From Jew to Gentile: Jewish Converts and Conversion to Christianity in Medieval England, 1066-1290

Joshua M. Curk, Wolfson College

Faculty of History, University of Oxford

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History

---

Hilary Term 2015

Abstract(a)

From Jew to Gentile: Jewish Converts and Conversion to Christianity in Medieval England, 1066-1290 Joshua Curk, Wolfson College

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History *Hilary term 2015*

The subject of this thesis is Jewish conversion to Christianity in medieval England. The majority of the material covered dates between 1066 and *c.*1290. The overall argument of the thesis contends that converts to Christianity in England remained essentially Jews. Following a discussion of the relevant secondary literature, which examines the existing discussion of converts and conversion, the principal arguments contained in the chapters of the thesis include the assertion that the increasing restrictiveness of the laws and rules regulating the Jewish community in England created a push factor towards conversion, and that converts to Christianity inhabited a legal grey area, neither under the jurisdiction of the Exchequer of the Jews, nor completely outside of it. Numerous questions are asked (and answered) about the variety of convert experience, in order to argue that there was a distinction between leaving Judaism and joining Christianity. Two convert biographies are presented. The first shows how the liminality that was a part of the conversion process affected the post-conversion life of a convert, and the second shows how a convert might successfully integrate into Christian society.

The analysis of converts and conversion focusses on answering a number of questions. These relate to, among other things, pre-conversion relationships with royal family members, the reaction to corrody requests for converts, motives for conversion, forced or coerced conversions, the idea that a convert could be neither Christian nor Jew, converts re-joining Judaism, converts who carried the names of royal functionaries, the *domus conversorum*, convert instruction, and converting minors. The appendix to the thesis contains a complete catalogue of Jewish converts in medieval England. Among other things noted therein are inter-convert relationships, and extant source material. Each convert also has a biography.

Abstract(b)

From Jew to Gentile: Jewish Converts and Conversion to Christianity in Medieval England, 1066-1290 Joshua Curk, Wolfson College
Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in History *Hilary term 2015*

The subject of this thesis is Jewish conversion to Christianity in medieval England. The majority of the material covered dates between 1066 and *c.*1290. There is no evidence of Jews in England prior to the Conquest, and the Jews as a people were exiled from England in 1290. The thesis occasionally delves into material of a date later than 1290, but little after the reign of Edward II.

The introduction sets out the rationale for writing the thesis. The principal question for consideration is put forward: did Jewish converts to Christianity remain essentially Jews? The thesis maintains that they did. A discussion of the relevant literature follows. This review is arranged thematically within five distinct categories: general studies of the medieval Anglo-Jewry, localised studies, thematic studies focussing on history, thematic studies focussing on theory, and edited primary sources. Chronologically, the review is bracketed by William Prynne's *A short demurrer to the Jewes long discontinued remitter into England*, published in 1656, and *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: the York massacre of 1190, narratives and contexts*, edited by Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson, and published in 2013. Prynne's polemic came while the Protectorate's decision to re-admit the Jews into England was being considered, and begins with an impassioned argument against this proposition; Rees-Jones and Watson bring together various papers on the subject of the early Anglo-Jewry, with contributing authors including Robert Stacey, Paul Hyams, and Robin Mundill. This review examines, in addition to the content of the works, the state of the existing discussion of converts and conversion itself in general. An attempt is made to place the thesis within the wider narrative of Anglo-Jewish history. Broadly, the necessity of a study of Jewish converts during this period is addressed and proven. The notion that aspects of the Anglo-Jewish conversion narrative might fit into the larger Western European context is accepted. By the close

of this review, the necessity of augmenting the existing literature through in-depth discussion of the English legal and administrative systems in place is proven.

Having explained the distinctive context in which the Anglo-Jewry should be placed, the second chapter of the thesis is concerned with examining that context from a specifically legal standpoint, discussing the relative legal position of Jews over the course of the thirteenth century. This chapter argues that the increasing restrictiveness of law relating to the Jewish community was the main push factor towards conversion. The first part of the chapter charts the evolution of Jewish-specific law in England with specific reference to the relevant case law. This discussion includes the distinction between statutory and non-statutory law as it related to Jews, and the relationship between Jewish-specific common law and Jewish-specific canon law in the period. The relevant laws, rules, and regulations are shown to have begun as a method of enshrining privileges for the Jewish community at the outset, but which changed over time, becoming a method of regulating both social intercourse and Jewish business activities. This chapter also contends that, by the end of the Jews' stay in England, the church was more friendly to the Anglo-Jewry than was the English royal administration. The third chapter focusses on the Exchequer of the Jews, and its lack of jurisdiction—both held and exercised—over Jewish converts. This is achieved by applying the categories contained in Paul Brand's study of the Exchequer of the Jews from the second chapter of the introduction to his *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, vol. vi, to cases involving converts. The two main categories concern administrative functions performed while engaged in the task of managing the Jewish population and their personal lives, and jurisdiction—both held and exercised—over Jews, involving the business and legal facets of their lives. The chapter argues that Jewish converts to Christianity inhabited a legal grey area; this is clearly expressed in the manner they were dealt with by royal administration post-conversion.

Concentrating initially on the broad evidence for the ways in which Jewish conversion was undertaken and perceived by both Christians and Jews, the fourth

chapter provides analysis of various aspects of the convert experience. The aim is to demonstrate that there was a distinction between leaving Christianity and joining Judaism; one did not necessarily follow from the other. This chapter addresses various themes, including pre-conversion relationships with members of the royal family and the possible effect this relationship might have had on the post conversion experience; the reasons for the massive denial of royal corrody requests for converts; the liminality of the conversion experience; the naming of converts, and the effect their baptismal names might have had on their post conversion lives; and the *domus conversorum* as a place where the liminality of conversion was clearly defined. The fifth chapter is a biography of Henry of Winchester—the convert for whom the most evidence survives about the daily workings of his life. The liminality discussed in the previous chapter is a key concept for understanding Henry's life; even when he might have thought that he had fully joined Christianity and was perceived as a Christian, it was not in fact the case. The sixth and final chapter is another biography, of Alexander le Convers, who may or may not have been a convert. The chapter argues that Alexander's story can be read in two possible ways: either he integrated so successfully into Christian society that he was rewarded with a bishopric, or, he was a second generation convert whose story shows that the surname *convers* was only a detriment to first generation converts.

The appendix to the thesis is a catalogue of Jewish converts in England during the relevant period. It is in table form, and each convert has been assigned a number for ease of cross-referencing within the catalogue. Each convert's family name or toponymic is listed, as is his or her given name, as well as an indication of each convert's presence on the 1255 Fine Roll lists. Any inter-convert relationships are noted, as are all available primary and secondary source references. A biography of each convert, gleaned from the primary source material, is given, and the first date on which each convert appears in the surviving evidence is noted. The catalogue contains entries for 421 potential converts, and provides a sense of who the converts were, what they did post-conversion—and in some cases pre-conversion—and when

they were active. Though it is unclear whether all who bore the name *convers* were in fact converts, those for whom there is legitimate doubt are noted as such.

All sources used for this thesis are indicated in the bibliography. The majority of the manuscript sources are located at The National Archives at Kew, and those consulted include records of Chancery, records of the Court of Common Pleas, records of the Court of King's Bench, records of the Exchequer, records of itinerant justices, and special collections. Printed primary sources consulted originating from Chancery include the Close Rolls, Fine Rolls, Charter Rolls, Parliament Rolls, Liberate Rolls, and Patent Rolls. Those originating from the Exchequer include the Pipe Rolls, and various Plea Rolls. Primary sources from local history societies were consulted, as were many of the volumes contained in the *Victoria County History* series.

Acknowledgements

I owe an inestimable debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Paul Brand, for his very generous sharing of his expertise, and for five years of patience with a very tiresome graduate student.

For their unwavering support, I owe many thanks to my parents, who have doubtless started to wonder what I have been doing with my time and their money, and to my sisters, whose continued encouragement means more than they might imagine.

And, for their positive reactions to my friendship-straining requests to proofread, I am grateful to Messrs. Daniel Picus and Henry Spelman.

Contents

Abstract(a) i
Abstract(b) ii
Acknowledgements 1
Abbreviations & Miscellanea 3
Introduction 4
1 Limitations and Issues With the Existing Literature on the Medieval Anglo-Jewry 8
2 Laws, Rules, and Regulations: The Evolution of Jewish-Specific Canon and Secular Legislation 28
3 The Exchequer of the Jews, Jewish Converts, and Jurisdiction 70
4 Jewish Converts in England 95
5 Apostasy and Administration: The Life and Times of Henry of Winchester, Convert 139
6 The Convert, the Paymaster, and the Priest: The Many Lives of Alexander the Convert 170
Conclusion 190
Appendix 194
Bibliography 306
Manuscript and Archival Sources 306
Printed Primary Sources 313
Printed Secondary Works 323
Unpublished Theses 331

Abbreviations and Miscellanea

All references to manuscripts are to those held in The National Archives/Public Record Office Kew, Richmond, Surrey, United Kingdom, unless otherwise noted

References to Canon Law are found in *Decretum Magistri Gratiani: Editio Lipsiensis Secunda*, eds. Emil Ludwig Richter and Emil Friedberg (Leipzig, 1879) and *Corpus Iuris Canonici: Editio Lipsiensis Secunda* eds. Emil Ludwig Richter and Emil Friedberg (Leipzig, 1881).

Chapters and verses in Biblical references are cited according to the Vulgate; the version referred to is *The Vulgate Bible*, eds. Angela M. Kinney and Swift Edgar (Douay-Rheims Translation) (6 vols., London, 2010-13).

References to *VCH* are to the relevant volume in the *Victoria County History* series

References to *ODNB* are to the online edition of the *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*

References to *TJHSE* are to *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*

References to *Fine Rolls* during the reign of Henry III are to the publicly available online transcriptions and translations at www.finerollshenry3.org.uk, unless otherwise noted

Dates given in the form '20 Edward I' refer to regnal years

l. indicates pounds
m. indicates marks
s. indicates shillings
d. indicates pence

Introduction

At the Easter parliament of 1290, some London Jews brought a petition concerning the kidnapping and baptism of a Jewish child. The Jews asked that the king do justice to them. The king's response—*Rex non vult revocare baptismum; et non queruntur de certis personis: ideo nichil fiet*—could have been the answer to so many of the questions posed by the Jews in medieval England.[1] It rarely mattered what the question was, because the spirit of the answer—nothing is to be done—was so often implied. It was, in 1290, as it had been for much of the thirteenth century. The Jews were simply tools in the hands of the king, used to squeeze as much out of the English people as possible. When the Jews had outlasted their usefulness, they were cast aside, seemingly the detritus of a society where they had been permanent immigrants for over 200 years.[2] The Christian masses, not understanding, or perhaps refusing to understand, the lifestyle and religion of the only minority group in their midst, resorted to treating the Jews as that 'other' so beloved of sociological theoreticians. The Jews were something to be railed against and hoisted up as a symbol of non-conformity. This was readily displayed in the blood-libel canard beginning in the mid twelfth century,[3] and continued almost until the day they were required, again, to submit to exile.

What then, of those breakaway English Jews who converted to Christianity? Theological implications aside, converting did not make good sense. Rich Jews became poor Christians, and poor Jews became poorer Christians. The only benefit was to the Crown. Upon conversion, the newly minted Christians often became outsiders in the society which they had just joined. Furthermore, there is a distinction to be made between leaving Judaism, and joining Christianity; one did not necessarily

[1] *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, Edward I: 1275-1294*, i, ed. Paul Brand (London, 2005), no. 8, p. 293. A transcription is found in the appendix, *l.c.*, no. 8, p. 350; a translation is found in the appendix, *l.c.*, no. 8, p. 396. The original petition is SC 8/180/8966.

[2] For discussion on this unchanging 'immigrant' status, see Paul Hyams, 'The Jewish Minority in Mediaeval England, 1066-1290', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, no. 2 (1974), pp. 270-293.

[3] See discussion of Little St William of Norwich in Simon Yarrow, *Saints and their communities: miracle stories in twelfth century England* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 122-168.

follow from the other. Edward's famous response to an Easter parliament, 1290 petition from his *domus conversorum*-bound converts seems to confirm exactly this—*Rex cogitabit, cum viderit tempus.*[4] 'The king will consider this when it seems to him that the time is right' was hardly a confidence-inspiring statement,[5] as the vast majority of English Jewish converts might have attested. Yet despite this environment, conversions in England were a constant between 1066 and 1290. Conversion, in the context of this thesis, was an act or statement, or a series of acts or statements, by which the member of one religious community left that community and publicly adhered to another religious community.

England was the only place where the Crown had successfully established 'a claim to be the sole protector of its Jewish subjects and the sole judicial arbiter of legal cases in which Jews and Christians clashed'.[6] There was no institution anywhere on the continent that is a convincing parallel to the English Exchequer of the Jews. It was the most immediately visible symbol of 'Jewishness' or the Jewish presence in England. Indeed, it was perhaps the only constant throughout any given Jew's life: it was a representation of the Christian conception of the salient attributes of Judaism. One might imagine a thirteenth century governmental administrator saying 'Business and crime—these are what the Jews do, perhaps best as well as most, and this is therefore what needs to be regulated'. But, representations can not only reflect culture—they can create it, along with a parallel understanding of that culture. The very existence of the Exchequer of the Jews, along with the attendant laws that it enforced makes the English context distinctive. There was no institution like the Exchequer of the Jews that existed to administer the lives of Jewish converts. The *domus conversorum* springs to mind, but it is a poor substitute since its mandate was never to administer post-conversion lives, but rather to provide a refuge and

[4] *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England*, i, no. 47, p. 301. The original petition is SC 8/120/5971. A transcription is found in the appendix, *l.c.*, nos. 46-9, p. 362; a translation is found in the appendix, *l.c.*, nos. 46-9, p. 408.

[5] Ibid., no. 47, p. 301.

[6] Robert C. Stacey, 'The Massacres of 1189-90 and the Origins of the Jewish Exchequer, 1186-1226', in Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson (eds.), *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts* (York, 2013), p. 107.

occasionally a stipend. The result being, of course, that there was no Jewish convert 'culture' that might be reflected. The lack of institutional control over conversion means that the most relevant context in which to discuss Jewish conversion and converts in medieval England was the situation in which they had previously lived. Complete comprehension of the topic should rightly begin with an understanding of that which the Anglo-Jewish converts thought they were escaping: the stifling tallages, the suffocating laws, and the jurisdiction of the Exchequer of the Jews.

This thesis seeks to answer a question posed by William Jordan: did baptised Jews in England remain essentially Jews?[7] I intend to argue that they did. In making this argument, it will be necessary to discuss what caused conversion, how converts worked within the law post-conversion, the varieties of experience of conversion, liminality after conversion, the *domus conversorum*, and the difference between a convert and the child of a convert. I have searched for the range of primary source evidence, and though in some cases I have not found exactly what I wanted, such evidence as there is does show that conversion from Judaism to Christianity in medieval England was rarely a straightforward Jewish-to-Christian process. While overall patterns of convert life and details of conversion are important to a complete understanding of the topic, I do not discuss them in-depth until the fourth chapter. The third chapter discusses the jurisdiction, both held and exercised, of the Exchequer of the Jews over Jewish converts. The fifth and sixth chapters provide a different register than the rest of the thesis: two biographies are presented. One is certainly a convert, and the other is very possibly one. These case studies provide a life-writing angle that allows for discussion of the personal histories of two people included within the catch-all term of 'convert'. The careers of both men provide examples for convert integration, separation, convert responsibility, punishment, and post-conversion careers.

The chief difficulty with writing the history of these converts is a dual one: the nature of the evidence as well as its lack of comprehensiveness. When the majority

[7]William Chester Jordan, 'Why "Race"?', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31, no. 1 (2001), p. 166.

of the converts are mentioned in the records, the entries are, in the first instance, very short; this is a trend that does not seem to wane as the thirteenth century wore on. Secondly, the records are invariably governmental sources. This is not to say that these are inadequate or inaccurate representations of daily life for a Jewish convert, but rather that the scope of the records is less than ideal for formulating wider pictures of converts' lives.[8] Single references are often nothing more than time stamps, proving that a certain convert existed, and not going much beyond that. Though single references to converts are not always bereft of detail, they generally lack contextual information and information beyond what is immediately relevant to that particular instance. The way this is remedied is simply by finding all available references to a specific convert, and attempting to cross-reference these as many times as possible. Greater context is thus gained, not only providing a clearer view of that convert's life, but also placing that convert into a wider social, economic, or legal context, and helping to pose—and to answer—some explicit questions concerning the convert experience.

[8]For examples of single references contributing comparatively minimal information, see *inter alia*, *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 383, *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 224, *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 109-10, and every convert listed in Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62.

1 Limitations and Issues With the Existing Literature on the Medieval Anglo-Jewry

There is a long history of writing the story of the medieval Anglo-Jewry, and beginning with a discussion of the influences carried over from previous works seems appropriate at this point. The existing literature that discusses the Jews of medieval England can be broadly divided into five distinct categories. They include general studies of the medieval Anglo-Jewry, localised studies, thematic studies with a historical slant, thematic studies with a theoretical slant, and edited primary sources. Within these labels, it is convenient to discuss the works chronologically. The dangers of a fragmentary result are allayed by the connections that are made through this methodology, which might otherwise be missed. It must also be noted that what follows is not an exhaustive list of everything published on the Jews of medieval England, but rather represents a cross section of what is the more important and more valuable literature. Furthermore, those works that discuss conversion will be discussed at greater length than those that are solely about the general Jewish experience in medieval England.

Nearly four hundred years had passed since the Jews of medieval England had been exiled, but the desirability of their residence in the country was again up for discussion. Cromwell was on the verge of readmitting the Jews into the Commonwealth, and William Prynne, a lifelong puritan, anti-papist, anti-Jew, and sometimes royalist, wrote *A Short Demurrer to the Jewes Long Discontinued Barred Remitter into England*,[1] which argued vehemently against this. Prynne had had his ears cropped and nose slit in 1637 for sedition—he was no stranger to controversy.[2] Prynne printed many of the records relating to the Jews, but there are issues with his

[1]William Prynne, *A Short Demurrer to the Jewes Long Discontinued Remitter into England.: Comprising an Exact Chronological Relation of Their First Admission into, Their Ill Deportment, Misdemeanors, Condition, Sufferings, Oppressions, Slaughters, Plunders, by Popular Insurrections, and Regal Exactions in; and Their Total, Final Banishment by Judgment and Edict of Parliament, out of England, Never to Return Again: Collected out of the Best Historians and Records* (London, 1656).

[2]William Lamont, 'Prynne, William (1600-1669)', *ODNB*.

translations, transcriptions, and interpretations that did not go unnoticed by later scholars. Prynne's ideological bias is also made fairly clear throughout his polemic: Avrom Saltman described him as being prone to 'vindictive verbal violence'.[3] And yet, Prynne has still 'been universally recognized as the father of medieval Anglo-Jewish historiography'.[4] Later, D'Blossiers Tovey, an eighteenth century academic and lawyer who wrote on the Jews seemingly purely out of interest,[5] published his *History and Antiquities of the Jews in England*, which might rightly be considered the first general history of the Jews of medieval England.[6] Tovey wasted no time in making his opinion of Prynne's work clear, contradicting him by the second page.[7] Moses Margoliouth followed Tovey's work,[8] and corrected some of what both Tovey and Prynne had written, and even briefly discussed conversion, some named converts, and the *domus conversorum*.[9] His interest in conversion might have been because he himself was a convert from Judaism.[10] There are very few references to any primary source material in Margoliouth's work, with the result that he misidentifies specific converts—in one case he names a convert 'Belager' and male, as opposed to 'Belaset' and female.[11] H.P. Stokes followed Margoliouth with a more readable account of the Anglo-Jewry, only the first part of which concerned the medieval period.[12] Stokes' volume represented the beginning of more scholarly general studies. The book might more properly have been entitled 'The History of the Jews in Cambridge', however, but this does not detract from its worth.[13] Stokes' second volume appeared in 1921,[14]

---

[3]Avrom Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655: Studies in Prynne's Demurrer* (Bar-Ilan, 1995), p. 17.
[4]Ibid., p. 19.
[5]Sidney Lee, 'Tovey, D'blossiers (1692-1745)', rev. Robert Brown, *ODNB*.
[6]D'Blossiers Tovey, *Anglia Judaica: Or the history and antiquities of the Jews in England,: Collected from all our historians, both printed and manuscript, as also from the records in the Tower, and other publick repositories* (Oxford, 1738).
[7]Ibid., p. 2.
[8]Moses Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain* (London, 1851).
[9]Ibid., pp. 143-44, 148-51, 169-72, 252-55.
[10]David S. Katz, 'Margoliouth, Moses (1815-1881)', *ODNB*.
[11]Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, p. 255.
[12]H.P. Stokes, *Studies in Anglo-Jewish History* (Edinburgh, 1913).
[13]See discussion in Barrie Dobson, 'The Jews of Medieval Cambridge', in Helen Birkett (ed.), *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the collected essays of R.B. Dobson* (York, 2010), pp. 102-3.
[14]H.P. Stokes, *A Short History of the Jews in England* (London, 1921).

and was much more general in scope, including a chapter on the *domus conversorum* which ended up being more about conversion and converts than the *domus* itself.[15] Stokes himself was a Canon with two doctorates, and was described by Herbert Loewe as a man whose 'memory will be cherished by Anglo-Jewry as a scholarly historian who rendered valuable help in writing its early annals'.[16] Michael Adler added to the corpus in 1939, with what was essentially a book of his collected essays. Adler was also the first author to deal specifically with the question of converts, though less so the question of conversion. His chapter on the *domus conversorum*[17] remains perhaps the definitive work on the subject.[18] He also included several appendices with translations of documents. Though his footnotes left much to be desired, with many mis-references and mix-ups,[19] during his life as a Rabbi and an historian he 'attained recognition as a leading authority on pre-Expulsion Jewry in England', and also discussed various localised Jewries as well.[20]

When he was 76 years old, H.G. Richardson provided perhaps the first general study that was minutely detailed, fantastically referenced, and still remains one of the best pieces of writing on the subject of the medieval Anglo-Jewry.[21] In his not entirely flattering obituary notice for Richardson, G.O. Sayles remarked that 'it is unlikely that this very learned and sympathetic work will be supplanted as the standard authority on the subject'.[22] This has held true. His chapter 'The Assize of the Jewry', while perhaps unsuitably titled given its content, was the first to thoroughly discuss the legislation concerning the Jews in thirteenth century England.[23] Vivian Lipman,

---

[15]Stokes, *A Short History of the Jews in England*, pp. 36-9.
[16]Herbert Loewe, 'Canon Dr. Henry Paine Stokes, LL.D., D.Litt., F.S.A., 1849-1931', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 12 (1928-31), p. 268.
[17]Michael Adler, *Jews of Medieval England* (London, 1939), pp. 279-379.
[18]For an earlier discussion, see C.T. Martin, 'The *Domus Conversorum*', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 1 (1893-94), pp. 15-24.
[19]See 'notes' column in the appendix.
[20]Arthur Barnett, 'The Rev. Michael Adler, D.S.O., S.C.F., B.A. (1868-1944)', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 15 (1939-45), p. 194.
[21]H.G. Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings* (London, 1960).
[22]G.O. Sayles, 'Henry Gerald Richardson, 1884-1974', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 61 (1975), p. 516. Puzzlingly, Sayles refers to Richardson's aforementioned book as 'The English Jewry under the Norman Kings.'
[23]Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, pp. 176-97. See also chapter 2 in this thesis for a comprehensive treatment.

the professional civil servant and later, full-time academic,[24] wrote a characteristically highly readable paper which discussed the geographical and numerical distributions of the Jewish communities, as well as his own theories on the social context of the medieval Anglo-Jewry.[25] Cecil Roth's second work on the Jews in England did not have as its focus solely the medieval Anglo-Jewry, but his writing is nevertheless a highly accurate, if brief, history of the medieval Anglo-Jewry.[26] Roth remains perhaps the most famous historian of the Jews, both because of his immense scholarly output, as well as his style, described by Vivian Lipman as 'vivid, and he had a penchant for colourful, even shady characters, and a zest for historical detection'.[27] This made him popular with scholars and the general public alike. In 1974, while still at Pembroke College, Oxford, and prior to moving to Cornell University, Paul Hyams wrote an article wherein he discussed the basic aspects that caused the Jews to remain separate from Christian society, despite being in England for over two hundred years.[28] He also successfully combined discussions of the religious, political, and legal problems faced by the Jewish community, as well as the tensions that conversion might have created between the two communities. Robin Mundill's first monograph was an expanded and revised version of his PhD thesis, and had as its subject the expulsion of the Jews in 1290, wherein he posited several theories, and discussed conversion briefly by way of the *domus conversorum* and chevage.[29] Patricia Skinner has edited a volume of first-rate papers, by and large, but as these are thematic, they will be discussed below.[30] Her introduction, however, provides an excellent overview of the latest historiography concerning the medieval Anglo-Jewry. Richard

[24]Israel Finestein, '*In Memoriam*: Vivian David Lipman, CVO, DPhil, FSA, FRHistS, 1921-1990', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 31 (1988-90), pp. xiii-xviii.
[25]V.D. Lipman, 'The Anatomy of Mediaeval Anglo-Jewry', *TJHSE* 21 (1962-67), pp. 64-77.
[26]Cecil Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1964). For the history of the Anglo-Jewry to 1290, see *l.c.*, pp. 1-131. For discussion of Roth's first work, a localised study of the Jews of Medieval Oxford, see discussion on p. 13.
[27]V.D. Lipman, 'Roth, Cecil (1899-1970)', rev., *ODNB*.
[28]Hyams, 'The Jewish Minority in Mediaeval England, 1066-1290', pp. 270-293.
[29]Robin Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution, 1262-1290: Experiment and Expulsion* (Cambridge, 1998), pp. 100-03; 275-76.
[30]Patrica Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003).

Huscroft's concise volume is highly readable and agrees with my own view rather than Mundill's, regarding the expulsion: the main reason was economic pragmatism as opposed to religious bigotry.[31] This volume does exactly what it sets out to do, in that it provides a survey of the life and times of the Jews of medieval England. Robin Mundill's latest work provides an up-to-date socio-economic narrative of the Jewish community in England.[32]

Several of these books and articles suffer from similar failings: the works by Prynne, Margoliouth, and to a lesser extent, Tovey, all betray their particular ideological bents. This can perhaps be dismissed as indicative of Jewish history during the times in which it was written. What they write, the discussions they put forward, and the manner in which they treat evidence—or do not treat evidence, in some cases—are all coloured by their convictions. Other monographs, such as those by Mundill, are poorly served because of the unshakeable feeling that we—the reader, the author, and the Jews themselves—are marching relentlessly towards expulsion in 1290, pausing every so often to reinforce the inevitability of what is to come. Most of the evidence is interpreted to point this way. Mundill's first monograph, which had as its subject the expulsion, began interpreting the evidence beginning as early as 1262 as pointing towards the certainty of the eventual exile of the Jews. This could hardly have been the case at the time.

The localised studies have had a broader impact on the study of the Jews of medieval England, for several reasons. Chief among these is the fact that they are all recognisably scholarly works published from 1932 onwards. With these studies, the writing of medieval Anglo-Jewish history moved away from a 'broad strokes' approach, and into more detailed descriptions of the Jewish experience in England—something that required a more academic bent than had previously been visible in the literature. 'The Oxford Jewry in the Thirteenth Century'[33] was the first of these

[31]Richard Huscroft, *Expulsion, England's Jewish Solution: Edward I and the Jews* (Stroud, 2006).
[32]Robin Mundill, *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England* (London, 2010).
[33]Sarah Cohen, 'The Oxford Jewry in the Thirteenth Century', *TJHSE* 13 (1932-35), pp. 293-322.

intensely academic papers, written by Sarah Cohen, a schoolteacher and eventual editor of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews.[34] It was notable for weaving together the history of the town with that of the Jews, and she came to the conclusion that, by the time Henry III had died in 1272, the Oxford Jewry had already 'passed through its most eventful history'.[35] What is, in my opinion, Cecil Roth's greatest work followed this, and also had as its subject the Jews of medieval Oxford.[36] Unlike Cohen's work, Roth's paid particular attention to converts from Oxford, which, with the exception of Adler's *Jews of Medieval England*, was the first to do so. Lipman followed this up with *The Jews of Medieval Norwich*,[37] which gave a much lengthier treatment of a localised Jewry. Joe Hillaby discusses the Hereford Jewry to great effect in an article primarily about Hamo of Hereford,[38] and has also authored two articles on the London Jewry which are excellent:[39] he discusses the economics of the Jewry, the political aspects of the Jewish communities' residence in England, taxation, and still other things.[40] The two articles are impeccably referenced, as has come to be expected from Hillaby's articles generally,[41] and contain good discussion on specific converts.

Lauren Fogle's PhD thesis is the most important work on Jewish converts and

[34]For a brief biography of Sarah Cohen, see Paul Brand's preface to the *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, v (London, 1992), discussed below on p. 24.

[35]Cohen, 'The Oxford Jewry in the Thirteenth Century', p. 306.

[36]Cecil Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford* (Oxford Historical Society New Series 9)(Oxford, 1951).

[37]Vivian D. Lipman, *The Jews of Medieval Norwich; With an Appendix of Latin Documents from the Westminster Abbey Muniment Room; and the Hebrew Poems of Meir of Norwich* (London, 1967).

[38]Joe Hillaby, 'A magnate among the marchers: Hamo of Hereford, his family and clients, 1218-1253', *TJHSE* 31 (1988-90), pp. 23-82.

[39]Joe Hillaby, 'London: the 13th Century Jewry Revisited', *TJHSE* 32 (1990/2), pp. 89-157; Joe Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', *TJHSE* 33 (1992/4), pp. 1-44.

[40]For other studies by Hillaby, see discussion on pp. 21 and 21.

