

**A Study on the Anti-Jewish Movement of
Christianity
in the Middle Ages**

- Focus on the Barcelona disputation in 1263 -

Kim Jaehyun
(Chongshin Theological Seminary, 3)

Contents

- I. Introduction
- II. Backgrounds of the Barcelona Disputation
 - II-1) The Anti-Jewish Movement up to the Twelfth Century
 - II-2) Causes of the Radical Anti-Jewish Movement in the Thirteenth Century
 - II-3) Background of the Barcelona Disputation
- III. Analysis on the Barcelona Disputation
- IV. Meanings and Results of the Barcelona Disputation
 - IV-1) Meanings of the Barcelona Disputation
 - IV-2) Results of the Barcelona Disputation
- V. Conclusion

I. Introduction

When the power of Christianity reached its highest in the thirteenth century, the Christian's moderate view of Jews that had lasted for many centuries changed fundamentally. The following factors made it possible to persecute Jews at a large scale and systematically: The establishment of Christian identity, the pursuit of Christian society, the fear of uncertainty which lied under Christian firm beliefs, the socio-economic changes and the effect of eschatology. The anti-Jewish feelings which became regular and came up to the surface with Pope Innocent III(1160-1216) was clearly disclosed at the edict 'Vineam Domini Sadaoth' which was published after the fourth Lateran Council(1215). The edict proclaimed the reform of Christian lives, suppression of pagans, new rules for clergies, and encouraged the crusades. Moreover, Jews was prohibited from reading and possessing the Talmud, and the related books of the Jewish tradition were burned right after the Paris disputation in 1240. In its modern meaning, anti-Jewish movement of Christianity¹⁾ was systematized, activated and set in motion in the thirteenth century, but it was nothing but a prelude to the ever-increasing anti-Jewish movement up to the fifteenth century.

The Barcelona disputation shows most objectively the situation and the

1) Langmuir defined Anti-Judaism as "a total or partial opposition to Judaism-and to Jews as adherents of it-by men who accept a competing system of beliefs and practices and consider certain genuine beliefs and practices as inferior."(Gavin Langmuir, "Anti-Judaism as the necessary preparation for anti-Semitism", in Viator Vol. 2(1971), p. 383). But it is pertinent to say that it is the thirteenth century when this kind of anti-Jewish has the dynamic motivation, irregardless of the idea and the definition of that conception.

issues of the thirteenth century's anti-Jewish movement.²⁾ This disputation happened for two weeks in twenty of July at Barcelona under the supervision of the king Aragon, James I. Christians and Jews argued mainly about the Messiahship and the divine quality of Jesus. While the Paris disputation criticized unilaterally the Talmud and Judaism, the Barcelona disputation tried to find sources inside the Talmud and the post-biblical literatures. It is meaningful for Christians to gain the legitimacy of their own claims form the original texts of Jews. The Barcelona disputation contains more objective and detailed discussions of Christianity and Judaism. And this disputation unfolds logics and subjects of the contemporary Christians and the structures of the Jews' responses. Particularly, participants' stance of both parties within their religions confirms the fact that this disputation had very important position in the history of anti-Jewish movement in the middle ages.

But the recent studies on the Barcelona disputation tend to regard this disputation as only one example of the radical anti-Jewish movement in the thirteenth century. They neglect systematic analysis on the stream of disputation itself and subjects discussed in this disputation. They did not show much concern about the structure of arguments themselves of both parties. The meaning that those main topics and the relevant arguments had inside Christianity and Judaism has not been dealt with profoundly. In fact, this difficulty comes from the fact that

2) In spite of the limited materials on Christianity-Judaism disputations, the writings about the Paris disputation in 1240, the Barcelona disputation in 1263, the Tolosa disputation in 1391 have remained until now. Judaism on Trial(Maccomby, Hyam, ed. & trans., Rutherford: Associated University Press,1982) described very well three disputations.

our materials still have the problem of authenticity. However, the objective analysis of the structure and the unbiased comprehension of its effects and meanings would make us understand not only the peculiarity of the Barcelona disputation itself but also claims and methodologies of those participants.

This article will contribute in three ways. Firstly, this study shows the best representing feature of crisis and jealousy between Christianity and Judaism that had been progressed since the birth of Christianity. Secondly, this study represents how Christians and Jews understood differently the quality and the divine nature of the Messiah. Besides, this will show the fundamental inconsistency between Christians' and Jews' claims. Lastly, I can suggest through this study that the exclusive Christians have to recognize themselves in more wider contexts, in dealing with dialogue and crisis among religions. This means that we need more developed and open-minded attitude of study in dealing with the dialogue among religions.

Considering these facts, I would like to analyze the structure, contents and characters of the Barcelona disputation itself. For this writing, I will use Judaism on Trial which was arranged and edited by H. Maccomby³⁾. Especially, for the structural analysis on the Barcelona disputation, I will take Vikuah (in Judaism on Trial) as a main text. In chapter 2, I will examine briefly the history of the western Christian view of Jews and their tradition up to the twelfth century. Pursuing the religious, political and cultural changes around the thirteenth century, I would like to investigate the

3) Maccomby translated and annotated the whole text Vikuah, and added the writing which was edited by Y. Baer. Maccomby, *Judaism on trial*, pp.99-146.

proper and main causes of the Barcelona disputation. Moreover, I will look into several direct backgrounds of Aragon and some participants. In chapter 3, I will analyze systematically and structurally the specific contents and stream of the Barcelona disputation. Attempting to do the structural analysis on this disputation, I want to pursue the change of discussed subjects and methodologies in this disputation. In addition, through the exegetic study on the proof texts, I want to reveal the difference of understanding on the same subjects which Christians and Jews shared with. Lastly, in chapter 4, I would like to point out several characteristics, effects and meanings that the Barcelona disputation had in the context of the thirteenth century.

II. Background of the Barcelona Disputation

To understand the anti-Jewish movement which reached its highest in the thirteenth century, I will investigate briefly the historical development of Christians' view toward Jews by the twelfth century. And then, I will investigate first the background of the ferocious anti-Jewish movement in the thirteenth century which became the fundamental cause of the Barcelona

4) The study to find the fundamental causes of the thirteenth century's anti-Jewish movement has been increasing. The main streams of recent study (1) Christians' attitude to avoid their theological responsibility which has been regarded as a major cause (Breoero, H., *Christendom and Christianity in the Middle Ages*, 1994), (2) Attitude to relate the fundamental anti-Semites' trend (Langmuir, *History, Religion, and Anti-Semitism*,

disputation, and I want to look into the major participants and the situation of Aragon ⁴⁾.

II-1) The anti-Jewish movement up to the twelfth Century

Christianity, originated with the coming of Jesus, shared Abraham, Moses and the precious tradition of the Old testament with Judaism. However, Christianity had conflict with Judaism from the beginning. Jesus' self-claim as the Son of Man and the pursuit of the early Christians' identity brought about endless conflict with the Jews, because the Jewish tradition backgrounded the birth of Christianity. Jesus was attacked by Jews and crucified at last. After Jesus' death, Christianity had been attacked incessantly by Jews. Thereafter, most evangelizations of the apostles around the Minor Asia, including Paul, became a conflict between Christianity and Judaism for a long time. It does not go far to claim that early Christianity had established its own identity through the struggle against the persecution of Jews and resistance of it rather than by the help of the civilizations of Rome and Greek ⁵⁾.

However, this situation changed rapidly after Jerusalem was destroyed and the emperor, Constantine the Great, authorized Christianity. Christianity, being supported by the Roman government, took the dominant position over Jews. Now, the question whether Christians oppressed Jews or not was raised. Then the patristic claims were established: Jesus accomplished the prophecies of the Old Testament on Messiah; Jesus' covenant of grace abolished the

1990), (3) Attitude to describe the socio-economic aspects more objectively (Bachrach, B. S., *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe*, 1977, pp.132-140). However, the systematic study to find the major reason is rare now.

5) Gavin Langmuir, "Anti-Judaism as the necessary preparation for anti-Semitism", p. 384.

covenant of Moses; and the conception of the church as God's chosen people replaced the conception of the temple. Notwithstanding this reversed situation in this period, however, Christianity regarded their suffering of early Christianity as the grace and the blessing of God, and did not persecute particularly Jews ⁶⁾.

