

Ibn Rushd Marrakesh 1195 — Ninth Topos Case, Configuration I

Thomas Schüller

2026-05-30

Ibn Rushd Marrakesh 1195 — Ninth Topos Case

Index card v0.2-c for the Layered Methodology Research Programme. Extends the configuration series A–H with Configuration I.

Author: Thomas Schüller · Syntagma Forschung · Vienna **Contact:** forschung@tschueller.com
· ORCID 0009-0003-9799-6747 **Licence:** CC BY 4.0 · v0.2-c · 2026-05-30

Layer profile (6 layers)

Layer 1 — Ibn Rushd's own work 1153–1198

- **Dating:** ca. 1153 (astronomical observations in Marrakesh) to 1198 (death)
- **Source:** Aristotle commentaries (Organon, De anima, Physica, Metaphysica, Parva naturalia, Meteorologica, Rhetorica, Poetica, Nicomachean Ethics); commentary on Plato's *Republic* (Aristotle's *Politica* inaccessible); *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut* (response to al-Ghazālī); *Faṣl al-maqāl* (theology-philosophy relation); *Kulliyāt fi 'l-ṭibb* (medicine)
- **Core content:** extensive Aristotelian commentary in three styles (summa, middle, long); doctrine of the eternity of the world; denial of bodily resurrection (soul survives, body does not); distinction between *ahl al-burhān* (people of demonstration, philosophical minority) and *ahl al-khaṭāba* (people of rhetoric, who hold the literal sense); critical distance from Ibn Tumart's Almohad creed (shown in recently discovered revisions to *al-Kaṣhḥ 'an manāhij al-adilla*)
- **D1:** near-contemporary (first-person)
- **D2:** G1 (extensive written œuvre)
- **D3:** lost-intermediate (many Arabic originals lost; transmitted in Hebrew and Latin translation; partial book-burning 1195)
- **D4:** philosophical-systematic; partly apologetic (theology-philosophy relation); partly critical of Almohad theology
- **D5:** fragmentary (in Arabic) / canonical (in Latin-Hebrew tradition)

Layer 2 — Almohad records and banishment order 1195–1197

- **Dating:** 1195 banishment, 1197/98 recall, 1198 death
- **Source:** Almohad chronicler Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī (d. 702/1302); primary banishment record not preserved; reconstruction via al-Marrākushī, al-Maqqarī and later Arabic historiography
- **Core content:** Caliph Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb al-Manṣūr dismisses Ibn Rushd from court office and banishes him to Lucena (largely Jewish town southeast of Cordoba). Selective book-burning: philosophy banned, medicine/arithmetic/elementary astronomy exempted. On petition by eminent men of Seville the banishment is lifted after 2–3 years; Ibn Rushd recalled to the Almohad court at Marrakesh and dies there 1198 (according to one source under house arrest)
- **D1:** near-contemporary to mid-range (al-Marrākushī about 100 years later; original records not preserved)
- **D2:** G1 (court chronicle)
- **D3:** known-intermediate
- **D4:** political-administrative; with jihad-strategic domestic-political context (see Layer 3)
- **D5:** canonical in the factual base; motives contested

Layer 3 — Political logic of the banishment (Almohad domestic politics)

- **Dating:** 1195 occasion: jihad against Christian Spain (Battle of Alarcos, 19 July 1195)
- **Source:** Urvoy 1991, *Ibn Rushd (Averroes)* (Routledge); Urvoy 1998, *Averroès. Les ambitions d’un intellectuel musulman* (Flammarion); Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy “Ibn Rushd”; Britannica “Averroes”
- **Core content:** public pressure against perceived liberalising tendencies under the Almohads; “Ibn Rushd was the victim of a political gesture, sacrificed by the Sultan to win over the masses” (Urvoy 1991:35). In the moment of jihad the caliph needs the undivided loyalty of theologians and jurists (mutakallimūn and fuqahā’) who had agitated against philosophy for years. The banishment is a concession to the religious majority, not a conviction-driven act
- **D1:** mid-range (Urvoy’s reconstruction 800 years after the event)
- **D2:** G1 (academic historiography)
- **D3:** known-intermediate
- **D4:** science-historical reconstructive (analysis of political logic)
- **D5:** largely canonical in Western scholarship; in parts of Islamic scholarship contested

Layer 4 — Islamic reception after 1198

- **Dating:** 12th–20th c.
- **Source:** Ibn Taymiyya (d. 1328) critical; Mamluk and Ottoman theology largely rejecting; Arabic rediscovery only in the 19th/20th c. (*nahḍa* renaissance discourse; Muhammad Abduh; Mohamed Talbi; Jaber Asfour)
- **Core content:** in the Islamic mainstream Ibn Rushd's philosophy loses substantial influence after 1198. The theology-philosophy relation is largely decided in Sunni discourse following al-Ghazālī (against whom Ibn Rushd had polemicised). Only the 19th-c. *nahḍa* movement rehabilitates him as forerunner of an enlightened Islam
- **D1:** long-range
- **D2:** G1 (theological writing, later academic reappropriation)
- **D3:** known-intermediate
- **D4:** religious-polemical (Ibn Taymiyya); reformist-apologetic (*nahḍa*)
- **D5:** contested, in waves — largely marginal, periodically revised

Layer 5 — Latin and Hebrew Averroes reception 13th–17th c.

