
THE SCHOOL OF TRANSLATORS OF TOLEDO AND THE IDENTIFICATION OF GUNDISALVO'S MAIN CONTRIBUTOR. / LA ESCUELA DE TRADUCTORES DE TOLEDO Y LA IDENTIFICACIÓN DE LAS PRINCIPALES CONTRIBUCIONES DE GUNDISALVO.

Luisa M^a Serrano Patón

University of Alcalá, Spain

susi.serrano@hotmail.es

Abstract: The main issue of this article will revolve around the *School of Translators of Toledo*, one of the first European institutions carrying out translations that could be considered as translations within the Public Services and examples of Community Translation. The main objectives of this project will be to highlight the institution, as well as to carry out an inner investigation for trying to demonstrate the *identity* of one of the School's most relevant translators: *Gundisalvo's main contributor*, analyzing documents found in the current School's Library and in the Cathedral Archive of Toledo. Firstly, there will be a brief analysis about the historical development of the School of Translators. Secondly, the research part about the identity of Gundisalvo's contributor will be developed and explained, as well as the methodology used for the research and the conclusions obtained. Finally, general conclusions about the whole project will be exposed too.

Keywords: School of Translators of Toledo; Translation; Gundisalvo.

Resumen: El tema principal de este artículo girará en torno a la Escuela de Traductores de Toledo, una de las primeras instituciones europeas en realizar traducciones que podrían ser consideradas como traducciones de los Servicios Públicos y ejemplos de Traducción Comunitaria. Los principales objetivos de este proyecto serán el de resaltar la figura de la institución, así como llevar a cabo una investigación interna para tratar de demostrar la identidad de uno de los traductores más relevantes de la Escuela: el colaborador principal de Gundisalvo, analizando los documentos encontrados en la actual biblioteca de la Escuela y en el Archivo Catedralicio de Toledo. En primer lugar, se realizará un breve análisis sobre el desarrollo histórico de la Escuela de Traductores. En segundo lugar, se llevará a cabo una investigación sobre la identidad del colaborador de Gundisalvo, así como la metodología utilizada y las conclusiones obtenidas. Por último, se expondrán también las conclusiones generales sobre el proyecto completo.

Palabras clave: Escuela de Traductores de Toledo; Traducción; Gundisalvo.

1. Introduction

When talking about the Medieval Age, one of the most unknown details of the period is its importance to the development of knowledge and science in Europe. The continent experienced a cultural impulse due to the labor of the School of Translators of Toledo. This historical period is characterized by a strong intellectual obscurantism, which supposed a huge restriction on the diffusion of knowledge and information. Due to this obscurantism,

most of the Greek and Oriental texts about Philosophy, Medicine, Mathematics and Astronomy were unknown in Europe and its universities, which mainly based their doctrines on Latin texts.

Brasa Díez states in *Las traducciones toledanas como encuentro de culturas*:

The School was one of the biggest contributions of Spain to the Occidental culture. It might be added that it is a contribution to our 'profession', 'craft' or 'art' too, which [...] is, in addition, an element of coexistence, factor of European integration and an indispensable tool for cultural and technical knowledge transmission (1948: 589). (Author's translation).

The appearance of the School of Translators between the 12th and 13th centuries meant a complete revolution for European knowledge. Several universities from Europe experienced an unprecedented impulse in literary, astronomic, medical and mathematical scopes due to the institution. Even so, although the labor of European universities has been strongly recognized, some people are not aware of the role that the School has had in this development (as it was my personal case).

It was precisely this lack of awareness that led us to write this paper as well as the contradiction around a specific figure related to the School of Translators: the main contributor of Gundisalvo (who was another of the main translators of the period). It was brought to our attention that, although there were several theories around his identity, there was not an agreement on the issue, and the topic still remained unclear. Due to this lack of agreement, we will analyze the most important theories and, after comparing them, we will reach a conclusion, supporting it with the information obtained in the Cathedral Archive.

Throughout the project, all the readings and the visits to the Archive, the image of the School of Translators has completely changed. After analyzing the historical development of the institution of the School of Translators, the importance of the institution in all scopes is apparent. It was one of the pioneer institutions of Translation, as well as a powerful and real example of Community Translation, which made possible not only the communication, but also the peaceful existence in a multicultural society.