St. Augustine formulated Christians' view of Judaism in early medieval ages, and his views continued to the late twelfth century ⁷⁾. When he witnessed that many Christians were still converting into Judaism and pagans were doubting the historicity of Christianity in understanding the Old-testament, however, Augustine felt the need to append to the views of the former Fathers. Basically, Augustine reconfirmed the claims of his former Fathers. Reconfirming the patristic views against Jews that Jesus fulfilled the Old Testament, Augustine claimed that the murderers of Jesus had no value to live inside Christian society and should be dispersed into the world for the cost of killing Jesus. And he asserted against pagans attacks that the New Testament and the Old Testament had the identical nature and Jews' ruins justified the teachings of the New Testament and provided more authority to the Bible. But characteristic of his explanation was that God left Jews to the final days to fulfill the historical prophecies and the truth of Christianity. He claimed that Jews would accept ultimately Christianity at the final days and could fulfill the prophecies of Christianity. Augustine asserted that this kind of dispersion and declination of Judaism

6) For the position of Judaism in Rome before Augustine, see James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue* (London, 1934), pp. 151-269.

7) Bernhardt Blumenkranz, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins*, Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1946.

would enhance the value of existence of Christianity, and could be a real model for the pagans. And Augustine' dual structure of persecution and protection of Judaism remained up to the twelfth century.

During the early Middle Age, from the emergence of Visigoths(418-507) to the Carolingian Age(-877), Christians attitude toward Jews was comparatively moderate. Furthermore, Jews received better treatment in comparison with Christians attitude toward the other pagans(including the Muslims). Hundreds of kings had ruled western Europe during this period in the various political contexts, but only twelve emperors established and pursued the anti-Judaic policy. Anti-Judaic policy had been pursued more strongly in the rule of early Visigoths age. Agde conference in 506 prevented Christians from participating in the Jewish festivals and dining with them. The king Sisebut prohibited strongly Jews from having slaves in 612. Sisebut ordered that all Jews who married to Christian should convert or be expelled abroad. In addition, the king ousted them from the key positions of his time⁸⁾. However, it is difficult to regard these several examples as typical policy for Jews⁹⁾ in early Christianity.

8) B. S. Bachrach, *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe*, Minneapolis, 1977, pp. 7-8.

9) In fact, Bachrach regarded that the Visigoths used this anti-Jewish movement to secure their feeble royal authority. But, this reason was neither the exemplar model and nor the prelude of the anti-Judaism. Anti-Jewish movement did not happen most ferociously in Spain, either. I think that Baron's expression that described the medieval Jewish position as "Lachrymose conception"(Solo W. Baron, "The Jewish Factor in Medieval Civilization", *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History*, New Brunswick, 1972, p.514) is too subjective opinion to apply here.

Even though the church requested consistently that the secular powers had to cooperate with the Christians policy, all of these policies were not enforced sufficiently. Kings of early middle ages took Gregory the Great(590-604)'s favorable attitude toward the Jews as an ideal type. Gregory treated with favor Jews. Even though he sometimes thought of the Jews as the disgusting people and emphasized the mission to Jews, Gregory protected basically Jews and secured their legal right and religious magnanimity in public. The following phrase shows his fundamental attitude about Jews: ".....their freedom should not be violated likewise no freedom may be granted to the Jews..... to exceed the limits legally established for them¹⁰⁾".

Anti-Judaism was enforced partly by the churches and kings in the early middle ages, but a moderate policy toward Jews prevailed generally. It was because that the Roman empire insured the nominal self-definition as a Christian nation, but it failed to verify the self-identification as a real Christian society¹¹⁾. This means that the kings of western Europe thought little of the matter of religion, to the contrary they thought much of survivals and maintenances of their territories. What was more, the substantial economic and cultural powers which Jews had were so great that the rulers could not ignore them. The contemporary kings recognized well that Jews, organized and civilized better than any other nation in Europe, could be of great help. The inextricable relation between their own religion and nation was authorized

10) Bachrach, op. cit., pp. 35-39.

11) Bachrach, op. cit., pp. 136-140.

12) King Alaric I respected the religion and the law through Breviary of Alaric in 506. The privilege of the religion and the law had kept continuously under the rule of Romana kings. Bachrach, op. cit., p.4.

and protected under the various rulers of the Roman empire¹²⁾ since king Alaric I.

The Christian view of Jews in the eleventh or the twelfth century, after the Norman invasion, seems to have taken a little different shape. Introduction of reason with Anselm (Anselmus Cantaberiensis, 1031-1109) was characteristic in this period¹³⁾. Besides, Odo, Joachim de Flora, and Peter the Venerable¹⁴⁾ developed the rational arguments to show the philosophical excellence or superiority of Christianity. Furthermore, they argued the perfection of the post-biblical Jewish literature¹⁵⁾.

But despite of these kinds of sophisticated anti-Judaic arguments and the crusades' massacre of the Jews in 1096, the churches attitude in general was to bestow leniency. Sicut Judaeis presented most clearly the Christian attitude towards Jews up to the twelfth century. It was published by Calixtus II in 1119¹⁶⁾ Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, New York, 1988, pp. 4-5, pp. 26-27 (Latin Text).

13) Jacques Le Goff, *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, Blackwell, 1993, pp.5-6.

14) David Berger, "Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Polemical Literature of the High Middle Ages", in *American Historical Review* 91(1986), pp. 576-591.

15) Amos Funkenstein claimed that two types of anti-Judaism appeared; (1) rational argument that deduced Christians' dogmas and showed the philosophical excellence of Christianity, (2) attack on the Talmud and post-Jewish biblical literatures and texts. "Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages", in *Viator*, pp. 373-82). We can think these two types in the same context.

16) Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, New York, 1988, pp. 4-5, pp. 26-27 (Latin Text).

II-2) Direct Causes and Backgrounds of the Barcelona disputation

The radical anti-Judaism in the thirteenth century was intimately related with the Christians' attempt that pursued the self-identity of Christianity and tried to institutionalize it. This pursuit of Christians reveals the hope to construct 'Societas Christina' through the universalism and the unity in medieval western society. The conception of church as a super-natural reality which ruled the European society began to appear after the reformation and the disputation over the clergy of Gregory VII. This connected with the Christian identity. Gregory VII attempted to reconstruct all the secular institutions as one organic structure under an ideal of 'Societas Christina'¹⁷⁾. Innocent III promoted very strongly this idea, too. Naturally, the idealism and the activity of Innocent III greatly influenced upon the European society and Christendom in the thirteenth century, and strengthened the systematic conception of Christian unity. And this unified viewpoint of 'one' effected strongly upon the contemporary spiritual and

17) G. Tellenbach, *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of investiture Contest*, New York, 1970, pp. 185-222.

18) The examples are as follows; transition from the humanism of Charlemagnu Renaissance in the twelfth century into the Catholic system of thought, what is called Scholasticism in the thirteenth century, appearance Francis of Assis who tried to identify the life with the religious piety, theology of Aquinas who attempted to reconcile the nature to the human, the flourish Gothic which requested cosmological unity. In addition, philosophers, theologians and judiciary endeavored to embody the mysterious body of Christ through which they tried expressed the Christian world. Jacques Le Goff, *op. cit.*, pp.65-118.

academic streams¹⁸⁾. The introduction of the fourth Lateran Council which began as '.....one universal church.....' shows definitely Christian universalism and the pursuit of the unity in this period. And it disclosed the conceptualizing process of 'romana ecclesia' which exercised their authority upon the church and the world. Moreover, Decretales(1234) of Gregory VI appeared as the first official manual to accomplish this kind of ruling.

Consequently, the pursuit of the Christian unity in the thirteenth century left no room for Christians' apostates. As the first step, Jews were excluded because they was regarded as a stumbling block in pursuing the Christian ideal. Over-pride of the church in the thirteenth century, at last, appeared as an obstinate exclusivity¹⁹⁾.

Secondly, uncertainty and instability which lied under the golden age of Christian powers was one of the important causes of anti-Judaism²⁰⁾. This uncertainty arose from Christians' recognition of nationalism and Europe empire. The conception of nationalism and Europe empire had gradually been dawning from conflict and tension between the church powers and the secular powers²¹⁾. The Christendom recognized consciously or unconsciously this

19) R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, Berkeley, 1989. pp. 13-14.

20) R.Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 25-37. I think that Chazan's suggestion is very appropriate. But he did not explain why this consciousness appeared within Christianity.

21) W.K. Ferguson, *Europe in Transition 1300-1520*, Boston, 1962, pp.206-212.

22) Chazan's argument that the recognition of uncertainty and the decline of the church and a counterplan against that came on a stage in the late thirteenth century is unadequate, I think. We can see the fundamental frame already in early thirteenth century.

uncertainty and instability within themselves in the pursuit of 'Societas Christina'²²⁾. To prepare against these crises, the church attempted to control the academic studies. By using the religious inquisitor and excommunication, Pope confronted to intervene excessively against new-arising thoughts and scholastic studies which included universities. And, he overemphasized to establish firmly the clerical system and to protect the traditional dogmas which excluded the revolutionary renewal. In these situations, Jews were expelled from most nations and became a scapegoat.