[41]There are small issues. For example, in Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', p. 2, the assertion that William Rufus' famous oath that he would join the Jews if they bested the clergy in a debate had happened 'in the royal presence in London' is stated slightly too matter-of-factly for my liking; the Latin is *Judaei qui Londoniae habitabant*—I would posit that this had happened in Rouen, with Jews who had formerly lived in London, given the use of the imperfect over a present participle. For the text, see J. Armitage Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster: a study of the abbey under Norman rule* (Cambridge, 1911), p. 66. Also on p. 2 of the aforementioned article, Hillaby states with certainty that William Rufus' 10,000*m.* payment to his brother Robert in 1096 was for a period of three years—this was actually the subject of debate amongst various chroniclers. See R.M. Thomson and M. Winterbottom, *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum, The History of the English Kings*, ii (Oxford, 1999), p. 280 no. 318.

conversion in medieval England, and is the only lengthy treatment of the subject.[42] A great strength of the work is its third chapter, containing a series of convert biographies. There is an opportunity for including the legal history of the Jews in England in the analysis, which is something I attempt to address in the current thesis. The most recent set of localised studies available is a collection of the late Barrie Dobson's papers, edited by Helen Birkett.[43] These focus primarily on the Jews of medieval York, and the Jews of medieval Cambridge. They are not overly detailed and yet are sufficiently specialised to be useful to the scholars of the medieval Anglo-Jewry. Dobson also manages to present a refreshing look at that most important incident, the Clifford's Tower massacre, using the extant Hebrew martyrologies as social commentaries, and thus providing a good entry into the discussion of the possible socio-economic causes behind the massacre.

The thematic method of writing the history of the medieval Anglo-Jewry is obviously more prevalent than the previous two categories. This is perhaps attributable to the early general histories, and the comprehensive nature of, chiefly, Richardson and Roth's works. The category of 'thematic studies' is here subdivided into two sub-categories: those of theory and those of history. This is not for lack of historical veracity in the former category, but rather the direction of the narrative which focusses on theories of history, rather than being event-driven. In terms of those monographs that are theoretical in nature, there are two relatively early works by Jacob Katz, a professional Jewish historian, and James Parkes, the historian of anti-Semitism and Jewish-Christian relations;[44] and two more recent works, one by Robert Chazan and the other by Anthony Julius. Katz' work does not discuss the English context at all (and covers the tenth to the eighteenth centuries) but is still useful for the purposes of medieval Anglo-Jewish history.[45] This is primarily because

[42] Lauren Fogle, *Jewish Converts to Christianity in Medieval London* (Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London PhD thesis, 2005).
[43] *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the Collected Essays of R.B. Dobson*, ed. Helen Birkett (York, 2010).
[44] N. de Lange, 'Parkes, James William (1896-1981)', rev., *ODNB*.
[45] Jacob Katz, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times* (Oxford, 1961).

it defines a framework for conversion which involves writing about the history of continental conversion from the Jewish point of view, rather than the usual way of writing Jewish history, in the English context at least, which supposes that the medieval Jewry was interesting simply because it was a convenient 'otherness' against which Christianity was fighting. James Parkes' work does something similar, that is, creates a framework of conversion, but in time rather than space.[46] Its utility, as with Katz' work, lies in the possibilities for comparison that he brings up. Much closer in both time and space, Robert Chazan's latest work deals with his desire to establish a counter-narrative as an antidote to the prevailing view of medieval Jewish history.[47] He is an endowed Professor of Hebrew and Judaic studies at New York University, and though his areas of concentration are not English there are references to the Anglo-Jewry, and, as above, the comparative possibilities that he establishes are good. Anthony Julius, a well known London lawyer, has written a wide-ranging history of anti-Semitism in England,[48] but the relevant chapter, 'Medieval English anti-Semitism' begins with a basic misunderstanding of the laws of Richard and John.[49] He makes other odd mistakes, but perhaps the oddest is the statement that English Jews 'were massacred with impunity, and robbed with the express sanction of the state, when not at its actual instigation'.[50] This narrative—its falseness notwithstanding—seems to be exactly what Chazan was seeking to change. Julius manages complete a discussion on the coin-clipping trials without a reference to Brand's definitive article on the subject, and betrays his lack of general knowledge of the relevant ecclesiastical history by stating that the threatened excommunication of Jews was a 'somewhat crazy act—how could *Jews* [sic] be excommunicated?'[51]

[46] James Parkes, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Anti-Semitism* (New York, 1974).

[47] Robert Chazan, *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* (New York, 2010). For a treatment of Jewish identity politics in France and Spain, see Robert Chazan, *Fashioning Jewish Identity in Medieval Western Christendom* (Cambridge, 2004).

[48] Anthony Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford, 2010).

[49] Julius, *Trials of the Diaspora*, p. 106. Julius misinterprets the two laws to mean that the Jews themselves were items of possession. See discussion of the laws on p. 31.

[50] Ibid., p. 108.

[51] Ibid., p. 134.

The point at the time was, of course, to deny the Jew any communication with the faithful—that is to say, Christians, who also happened to be the primary customers of the Jews.[52]

Studies of the continental European context also fit into this category. One of the most useful works is that of Walter Pakter. In it, he gives a thorough analysis of the major facets of canon law as it pertained to Jews, and his sources are extensive. His strongest chapter is that which discusses jurisdiction, wherein he surveys the development of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Jews, and comes to the conclusion that being outsiders was a form of sanctuary, as opposed to when they became wards of the papacy.[53] Also very useful for the continental context is Gavin Langmuir's volume.[54] His dozens of references to secular law in France aid in contextualising other rules and regulations, chiefly in England. William Jordan's seminal work on the Jewish community of medieval France provides excellent comparative material for the English context,[55] and is especially thorough in its discussion of Jewry law under Philip Augustus, and the evolution of the law under his heirs. The Jews in twelfth century canon law are covered by John Gilchrist;[56] he argues that the practical decline in the status of Jews began in the period between the first two crusades. His article is insightful, though the second chapter of this thesis proposes a rather later date for the decline in the status of English Jews. John Watt's article discusses the Jews in canon law, by way of interpreting the word *servus* as it related to Jews, and its possible meanings of slave, servant, or serf.[57] Few of these works discuss conversion in any depth, but their usefulness is not reduced; rather, they all

[52]See discussion in William Chester Jordan, 'Christian Excommunication of the Jews in the Middle Ages: A Restatement of the Issues', *Jewish History* 1 (Spring 1986), pp. 31-38. See also F. Donald Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity: Problems of Apostasy in the 1280s', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 45, no. 112 (Nov. 1972), pp. 225-6.

[53]Walter Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews* (Ebelsbach, 1988), p. 82.

[54]Gavin I. Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1990).

[55]William Chester Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Philadelphia, 1989).

[56]John Gilchrist, 'The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades', *Jewish History* 3, no. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 9-24.

[57]John A. Watt, 'Jews and Christians in the Gregorian Decretals', in Diana Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism: Papers Read at the 1991 Summer Meeting and the 1992 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 93-105.

provide excellent background from a wider angle.

Those studies concerned with thematic history—that is to say, not constrained by time and not focussing on events, or specific series of events—are the most relevant and useful sources for the study of the medieval Anglo-Jewry. The latest work is a volume edited by Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson, bringing together a collection of papers on the York massacre of 1190.[58] They treat issues wider than simply the massacre itself, and to good effect; Stacey, Hyams, and Mundill have all contributed. Two of the earliest works were those of Thomas Madox[59] and Frederic William Maitland,[60] which devoted chapters or sections within longer works to the Jews. Abrahams' three-part work on the expulsion of the Jews from England is the earliest thematic reconstruction of the Expulsion.[61] That being said, the three articles are not particularly about the exile itself, but rather constitute a brief history of the Jews in England. This seems to be the first example of the 'inevitability of exile' school of thought that has mostly disappeared in later scholarship. F.W. Maitland's famous article first appeared in 1896,[62] and discussed the two most well-known incidences of a Christian converting to Judaism. B. Lionel Abrahams continued with a brief summary of the Jewish financial position,[63] and in perhaps one of the more interesting articles, H.P. Stokes followed up his monograph with a discussion on the Jews and their relationship with the royal family.[64] Michael Adler's

[58]Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson (eds.), *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013).

[59]Thomas Madox, *The History and Antiquities of the Exchequer of the Kings of England*, 2nd ed., vol. i (London, 1711), pp. 221-61.

[60]Sir Frederick Pollock and Frederic William Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, 2nd ed., vol. i (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 468-75. This was written almost entirely by Maitland. See C.H.S. Fifoot, *The Letters of Frederic William Maitland* (Selden Society Supplementary Series 1)(London, 1965), no. 138.

[61]B. Lionel Abrahams, 'The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 1 (Oct. 1894), pp. 75-100; B. Lionel Abrahams, 'The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290 (Continued)', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 2 (Jan. 1895), pp. 236-258; B. Lionel Abrahams, 'The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290 (Concluded)', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 3 (April 1895), pp. 428-458.

[62]Frederic William Maitland, *The collected papers of Frederic William Maitland: Downing professor of the laws of England* (Cambridge, 1911), pp. 385-406.

[63]B. Lionel Abrahams, 'The Economic and Financial Position of the Jews in Mediaeval England', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 8 (1918), pp. 171-188.

[64]H.P. Stokes, 'The Relationship Between the Jews and the Royal Family of England in the Thirteenth Century', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 8 (1918), pp. 153-170.

biography of Aaron of York was the earliest full-length biography of a medieval Jew of consequence, but somewhat lacked context, with the result that the article seems to be more about the economics of the office of arch-presbyter rather than Aaron himself.[65] One of the most useful articles in the corpus of the secondary literature surrounding the medieval Anglo-Jewry is C.A.F. Meekings' list of the justices of the Jews up to 1268.[66] These small biographies of the men who headed the Exchequer of the Jews are invaluable, and though Meekings did well to collect every available life reference for the men he was profiling, he did neglect some.[67] However, the point remains: these biographies are concise representations of the men who administered the Exchequer of the Jews. Meekings also sounds a note of caution to those who would judge the justices out of context: 'In contrast to the current view, their standing and integrity as a whole seems to have been as high as that of other royal servants under Henry III, whose reign, in this respect, will bear comparison with any other'.[68] Paul Brand later completed the list of justices of the Jews up to Trinity term 1290.[69]

One of the few articles to deal entirely with conversion and individual converts is F. Donald Logan's, detailing the situations of several double-apostates—that is to say, Jews who had converted to Christianity, then 'relapsed' back to Judaism—in London in the 1280s.[70] In addition to discussing the thirteen specific converts who make up the subject of his article, Logan discusses conversion itself in the English context, something that was, up to this point in the literature, ill-served. The coup-de-grâce of the article is twofold: the discussion of the disincentives to conversion, and the appendix. In the latter, Logan published for the first time the letters of John of Peckham, as well as the returned writs. They go a long way to illustrating the

[65]Michael Adler, 'Aaron of York', *TJHSE* 13 (1932-35), pp. 113-155.
[66]C.A.F. Meekings, 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-68: a Provisional List', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 28, no. 78 (Nov. 1955), pp. 173-188.
[67]For a relevant example, see p. 143.
[68]Meekings, 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-1268', p. 179.
[69]Paul Brand, *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, vi (London, 2005), pp. 52-3. See discussion below on p. 25.
[70]Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 214-29.

problems that these double-apostates had caused Peckham, borne largely out of his convictions. Chazan surfaces again, though surprisingly he falls victim to the same incorrect interpretation of the legislation of Richard's reign as does Julius, stating that the Jews were the property of the king.[71] He discusses and prints the primary sources surrounding the blood libel accusations,[72] and the massacres of Jews that had happened following Richard's coronation,[73] as well as other incidents. Jeremy Cohen's monograph, though light on the English context, is useful for its comparative purposes, and the light it sheds on both the conversionist activities of the friars and conversion theory in general.[74]

Vivian Lipman, in a typically excellent article,[75] draws a distinction between jurisdiction over Jews and the enforceability of that jurisdiction, using the example of the relationship between Jews and royal castles. In the second of the three main papers that focus solely on Jewish conversion in medieval England, Robert Stacey's article stands out because it presents an in-depth background to conversion in England, and seamlessly intertwines—inasmuch as an article-length piece can—the religious, political, and economic aspects.[76] Particularly welcome is Stacey's assertion that the *domus conversorum* was not likely to have been the centre of converted Jews' lives, despite how tempting it might be to see it as such.[77] Stacey also has a small summary biography of Henry of Winchester, using him as an indication of the uppermost level of post-conversion success.[78] Stacey published another article a year later, putting forward the less-specialised thesis of a mid-century watershed in Anglo-Jewish relations (between 1240 and 1260).[79] His thesis centred on the drastic increase in the size and number of tallages, and the effects these had not only on the

[71]Robert Chazan, *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1980), p. 67.
[72]Ibid., pp. 151-57.
[73]Ibid., pp. 157-61.
[74]Jeremy Cohen, *The Friars and the Jews: the Evolution of Medieval anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982).
[75]Vivian D. Lipman, 'Jews and Castles in Medieval England', *TJHSE* 28 (1981-82), pp. 1-19.
[76]Robert Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England', *Speculum* 67, no. 2 (1992), pp. 263-83.
[77]Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 273.
[78]Ibid., pp. 276-78.
[79]Robert Stacey, '1240-60: A Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations?', *Historical Research* 61, no. 145 (1988), pp. 135-150.

Jews paying them, but on their Christian debtors as well, and the way this informed the changing attitudes in Christian-Jewish relations.

Robert Chazan's most useful work, in terms of defining a framework for conversion, utilises, as far as is possible, comparisons between various territories with Jews who were or were not converting.[80] Chazan is very careful not to extrapolate unnecessarily, and does not fall prey to the desire to use sources outside their original contexts. The final article in the series of three that deals solely with Jewish conversion is Joan Greatrex' offering.[81] She analyses the 1255 Fine Roll lists that contained a roster of Jewish converts, and the monasteries to which they were being sent. She discusses not only the composition of the lists, but also the real-world consequences that might have emerged from them. Among others, these included the splitting up of families and the political implications stemming from the monasteries' refusals to accept converts.[82] Nicholas Vincent's article on the Jewish badge is the definitive work on that matter,[83] though his lack of references to Richardson's work on the subject is somewhat puzzling.[84] Vincent does, however, make sure to draw the distinction between the church's mandating the wearing of the Jewish badge, and the enforcing of that requirement by the secular arm. This distinction is occasionally muddled.[85]

Paul Brand's article on the coin-clipping trials of the late 1270s offers a focussed look at Christian-Jewish relations up to the expulsion of the Jews.[86] Brand also included a discussion of the convert Henry of Winchester and his role in the coin-

[80]Robert Chazan, *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley, 1989).

[81]Joan Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts: The Requisition of Corrodies by Henry III', in Diana Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism: Papers Read at the 1991 Summer Meeting and the 1992 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 132-143.

[82]See discussion on pp. 114-116.

[83]Nicholas Vincent, 'Two papal letters on the wearing of the Jewish badge, 1221 and 1229', *TJHSE* 34 (1994-96), pp. 209-224.

[84]Vincent's reference at p. 215, n. 41, to Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, pp. 178-80, simply discusses the fines paid for exemptions to wearing the badge. There is very relevant discussion in Richardson at pp. 180-84 and pp. 190-92 that is not taken into account.

[85]As in Robert Stacey, review of *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England*, reivew no. 1077, from www.history.ac.uk/reviews/review/1077, citing Mundill, *The King's Jews*, pp. 133, 151.

[86]Paul Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', *English Historical Review* 115, no. 464 (Nov. 2000), pp. 1138-1158.

clipping investigations—a role that was more significant than might otherwise be believed for a convert.[87] Joe Hillaby's contribution to the Skinner volume is a welcome addition to the corpus of literature, because it discusses the origins of the Anglo-Jewish community in the twelfth century. This paper is very similar in content to his previous paper on the Jewry up to John.[88] This has been a neglected area of Anglo-Jewish history, mostly due to the lack of evidence as compared with the thirteenth century developments in Anglo-Jewish-Christian relations. Regardless, Hillaby does an excellent job with a difficult topic, resulting in a comprehensively detailed paper. The article also functions as a sort of lead-in to Stacey's piece,[89] Mundill's,[90] and Brand's.[91] Together, the four papers cover the entirety of the Jewish experience in medieval England. Stacey and Mundill give more or less chronological accounts of the Jewish experience under Henry III and Edward, and Brand details the administrative network, including the Exchequer of the Jews, that regulated and supervised the Jewry. Fogle's latest work is an article based on a chapter of her thesis discussing the *domus conversorum*. In this article, she makes the claim that there was a house for converted Jews in Bristol.[92] This is roundly refuted by Hillaby in a response article, wherein he correctly explains the true nature of the *scola judeorum* in Bristol, and furthermore, shows that both Richardson and Roth had disproved the idea many years ago.[93]

---

[87]Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', pp. 1149-1153.

[88]Joe Hillaby, 'Jewish Colonisation in the Twelfth Century', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 15-40.

[89]Robert Stacey, 'The English Jews Under Henry III', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 41-54.

[90]Robin Mundill, 'Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 55-70.

[91]Paul Brand, 'The Jewish Community of England in the Records of English Royal Government', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 73-83.

[92]Lauren Fogle, 'The *Domus Conversorum*: the personal interest of Henry III', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 41 (2007), pp. 1-7.

[93]Joe Hillaby, 'A *Domus Conversorum* at Bristol?', *Jewish Historical Studies* 42 (2009), pp. 1-5. See p. 1, n. 4 for the citations to Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 31 n. 6 as well as Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 43 n. 2.

One of the most underserved areas of the secondary literature is that concerning the history of Jewish medieval women. Adler had a chapter in his volume devoted to an overview of Jewish women,[94] but more recently, Dobson's two papers on the subject have been brought together in the volume edited by Birkett. In the second of the two articles, Dobson discusses female converts briefly, and makes an excellent point that is often forgotten: simply because female converts, and indeed converts generally, had toponymic surnames does not in fact mean that they were or had previously been resident in that place.[95] Dobson seems to confuse his interpretation of the relevant laws, when he states that 'they were compelled (from at least 1222) to wear the *tabula*'.[96] This is not correct—though the Lateran council in 1215 had mandated wearing the badge, as had previous provincial English councils and synods, there is no evidence that it was enforced between 1218 and 1253.[97] Generally, the article is slightly superficial and deals mostly with the demographics of Jewish women in English communities. Dobson's first article in this volume seems to have been repeated in a slightly more general way, which is not only disappointing, but somewhat reductive.[98] That having been said, at least this attempt at writing the history of medieval English Jewish women has been made, and fairly successfully. Dobson argues that Jewish women were far more independent than their Christian counterparts, and sheds excellent light on Jewish widowhood and remarriage practices. The final article in this 'thematic history' category is David Carpenter's analysis of the alleged martyrdom of Little Saint Hugh of Lincoln.[99] The article synthesises elements of Henry III's itinerary with the events that took place at Lincoln, with the

[94]See previous discussion of Adler's work on p. 10.

[95]Barrie Dobson, 'A minority within a minority: the Jewesses of thirteenth-century England', in Helen Birkett (ed.), *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the Collected Essays of R.B. Dobson* (York, 2010), pp. 152-53.

[96]Ibid., p. 158.

[97]See discussion on pp. 37-41.

[98]Barrie Dobson, 'The Role of Jewish Women in Medieval England', in Helen Birkett (ed.), *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the Collected Essays of R.B. Dobson* (York, 2010), pp. 127-47.

[99]David Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion: King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', in Susanne Jenks, Jonathan Rose, Christopher Whittick (eds.), *Laws, Lawyers, and Texts: Studies in Medieval Legal History in Honour of Paul Brand* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 129-148.

main point being that the ballad telling the story of St. Hugh should be considered as being more factual than perhaps it has been in the past. Carpenter also gives a good discussion of conversion and the Fine Roll lists of 1255 in the context of the story of St. Hugh because of the role that a converted Jew named Copin had played in it.[100]

Primary source editions and commentary comprise the final category of the literature on the medieval Anglo-Jewry. Within this section, it is often the introductions to the works that are the most relevant, with a few exceptions. William Prynne's *A Short Demurrer* would fit in this category as well as that of general studies. Joseph Jacobs made the first modern foray into the editing of documents,[101] and his work is invaluable, though as Stacey points out, occasionally Jacobs' translations leave something to be desired.[102] Beginning the tradition of editing the records of the Exchequer of the Jews, J.M. Rigg edited three volumes in fairly quick succession.[103] *Select Pleas* as well as the first two volumes of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews have stood the test of time, and remained the standard to which subsequent works have been held. The introduction to *Select Pleas* mostly discussed the economics of the Jewry, as well as a discussion of Rigg's belief that the expulsion had been planned as early as 1275. The preface to the first volume of the Plea Rolls was slightly less specialised than later volumes, and included a glossary of sorts for the non-specialised reader. The Plea Rolls edited in this volume cover the years 1218-72.[104] The introduction to the second volume of the Plea Rolls is, as Rigg

[100]Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion: King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', pp. 140-42. For a slight misunderstanding on Carpenter's part, see discussion below on p. 123, and nos. 189 and 244 in the appendix.

[101]Joseph Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England: Documents and Records* (New York, 1893).

[102]Robert Stacey, 'Recent Work on Medieval English Jewish History', *Jewish History* 2, no. 2 (Fall, 1987), p. 61. For example, on p. 72, Jacobs' translation reads 'Jeremias the Jew renders count of one mark for Isabella the Convert whom he personated...', while the original entry on the *Pipe Roll* for 26 Henry II, p. 129, reads *Jeremias Judeus redd. comp. de .j. m. pro Ysabella conversa quam imprisonavit...*

[103]J.M. Rigg, *Select Pleas, Starrs, and Other Records from the rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, A.D. 1220-1284* (London, 1902); hereafter Rigg, *Select pleas*; J.M. Rigg, *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, i (London, 1905); hereafter *PEJ*, i; J.M. Rigg, *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, ii (London, 1910); hereafter *PEJ*, ii.

[104]The rolls are not complete. The years covered, while ranging from 1218-72, actually cover 1218-20, 1244-45, 1252-53, 1266-68, 1270, and 1272.

readily admits, a version of a lecture he had previously given on the Jews in England in the thirteenth century. It ranges in topical focus from the Plea Rolls themselves, to feudalism, Jewish trade rights, Jewish-specific regulations, anti-Semitism, and the Expulsion. The rolls edited in this volume cover the years 1273-75.

Hilary Jenkinson wrote an article on the records of the exchequer receipts of the English Jewry,[105] which might more properly have been entitled simply 'The Exchequer of the Jews' given its subject. Jenkinson does admit halfway though that '...this paper is intended only as an investigation of the machinery used in the collection of moneys by the Crown from the Jews, and of the records of such collections' so perhaps he too realised this.[106] Nevertheless, it still serves as a respectable introduction to the Exchequer of the Jews and its records. Later, when he edited the third volume of the Plea Rolls,[107] the introduction therein was a more detailed version of that article from eleven years earlier. The rolls edited in this volume cover the years 1275-77. The fourth volume is edited by H.G. Richardson,[108] and its introduction is concise and to the point—presumably everything that was thought able to be said about the Exchequer of the Jews and the nature of the records had been said already. However, it does discuss the content of the volume, which is two Plea Rolls from Easter term 1272 and Hilary term 1277 which were not included in previous editions, two Memoranda Rolls from 1275 and 1276,[109] and two non-Plea Roll appendices. This was also the first volume to have a mix of calendared English and transcribed Latin entries. The fourth volume, edited by Sarah Cohen,[110] is unusual because as Paul Brand writes in its preface, it originated under fairly unique circumstances and is also the first of the edited volumes to be completely in transcribed Latin. The volume covers the years 1277-79. The most recent volume is

[105]Hilary Jenkinson, 'The Records of the Exchequer Receipts From the English Jewry', *Jewish Historical Studies: TJHSE* 8 (1918), pp. 19-54.
[106]Ibid., p. 44.
[107]Hilary Jenkinson, *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, iii (London, 1929); hereafter *PEJ*, iii.
[108]H.G. Richardson, *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, iv (London, 1972); hereafter *PEJ*, iv.
[109]*PEJ*, iv, p. viii.
[110]Sarah Cohen, *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, v (London, 1992); hereafter *PEJ*, v.

edited by Brand,[111] whose lengthy and incredibly detailed introduction completes what had been begun by Jenkinson prior to the third volume. Brand's focus is the Exchequer of the Jews, its records, and its functions from 1265-90. In his first appendix, he also completes what had been begun by Meekings but again, with the focus on 1265-90.[112] The edited Plea Rolls in the volume cover the years 1279-81 and are in transcribed Latin.

Solomon Grayzel published two phenomenally useful volumes on the relationship between the church and the Jews between 1198 and 1314.[113] The two volumes are edited papal letters and bulls concerning the Jews, and the introduction to the first volume is especially useful, given its discussion of the papal stance on conversion.[114] Zefira Entin Rokeah has published extensively, including a three-part work on the property of the Jews condemned during the coin-clipping trials in the late 1270s,[115] and a later two-part work on what amounts to the same subject.[116] The former work is in a slightly curious form, in that every entry is completely transcribed, but with square brackets around every abbreviated ending. If there was ever an argument for calendaring, this would surely be it. There is a mistake concerning a convert that Rokeah identifies as John le Convert who receives 10*l.* 'for his expenses while in the king's service'[117] when the person actually being spoken of is a convert named Henry who had received this sum.[118] Rokeah has also published a volume of

[111]Paul Brand, *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, vi (London, 2005); hereafter *PEJ*, vi.

[112]See discussion on p. 18, above.

[113]Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century: a Study of Their Relations During the Years 1198-1254*, rev. ed. (New York, 1966); Solomon Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century, 1254-1314*, ed. Kenneth R. Stow (New York, 1989).

[114]Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century, 1198-1254*, pp. 13-21.

[115]Zefira Entin Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls', *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 1 (1973), pp. 19-42; Zefira Entin Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls, Part 2', *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 2 (1974), pp. 59-82; Zefira Entin Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls, Part 3', *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 3 (1975), pp. 41-66.

[116]Zefira Entin Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman in Late-13th-Century England: Jews, Christians and Coinage Offences Alleged and Real (Part I)', *Jewish Historical Studies* 31 (1988-90), pp. 83-109; Zefira Entin Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman in Late-13th-Century England: Jews, Christians and Coinage Offences Alleged and Real (Part II)', *Jewish Historical Studies* 32 (1990-92), pp. 159-218.

[117]Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls', p. 24.

[118]Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls, Part

calendared Memoranda Roll entries of Jewish interest that cover 1266-93.[119] This volume provides a useful glimpse into the primary sources concerning specific Jews' relations with Crown, in the years leading up to the Expulsion. Ann Causton has edited a useful volume of the unpublished documents held in Westminster Abbey concerning Jews.[120] These are all Jewish bonds that had been held in the muniments room of Westminster Abbey that were originally from the chirograph chests at Bristol, Canterbury, Colchester, Lincoln, Norwich, and Nottingham. The volume contains an excellent introduction and useful commentary on some of the more complicated writs.

The chief problem with the existing literature is the lack of any general, overall discussion of conversion. Stacey, Logan, Greatrex, and Fogle have contributed to the discussion that does exist, and to a lesser extent, so too have Brand and Carpenter. Much remains unexplained, despite these previous attempts. Stacey's article is perhaps the best example of what the current thesis hopes to achieve. That being said, there is only so much that an article-length study can seriously discuss. The general lack of meaningful discussion of converts and conversion in England aside, several other topics are missing from the literature. In order of importance, unnecessary stress is laid on the financial activities of both Jews and Jewish converts; converts have been decontextualised; there is a lack of in-depth analysis of the legal environment in which Jews were living prior to converting; and finally, a mix of good micro and macro analysis of converts and the overall phenomenon of conversion is, for the most part, absent. Mundill treats medieval Anglo-Jewish history as though it were a brief history of Jewish finance and credit in England; concerning this issue he is certainly not alone, but merely the most representative example. The decontextualisation of converts is most noticeable in Fogle's thesis, which ignores much in the immediate English conditions. The Jewish community in medieval

3', p. 58. See discussion of this entry on p. 155.

[119] Zefira Entin Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials: Entries of Jewish Interest in the English Memoranda Rolls, 1266-1293* (Jerusalem, 2000).

[120] Ann Causton, *Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey* (London, 2007).

England was certainly part of the wider Ashkenaz Diaspora;[121] what is needed is a work synthesizing Fogle's approach with one that explores the English legal context. As a tool for comparison, discussing continental Jewish conversion is useful, and augmenting this with a discussion of the English legal and administrative systems in place for Jews will bring out the distinctiveness of the English environment. The final issue with the existing corpus of literature is the lack of a mix of micro and macro-focussed history. Brand and Stacey have done this to an extent, as has Adler, but again, only so much can be accomplished in article-length works. An intense focus needs to be brought to bear on the legal status of the medieval Anglo-Jewry, after which it is appropriate to advance more detailed discussion of the convert experience. But to do so before having set the scene, so to speak, risks leaving out integral parts of the pre-history of Jewish conversion, or worse still, creating a new pre-history entirely alien to the actual convert experience.

[121] Paul Hyams, 'Faith, Fealty and Jewish 'infideles' in Twelfth-Century England', in Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson, eds., *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 138-39.

2 Laws, Rules, and Regulations: The Evolution of Jewish-Specific Canon and Secular Legislation

The legislation concerning the Jews enacted between 1190 and 1290 tells a very important part of the story of the Jewish community in England. The legislation helped to shape the development of the Jews' relations with both the crown and church, and shows the manner in which those relations changed over the century. Moreover, it also shows the increasingly restrictive legal environment that Jews converting to Christianity were leaving behind. Why did some Jews attempt to convert to Christianity? It is my contention in this chapter that the increasing restrictiveness of law relating to the Jewish community created a push factor towards conversion, and one that became more pronounced over time. This chapter does not make an explicit comparison of Christians and Jews under the law, but rather contains a discussion of the relative legal position of Jews over the course of the thirteenth century; English Jews might very well have believed that had they been Christian, they would have been better off. There is a certain amount of difficulty in defining a conceptual framework for discussing the two separate traditions of law at the same time and in a meaningful way. The Jewish-specific secular and canonical legislation in England up to 1290 regulated similar things at different times, similar things at similar times, and different things at different times. Some overlapping subject matter did exist between the two: the conciliar and synodal legislation in England between 1219 and 1287 covered a large portion of what the secular legislation of England concerning Jews from the thirteenth century covered. Much of what was contained in the Jewish-specific secular legislation had its roots in the English church's councils and synods of the thirteenth century, some of which was in turn based on pre-existing canon law. There were at least two pieces of legislation in the secular sphere that appear to have had a solely secular origin.[1] Of the major themes covered in the conciliar and synodal legislation, five of them

[1]These were the legislation of 1269, and the Statute of the Jewry in 1275. See discussion below, on pp. 58 and 60.

had previously occurred in the conciliar and synodal corpus and then occurred in the secular legislation.[2] This would seem to indicate that the church's views on many things that concerned Jews actually defined the secular government's attitude towards those same things.

