'Umar b. Diḡya [al-Kalbī] (d. 1235)²⁶. It can be assumed that, if the information provided at the margins of the manuscript is accurate, Ibn Diḡya was speaking on the authority of Ibn Sa'īd al-Awsī, a disciple of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd who appears to have had direct contact with his grandson, Averroes.²⁷

Conversely, the publication of my 2009 "'Iyād b. Mūsā'", in which 'Iyād's writings are examined with detail in the historical and ideological

²³ See Serrano Ruano, "Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion", p. 230.

²⁴ Cf. Fierro, "Ibn Rushd al-Hafīd (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena", p. 141, note 49: "Serrano ... refers to a future Ph.D. Thesis on the Banū Rushd's lack of *nisba*, but to my knowledge it has not yet been written".

²⁵ See Bouchiba, *Juifs et chrétiens au miroir de la loi musulmane*. Before the publication of my article in *JMIS* (2010) the genealogy of the Banū Rushd was not a thought-provoking issue requiring any reflection other than reproducing the data provided by the sources.

²⁶ See Ibn Bashkuwāl, *Kitāb al-ṣila*, II, p. 546, number 1270, note 1. I thank Farid Bouchiba for allowing me to use this piece of information. Al-'Aṭṭār's rendering of the name of the Spanish city, or province, of Zaragoza as *Saraḡuṭa* appears to be a middle way between present day Spanish pronunciation of that name and the medieval Andalusī toponym of *Saraḡuṣṭa*, rather than a repeated typo. See the index of places to his edition of the *Ṣila*, II, p. 761.

²⁷ Chronology renders it impossible that Ibn Rushd taught Ibn Diḡya, as the text in *Ṣila*, II, p. 546, note 2 would indicate (*qāla* 'Umar: *sa'altu ḡafīd shaykhī-nā al-'ālim Abā l-Walīd [sic] b. Rushd 'an dhalik...*) whereas the main source to include Ibn Sa'īd al-Awsī in the list of Ibn Rushd al-Jadd's disciples is, precisely, Ibn Diḡya. See Serrano Ruano, "Ibn Ruṣd al-Ÿadd", p. 621. I checked the information provided in the marginal annotations with the edition of Ibn Diḡya's *Muṭrib* that is available to me, but could not find it there.

context of their production²⁸, seems to have contributed to foster Spanish scholarship on ‘Iyād’s *Kitāb al-shifā*²⁹. Let’s see what the future will hold in this exciting quest for expanding our present knowledge on the contribution of pre-modern Andalusī and Maghribī religious scholars to Islamic religious sciences from a multidisciplinary perspective.

Bibliography

- Albarrán, Javier, *Veneración y polémica: Muḥammad en la obra del Qādī ‘Iyād*, Madrid, Ediciones de La Ergástula, 2015.
- Bouchiba, Farid, *Juifs et chrétiens au miroir de la loi musulmane : transmission, herméneutique et pensée juridiques envers les non-musulmans à l’époque almoravide dans l’oeuvre d’Ibn Rušd al-ġadd (m. 520/1126)* [working title], under the supervision of John Tolan and Christian Müller, University of Nantes (France).
- Burnett, Charles, “The ‘Sons of Averroes with the Emperor Frederick’ and the transmission of the philosophical works by Ibn Rushd” in G. Endress & J. Aertsen (eds.), *Averroes and the Aristotelian tradition. Sources, constitution and reception of the philosophy of Ibn Rushd (1126-1198)*. Proceedings of the Fourth Symposium Averroicum (Cologne, 1996), Leiden, Boston-Cologne, 1999, pp. 259-299.
- Fierro, M. “Conversion, ancestry and universal religion: the case of the Almohads in the Islamic West (sixth/twelfth-seven/thirteenth centuries), *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 2/2 (2010), pp. 155-173, at pp. 157-160.
- Fierro, Maribel “Ibn Rushd al-Ḥafīd (Averroes) and his exile to Lucena: Jewish ancestry, genealogy and forced conversion”, *Al-Qanṭara*, XXXVIII (2017), pp. 131-152.
- Fierro, Maribel, “El tratado sobre el profeta del Cadí ‘Iyād y el contexto almohade” in R.G. Houry, J.P. Monferrer-Sala and M^a J. Viguera Molins (ed.), *Legendaria Medievalia. En honor de Concepción Castillo Castillo*, Córdoba, Ediciones El Almendro-Fundación Paradigma Córdoba, 2011, pp. 19-34.