2. Methodology

A qualitative phenomenological approach has been followed in order to fulfill the main purposes of this paper. Before starting any investigation, it was necessary to contextualize the historical framework in order to get an accurate idea about the development. This contextualization was made throughout a theoretical study of the sources, which were written in Spanish (most of them), and were found on the library fund of the current School of Translators. The most important source along the historical part of the paper is a document called "La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo". The book *La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo y sus Colaboradores Judíos* by José S.Gil, was really significant too. In order to fulfill the first objective of the paper, which was to contextualize the institution, as well as to emphasize in the importance of it towards the European Universities, we read the mentioned documents and we interpreted it considering the combined information obtained from this reading and our own knowledge about the history of Toledo.

The main sources have been found on the current School of Translators. Most of them were written in Spanish and all of them deal with the identification of the meaningful translators within the old institution. The main sources used during the research part are the articles written by Manuel Alonso, the article "Nuevas notas sobre los traductores Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano" by Rivera Recio and the theory that Alexander Fidora supports

in “La Catedral Primada de Toledo, dieciocho siglos de Historia”. In addition to these sources, the articles: “A group of Arabic-Latin translators working in Northern Spain in the mid-12th century”, “Sobre la Escuela de Traductores de Toledo or Toledo, la dependencia de Occidente” have been also used.

The procedure for doing this research part was the following one: once we had placed the research in its historical context, we could follow two different theories: the theory which was supported by Alonso (Juan Hispano was Ibn Dawud, a Jew converted who became archbishop of Segovia and Toledo) and the theory of Fidora, Alverny and Riviera Recio (Abraham Ibn Dawud was the main contributor of Gundisalvo and Juan Hispano was another contributor, who turned to be the dean of the Cathedral of Toledo). Once we read both of them, in order to get more reliable data, we went to the Cathedral Archive, with the aim of looking for something that could prove one or other theory.

In the Archive, the first thing that we did was to take one of the books which had always been attributed to Gundisalvo and his contributor: *De Anima*, by Avicena. In the dedicatory, and with the aid of one of the Archivists, we looked for the name of Gundisalvo (which we actually found) and the name of his contributor. We were expecting to find the name of Juan Hispano somewhere. When we did not find it, we looked for the name of Ibn Dawud or Avendahuth, but we did not get results either. We did the same with another translation that has always been attributed to this tandem of translators: *Fons Vitae*, but there were any references to the contributor. Finally, what we figured out was that, if Gundisalvo was the translator who wrote in Latin, he did not mention his contributor anywhere. That is why we stopped looking for evidences in the translations.

After that, we followed a different path, looking for information about the name of Juan Hispano in the data base of the Archive, using for it the *Spanish Archives Portal, PARES*. The results obtained were really confusing, because the Juan Hispano that appeared on this data base was the same who had been archdeacon of Cuellar (substitute of Gundisalvo) and dean of the Cathedral, that is, the Hispano mentioned by Fidora, Alverny and Recio. The Juan Hispano mentioned by Alonso, who had been archdeacon of Segovia and had become archbishop of Toledo, apparently did not exist. This fact drove us to look for information about the ecclesiastical functions at those times, to check if, in fact, there was an archbishop of Segovia named Juan. Using Mansilla’s Pontific Documentation until Inocencio III (1995: 969-1216) and the book *Hierachia Catholica Medii Aevi*, which contain recordings and Latin transcriptions of the ecclesiastical designations of those times, we realized that the theories of Alonso were wrong: there was not a John archbishop of Segovia, but there was a John archbishop of Segorbe (which was a city very close to Segovia), this Juan archbishop of Segorbe, later on, turned to be dean of the Cathedral of Toledo (who was the Juan that appeared in the *Spanish Archives Portal, PARES*). One more time, the theory given by Riviera Recio and Fidora became stronger.

Although it was clear enough that the theory of Alonso was mistaken, we tried to look for evidences which supported, if possible, one of the points of his theory: the issue of the conversion. In case that there was such a conversion, there should be a document for proving it. That is why we review the baptism records, trying to look for an Abraham Ibn Dawud who had become Christian, adopting the name of Juan. However, we did not find such record.

3. The School of Translators of Toledo

Previous knowledge about the history of the city and the institution has been supported using, mainly, the essay made by the *Diputación Provincial de Toledo* called *La Escuela de*

Traductores de Toledo, José S. Gil's book, together with other sources, as well as *Studies in the history of medieval science* by Haskins.