Thirdly, in econo-social terms, we can find one reason of anti-Judaism²³⁾. The third Lateran Council prohibited the money lending of Christians to gain the interest. This action classified Jews into the money lender in the early thirteenth century. As a consequence, Jews' high-rate interest policy which showed their economic ability during early middle ages increased the distrust between Judaism and Christianity. The riches of Jews and the formation of ghetto became a target of the public outrage of many Christians. Moreover, the crusades and radical social changes added such charges as the infant killing, decommunication, poisoning on the walls. This charges were the same as those in early Christianity.

Lastly, the prevalent emphasis on the termination of this world was a cause. An emergence of the new eschatology which was related with "continuous step-theory of the history of redemption" made the patriarchs' cycling theory of history live again. The idea of the Europe's termination, emphasized by Joachim of Flora(1135-1202), influenced seriously inside church. Emphasis on the termination, naturally, made the request that Christians should convert

23) A. H. Bredero, *Christendom and Christianity in the Middle Ages*, Michigan:Erdmans Publishing Co., 1994, pp. 274-276.

betrayers and pagans at final historical stages. This anticipation on Messiah was promoted strongly by the mendicant orders(esp. Dominican orders) who predominated the contemporary Christendom and became a driving force to convert Jews²⁴⁾.

II-3) Background of the Barcelona Disputation

In this situation, antagonism against Jews began to unfold in public as well as in private. Pope sent many inquisitors to eradicate the anti-Christian powers and enemies including Jews through disputations, preachings, and many oppressive methods. A roar of antagonism on Judaism blew toward Spain which enjoyed the golden age in more comfortable situation in comparison with other nations up to the twelfth century. Spain had been under the reign of Islam powers for a long time before Christians recaptured him, and Spain played a role as the frontier between Islams and Christians. Jews had played a role as a bumper in the whirlpool of the radical political changes, because of their economical talent and capability. And they had developed a splendid culture. The king James I(James the Conqueror), ruler of Aragon, showed tolerance toward Jews. After having conquered the Moorish cities in Balencia in 1238, James I let Jews defend the frontier. And he appointed them to the higher official positions and maintained the favorable attitude toward them. This attitude of the king James was shown clearly through all the Barcelona disputation²⁵⁾.

24) For further study, A. B. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, Ithaca, 1982.

25) Because of disharmony with the church, divorce from ex-wife and his personal ability, he was contrasted with Henry VIII of England.

But the ever increasing anti-Judaism of Christianity reached Spain. The king James convened Barcelona disputation by the order of James' confessor, Penaforte, and Pope Urban. The Barcelona disputation continued from 20 to 27 of July in 1263. That disputation was convened in 20(Friday), 23(Monday), 26(Thursday), 27(Friday) of July. And irregardless of an assertion of sucess on each part, the formal Barcelona disputation ended with the sermon that Christian representatives visited the Jewish synagogue to preach around Aragon.

Though in more moderate mood, Barcelona disputation was held in oppressive conditions. James I presented and many Christians manipulated that argument. Many participants attended from both sides; king James I, Raymund de Penaforte(1180-1275) and Pablo Christiani(Paul Christian) on Christian part, and Moses ben Nahmanides(1194-1270) on behalf of Jews.

Penaforte, who started and finished the disputation by taking the leadership, began to have relationship with this area as the inquisitor of Aragon since 1232. His eagerness of mission was so great as to resign his office of Master General in Dominican orders to evangelize Muslims and Jews. And he presided a special committee to investigate whether the Talmud had any impious thing or not, shortly after the Barcelona disputation finished. And he participated as an inquisitor to investigate the book that Nahmanides published in 1265.

Next, Pablo Christiani, the main contestant of the Christian part, was a disciple of rabbi Eliesel of Tarascon(). Pablo attended this disputation by leading the argument. After the disputation, he visited around Aragon to have Jews convert compulsorily. He made forcefully Jews put the badges on

26) R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 70-71.

themselves in 1269 by persuading Louis IX²⁶.

Moses ben Nahmanides, the powerful contestant on the Jewish part, was rabbi and physician²⁷. He participated as a mediator for the argument which was dealing with the philosophical works of Maimonides in 1232, and he consulted his important matters with the king James I. He had already taken a leading position among the Jewish society. After attending the Barcelona disputation, Nahmonides published *Vikuah* in 1265, and was charged with blasphemy by the Dominican orders.

We have not only *Vikuah* which was written by the order of the bishop in Gerona in 1265, but also the explanation of Christians which was composed by the Dominicans and ratified by the king James I. *Vikuah* is made up of the introduction and the main text, but there are different opinions about the authenticity of the introduction text itself²⁸. Introduction itself doesn't effect greatly upon my intended study, however, I will not treat the relationship between authenticity of the introductory text and the main body. Though there are still delicate difference between the present Latin and the Hebrew version, there is little difficulty in understanding the consistent points and subjects of

27) Isadore Twersky, *Rabbi Moses Nahmanides (Ramban): Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1983.

28) Chazan counted for much the Latin version and acknowledged the introduction (Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, p. 75). However, Maccomby excluded the introduction from the whole argument, presenting five reasons (Maccomby, *Judaism on Trial*, pp. 98-99).

29) For most outstanding contrast, we can note that Chazan contrasted the anonymous Latin version with the Hebrew version which Maccomby used. Furthermore, Chazan emphasized the role of Dominicans and Paul's initiative. R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 71-72.

disputation²⁹.

Christians' explanation about the Barcelona disputation was made by the Dominicans. The text translated by Y. Baer in 1930-31 is accepted as the typical explanation of Christianity. The Christian explanation asserted that they won the complete victory, nevertheless they described very briefly the central points of argument. Except the matter of order that the name of the master and the question of trinity are dealt with at the first part of the text, it is hard to find the deviated or different points in understanding the central matters of the Barcelona disputation³⁰.

III. Analysis on Barcelona Disputation

I want to look into the contents and the drift of argument of the Barcelona disputation which was convened four times from 20 to 27 of July in 1263 at Aragon.

III-1) The First Day Argument

Disputation of the first day started with the King's order that Nahmanides should attend at the disputation and Nahmanides' request for some more

30) The order of Christian explanation is as follows; introduction-agreement on the subjects which are to be dealt-name of Master and the question of Trinity-the coming of Messiah(scepter-ruler-possibility of Messiah's death)-question on the former authorized text(including Hallaka)-confidence on victory. There is little difference of subjects and references, even though there is a little difference of emphasis and tone. Maccomby, *Judaism on Trial*, 147-150.

freedom of answer and discussion. Immediately, both parties agreed to the three matters to argue³¹ : (1) Whether did Messiah come already or not, (2) Is the Messiah the divine or the human, (3) Do Judaism still possess the true law³². From Christian perspective, it seems that the second argument confirmed the first argument and nullified the Jewish dogma which objected Christian dogma.

After selecting the basic items to discuss, main disputation started with Paul's saying that he can prove that the conception of Messiah originated from the Talmud. Then, Nahmanides claimed that Jesus was neither Messiah nor God, and Jesus was not born in the period of the second temple. Raising the question why they did not convert if the former Jews accepted above-mentioned fact, Nahmanides asserted that there is no denying the Talmud for those who acknowledged it deeply. Then, after refuting that Nahmanides'

31) According to the Christians' explanation edited by Y. Baer, four subjects to argue were presented; (1) the coming of the Messiah, (2) whether the Messiah is the divine or the human, (3) Whether Jesus suffered and died for the sin of the humankind, (4) if the legal and ritual matters should be ceased after the coming of the Messiah. I think the numbers and kinds of questions make little difference, because the coming of the Messiah and the divine quality of the Messiah comprehend the rest of questions. For the kinds and numbers like this, Chazan does not raise any question, even though he preferred the Latin text. R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 83-84.

32) The word which is translated into 'the law' means originally the Torah. The Torah can be translated into 'law' or 'religion'. Baer asserted that Christians used differently this word from that of Judaism. But Maccomby claimed that there is no difference in using that word. Maccomby, *Judaism on Trial*, pp. 103, 147.

argument made the disputation go deviating, Paul finished the introductory argument.