Broadly speaking, the corpus of legislation, administrative acts, rules, and regulations can be divided into two categories: what regulated business and financial activities, and what did not. The latter category included regulations concerning lifestyle and private life. These two categories can be further subdivided into legislation or administrative acts that attempted to regulate a single problem, and those acts that attempted to regulate numerous problems at once. There is also the question of what were enforceable regulations and what were not. My own view is closer to that of Richardson, who maintained that

> Conciliar decrees against the Jews were, in fact, not enforced because they were unenforceable...If, indeed, we were to assume that Jewish affairs could be regulated by ecclesiastical authority, however exalted, we should grievously distort the picture we ought to draw of the condition in which Jews lived in medieval English society, and we should misrepresent the nature of the authority that governed their conduct and of the law under which they fell[3]

than to that of Roth, who believed the opposite.[4] Anything ecclesiastical was only indirectly enforceable; the Jewish community was unlikely to be directly responsive to any kind of spiritual sanction. Conversely, anything secular was directly enforceable, but only if the crown so chose.[5] Finally, the church's position vis-à-vis the Jews during the thirteenth century in England was never very enlightened, as is made obvious in the ecclesiastical statutes, but their position throughout the century never changed. The crown's position, on the other hand, began as the granting of privileges and the confirmation of liberties established during a period of comfortable

[2]In no particular order, these were the prohibition against Christian nurses suckling Jewish children; the prohibition against Christians acting as servants for Jews; the obligation for Jews to wear the identifying tablet on their clothing; the prohibition against Jews receiving bibles and ecclesiastical vestments and ornaments; and the prohibition against the building of new synagogues.
[3]Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 180.
[4]Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, pp. 95-6.
[5]For an example, see discussion on the wearing of the Jewish tablet below, on p. 38.

relations between the two parties. Then, under the influence of canonical, conciliar, and synodal decrees, it became progressively more restrictive towards the Jews, and provided a point of departure for the ultimate crumbling of relations. What had happened in France and the Rhineland in the period between the first two crusades eventually came to pass in England during the thirteenth century; as Gilchrist put it, 'the authorities were able to afford the Jews better physical protection, but the Jews' overall status continued to decline.'[6] This decline, on display in the laws, rules, and regulations introduced to administer the Jewish community in England, will be charted in this chapter.

Though the earliest surviving piece of conciliar and synodal legislation for the English church does not appear until 1219,[7] the first surviving secular piece is an 1190 charter of liberties that was granted to Isaac, son of Rabbi Josce, and to his children and men.[8] This grant of franchises was, essentially, a promise to treat specific Jews—Isaac and his men—in a certain way, and was not promulgated by being sent to any justices. Isaac was one of the wealthiest Jews in England at the time,[9] owned houses in both Rouen[10] and London,[11] and was a lender of not insignificant amounts to Henry II.[12] The charter was issued by Richard, and was a reissue of a charter from Henry II who had issued it to the Jews of England and Normandy, and was reissued by John in 1201.[13] There are two possibilities as to why the charter may have been issued to Isaac: either Isaac stood at the head of both communities of Jews and the charter applied to every Jew in England and

[6]Gilchrist, 'The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades', p. 9.
[7]See discussion below, on p. 40.
[8]Rymer's *Foedera*, ed. Adam Clarke and Frederick Holbrooke (London, 1816), i/i: p. 51. There was a small piece of legislation before this touching the Jews, in Henry II's Assize of Arms. The seventh clause of that legislation ran *Item nullus Judaeus loricam vel aubergellum penes se retineat, sed ea vendat, vel det, vel alio modo a se removeat, ita quod remaneant in servitio regis* (see *Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History*, ed. William Stubbs, rev. H.W.C. Davis, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1921), p. 183). It is unclear if the Jews had weapons at all, or for any other reason than occasionally as gages for debts.
[9]Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 65.
[10]Ibid., p. 2.
[11]Ibid., p. 8.
[12]Ibid., p. 60.
[13]See discussion on p. 35.

Normandy, or there was no general regrant of charters, but an individual who was willing to pay enough got a regrant. This second option seems more likely, as the charter was only given to the people it concerned. The charter was wide-ranging, in that Isaac and his men were allowed to reside in 'our land' freely (presumably this meant both Richard's continental possessions as well as England) and they might go wherever they wished; Isaac and his men might be judged by their Jewish peers in any quarrel arising with a Christian; the body of a dead Jew was not to be kept above ground after his death and his heir was to have all of his money and debts; Isaac and his men were allowed to take in pawn whatever they liked as a pledge for a debt—with the exception of church property and bloodstained-garments; they might sell their pledges after having held them for at least a year and a day (this likely meant movables only); in the context of litigation they might swear their oaths on the Torah; and Isaac and his men were exempt from all customs and tolls in the kingdom. The charter also laid down the rules concerning the process of dispute resolution between Christians and Jews, as well as dispute resolution for lending money. In criminal cases, the Jew was quit of any appeal that lacked a witness (on the Jew's own oath), and in cases that involved disputes over money, the Jew needed only to prove the original debt—the interest was to be proven by the Christian debtor. The existence of a debt proved the existence of interest *ipso facto*; this last proviso presumably referred to the length of time that interest had been running on the debt, given that bonds were undated at this point.

A misconception that might arise out of a reading of this set of regulations is the assumption that the second-to-last paragraph meant that the Jews were the king's property.[14] In actuality, the sentence was meant to indicate that the Jews were to be allowed to move about Richard's land with their chattels just as though those chattels were the king's. Essentially, the Jews were to enjoy a privileged position, which fits nicely with the prohibition against charging the Jews tolls, customs, and

[14] *Liceat eis ire quocunque voluerint cum omnibus catallis eorum, sicut nostre res proprie, & nulli liceat eos retinere neque illas eis prohibere.* See Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 51b.

the modiation of wine (the right of the king to exact a duty on the wine). It is not clear, given that this is the first surviving set of regulations, how much it changed from that which came before it. However, given that it is a reissue, it is likely to have been very similar in content to the charter upon which it was based, apart from the fact that the previous grant was to all the Jews of England and Normandy, and this grant was only to Ysaac and his children and men. A noticeable difference from the original charter is the change from the first person singular that was in use in nearly all chancery documents from 1066 to 1189, to 'the plural of majesty in all documents issued under the king's name'.[15] Thus, the dispositive clause *Sciatis nos concessisse, & presenti carta nostra confirmasse* at the beginning of the charter clearly marks it as having been reissued in 1190 or later. There is no indication, however, as to whether or not the witness list at the bottom of the charter simply meant that those five men merely witnessed the charter, or whether they actually participated in a decision to reissue it. Three of these men were Richard's office holders in Normandy and Anjou, the charter was dated at Rouen, and the charter was given by the hand of the Bishop of Ely, which made this grant essentially an Anglo-Norman document.[16]

The 1194 provisions[17] were markedly different from the 1190 charter. They were of dual purpose—to legislate in respect of Jewish business activities, and to act as instruction to the justices about to depart on eyre. The provisions provided for the establishment of chirograph chests in six or seven places and the process by which the chests were to be governed, followed by setting the price of a chirograph at $3d$. The process for dividing these chirographs was set out: one part was to be sealed with the seal of the debtor and given to the Jew, and the other placed in

[15]Pierre Chaplais, *English Royal Documents: King John-Henry IV 1199-1461* (Oxford, 1971), p. 13.

[16]There was a second charter issued by Richard, also a reissue of a Henry II charter, and itself reissued by John (see discussion below, on p. 35) that granted privileges to the Jews. As per Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', p. 1138, the charter allowed for '...jurisdictional autonomy in deciding all intra-communal disputes other than those relating to major crimes...[and]...it also made certain provisions about the procedures to be followed in such cases when they involved only members of the Jewish community'. Brand cites C 52/21, m.3.

[17]Stubbs, *Select Charters*, pp. 253, 256-57.

the chirograph chest. Two lawful Christians, two lawful Jews, and two scribes were to administer each chest. The establishment of a single roll recording debts was required, as well as three rolls recording the receipts of payments to Jews: one for the two Christian chirographers, one for the two Jewish administrators, and one for the keeper of the roll of debts. These regulations also required that all future loans be made in this way, and mandated that no change of bonds was to be made except before a majority of the chirographers.

The second purpose of the legislation was to act as instruction to the justices going on eyre in 1194—'...they were enjoined to conduct an inquiry into the events of 1190. Any person who had been implicated in the attacks and had not yet compounded for his offence was to be arrested'.[18] The justices were to investigate who had killed the Jews, and were to find out what pledges they had held at their deaths, the worth of those pledges, as well as the worth of their chattels, debts, and lands, and all of the debts of the deceased Jews were to be taken into the king's hand.[19] The instructions were very clear, given the consequences of this latest pogrom: the king had lost far too much revenue—and potential revenue—to let the massacre go unpunished. These instructions were part of a larger set of general instructions to the justices. Of the 24 chapters that made up the instructions, only two concerned the Jews.

Under these provisions, the Jews were also mandated to have recorded everything they owned. The requirement included all debts, gages, lands, houses, rents, and possessions, and the Jews were also to expose other Jews' dishonesty in the recording of property. This recording was presumably to be done in a public way, otherwise the system of self-reporting would have been easily exploitable. The same also applied to clippers of money and forgers of charters: the Jews were mandated to

[18] Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 28.

[19] *Item de interfectoribus Judaeorum, qui sint; et de vadiis Judaeorum interfectorum, et catallis et terries et debitis et cartis; et quis ea habuerit, et quis quantum eis debuerit, et quae vadia habuerint, et quis ea teneat, et quantum valeant, et quis exitus inde habuerit et quos; et omnia vadia et debita Judaeorum interfectorum capiantur in manu Regis; et qui ad occisionem Judaeorum fuerunt et non fecerunt finem cum domino rege vel justitiariis suis, capiantur et non deliberentur nisi per dominum regem vel justitiarios suos* (see Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 253).

secretly reveal these people. Specific punishment was mentioned if a Jew did not record everything truthfully: his person and all his possessions and chattels would be forfeit to the king, and he would never be able to recover that which he had concealed.[20] The 1194 provisions differed from the 1190 charter in tone but also in content, in that the 1190 provisions made no mention of punishments and, really, nothing that could be construed as unhappiness on the part of the king towards the Jews. The 1194 provisions mentioned 'concealing' or 'concealment' on the part of the Jews five times—clearly something had happened between 1190 and 1194 that caused the king to think somewhat differently about the Jews. It is likely that these regulations were enacted in order to enforce and facilitate governmental control of Jewish moneylending. This involved streamlining the process of lending and the writing of obligations, requiring all Jewish financiers to record their main lending transactions; this also continued the reforms leading to the institutionalisation of the Exchequer of the Jews.[21]

By the same token, it is unlikely that the 1194 provisions would discuss the punishment for concealing the truth about possessions if the king had not suspected that it might turn into a problem.[22] There seems to be no continuity between the 1190 charter and the 1194 legislation, but this is less surprising when it is considered that the 1190 charter was a reissue, and not in fact brand new. The 1194 provisions essentially formed a policy regarding chirograph chests that lasted in some form until 1290; it is likely that Hubert Walter, the king's justiciar, dreamt up the chirograph system in the form in which it was seen in 1194 (with the added safeguard of the foot of fine). He had an unparalleled ability to organise financial business. His emphasis on the control and recording of Jewish assets—as well as the implementation (if not the invention) of organisational devices designed to streamline governmental

[20] *Omnia debita et vadia Judaeorum inbrevientur, terrae, domus, redditus et possessiones. Judaeus vero, qui aliquid horum celaverit, sit in forisfactura domini regis de corpore suo et concelamento, et de omnibus possessionibus suis et omnibus catallis suis, nec unquam concelamentum Judaeo recuperare licebit* (see Stubbs, *Select Charters*, p. 256).

[21] Stacey, 'The Massacres of 1189-90 and the Origins of the Jewish Exchequer', p. 113.

[22] For a case where a Jew and his wife were accused of concealing goods, see *Pipe Roll, 1204*, p. 97, as in Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', p. 36 n. 102.

processes— changed the chirograph system (the 'final concord' of an agreement).[23] The endorsement on the first such concord stated

> This is the first chirograph that was made in the lord king's court in the form of three chirographs according to the command of his lordship of Canterbury and other barons of the lord king, to the end that by this form a record could be made to be passed to the Treasurer to put in the Treasury.[24]

Walter's originally conceived bipartite chirograph system lasted until 1233,[25] though there is evidence of the dual-clerk system that he had originally envisaged not being followed.[26]

On 10 April 1201, John reissued the charter[27] that had been issued by Richard in 1190, which was itself a reissued charter. The two charters were similar in content, and this charter was reissued for the same reason as Richard had done eleven years earlier—simply to confirm to the Jews that they still possessed all the liberties and customs that they had formerly possessed—but this time it was a general regrant to all the Jews of England and Normandy, as opposed to being simply for a single Jew and his men. The fact that the charter was not addressed to a single person (as in 1190, to Isaac) made it a much more generic and general charter than that of 1190. The consistent reissue of the same charter, however, meant that the king was paid for the reissue, and in this case, the Jews of England offered a fine of 4,000*m.* for it.[28] This charter was similar in tone to the 1190 charter, in that it was very conciliatory, and spoke mostly of the privileges that the Jews possessed. The second charter of 10 April 1201 was addressed only to the Jews of England.[29] It discussed the jurisdiction of the crown over the crimes committed amongst the Jews, and

[23] C.R. Cheney, *Hubert Walter* (London, 1967), pp. 93-5.
[24] Ibid., p. 96.
[25] See discussion on p. 48.
[26] See discussion in *PEJ*, vi, p. 6 n. 4.
[27] *Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*, i/i, ed. T.D. Hardy (London, 1837), p. 93. Hereafter '*Rot. Chart.*'.
[28] This charter was reissued again in 1249 and 1271, in the form of inspeximuses on the Charter Rolls. For the 1249 entry, see *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1226-57*, p. 347. For the 1271 entry, see *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, p. 164. For the fine, see *Rotuli de Oblatis et Finibus in Turri Londinensi asservati, tempore regis Johannis*, ed. Thomas Duffus Hardy (London, 1835), p. 133.
[29] *Rot. Chart.*, p. 93b. This charter was a reissue of legislation issued by Richard on 22 March 1190 (and referred back to a charter of Henry II that is now lost); see also C 52/21, m.3.

claimed jurisdiction over all the crimes one would expect it to: homicide, maiming, assault, house-breaking, rape, theft, arson, and treasure-trove. Essentially, this legislation provided for an inquest by the king if there was no accuser. Irrespective of its appearance, this legislation was not primarily about crime since it allowed for litigation between Jews on matters other than the above crimes to be heard in Jewish courts, and according to Jewish law. The crown pleas mentioned above were still to be heard in the king's courts.

In 1202 this charter was put to the test, when Bonefand the Jew of Bedford was accused by Robert of Sutton of 'shamefully mutilating' and thereby causing the death of Robert's nephew. Bonefand offered the king a mark for an inquest, and the jurors found him not guilty.[30] There was no mention of witnesses, nor of an oath by Bonefand, but presumably the jurors were all Jewish—or at least they should have been according to the terms of this charter.[31] In another case from June 1224, the charter was explicitly mentioned when a Jew named Bonevie Mutun was accused of killing a Christian man named William. When asked whether he wished to be cleared of the death by putting himself upon a jury of twelve Christians and twelve Jews, he answered that he had 'no wish to put himself on any jury in breach of the franchise which the Jews have by king John's charter'.[32] Bonevie was referring to the fourth provision of the charter, which allowed that an accused Jew needed nothing more than an oath to be quit of the crimes that belonged to the crown[33]—homicide being one of these. Despite the charter supporting him, an inquest by both Christians and Jews did occur, but there was no judgment entered on the roll.[34]

The change between this second charter and the first charter of 10 April was noticeable. John reissued the first charter with the intent to reaffirm the liberties of the Jews, and then issued this second charter—one that discussed criminal justice and

[30] *Select Pleas of the Crown*, ed. F.W. Maitland (Selden Society, vol. 1)(London, 1888), no. 59.
[31] *Rot. Chart.*, p. 93b.
[32] *Select Cases of Procedure Without Writ Under Henry III*, eds. H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles (Selden Society, vol. 60)(London, 1941), p. 3.
[33] *Rot. Chart.*, p. 93a.
[34] *Select Cases of Procedure Without Writ Under Henry III*, p. 5. Bonevie did forfeit his house, however, and a fine of 100*m.* was levied on the Jews of London. See p. 5 n. 1.

jurisdiction—to confirm that he was legislating from a position of strength regarding the Jews. The tone of the second charter was much more restrictive towards the Jews, but it discussed what the Jews might not do regarding jurisdiction, as opposed to the 1190 and 1201 reissues of the charters which simply confirmed liberties wholesale. In practice, however, the second charter was likely not significantly more restrictive; it was a confirmation of communal autonomy in dispute resolution.

The administrative act of 30 March 1218,[35] addressed to the sheriff of Worcestershire and given at Oxford, implemented the requirement for the special Jewish tablet that was to be worn on the Jews' clothing. It stipulated that any Jew walking in public was to wear two white linen tablets on his breast so that it might be possible to differentiate Jews from Christians. This act was also sent to the sheriffs of Gloucestershire, Warwickshire, Lincolnshire, Oxfordshire, Northamptonshire, and to the mayor and sheriffs of London. It had its origins in the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215, in canon 68, where both male and female Jews as well as Saracens (read: Muslims) 'in every christian province and at all times, are to be distinguished in public from other people by the character of their dress—seeing moreover that this was enjoined upon them by Moses himself, as we read'.[36] This decree was implemented in England with a dual purpose: it was a method of raising money—mandating the wearing of the badge, and then allowing the Jews to pay a fine not to wear it—and, as Richardson writes, it was 'a half-hearted secular concession to the decrees of the Lateran Council'.[37] Royal legislation in France did not take the same approach; legislation from 1219 made no mention of the badge, nor of the requirement that Jews wear it.[38] There is ample evidence of Jews paying fines in order that they might not be required to wear the badge.[39] These fines ranged from 4*l.* in Easter

[35] *Rotuli litterarum clausarum in Turri Londinensi asservati*, ed. T.D. Hardy (London, 1833), vol. i, p. 378b. This is also found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 151.
[36] *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, ed. Norman P. Tanner S.J. (London, 1990), p. 266.
[37] Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 182.
[38] Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, p. 145.
[39] *Receipt rolls of the fourth, fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Henry III, Easter 1220, 1221, 1222 (Receipt rolls 3b, 4, and 5).*, ed. Nicholas Barratt (Pipe Roll Society New Series, vol. 52)(London, 2003), nos. 2617, 2619, 2678, 2724, 2761, 2763-68, 2807, 2809, 2821-22, 2874, 2899; no. 2619 is mis-referenced in the index as no. 2819. See also *Receipt rolls of the seventh and*

term 1221, paid by Mossey son of Abraham in Norfolk and Suffolk,[40] to 11*d.* in Michaelmas term 1224, paid by Isaac son of Elias in Oxfordshire.[41] Generally, the fines were for exemptions for individuals, but at least five times, entire communities paid fines in order that they might not be required to wear the badge.[42] The lack of enforcement in return for payment was by design. In England, 'the king and his council were in a position both to enforce the Jewish badge and then to profit by allowing Jews to fine for its relaxation'.[43] The Church had re-enacted this in the Council of the province of Canterbury at Oxford on 17 April 1222, and in that act, outlined precise specifications for the tablet: it was to be two inches wide and four in length, be of a different colour than the garment itself, and was to be woollen.[44] Despite this being reissued, there is no evidence that the badge requirement for Jews was actually enforced between 1218 and 1253.[45] The wearing of the badge was mentioned in passing in the synodal statutes of Bishop Richard de Wich for the diocese of Chichester, dated between 1245 and 1252, but this is likely to have been unenforceable and more of a general reiteration of church doctrine.[46] Other ecclesiastical legislation survives which was much less general: the synodal statutes of Bishop Fulk Basset for the diocese of London, dated between 1245 and 1259,[47] specifically recalled the authority of the Lateran Council, and also gave the precise measurements of two by four inches that were last seen in the ecclesiastical legislation

---

eighth years of the reign of King Henry III, Easter 1223, Michaelmas 1224 (Receipt rolls 6 and 7)., ed. Nicholas Barratt (Pipe Roll Society New Series, vol. 55)(London, 2007), nos. 1959, 4158. See also Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 179 n. 3, 4.

[40] *Receipt rolls of the fourth, fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Henry III, Easter 1220, 1221, 1222*, no. 2761.

[41] *Receipt rolls of the seventh and eighth years of the reign of King Henry III, Easter 1223, Michaelmas 1224*, no. 1959.

[42] *Receipt rolls of the fourth, fifth and sixth years of the reign of King Henry III, Easter 1220, 1221, 1222*, nos. 2822, 2899. These were the Jews of Stamford and London. For the Jews of Canterbury, Hereford, and Oxford, see Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 179.

[43] Nicholas Vincent, 'Two papal letters on the wearing of the Jewish badge, 1221 and 1229', *Jewish Historical Studies* 34 (1994-6), p. 215.

[44] *Councils & Synods with other documents relating to the English church II, part I (1205-1265)*, eds. F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964), p. 121 no. 47.

[45] Vincent, 'Two papal letters on the wearing of the Jewish badge, 1221 and 1229', p. 219.

[46] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, pp. 465-66 no. 71. That the bishop was simply reiterating this without it being terribly significant is lent credence by the fact that there were no Jewish communities as such in the diocese of Chichester.

[47] Ibid., p. 651 no. 84.

of 17 April 1222. The king promulgated the Statute concerning the Jews in 1253 and the badge was mentioned again, albeit briefly, but this legislation lacked the precise technical details that had characterized the previous regulations on the matter. Even though 1253 had marked a change in the tone of the rules imposed on the Jews, it is still not certain that the badge was worn by all the Jews after this point,[48] or indeed, before this point. This legislation resurfaced in Bishop Giles of Bridport's synodal statutes for the diocese of Salisbury from 1257, though apparently as somewhat of an afterthought since it was the last sentence of the legislation, and simply referred to the requirement of 'distinction of dress'.[49]

The preoccupation with differentiating Jews from Christians surfaced again in the Statutes of the Jewry in 1275,[50] though in its content that legislation did not refer back to the 1218 secular legislation, nor to the 1222 canon law legislation. The fifth article somewhat echoed the 1239 legislation and the 1253 legislation. It still dealt with the supervision and identification of the Jews after all—but it mandated that each Jew aged seven and over should wear the badge in the form of two tablets of yellow felt, six inches by three, on his outer garments. This was a change from the previous legislation that had given measurements for the badge,[51] and had not given any age requirements for the wearing of the badge. This solution to the problem of differentiating Jews from Christians was brought up again in 1279,[52] and at that point implied that the 1275 legislation concerning the wearing of the badge had only applied to Jewish men.[53] There was no mention of measurements, as in the 1275 regulations for Jewish men, but the stipulation did exist in both pieces of legislation that the badge be worn on the outer garment. The 1282 legislation was addressed to the justices of the Jews, and again discussed the patch on the outer clothing for

[48]Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 180.
[49]Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, pp. 560-61 no. 27.
[50]See discussion on p. 64.
[51]See discussion on p. 39.
[52]See discussion on p. 64.
[53]Compare the 1275 wording '...and that each Jew after he shall be seven years old, shall wear a badge on his outer garment...' (see *The Statutes of the Realm*, i, ed. Alexander Luders (London, 1810), pp. 221-221a) with the 1279 wording 'The king wills that Jewish women shall henceforth bear a sign on their outer garment as Jewish men do...' (see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 565).

Jewish women, and reminded the justices to cause this to be proclaimed.[54] The king was noted as having witnessed this legislation at Westminster.[55] The final word on the matter was promulgated in the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel (or Quivel) for the diocese of Exeter on 16 April 1287. In this last set of regulations, the Bishop and his synod strictly ordered that Jews of either sex wear the Jewish tablet, and that the tablet be of a minimum size of two inches by four (*latitudo duorum digitorum et longitudo quatuor sit ad minus*). This piece of legislation was very clear as to why it required the badge: its stated aim was to prevent the excesses of 'prohibited miscegenation'.[56]

The prohibition against Christians suckling Jewish children first occurred in a specifically English context in the surviving conciliar and synodal legislation in the statutes of Bishop William de Blois for the diocese of Worcester, from 24 September 1219.[57] It occurred again later in the synodal statutes of the same Bishop William de Blois for the diocese of Worcester, but this time in 1229.[58] Christian women were to be excommunicated should they suckle Jewish children, and nothing more was elaborated concerning this. The secular legislation picked up the theme of suckling in 1234, when the king sent a missive to the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk outlining the prohibition.[59] The church re-enacted this legislation in the synodal statutes of Bishop Walter de Cantilupe for the same diocese of Worcester, on 26 July 1240,[60] where the wording of the legislation was identical, and again in the synodal statutes of Bishop Fulk Basset for the diocese of London (dated between 1245 and 1259).[61] Bishop Fulk noted that ecclesiastical penalties were to be used not only against the Jews should they contravene this prohibition, but also against the

[54] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 176. The original text is found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 599.
[55] This witnessing clause appears in the *Foedera* text, but not on the Close Roll. See previous footnote.
[56] *Councils & Synods with other documents relating to the English church II, part II (1265-1313)*, eds. F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964), pp. 1044-45.
[57] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, p. 55 no. 6. This was based on an earlier papal decretal from July 1205. See X 5.6.13.
[58] Ibid., p. 177 no. 44.
[59] See discussion on p. 44.
[60] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, p. 318 no. 91.
[61] Ibid., p. 651 no. 84.

wet-nurses themselves—something the prior statutes did not mention. The secular arm also enacted this prohibition for good measure, in the Statute concerning the Jews from 31 January 1253,[62] when the legislation of 1234 was reiterated. Though it is impossible to say whether or not Bishop William de Blois ever got over his fascination with the suckling habits of Jewish children, the prohibition against having Christian wet-nurses was again re-enacted in the synodal statutes of Bishop Giles of Bridport for the diocese of Salisbury in 1257.[63] Finally, in 1287, the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel (or Quivel) for the diocese of Exeter mandated that Jews having Christian servants in their houses for the purposes of nourishing their children was illegal.[64]

The prohibition against Jews receiving bibles and ecclesiastical vestments or ornaments occurred several times between the conciliar and synodal legislation and the secular legislation. It can be argued that this prohibition first appeared in the charter of 1190 granted to Isaac, where Jews were prohibited from taking church property in pawn as a pledge for a debt. Though it does not specifically mention bibles, vestments, or ornaments, it can be assumed that 'church property' included those items, and they were therefore prohibited from being possessed by Jews. Apart from this somewhat questionable beginning, the next time this prohibition appeared was in the statutes of Bishop William de Blois for the diocese of Worcester, from 24 September 1219, when it was prohibited that Jews receive these items as a pledge, or indeed, in any other way. This was not only a concern in England; in Northern France, legislation from September 1206 forbade similar things, though it was royal legislation, not ecclesiastical.[65] The synodal statutes for an unidentified English diocese (dated between 1222 and 1225) also legislated against this, but interestingly, a caveat was inserted: it was prohibited, unless urgent necessity might require it, and the bishop of the diocese had given his agreement beforehand.[66] This piece of

[62]See discussion on p. 44.
[63]Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, pp. 560-61 no. 27.
[64]Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part II*, pp. 1044-45 no. 49.
[65]Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, p. 144. This legislation was repeated in 1219.
[66]Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, p. 149 no. 54.

legislation was also not solely about Jews, since it referred equally to both Jews and Christians. This was also the only piece of legislation concerning this topic that allowed the pawning of church property, albeit in specific cases. It did not fit at all with the rest of the legislation of the period. The synodal statutes of Bishop Peter des Roches for the diocese of Winchester in 1224 also legislated against this in a generic fashion, referring to both Christians and Jews. But, in this legislation, a punishment was threatened to those who might have already gone against the prohibition: they were to be excommunicated until they made amends, and were to be denied all commerce with Christians.[67] These two last pieces of legislation referred to both Christians and Jews rather than just Jews. Rounding off the church's prohibitions against this, Bishop William legislated this again in his synodal statutes from 1229, where the wording was much the same as his original statutes from 1219.

It appears as though the church thought this matter closed in England by 1229, because it was not repeated again in conciliar or synodal statutes in the thirteenth century. The secular legislation, however, continued legislating against Jews having in their possession church property. Notably, in the legislation of 4 April 1233 made at Canterbury, Jews were prohibited from giving loans on the surety of ecclesiastical vessels.[68] This was exactly the same as prohibiting Jews from having church property in their possession. The secular legislation contained one further prohibition against Jews owning church property. The July 1246 legislation contained the most strongly worded of these prohibitions. It also specified one of the harsher penalties for contravening: all the chattels of the offending Jew were to be forfeited, as well as the seizure of their person. These regulations of July 1246 had two different halves.[69] The first half was not relevant to Jews at all; it was sent to the sheriff of Northampton, and simply made mention of feudal obligations. The second half

[67] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, p. 131 no. 32.

[68] In H.G. Richardson, 'Glanville Continued', *Law Quarterly Review* 54 (1938), pp. 392-93, the fact is discussed that 'there seems to be no trace of it [this 1233 legislation] on any roll of the chancery, where, clearly, the ordinance was drawn up, nor in any surviving book or roll of the exchequer...' (*l.c.* p. 393.) It survives on BM MS. Additional 25005, fo.63b and Harleian MS. 323, fo.66b. It is printed *l.c.*, p. 393, and Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 294.

[69] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 476.

concerned the Jews, and reiterated the prohibition against their taking bibles in gage, holding chalices or ecclesiastical ornaments, and specified the penalty should this legislation be contravened: all the chattels of the offending Jew were to be forfeited. This was a reiteration of portions of the 1190 charter as well as the 1233 legislation which forbade the same things. It is likely that this was simply a reminder that such behaviour was disallowed, with the harshest possible penalties for disobedience. The first part of this legislation did not really fit with the second part and so it appears as though the Jewish-specific portion of this legislation was an afterthought, given the nature of the first half.

The prohibition against Christians acting as servants for Jews was more widely legislated on both the church and secular sides. As with the prohibition against Christian nurses suckling Jewish children, this was first legislated by Bishop William de Blois in his statutes for the diocese of Worcester on 24 September 1219—but was mainly concerned with female servants who stayed overnight in Jewish homes—followed again by the same prohibition being re-enacted by Bishop William in 1229, again at Worcester. There was precedent for this: the Third Lateran Council in 1179 had also legislated against cohabitation;[70] Anne Duggan's view that that council's legislation had profoundly affected the provincial and diocesan legislation across Europe is certainly proven in this case.[71] It seems as though, in these two pieces of legislation, Bishop William's only concern was that female Christian servants not spend the night in Jewish lodgings, as opposed to simply serving Jews. This regulation evolved as the century wore on. The council of the province of Canterbury at Oxford had mentioned this on 17 April 1222, but it was only spoken of in general terms, as did the king's missive to the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk in 1234.[72] By 1234, however, the prohibition had been taken from simply disallowing female

[70] *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, p. 223-24.
[71] Anne Duggan, 'Conciliar Law 1123-1215: The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils', in Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (eds.), *The History of Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: from Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX* (Washington, 2008), p. 340.
[72] *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, pp. 13-14.