In 711 BC, the Arabs conquered Toledo and they dominated the city throughout four centuries. Back then, Arabs, Jewish and Mozarabs, which were Christians who lived under the power of an Arabian Government keeping their religion and their culture, were living together in the city in a peaceful way. According to Haskins (1924: 3-8) and the essay "La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo", during that process of expansion the Arabs studied, commented and translated every treatise that was found. Those treatises were unknown to Europeans because of the obscurantism that existed in the Medieval Age. In turn, the Arabs themselves were creating their own intellectual baggage (numbers, important documents relating to Astronomy, Physics, philosophical treatises, etc.). They brought all their knowledge to their *Taifas*, which were the areas that they have conquered in the Peninsula. This huge amount of knowledge and information came to Toledo with the Arabs and throughout four centuries, they spread their own knowledge and their translations, preserving all the documents in libraries and private collections in the city.

In 1085, Alfonso VI and the Christians conquered Toledo in an episode known as "the *Reconquista*". This historical event put an end to four centuries of Arabian domination. Nevertheless, in contrast to other historical recaptures, this one did not imply the immediate expulsion of the Arabs or the elimination of their essence. They were allowed to stay in some areas of the city, along with the Jewish people. It was in that moment when the city became the *City of the Three Cultures*. The libraries were still preserved, as well as the private collections, and Jewish and Arabian scholars remained in the city, carrying on with their studies, researches and their translations. The previous cultural baggage was combined with the knowledge that Christian intellectuals brought, and that situation of ethnographic symbiosis made Toledo a revolutionary city in cultural terms.

The School of Translators of Toledo was firstly established as a result of this historical period within a complete multicultural atmosphere. The institution appeared between the 12th and 13th centuries. Rather than being an organized institution as such, it was more an intellectual movement that existed within the city. Oriental and Greek knowledge, translated into Arabic and preserved for so many centuries, in addition to the Christian culture, promoted the intellectual movement mentioned before (*La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo*, 1996: 5).

The aim of the School was to transmit Oriental and Greek knowledge to Europe, opening the cultural framework that, until then, had been confined to Latin texts. However, how and why did it appear? The main reason for the appearance of the institution dates back to the Arabian expansion that was advancing from Byzantine lands towards the Iberian Peninsula.

When the School appeared, an exodus of wise men and scholars took place: the most important intellectual figures came to the city with the aim of studying, translating and bringing back to Europe the new amount of knowledge brought by the Arabs. It brought a huge revolution for the wisdom of the period. It is important to emphasize the scholars' presence, because they were the ones who translated the Arabic translations of classic Oriental and Greek works into Romance and Latin. Amongst the translators that worked in the School, there were a lot of characters who had a more remarkable role within it. Nonetheless, the hardships of the period, the lack of documentation and the multilingualism of the city, have created a lot of difficulties for identifying some of them in a reliable way.

In terms of its development, the School has three clear periods: the *Periodo Raimundiano*, where the joint work between Arabs and Jewish was essential while translating; the *Periodo Alfonsino*, and the changes made on the procedure of translating;

and, finally, the Contemporary period of the School, where the institution became an educative organism.

4. The identification of Gundisalvo's main contributor

Although the historical periods of the School of Translators of Toledo have been clearly identified through history, the identity of some of the most important translators who composed it, such as Gundisalvo's contributor, still remains unclear. This fact makes really complicated to give to these translators the deserved recognition of their works, and their labor within the institution and Europe too.

Gundisalvo, who was one of the most important figures during the *Periodo Raimundiano* and has been clearly and irrefutably identified, however, there are a lot of theories around the real identity of his contributor, but none of these theories are truly reliable. Considering this, all the information obtained on the topic was separated into two parts: the first part was composed of the information that was, for sure, real and reliable. The second part consisted of theories or articles whose details did not coincide between them or others that did not gather evidence which could support them. All these theories were compared in order to get the most possible and accurate conclusions.

What was considered as reliable information was the fact that there was an important contributor of Gundisalvo and that this tandem of translators worked under the patronage of Don Raimundo. Another reliable fact was that this character has been considered throughout history as one of the promoters of translation activity in Toledo, due to his aim of transmitting Avicena's doctrine. Finally, the most relevant information about this figure was that his knowledge of Arabic was really high and he could speak Romance but not Latin (the main reason for which he worked with Gundisalvo).