This introductory argument represented Paul's attitude which tried to lead all the arguments by following the proof texts, and Nahmanides' attitude that denied basically the coming of the Messiah and rejected to provide the divine to Jesus. At the same time, this introductory argument showed implicatively the points and the subjects of the first day argument as well as of the whole disputation. And as we can see in Nahmanides' response, the first day's argument is composed of the question if the Messiah came already and the question if the Messiah is God. Paul's and king's questions which had little relation with the general subjects, were inserted between them. The following

A.	B. Introductory question. answer	C. Question	C'. Answer (Nahmanides)	
making subjects of discussion	Paul: he can suggest the sources from Talmud	1. Paul: whether the sceptre exists	1'. Possibility the interruption	
		2. Paul: whether the ruler exists	2'. Ordination	
		3. Peire: interruption is too long	3'. Interruption is not long	
	Question of the Temple Destruction			
	N: Neither Messiah nor the divine.		D. Question	D'. Answer (Nahmanides)
			1. Guillaume: Isa.52.13= Suffering of Messiah	1'. born but did not come yet
		2. Paul: Isa.52.13 suggest the supplementary proofs	2'. Stress on literal interpretation	
Jesus in Rome, Question of Jesus' age				

diagram of the first day argument represents most implicatively the Barcelona disputation.

After the introductory argument, the disputation that whether Messiah came already or not was begun (diagram C & C'). As a means to deal with the coming of Messiah, they argued the meaning of 'sceptre' in Gen. 49.10, and then the period of interruption of the sovereignty of king. Firstly, presenting "the sceptre shall not depart from Judah...." (Gen. 49.10) as a proof, Paul claimed that Judah did not have the sceptre yet in spite of their belief on the bible that the sceptre shall not depart from Judah until Shiloh comes. Against this attack, following the traditional and predictable rabbis' tradition, Nahmanides replied that the interruption of Paul's question did not mean that the Judah' ruling had no interruption, but the kingdom would not disappear at all from the Judah. For example, the division of the kingdom after Solomon and the Babylonian exile actually did not mean that the Judah's ruling was disappeared but his kingdom had stopped temporarily.

Immediately after this response, Paul claimed that even though they had rulers while they had no kings, they had no the Ordination either. Nahmanides refuted against this that the actual Kingship continued through the Judah, and that the Ordination in the Babylonian exile only means the limited right to provide the king's descendant with the permission to rule the conquered area and to grant licence and the Ordination. Nahmanides denied that it meant the kingship. That is, there was an actual interruption of the rulers. Nahmanides confronted this question in far narrower structure of laws³³.

33) R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 90-91.

34) A. B. Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews*, Ithaca, 1982, p. 186. He belonged to the Franciscans. But he could not an important role in this disputation.

Peire de Genova³⁴ raised one question which was related to Gen. 49.10. Going further from the perspective of Paul, Peire admitted the interruption of the sceptre, but questioned that the period after Jesus was too long in comparison with the Babylonian exile, which lasted no more 70 years. Nahmanides refuted against this that the interruption of the Babylonian exile started after the death of Solomon, it is hard to say that the Judah's sovereignty was passed away to others in the situation that Israelites themselves had not self-sovereignty, and that the Judah's sceptre still belonged to them. Peire questioned that the interruption was too long to assert that Messiah had come already, even though he admitted the interruption of the Judah itself.

Paul, secondly, refuted that Nahmanides objected the earlier interpretations of Jews (especially Aggadah). But Nahmanides said, even though he did not believe the Aggadah that was interpreted like that, and even if he accepted such kind of interpretation, he could refute enough Paul's argument. However it is not so clear in what points Nahmanides attacked Paul's argument. But considering Nahmanides' explanation, we can deduce that he thought the birth of Messiah and the destruction of the Temple happened at the same time. Against this explanation, Nahmanides disproved that the destruction of the Temple happened 200 years ago before Jesus came³⁵. This argument does not fit well with his whole disputation. Nahmanides was changing the point of argument from the coming of Messiah into the question whether Jesus came

35) We can raise the question who is Jesus discussed here is definitely. It seemed that Nahmanides thought a different Jesus from Jesus of Christians. Nahmanides understood Jesus as a student of Rabbi Joshua ben Perahia who lived around BC 100. This opinion is different from Rabbi Yehiel in the Paris disputation.

as Messiah or not. Following Nahmanides' explanation, we can deduce that Jesus was not born at the time when Christians believed, even when they admitted Jesus who Christians claimed as the Messiah. From this, we can know that Nahmanides thought another Jesus, who is not the person whom Christians believed till then.

Thirdly, Maestro Guillaume, the King's judiciary, appeared and reminded Nahmanides of the original points of argument that they were discussing whether the Messiah came or not rather than Jesus himself. And presenting the proof texts, he pointed several difference from Nahmanides' saying. Nahmanides claimed against this that the birth of Jesus and the official anointment were not the same matters, which we could see in cases of Moses, Jesus, and David. He claimed if Messiah could have been born, but he had not come. Nahmanides' explanation seemed that he withdrew from his consistent argument. But this superficial change of attitude never changed his basic position that tried to reject the Christian explanation. In fact, we can regard Nahmanides' explanation as the viewpoint of the Messiah in Judaism.

Furthermore, connecting the phrase "Behold, my servant will prosper...."(Isa.52.13) with the suffering of Messiah, Guillaume asked if this phrase was about Messiah. Chapter 52 of Isaiah is a proof text which is intimately related with the image of the suffering Christ in the Christian theology³⁶. Therefore, the question which was connected with chapter 52 of Isaiah was related with the conception of Messiah as the suffered in Christianity, and the Passion of Christ meant the original sin which originated from Adams. And it contains the theological implication that the Passion of

36) Isa. 52 in Talmud is applicable to Isa. 53 in the Bible of Christianity.

Christ as the divine redeems the sin of mankind. Considering all of these, we can say that Nahmanides asked if Messiah was the divine. Of course, refuting that this meant the suffering of all Israelites and themselves rather than a particular Messiah, Nahmanides rejected the idea of Messiah. This rejected simply not only the suffering of the Messiah, but also the consciousness of the original sin and the need of the Saviour. On more step, even though the Messiah could come as Christian claim, he asserted that the Messiah who accomplished the righteousness and established the nation did not come yet when we saw the effect. This interpretation revealed the fundamental difference between Christian conception of the Messiah and the Jewish one.

With this Guillaume's question, Paul insisted that he could find the proof that connected Isa. 52.13 with the Messiah at the Jewish Sages. Of course, using the standard phrases of the Bible which Jews could accept, Paul claimed that the present Jewish understanding of the Bible was the result of the false interpretation after the post-biblical literature of Jews³⁷. Nahmanides refuted against this claim that there was no direct reference on that, while he admitted the possibility that the Jewish Sages sometimes could interpret metaphorically this phrase to indicate Messiah.³⁸

As we saw in the question of the coming of the Messiah and the destruction of the Temple, we could find the improper question in the first day. He asked whether the Messiah came in Rome or not, by using an example of Joshua ben

37) Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 71.

38) In fact, this overemphasis on the literal interpretation is in contrast with an allegorical interpretation on the fourth argument. While Christians doubted this change of emphasis, Nahmanides did not place any restriction on the liberal interpretation of the Aggadah.

Levi. Naturally, Nahmanides refused shortly this question. But in replying to this question, Nahmanides could not provide an accurate explanation. The first day argument ended with the King's question if Messiah who could possibly be born can live so long.

I investigated the main stream and several related questions of the first day. We can see very clearly the difference between Paul's and Nahmanides' pursuits. Paul emphasized consistently the quality of the Messiah in Jesus, and he accentuated that Jesus was the Messiah irregardless of authenticity of Jesus himself. In fact, the dogma of the Messiah is the common ground of argument which Judaism and Christianity shared with. Confirmation on the coming of the Messiah meant that confirmation of Jesus as the Messiah fulfilled the prophecy, and this can demolish the crux of Judaism. On these hypothesis, Paul tried to prove the following things: The Messiah came already, The Messiah is the divine and the human, died and suffered, and that these facts coincided with the various prophecies³⁹⁾. Paul's basic strategy to accomplish this object was to find the supporting phrases within the rabbinic literatures. This method had not been used yet, however, this new methodology was introduced experimently to Barcelona Disputation. Through this method, Paul used the standard phrases of the Bible which Jews could accept, And then, he introduced various interpretation of many rabbies, concretized the Christian attitude, and criticized the traditional methods of the Judaism. So, he emphasized the rabbinic interpretation on the important phrases of the Midrash and the Aggadah which were no immediate connection. Naturally, Nahmanides knew and objected this strategy. Nahmanides had two aims: To

39) Sometimes, there is argument whether Paul avoided the mention of Jesus itself or not.

provide the justifiable disproof against Christians(to find out the fundamental defect of new Christian strategy), and to present the acceptable alternative for Jews. Because of his embarrassing circumstance, sometimes he could not present clearly his own account. Nevertheless, Nahmanides emphasized that the Messiah had not come yet, and that the Messiah could not possess continuously the divine nature. And these two disproofs showed the points of the whole disputation.