²⁸ See Serrano Ruano, “‘Iyād b. Mūsā”, pp. 417-433 of which pp. 425-430 are devoted to ‘Iyād’s seminal biography of Prophet Muḥammad known as *Kitāb al-shifā’ bi-ta’rīf ḥuqūq al-Muṣṭafā*. Of special mention are also the efforts made by M^a José Hermosilla to approach ‘Iyād’s legacy from an overall perspective. See “‘Iyād b. Mūsā”, section on bibliography, pp. 433-434.

²⁹ See Fierro, “El tratado sobre el profeta del Cadí ‘Iyād y el contexto almohade”, pp. 19-34; Albarrán, *Veneración y polémica*. Albarrán holds an M.A. degree in Hispanic Medieval Studies and is currently preparing his PhD thesis on a related topic. *Veneración y polémica* appears to be the result of his M.A. thesis.

- Geoffroy, Marc, “À propos de l’almohadisme d’Averroès: l’antropomorphisme (*taḡsīm*) dans la seconde version du *Kitāb al-kašf ‘an manāhiḡ al-adilla*” in P. Cressier, M. Fierro and L. Molina (eds.), *Los almohades: problemas y perspectivas*, Madrid, Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2005, 2 vols., II, pp. 853-94.
- Ibn Bashkuwal, *Kitāb al-šila*, ed. ‘I. al-‘Aṭṭār, 1955, II, p. 546, number 1270, note 1.
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “‘Iyād b. Mūsā” in J. Lirola Delgado (dir. & ed.), *Biblioteca de al-Andalus*, Almería, Fundación Ibn Tufayl de Estudios Árabes, 2009, VI, n° 1479, pp. 404-434.
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Al-Qurṭubī” in J. Dammen McAuliffe (general ed.), *Encyclopaedia of the Qur‘ān*, Georgetown University, Washington DC. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1875-3922_q3_EQCOM_050504> First published online: 2016, p. 4).
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Ibn Rušd al-Ŷadd” in J. Lirola Delgado & J.M. Puerta Vilchez (dirs. & eds.), *Biblioteca de al-Andalus: de Ibn al-Dabbāg a Ibn Kurz*, Almería, Fundación Ibn Tufayl de Estudios Árabes, 2006, IV n° 1007, pp. 617-626
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Explicit Cruelty, Implicit Compassion: Judaism, Forced Conversions and the Genealogy of the Banū Rushd”, *Journal of Medieval Iberian Studies*, 2/2 (2010), pp. 217-233.
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Ibn ‘Iyād al-Sabtī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh” en J. Lirola Delgado & J.M. Puerta Vilchez (Dirs. & eds.), *Biblioteca de al-Andalus: de Ibn al-Dabbag a Ibn Kurz*, I, Almería, Fundación Ibn Tufayl de Estudios Árabes, 2004, n° 661, pp. 542-544.
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Ibn Rushd al-Jadd” in O. Arabi, D. Powers & S. Spectorsky (eds.), *Islamic Legal Thought. A Compendium of Muslim Jurists*, Studies in Islamic Law and Society, Leiden, Brill, 2013, pp. 295-322.
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Later Ash‘arism in the Islamic West” in S. Schmidtke (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Islamic Theology*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2016, pp. 515-533.
- Serrano Ruano, Delfina, “Los Banū ‘Iyād (de la caída del imperio almorávid a la instauración de la dinastía nazarí)” in M.L. Ávila & M. Fierro (eds.), *Estudios Onomástico Biográficos de al-Andalus (EOBA)*, IX, Madrid-Granada, CSIC, 1999, pp. 351-406.
- ‘*Uyūn al-anbā’ fī ṭabaqāt al-aṭibbā’*, ed. Henri Jahier and Abdalqadir Noureddine, Beirut, 1965, pp. 132-133.

Recibido: 03/05/2018

Aceptado: 30/05/2018