Another aspect that has been highly taken into account during this investigation is the multilingual condition of Toledo of those times. This multilingual atmosphere could lead to phonetic and graphic corruption of words and names. A word pronounced by a Christian and an Arab would sound different depending on who was pronouncing it. A variation in the pronunciation could lead to a different way of writing that specific word. The result was that there could be a lot of different versions of the same word or, in this case, of a name.

Finally, the last point that must be considered was the possibility of confusion due to homonymy. The most common theory around the identity of this character is that his name was Juan Hispano. The name of Juan was, if any, one of the most common names during those times because its relation with the Bible, and this fact made the project even more difficult, giving the fact that the School of Translators was mainly composed and supported by clergy men and many of them were called Juan.

3.1 The name of Ibn Dawud (Avendahuth)

Ibn Dawud is another character that has always been associated to Juan Hispano and he must be analyzed because, apparently, both characters were the same person.

At the same time, the name of Ibn Dawud has always been linked to another similar name: Avendahuth. It is necessary to clarify this question before going deeper into the investigation of this figure. Some theories state that these two characters, Ibn Dawud and Avendahuth, were different people. Others suggest that Avendahuth was, indeed, a derivation of the name of Ibn Dawud. In "Sobre la Escuela de Traductores", by M^aTeresa Garulo, she

supported the same theory too: “Juan Hispano converted Jew named Avendahut, corruption for Ibn Dawud” (1973: 9) (Author’s translation).

Moreover, there is another similar theory, given by Alexander Fidora: he suggests that Avendahuth is, indeed, the Latin version of Ibn Dawud (2010: 481).

Nevertheless, what is irrefutable is that Ibn Dawud and Avendahuht were the same character. However, this figure is so important because it has been related to Juan Hispano throughout history, and some theories support that they were the same person. Other theories suggest that Ibn Dawud was a different translator who also collaborated with Gundisalvo. This research project will try to clarify the issue, examining the former theories around it, firstly considering John Hispano as Gundisalvo’s contributor.

3.2 Ibn Dawud (Avendahuth) was Juan Hispano but not Juan Hispalensis

According to Alonso, these two names referred to the same person: Ibn Dawud was Juan Hispano. He claims that there was an Israeli philosopher known as Ibn Dawud that changed his name after his baptism into Juan Ibn Dawud. This figure used the name of Hispanus instead of the name of Israeli (1943:162). Other authors, such as Gil (1989: 31), Henelde (46), Lomba (1997: 46) or M^a Teresa Garulo (1973: 9), also support this theory.

In the investigation about Juan Hispano, Alonso stands out another important detail that has caused a lot of difficulties when trying to identify the contributor of Gundisalvo. The figure of Juan Hispalensis was another translator who was commonly mistaken with Hispano. Alonso states that Hispano and Hispalensis were two different people with a homonymic name and a similar surname. People tend to identify Hispalensis with Hispano and, according to what Alonso says, this identification is wrong: Johannes Hispalensis was an astrologist and astronomer, who lived in Andalucía (that is why he was known as Hispalensis, Juan de Sevilla or Juan de Luna). Moreover, Hispalensis had a high knowledge of Latin language and he could translate on his own. In contrast, Juan Hispano (apparent contributor) needed Gundisalvo for translating into Latin because, as Alonso assures, Hispano did not have enough knowledge to translate into Latin without help. This theory is also supported by Brasa (1948: 592) or Hayyek: “he did not know the educated Latin, but he knew the vulgar one, as well as he knew the technical philosophical Arabic with more perfection than any other of the translators” (1990: 12-13).

Alonso continues his investigation, finding out that the works of the translator from Andalucía, dealt more with Astronomy and Astrology, and they were translated before 1136; on the other hand, the translations made by the tandem Gundisalvo-Hispano, were about Philosophy and were published later than 1138. In addition, Don Raimundo, patron of Gundisalvo and Hispano, is mentioned in the works of the tandem, but not in Hispalensis’.

In his works, Alonso provides information about the ecclesiastic career of Juan Hispano too. According to him, he was named the substitute for Don Raimundo when this died. After that, he became the Archbishop of Segovia and, later on, Archbishop of Toledo. We did not realize of the importance of these facts until later, because this information was the key for determining important points of the investigation.