For the superficial characteristic in the first day, the amount of Nahmanides' saying takes 2.6 times as much as that of Paul's, which trend is common in other days⁴⁰⁾. So, the essential intention of Paul's question was not represented well enough. Secondly, this disputation takes Christian-leading structure. Christians' dominant position prevailed in the first day. This situation changed greatly in the second day, Jews' interest took a lead in the third and fourth days. Next, Nahmanides' personal attitude to Paul which appears throughout the whole disputation is notable. Nahmanides held in contempt on Paul's every remark, background knowledge, information on the Talmudic texts. Nahmanides occasionally described that Paul did not

40) The quantity rates of the text Vikuah are as follows. Of course, the rates is grounded upon the writing of Maccomby

	Christians(Paul, etc) : Nahmanides, etc,
1st day	1 : 2.6,
2nd day	1 : 4.6,
3rd day	1 : 3.7,
4th day	1 : 5.17.

41) Maccomby, Judaism on Trial, in p.105 "he cannot say anything about any reality...", in p.106 he described Paul who argued with the name of Maestro. In p.110, Paul was described as disproving the argument which was never stand to reason. In p.

comprehend quite enough the question they were discussing, present awkward answers, and finally he kept Paul silencing⁴¹⁾

III-2) The Second Day Argument

The second day's disputation was held at the cloister on next Monday. Gentiles and Jews, bishop and the important priests gathered. Actually, the second day disputation was the core of the Barcelona disputation. For the positions and the difference between the main dogmas of both sides were revealed most well in this day. This argument started with Nahmanides' explanation. This kind of Nahmanides' explanation summed up the points of the first day argument, and he reexplained several questions that he did not account for. And Nahmanides' leading position of argument could be the most remarkable characteristic of the second day disputation. Irregardless of the

A. Introductory Sum up	Nahmanides' Explanation	Paul's Claims at the First Day
	1'. Difference of Bible, Talmud, Midrash.	1. Ground of Aggadah
	2'. It is possible to live over 1000 if he is Messiah	2. Jesus' age
	3'. is in Eden	3. Abode of Jesus
B. Redemptive meaning of extinction of the Original Sin	Nahmanides' Question and Answer	Paul's Q. & A.
	1(Q). If Adam's sin destroy Messiah?	1'. Agree
	2.(E.) Groundless & meaningless	
	3'. Avoiding definite answer	3. If one believes Messiah
C. Nature of Messiah and the Time to come	Paul's Question	Nahmanides' Answer
	1. Messiah is the Divine (Isa.52.13)	1'. Difference of interpretation
	2. Dan.9.24-25, Messiah was prophesied	2'. Time & interpretation of Messiah is different

111, Nahmanides made Paul keep completely silent. We can find the most contemptuous remark in p. 135. But it is not difficult to find these kinds of the insulting expressions throughout the whole *Vikuah*.

explanations of James I and Paul, Nahmanides took a lead throughout the whole disputation. I diagramed this disputation as follows.

Firstly, mentioning Paul's argument that several phrases of the Aggadah supported the claim, the Messiah had come already, Nahmanides referred three kinds of the Jewish books. Nahmanides explained that it was hard to accept the Midrash (book of sermons) as an established theory, even though they admitted the Bible and the Talmud without any argumentation. So, he argued that it was impossible to receive parts of the Midrash or the Aggadah as an universal and official opinions.

On the basis of this ground, Nahmanides tried to prevent in advance and moreover nullify Paul's any trial and attack. Nahmanides had a well-organized system of explanation against Paul's. Secondly, answering James' question whether the Messiah could live over 1000 years, Nahmanides said that the Messiah, in whom the effect of Adam's sin could be removed, could live an eternal life. This explanation implied that Christian claims could be false, considering that Christians' Messiah had not come as the form that the Old Testament prophesied over 1000 years. Nahmanides attacked Christians with the tool and method of Christians' themselves. For the third question that the King asked "where the Messiah is now", Nahmanides claimed that "the Messiah who has no Adam's sin is in Eden now"⁴²⁾.

For this above mentioned response, James asked back to Nahmanides if he told that the Messiah stayed in Rome. Even though having explained that the

42) We can know immediately through Nahmanides' argument that the fact that the Messiah stays in Eden is not to recognize the divine of the Messiah, but the human of the Messiah. Maccomby, *Judaism on Trial*, pp. 118-119.

43) The argument on authenticity of the phrase "where Jesus is"

Messiah stayed temporarily in Rome until he destroyed the Rome, however, he continued to answer a little equivocally⁴³⁾.

Here, in fact, Nahmanides took a lead the points of argument, and this trend became more noticeable in the following question as we could see in diagram B & B'. Nextly, Nahmanides raised the question, "could Adam's sin be destroyed in the time of the Messiah?" Nahmanides fulfilled his consistent wish to ask before Paul. Of course, the King and Paul agreed to his explanation. Nothing seemed to have been redeemed and the suffering remained even when most Christians believed that the Messiah had come. Furthermore, he had no relationship with the sin of Adams more than he had with Paraho. Adam was punished physically. And it is natural for us, physical descendants of Adam, to die in punishment for penalty.

Nahmanides rejected the dogma of original sin in Christianity. This answer was very shocking for Christians who had connected the original sin of Adam with the pardon of the sin. Furthermore, his answer diluted the Passion and the Resurrection of the Messiah, and could be expanded to deteriorate the ground of Christianity. Considering these, it seems that Nahmanides defeated almost Paul through the rejection of fundamental matters of Christianity.

Thinking he was leading the disputation, Nahmanides explained that Jews did not regard the matter of the Messiah as fundamental. In addition, excessive attachment on Christian dogma made the matter of dogma more fundamental matter than any other problem for both parties, and made it tedious for Jews.

still being discussed up to the present. It is hard to accept the claim that Nahmanides explained ambiguously, intentionally thinking the Jews. Maccomby, *Judaism on Trial*, p. 117.

Paul, again, raised the basic question whether Nahmanides believed that Messiah came or not. Objecting definitely, of course, Nahmanides asked back to him what was changed if the Messiah had come. Jesus could not save himself, and even the Rome who proclaimed Christianity as the main religion had suffered seriously from lots of pagans. Therefore, Nahmanides asserted, there was little trace that the Messiah came.

As the irritating response continued, Paul yelled that "Nahmanides always twisted matters". Then the King mediated between them, and made Nahmanides answer the question. Then Paul asked the second question, "is Messiah the divine?" on the basis of Isa. 52.13: "My servant shall be exalted and lifted up and shall be very high"(Yalkut Isaiah, 476). Nahmanides explained that the one who was better than these angels meant the righteousness, not the Messiah. Moreover the true Messiah would come to the present Pope and the kings with the great power and with the name of Christ. And he would claim to "send away my people". Against this assertion, Paul tried to find the mentions of Messiah that exonerated and suffered himself, and he wanted to prove that the suffering of the Messiah meant the death sentence of Jesus, and Jesus accepted it with his own will. Confronting with this argument, Nahmanides explained differently the meaning of the suffering from that of Christianity in that the suffering of Jesus was the suffering for the acts that God's people did not follow God, and wandered, passioned. Nextly, referring 70 weeks of Daniel(Dan. 9.24-25), Paul asserted that "the most holy" and "the anointed one...." meant Jesus. In contrast, Nahmanides explained that the One who was going to come after 7 weeks was Zerubbabel, and the anointed one is, Paul again asked how he could be Messiah, Nahmanides explained the conception of the Messiah which had been used popularly from Abraham. On basing upon the Dan. 12.11,

Nahmanides claimed that there remained 95 years before the arrival of the Messiah(from that year). And one more question about the 45 years' vacuum between the coming and the emergence of Messiah was raised. As the question proceeded from the coming of Messiah to the Daniel and interpretation of "yom", Arnol of Segura suggested to interpret "days" by depending upon that of Jerome⁴⁴.

Up to now, I investigated the main stream and important matters of the second day disputation. Representing his own points of argument, and claiming the possibility of the different interpretations on the Midrash and the Aggadah throughout the whole disputation, Nahmanides refuted Paul's argument. Comprehending the general issues in the first day, Nahmanides tried to expose that the Messiah is not the divine in the second day. Moreover, he repudiated Paul's arguments which were based on Isa. 52 and Dan. 9 by rejecting the fundamental divine quality of the Messiah. In the second day disputation, Nahmanides developed more systematically his argument that Messiah is not the divine.