Christians from spending the night in Jewish homes (but presumably still being allowed to serve them during the day) to a complete prohibition against serving the Jews in any way whatsoever.[73] This was the first instance of this specific prohibition in the common law, but there was clearly no point in legislating against something that was not actually happening, so such arrangements must have been commonplace. This legislation was likely general, even though it was addressed to the sheriffs of only two counties, because it simply would not have made sense for Jews to be prohibited from having Christian servants only in Norfolk and Suffolk, and have had it be fine in the rest of the country.

The church seemed to be slow in picking up this thread that had started in the secular sphere, because when it was again re-enacted in the synodal statutes of Bishop Walter de Cantilupe for the diocese of Worcester on 26 July 1240,[74] the prohibition was still against female Christian servants spending the night in Jewish lodgings, and not against serving Jews.[75] The secular legislation of 31 January 1253 was markedly different in format from all preceding Jewish-specific legislation.[76] The preceding legislation usually discussed a single point of law, such as the administration of chirograph chests or the proper application of interest rates, but that of 1253 made an attempt to cover most aspects of Jewish lives in England—specifically, their non-commercial activities and private lives. It began by stating that no Jew was to remain in England without serving the king, and that as soon as a Jew was born, he or she must serve the king in some way. This became important in the lead-up to the expulsion in 1290. Apart from the reiteration of the restrictions on the movements of Jews and the prohibition against Christian wet-nurses for Jewish children, everything

[73] Apart from the prohibition against Christian women suckling Jewish children which had been legislated canonically in 1219, this was the only other subject in the 1234 regulations sent to the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk. The prohibition against Jewish servants *cuchaunz e levaunz od Gyus* made a reappearance in the undated legislation of *c.*1275-79. See discussion on p. 65, below.

[74] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, p. 318 no. 91.

[75] The secular arm legislated this matter again in the Statute concerning the Jews on 31 January 1253, banning all Christians from serving any Jew or Jewess. The requirement that Jews be able to be of service to the king or face exile was mentioned as early as the 1233 legislation; see discussion on p. 48.

[76] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, pp. 312-13. This is also found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 293.

else contained within this piece of legislation was new from a secular standpoint;[77] this legislation also specifically mentioned that no male or female Christian serve any Jew or Jewess, nor should they eat together, nor live in the houses of the Jews.

The church picked up where the king had left off, with the synodal statutes of Bishop Giles of Bridport for the diocese of Salisbury in 1257.[78] The church had finally realised that its wording was not only ambiguous but inconsistent with the secular laws concerning the same, and Bishop Giles prefaced his statute with the comment that many Jews had scorned the prohibition against retaining female Christian servants. Irrespective of the fact that the church had yet to specifically legislate anything other than the prohibition against having Christian female servants sleep in a Jew's home—apart from a similar indication contained earlier in the synodal statutes of Bishop Richard De Wich for the diocese of Chichester, dated between 1245 and 1252, where cohabitation was prohibited—Bishop Giles sentenced all would-be and past female Christian servants and midwives of Jews to excommunication.[79] He also mentioned sexual intercourse with married and unmarried Christian women as being particularly scandalous to the Christian faith.[80] Though it is impossible to know for certain, perhaps Bridport's prohibition of interfaith sexual relations was not simply abstract legalism, but rather a real-world defence of what he perceived as Christian bloodlines 'undiluted' by Judaism. Similarly, the bishop might have been thinking that Jewish men having sex with Christian women subverted the 'proper' relations between Christians and Jews; Christians were always superior, and had no business engaging in sexual relations with their religious inferiors.[81]

Bishop Fulk Basset lent his name to this cause in his synodal statutes for the diocese of London (dated between 1245 and 1259) but used the justification of 'scandal' arising in God's church as a result of cohabitation with Jews. The 1253

[77] See discussion on pp. 40 and 52.
[78] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, pp. 560-61 no. 27.
[79] It is puzzling that the threat of excommunication should appear between 1245 and 1252, and not earlier, given that it is based on an earlier decretal dated to the third Lateran Council, in 1179. See X 5.6.5.
[80] This was all based on earlier canon law prohibitions. See X 5.6.2; X 5.6.5; X 5.6.8; and X 5.6.13.
[81] See also discussion in Hyams, 'The Jewish Minority in Medieval England, 1066-1290', p. 274.

Statute of the Jewry forbade 'secret familiarity' (read: carnal relations) between Jews and Christians.[82] The king re-enacted Bishop Fulk's legislation in 1279, decreeing that no Christians serve Jews in any way. At this point, the legislation had evolved to include all Christians, and no longer only female Christians.[83] The 1282 legislation that was addressed to the justices of the Jews reiterated the prohibition against Jews having Christians as servants in their houses.[84] The church then had one last attempt at ensuring that all Christians were prohibited from serving Jews, in the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel (or Quivel) for the diocese of Exeter, on 16 April 1287, but used as its justification the idea that persistent familiarity would lead the simple-souled Christian servants to the Jewish perfidy, the perfidy being the Jewish faith generally, and specifically the potential apostatising from Christianity.

The prohibition against the building of new synagogues was also legislated fairly often during the thirteenth century in the conciliar and synodal statutes, but only once in the secular legislation.[85] In a specifically English context, it began as a prohibition in the statutes of the council of the province of Canterbury at Oxford, from 17 April 1222,[86] and stated simply that new synagogues were prohibited from being built, because of the many outrages recently committed and the ungrateful nature of the Jews. It did not specify the exact nature of these outrages, nor how the Jews were perceived to be ungrateful. There is a possible parallel with classical Roman law: 'The grant of freedom by the slaveholder was considered a favor or kindness (*beneficium*) for which the freed slave was expected to show gratitude. The

[82] In 1256 a Jew named Abraham Russell had a fine pardoned for having been 'defamed as having had to do with Letitia de Cerfmenistre, a Christian, of what pertains to the king touching such defamation...' See *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 532. Interestingly, Russell had also been indicted three years earlier for coin-clipping. See *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 184. Carnal relations between Jews and Christians were also touched on in the undated secular legislation of *c.*1275-79 (see discussion below, on p. 65).

[83] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 565-66. The original text is found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 570.

[84] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 176. The original text is found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 599.

[85] In the 1253 secular legislation, synagogues were referred to as *scole Judeorum*—Jewish schools. This was simply a different way of referring to a synagogue. See discussion in Hillaby, 'A *Domus Conversorum* at Bristol?', p. 5.

[86] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, p. 120 no. 46. This was based on an earlier decretal. See X 5.6.3.

appropriate behavior was called *obsequium*'.[87] This gratitude commonly denoted compliance to the will of the patron. In the context of the Jewish community in England, however, the perceived ingratitude was likely for being allowed to live in peaceful coexistence; the English Jewry enjoyed a relative level of safety at the pleasure of the king, and it is possible that their level of gratitude was not perceived as being visible enough. The prohibition against building new synagogues was furthered in the synodal statutes of Bishop Richard de Wich for the diocese of Chichester (dated between 1245 and 1252), which seemed to be a repeat of the earlier conciliar legislation.[88] The synodal statutes of Bishop Fulk Basset for the diocese of London (dated between 1245 and 1259) re-legislated this again in much the same terms as the church had before.[89] There was also a stipulation in the 1253 Statute concerning the Jews that no synagogues be in England except in those places where they had been during the time of King John. This was followed by mandating that the Jews worship in their synagogues in soft voices so that Christians might not hear them. Though the secular legislation took its cue from the conciliar legislation regarding the building of new synagogues, it appears that the church's position was somewhat tempered by the late 1280s. When the church had this re-legislated in the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel (or Quivel) for the diocese of Exeter, on 16 April 1287, it echoed the 1253 secular Statute concerning the Jews of 1253 and not the previous conciliar legislation of Bishop Fulk Basset dated between 1245 and 1259. It did not stipulate that the Jews could not build new synagogues, but rather that they were to be allowed to rebuild existing synagogues provided that they were not made bigger or more lavish.[90]

Apart from the previous categories of legislation, regulations, and administrative acts, what remained can be broadly subdivided into that which attempted to regulate business and finance, and that which attempted to regulate the private lives of the

[87]Sandra R. Joshel, *Slavery in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 2010), p. 44.
[88]Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, no. 71.
[89]Ibid., p. 651 no. 85.
[90]This was also based on an earlier decretal. See X 5.6.7.

Jews. The secular administrative legislation that was promulgated in the 1230s did not mix business and private regulations; each individual piece had either one or the other as its focus. The secular legislation of 4 April 1233 made at Canterbury was somewhat of a clarification and modification of the 1194 provisions, but also contained some new material.[91] The main point of the 1233 legislation was the reiteration that the chirograph system be used for Jewish debts—and the disallowing of tallies as a method of record keeping for debts[92]—but this time a tripartite system was instituted, as opposed to the bipartite system introduced in 1194. As of this 1233 legislation, the Christian debtor got a piece of the chirograph, the Jewish lender got a piece, and the foot was placed in the chirograph chest. The establishment of maximum interest on a debt at two pence in the pound per week was noted (with the attendant prohibition against charging compound interest), as well as the idea that should a Jew be judged to be poor or without resources (and thus not useful to the king) he should leave the kingdom by Michaelmas. This legislation also contained an insistence that the sum recorded as owing be the actual amount that was lent, as opposed to a larger amount that included interest, and a prohibition on 'penalty' clauses in bonds. In England, penalty clauses were in regular use by the 1170s. They had likely been introduced to England by Jewish moneylenders, though in the late twelfth century these penalty clauses were of the escalating variety, as opposed to the fixed variety that became the norm in the early thirteenth century.[93] In Jewish-lent bonds, escalating penalty clauses were only activated if the debtor failed to repay the loan on time; the penalty was due in addition to the agreed interest. Until penalty clauses were banned, there were generally two ways in which Jewish creditors might make a profit on a loan, and they might avail themselves of

[91] See discussion on p. 42.

[92] Richardson writes that the tally system was prohibited before 1220, then relaxed at some point before it was reimposed in 1233, and was then dropped after that (see Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 193). Despite the prohibition on tallies here, the undated legislation of *c.*1275-79 also touched on tallies outside the *archae*—it is hard to believe that this later legislation referred to tallies made in the mid-1230s. See discussion of the legislation of *c.*1275-79 below, on p. 65.

[93] Joseph Biancalana, 'Monetary Penalty Clauses in Thirteenth-Century England', *The Legal History Review* 73, no. 3-4, pp. 247-48.

one, the other, or both. A Jewish creditor might include the usury in the amount to be repaid, or, might append a penalty clause which was exacted on the debtor's default.[94] The move to fixed penalty clauses in the early thirteenth century was initiated by Christian creditors who could not exact escalating penalties because these were usurious. Christian creditors used fixed penalty clauses to ensure timely repayment of loans, or to replace other creditor protections such as a gage, pledge, or permission to distrain the debtor.[95] The secular conception of penalty clauses disagreed with the canonist stance; in canonist thought, a distinction was made between usury, which was a payment for the use of the loaned money, and interest. Thus, a loan could legitimately carry a penalty which compensated the creditor for the loss suffered when the debtor did not repay on time. The common law accepted the canonist theory that the debtor could avoid the penalty by prompt repayment of the loan; this same theory allowed that a fixed-sum penalty—as distinct from escalating—was legitimate compensation to the lender.[96]

The legislation ended with the reiteration that the Jews were prohibited from giving loans on the surety of ecclesiastical vessels and bloodstained clothing.[97] The tone of this legislation was quite different from that of prior examples, mostly because of the proviso that poor Jews leave the kingdom. This was the beginning of the idea that if a Jew was not useful to the king, he should leave the kingdom—a foreshadowing of sorts for the events of 1290.

The legislation of 1234, directed to the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk, discussed the restriction on the lending of money to Christians who held land by villeinage or socage of the king.[98] Though it was only addressed to the sheriffs of two counties, it appears as though it was intended for the entire kingdom. There is evidence on the

[94]Robin R. Mundill, 'Christian and Jewish lending patterns and financial dealings during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries', in P.R. Schofield and N.J. Mayhew, eds., *Credit and Debt in Medieval England, c.1180-c.1350* (Oxford, 2002), p. 48.

[95]Biancalana, 'Monetary Penalty Clauses in Thirteenth-Century England', p. 264.

[96]A.W. Brian Simpson, *A History of the Common Law of Contract: the Rise of the Action of Assumpsit* (Oxford, 1987), p. 114.

[97]This would be touched on in the undated legislation of *c.*1275-79 as well. See discussion on p. 65, below.

[98]*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 592.

Close Rolls that this legislation was applied in Hampshire.[99] In keeping with the theme of punishment that had begun to creep into the legislation, it was mentioned that should a Jew contravene this law in any way, he would lose his money, and the Christian borrower his land. Furthermore, should a Jew wish to lend money to such Christians, he was to do so on the surety of chattels and movables. This prohibiting of certain business activities was not something new, and nor was the legislation of a specific punishment, but the particulars were not seen in any prior legislation. The second 1234 missive from the king to the sheriffs of Norfolk and Suffolk discussed the private lives of the Jews.[100]

The 1235 legislation was addressed to the justices of the Jews, and in it the king mandated that in future, should the heir of a debtor owe a Jew a debt from his ancestor, no usury was to run during the minority of the debtor.[101] This was applied to an ongoing case, making the actual legislation upon which this was based a little earlier. Specifically, this piece of legislation had its origins in the 1215 issue of Magna Carta. Clause ten of that charter stated,

> If anyone has taken anything on loan from the Jews, more or less, and dies before that debt is paid, the debt is not to bear usury for as long as the heir is underage, from whomever he holds; and if that debt falls into our hands, we shall not take anything save the capital contained in the charter.[102]

The beginning of clause eleven went further: 'And if anyone dies, and owes a debt to the Jews, his wife is to have her dower, and is to pay nothing of that debt; and if children of the deceased, who are underage, remain, their needs are to be provided for in keeping with the tenement which was the deceased's...'[103] These two clauses were omitted in the later reissues of Magna Carta in 1216, 1217, and 1225, perhaps because the advisors to Henry III '...were unwilling to impair so useful a source of

[99] *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 465.
[100] See discussion above, on pp. 40 and 43.
[101] *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 214. The case concerned the land of William le Joynnur in London, which was the gage of Leo and Elias le Blund, Jews.
[102] David Carpenter, *Magna Carta* (London, 2015), p. 43.
[103] Ibid.

revenue'.[104] The 1235 legislation was relatively straightforward, and provided a basis for the 1236 legislation that followed, mirroring the 1235 legislation closely in both tone and content.

The 1236 legislation concerning the Jews was contained in chapter five of the Statute of Merton, and reiterated the proper application of usury.[105] It was not to be charged during the minority of the person who had inherited the debt, though the payment of the principal of the debt plus the interest up to the time of death of the debtor needed to be paid. There are two possibilities as to why this was re-legislated. Either the original legislation was not being followed to the satisfaction of the king or the barons, or, given that a legislative package was being put together, including this even though it had only been enacted the previous year was a way of garnering additional publicity for the measures. The barons may have had a say in this legislation because they played a large part in the drafting of the Statute of Merton, so it remains unclear whose idea it was to include this in the Statute. It could have been either the king or the barons. In all likelihood it was the barons' idea, as it was in their interests.

The 1239 legislation again discussed the administration of the chirograph chests,[106] and elaborated on themes established in 1194 and 1233 concerning the chirographers and chirograph chests. As opposed to the 1194 provisions where the two Christians and two Jews shared two keys to the common chest along with the clerk, now all four were given their own keys; in terms of the deeds themselves, the tripartite system of sharing the deeds between the lender, the borrower, and the chirograph chest was reaffirmed, repeating the legislation from six years earlier, but the seal of the debtor now went on to the foot that was placed in the chest. The distribution of the four

---

[104] W.S. McKechnie, *Magna Carta: A commentary on the great charter of King John, with an historical introduction*, 2nd ed. rev. (Glasgow, 1914), p. 228.

[105] *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, pp. 337-38.

[106] *Liber de Antiquis Legibus: Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum*, ed. Thomas Stapleton (London, 1846), pp. 237-38. See also BL MS. Additional 62534, fos.257v-258r. This legislation survives in two writs, one from February 1240 and the other from May 1241. See Causton, *Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey*, nos. 81 (WAM 9001) and 197 (WAM 9002), and for discussion of these two writs, see *l.c.*, pp. 20-22.

keys was not new. There was an undertone that this was based on legislation that has not survived.

The 1239 legislation also included punishment for anyone who attempted to prevent (or simply did not give over) the wax-ended foot from getting to the chirograph chest. The liberty of free movement about the country that was part of the 1190 and 1201 charters was rescinded in the 1239 legislation, and Jews were no longer able to move about the country without special permission.[107] Though it might appear that this was an attempt to control the private lives of the Jews, in reality it is likely that this was about their supervision. There was a desire on the part of the king to know exactly where the Jews were in order to avoid a repetition of what had happened in the mid twelfth century, where he had lost control over the Jews to major magnates.[108] The Jewish community itself had reasons for not living in the countryside, chief among which was likely the difficulty of assembling a *minyan*. The king and the Jews likely also had common ground here: towns with chirograph chests were in royally-controlled places with sheriffs and constables who were under the control of the king; the Jews were thus assured of their security.[109] Regardless, the repudiation of the right of free movement about the country (even though it may have been thought of as a temporary restriction) did not really fit in with the rest of this piece of legislation. Why, then, was the rescinding of free movement included? It is possible that its inclusion was the result of events that

[107] This was repeated in December 1244. See *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 275; Causton, *Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey*, p. 22. This was the final step in curtailing the movements of the Jewish community. In November 1218, the Jews had been forbidden from going overseas without special license. See *Patent Rolls, 1216-25*, pp. 180-81 and Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 152.

[108] The king's lack of control had been reversed to such an extent that it was now possible for one of his justices of the Jews, Robert Passelewe, to extort money from two Jews—Samuel of Hertford and Solomon of Kingston—in order that they might be given permission to live in places with no *archa*. For a transcription of the charge, see *Curia Regis Rolls, 1233-37*, no. 1123, quoting KB 26/115b. For discussion, see Michael Adler, 'The testimony of the London Jewry against the ministers of Henry III', *TJHSE* 14 (1935-39), p. 149. The section concerning these two Jews is on pp. 165-66, with the translation on p. 178. This might be the purest expression of royal control—the ability of one of the king's justices to extort money in order that a law might be circumvented; Passelewe had also 'ordered the London chest to be removed from the custody of the Chirographers and taken to his house' (*l.c.*, pp. 150-51).

[109] For discussion on the relationship between Jews and castles and how the castle was a place of both refuge and control, see Lipman, 'Jews and castles in Medieval England', pp. 1-19.

transpired earlier in the decade. Between 1231 and 1232, Robert Grosseteste had written a letter to Margaret de Quincy, Countess of Winchester.[110] The young Simon de Montfort had recently expelled the Leicester Jewry, and the countess had allowed them to settle on her lands outside Leicester.[111] Grosseteste took exception to this accommodation, and in no uncertain terms not only reminded the countess that the Jews had killed Christ, but that their religion was one of unbelief that blasphemed against Christ and mocked his passion. He also alluded to the conversion of the Jews as a prerequisite for the end of days, and that they were not to be killed because they were proof of the promise of Christ. It does not seem impossible, therefore, that this event might have played a part in abrogating Jewish free movement. Over the next decade, Grosseteste's views on the Jews do not seem to have relaxed. Between 1243 and 1244, in a letter to the archdeacons of the diocese of Lincoln, he added at the close 'And you are to do all you possibly can to put a stop to the practice of Christians living with Jews'.[112] It is likely that Grosseteste was referring to Christian servants staying in their Jewish masters' homes overnight, but given that Bishop Richard de Wich attempted to legislate against Christian-Jewish cohabitation between 1245 and 1252,[113] Grosseteste might have had that in mind instead. It is unlikely that he was making a push for ghettofication; though the Jews were later to be restricted to specific cities, they were not confined by law to any particular areas in those places.[114] The rest of the 1239 legislation straightforwardly discussed business and made no mention of the personal liberties of the Jews as they related to business or finance. It also provided that no usury be charged for a year and a half, and the proper rate of interest—two pence in the pound per week—was reaffirmed (to take effect once the taking of interest was to resume). This

[110] *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, eds. F.A.C. Mantello and Joseph Goering (Toronto, 2010), no. 5.

[111] The Countess had inherited half of the honour of Leicester, and had married Saher de Quincy, Earl of Winchester in 1206; see I.J. Sanders, *English baronies: a study of their origin and descent, 1086-1327* (Oxford, 1960), p. 61.

[112] *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, no. 108.

[113] Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part I*, pp. 465-66, no. 71.

[114] See brief discussion in Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 123.

was also the first piece of legislation concerning the Jews that referred to them in a derogatory fashion, and referenced their 'evilmindedness' and their 'falsehood'. Additionally, this legislation was backdated to the date on which the chirograph chests were closed. The final line was 'Witness myself at Clarendon, this tenth day of December in the four-and-twentieth year of our reign' (1239), but in the body of the legislation, it was mandated that interest not be charged from the 24th of June in the three-and-twentieth year of the reign (1238).

The secular regulations of 1242 were fairly unique in the corpus of Jewish-specific administrative acts, because they discussed a specific case, and included a follow-up piece of legislation that was targeted at all Jews as a result of this case. This 1242 legislation imposed a restriction on Rabbis Moses of London, Aaron of Canterbury, and Jacob of Oxford, and prevented them from holding pleas concerning David the Jew of Oxford, and his former wife Muriel.[115] It also prohibited the rabbis from distraining him to take Muriel, or anyone else, as his wife. The penalty for contravening was not mentioned, only that 'serious' penalties awaited those who did. This paragraph concerning David of Oxford acted as context for legislation that was passed on the same day. Muriel was still alive but was being divorced by David, and the rabbis were being prohibited from hearing the case. This was one of the few instances, apart from 1235, where a specific case was discussed.[116] The essence, however, remained the same. It was still placing restrictions on Jews as opposed to enshrining privileges. The order not to hear the case was given on the king's behalf by the regent, the Archbishop of York, to the justices of the Jews. The legislation of 1190 and 1201 (the second charter of 10 April) had said that the matters between the Jews themselves were to be decided amongst the Jews, but this case concerning David the Jew is the only known breach of this legislation.

The follow-up legislation, given on the same day, continued in the same vein as the first portion, but discussed the prohibition against Jewish courts in England.

[115] *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 464. See also brief discussion in Cohen, 'The Oxford Jewry in the thirteenth century', p. 309.
[116] See discussion on p. 50.

Its tone suggested that there had already been some sort of prohibition that this set of rules was merely reinforcing. It mandated that the justices of the Jews were to prohibit all the Jews of England from holding chapters (sessions of a religious court) in England. They were also to ensure that several Jews (Peytevin of Lincoln, Muriel the former wife of David of Oxford, Benedict son of Peytevin of Lincoln, and Vaalun and Moses de Barbun) answer before the Archbishop of York and others of the king's council on a specific day, as to the reasons they sent to the Jews of France to hold chapters regarding the Jews of England. The chapters had as their purpose 'to decide questions of Jewish law', while being subject to the control of the king's courts.[117] At the end of the legislation, the justices of the Jews were prohibited from allowing David to be distrained to take a wife except by his own will. As this piece of legislation was a follow-up, it made sense that the specific case of David of Oxford be mentioned.

The provisions of 1253 were the most stringent and invasive restrictions on Jews—at least thus far in the common law of the thirteenth century. It may have been that these provisions were simply accepted practice and this was the first time they had been enshrined as laws, but they were still quite restrictive. They attempted to regulate the private lives of the Jews, and were very wide-ranging. In addition to what has previously been discussed,[118] every Jew was to answer to the rector of the church in whose parish he resided for all parochial dues belonging to his house (the parochial dues also came up in the 1271 legislation); Jews were forbidden from eating and buying meat during lent;[119] Jews were not to detract from the Christian faith or engage in public debates on faith; Jews were forbidden from entering any church or chapel except for the purposes of transit; and they were forbidden from lingering in churches in order to dishonour Christ. As of this legislation, Jews were also forbidden from hindering any Jew who wished to convert to Christianity, and the

[117]Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 130.
[118]See discussion on pp. 44, 46, and 47.
[119]This would change by the 1282 legislation, to prohibit Jews from selling meat to Christians in any way.

legislation of 1239 was reiterated, though phrased differently. In 1239, the legislation merely mandated that Jews remain where they were and not move without the king's permission. By 1253, however, this had changed to reflect the idea that no Jews were to be received in any town without the permission of the king, except in those towns where they had been accustomed to live.[120] This was immediately enforced. In Easter term 1253, Isaac Le François gave the king four bezants for the right to move from Winchester to Oxford with his family, and the sheriff of Oxfordshire was commanded to permit him to dwell in Oxford.[121] The legislation was again enforced in Easter term 1270, when Jacob of Norwich was found to be resident at Honiton—where there was no community of Jews, and his goods and chattels were seized by the sheriff of Devonshire.[122] Later, in Michaelmas term 1274-75, Joce Bundy acknowledged that he had 'for a long time past...dwelt at Rayleigh without warrant or license of the King'.[123] This, along with other trespasses, caused him to forfeit all his goods and chattels.[124] This was not only enforced on individual Jews, but communities as well. Jews had settled in Winchelsea by June 1273,[125] and Bridgnorth by October 1274,[126] and were ordered to be removed from both. The legislation ended by mandating that the justices for the custody of the Jews firmly enforce these provisions on pain of forfeiture of the Jews' goods. The regulations of 1253 were the only piece of legislation that attempted to administer the private lives of the Jews between that point and 1275.

There was no secular legislation between 1253 and 1269, likely because of the trouble involving the Jewish community from 1262 to 1265. The Jews were mentioned

---

[120] The king seems to have licensed this right of refusal at least once, to the abbess and nuns of Romesey. See *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, p. 613. The repudiation of the right of free movement was elaborated upon in 1275 as well; see discussion on p. 63.

[121] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 28.

[122] Ibid., p. 61. There is also an example from 1261 of burgesses pre-empting any Jewish desire to settle in their town. See *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, p. 153.

[123] Ibid., p. 82.

[124] He had also received a missal stolen from the Prior of Newnham. See Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 95. For further discussion of Joce Bundy, see Cohen, 'The Oxford Jewry in the thirteenth century', p. 300.

[125] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 50; this is also found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 503.

[126] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 130.

in the Petition of the Barons of May 1258, however, and there survives evidence that further legislation of some sort may have been planned in 1258.[127] The twenty-fifth clause of the Petition of the Barons requested a remedy for the 'manifest disherison' brought about when lending Jews transferred outstanding debts and the lands pledged for them to 'magnates and other persons powerful in the kingdom' who then refused to allow the debt to be paid and the land returned.[128] Despite Treharne and Sanders' note that this clause was a baronial display of altruism, more recent work has conclusively shown this to be unlikely. Broadly, the Petition of the Barons as a whole is likely to have been a list of complaints from various sources, and not only from earls and barons; specifically, the twelve baronial members of the Committee of Twenty-four did not actually meet until the Oxford parliament.[129] Furthermore, the twenty-fifth clause complained about magnates and potentates (*magnates et potentiores regni*) on behalf of lesser men (*minores*);[130] it is inherently unlikely that the barons were seeking to foul their own nests. Despite the absence of formal legislation, the Jews and their lending practices were still very much under scrutiny.

In 1262 a dispute between a Jew and his debtor erupted into a riot, causing the London Jewry to be sacked. In 1264, during the uneasy peace that had followed the earlier riot, Simon de Montfort's men, assisted by a mob, killed and pillaged their way through the Jewry.[131] De Montfort and his men 'were heavily involved in this atrocity, largely...because they needed money to sustain their army in the capital'.[132] This example was followed at Canterbury, and at 'Worcester, Lincoln, Bristol, and Bedford similar outbreaks took place, the chirograph-chests being burned or carried off'.[133] When de Montfort was killed in 1265, various steps to strengthen the Jewry were taken, including allowing the Jews to recover their debts if they could reasonably

---

[127] *Close Rolls, 1256-59*, p. 318, and *Documents of the baronial movement of reform and rebellion, 1258-1267*, eds. R.F. Treharne and I.J. Sanders (Oxford, 1973), pp. 108-09.
[128] *Documents of the baronial movement of reform and rebellion,* pp. 86-87.
[129] Paul Brand, *Kings, Barons, and Justices: The Making and Enforcement of Legislation in Thirteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2003), pp. 22-23.
[130] Ibid., p. 23.
[131] Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 61.
[132] J.R. Maddicott, *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994), p. 268.
[133] Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 62.

prove their existence, given the destruction of the chirograph chests. Complaints then arose (though they were certainly not new) as to the loans made by Jews on the security of land,[134] and it was in this context that the Provisions of Jewry in 1269 were enacted.

These 1269 provisions, coming as they did on the heels of the disturbances of the mid-1260s, touched on economic matters as opposed to lifestyle issues and restrictions.[135] They mandated that all perpetual rent charges in the hands of Jews that had not been given to Christians and confirmed by the king, or sold (or recorded at the Exchequer), were to be considered quit by the Christians that owed them. Charters were to be surrendered, and no Jew from the date of the legislation forward was to take a rent-charge from a Christian on pain of forfeiture of life and chattels.[136] Similarly for Christians, it was mandated that no one buy Jewish fee debts on the pain of forfeiture of his chattels and his inheritance. The legislation continued and prohibited all Jews, no matter who they were, from selling any of their other debts to a Christian without permission of the king, and should a Christian buy a debt he should get no more than the king would (nothing was to be charged over the amount of debt indicated and no usury was to run).[137] These provisions were not echoed in any conciliar or synodal legislation. It is unclear whether the prohibition on Christian lenders from charging in excess of the actual debt (or being usurious) was simply a reminder that this was prohibited, or if it was actually a problem that the legislation was trying to address. The follow-up piece of legislation, from May 1270,[138] confirmed much the same sorts of things as did the 1269 legislation, with the

---

[134] Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 64.

[135] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 376. They also appear in *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 101.