Considering these facts and the whole agreement on this topic amongst Alonso’s theories and many authors, it seems that Hispano and Hispalensis were different characters who have been confused throughout history by their homonymic names. However, the rest of the data given by Alonso has turned out to be inaccurate.

After reading Alonso’s work, we went to the Cathedral Archive in order to look for evidences. First of all, we tried to look for a document that proved the conversion of Ibn Dawud to Christianity: a baptism record or a document that mentioned this conversion.

However, anything was found. Given the fact that this translator lived in a period where faith determined even the area of the city someone was living in, we may venture to say that, given the fact that any official document, which supported this conversion, was found it is very difficult to consider this theory as real.

In respect of the translator's ecclesiastical career mentioned by Alonso, during my visit to the Archive we found several inaccuracies, which will be exposed below, that do not coincide with the theory exposed by Alonso. This fact made us to continue with the research, which led us to analyze another theory related to this figure.

3.3 Ibn Dawud (Avendahuth) was not Juan Hispano

Despite the fact that most of the sources support that Ibn Dawud was Hispano, others distinguish them as two different men, supporting that Gundisalvo could have worked with two contributors. We focused on these other articles too, because of some evidences that were found in the Cathedral Archive. These new evidences supported the new theory in a more reliable way than the previous theories given by Alonso.

The first time that we found the name of Avendahuth as contributor of Gundisalvo (instead of Juan Hispano) was in Gil's book, when he mentioned a team formed by Gundisalvo - Avendahuth, who worked together from 1130 to 1150 (1985: 31), under the patronage of Don Raimundo. According to Gil, the whole name of Avendahuth was Iohannes Avendahuth Hispanus. If we consider that Avendahuth is a derivation of Ibn Dawud and that, according to Alonso, Ibn Dawud adopted the name of Juan when he became a Christian, we could say that Iohannes Avendahuht Hispanus was, indeed, Ibn Dawud.

However, Gil also quotes M. T. Alverny's suggestion: Avendahuht was a Jewish-Hispano (because he lived in Hispanic lands), whose real name was Abraham Ibn Dawud. He came from a really relevant Jewish family of Toledo. When he moved to Cordoba in order to go to University, he focused his studies, mainly, on the Neoplatonism of Avicena. In 1148 he came back to Toledo, and he started translating the Arabic works that he had studied in the University into Latin with the collaboration of Gundisalvo (1985: 33).

Alexander Fidora, another author who worked on the issue, describes Avendahuth as the Jew philosopher of M. T. Alverny. He states that history has had the tendency to identify Ibn Dawud (Avendahuth) as a Jew converted, who adopted the name of Juan (this is the theory supported by Alonso). However, the archivist affirms that there is not an evidence of this conversion and this association was made due to an incorrect reading of the dedicatory in the translation of *De Anima* by Avicena. This dedicatory was made for John, archbishop of Toledo (2010: 481).

At the same time, this very translation has always been attributed to Juan Hispano (considering Hispano as Ibn Dawud/Avendahuth) and Gundisalvo. Thinking over what Fidora says, the name of Juan was a leak which was wrongly associated to the name of Abraham Ibn Dawud. We may then say that the translation of *De Anima* was carried out by Gundisalvo and Ibn Dawud (Avendehuth), but not by any Juan Hispano.

In addition, if we gather all the information, what we know is that Ibn Dawud was a philosopher expert on Avicena, just as the Abraham Ibn Dawud mentioned by M. T. Alverny. We assume that Ibn Dawud and Abraham Ibn Dawud were the same person, not only because of the similarities between their names, but because of their personal similarities (both were philosophers, experts on Avicena and Arabic language) are so high that it is really difficult to believe that two different people can share have so much in common.

Putting all these details together, the conclusion is that Ibn Dawud (Avendahuth) and Abraham Ibn Dawud was the same person: a philosopher, expert on Avicena, who translated

De Anima together with Gundisalvo. He was the most qualified person to carry out this translation, because he went to the University in order to study the philosophy of Avicena.

Another theory that will be analyzed at this point of the paper is Juan Francisco Riviera Recio's in his article *Nuevas Notas sobre Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano*. He supports the theory that Abraham Ibn Dawud "belonged to the previous generation to Hispano" (1966: 279) (Author's translation) and he was the professor of Gundisalvo. M^a Teresa Garulo speaks about an Ibrim b. Dawud as the teacher of Gundisalvo too (1973: 10). We considered this theory as true and that Garulo was referring, indeed, to Abraham Ibn Dawud. These testimonies can confirm, in a certain way, the origins of the link between Ibn Dawud and Gundisalvo. Finally, we have to consider the fact that Riviera was a canonical man that worked in the Cathedral Archive of Toledo so, nobody but him could do a better investigation within the Archive. That is why this testimony has been considered the most reliable on this paper.