III-3) The Third Day Argument

The third disputation happened at royal court on Tuesday. Disproving Nahmanides' claim that the Messiah cannot die, Paul requested that Nahmanides see the Judges. Admitting that several Aggadah meant the death of Messiah for this attack, Nahmanides explained that the Messiah would come at the last moment of time, die in glory, and bequeath his throne to his

44) The discussion about 'days' of Daniel between Christianity and Judaism started around the ninth century. That argument is so difficulty as to the present Protestants have many various opinions. B. Blumenkranz, p. 166.

descendants. And there is little difference between this world and the day of Messiah except the solution of Israelites' fettering.

Angered at this, Arnol questioned if "he"(Mainonides) lied. Nahmanides defined the essential ministry of the Messiah as "to gather the dispersed of Israel, building the Temple, and ruling", and asked if Jesus of Christianity

	A. Paul' Question	A'. Nahmanides' Answer
Concerning the death of Messiah	1. Whether Messiah die?	1'. Admit partly/ But, The End comes
	2. Whether Messiah die?	2'. Stress on the Role of Messiah

satisfied these conditions. And Nahmanides concluded that the enemies in 30.1-7 of Deuteronomy were Christians, and "them that hate thee" are Muslims. Naturally, this expression raised the extraordinary rage of Christians. The diagram of the third day's disputation is as follows.

This third disputation was concerned with the death of the Messiah. This disputation dealt with very deeply the meaning of the Messiah's death. The death of the Messiah is the essential dogma of Christians, because it contains the redemptive meaning. It meant to redeem the sin of Adam, that is, the original sin. Moreover it became the epistemological foundation for the divine incarnation. Therefore Paul emphasized the death of the Messiah, and claimed that the Messiah is the divine and such the Messiah was incarnated as Jesus. Not having been dragged in this intention, Nahmanides excluded several interpretations of the Aggadah that stressed the death of the Messiah, and he changed the point of argument into the ministry and the nature of the Messiah. And emphasizing the Messiah as the granter who would fulfill the nation and

the eschatology, he retort back against the claims of Christians. Nahmanides refuted Christian argument by lack of the actual proof, and he insisted that the Messiah had not come yet.

The amount of Nahmanides' argument predominated by 3.7 times as much as that of Paul's in the third day's disputation. Nahmanides' mention that Christians were the real enemies of Jews stimulated Christians so that it influenced the fourth day disputation.

III-4) The Fourth Day Argument

The fourth disputation happened at the palace on Friday. As we saw that the

	Paul's Question	Nahmanides' Answer
Topic of Argument	1. Whether Messiah is the Divine or the Human?	1'. If the Coming of Messiah is solved?/ He is human
Proof Text	1. Psalm, "My Lord said to my lord"	1'. Difference in Understanding. Messiah is not the Divine, and did not come
	2. Lev. 26. 12(Incarnation)	2'. Stress on Allegorical Interpretation.
	3. Gen. 1.2(God the Messiah)	3'. Stress on Allegorical Interpretation.

third disputation was concluded by the ferocious mention of Nahmanides, it seemed to natural that Nahmanides was pressured a lot. After discussion and the proclamation to stop the argument, they could start the disputation with difficulty. We can diagram it as follows.

Firstly, the King asked if the Messiah is the human or the divine. Nahmanides claimed that it was improper to start to discuss the second question without solving the first one. However, by the order of the King, Nahmanides had no choice but to reply. Nahmanides replied that the Messiah would come as a complete human, a son of man. Even if the Messiah came as a spiritual being, it contradicted Gen. 49.10 which both parties took it as a starting point of their beliefs. And "the Lord said to my lord....." was the phrase that David made for Levites to sing easily without any confusion, and such phrase meant "the Lord(God) said to my lord(David).....", Nahmanides said. Nahmanides left room saying that my lord might mean the coming Messiah, even though it meant fundamentally David. By referring Yalkut Tehillim, 869, Nahmanides presented Abraham as an example, who felt being insulted to see the Messiah sitting by the left of God and emphasized the Messiah was the man. Moreover, following the same text, the Messiah was supposed to come "at the times to come". And considering that this writing was written 500 years after the death of Jesus, Nahmanides asserted that Jesus could not be the Messiah. Nahmanides denied both that the Messiah is the divine and that Jesus is the Messiah.

By mentioning Lev. 26.12 "And I will walk among you..." (Yalqut Behuqotai, 672), Paul raised again the question whether the Messiah was the incarnated God by himself or not. But Nahmanides argued that we should understand proverbially this phrase, the idea was the image of the future, and that this was not happened at Jesus' age. What the Sages intended was to make the people meet God with ease without trembling as Moses did before God. Not moving backward, Paul argued about God who floated on the surface of water(in fact, the spirit of the Messiah) on the basis of Genesis 1.2. In contrast to this explanation, Nahmanides insisted, such a literal

interpretation ignored the metaphorical understanding. And then, the King stood and four disputations had finished.

The fourth disputation primarily aimed at the question whether the Messiah is the divine or the human. Usually, Paul presented the proof text and Nahmanides disproved it. Paul presented the phrases that most Christians used as the proof text for the coming of the Messiah, but Nahmanides rejected all of them. Nahmanides disproved Paul's questions most clearly in the fourth day. The amount of Nahmanides' explanation in the fourth day took comparatively the larger portion.

The meeting of both parties concerning the Barcelona disputation ended with Christian visit at the Jewish synagogue eight days after the fourth disputation finished. Nahmanides talked first at synagogue. The situation in dealing the Messiahship of Jesus had not changed a lot from then on. Even when they saw and heard him, the former predecessors did not believe. Nahmanides said, there is no believing the Messiahship of Jesus.

Next, Penaforte discussed the Trinity composed of wisdom, will, and power⁴⁵. We have only Penaforte's questions and the immediate answers of Nahmanides. And Penaforte claimed that Nahmanides had agreed to the conception of Trinity through the dialogue between Paul and Nahmanides, but Nahmanides refuted that he only asked then what was the Trinity. He claimed that it was hard to see the Trinity, for wisdom, will, and power are all one. When tried to explain the Trinity through the analysis on

45) It has been unknown why this argument had brought about abruptly. Even though Nacomby regarded this text as proper, this text does not connect smoothly in the whole texts. Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial*, p. 64.

colour, taste and smell, James told that such an explanation would request four or five properties. On this context, Paul believed himself in the Trinity, but it was too hard for the angels to understand. Then Nahmanides concluded by mentioning it is obvious that a person cannot believe what he does not know".

The Barcelona disputation ended with the reminiscence of the King James and Nahmanides. The King called in and consoled Nahmanides. The king gave 300 denarions and told him to go back to his homeland. Nahmanides came out of the palace with thanks for him. Whenever they met each other throughout the whole disputation, Nahmanides had treated the king with the great courtesy. At last, this reminiscence finished as the thankful remarks.

IV. Meanings And Results of Barcelona Disputation

I would like to point out several characters, meanings and effects of the Barcelona disputation.

IV-1) Meanings of the Barcelona disputation

The Barcelona disputation provide the best material for the study of anti-Jewish movement of Christianity in the thirteenth century⁴⁶. Especially, comparatively objective situation of the disputation itself exposed very clearly the importance of that disputation. The King James of Aragon was not a reckless follower of Pope, and he recognized well not only the particular political, religious and social contexts of Spain, but also the important stance of Jews. Though being compelled by his confessor Penaforte and Pope, he

46) Maccoby, *Judaism on Trial*, pp. 39-40.

convened the disputation and attended himself there to convert Jews into Christian. But he did not take any partial and biased stance. His situation makes us see more objectively the disputation. Nahmanides' stance in the Jewish tradition made his explanation more important, too. Nahmanides was recognized as the best known Jewish teacher in the thirteenth centuries when Jews enjoyed the medieval Jewish renaissance in Spain, in the whirlpool of Islam and Christianity. Though aggressive mood against Jews ruled in this period, this disputation described well Jews' position in the thirteenth century. Furthermore when Christianity arose to the most flourishing times, Christians can not help recognizing the growing self-government and autonomy of the secular powers. This situation made us understand and analyze the Barcelona disputation more unbiasedly than the Paris disputation. Irregardless of the immediate victory and failure of the Barcelona disputation participants, considering these contexts, the objective analysis makes us study crisis and dialogue between Christianity and Judaism.