- **Dating:** from ca. 1230 (Michael Scot's Toledo translations) to 17th c.
- **Source:** Latin translations of the Aristotle commentaries (Michael Scot, Hermannus Alemannus, William of Moerbeke); Hebrew translations (Moses ibn Tibbon); Parisian Averroism controversy (Siger of Brabant, Bishop Tempier 1277); Renaissance Aristotelianism
- **Core content: massive impact in the Christian West.** In the Latin Middle Ages Aristotle is read primarily through Averroes' commentaries ("Averroes Commentator"). Thomas Aquinas responds in detail (*De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*). Bishop Tempier condemns 219 propositions in Paris 1277, many Averroist. Renaissance Padua becomes the centre of "secular Averroism". The "double truth" thesis (not actually Ibn Rushd's doctrine but a Parisian construction) becomes a topos
- **D1:** mid-range to long-range
- **D2:** G1 (scholastic commentary tradition)
- **D3:** cross-genre transposed (Arabic commentaries → Latin scholasticism → early-modern university teaching); known-intermediate (translators as identifiable layer)
- **D4:** philosophical-systematic; partly apologetic (Aquinas) against Averroes; partly enthusiastic (Padua school)
- **D5:** canonical in the history of Western philosophy

Layer 6 — History of science and updating topoi 19th–21st c.

- **Dating:** from Renan 1852 (*Averroès et l'averroïsme*); intensively from the 1990s
 - **Source:** Ernest Renan 1852; Urvoy 1991/1998; Endress 1999; Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy; Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy; Britannica; muslimphilosophy.com; *nahḍa* literature (Abduh, Talbi)
 - **Core content: two competing updating topoi.** (a) Renan and the positivist tradition: Averroes as forerunner of Western enlightenment, rupture between Islam and reason. (b) *nahḍa* and post-colonial history of science: Averroes as a lost possibility of an enlightened Islam. Both topoi are politically functional; Urvoy 1991/1998 differentiates source-critically
 - **D1:** distant
 - **D2:** G1 (academic historiography)
 - **D3:** known-intermediate
 - **D4:** science-historical + politically-functional (on two different axes)
 - **D5:** canonical within their respective traditions; in mutual contestation
-

Configuration I (new)

I — Scientific marginalisation by banishment (not death); selective work-prohibition; political concession rather than conviction-driven act; posthumous reception in foreign tradition.

Six features distinguishing I from A–H:

1. **Banishment rather than killing.** Unlike A (Socrates: execution), B (Archimedes: sword), C (Hypatia: mob), D (Maya scribes: destruction of writings after inquisition), E (Galileo: house arrest but lifelong after recantation), G (Vavilov: prison death), H (al-Ḥallāj: execution): with Ibn Rushd the power measure is **temporary and reversible**. Banishment 1195, recall 1197/98. Death 1198 then not caused by power measure but natural end of life (according to one source under house arrest, which is contested).
2. **Selective work-prohibition.** Unlike D (Maya: total destruction), H (al-Ḥallāj: total burning): with Ibn Rushd philosophy works are banned and partly burned, **medicine/arithmetical/elementary astronomy explicitly exempted**. Power differentiates between threat classes of the work. The work is not treated as the person of the knower but devalued modularly.
3. **Political concession rather than conviction-driven act.** Unlike E (Galileo: Inquisition with theological conviction logic), C (Hypatia: confessional rivalry with

belief-in-cause): with Ibn Rushd the banishment is **explicitly identified as political gesture** in scholarship (Urvoy 1991:35). In the moment of jihad 1195 the caliph needs the loyalty of religious elites who had agitated against philosophy for years. Ibn Rushd is *pawn sacrificed* in a coalition manoeuvre — not heretic against whose doctrine the power fights.

4. **No apocryphal phrase.** As with Vavilov (Configuration G) — unlike B, C, E, H. Ibn Rushd has no phrase topos circulating popularly as execution charge or martyr's word. **Pop topos formation arises only in the modern *nahḍa* and Renaissance constructions**, not from the event itself.
5. **Posthumous reception in *foreign* tradition.** Structurally new: unlike all preceding configurations (posthumous rehabilitation or consecration in the own tradition, whether F/G institutional, H Sufi, A Platonist, B Roman-humanist): with Ibn Rushd **central posthumous reception runs in the Christian West** (Latin scholasticism, Renaissance Aristotelianism) and Jewish Middle Ages (Hebrew translations), while in the Islamic mainstream he remains marginalised. Only the 19th-c. *nahḍa* rehabilitates him intra-Islamically — on an entirely different axis from the Christian reception.
6. **Double updating topoi.** Unlike most v0.1/v0.2 cases (one dominant pop topos): with Ibn Rushd **two competing updating topoi** exist in parallel — (a) Renan topos “Averroes as forerunner of enlightenment against Islam” (politically functional in the colonial period), (b) *nahḍa* topos “Averroes as lost possibility of enlightened Islam” (politically functional in post-colonial reform discourse). Both topoi are source-critically inadequate, both functional.