[136] Writ no. 238 (WAM 6909) in Causton, *Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey*, was dated to 8 February 1267 and seemingly allowed a fee-debt to be contracted, which meant that fee-debts and presumably perpetual rent-charges were allowed from at least this time until the current legislation in 1269.

[137] This was addressed in the undated legislation of *c.*1275-79 as well, but included the selling of Jewish houses as well as rents without license. See discussion below, on p. 65.

[138] *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 268. This follow-up legislation was addressed to the treasurer and barons of the exchequer. For evidence that this legislation was sent to the chirographers in Bristol and the chirographers and sheriff of Norfolk in 1270, see Causton, *Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey*, nos. 2 (WAM 9005) and 174 (WAM 6940).

addition that any charters found or discovered in the chirograph chests or outside of them that were not already given or sold to Christians were to have no value, and all chirographs that recorded debts that related to fees were to be cancelled at the Exchequer.

The 1271 legislation mandated that no Jew have any freehold whatsoever in manors, lands, tenements, fees, rents, or tenures.[139] This statute was the end result of the lobbying efforts of a Franciscan friar named Henry of Woodstone, who petitioned sympathetic bishops to introduce legislation 'against the freedom of the Jews to harm Christians'.[140] According to Woodstone, the capacity of the Jews to hold land in freehold was a reversal of the way matters ought to have been. The statute also provided that Jews might only rent out the houses which they already owned in the cities, boroughs, and other vills—and even then, only to other Jews. The acquisition of new houses by Jews in London was prohibited—but only because the parish churches sustained losses on the sales. Jews were prohibited from pleading before any other than the justices of the Jews, and the legislation also annulled any enfeoffments of the Jews, and returned those tenements to the Christians who had formerly granted them. There was a caveat, however, that the Christian who was reassuming control of his tenement must pay the Jew whatever money he had formerly owed, the non-payment of which had caused the Jew to become enfeoffed. Jews were also forbidden from having Christians as bakers, nurses, cooks, and brewers, which echoed the legislation from both 1234 and 1253. The Annals of Dunstable briefly discussed this legislation, describing these *leges bonas* against the Jews as *ne, scilicet, haberent feudum vel aliquod liberum tenementum.*[141] The annalist dates these laws to 1275, however, despite their 1271 provenance.

The 1272 legislation continued the trend in Jewish-specific law in the later thirteenth century that concerned itself mostly with economic and business law. The

---

[139] *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, pp. 235-36; this is also found in BL. Add. Ms. 38821, fos.38^{r-v} (where it is misdated to 25 July 1267), is calendared in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 598, and is printed in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 489.

[140] Hyams, 'Faith, Fealty and Jewish 'infideles' in Twelfth-Century England', p. 126.

[141] *Annales Monastici*, iii, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London, 1866), p. 265.

reasons for passing this legislation were given at its beginning: in order 'to relieve the Christians from the losses and grievances which they have sustained', which was done both for the current generation of Christians and its heirs. That this legislation was presumably discussed at the parliament held in April 1271 is important. By this point, parliament had become not only 'the central institution of the political nation and the point of contact—often the point of collision—between the policies of the crown and the wishes of the community', but the 'consultative body, to be summoned three times a year to deal with 'the common business of the realm".[142] Maddicott has also suggested that the legislation was passed as a result of the king's wish for a grant of taxation—a twentieth on the movables of the realm.[143] The wishes of relatively minor players in the kingdom—the parish churches, for example—were evident without being explicitly stated, and were clearly being defined as component parts of 'the common business of the realm' irrespective of the fact that this business affected nothing other than the parish churches.

In a departure from business and financial regulations, the 1275 legislation, known as the Statutes of the Jewry, covered many things that the conciliar and synodal statutes did not mention during the entirety of the thirteenth century.[144] This is perhaps due, again, to the simple reason that it involved things that were outside ecclesiastical jurisdiction. In its first article, the Statutes disallowed any future lending at usury, and ordered that usury cease on old loans. But, seemingly, in somewhat of a concession to the Jews, Christians who had borrowed from the Jews on the pledge of moveables were only to pay them off before Easter, or forfeit the chattels. It is possible that the inspiration for this article came from Northern France when, in November 1223, Louis VIII had ordered that no Jewish debt run at usury, and that outstanding debts to the Jews that had been contracted within the past five years be repaid within three years.[145] The disallowing of future lending at usury

[142]Maddicott, *The Origins of English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford, 2010), p. 274.
[143]Ibid., p. 269.
[144]See previous discussion on p. 39.
[145]Langmuir, *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism*, p. 146.

was not a retroactive piece of legislation, and in fact, this was expressly mentioned in the 1275 Statutes.[146] However, in Hilary term 1278 this did not stop Robert Ryvel from trying to claim that unjust usury had run on a debt taken into the king's hand before the Statutes of the Jewry had forbidden usury.[147] The case hinged upon the timing of the debt being surrendered by Moses, son of Jacob, to the king for his tallage. Robert had apparently overstated the amount of time that the debt had not been in the possession of Moses, and the result of the case did not favour Robert.[148] He was to pay interest 'from the day when the debtor ought to have paid the debt until the debt was taken into the King's hand, and from the day when the said charter was delivered to the said Jew until the day when the said Statute was made'.[149] Robert Ryvel was not the only Christian debtor who attempted to work the timing of the Statutes to his advantage. In Hilary term 1282, Cok Hagin brought suit against Roger de Ling, demanding the interest on a debt 'arisen before the Statutes of the King'.[150] This article betrayed agreement with the thirteenth century canonists rather than the pope; the canonists were 'unswerving in their opposition to interest of any kind', whereas the popes considered openly charged interest at a moderate rate to be the norm.[151]

The second article discussed distresses for debts to Jews and mandated that they not be so grievous, and that half of the Christian's chattels and land should remain for his maintenance and his chief messuage. It also mandated that there be no execution of a Jewish debt on an heir without proof; there always had to be prior legal process. The second article was explicitly mentioned in a case from Hilary term 1278, when Joce, son of Deulecresse was accused of seizing more than a moiety

[146] *Statutes of the Realm*, i, pp. 221-221a.
[147] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 102.
[148] Ibid., p. 103 n. 1—Rigg's interpretation.
[149] Ibid., p. 103.
[150] Ibid., p. 117. There was no judgment entered on the roll—Roger was given time to consider the suit. In a suit from Trinity term 1281, Matilda La Megre sued Moses of Dog Street and Bona his wife after they attempted to charge her interest 'against the King's Statutes'. See *l.c.* p. 115. In a case from Trinity term 1284, Joce, son of Saulot, brought suit against the Abbot of Eynsham, in a case again hinging on the timing of the debt vs. the timing of the Statutes. See *l.c.* p. 130.
[151] Kenneth R. Stow, *Popes, Church, and Jews in the Middle Ages: confrontation and response* (Aldershot, 2007) , p. 166.

of John FitzHervey's chattels 'against the Assize and Provision made touching the Jewry'.[152] The third article discussed the delivery of seisin of chattels or land to the Jew up to the value of the debt, and that the Christian's chattels and land were to be valued by the oaths of good men. The fourth article mandated that the Jew be allowed his warranty if any Christian were to sue him, and discussed what would happen if the Jew had to answer for the charge. It referred to the criminal proceedings that followed an appeal of robbery or theft. In what seemed to be a very deliberate change, if a Jew lacked a warrantor, he was no longer allowed to clear himself on his own oath, as he had been able to do in the 1190 and 1201 charters of privilege.[153] The same thing was not happening to Christians *pari passu*; if Christians across the country had ever had the privilege to clear themselves of criminal charges by their own oath they had certainly lost this ability a long time prior. The only Christian parallel to the Jews' ability to clear themselves of criminal charges by oath was in the City of London and a small number of other towns; even in these cases the privilege was extended only to burgesses or citizens. The privilege had existed since about 1131, but had fallen into disuse by the mid-point of the twelfth century, though the City of London retained it past this point.[154] The 'Great Law' allowed for thirty-six compurgators to be chosen by City officials: eighteen from east of the Walbrook, and eighteen from west of it.[155] It was only to be used in the gravest possible cases because of the dire consequences of failure.[156] Maitland noted that the citizens of London 'do this in the thirteenth [and] they talk about doing it in the fourteenth century',[157] and it is evident that it was not a significant portion of the population of England that enjoyed this privilege.

Chevage was enshrined in the fifth article, as was the wearing of the Jewish

[152] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 101.
[153] *Statutes of the Realm*, i, p. 221a.
[154] *Borough Customs*, i, ed. Mary Bateson (Selden Society, vol. 18) (London, 1904), p. 37.
[155] T.F.T. Plucknett, *A Concise History of the Common Law*, 5th ed. (London, 1956), p. 113. The untranslated passage can be found in Stubbs, *Select Charters*, pp. 172.
[156] *Borough Customs*, i, p. 39.
[157] Pollock and Maitland, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, i, p. 666.

badge;[158] this legislation is the earliest evidence of this poll tax. It was payable every Easter by all Jews aged twelve and up, and was paid as recognition of personal subordination by the unfree to a particular lord—in this case, the king. Nowhere was the deterioration of the status of the Jews more evident than in this article. The requirement that Jews live only in those towns with chirograph chests was also included in this article.[159] The sixth article prohibited any Jew from enfeoffing another Jew or Christian of houses, rents, or tenements in cities in which they were resident, and from acquitting a Christian of his debt without the permission of the king. The seventh article did not address the Jews, but rather everybody else in the kingdom: the Jews had the king's peace, and were to be defended and protected by the sheriffs and bailiffs of the realm, and they were not to plea or be impleaded in any court other than that of the king. This article marked a departure in tone from the past legislation, as it explicitly stated that the Jews were to be protected as the church willed it; under Henry II, Richard, and John, the Jews were protected by the will of the king. The wording of this article gave the impression that the king would rather not protect the Jews.[160] The eighth article granted the Jews the right to carry out trade by selling, buying, and working, but also prohibited Christians from living with Jews, and reiterated that the Jews were taxable only by the king. The ninth and final article of the 1275 legislation discussed the length of time a Jew might hold a farm, that period being ten years or fewer, with the provision that the Jews only take lands to farm for the next fifteen years. It is entirely possible that Robert Grosseteste had foreshadowed these Statutes of the Jewry in the 1230s: his letter about the Leicester Jews noted that 'it is the duty of the princes who hold them captive to protect them from being killed, and at the same time prohibit them

[158] See previous discussion of the Jewish badge on p. 39.

[159] *Statutes of the Realm*, i, p. 221a; see discussion of precursor legislation and cases on p. 52 and p. 56. In 1283, the constable of Windsor castle was ordered to remove the Jews from that town because of the lack of chirograph chest there—see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 241; this is also found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 634. By 1284, the justices of the Jews were ordered to have removed all Jews living in places with no chirograph chest—see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 256.

[160] *Statutes of the Realm*, i, p. 221a.

most strictly from oppressing Christians with usury, and to ensure that they are able to gain their own livelihood by the lawful labour of their hands'.[161] Grosseteste's possible influence can be seen in clauses 1, 7, 8, and very possibly 9 of these Statutes.

With the exception of the fifth article, the laws discussed in this piece of legislation were new and not found prior to 1275. Interestingly, the farming license ran out in 1290, the same year of the expulsion. The opening line, echoing the 1239 legislation, ascribed 'evils' to the Jews, which had caused the disinheriting of the 'good men' of the land, clearly indicating the contemporary thoughts on Jews as well as where they stood in relation to Christians. Though this legislation might have seemed fairly straightforward for those who wrote it, there survives an ancient petition presented to the king on behalf of the Jews, wherein the communalty of the Jews asked for interpretation of the recent legislation.[162] Their chief concerns were the interpretation of the second and third articles. To this end, the Jews presented a hypothetical scenario for both articles. Concerning the second article, regarding distresses for debts to Jews, they asked if a debtor should die with no heir and his lands and rents should fall to someone who has enough to live on without the lands and rents that had been pledged, was then the Jew to have possession of the entire pledged property until the debt was paid?[163] Concerning the third article, which discussed the delivery of seisin of chattels or land to the Jew up to the value of the debt, they asked what seisin the Jew would have for the recovery of his debt if a Christian who had borrowed money from the Jew had nothing but the house in which he lived.[164]

The 1279 legislation was fairly unique for the time at which it appeared, because it regulated both the public and private lives of the Jews.[165] It prohibited them

---

[161] *The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln*, pp. 67-8.
[162] G.O. Sayles, *Select cases in the Court of King's Bench under Edward I*, iii (Selden Society vol. 58)(London, 1939), p. cxiv.
[163] See translation in Harry Rothwell, *English historical documents 1189-1327*, iii (London, 1996), pp. 412-13. For the original in French, see Sayles, as above.
[164] Rothwell, *English historical documents 1189-1327*, iii, pp. 412-13; Sayles, *Select cases in the Court of King's Bench under Edward I*, iii, p. cxiv.
[165] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 565-66. The original text is found in Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 570.

from blaspheming, under peril of life and limb (*sub periculo vite & membrorum*). It went on to discuss converts from Judaism who had 'perverted to the Jewish wickedness'—that is to say, Jews who had become Christian and then reverted to Judaism—again increasing the intensity of the language directed at the Jews. Jewish women were mandated to wear a patch on their outer clothing, as was most recently mandated in 1275, and it reiterated that no Christians serve Jews in any way.[166] It also outlined a method of dispute resolution over the pledges held by condemned Jews, and the way in which they were to be identified as their own property. The king also protected his right to the escheated goods of condemned Jews by mandating that no one was to receive the goods of Jews who had been, or were to be, condemned. This legislation was sent to twelve men, all of whom were justices on the different circuits of coin-clipping enquiries. Enquiries into clippers of coin had been happening since at least November 1278, when 600 Jews in England were arrested for money-related offences, as were all the goldsmiths and keepers of mints and dies.[167] The wholesale arrests of Jews were stopped abruptly on 1 May 1279 at the government's behest. It was apparently clear that all those who were guilty of clipping coin had been arrested already.[168]

The piece of canonical legislation that contained the most unique material was that from the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel (or Quivel) for the diocese of

---

[166] See discussion on p. 46.

[167] Brand, 'Jews and the law in England, 1275-90', p. 1151. For an early example of a coin-clipping enquiry, see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1232-47*, p. 228.

[168] Ibid. Undated legislation survives, dated definitively by Brand to *c.*1275-79, composed of fifteen articles. As in Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. lv, they discuss Jewish coin-clippers and receivers who bought bullion composed of clipped coin; Christians and Jews who exchanged good money for clipped money; charters outside of chirograph chests; Jewish receivers of bloodstained cloth and church ornaments; Jews practicing usury since the 1275 statutes; Jewish houses and rents sold without license; Jews imprisoned for coin-clipping or trespasses against the peace without the king's warrant; sheriffs and bailiffs amercing Jews above 2*s.*; treasure-trove in Jewish houses after their deaths; concealed chattels of Jews after their deaths; Jews whose chattels and houses had not been fined within a year of their deaths; Jews having carnal relations with Christian women; relapsed Jewish converts; outlawed Jews received in the Jewry; and Christian servants spending the night in their Jewish masters' houses. The manuscript transcribed by Rigg, *l.c.*, is BL. Add. Ms. 32085, fo.120^{r}. As in Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', p. 1144, the other manuscripts containing this legislation are BL. Add. Ms. 38821, fos.81^{v}-82^{r}; Lincoln's Inn, MS Hale 140, fo.49^{r}; BL. MS. Harley 79, fos.12^{v}-13^{r}; and Cambridge University Library, MS. MM.1.27, fos.104$^{r\text{-}v}$.

Exeter, from 16 April 1287,[169] and this same piece of legislation was also the final major piece before the Jews were expelled in 1290.[170] These statutes prohibited Jews from holding public offices,[171] prohibited Jews from attending feasts of Christians and vice-versa,[172] mandated that Christians not accept medicine from Jews,[173] and mandated that Jews keep their doors and windows closed on Good Friday.[174] It was very odd that the prohibition against Jews holding public office should reappear at this point, because by 1287 this prohibition had been in place for a long time, as had been the stipulation concerning Jewish doors and windows. That Christians not accept any kind of medicine from Jews played well with the stipulation in other pieces of legislation that Christians were not to eat with Jews, nor were they allowed to buy meat from Jews. The prohibition against buying meat from Jews echoed the secular provisions of 1253, as well as those of 1282.[175] There survive articles for inquiry of uncertain date, though likely from the second half of the thirteenth century, that also refer to a prohibition against Christians buying meat from Jews. The Judgment of the Pillory inquired into breaches of previous legislation which had forbidden butchers from selling contagious flesh of various kinds, and from buying 'Flesh of Jews, and then sell[ing] it to Christians';[176] the Statute Concerning Bakers, also of uncertain date, seems to ascribe these shoddy butchery practices to the Jews

[169]Powicke and Cheney, *Councils & Synods II, part II*, pp. 1044-45.

[170]Secular draft legislation survives from from the mid-1280s. It is found in Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. liv-lx, who transcribed it from BL. Add. Ms. 32085, fos.120^{r}-121^{r}. It is definitively dated to *c.*1284-86 in Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', p. 1154. The most interesting thing covered within this draft legislation was the potential prohibition of double-blind lending—that is, Jews giving money to other Jews in order to have that money then lent to Christians, *ipso facto* allowing Jewish moneylending at interest. For detailed discussion of the contents of the draft, see Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', pp. 1153-1156.

[171]This was based on several earlier canons. See D.54 c.14; C.17 q.4 c.31 (this canon had a *dictum* which read *Sacrilegii quoque reatum incurrit, qui Iudaeis publica officia committit.* See C.17 q.4 d.a.c.31); c. 69 of Lateran IV (see *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, pp. 266-67); and X 5.6.18. These date from 1139-50 for the canon contained in the *Decreti Prima Pars* to 1227-34 for that contained in the *Liber Extra.*

[172]This was based on earlier canons. See C.28 q.1 c.13 and C.28 q.1 c.14, both dating from 1139-50.

[173]This was based on an earlier canon. See C.28 q.1 c.13.

[174]Per *c.*68 of Lateran IV, Jews were not to go into public for three days before Easter, and especially on Good Friday (see *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, p. 266); see also X 5.6.4, dating from 1230-34.

[175]See discussion on p. 55.

[176]*Statutes of the Realm*, i, p. 202.

themselves: A butcher who sells measled pork or beef dead from cattle plague, or who buys this meat from Jews and then sells it to Christians, shall be convicted.[177] The law against buying meat from Jews had clearly not been followed by Jews any more than by Christians, however. Even in 1288, at a leet of Cunisford, it was noted that 'Roger de Lakenham has sold Jewish meat, to wit, trepha'.[178]

The stipulation that Jews pay tithes and offerings to the churches in whose parishes they lived also appeared in the English conciliar and synodal legislation but not in the secular legislation,[179] including in the legislation of 17 April 1222 from the council of the province of Canterbury at Oxford, in the synodal statutes of Bishop Fulk Basset for the diocese of London (dated between 1245 and 1259, and which also prohibited Jews from entering churches) and in the synodal statutes of Bishop Peter Quinel (or Quivel) for the diocese of Exeter on 16 April 1287. The stipulation that Jews pay tithes might have been an echo of a problem from 1179 in Marseilles; there, the bishop had complained to the pope about the loss of tithes as a result of land having been sold to Jews. That this stipulation never appeared in any secular legislation was mirrored across Western Europe; the church simply forwarded complaints to the secular authorities, who could not be relied upon to cooperate.[180]

There were also at least two instances where the two traditions of law clashed. The question of jurisdiction over Jews and the court in which the Jews were to be impleaded was never reconciled between the conciliar and synodal statutes and the secular legislation. In June 1218, three months after the secular administrative act of 30 March 1218 addressed to the sheriff of Worcestershire and given at Oxford,[181] the king's council reminded the sheriffs and constables of nine counties and cities

---

[177] *Statutes of the Realm*, i, p. 203. The editors note that these articles have been attributed to both 51 Henry III and 13 Edward I; apart from the fact that they were certainly made before 1290, there is no evidence for any more specific date.

[178] *The Records of the City of Norwich*, i, ed. Rev. William Hudson and John Cottingham Tingey (London, 1906), p. 359. As in *l.c.*, *terefah* is ritually unfit meat rejected by Jewish butchers.

[179] For the earlier canons on which this was based, see the papal bull *Quia Super His* in Shlomo Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, i (Toronto, 1988), no. 48; c. 67 of Lateran IV (*Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils* i, pp. 265-66); and X 3.30.16. *Quia Super His* dated from 1159-81, and the canon from the *Liber Extra* from 1230-34.

[180] Pakter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews*, pp. 50-1.

[181] See discussion on p. 37.

that the Jews were not to be impleaded in ecclesiastical courts concerning actions of debt (*& non permittas quod implacitentur in curia Christianitatis, occasione alicujus debiti*).[182] The complaints of the clergy from the council of the province of Canterbury at London, from 22 August 1257, specifically mentioned that the Church courts hearing cases involving crimes committed by Jews was impeded because it was alleged that the Jews had their own judges. They of course did, namely the justices of the Jews. In the statutes of the council of the province of Canterbury at Lambeth from 8-13 May 1261, it was mandated that by the prohibition of commerce, contracts, and contact with the faithful, the Jews were to be compelled to answer before an ecclesiastical judge. This, despite the fact that the Jews refused the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical judges in cases where they were offending in respect of ecclesiastical property and persons, simply because doing so was not allowed by the king or sheriffs or bailiffs. The statutes went on to say that those who impeded the ecclesiastical jurisdiction in these cases were to be excommunicated. This was in stark contrast with the secular legislation of 1275 (the Statutes of the Jewry), which stipulated that the Jews were not to plead or be impleaded in any court other than that of the king. It did not mention specific cases or types of plea, but was rather a blanket prohibition, directed at the over-zealous local courts from hearing all cases involving Jews.

Between 1190 and 1290, the granting of legislation and charters that had originally begun as a method of enshrining privileges for the Jewish community in the king's lands became a method of regulating both social intercourse and Jewish business activities. The majority of the pieces of legislation discussed either moneylending or social aspects of Jewish lives, but occasionally there were pieces of legislation that covered all aspects of Jewish life—the legislation of 1239, 1275, and 1279 covered everything. This chapter is necessary as a prelude to discussion of converts and conversion in England because these laws and regulations were exactly why Jews

[182]Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 151; this also appears in *Patent Rolls, 1216-25*, p. 157. See brief discussion in Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 183.

converted: they sought to avoid the limiting conditions placed on their lives. Where the secular authorities had orginally seen no problem confirming Jewish privilege, the official position gradually transformed, culminating in the restrictions evident shortly before the Jews were expelled. The church position, never terribly friendly, seems to have been borrowed from the royal administration; by 1275, the church found itself in the curious position of being more friendly to Anglo-Jewry than the English royal administration. It is not difficult to see why a Jew in England in the thirteenth century might wish to convert, especially as the century wore on. No matter when an English Jew was born, it would always have been apparent that the past had been a relative idyll. It would have been worse for a Jew who remembered the bestowing of privileges upon the community during the reigns of Richard and John; the deterioration in their legal status would have been brought into stark relief. Over the course of the century the vice tightened, and the degradation of their legal status was complete.

3 The Exchequer of the Jews, Jewish Converts, and Jurisdiction

If it is obvious that the laws pertaining to the Jewish community were incredibly restrictive, less so is the way these laws, originally meant to supervise and regulate the Jews *qua* Jews, applied to those who had left Judaism. The Exchequer of the Jews was the administrative department of the royal government where the secular legislation and rules discussed in the previous chapter were applied to the Jewish community. Though Paul Brand has recently written the definitive work on the Exchequer of the Jews and its function from 1265 to 1290,[1] the history of the relationship between *quondam* Jews and the institution that had formerly administered most aspects of their lives remains unwritten. In order to facilitate this writing, it is expedient to use Brand's framework of splitting the Exchequer of the Jews into two distinct theoretical entities: one concerning administrative functions and the other concerning jurisdiction.[2] The relationship between Jews *qua* Jews and the Exchequer of the Jews falls into two conceptual categories: administrative functions performed while engaged in the task of managing the Jewish population and their personal lives, and jurisdiction—both held and exercised—over the said Jews, which, much more than the administrative functions, involved their business and legal lives. The Exchequer of the Jews only functioned as it was meant to when a Jew was, obviously, Jewish. The aim of this chapter is to argue that converts to Christianity inhabited a legal grey area. The neither-here-nor-there status of Jewish converts was clearly expressed by the manner in which royal administration dealt with them post-conversion. The Exchequer of the Jews occasionally exercised authority over them, but this authority was never exclusive. Furthermore, this authority and jurisdiction does not seem to have been uniformly applied. Though there were cases where the Exchequer of the Jews was involved in some capacity in the cases of converts, it was more often than not the king who was the final arbiter.

[1] *PEJ*, vi, pp. 1-73.
[2] Ibid., pp. 6-16.

Some of Brand's sub-categories within 'administrative functions' of the Exchequer of the Jews had more bearing than others on the lives of Jewish converts. In order, these were the administration of the chirograph chests, tallage assessment and collection, chevage collection, residence controls, inquisitions post mortem, licences for the purchase and sale of property, and licenses for the sales of debts to Christians. When a Jew converted, he gave up the legal right to lend money at interest. Generally, that was the sole preserve of Jews in England.[3] However, some converted Jews continued to lend money at interest even after their conversions, often with the tacit permission of the king.[4] Normally, when a Jew converted, all his chattels escheated to the king, including any debts in chirograph chests. Though technically the relationship between a *quondam* Jew and the Exchequer of the Jews was voided upon conversion, it appears as though the king could force that relationship to continue until his interests were satisfied. In other words, the convert could be forced to retain a relationship with unconverted Jews, who were still completely under the jurisdiction of the Exchequer of the Jews, until all the business had been cleared up to the king's satisfaction. In Hilary term 1268, there was a case involving a convert named Joiette having to do with a charter showing that she was owed $32m.$ from a debt made with Hugh Lovel. This charter should have escheated to the king, but her father-in-law, Lumbard of Cricklade, had allegedly changed the charter to one in his own name after Joiette had converted.[5] The idea here was obviously not to lose the $32m.$ by reason of Joiette's apostasy. Lumbard's alleged ruse was likely the result of having originally lent the money in Joiette's name, which was not an unusual way for moneylending Jews to avoid being tallaged on certain sums of money. It is likely that Joiette had no particular interest in her father-in-law's recovery of the money as conversion generally meant not only a rejection of one's existing religion, but of

[3]There were lenders who lacked the legal right to lend at interest in England but did so regardless; for the complaint raised about the Cahorsini in the Petition of the Barons, see *Documents of the Baronial Movement*, pp. 87-88 at c. 26; more broadly, see discussion in David Carpenter, 'King Henry III's 'Statute' against Aliens: July 1263', *English Historical Review* 107, no. 435 (Oct. 1992), pp. 925-944.

[4]For various examples in the life of Henry of Winchester, see chapter 5, *passim.*

[5]Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 42-3.

family ties as well. The sheriff was commanded to cause the Christian chirographers of the Marlborough *archa* to certify what had actually happened. However, at no point was Joiette commanded to appear before the justices of the Jews. It is unclear whether she would have had to appear even if she had been commanded to do so, as the majority of the time Christians were commanded to appear was in order to answer for debts. Furthermore, Jospin, the Jew who had originally informed the justices of Lumbard's alleged duplicity, did not pursue the case. The surviving records of the proceedings end there. Joiette, despite being relegated to the status of non-participating observer, was still involved in name with the Exchequer of the Jews, despite neither being Jewish, and really, having no interest in the outcome of the case.

The relationship with the Exchequer of the Jews was not always an involuntary one; Henry of Winchester, perhaps the most famous of the thirteenth century converts, was briefly the king's scribe who wrote pleas and starrs in Hebrew at the Exchequer of the Jews.[6] Occasionally, the king would show his largesse to recent converts by allowing them to keep debts, or portions of debts, that had been owed to them while they were Jewish, and which technically should have escheated to him. Henry of Winchester, again, benefited from this sort of arrangement,[7] as did a convert named William de Warenne. William was known as the *conversus* of Stamford, and his arrangement was slightly different than that of Henry. Whereas Henry was allowed to keep a certain number of debts *ad sustentacionem suam*, the implication being that the amounts outstanding did not matter, William was given 10*m.* out of the debts that had been owed to him which had originally totaled 20*m.*, with the king keeping the other 10*m. ad opus nostrum*.[8] The convention of escheat upon conversion was clearly more of a guideline rather than a law, if the king so desired it, and was changed for all converts by 1279-80. This change might have provided an additional incentive to convert, since there were few exceptions to the rule prior to 1279.

---

[6]See discussion on p. 140.
[7]See discussion on pp. 141 and 142.
[8]*Fine Rolls 25 Henry III, 1240-41*, no. 66.

Regarding tallage assessment and collection, the relationship between the Exchequer of the Jews and Jewish converts seems to have ended once the Jew converted. There was no reason for the former Jew to remain liable to any future tallages, as in England this was a Jewish-specific tax. Even when the now-converted Jew had been Jewish, the only time the Exchequer entered into the process of tallage was after the fact, in order to enforce payment after the tax had been levied.[9] Converted Jews, as Christians, would have been subject to regular tax paying, which was itself regulated by parliament well before 1254.[10] That being said, there are examples that indicate that occasionally, converted Jews remained liable for unpaid tallages that had presumably been assessed while they were Jewish. Alberic le Convers was one of these as his portion remained unpaid when he fled the country,[11] as was Thomas of Canterbury, who was assessed 1*m.* for tallage in 1198.[12] There was also a third case in 1272, when Benedict *Conversus*, recorded as being a Jew despite his last name, paid a portion of the tallage.[13] It is unclear why a converted Jew might remain liable to tallage, since it stands to reason that a Jew might convert in order to escape that liability. Given the lack of evidence for it, it seems as though remaining liable for previously assessed tallages was the exception for converted Jews. Regardless, there seems to have been an understanding within the Exchequer of the Jews, at least concerning tallage, that converted Jews were not under their jurisdiction. Had they been so, the Exchequer of the Jews would no doubt have begun proceedings to enforce payment of the unpaid tallage, which had been something they were mandated to do for Jews, and yet did not do for the converts.