Secondly, the new-arising methodology was introduced to this disputation, and then became to be prevailed. Instead of following the traditional ways of explanation of Augustine and excluding the Talmud, Christians tried to justify Christianity not only by using the reason but also by referring the proof texts of the Jewish traditions. Though this new methodology was neither accomplished fully yet, nor did they use the Jewish texts to retrospect Christians' own belief systems, this method was quite different from that of the Paris disputation 20 years ago. Contents of Paris Argument in 1240 were made up of the direct attack against the Talmud in the aggressive circumstance. The Barcelona disputation tried to justify the Christian claims by using the post-Jewish biblical literature rather than to attack only the Talmud. Especially, in justifying the Sillo text, the coming of

the Messiah in Daniel, the conception of the suffering servant, Christians adapted broadly conceptions of the Talmud and the Midrash. And we can regard those adoptions as meaningful changes. The need of this adoptions originated from Penaforte. He felt the need to teach the pagan instructions for the Christian mission. Penaforte tried to use this method through the Paris disputation of Donin. And then this newly-arisen methodology was developed fully at the Barcelona disputation. Even though this methodology was not shaped as a formal argumentation, it was to be flourished through Fugio Dei of Martini about 20 years thereafter.

Thirdly, this disputation represent main concerns, the theological foundations, and the framework of Jews' and Christians' recognizances through the major theologians. By developing objective argument for some subjects and exposing their theological attitude, they influenced the later arguments and works. Theologians of both parties were approved by the representative institutions of their religions. And they were in the moderate circumstance and political situation. In this situation, both parties explained in detail, their basic attitudes on the primary questions. At first, they agreed with three questions: the coming of the Messiah, the possibility of the divine nature of the Messiah, and the question of the obedience of law. In general, Christians tried to accentuate the fact that the Messiah had come. Emphasizing the major matters—the meaning of the redemptive death of Jesus who had come already, the generation and transmission of the original sin through Adams, proof texts in the Old Testament—, he tried to show that this meant the divine incarnation of the Messiah. Finally, Christians stressed the coming of the Messiah which included those above-mentioned meanings and natures. This claims are the cruxes and fundamental dogmas of Christian theology. Elaboration of the basic Christian doctrines was not made completely by the

fathers of early Christianity. St. Augustine and protestant reformers, even though in the suppressive meaning, completed its meaning in the thirteenth century through conflict with Judaism. These crises and the process of differentiation made Christians deepen and internalize following factors: the view of the Messiah, the incarnation and the meaning of salvation which are different from that of Judaism.

For those important questions of Penaforte, Nahmanides should made the unique and standard answers of Judaism. Nahmanides should answer for Christians and Jews simultaneously. Rejecting the fundamental implication of Christian theology, he stressed that the conception of the Messiah was not so crucial in Judaism. Furthermore, he rejected all the central frameworks of Christian theology. And he suggested the conception of the Messiah validated and rewarded the accomplishment of the human acts on the basis of "the perfection of eschatology and law". However, in rejecting the coming of the Messiah, Nahmanides emphasized continually the fact that the Messiah was not basically the divine. The Judaism did not question traditionally even if anyone claimed oneself as a messiah. The question whether someone was God or not was more important. The question whether he comes as a Messiah or not was not important. Therefore, Nahmanides stressed that Jesus was not the divine. In proving these, Nahmanides stressed constantly the possibility of the different interpretation on the Midrash. And he showed the following matters: the Jewish cognizant framework of the post-Jewish biblical literature, the basic difference between Christianity that stressed the theological doctrine and Judaism that emphasized the observance of law, the nature of Messiah's ministry, and their different understandings on these meanings. But it should be pointed out that he did not discussed enough the law which seemed to have played an important role. The problem of observing the law was absorbed into

the whole disputation as a main argument, but it was not treated as an independence issue.

Fourth character was related with the second character. It seems that the methodology of Nahmanides was unique method. Nahmanides developed a series of disproofs: the denial of the proof text that Paul cited, objection to the christological understanding which was founded upon the proof text⁴⁷⁾, rejection of Paul's analogy and meanings of the several texts of the Aggadah. When he presented his argument, he discussed it by taking a roundabout way rather than the direct answer. It is not certain whether it was because of then contexts or because of his original attitude which devoted himself to the floating and poetic suggestions and answers, even while he preserved the mystic and theophanic tradition of the Kabbala⁴⁸⁾. Moreover it is not appeared clearly if he thought such kind of evading method was most useful way. The fact that he avoided giving direct answer makes us feel that his answer was insincere.

Moreover, this claims were grounded on the contemptuous attitudes and phrases against Paul. Changing continuously the Christian questions at his own will, Nahmanides attempted to nullify the issues which were raised by his opponents. He disproved Christian questions, by coming and going between the question of the Messiah's coming and the question of the divine nature. While he dealt with the coming of the Messiah and the question of the Divine evenly in the first day, Nahmanides discussed the divine nature of the Messiah in the second day. When looking into in detail, we can see that Nahmanides changed two times the essence of the question at his own will: in the response

47) R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, p. 100.

48) Maccomby, *Judaism on Trial*, p. 44.

to Guillaume's question in the first day and to the Paul's question whether the Messiah could die or not in the third day. Especially, considering the expositions on the Aaggdah, Nahmanides emphasized the literal interpretation for Paul's question about Isaiah 53.13 of the first day. And he stressed the metaphorical interpretation of the question about Lev. 26.12 and Gen. 1.2. This kind of evading method in this argument is the predominant characteristic of Nahmanides' attitude⁴⁹. We need more serious study about this matter.

IV-2) Results of the Barcelona disputation

Neither Christians nor Jews referred about the immediate and official result. Though having led the advance guard of the anti-Jewish movement in the thirteenth century, the Dominican orders left no document which showed the immediate and definite victory or the failure. Moreover, it is hard to know any symptom. Neither direct and intensive anti-Jewish policy had been taken up, nor Christian activity was more restricted. Though this material I analyzed contains some exaggeration in describing this issue, it seems that both parties satisfied properly.

It seemed that Christian efforts to try to find the ground of the anti-Jewish movement within the post-Jewish biblical tradition took a positive evaluation to some degree. The King and Penaforte were able to preach at synagogue shortly after the fourth argument. This shows that the Christian methods of this time took the favorable response. More official result was appeared as the

49) I deduced these characteristics from the writing I took as a main text. We should compare this characteristics to Chazan's position who hesitate to use Nahmanides' writing for the Jewish proof text. R. Chazan, op. cit., pp.73-76.

50) R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, p. 53.

51) Heinlich Denifle, ed., "Quellen zu Disputation Pablos

King's message. And it was published for Jews in the late August of 1263⁵⁰. Here the King of Aragon acted as an intermediary for Paul to preach to Jews, and the King ordered that Jews should submit to Paul some related books they are using⁵¹. In addition, Paul's logic induced immediately the works of Nahmanides and Mahazik Emunah (The Reinforcer of Faith) of Rabbi Mordechai ben Joseph. Notwithstanding the intention of Mordechai's writing, the contents showed that Paul's logic was not at all meaningless as was described in *Vikuah*. This means that the experimental anti-Jewish method begun by Nahmanides anew was evaluated positively.

How did Jews think about this disputation? Jews did not referred concretely to Barcelona Disputation. However, considering *Vikuah* which contained the positive and self-confident image, we can see that Jews contented more or less. Nahmanides' writing provided Jews with the new logic with which they confront the newly-shaped attack of Christians. By arguing the disputation with boldness and logic, Nahmanides tried to establish his own confidence as well as to encourage confidence and activity of his Jewish companions. Many Jews used Nahmanides' writing and logic as a leading manual when Paul began to enlarge his activity toward the northern France and to persecute Jews⁵².

The Barcelona disputation itself was a certain prelude for the radical anti-Jewish movement in the thirteenth century. The Barcelona disputation provided the firm ground for the anti-Jewish movement developed very

Christiani mit Mose Nachmani zu Barcelona 1263", *Historisches Jahrbuch des Gorres-Gesellschaft* 8(1887), pp. 225-244. R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, p. 83 recite.

52) R. Chazan, "A Medieval Hebrew Polemical Melange", *Hebrew Union College Annual* LI(1980), pp. 89-110.

strongly thereafter. However, irregardless of the importance of the Barcelona disputation, Nahmanides' and Paul' arguments cannot help having limitations within the disputation itself.

Though these Christians' logic was more advanced and useful than that of Donin at the Paris disputation, the logics and method could not used continuously without being changed. As the first step to use this new method, the Barcelona disputation contributed to draw out concretely and objectively the Jewish explanation from the post-Jewish biblical literature texts. While trying to arrange and make an experiment on the method and the logic through his activity around the northern France, Nahmanides felt the need to make new and sophisticated form of argument. And this desire could be accomplished through the *Fugio Dei* of Martini in 20 years after the Barcelona disputation. Martini investigated more concretely the proof text, and attempted to justify the Christian faith far more logically and systematically than that of Paul. But the fact should not be neglected that lots of Martini's logics were still developed on the basis of Paul's logic.