Considering all the data about Ibn Dawud and Abraham Ibn Dawud, we would affirm, that Abraham Ibn Dawud (also known as Ibn Dawud and Avendahuth) was the main contributor of Gundisalvo. However, he has always been mistaken with a character called Juan, because of a misunderstanding. However, there was person called Juan who was contributor of Gundisalvo too. This Juan turned to be the same Juan mentioned by Alonso, but with a slightly different ecclesiastical career.

3.4 The ecclesiastical career of Juan

One of the main aspects that drove me to reject Alonso's theories was the ecclesiastical career that he attributed to the so-called contributor. Remember that according to Alonso's notes, around 1149 Hispano was named Archbishop of Segovia. Alonso also states that when Don Raimundo died, Hispano was translated to Toledo for being his substitute, until 1166. However, when we went to the Cathedral Archive, looking for this archbishop of Segovia in the *Documentación Pontificia hasta Inocencio III* (1955: 969-1216), as well as in *Hierachia Catholica Medii Aevi*, which contain accurate lists of the ecclesiastic characters (and their positions) of those times. Curiously, during this period of time, there was an Archbishop in Toledo called Juan, from 1151 to 1166, who was not the translator who is occupying this investigation, but there was not an archbishop of Segovia. Our explanation is that there could be a chance that Alonso could have mistaken these two characters due to their homonymic names.

In addition to this, Fidora states that this Juan who was mistaken with Avendahuth was, indeed, another translator who also was the contributor of Gundisalvo, but in a lesser way than Ibn Dawud was. This Juan was a clergyman who translated documents related to Mathematics or Astronomy. He was known as *Magister Iohannes*¹ or *Ihoannes Hispanus*, according to González. Fidora states that when Gundisalvo died, he was named Archdeacon of Cuellar (a position that had been occupied by Gundisalvo until his death. Remember that Alonso stated that Juan Hispano was named the substitute of Gundisalvo when he died) and, later on, Dean of the Cathedral of Toledo. Finally, in 1212, he became the Archbishop of Segorbe – a city really close to Segovia, this may suggest why Alonso confused his theory -

¹ *Maestro Iohannes*: According to Ramón González in his article "The master translator John of Toledo", this canon character was the Chantree of Toledo who has been mistaken with Ibn Dawud throughout history. However, his signature is irrefutable, as well as his career (he had a University degree, which is an official document that leaves any confusion behind it). He mainly translated documents of medicine.

(2010: 481). Riviera also agrees with this theory (1966: 277-279) and one of the essays about the School of Translators of Toledo, recognizes that Juan, Archdeacon of Cuellar and, later, Dean of the Cathedral, was the unique Juan who belonged to the School of Translators of Toledo.

Considering the data obtained in Mansilla's work (1955: 969-1216), as well as the *Hierachia Catholica Medii AEVI* about the Juan who was Archdeacon of Cuellar, Dean of the Cathedral and Archbishop of Segorbe, it is undeniable and there is no room for error: there was just one Juan translator in Toledo at those times, and he was not the one proposed by Alonso.

Finally, we must not forget that the theory proposed by Alonso is based on the so-called Jew converted Ibn Dawud, who turned into Juan when he became a Christian. As it is previously mentioned, we cannot give real credit to this theory because there is no evidence of this. The fact of the conversion itself makes us reject this theory because when someone became a Christian the first compulsory act was to get baptized. This act was official, in case this conversion was real, all the investigators who have tried to solve this problem would have found a document to prove it.