Chevage, on the other hand, specifically impacted converted Jews in several ways. They were both the chief beneficiaries of this poll tax as well as being, at least for a time, the chief collectors of it as well. The collection of the tax by converts was

[9] *PEJ*, vi, p. 8.
[10] This arguably began in 1217 with a reissue of *Magna Carta*; see D.A. Carpenter, *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990), pp. 60-1.
[11] See extended discussion below concerning Alberic, on p. 77.
[12] *Pipe Roll 10 Richard I, 1198*, p. 208.
[13] E 401, no. 1567.

mandated by chancery writ to commissioners,[14] and the tax was enshrined in the 1275 secular Statutes of the Jewry.[15] The collection of chevage was not solely the responsibility of converts, however: one of the collectors for the 1278 chevage was Hugh of Dinnington, who does not appear to have been a convert.[16] There is no surviving evidence of the first three years of the chevage in terms of its payment or collection, and the first surviving evidence for both of these appears in 1278. In that year, William le Convert and John le Clerk, goldsmith,[17] were mandated to collect the chevage from the Jews of England in order that it might be granted to the converts (*quod quidem chevagium Dominus Rex concessit Fratribus predicte Domus*).[18] William and John accounted in 1280 for the amounts collected in 1278, but interestingly, despite being inmates of the *domus conversorum* in London, did not collect the chevage from London or Canterbury. This reduces the likelihood that he and John might have been collecting from Jews whom they had either known previously, or come into contact with once converted. William did have the toponymic surname 'of Oxford', making it unlikely that he was, or indeed ever had been, friendly with London Jews. He was assaulted by Jews in Oxford in 1290, presumably while collecting the chevage, and an oyer and terminer was ordered.[19] The Oxford Jews likely did not appreciate the irony of a former coreligionist, perhaps with local ties, collecting a tax from them in order to support him and his new calling. John le Bel, the other convert with whom William was collecting the chevage, owed money in 1295 secured on his lands and chattels in London and Middlesex,[20] and was mentioned in the 1308 inquisition as having been alive in 1292 and living in the *domus*, but having since died.[21] This pair of converts was not the only pair to

[14] *PEJ*, vi, p. 8.
[15] See discussion above on p. 62.
[16] For Hugh collecting the chevage, see Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 113. For other references, seemingly proving that he was no more than a royal administrator, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 86, 406.
[17] John was variously known as John le Clerk, goldsmith, John Bele, and John le Bel.
[18] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 113. The untranslated version of this plea is found in *PEJ*, vi, no. 492.
[19] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 397.
[20] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 447.
[21] Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62a.

collect the chevage; there was also Philip le But of Cricklade and John of Havenaked. Philip and John were mandated in February 1290 to collect the chevage for 1289 and 1290, as well as the arrears for 1287 and 1288. There was no mention of the amount in arrears, and there were no counties excepted as with William and John; the order specifically mandated that the king 'has directed all sheriffs and constables to cause all Jews in their bailiwicks to come before the said John and Philip'.[22] There remains the possibility that previous executors of the chevage collection had perhaps been deceived by Jews claiming that their children were less than twelve years of age; the order mandated that twelve jurors make recognition upon oath of the number of the Jews and Jewesses above the age of twelve, and John and Philip were to be able to distrain non-paying Jews if they felt it necessary. Philip disappeared from the records at this point, but John was noted in the 1308 inquisition as living in the *domus* at that time.[23]

As far as the evidence shows, converted Jews were not subject to residence controls, as were current Jews. In fact, at the beginning of the fourteenth century, the king not only had no idea where his converts lived, but he had no idea who they were, nor how many of them there were. This fact was essentially admitted to by the king and his administration in 1308, when the investigation into the affairs of the *domus* showed how many converts were in each of the previous categories. Had the 1308 inquisition not indicated the state of disarray into which the *domus conversorum* had fallen by Edward II's reign, the *domus* might properly have been considered a form of residence control. The converts were not mandated to live in it, however, so perhaps this was not in fact the case. It is likely to be the case that the *domus conversorum*, established as it was by Henry III, and only grudgingly supported by Edward I, had become a governmental albatross by the time of Edward II. The Exchequer of the Jews had nothing to do with the *domus conversorum*, given that it was the personal project of the king. The Fine Roll lists in 39 Henry III where

[22] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 398.
[23] Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b.

the king assigned converts to various religious houses, were, in the first instance, only moderately successful in terms of being a relocation project, and secondly, were perhaps not quite what they appeared to be at first glance.[24] Though technically the king was sending the converts to these religious houses because they needed places to live—and the *domus conversorum* was likely full—the corollary was that once the converts were safely ensconced in whichever religious house to which they had been assigned, the king would have had a better idea of they were living. Though the Exchequer of the Jews had no direct relationship with converted Jews and where they lived, holding only responsibility for the residence controls of current Jews, the king had taken it upon himself to fulfill that role with the converts.

When a Jew died in England, it was accepted convention that the king was entitled to 'a sum equal to one third the value of his movable goods, his outstanding debts, and of the value (but for one year only) of any houses or other immovable property in his possession'.[25] But, when a Jew converted, the king was entitled to the entirety of his or her chattels. For much of the thirteenth century, a tacit policy existed in England that directly contradicted the relevant canon of the Third Lateran Council. According to the twenty-sixth canon of that council,

> If any by the inspiration of God are converted to the christian faith, they are in no way to be excluded from their possessions, since the condition of converts ought to be better than before their conversion. If this is not done, we enjoin on the princes and rulers of these places, under penalty of excommunication, the duty to restore fully to these converts the share of their inheritance and goods.[26]

The canon did not neglect to mention punishment for the rulers who disobeyed it, and yet the English kings had a policy in effect from at least John's reign that directly infringed on it; notably, the papal legate to England attempted to enforce this canon in Alberic's case, discussed below. Where English policy agreed with policies mandated elsewhere was in the area of preaching for conversion, though this

[24] For complete discussion on the 1255 Fine Roll lists, see discussion on pp. 134-137, and on pp. 114-116.

[25] *PEJ*, vi, p. 8. As Brand points out, this convention was in force from at least 1220, if not before; see *PEJ*, i, p. 37.

[26] *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, p. 224.

was never as prevalent in England as it was elsewhere.[27] The Pope supported forced Jewish attendance at sermons,[28] as Edward was also to do later. In January 1280, Edward had mandated that the Jews attend sermons preached by the Dominicans.[29] Though new in England, this had been mandated decades earlier elsewhere.[30] Why this proclamation had come so late in the history of the Jews in England is unclear. Rodocanachi, speaking of another time and another place, put it down to the understanding that preaching against something so ingrained in collective memory and such a part of the individual would have had the opposite effect, that is, strengthening the resolve to remain Jewish.[31]

This English practice of escheat upon conversion was referenced consistently throughout the thirteenth century, although there is no definitive start-date for it. Prior to 1279, the decision to allow a convert to keep anything he had formerly owned was entirely dependent on royal prerogative. One of the earliest instances of this type of favour was the case of Alberic le Convers in 1213, though this was certainly not how these cases usually turned out. Alberic had converted at some point prior to 1213, and in November 1213 the Papal legate, Nicolò of Tusculum, intervened on the convert's behalf in order that the house which had belonged to his father, Isaac, and which he presumably owned at this point, might not escheat.[32] Why would the papal legate bother to intervene? Surely the papal legate in England

---

[27] Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, i, p. 16 n. 21 discusses this in the context of the Kingdom of Aragon, which dated from at least 1242.

[28] Ibid, no. 105.

[29] Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 576. This is also calendared in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 356.

[30] James of Aragon had decreed this nearly forty years earlier. Edward demanded that when the Jews attended the friars' sermons, they were to do so *absque tumultu, contentione, vel blasphemia, audiant diligenter et benigne* (see Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 576). James of Aragon demanded that Jews and Saracens gather at the call of the friars, *et patienter audiant predicationem eorum* (see Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, i, no. 105).

[31] Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, i, p. 16, alludes to this. The paragraph that Grayzel is paraphrasing, and to which I am referring, runs 'Quand on se trouve en face de dogmes très anciens et profondément enracinés, comme l'était alors le judaïsme, on est dans cette alternative, ou d'arracher par la violence, ou d'attendre avec patience, les conversions; en les solicitant, on court risque de n'aboutir à autre chose qu'à irriter en vain les esprits et à surexciter cet appétit de contradiction qui est inné à la race humaine'. See Emmanuel Rodocanachi, *Le Saint-Siège et les Juifs: Le Ghetto à Rome* (Paris, 1891), p. 273.

[32] *Rot. Lit. Claus., 1204-1224*, p. 139b. The house was likely larger than was usual: it was described as having a *camera lapidea*, or 'stone chamber'. See *Close Rolls, 1227-31*, pp. 48-9 and *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1226-57*, p. 76. The two entries are very similar.

had more pressing matters to attend to, especially leading up to 1215? It does seem likely that Nicolò of Tusculum had intervened on Alberic's behalf because of recent personal experience. A letter survives from June 1213 wherein the Pope mentioned, in passing, that in the Archbishopric of Sens, a Jew who wished to be baptised had 'held much discussion in the laws and the prophets with him, then our venerable brother, the Bishop of Tusculum carefully instructed him, and baptized him into the Catholic faith'; the letter went on to order the Archbishop 'to arrange matters that he and his family, also converted to Christianity, should be provided with the necessities of life; so that because of lack of temporal goods they should not be forced to look backward'.[33] Nicolò of Tusculum was in England by September 1213,[34] and by November 1213 had intervened on behalf of Alberic the convert. This intervention was certainly unusual in many respects. Petitioning on behalf of a convert was itself not terribly unusual as the century wore on, but a papal legate petitioning the king on what was essentially a domestic financial matter was not repeated. In any case, the papal legate need not have bothered, because by the mid-1220s, Alberic was still in arrears by 10*m.* on his portion of the Bristol Tallage and had fled the country.[35] What is interesting about this case, apart from the intervention of the papal legate, is that, at least at this point in the century, a Jew's responsibility to pay his portion of a tallage did not disappear by virtue of his having converted to Christianity. The king was essentially double-dipping: the convert's chattels escheated to him, and the convert was still liable to pay any tallage assessed *tempore judeitatis sue*. The only way the king was going to preserve his financial interest was by ensuring the proper outcome himself; the Exchequer of the Jews was nowhere to be seen in this case.

Had Alberic designs on perhaps fleeing to France and integrating with a local French Jewry, his situation vis-à-vis tallage is unlikely to have been greatly improved.

---

[33] Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, no. 29.

[34] Christopher R. Cheney, *Pope Innocent III and England* (Stuttgart, 1976), p. 39.

[35] *Fine Rolls 12 Henry III, 1227-28*, no. 212. There were two previous entries on the Fine Rolls referring to this case; see *l.c.* no. 176 and no. 191. The tallage referred to was presumably the Bristol Tallage of 1210. None of the Fine Roll entries are dated any more specifically than the regnal year, but they do refer to the fact that King John had committed the house and chamber to Brito Balistarius, meaning Alberic had fled the country before 1216.

There did exist some transfer of thoughts on Jews between England and her closest continental neighbour, pointed out both by other historians as well contemporary chroniclers. Jordan, in particular has described the similarities in the Jewish policies of John and Philip Augustus as 'unsettling, even uncanny'.[36] The Chronicle of Melrose Abbey provides contemporary evidence that these policies were perceived to be similar, writing that in June 1210, as soon as the King of France became aware of King John's massive arrest and mistreatment of the Anglo-Jewry with the aim of securing payment of his 60,000*m.* tallage, he arrested the entirety of the French Jewry;[37] in order to be released from jail, every Jew was to ransom himself.[38] The similarities in the treatment of their Jewish populations was not limited to the reigns of John and Philip Augustus, considering that in the decade and a half following the late 1220s, during the reigns of Henry III and Louis IX, further parallel developments can be seen. In France, the Capetian policy of *captiones* closely mirrored the Angevin policy of tallages. The *captio* launched by Louis IX between 1227 and 1230 was possibly imitated in 1239 by Henry III, who had yet to tallage his Jewish subjects with a severity resembling that of John. Stacey has characterized the tallages between 1221 and 1239 as 'steady, moderate, effectively annual contributions to the king'.[39] In 1239, however, Henry III suddenly demanded a third from the Anglo-Jewry, imprisoning Jewish leaders and sealing the *archae.*[40] The implication was that the Jews would fund this third by 'redeeming their bonds and possessions

---

[36] Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews*, p. 64.

[37] *Chronica de Mailros*, eds. Sir John Hay and Alexander Pringle (Edinburgh, 1835), p. 109; regarding King John's treatment of the Jews, he writes *A Judeis autem quicquid fere habebant auferens, eosque a domibus suis excludens, quibusdam oculos eruens, quosdam fame perdens, omnes in tanta necessitate dejecit pericula...*; regarding Philip Augustus' reaction, he writes *Quod cum regi Francorum innotuit, sciens Judeos...subtili fretus astucia, per omnes Galliarum provincias simul ut omnes Judei carceribus manciparentur edixit. Quod cum factorum est usque adeo eos omnibus apporiavit* [sic] *ut nec sibiipsis* [sic] *possent subvenire, necnon et militibus suis terras suas et kartas, quas Judei inpignoraverant* [sic] *absque fenore restituit, et divites dimisit inanes.*

[38] Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews*, p. 67. Jordan notes that it was possibly only male Jews who were arrested.

[39] Robert Stacey, 'Royal Taxation and the Social Structure of Medieval Anglo-Jewry: The Tallages of 1239-1242', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 56 (1985), p. 179.

[40] Robert Stacey, 'The English Jews Under Henry III', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), p. 49.

from royal confiscation by paying the king a communal relief amounting to a third of their value.'[41] This English tallage mirrored the French events of 1227, which authorised the taking of all outstanding Jewish debts.[42]

A case similar to that of Alberic unfolded when a Jewish convert named Augustine of Canterbury converted at some point prior to 1227, and was allowed to keep his home in Canterbury in January 1227 by mandate of the king.[43] Between 1227 and 1234 nothing was recorded, but in April 1234 the case was brought to an interesting close. After Augustine had converted to Christianity, he gave the house that he had been allowed to keep to the monastery of St. Augustine of Canterbury, whose abbot then sold the house to Isaac of Canterbury, a Jew. Chera, the converted Augustine's former wife, sued Isaac in order to receive a third of the house's value as her dower portion, based on her previous marriage to Augustine. The plea was disallowed on the grounds that Chera should have followed her husband into Christianity, and the justices of the Jews were ordered not to hear any future pleas concerning this (*decetero placitum inde non teneant*).[44] The case, found on the Close Roll for 18 Henry III, was witnessed by the king, and the order was apparently handed down to the justices of the Jews (*mandatum est justiciariis ad custodiam etc.*). It was not discussed by the justices of the Jews themselves and then handed down to the parties concerned as was the norm. It is interesting that for Chera, a Jew, her husband's conversion was tantamount to his having died—thus her claim to dower.[45] It is not terribly surprising that the king ruled that Chera should have followed her husband into Christianity. The king, a lifelong proponent of conversion, was not likely to rule in her favour, even if only to make a theological point. The king also benefited financially in the long run. He was able to both exercise kingly largesse in allowing

[41] Stacey, 'Royal Taxation', p. 179.
[42] Jordan, *The French Monarchy and the Jews*, pp. 129-30; Stacey, 'The English Jews Under Henry III', p. 49.
[43] *Rot. Lit. Claus., 1224-27*, p. 167a.
[44] *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 555.
[45] It is possible that Augustine had died between 1227 and 1234, but equally possible that he might have been alive. The Latin *fuit* is ambiguous and though it commonly meant that the subject had been widowed, it is also possible that it simply meant that the marriage had been dissolved upon the conversion of one of the parties.

Augustine to keep his house, and in the longer term, would benefit from the house remaining in Jewish hands once the new owner, Isaac, died or converted.

Until 1279, there was no change in the long-held convention that the entirety of a convert's chattels escheat to the king upon conversion, despite being a disincentive to conversion to Christianity. The accepted date for the change that occurred is May 1280, when the king mandated that only half of a convert's chattels were henceforth to escheat to him.[46] The king might have been thinking about this change slightly before this date, however, because in November 1279 he issued an order that was seemingly to do with the ongoing coin-clipping controversy, but actually might have had to do with the impending change in the rules of escheat. The order, issued to the Christian and Jewish chirographers of Northampton, was for a quasi *appuramentum*, though there was no order for the chirograph chest to close. The king wished to be certified of all the debt instruments in the chest 'that belonged partly or wholly to Jews lately condemned, fugitive, or converted to the Christian faith, and to other Jews whose chattels are forfeited to the king by reason of the clipping of his money...'[47] I would posit that despite the fact that the coin-clipping trials were ongoing, the king really had no interest in them by late 1279 because the investigations had been dragging on for nearly two years.[48] If this is in fact true, the order stating that Jews lately 'condemned, fugitive, or converted' was really an intentional misnomer; by November 1279, all the Jews who would be condemned for coin-clipping had been so many months prior,[49] and those who were fugitive were so few as to be non-factors.[50] This left 'converted Jews' as the only category of

[46] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 371-72.
[47] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 41.
[48] Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1148. Since 1277, alleged offenders had been punished, and justices had been commissioned in January 1279 to investigate something tangential to the coin-clipping trials—that of Jews who had forged or clipped money, but more importantly, Christians and Jews who had exchanged good money for clipped money. The focus had thus moved from coin-clipping *qua* a felony, to that which was peripheral to it and was a result of the felony—the purchase or use, after the fact, of the feloniously-created money, the creation of which had already been punished.
[49] The final group of Jews being punished during the coin-clipping trials was in May 1279. See Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1148 n. 4; he cites, amongst others, *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 529-30.
[50] Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, Part II', pp. 177, 178, 185, 187, 189, 202, 210. Concerning

Jew about whom the king wished to know the state of his debt instruments. It is interesting that the king chose to send the order for the quasi *appuramentum* solely to the chirographers of Northampton in the first instance. Surely, if it had to do predominantly with coin-clipping, it might have originally been sent not only to the chirographers both Jewish and Christian, who, necessarily, were the only ones with access to the *archae* and their contents, but to a sheriff as well, and indeed, several sheriffs beyond the borders of Northampton. Had it actually to do with coin-clipping, it is doubtful that the Jewish chirographers would have been included as recipients. The inclusion of anyone outside of Northampton was done almost as an afterthought. The other towns containing *archae* were listed below the order to the chirographers of Northampton. However, the king was sending this in the first instance to the chirographers of Northampton because there was a Jewish couple based there who had just converted.[51] Agnes and Barnabas of Northampton, and their daughter, Joan, had converted to Christianity prior to May 1280,[52] and the constable of Northampton castle was mandated to return all of Agnes' and Barnabas' goods and chattels to them.[53] There was some delay in fulfilling this order, as in late July 1280 the king had to mandate to Hugh of Kendal that he return any goods belonging to Agnes that he still held, and to the sheriff of Northampton reminding him that the house in which Agnes lived prior to her conversion was to be restored

---

the 481 Jews accused of coinage offences, Rokeah counts nine fugitive or outlawed—I count seven. None were from Northamptonshire. Of course this does not mean *ipso facto* that they had no bonds in the Northampton *archa*—it is possible that they did, though the likelihood is reduced. The Jews fugitive or outlawed were Cok of Andover (Hampshire), Copin of Hailsham (Sussex), Hagin son of Hagin of Canterbury (Kent, Sussex), Hake son of Horess' (Norwich), Isaac de Caun (Wiltshire), Meyr de Bruges (Shropshire, Oxfordshire), and Salomon son of Josce of Marlborough (Wiltshire).

[51] I believe this to be the reason that the order to certify all the debt instruments was sent in the first instance in November 1279. The couple had converted and the king wished to know the extent of what was about to escheat to him.

[52] As in the footnote above, I believe the Jewish couple had converted prior to November 1279. The order to return the Jewish converts' goods to them (in June 1280) specifically stated that all of their goods and chattels had already been taken into the king's hands ('...to have restitution of all their goods and chattels within the town of Northampton, which were taken into the king's hands...'; see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 25), meaning that they would have had to have converted prior to the existence of the order to leave a moiety of goods to the convert's use, which was sent in May 1280.

[53] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 25.

to her.[54] Agnes and Barnabas' daughter, Joan, was also to have all her goods and chattels restored to her. Both Barnabas and Joan were listed in the 1308 inquiry into the affairs of the *domus*. Barnabas was entered as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292, but Joan was entered as living there in 1308.[55] As with Alberic and Augustine, the Exchequer of the Jews had no involvement in this case, and it seems as though it was intentionally kept at arm's length by kings who wanted direct control over matters that affected them financially.

The absence of institutional control over converts in favour of royal prerogative was not always the reality. Occasionally, the king's will concerning some of his converts was exercised through the justices of the Jews, but it remained fairly clear that the king was the main driver behind the actions of the justices. One of the more well-known cases fitting this description still concerned this change in the rules of escheat as they related to conversion, and was the case of the converts Belaset (or Belasez), her sister Hittecote, who were both of Oxford, and a third, unrelated convert named Floria Tapay.[56] In Trinity term 1280, Belaset, the wife or widow of Solomon of Alecetre, had converted, along with Hittecote, as had Floria Tapay, who was the wife or widow of Solomon of Brubrok.[57] A panel of six Christians and six Jews was commissioned to discover the extent of the property held at death of a certain Jew, as well as the property held upon the conversions of Belaset, Hittecote, and Floria, and to whom that property had come.[58] The sheriff sent word that the writ had been returned to the bailiffs of Oxford, and that they had not responded in respect of the six Christians. It was adjudged that he was not to fail because of

---

[54] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 28. Oddly, the phrasing of the order suggests that Agnes had had her house seized prior to her conversion, and not as a result of it: '...and the king has now granted to them the house that Agnes had and held in that town before her conversion, which was taken into the king's hands before her conversion...'

[55] Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b.

[56] Secondary literature discussing one of or both Belaset and Hitecote or their cases includes Prynne, *A short demurrer to the Jewes*, p. 94; Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, pp. 254-55; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 300-1, 303; Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 36, 133, 161; and Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 242-43.

[57] *PEJ*, vi, nos. 653, 691. It is unclear whether or not Belaset and Floria were actually widows, or their marriages had been dissolved because they had converted to Christianity.

[58] *PEJ*, vi, no. 653.

the liberty, and the six Christians were to be made to come before the justices of the Jews along with the six Jews. Later in Trinity term 1280, six Christians did appear as instructed along with six Jews, but all six Christians were paupers—and therefore inappropriate to judge the worth of the chattels—and the Jews were also not wealthy enough, and therefore also insufficient to inquire into the said goods by their oath on behalf of the king.[59] The sheriff was given a new day by which to produce six new Christians and six more suitable Jews, and was ordered to be more discerning in his selections. What happened with the panel and its mandate is unclear; the final writ concerning Belaset and Hittecote mandated that they be allowed to keep a moiety of their goods despite having converted slightly prior to the order allowing this for new converts.[60] Together they owned nine books worth 2*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*[61]—a not insignificant amount. They were also allowed to keep half of the 10*s.* that had been raised from the selling of their clothes. This final writ was brought by John de St. Denis, the warden of the *domus conversorum*, to the justices of the Jews, who needed the authority of the writ to release the other half of the chattels to him.

Occasionally, it was not the king himself who had an interest, for whatever reason, in keeping new converts solvent. By November 1289, a convert who picked (or perhaps was given) the name 'Eleanor of St. Paul' had converted.[62] At the request of the king's daughter, Eleanor, the convert Eleanor was allowed to keep the entirety of her goods, debts, and chattels.[63] The entry is interesting for numerous reasons. In the first instance, because the order that Eleanor be allowed to keep all her property was sent to the justices of the Jews. Again, as with Belaset and Hittecote, the king

[59] *PEJ*, vi, no. 691.

[60] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 114. See also *PEJ*, vi, no. 914—this is identical to the plea in Rigg, *l.c.*, but untranslated; in Rigg, *l.c.*, *pium* is transcribed as *parvum*, which does not make much sense.

[61] Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, pp. 254-55, is of the opinion that Belaset (or Belager, as he writes) 'was a man of learning, for his moveable goods consisted chiefly of books'. It is indeed possible that Belaset was a woman of learning, but it is more likely that she held these books in gage, or that they had been pawned to her and Hittecote prior to their conversion.

[62] Eleanor's sponsor might not have been from England at all, but rather from St. Pol, in French Flanders, a traditionally English-allied part of France. For another convert perhaps in the same situation, see discussion on p. 102.

[63] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 27.

used prerogative to circumvent the long-held convention governing converts and escheat. This might indicate that the Exchequer of the Jews was still involved in the lives of converts until such time as it took possession of the *quondam* Jew's goods and chattels. At that point converts became, administratively speaking, the concern of either the *domus* if they were destitute,[64] or perhaps Christian acquaintances or noblemen with whom they had had previous relationships.[65] A minority either acquired a trade, or continued in the trade they had carried on while Jewish.[66] Secondly, the king gave Eleanor the convert all her goods, debts, and chattels at the insistence of his daughter. This seems to point to the idea that there was a previous relationship between Eleanor the convert and Eleanor the king's daughter.[67] This brings up the final point of interest: Eleanor the convert was not only to be allowed to keep her goods and chattels, but also her debts. Though it might have been implied, there was no insistence, as with some other converts who were allowed this arrangement, that she collect only the principal of the debts,[68] or that she be allowed to keep simply a portion of them.[69] Whatever the reason, she lived for a fairly long time after this, being noted in the 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time.[70]

It is important to understand that Brand's penultimate category of the Exchequer of the Jew's administrative functions, that of licenses to buy or sell property, dealt solely with real property.[71] However, the Exchequer of the Jews did not exercise any administrative function over the real property of Christians, which was effectively what the Jewish converts had become. The licenses themselves were not actually

[64]The 1308 inquiry listing those who lived in the *domus* is found in Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62.
[65]Henry of Winchester is the most pertinent example of this; see discussion of his life in chapter 5.
[66]Among others, there were goldsmiths, tanners, and crossbowmen. See the appendix, *passim*.
[67]Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 300, is under the impression that Eleanor the *quondam* Jew had converted in the presence of Eleanor the king's daughter, and was therefore allowed the favour of retaining her property. Though an intriguing theory, there is no evidence for this.
[68]For an example, see discussion on pp. 141-142.
[69]See discussion above concerning William de Warrenne, on p. 72.
[70]Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b. The inquiry lists 'Isabella de Sancto Paulo' and 'Alienora Convers'; the former is a different convert, though perhaps a relative. It is assumed that Alienora is actually Eleanor.
[71]*PEJ*, vi, p. 9. Regarding moveable property, the Exchequer of the Jews also exercised jurisdiction over its litigation (*l.c.* p. 10).

issued by the Exchequer of the Jews, but rather by Chancery, with 'both the letters patent licensing the transaction and the charter recording the transaction...recorded on the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews'.[72] Given the available evidence, the Exchequer of the Jews did not exercise this right over converted Jews. Several times over the course of the thirteenth century, converted Jews either bought or sold real property without a licence, or, in a separate but related jurisdiction, litigated about real property title without the Exchequer of the Jews becoming involved.

One of the earliest examples was the Michaelmas term 1199 case of Constance, wife of Gerin the Tailor. Gerin was presumably a Gentile, and Constance the convert. Constance expected to receive some land in York that had belonged to her deceased father, and had since escheated to the king.[73] The end result was Constance being allowed to keep her father's land.[74] This was seemingly counterproductive for the king, since it would have been better for the treasury had he allowed the land to remain in escheat. In Trinity term 1214, there was again a real property dispute, though this time it was a dower court case. Emma of Winchester, a convert, who had been married to the late Reiner son of Vitalis, attempted to claim her dower portion. It concerned a third of 60*s.* of rent and appurtenances in Winchester,[75] and was withheld by Isaac the Jew, and his wife Chera.[76] Isaac and Chera did not appear or essoin, and the dower was ordered to be taken into the king's hand and a second summons be made. At that point it emerged that Reiner, the late husband of Emma, had given this dower to her, and as above, Emma said that Isaac and Chera

[72] Unless in such a case where litigation over title had arisen, and one of the litigants was Jewish; see *PEJ*, vi, p. 9.

[73] *Memoranda Roll 1 John, 1199-1200*, p. 24. See also Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30.

[74] Though not explicitly stated, the fact that Constance's father previously owned the lands is implied by *terra nunc remanet hereditaliter eis*, as in Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30.

[75] Dower portion was typically a third of everything. However, it is unclear how much Emma was actually seeking. The plea contained in the first *Curia Regis* entry (from Hilary term, 1214, see footnote #77, below), asked for a third of the rent and appurtenances (*...de placito dotis de tercia parte lx. solidatarum redditus cum pertinentiis in Wintonia*), but the plea contained in the second *Curia Regis* entry (from Trinity term, 1214, see footnote #78, below), seems to be asking for the entirety of the six messuages (*Emma la Converse petit versus Isaac Cirographarium et Cheram uxorem suam sex mesagia in Wintonia, que valent per annum lx. solidos*).

[76] *Curia Regis Rolls, 1213-15*, p. 70-1.

were withholding it.[77] Isaac and Chera denied that this was the case, and said that Chera's son Abraham, the product of a previous marriage, held the six messuages concerned. All the parties involved placed themselves in inquest to ascertain the truth. This case was an oddity because it was heard in the king's court—though it is impossible to ascertain whether the Exchequer of the Jews exercised a monopoly of these cases at this point in the century. What seems to have been very clear, however, was Emma's undeniable status as a Christian. Had she still been considered Jewish, per the terms of both charters issued by John on 10 April 1201,[78] the case would perhaps have been considered to be between two Jewish parties and thus grounds for having it heard in a Jewish court and according to Jewish laws. It is also possible that having the case heard in the king's court might not have been a reflection of Emma's Christian status, but rather the fact that the case concerned land; these cases often found themselves under crown jurisdiction, despite not being crown pleas.