Notwithstanding Nahmanides' great merits, his interpretation could not solve all the problems. Even though the direct reason had not been unknown, Mordechai's Mahazik Emunah came out to struggle with Paul's anti-Jewish logic. By referring Paul's argumentation on a large scale, Mordechai proved comprehensively that Christians' Messiah did not come yet⁵³. Mordechai believed that he could win the Christian claims by disputing directly the question of the Messiah which many Christians wanted to maintain through the Barcelona disputation. Mordechai's direct explanation of the Messiah is

53) R. Chazan, *Daggers of Faith*, pp. 109-112.

quite different from the evading explanation of Nahmanides. This shows that Nahmanides' explanation lacks the power to cope with an ever-increasing Christians' explanation in this period.

The Jewish pride, which contained the Jewish faith and thought, could not be continued so long. In addition, the Jewish dogmatic and logical pride did not lesson the immediate and superficial persecution on themselves. Not long after the Barcelona disputation finished, Jews should listen to the sermons of the inquisitors and submit their own documentations. And that material was to used to strengthen the Christian dogmas and to accuse the Jewish dogmas. And the placidity at the Barcelona disputation which the geographical and political situation provided came to disappear little by little. And they started to undergo the continuous persecution up to the fifteenth century. As the situation became worse, Jews could find little room to present more comparative and objective attitude of theirs. It was the high time to apply the idea of "Lachrymose conception" of Baron⁵⁴.

V. Conclusion

The Barcelona disputation is the most representing argument in the history of anti-Judaism of Christianity in the medieval ages. The Barcelona disputation show most clearly and paradigmatically the Christian attitude on Judaism and Jews' claims of themselves in the thirteenth century. In the thirteenth century, the power of Christianity arrived its height and Augustine's

54) Solo W. Baron, "The Jewish Factor in Medieval Civilization", *Ancient and Medieval Jewish History*, New Brunswick, 1972, p.514.

traditional view of Jews had collapsed. And persecution of Judaism and Jews become severe in this times.

Christianity, which gained eventually power with the emergence of Innocent III, forced all the secular powers and Jews to reply to the truth of Christianity. Therefore mission and persecution to Jews were coerced, even though Jews belonged to the third group after Muslims and pagans till then. Blind anti-Jewish method in the thirteenth century changed into the systematic anti-Jewish argument which used the post-biblical literature. That experimental method was adopted on a full scale into the Barcelona disputation in 1263.

Christians tried to prove the coming of the Messiah through the Barcelona disputation. Representatives of Christianity attempted to prove the coming of the Messiah from the post-biblical literatures such as the Talmud and the Midrash. And they took granted that the Messiah who had come here had the divine nature. To the contrary, Nahmanides discussed primarily the question of the divine nature of the Messiah rather than the coming of the Messiah. Nahmanides showed clearly the thirteenth century's Jewish attitude of the post-biblical literature by refuting that the Messiah of Christianity had no the divine nature. Through the structural analysis and expository work of the Barcelona disputation, this article investigated that the coming of the Messiah and the divine nature of the Messiah were the most controversial subjects of Christianity and Judaism in the thirteenth century. We can understand, that Christians and Jews had much different understanding on those subjects. Furthermore, I showed that this difference of understanding did not come about in the thirteenth century but originate from the deep-rooted difference of comprehension since the birth of Christianity.

This study suggests to us how we should approach to the problem of

dialogue and crisis among many religions. This indicates well that over-confidence of oneself on the twisted religious belief and excessive adoption can have the negative effects on the people those who have other religions and beliefs, at last on themselves. And, in the perspective of ecclesiastical history, it shows how Christian identity should be made. To establish the self-identity by persecuting other religions is quite different thing from having an unbiased belief of own religion. This fact suggests implicatively how Christianity can consolidate the self-identity in the twenty first century, even though today Christianity faces the great crisis of its own identity.

This article, however, has several limits of mine. Firstly, I should have studied Judaism more comprehensively to get better understanding on it. Particularly, I need to study deeply main streams and central thoughts of Judaism after the birth of Christianity. This means that I have to investigate objectively the main subjects of Judaism rather than the bible and important issues of Christianity. Secondly, it is necessary to research how the understanding of Judaism had been changed in the Old Testament and the New Testament as well. We have to restrain to evaluate Judaism only by mentioning the subjects of the New Testament of Christianity. In other words, this means it is necessary for us to examine the Jews' claims and instructions in the whole contexts of the Bible rather than in the narrower perspective of particular subjects. Lastly, this research shows my limit to obtain and analyze the relevant materials. If we can interpret and analyze much more original texts, we can get better abundant arguments.

● References

Texts:

- Bachrach, B. S., *Early Medieval Jewish Policy in Western Europe*, Minneapolis, 1977.
- Blumenkranz, Bernhardt, *Die Judenpredigt Augustins*, Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn, 1946.
- Bredero, Adriaan H., *Christendom and Christianity in the Middle Ages*, Michigan: Erdmans Publishing Co., 1994.
- Bynum, C. W., *Jesus as Mother*, California, 1984.
- Chazan, R., *Medieval Jewry in Northern France*, Ann Arbor, 1973.
 _____, *Daggers of Faith*, Berkeley, 1989.
 _____, *European Jewry and the First Crusade*, Berkeley, 1987.
- Cohen, A. B., *The Friars and the Jews*, Ithaca, 1982.
- Epstein, Isidore, *Judaism: A Historical Presentation*, Penguin Books Ltd, 1960.
- Ferguson, W.K., *Europe in Transition 1300-1520*, Boston, 1962.
- Geary, P. J., *Readings in Medieval History*, Petersborough and New York, 1991.
- Grayzel, S., *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, New York, 1988.
- Hamilton, B., *Religion in the Medieval West*, London, 1966.
- Head, T., and Landers, R., eds., *The Peace of God*, Ithaca and London, 1992.
- Isidore Twersky, *Rabbi Moses Nahmanides (Ramban): Explorations in His Religious and Literary Virtuosity*, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard

University Press, 1983.

- Langmuir, G. I., *History, Religion, and Anti-semitism*, Berkeley, 1990.
- Le Goff, Jacques, *Time, Work, & Culture in the Middle Ages*, The University of Chicago Press, 1977.
 _____, *Intellectuals in the Middle Ages*, Blackwell, 1993, pp.5-6.
- Lynch, Joseph H., *The Medieval Church: A Brief History*, Longman, 1992.
- Naccomby, Hyam, ed. & trans., *Judaism on Trial*, Ithaca: Associated University Press, 1982.
- Pantin, W. A., *The English Church in the Fourteenth Century*, Toronto, 1980.
- Parkes, James, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue*, London, 1934.
- Southern, R. W., *The Making of the Middle Ages*, New Heaven, 1973.
- Southern, R. W., *Western Society and the Church in the Middle Ages*, Grand Rapids and Harmondsworth, 1970.
- Tellenbach, G., *Church, State, and Christian Society at the Time of Investiture Contest*, New York, 1970.

Articles:

- Berger, David, "Mission to the Jews and Jewish-Christian Contacts in the Polemical Literature of the High Middle Ages", *American Historical Review*, Vol. 91(1986).
- Chazan, R., "A Medieval Hebrew Polemical Melange", *Hebrew Union College Annual* LI(1980).
 _____, "The Barcelona "Disputation" of 1263: Christian Missionizing and Jewish

Response”, *Speculum*, Vol. LII(1977).

- Deutsch, K. W., “Anti-Semitic Ideas in the Middle Ages: International Civilization in Expansion and Conflict”, *Journal of the History of Ideas*, Vol. VI(1945).
- Funkenstein, Amos, “Basic Types of Christian Anti-Jewish Polemics in the Later Middle Ages”, *Viator*, Vol. 2(1971).
- Langmuir, G. I., “Anti-Judaism as the necessary preparation for anti-Semitism”, *Viator*, Vol. 2(1971).

선악과와 인류의 창조위치에 대한 고찰

김 영 일
(신대원 1년)

목 차

- 서 론
1. 연구동기 및 목적
 2. 연구방법
- 본 론
1. 하나님은 왜 선악과를 만드셨는가?
 2. 인류는 왜 선악과를 취했는가?
 3. 선악과를 취한 결과는 무엇인가?
 - 1) 인류자신에 나타난 변화
 - 2) 하나님의 저주
 - 3) 생명나무에의 길이 막힘
 4. 범죄후의 인류
- 결 론
1. 살려주는 영으로써의 그리스도
 2. 생명나무로써의 그리스도