5. Results

Considering the results of the analysis of the previous theories, we support the theory given by Fidora, Alverny and Riviera Recio: the most important contributor of Gundisalvo was Abraham Ibn Dawud (Avendahuth) and not Juan Hispano, as it has always been believed. The evidence that Abraham Ibn Dawud and Juan Hispano were different characters, as well as the coincidences between the main contributor of Gundisalvo and the Jew Abraham Ibn Dawud described by the authors previously mentioned, are so apparent that it is almost impossible to believe in the other theory about a Jew person who was converted, adopting the name of Juan, becoming archbishop of Segovia and Toledo (data which has turned to be a wrong information, because there were not such archbishops) in few years. In addition, the lack of a baptism record or other documents related to the conversion, made partially impossible to consider the theory of Alonso as real. Abraham Ibn Dawud, however, joined the qualities that are described when talking about Gundisalvo's main contributor. The Juan Hispano proposed by Alonso has been based on generalized mistakes and presumptions, in addition to some wrong information, while the theory proposed by M. T. Alverny, Fidora and Riviera Recio has been supported by real documents which are recorded in the Cathedral Archive.

To summarize, throughout this investigation, we have tried to clarify the question concerning the main contributor of Gundisalvo: this contributor (who seemed to be John Hispano at the beginning) was, indeed, the Jew Abraham Ibn Dawud, a recognized expert on Avicena's theories, which made the tandem Gundisalvo-Avendahuth famous (remember that Avendahuth is Ibn Dawud too). However, because of a possible wrong interpretation of a dedication, his identity was mistaken and mixed with a figure that also had some relation with Gundisalvo. This new figure was a canonical man, called Juan, known as Maestro Iohannes or Juan Hispano, who was Dean of the Cathedral, Archdeacon of Cuellar and, lately, Archbishop of Segorbe (city near to Segovia, which could help to confuse the investigation of Alonso). This Maestro Iohannes was a translator too and he worked with Gundisalvo, but not on as many occasions as Ibn Dawud did.

References

- Alonso Alonso, M. 1943. "Notas sobre los traductores toledanos Domingo Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano." *Al-Ándalus. Revista de las Escuelas de Estudios árabes de Madrid y Granada*, 8 (1).
- Brasa Díez, M. 1947. "Las traducciones toledanas como encuentro de culturas". *Estudios filosóficos*, 23: 129-589.
- Consejería de Educación y Cultura (Comunidad de Madrid) y Diputación Provincial de Toledo. *La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo*. Toledo.
- Diputación Provincial de Toledo, S.I. Catedral Primada de Toledo y el Servicio de Traducción de la Comisión Europea. 1996. *La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo*. Madrid.
- Fernández Parrilla, G. y de Larramendi, H. "La Nueva Escuela de Traductores de Toledo". *La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo*. Toledo: Diputación Provincial de Toledo.
- Fidora, A. 2010. "La Escuela de Traductores". *La Catedral Primada de Toledo, dieciocho siglos de Historia*.
- Garulo, M^a T. 1973. "Sobre la Escuela de Traductores de Toledo". *Islam español*, 18. Madrid.
- Gil, J. 1985. *La Escuela de Traductores de Toledo y sus colaboradores judíos*. Toledo. Salamanca.
- Gonzálvez, R. *El traductor Maestro Juan de Toledo*. Homenaje a Rivera Recio. Toledo.
- Harvey, L.P. 1997. "The Alfonsine School of Translators: Translations from Arabic into Castilian Produced under the Patronage of Alfonso the Wise of Castile (1221-1252-1284)". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland*. Cambridge: 109-117.
- Haskins, C. S. 1924. *Studies in the History of Medieval Science*. Cambridge.
- Hayyek, S. 1990. "Escuela de Traductores. Toledo despensa cultural de Occidente". *Islam español*. Madrid: 219-220.
- Henelde Abecasis, R. 1998. "Escuela de Traductores de Toledo. Pasado y presente". *Raíces, Revista judía de cultura*, 35.
- Lomba, J. 1997. *La llamada Escuela de Traductores de Toledo*. Madrid: Los Berrocales del Jarama.
- Mansilla, Demetrio. 1955. *La documentación Pontificia hasta Inocencio III (965-1216)*. Roma: Instituto Español de Estudios Eclesiásticos.
- Millás Villacrosa, J. M^a. 1942. *Las traducciones orientales*. Manuscritos Biblioteca Catedral de Toledo. Madrid.
- Rivera Recio, J. F. 1966. "Nuevos datos sobre los traductores Gundisalvo y Juan Hispano". *Al-Ándalus: Revista de las Escuelas de Estudios árabes de Madrid y Granada*, 31: 267-280.
- Summorum Pontificum, S. R.E. Cardinalum. *Ecclesiarum Antistutum*. Hierarchia Catholica Medii AEVI.