The requirement to hold a licence was not a constant during the thirteenth century, with the accepted date for its formal enforcement not occurring until the Statutes of the Jewry in 1275. It did happen before that point, but it does not seem to have been an official necessity.[79] Though it might seem like an important case for these purposes, there are two problems with using Augustine of Canterbury's case as a model, vis-à-vis the rules and regulations listed above. In the first place, the case occurred between 1227 and 1234—much earlier than even the earliest issued licences, and secondly, because Augustine had already given his house to the monks of St. Augustine's prior to the case beginning. The Exchequer of the Jews was involved in the case simply because Chera, Augustine's former wife, was Jewish, and it retained the right to exercise jurisdiction over litigation to title of real property if either of the litigants was Jewish.[80] Augustine, despite causing the case through his conversion,

[77] *Curia Regis Rolls, 1213-15*, p. 245.
[78] For complete discussion of these two charters, see p. 35.
[79] For examples of licences being obtained prior to the Statutes of the Jewry, see *PEJ*, vi, p. 9 n. 39.
[80] *PEJ*, vi, p. 9.

was relegated to a secondary character in terms of the litigation to the title of the property; his only role was as convert who should have been followed into Christianity by his former wife. While there was no rule that mandated a convert's wife to follow her husband into conversion, the tolerance level for mixed-religion marriages in thirteenth century England was decidedly low. Moreover, a mixed marriage would have been 'abhorrent both to the Church and to the Jewish community'.[81]

While Augustine's case was too early, Hawisia la Converse of Oxford's case was slightly too late; moreover, the surviving records are not sufficiently detailed. Hawisia was listed in the 1308 investigation as living in the *domus* at that time,[82] and was last recorded as living in April 1323, when she was given protection with clause *volumus* along with a fairly extensive list of parsons, priors, and abbots, and was the only woman listed among 38 men.[83] Thomas of Hereford, the common serjeant of the university of Oxford, died between August and October 1332. His will stated two things concerning Hawisia. Firstly, she had sold a tenement and appurtenances to Thomas at some point previously, and secondly, she held land of Thomas during her life.[84] There is no indication if the land she held during her life and the tenement and appurtenances that she sold were one and the same. That she had land which she then sold while also being noted as being resident in the *domus* in 1308 is unusual in that there does not seem much point in having land and simultaneously living in the *domus*. A secondary point to be made, though slightly irrelevant for the present purposes, is that if the land held by Hawisia was outside of a town, she was not considered bound by the 1271 legislation that prohibited Jews from having freehold in, among other things, lands and tenements.[85] The point is moot if the land was in fact within a town. There is an absence of proof that she did not have a licence to sell land, but it can be inferred that she did not require one if she held the land by

[81]Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 35.
[82]Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b.
[83]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1321-24*, p. 270.
[84]William Patterson Ellis, *Liber albus civitatis Oxoniensis: abstract of the wills, deeds, and enrolments contained in the White book of the city of Oxford* (Oxford, 1909), p. 13 no. 21.
[85]For discussion of the 1271 legislation, see p. 59.

freehold after 1271.

It is difficult to discuss the jurisdiction of the Exchequer of the Jews over litigation to title of real property because often, the litigation was between a Jew and a converted Jew, making it difficult to ascertain if the Exchequer of the Jews was involved precisely because one of the litigants was Jewish. What is required in order to discover the nature of its jurisdiction over converted Jews in cases of real property litigation are cases where the said converted Jews were litigating against Christians over title to real property, with no current Jews being involved. Perhaps the only cases that fulfill these requirements involve, again, Henry of Winchester. In 1284, Henry was involved in a suit with Roger Loveday over the title to Henry's manor at Romford, Essex, as well as a separate case also involving land law, spanning thirty years, and concerning a man named Roger le Peytevin.[86] In the Loveday case, Henry retained the property in question, and the litigation was contained on the Plea Rolls of the Court of Common Pleas and not the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews. Indeed, apart from referring to him as *Henr' le Convers de Wynton'*,[87] at no point in the records of either process of litigation was it mentioned that Henry was a former Jew. Given the evidence of only two cases, it is difficult to make any broad statements as to the nature of the litigation to title of real property when one of the litigants was a Jewish convert. However, if these cases involving one of the more high profile converts of the thirteenth century can be used as an indicator of a broader trend, it seems likely that the Exchequer of the Jews did not exercise jurisdiction over converted Jews. Making an example of Henry of Winchester would have been the perfect opportunity, were the Exchequer of the Jews in fact to exercise jurisdiction; he was one of the more publicly noticeable converts, and there would likely have been no better time to remind a former Jew that he was always going to be subject to the Exchequer's jurisdiction.

The Exchequer of the Jews' jurisdiction over litigation about moveable property

[86]See discussion on p. 163 for the Loveday case, and p. 161 for the Peytevin case.
[87]CP 40/55, m.107d. Often, 'le Convers' became a surname for *quondam* Jews. For numerous examples, see the appendix, *passim*.

is slightly easier to discuss than jurisdiction over litigation to title of real property, simply because the number of cases where it concerned converts is greater. This jurisdiction, even for non-converted Jews, was not exclusive.[88] This lack of exclusivity is also mirrored in the converts' cases. The entirety of a converts' moveable property escheated to the king upon the Jew's conversion—or rather, it was supposed to. This was not always the case, causing actions to be brought, usually by the king in the Exchequer of the Jews, to recover moveable property that should have escheated to him but was in possession of third parties.[89] Again, this was not exclusive; the king occasionally used prerogative to cause a case to be concluded in a certain way, and against expectations, not always in his favour or that of the treasury.

When Joan of Winchester converted in July 1246, the king awarded her 34*m.*, which was a third of her husband Deulebeneie's chattels and debts.[90] But, contrary to what accepted practice must have been, the king paid Joan her 34*m.*, and then credited Deulebeneie with the same sum in his debts. Thus, Deulebeneie really paid nothing at all to his wife, with the only cost affecting the king. Either the order to add 34*m.* to Deulebeneie's debts was lost in translation, with the result that he was actually credited that amount, or there was an existing relationship between the king and Deulebeneie, causing this sum to be, essentially, a gift of the king. It is also possible that the king had ordered the justices of the Jews to let Joan have this amount from Deulebeneie's debts. Whatever the reason, the only involvement that the justices of the Jews had with the grant to Joan was as recipients of the king's order to release the sum to her; the justices really had nothing to do with the grant.

The king also considered authorisations and grants concerning Jewish converts as being within his area of royal discretion, as opposed to that of the justices of the Jews. In December 1237, a convert named Martha of Canterbury had converted and was admitted to the *domus conversorum*.[91] By 1247, she had married another converted

[88] *PEJ*, vi, p. 11 n. 69.
[89] See discussion in *PEJ*, vi, p. 11 n. 70.
[90] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1245-51*, p. 70.
[91] *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 9.

Jew named Richard of London, at which point it emerged that when she had converted in 1237, her father and her kin had taken her 30*m. maritagium* from her.[92] The king mandated to the justices of the Jews that Martha and Richard be given the sum, and nothing more concerning this survives in the records. Theoretically at least, the case should have gone before the justices of the Jews, dealing as it did with a Jew. Appearing as they did on the Close Rolls for these years, it is possible that they did not appear simultaneously on the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews.[93] Regardless, the king clearly had no qualms about intervening on behalf of his converts, instructing the justices of the Jews despite their not having heard the case. Richard and Martha were subsequently sent to the Benedictines at Abingdon in 1255, likely due to the overcrowding of the *domus*.

Perhaps the best indication that the jurisdiction over converts and their chattels was held in the king's person and not in the Exchequer of the Jews was the case of Amitia Batecok, former wife of Abraham Batecok. Upon her conversion, her chattels were to escheat to the king, but her former husband Abraham objected.[94] The king accepted Abraham's offer of half a gold mark not to hear the case, and instead, that it be heard by the justices of the Jews according to the law and custom of the Jewry.[95] There are two possibilities as to why this was allowed to happen. Either Abraham actually thought that he had a case, and was able to show that the chattels were in fact his, or, despite it appearing as though the king was giving up prerogative rights, it is possible that the king did in fact know what the decision of the justices of the Jews was likely to be. If so, this was tantamount to the king double-dipping—receiving half a gold mark as well as the potentially escheating chattels of Amitia. Not only was the king being given money for what technically should have happened anyway, but he was also proving that where converts were

[92] *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 194.

[93] This is, of course, conjectural; the closest surviving Plea Rolls were from Easter, Trinity, and Michaelmas terms 1244. See *PEJ*, vi, p. 58.

[94] Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271, writes that this case concerned Abraham's protest over dower that he was going to potentially be forced to pay to Amitia, not escheated chattels.

[95] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 276.

concerned, he was both the first and final judge.

Occasionally, the king was content to let things run through the Exchequer of the Jews, despite his clear prerogative to judgment in most cases concerning converts. In Trinity term 1266, a man subsequently named Samuel had converted, but the question still remained as to whether or not his debts had been discharged prior to or after his conversion.[96] An investigation was to run, mandated by the Exchequer of the Jews. The king and his usual decisions regarding converts was nowhere to be found in this case, simply because he was not going to be the beneficiary of any escheated debts. The Jewry had been in the Lord Edward's hand when the debts were to have escheated. He obviously did not yet exercise the same prerogative powers in these matters as did his father, despite having right over the Jewry. Edward was particularly committed to receiving what he was owed. A case survives from Easter term 1270, where an unpaid debt of $10m.$ that had escheated to him was mainperned to be paid by the sheriff of Devonshire and other mainpernors if the sheriff's distraining of the tenants of the debtor's lands should prove unsuccessful.[97]

The Exchequer of the Jews also held jurisdiction over trespasses and felonies. Here, the problem seen above, where Jewish converts disappeared from the records if they converted and led quiet lives, is more pronounced. Regarding trespass jurisdiction, the Exchequer of the Jews possessed it in a wide variety of cases, ranging from ejection from a house, to defamation, to physical assault.[98] One of the only surviving cases concerning a convert dates to October 1254, and concerns John Belet, the convert, who had married without a license a woman named Emma Oliver.[99] The issue was apparently that she held land of the king in chief. They were put on a three

[96] *PEJ*, i, p. 132.

[97] Ibid., p. 265. Why this was happening in 1270 is unclear. Edward only held the Jewry for slightly more than a year in 1262, before granting it and its associated profits to Cahorsini merchants, then regaining it in 1265, only to lose it to Simon de Montfort (see *PEJ*, vi, p. 46 n. 5). Either this entry and that at footnote #97, above, are both misdated in the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, or Edward was chasing debts from three and seven years earlier, respectively. If the latter is the case, it is likely that these two converts had converted in 1262 when the Jewry was held by Edward, and not in 1266 and 1270 respectively, when their cases were recorded.

[98] See discussion in *PEJ*, vi, p. 11.

[99] *Fine Rolls 38 Henry III, 1253-54*, no. 890.

year payment plan, and John was to regain seisin of his lands and tenements which the king had confiscated as a result of the marriage-license trespass.[100] Though still few in number, there are slightly more cases concerning the Exchequer's jurisdiction over felonies that also involved converts than cases concerning trespass jurisdiction. In March 1252, two converts were accused of rape and breaking the king's peace, by the improbably-named Orframia of Gratlesden.[101] They were Simon of Norwich, and his accomplice, John *conversus*. Neither Simon, who lived in Thorney, nor John, who lived in Huntingdon, were currently in custody, but both were to be held and imprisoned (...*capiat et in prisona regis salvo custodiat*).[102] They had been captured by May 1252, but Orframia did not wish to prosecute, and the two converts were released.[103] Everything concerning the accusation and subsequent order to release the two converts appeared on the Close Roll for that year, though it is unclear why. It might suggest, however, that it was not simultaneously on the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews.[104] It is also interesting that the king himself was involved; it would stand to reason that Crown Pleas would be heard at an eyre, their increasingly infrequent nature notwithstanding.[105] In November 1265, Matilda of Grimsby committed a felony and fled the kingdom, and the 8*d.* weekly that she had formerly been receiving was to be distributed to Hugh and John, the chaplains of the *domus*.[106] As above, though the type of felony was not mentioned, this was on the Close Roll for the given year.[107]

The Exchequer of the Jews, it would seem, neither possessed nor exercised exclusive administrative rights or jurisdiction in the cases of converts, despite its

---

[100] On the membrane, the sentence beginning *Et quia Johanes et Emma manuceperunt* and detailing the payment timeframes looks as though it was written over an erasure; see C 60/51, m.2.

[101] This is perhaps a mis-hearing of 'Rattlesden', in Suffolk, though this does not address the implausibility of the name 'Orframia'.

[102] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 201.

[103] Ibid., p. 84.

[104] This is conjectural; the closest surviving Plea Roll of the Exchequer of the Jews was that of Easter term 1253; see *PEJ*, vi, p. 58. See also the case of Martha of Canterbury on p. 90, above.

[105] *PEJ*, vi, p. 11.

[106] *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 154-55.

[107] The closest surviving Plea Roll of the Exchequer of the Jews was that of Trinity term, 1266. See *PEJ*, vi, p. 58.

inevitable continuing involvement in the lives of the *quondam* Jews. As long as the king had the right of escheat after Jews converted, the Exchequer of the Jews was going to attempt to collect. If this was not terribly surprising, much more so was the king's direct intervention, often finding in favour of the convert and to the detriment of the treasury. The Jews of medieval England were at a legal crossroads for much of the thirteenth century. These competing rules, regulations, and laws had an even greater effect on converts: they were placed in a legal grey area upon conversion, with the result that their religious and legal statuses were never reconciled. What was the major consequence of inhabiting this grey area? In theory, converts were Christian. The reality, however, was far different. Converts inhabited a legal grey area precisely because they had not entirely become Christians. They were former Jews without being Jewish, and newly minted Christians while decidedly not being Christian. This ambiguity perhaps explains why the king was so often a figure in cases involving converts. Only he had a vested interest in them. Every convert was a theological and financial victory for him, which might be why he so often inserted himself into their legal lives, and found in their favour. Maintaining the theological high ground meant foregoing temporalities and assuming the mantle of legal protector. There was certainly nobody else waiting to assume this role.

4 Jewish Converts in England

There is very little surviving evidence of the actual act of conversion since the converts were never identified as 'potential apostates' in the records, and really, only came into being for the purposes of history once they became Christians. It can be safely assumed that the process of conversion in England up to 1290 was never really straightforward. In a small number of cases, evidence about past acts of conversion can be discovered, but never so much that broad statements concerning 'the process of conversion' can actually be made with any confidence. The lack of detailed evidence about many of the converts is a theme that runs consistently through the history of Jewish converts in England. The cases that can be discussed with any measure of certainty are few and far between. Beyond receiving some instruction in the Christian faith, the obvious first step to conversion was receiving baptism, and as important as the motives for converting obviously are for the purposes of historical inquiry, as above, the evidence is severely lacking. Conversion itself was occasionally something that was not irreversible; there were numerous cases of double-apostasy and insincere conversion.[1] These are generally well attested in the records, because they were atypical, at least according to the available evidence. The evidence for forced conversion, which was fairly common on the continent, is lacking in the English context. There were certainly coerced conversions, and conversions made in order to have death sentences commuted, but these were not common.[2] In most instances, what we are able to piece together concerning converts and conversion is severely limited by the available evidence. The purpose of this chapter, then, is to use the available evidence in order to answer some explicit questions about the varieties of convert experience, and to demonstrate through these experiences that there was indeed a distinction between leaving Judaism, and joining Christianity.

Very few records survive that detail the actual baptisms of converts, and those that survive do so because they were intimately connected with the king. An early

[1] See discussion below, beginning on p. 129.
[2] See discussion below, beginning on p. 111.

example from May 1234 recorded a convert named Philip, who had both converted and been baptised in the king's presence at Reading (*qui in presentia domini regis se convertit et baptizari fecit*).[3] The entry is both interesting and problematic. In the first instance, Philip had converted and been baptised on 1 May, in Reading, on the feast day of St. Philip and St. James, which was an important day in Reading, because Reading Abbey had the hand of St. James. On this day of celebration, a convert had come away with the name of one of the saints being lauded. Secondly, it is not entirely implausible that the scribe might have recorded that the conversion happened in the king's presence because Philip was to be admitted into the newly opened *domus conversorum*. There was clearly an ongoing debate as to what the *domus* actually was,[4] and the scribe might have felt that a conversion in the presence of the king himself would have been preferable to simply a baptism. Finally, *se convertit* might imply that the convert actually said something in the king's presence in order to begin the act of his conversion, which was then followed by the baptism. In terms of the problem this example presents, it is unclear whether the scribe had simply inferred the conversion happening in the king's presence from the fact that the king was present when a baptism had occurred, or not. The baptism in front of the king was itself fairly unusual for the thirteenth century. There is only one other recorded instance of its occurring: Henry of Winchester was baptised in the king's presence at Westminster, by the Bishop of Chichester, in 1252.[5] The presence of the king was not only recorded during a Jew's conversion to Christianity: on at least one occasion, a convert renounced his conversion in front of the king. In 1189, Benedict of York, a Jew, converted to Christianity while in London for Richard's coronation,

[3] *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 415.

[4] The entry on the Close Roll refers to Philip's admission *in collegio predictorum conversorum*, as in footnote #1, above.

[5] See discussion on p. 139, below. Adler asserts that Isabella of St. Paul, the queen's god-daughter, was baptised in her presence, but he provides no evidence for this. It is possible that he conflated Isabella of St. Paul with Eleanor of St. Paul, who was allowed to keep her goods, debts, and chattels at the instance of the king's daughter Eleanor. For Isabella of St. Paul, see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1330-34*, p. 122; for Eleanor of St. Paul, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 27; for the discussion in Adler, see his *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 300, 309. See also p. 84 for discussion of the possibility that Eleanor might have had a connection with St. Pol in French Flanders, and not in fact with St. Paul's, London; see p. 102 for the same regarding Isabella.

and recanted in front of the king the following day.[6] If the king was not present at a baptism, the only times the act seems to have been recorded otherwise was when the baptism was relevant to the later cases of specific converts. In March 1254, the sheriff of Southampton was ordered to arrest the convert Martin if he was seen, because he had obtained letters by deception from the king in Gascony, directed to the abbot of Hyde who gave Martin a mark. Martin then did the same thing at St. Swithun's, Winchester, claiming that he had been newly baptised in Gascony and that he had taken the king's name.[7] It is obvious that all converts were baptised as a matter of course, but the only surviving records that actually mention baptism did so because of the specific nature of the baptism as it concerned particular converts.[8]

How did a possible pre-conversion relationship with a king or a member of the royal family define a convert's post-conversion experience? The surviving evidence for Jewish converts under Richard is sparse, but does allow for a potential glimpse into the king's interaction with several of them. In the 1187-88 Surrey account, it was noted that Nicholas the Convert and John, both *ad fidem Christi conversis*, had been given 30*s.* 5*d.* in alms by writ of the king.[9] This was roughly five years after Nicholas had paid off a $\frac{1}{2}m.$ for default.[10] The 1187-88 account also noted, though this time for Essex and Hertfordshire, that Nicholas and John had been given 45*s.* $7\frac{1}{2}d.$ in alms along with a third convert named Peter.[11] Both of these payments by writ of Henry II were enrolled as being *hoc anno*—for the entire year. Nicholas and John were again given 30*s.* 5*d.*, this time in 1189-90 by Richard, and again in that year's Surrey, and Essex and Hertfordshire accounts.[12] But, these two gifts were enrolled by writ of the king *de dimidio anno*—for half the year. The gifts to converts

[6] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, iii, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1870), p. 12. For further discussion of Benedict, see p. 112.
[7] *Close Rolls, 1253-54*, p. 121.
[8] Several of the examples involving converts accused of double-apostasy also mention baptism. They are discussed below, on pp. 131-132.
[9] *Pipe Roll 34 Henry II, 1187-88*, p. 23.
[10] This was owed through 26 and 27 Henry II, before being paid completely in 28 Henry II; see *Pipe Roll 26 Henry II, 1179-80*, p. 147, *Pipe Roll 27 Henry II, 1180-81*, p. 150, and *Pipe Roll 28 Henry II, 1181-82*, p. 152.
[11] *Pipe Roll 34 Henry II, 1187-88*, p. 30.
[12] *Pipe Roll 1 Richard I, 1189-90*, pp. 20, 216.

on behalf of the king seem to have been at least intended to be more generous under Richard; there is no surviving evidence that the implied second instalment was ever paid. In Michaelmas term 1194, Nicholas was given $1m.$ by writ of the king (*in donis per breve R.*) out of the ancient farm of London, as reckoned by William of Haverhill.[13] There is a later reference to a convert named John who had some sort of relationship with King John, as he had letters of request and warning (*deprecatorias et commonitorias*) from the king at Loches in 1200,[14] but it is unlikely that these two converts were one and the same. Occasionally, as in September 1238, it was apparent that the king had a special interest in a particular convert. Nicholas of York was admitted to the *domus conversorum*, but rather than the usual perfunctory message to the keepers of the *domus* asking that the new convert be admitted and given the necessaries as with other converts,[15] the king's request for his admittance was followed up with *usque ad adventum regis et scire faciant regi quare amoverunt eum.*[16] This entry is telling not only of the king's relationship with the convert Nicholas, but of all his converts housed in the *domus*. That the king might have been planning a visit to the *domus* at some point is indicative of at least an existing relationship with the house he had founded for his converts six years prior.[17]

Glimpses of various king-convert relationships that seem slightly more sinister can also be gleaned from the surviving evidence. In March 1253, the abbot of Thorney was written a letter of thanks by the king, after having accommodated and furnished Simon of Norwich and his wife and children at the king's request (*quos ad rogatum nostrum admisistis exhibendos*).[18] Greatrex is of the opinion that this was the result of a request for a corrody along the lines of those requested in 1247 and 1255.[19]

[13] *Pipe Roll 6 Richard I, 1194*, p. 177.
[14] *Rot. Chart.*, p. 97b.
[15] For some examples, see *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, pp. 29, 124, 264. It is clear that for at least the first decade of its existence, funnelling converts to the *domus* was the king's principal connection with converts, as opposed to the individualised interactions seen later.
[16] *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 97. This might also suggest that the convert had already been admitted once and that he had actually been expelled.
[17] It is of course possible that the king might simply have been going to London, or somewhere else reasonably close to the *domus*—the entry was witnessed at Abingdon.
[18] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 457.
[19] Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 137.

However, Simon was the same convert who had been accused of the rape of Orframia of Gratlesden along with John *conversus*.[20] It is entirely possible that the letter of thanks sent to the abbot and convent of Thorney was in response to having sheltered Simon after he had been accused of the rape. Despite the fact that Orframia chose not to prosecute, neither Simon nor John were likely to have been *personae gratae* as a result. There is also surviving evidence that a convert's living situation was of concern not only to the king, but, during the king's quasi-imprisonment, to the council that acted in his name as well.[21]

It becomes clear that upon Edward's accession to the throne, the new king's attitude towards his converts was very different from that of his father: whereas Henry appears to have been proactive in dealing with his converts—establishing the *domus conversorum*, providing introductions, demanding monastic corrodies—Edward was more reactive. The converts themselves seem to have recognised this change as well, and the lack of any pre-existing relationships shows itself to have actually been detrimental to a convert's post-conversion life. In a letter from *c.*1274, Alice of Worcester appealed to Edward, asking for a renewal of a grant of corrody in the Cathedral priory at Worcester. She reminded Edward that his father Henry had granted her the original corrody (*par le graunt le rey Henri ki fu vostre pere*), and that while he was in Gascony, Edward himself had re-granted it—but only until his return to England (*e pus par vostre graunt ke vos ly grantastes en Gascoyne...ke ele dut ressayver la charite deskes a vostre venue en Engleterre*).[22] She continued, asking that since he was now returned to England, a letter be sent to the prior and convent at Worcester that she receive her charity there as she had been wont to do beforehand. A second letter was written by Alice and again delivered by her son, this time to Robert Burnell.[23] Her original appeal to Edward might have been unsuccessful,

[20]See discussion on p. 93.
[21]See discussion below, on p. 117.
[22]SC 1/16/63. Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141 n. 37, misreferences this as SC 1/16/65. A transcription is found in F.J. Tanquerey, *Recueil de Lettres Anglo-Françaises (1265-1399)* (Paris, 1916), no. 61. Tanquerey dates it to 1289.
[23]SC 1/24/201. Though the letter is undated, Robert Burnell became chancellor in September 1274, and bishop of Bath and Wells in January 1275 (see Alan Harding, 'Burnell, Robert (*d.*

given that a subsequent letter referred to her homelessness and her waiting for the chancellor to make further arrangements for her. A third letter survives, from Edward to the monks at Worcester, which reprimanded them for 'disobeying his father by their refusal to continue their maintenance of Alice and her son, for he had intended it to extend throughout their lives'.[24] Edward's reaction implies that Alice's first letter, where she mentions the monks' desire to have her stay might actually have meant that they wanted proof that she was indeed supposed to be receiving their charity.[25] The different interpretation hinges upon the understanding of the determiner 'le'. The relevant part of the sentence runs *ke vos ly grauntes vostre letter au Priour et au Covent de Wyrcestre de aver e resyvre la charite cum ele a ressu devaunt ses oures, kar le Priour et les bone gent de la mesun le volunt ben.* Either 'le' refers to the charity that she was accustomed to receive before these times, or, it refers to the letter that she wished granted to the prior and the convent.[26] Furthermore, this letter suggests that there was perhaps a letter in between the second and third that does not survive, wherein Edward responded to Alice's entreaty, and was rebuffed by the prior and convent. Was the problem here the fact that Alice was a convert, or was the issue the potential outflow of funds from the monastery? The surviving evidence does not indicate either way, though this situation is similar to those corrody requests of 1255. No matter how rich a monastery might have been, it was likely loath to part with funds—especially where the possiblity existed that a convert might receive these funds for the rest of her life. Can any broad consequences be extrapolated from this example? Edward's reaction to—and treatment of—Alice and her requests likely reinforced the need in any potential convert's mind for a good relationship with a royal prior to conversion. Those converts who lacked one, as did Alice, were likely to suffer a never-ending

1292)', *ODNB*). Since the letter refers to him with these titles, it would have to be dated after January 1275.

[24] Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141. The letter is in Bodleian Library, MS. Bodley 692, fol. 89v.

[25] SC 1/16/63.

[26] *Charité* and *lettre* are both feminine, making it equally likely that *le* could refer to one or the other.

back and forth between parties who had no vested interest in their well-being.

Royal women occasionally had personal interaction with converts as well, though not nearly as often as their husbands. Eleanor of Provence, Edward's mother, wrote him a letter between 1275 and 1285, which showed not only her personal involvement with a convert, but also Edward's potential reluctance to engage with converts.[27] In it, she asked that one Juliana la Converse be provided for in the *domus conversorum*. It seems likely that this Juliana was the same convert who was allegedly kidnapped in Michaelmas term, 1274.[28] In her later years, Eleanor was noted for her 'tact, magnanimity, and warm personal kindness', traits which were all clearly on display in her intervention on behalf of a convert.[29] In January 1275, all Jews had been expelled from her dower lands; Eleanor was certainly no friend to the Jews.[30] It is striking, then, that she should write so compellingly on behalf of Juliana, noting the threat of Juliana's reversion to Judaism, asking *qe ele eit sa sostenaunce a sa vie entre les autres convers a Londr' les ques vos trovez que ele nait acheson par defaute d retorner a sa primere lai*.[31] Did Eleanor suspect that the draw of Christianity might not be strong enough to persuade Juliana to progress through the liminal stages of conversion? It is possible, with the consequence that Eleanor then acted accordingly, attempting to ensure that the convert had somewhere to go. It is clear, though, that royal women did not have a uniform soft spot for converts: in Hilary term, 1280, Nicholas le Convers, a goldsmith, was sued on behalf of Edward's consort, Eleanor, because he allegedly held a silver pitcher and other jewelry of the deceased Jacob of Oxford.[32] Jacob's goods, debts, and chattels had previously been granted to Eleanor by the king.[33] On the day appointed for the inquisition into the

[27] SC 1/16/177.
[28] See discussion of the event on p. 106.
[29] Margaret Howell, 'Eleanor (*c.* 1223-1291)', *ODNB*.
[30] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 76.
[31] SC 1/16/177.
[32] *PEJ*, vi, no. 343. Jacob was relatively wealthy at his death, holding property in both London and Oxford (see Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 68-9).
[33] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 407. An oyer and terminer had been ordered in January 1280 to investigate those who held his goods—Nicholas was alleged to be one of these people. For others accused of holding Jacob's goods, see *PEJ*, vi, no. 342.

matter, Nicholas appeared but the jurors did not, and the day was reassigned.[34] Apart from Eleanor's suit against Nicholas, this example serves to illuminate another interesting idea: it is quite clear that Nicholas was still in close contact with Jews, despite his conversion. Edward's daughter, Eleanor, intervened in a convert's case in November 1289, succeeding in allowing the convert to keep the entirety of her goods and chattels,[35] and Isabella, Edward II's wife, had a convert as god-daughter, paying her 8*d.* daily out of the issues of Ponthieu;[36] though the evidence is actually very thin, a case can be made that royal women may have been willing to sponsor only female converts.

The evidence for potential motives for conversion is even more sparse than that recording the instances of actual baptism. Why convert at all? In instances where no goal is immediately visible—and it would be irresponsible to assume that all conversions were religiously motivated—any possible explanations must fall back on the idea that conversion to Christianity might have been a choice not for religion, but for money, an escape of trying personal circumstances, or any number of other temporal reasons. The ecclesiastical correspondence in the convert Robert's case points towards money and property as a deciding factor; the correspondence goes so far as to claim that if the convert is not bestowed temporalities, he might re-apostatise. Robert had converted by 1199,[37] and what is striking about this example is the interest that he was given by the Pope himself. Robert received a letter that was addressed to the prior and convent of St. Mary de Pré, Leicester. In it, the Pope

[34] *PEJ*, vi, no. 343. One of the things asked at the death of a Jew was what they held in real and chattel property on the day they fell ill—this entry is a follow up to that. For some examples *inter alia*, see *PEJ*, v, nos. 572, 666, 704b, 819.

[35] See discussion on p. 84.

[36] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1330-34*, p. 122. It seems likely that Isabella la Converse, if she is in fact the same person as 'Isabella de Sancto Paulo' as appears on the 1308 inquisition of the affairs of the *domus*, had a connection with St. Pol in French Flanders, and not St. Paul's, London. This is lent credence by the fact that her grant from the Queen was given at Pont Ste. Maxence, and was to be paid out of the issues of a French town.

[37] He is only known as 'R.' in the surviving evidence. As Richardson writes, this probably stands for Robert (see Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30). Richardson also discusses Robert's potential backstory, wherein he might have unsuccessfully petitioned Celestine III for the same letter, as well as his conversion at the instance of Robert, the earl of Leicester (*l.c.*).

instructed the abbot to provide Robert with food and clothes, echoing St. Anselm's demands of nearly a century earlier.[38] Innocent III echoed St. Anselm in two other ways as well. He feared potential re-apostasy, writing that 'many of them, after their baptism, are led into great distress, with the result that they are often forced to go backward because of the avarice of such as are possessed of plenty'; where St. Anselm wrote a second letter, ensuring that his commands be carried out regardless of the inclinations of those whom he exhorted, Innocent signed off with a thinly-veiled threat against the abbot's potential disregard for his instructions: 'Know you this for certain, that we tolerate this situation with regret and with impatience, nor shall we be able to let this pass unnoticed if you should leave in any respect unaccomplished this command of ours'.[39] In a potential denouement of Robert's saga, litigation survives from 1201, wherein a man named Robert Convers was mentioned in passing as holding land in Hundridge, Buckinghamshire.[40] This was a case between Elias de Wimberville and the Cistercians at Woburn. The evidence that this Robert Convers and the current subject were one and the same lies in the peculiar arrangement between the abbey of St. Mary de Pré, Leicester, and the monks of Woburn Abbey. St. Mary's had a relationship with the Woburn monks because they each held half of the advowson of the church of Chesham, Buckinghamshire.[41] The abbots of St. Mary's presented their own vicars, who served concurrently with those presented by Woburn Abbey, by way of Dunstable Priory, to whom they had granted the rights in the vicarage.[42] It is not entirely inconceivable that the 'Robert Convers' mentioned

[38] Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, pp. 98-99; this is calendared in *Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland A.D. 1198-1304*, i, ed. W.H. Bliss (London, 1893), p. 8.