Three v0.1 findings — re-examined (state after 9 cases)

Finding 1 (apocryphal phrase): With Ibn Rushd no apocryphal phrase. State: 4/9 with apocryphal phrase (B, C, E, H). The finding remains stable but is not universal — it correlates with configuration types containing a dramatic execution event. Where the event is less spectacular (G Vavilov: prison, I Ibn Rushd: banishment), no phrase topos emerges.

Finding 2 (knowers without first-person voice): Ibn Rushd has extensive voice, partly lost in Arabic but completely preserved in Hebrew and Latin. State: 4/9 without voice. Quota drops further (from 4/8 to 4/9 = 44 %). The scale differentiation from v0.2-b is extended: with Ibn Rushd voice is **weakened in the own tradition, preserved in foreign tradition** — a third intermediate state.

Finding 3 (empirical decidability): With Ibn Rushd the matter at dispute is primarily philosophical-theological (eternity of the world, bodily resurrection, status of the intellect) —

not empirically decidable. State: 2/9 empirically decidable (F, G). Theological and philosophical dispute configurations continue to dominate clearly.

New candidate finding (potentially systematic): In H (al-Ḥallāj) and I (Ibn Rushd) *political logic under religious guise* is the power mode. A pattern is emerging for Islamic and pre-modern Mediterranean science-politics configurations that was not foregrounded in v0.1 configurations A–F. This finding is sufficiently secured only after further comparison cases (Suhrawardī, persecution of Maimonides).

Connection to v0.1 and v0.2 configurations

- **I → G (Vavilov):** both without apocryphal phrase, both with political power logic foregrounded. G: secular frame with state-decreed pseudoscience; I: religious frame with political concession. G: death by prison; I: banishment with recall.
- **I → H (al-Ḥallāj):** both with religious accusation as political pretext. H: execution with posthumous saintly transfiguration; I: banishment with posthumous reception in foreign tradition. H: total work destruction; I: selective work-prohibition.
- **I → E (Galileo):** both with work prohibition. E: Inquisition procedure with recantation and house arrest; I: banishment without recantation. E: effect of the work in the Western mainstream after 1633; I: effect in the Christian-Jewish Middle Ages, marginalisation in the Islamic sphere.

Limitations

- Index card, not full analysis. Full version would go to Arabic primary sources (al-Marrākushī, al-Maqqarī, *Faṣl al-maqāl*, *Tahāfut al-Tahāfut*) and to Almohad political history.
- Secondary sources Western-anglophone with Urvoy as French-Arabic bridge work. Arabic and North African scholarship (Ben Sharīfa 1999, Ben Ahmed 2020c) referenced, not directly examined.
- Configuration I formulated based on one case. Comparison cases for I-stabilisation: Maimonides 1148 (Almohad conversion pressure, exile); Suhrawardī Aleppo 1191 (execution — different configuration, closer to H); Ibn Taymiyya imprisonments (political-religious conflict line).
- The “updating topoi” finding (sixth feature) is potentially also present in C and E (Hypatia: pop feminism vs. patristic perception; Galileo: science-religion conflict topos vs. revisionist scholarship). A systematic investigation of topos change through time would be v0.3 programme work.

Sources

- **Urvoy, Dominique** (1991): *Ibn Rushd (Averroes)*. London: Routledge.
- **Urvoy, Dominique** (1998): *Averroès. Les ambitions d'un intellectuel musulman*. Paris: Flammarion. (Spanish trans. D. Serrano, Madrid: Alianza, later.)
- **Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy** (online): entry “Ibn Rushd [Averroes]” (<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ibn-rushd/>).
- **Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy** (online): entry “Ibn Rushd (Averroes)” (<https://iep.utm.edu/ibn-rushd-averroes/>).
- **Britannica** (online): entry “Averroes” — historical research state up to ca. 1998.
- **Endress, Gerhard** (1999): *Averroes and the Aristotelian Tradition*. Leiden: Brill.
- **Ben Sharīfa, Muḥammad** (1999): definitive Arabic biography (Morocco).
- **Ben Ahmed, Fouad** (2020c): see Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy “Ibn Rushd” §Bibliography for historical context.
- **Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik al-Marrākushī** (d. 702/1302): Almohad chronicle (standard source for banishment background).
- **Renan, Ernest** (1852): *Averroès et l'averroïsme*. Paris: Auguste Durand. (Historically central for the Renan topos tradition; source-critically superseded today, but methodologically instructive.)

Index card v0.2-c, status 2026-05-30. Configuration I formulated for the first time with this case. Closure type: USE-CASE-SCHLUSS. Comparison cases (Maimonides 1148, Suhrawardī 1191) in subsequent v0.2 iterations.