[39] Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, pp. 97-99; this is calendared in *Regesta Pontificum Romanorum*, i, ed. Augustus Potthast (Berlin, 1874), no. 890.

[40] *Curia Regis Rolls, Richard I - 2 John*, p. 459; there is another relevant reference to the case, *l.c.*, p. 284.

[41] *VCH, Buckinghamshire*: iii, pp. 215-16; *VCH, Leicestershire*: ii, p. 13.

[42] *VCH, Buckinghamshire*: iii, p. 216. There was a suit running for roughly 40 years between the abbots of both Woburn and St. Alban's, as well as the prior of Dunstable, about the right to that half of the advowson (see *VCH, Bedfordshire*: i, p. 336). Interestingly, the chapel of St. Leonard, Chesham Bois, belonged to the half of Chesham Church that belonged to St. Mary de Pré. Though St. Mary's held the advowson, her abbots merely approved the chaplains nominated by the lord of the manor (see *VCH, Buckinghamshire*: iii, p. 220).

as having land near a property of Woburn Abbey in Buckinghamshire should be there because the abbey to whom he had been recommended, St. Mary de Pré, had sent him there.

Another striking example with personal motive on display is that of Elias l'Eveske. His life as Jewish *archpresbyter* became progressively more untenable as the 1250s wore on, mostly, as Stacey put it, because of his 'spectacular corruption'.[43] He was finally removed from his position in July 1257, and was so despised by the Jewish community that they paid the king three gold marks to ensure that he might never be re-appointed.[44] His conversion came by January 1259,[45] along with two of his sons, after an alleged murder-for-hire plot against a Jew named Hagin,[46] who had succeeded him as *archpresbyter* in February 1258.[47] His ever-increasing poverty, unpopularity with his fellow Jews, and the likely pressures of an undesirable office all contributed to his conversion.[48] It is possible that the pressure of a family member converting might have played a role in the conversions of two of Elias' sons at the same time, though family ties alone were clearly not determinative: Elias had a brother, Salomon,[49] who had abjured the realm by September 1260 after being accused of presumably the same felonies as Elias (*qui pro felonia quam fecit abjuravit regnum regis*),[50] and was noted as being dead by June 1268.[51]

On the continent at least, prebends and the livings of churches were occasionally offered to converts. In Reims in March 1169, a convert named Peter was promised a prebend,[52] and in Tournai in 1173-74, a convert named Miles was ordered to be installed in a prebend once one became vacant.[53] In the latter, the chapter and dean

[43]Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 272.
[44]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, pp. 570-71.
[45]*Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, p. 16; see also *Close Rolls, 1256-59*, p. 356.
[46]JUST 1/1187, m.10.
[47]*Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, p. 8.
[48]He took the name 'Henry' upon conversion. See E 159/32, m.7d. I am grateful to Dr. Henry Summerson for the reference.
[49]*Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 271.
[50]*Close Rolls, 1259-61*, pp. 119, 210.
[51]*Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 465.
[52]Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, i, no. 50.
[53]Ibid., no. 52.

were hostile to the idea of a Jewish convert receiving the prebend.[54] Converts as clerics also occurred in later years on the continent; in 1239 in Mainz, the Canon of St. John's was a convert,[55] and in 1250 in Paris, a convert cleric named Philip was given dispensation from paying tolls and taxes.[56] Later in 1250, the Pope wrote to the Prior of St. Nicholas at Nevers that a convert named John who had become a cleric there was to be given an ecclesiastical benefice in that province or diocese.[57] There is a lack of definitive evidence for a parallel in England; the only possible example dates to 1322, when it was ordered that Alexander le Convers be presented to any vacant prebend in Ireland that was free before Christmas.[58]

Jewish community resistance to child conversions often manifested itself through kidnapping the formerly Jewish child. In May 1236, Fermins of Amiens and his wife had converted to Christianity.[59] By June of that year, his children had been kidnapped by several Jews of Northampton, and it was ordered that his children be brought before him in order that they might also be given the opportunity to convert or to remain Jewish (*vel in errore suo remaneant*).[60] Later in 1236, a Jewish boy was kidnapped by several Jews of Oxford after being baptised without his family's consent.[61] He was eventually found in Exeter and released into the care of Robert Bacon, the Oxford academic.[62] This boy, John, was sent to the *domus conversorum* in April 1237.[63] Perhaps the most well known instance of kidnapping Jewish converts

---

[54]Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, i, no. 53.

[55]Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, i, no. 94. See also n. 1, *l.c.*

[56]Ibid., nos. 124, 125.

[57]Ibid., no. 128.

[58]See full discussion in the biography of Alexander, below, on p. 182. Another possible example actually concerns an advowson, and not a prebend, dating to May 1308; Stephen le Convers and his wife Matilda were granted the manor of West Barming, Kent, along with the advowson of the church there, by Robert de Barming. See *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 61, 68; C 143/68/8; *Rotulorum Originalium in Curia Scaccarii Abbreviato*, ii (London, 1810), p. 74; C 143/220/6.

[59]*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 264.

[60]Ibid., p. 358. Whether or not they decided to convert is unclear.

[61]The lack of familial consent is surmised in Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 24, though it seems slightly dubious; the forced conversion of a Jewish child in a large Jewish centre such as Oxford would likely have elicited some noteworthy response, either in administrative records or chronicles. The logical extrapolation is that the entire family converted, and the Jewish community thought to save the most vulnerable member.

[62]*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 383. For further discussion of Robert Bacon and his role in Jewish conversion, see discussion below on p. 127.

[63]Ibid., p. 436.

happened in 1274, and did not involve Jewish children at all. Juliana la Converse was allegedly kidnapped after having converted, and placed on a ship bound overseas, threatened with death, and sexually assaulted by one of her Jewish kidnappers. The ship was compelled to put in at Sandwich, where Juliana escaped and made her way back to London by way of Canterbury; at Canterbury, she received a letter from the Jews there addressed to the Jews of London, advising that amends be made to her for the trespasses she had endured.[64] She eventually withdrew her plea.[65] Rigg is of the opinion that this was nothing more than attempt at extortion,[66] while Stacey takes the approach that it was simply a Christian-invented story.[67] Juliana was briefly joined in her experience by a convert named Roesia, who, after converting, was placed in the custody of Juliana. They were allegedly separated by the kidnapping Jews, and Juliana claimed not to know whether Roesia was dead, alive, or had re-apostatised.[68]

There is a distinction to be made between leaving Judaism, and converting from it. Those Jews who made the conscious choice to convert to Christianity might rightly be termed pure 'converts', but those who left Judaism unwillingly, while still being 'converts' in the proper sense of the word, were in a very different situation, often not under their own control. Being forced to leave Judaism often amounted to a *de facto* conversion since there was no place in thirteenth century English society for someone who was neither a Christian nor a Jew. At least once, in 1277, during a case concerning coin-clipping, a Jew named Joce Bundy[69] was asked to which law he subscribed (*utrum se voluit tenere ad legem Christianam*

[64] *PEJ*, ii, p. 209.
[65] *PEJ*, iii, p. 42.
[66] Rigg, in *PEJ*, ii, p. 209: 'This very unlikely charge, of which nothing more is heard, was probably a mere attempt at extortion, which, being resisted, was abandoned'.
[67] Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 280: 'An assault may well have occurred; nevertheless the charges are so obviously the sort of thing Christian authors expected from Jews that one is reluctant to give the case much credence.' I would agree with Stacey—the story, though undoubtedly containing some elements of truth, smacks of an *exemplum*. For the potential denouement of Juliana's story, see discussion on p. 101.
[68] *PEJ*, ii, p. 209. For a theory, see below on p. 132.
[69] For further discussion of Joce Bundy, see discussion on p. 56.

vel Judaicam).[70] Contextually, *legem* may very well mean 'religion' as opposed to 'law'.[71] This interpretation makes Joce's decision seem much easier: no longer is he being asked to be a *legisperitus*, but simply to decide based on his knowledge of the two religions. When he asked for permission to think about his answer over the weekend, it was held by the masters of the law that he had forfeited the right to be a Jew because he did not immediately answer that he was so (*ipse incontinenti nisi respondisset, quod est Judeus, de cetero inter eos non teneretur pro Judeo*).[72] Joce seems to have been the passive recipient of conversion in that his leaving of Judaism became essentially a conversion, in contrast to the vast majority of Jewish apostates. This imposed conversion, and the accompanying seizure of all of his goods and chattels as a result, might have saved his life: coin-clipping was a capital offence. But why did conversion save him from hanging? It certainly looks as though a new legal person was born out of conversion, one being neither Jew, nor Christian, and this person was not subject to death for a capital offence. Joce's case seems to have been an accelerated version of what happened to Sadekin of Northampton and Cok Hagin in Trinity term 1275. In his introduction to *Select Pleas*, Rigg noted that were a Jew 'excommunicated by the Synagogue, and failed to make submission within forty days, the Crown evinced its solicitude for the due observance of the Jewish Law, and asserted its supremacy in matters synagogal by confiscating the offender's property'.[73] That this was the same result as having converted was likely not lost on the Jews to whom this punishment was applied. The goods and chattels of both Sadekin and Cok Hagin escheated to the king (who gave them to the queen), and though Sadekin's possessions and debts are not listed, Cok Hagin's are, and he forfeited a debt of 250*m.*[74]

[70]Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 96.

[71]For another instance where this interpretation is made, see Hyams, 'Faith, Fealty and Jewish 'infideles' in Twelfth-Century England', p. 135.

[72]Rigg, *Select Pleas*, p. 96.

[73]Ibid., p. xxxv.

[74]Ibid., pp. 87-8. Rigg explains that Cok Hagin's excommunication was likely due to factionalism at the Synagogue, and offers Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 591 as proof, wherein Cok Hagin was selected as *archpresbyter* of the Jews (see p. 88a, n. 1). In n. 2, p. 88b, Rigg writes that 'it is impossible to say how Richard of Staines, who was certainly no Justice of the Jews, came to be concerned in the affair'. It seems likely that Master Richard, noted as *hoc scire fecit predicto Domino Regi*

Importantly, nobody seems to have called Joce Bundy, Cok Hagin, or Sadekin 'Christians'. They certainly were not treated as Christians; they were treated simply as having left Judaism, and consequently, were neither Jewish nor Christian. The leaving of Judaism caused these Jews to forfeit their property, but was not accompanied by joining Christianity. Was there perhaps some action or phrase needed to renounce Judaism? In Joce's case, simply remaining mute when asked the question was enough. If there was something other than silence that was said in order to convert, was it then possible to join Christianity after both instruction and baptism? Concerning this quandary the evidence is far from conclusive, though the liminality of the conversion experience becomes increasingly clear. The threshold aspect of conversion was noticeable to contemporaries as well. Between 1105-06, St. Anselm, then Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote a letter that was co-addressed to William, the Archdeacon of Canterbury, and Ernulf, the prior at Canterbury. In it, he asked that a recent convert to Christianity named Robert be cared for. Anselm included specific instructions, asking Ernulf to allot something to Robert from the alms, and that William allot something to Robert from Anselm's own share of the archdeaconry's revenues.[75] Anselm's letter betrayed a worry that the new convert might regret his choice to flee from Judaism to Christianity, and referred to the fact that this had happened in the past: 'It is indeed a great disgrace for Christians, and above all for religious, that through their negligence and insensibility, they permit this to take place in their very presence'.[76] Anselm recognised the liminality of conversion and allowed for it; by addressing the issue directly, he hoped to negate the more distasteful aspects of conversion, chiefly the neither-here-nor-there status. It also seems likely that Anselm did not entirely trust William and Ernulf's desire or

Henrici, was involved in the case because of his previous experience as a clerk in the Exchequer, and his having been commissioned in the past to value the property of certain men on behalf of the king; see Brand, *Earliest English Law Reports*, i, pp. cxxxv-cxxxvi.

[75] *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, iii, ed. Walter Fröhlich (Cistercian Studies Series 142)(Kalamazoo, 1994), no. 380. The untranslated letter is found in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, v, ed. Franciscus Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1951), no. 380.

[76] *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, iii, no. 380; *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, v, no. 380.

capability to follow the instructions they had been given. A day later, Anselm took the trouble to write to Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, informing him that the letter had been sent to William and Ernulf, and that 'if at any time they should neglect to do what I told them—which I do not expect—you should supply with dutiful cheerfulness whatever is lacking out of our possessions'.[77] Anselm was not only a model of ecclesiastical tolerance, but a shrewd man: he recognised the difficulties foisted upon Jewish converts, and at least in this case, moved to confront them.

The blurry stages between Jew and Christian continued beyond the Expulsion, when, by definition, everybody in England was a Christian. A petition survives from Andrew, a convert, to Edward II, in which it is mentioned that he was sent to the priory of Bradenstoke after his baptism at the age of two during the reign of Henry III, and that he remained there during Edward I's reign (*...de un convers qe ad nun Andreu qe fust baptize al age de ij anz en le tens le Rey Henri e mande par sa lettre a Bradenstok de aver ma sustinance e la fu sustenu tote sa vie e la vie vostre pere Rey Edward*). Andrew's case displays the hallmarks of this idea of conversion where the convert could be neither Christian nor Jew. The king had re-granted Andrew his sustenance at the priory twice: once in the woods near King's Langley, Hertfordshire (*a la grave pre de Langhelee*) following his coronation five years earlier, and again that same year, at Waltham, Essex. Both times, Andrew had received Edward's letter under the privy seal (*vostre lettre o vostre preve ceal*).[78] At the end of the petition, Andrew noted that he had later asked the prior for the grant of sustenance to which he was entitled, but that it had been denied. The prior and convent expressed to Andrew that they would in no way fulfill his grant, (*e jeo le porta al prior e al covent il ne tyndrent ren de ceo*) and that there was nothing doing (*qe ren ne me valust*), Andrew's petition stated he had been accused of breaking down the door of the storeroom and stealing silverware and goblets; not only this, but he was also accused of celebrating mass as a Jew. The crimes which Andrew was

[77] *The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury*, iii, no. 381. The untranslated letter is found in *S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia*, v, no. 381.
[78] SC 8/279/13929.

alleged to have committed are very obviously the sort of thing that a prior might accuse a Jew of carrying out. And, concerning the mass, the accusation was brought forward despite the fact that he had been baptised at two years of age and would scarcely have remembered what a Jewish service sounded like, let alone the fact that a Jewish service would not have resembled a mass in the slightest. It seems likely that this accusation was added to that of thievery in order to make Andrew appear even worse. Regardless, this indictment caused him to be imprisoned at Salisbury, where the prior and convent asked and prayed to the *bones genz del pais* that he be put to death. These *bones genz*, presumably the jury, found Andrew to be a good and loyal Christian, and said so to the royal justice presiding, John of Foxley. They also found that the charge had been made with evil intent and hatred. When Andrew, finally released from prison, asked the Prior of Bradenstoke, who at this time was John de Botewell,[79] for his sustenance, the prior's alleged response was the slightly contemptuous instruction that Andrew should go off begging because he would get nothing at all, even if it were the king and queen who were requesting it.

It is clear that Andrew was shocked to learn that despite spending almost the entirety of his life as a Christian, he was still a Jew. Why might this have been the case? Two possible reasons present themselves: either the prior and priory had simply tired of paying his sustenance and had concocted the charges in order to rid themselves of a tiresome and expensive burden, or, Andrew had unwillingly become the poster boy for the idea that one could leave Judaism without joining Christianity. A mix of both reasons is likely to have been the reality. The Prior of Bradenstoke had lent credence to the idea that, as far as ecclesiastics were concerned, a Jew could never be rid of his Judaism; the jury, composed of laymen, disagreed. Though there is a complete lack of surviving evidence for the reactions of laymen to converts, it would be interesting to know the answers to several questions: was this jury of laymen and their verdict of Andrew as a *leals e bon cristien* only a localised Salisbury

[79]The prior had been elected in 1312 (see *Registrum Simonis de Gandavo, Diocesis Saresbiriensis A.D. 1297-1315*, ii, eds. C.T. Flower and M.C.B. Dawes (Oxford, 1934), p. 781).

phenomenon? Had the anti-Judaism that had been been given physical targets up to 1290 receded, and had the *bones genz del pais* softened their stances toward *quondam* Jews? Though the answers to these questions are impossible to verify, one thing is clear regardless: even when a convert thought he had joined Christianity, he might be pushed back to a transitional stage between the two religions; were he a more recent convert, he might seriously think about re-joining Judaism.

Forcible conversions of Jews to Christianity were never as common in England as they were on the continent—at least to judge by the surviving evidence. The most well-known example of coerced conversion on the continent was also the first case of widespread anti-Jewish violence. In 1096, marauding crusaders attacked the Jewish communities of the Rhine valley, including Speyer, Worms, Mainz, Cologne, Metz, Trier, and compelled the Jews resident there to choose between conversion and death.[80] The result was that the entire Jewish population of Regensburg was forcibly baptised in the Danube.[81] Perhaps significantly, the ultimatum offered to the Jews seems to have worsened over the course of the eleventh century. Between 1007 and 1012, Jews in Northern Europe were offered the alternative between conversion and expulsion, and only occasionally, death.[82] Guibert of Nogent wrote of the conversion-or-death scenario occurring in 1096 in Rouen,[83] and Ephraim of Bonn provided a lengthy list of anti-Jewish actions in Western Europe from 1171 to 1196. Of these, at least two—one in 1180, the other in 1186—contain depictions of forcible conversions.[84] Insincere conversions, on the other hand, were more prevalent. Despite

[80]Jeremy Cohen, 'A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade', in Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen, eds., *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Notre Dame, 2001), p. 10.

[81]Kenneth R. Stow, *Alienated Minority: the Jews of medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, 1992), p. 102.

[82]Robert Chazan, *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: a political and social history* (London, 1973), p. 12.

[83]Norman Golb, *Les Juifs de Rouen au Moyen Âge: portrait d'une culture oubliée* (Mont-Saint-Aignan, 1985), p. 77-78; for Guibert's text, see appendix I, *l.c.*, p. 95.

[84]Robert Chazan, 'Ephraim ben Jacob's Compilation of Twelfth-Century Persecutions', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 84, no. 4 (April 1994), pp. 401-403. Upon further inspection, a particularly interesting instance of potential forced conversion in England turns out to be something else entirely. Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 162, cites a transcription of a petition claiming that an Oxford student named John Brown was alleged to have christened and possibly kidnapped a Jewish child. In fact, this was an appeal of robbery that was brought by a Jewish woman on

the vagaries of record survival, insincere conversion was perhaps so serious that the majority of the instances of it were preserved in the records, and thus the extant cases can be discussed with some measure of certainty. One of the first examples of an undeniably insincere conversion occurred in September 1189, during Richard's coronation. A Jew named Benedict of York, along with other Jews, had come to London in order to present gifts to Richard. But, the day before the coronation, the Jews were forbidden from presenting themselves at the king's court on the day of the coronation itself (*sed quia prohibitum erat eis die hesterna, quae praeteriit, ne ad curiam regis die coronationis suae accederent*).[85] The gathered mob attacked the Jews, and ejected them from the hall. Among these was Benedict, who, being hurt and close to death, was baptised by William, the prior of St. Mary's, York.[86] Benedict was given the name 'William', and on the following day was ordered by the king to be presented to him at court. When asked *Tu quis es*?, he answered *Ego sum Benedictus Judaeus tuus de Eboraco*;[87] Richard then asked the archbishop of Canterbury what should be done with the man who had clearly converted merely to save his own life,[88] and the enraged prelate's answer was *Ille Christianus esse non vult, homo Diaboli sit.*[89] The convert William returned to Judaism, and upon his death a short time later, was refused burial in both Christian and Jewish cemeteries. Hoveden wrote that the Archbishop had said *sicut canis reversus ad vomitum, rediit ad Judaicam pravitatem.*[90] The fact that the chronicler spent, proportionately, a

behalf of a Christian child; Roth appears to have misinterpreted *e une Amice, Jue de Oxonford, furma un faus apel sur luy en sa absence pur un enfaunt ke fu cresteiene, e ele le fit apeler de roberie.* The manuscript cited is SC 8/97/4813; Roth, *l.c.*, cites a transcription of this petition to *Collectanea*, iv (OHS 47) (Oxford, 1905), pp. 93-4, but it is actually found in *Collectanea*, iii, ed. Montagu Burrows (OHS 32) (Oxford, 1896), pp. 93-4.

[85] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, iii, p. 12.

[86] Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 130, writes that the prior and the Jew were friends, but this lacks evidence. It is likely that Adler based this upon the fact that they had both travelled from York.

[87] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, iii, p. 12.

[88] Both verbs are in the passive voice, making it unclear whether or not Benedict sought conversion, or was forcibly baptised by the prior William in order to save his life.

[89] *Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, iii, p. 12.

[90] Ibid., p. 13. The simile of the dog returning to his vomit was not new. Jews re-apostatising from Christianity and termed as 'returning to their vomit' were mentioned in D.4 de cons. c.93, which was based on canon 34 from the Council of Agde in 506. This, in turn, made use of Proverbs 26.11 and the second letter of Peter 2:22; see Hosang Boddens, *Establishing Boundaries:*

large amount of space in his chronicle detailing the incident is telling of the emotions that a perceived apostate likely brought out in native Christians. Why was Benedict baptised? The chronicler does not ask, nor seek to answer, the question. Was it out of a genuine concern for the Jew's well-being? With the mob rioting and Benedict being close to death, his baptism might have saved him from further harm. Did the prior believe that the Jew's soul might be saved if he died after having been baptised—and conversely, that his soul would remain unsaved were he not baptised? Did Benedict seek conversion, justifying the Archbishop of Canterbury's ire at his double-apostasy? These are unanswerable questions, though there were historical continental parallels to the idea of converting in order to save one's life; Chazan allows for the possibility that at the time of the first crusade, the bishops might have viewed some conversions 'as contrived and insincere from the outset, meant to serve merely as a vehicle for extricating Jews from their perilous circumstances.'[91]

Later in Richard's reign, in Michaelmas term 1197, a Jew named Gentilia, daughter of Samson, was to pay four ounces of gold for an investigation into her father's religion at the time of his death,[92] and the Jews of Norwich were to pay the same amount for an investigation into whether or not some Jews of London who were jailed in Norwich for the death of a man had been baptised or not.[93] It is possible that Gentilia and the Jews of Norwich were arguing two sides of the same coin. Gentilia presumably sought to show that her father had not converted, in order that she might not lose a potential inheritance, and the Norwich Jews were presumably seeking to prove that the Jews imprisoned in London had in fact converted, thus escaping communal responsibility for the presumed offences committed by the potential converts. Occasionally, it seems as though the king and his administration were more suspicious of converts than was the Jewish community. In June 1234, the king

---

Christian-Jewish Relations in Early Council Texts and the Writings of Church Fathers (Boston, 2010), p. 151.

[91] Robert Chazan, *God, Humanity, and History: the Hebrew First Crusade Narratives* (Berkeley, 2000), p. 137.

[92] *Pipe Roll 9 Richard, 1197*, p. 59.

[93] Ibid., p. 242.

ordered that a convert named Hugh of Norwich receive the convert's necessaries at the *domus conversorum* since the two wardens had ascertained that he had been baptised and was of good conversation (*quod ex quo constiterit eis quod baptizatus fuerit et sit honeste vite et conversationis*).[94] This order was sent soon after the *domus* had opened, and though there is no surviving evidence for it, it is possible that this sort of preliminary investigation was de rigueur for all new converts. This mistrust of potential wards of the royal administration, which is what many converts became, might have been brought on for two distinct reasons. Most in keeping with the idea that 'true' conversions were sought, these investigations into the newly professed converts might have been brought on by previous conversions that had not been made in good faith, an example being the 'conversion' of Martin le Cumvers in 1254.[95] For converts destined to become royally-mandated corrodians, however, this mistrust was likely less inspired by faith and more by finances. Henry III had made it a habit to store his aged servants in monasteries, whose monks were mandated to provide them food, clothing, and lodging for life. The monasteries often rejected these requests to lodge former porters, sergeants, servants, and occasionally a favoured servant and his wife. Despite the fact that by Henry III's day these forced corrodies were close to being a legal rule, the monasteries excused themselves more often than not—the burden of supporting a single corrodian with a horse and groom was seen as prohibitive, let alone any more than one. There existed a delicate to and fro; generally, 'the matter was settled by the adjustment of pressure between the king's tenacity in asking and the monks' tenacity in excusing themselves. He could not absolutely command, and they could not absolutely refuse.'[96]

The life, and lifestyle, of a Jewish convert was generally difficult and as far as the surviving evidence shows, the life of a Jewish convert *cum* royal corrodian was exponentially moreso. In 1255, the king requested a host of monastic corrodies for

[94] *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 440.
[95] See discussion above, on p. 97.
[96] Susan Wood, *English Monasteries and their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1955), p. 110.

Jewish converts. The king's correspondence regarding the requests survives, as do the lists assigning converts to monasteries, convents, priories, and hospitals. Many of the requests were denied, and the converts were sent back to the king. Why were these converts denied? As above, it seems unlikley to have been because of religious factors; though they cannot be entirely discounted, the evidence that might prove this does not survive. The refusal to accommodate these converts was likely due to a combination of the king's absence from England and the potential material cost of acquiescing to the king's request. The cost is fairly self-explanatory: the term requested by the king was for two years of sustenance, or $1\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day instead.[97] The king had been in Gascony up to late 1254, and clearly implied in his letter to the Prior of St. Mary of Walsingham that this was a request and not an order.[98] All the same, the king advised that he would brook no excuses that might require him to ask another time (*Nullam super hac peticione nostra pretendentes excusacionem pro qua vos debeamus alias inde sollicitare*).[99] In the event he did have to ask several houses a second time, and as Carpenter has written, that letter 'contained a reproach so rueful, undignified and inconsequential that one feels it must have come direct from the king himself'.[100] The king reprimanded the priors and abbots for their failure to accede to his request, and mused on the fact that the response might have been worse had he still been overseas.[101] It seems likely that the king knew what the reaction on the part of the priors and abbots was going to be, given his absence. The houses were clearly opportunists, seeking to avoid the cost of housing or pensioning a convert for two years. This attitude of avoidance and refusal appears to have been a new phenomenon in 1255. Why did the religious houses suddenly

[97] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 53. The term used was *tres obulos*. Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 221, Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 137, and Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', p. 141, translate this correctly. Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 242, 289, and Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 269, do not.

[98] Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', p. 141.

[99] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 53.

[100] Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', p. 142.

[101] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', p. 142, cites this as no. 123.

acquire aversions to housing converts? The reason might very possibly be rooted in a very shrewd, almost business-like approach to their finances. The only other situation where the king had converts sent en masse to somewhere other than the *domus* happened in December 1247, when Henry had sent seventeen converts to various houses. Of these, only three appeared in later records as living not where they had been assigned in 1247. These were Henry *clericus*, who had been sent to the Benedictines at Hyde in 1247,[102] Hugh *conversus*, who had been sent to the Dominicans at Wilton Abbey, Wiltshire in 1247,[103] and Alice of Oxford, who had been sent to the Hospital of St. John the Baptist, Eastgate, Oxford in 1247.[104] It is entirely possible that the religious houses had taken note of these 1247 requests and refused the 1255 requests in an effort aimed at displaying independence from the demands of the crown. Unlike the 1255 requests, those of 1247 did not did not specify a particular period of time that the king wished his converts to be housed; furthermore, there is no surviving record of the houses' refusal to accommodate any of the converts at that time.

The 1250s were not the *terminus ad quem* for royal corrody requests; in April 1265, a letter close was sent to the Abbot of St. Osyth's asking for provision for Richard of Westminster for a period of two years.[105] It was witnessed by the king, and it noted that the request had been made *de consilio magnatum qui sunt de consilio nostro*. Why was this corrody request seemingly accepted, especially after the massive denial of royal requests a decade earlier? Though the request was sent in

---

[102] *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100. He appeared later on the Fine Roll lists of 1255 having been sent to the Hospital of St. John the Baptist, Eastgate, Oxford (see *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 124, 981). Roth, *Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 148, makes a slight mistake, stating that Henry was sent to the Hospital of St. John, Oxford in 1247, but correctly gives 1255 as the year for his commending to the Hospital in Oxford (*l.c.* p. 25).

[103] *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100. It is possible, though not very likely, that he might have been sent to the Benedictine Nuns at Wilton. He appeared later on the Fine Roll lists of 1255 having been sent to the Benedictines at Horsham St. Faith (see *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 981), as well as to the Premonstratensians at Beeleigh (see *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981).

[104] *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100. She appeared in 1308 inquiry into the affairs of the *domus* as living there in 1292, but having since died.

[105] *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 109. Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141, refers to Richard as 'Roger of Westminster'.

the king's name, the decision had been made by the council of magnates acting on his behalf; it is possible that the Abbot of St. Osyth's accepted the request in an attempt to ingratiate himself with the Montfortian council. There is at least one example where the religious house that had been asked to provide for a convert did not simply deny the request outright, and it occurred in 1275 when Henry, a convert, had a letter from the Pope, asking that the Prior of Dunstable provide him and his family with necessities. The Prior declined this request but arranged for him to be provisioned elsewhere (*Officialis Lincolniensis fecit dicto Henrico alibi provisionem*).[106] Why did this prior attempt to provide for the convert elsewhere, whereas the overwhelming response of similarly-positioned churchmen in 1255 garnered the outright denial of the king's request? Perhaps the prior was imitating his colleague at St. Osyth's and attempting to curry favour with the new king.

What if a convert was unhappy at being repeatedly shunted around the country, waving about a generally ineffectual royal corrody request? Might a convert, seeking a modicum of stability, consider re-apostasy and attempt to rejoin Judaism? According to Gratian's *Decretum*, the effects of conversion were permanent—one remained a Christian whether one liked it or not, and irrespective of its insincerity or forced nature it could not be reversed. Necessity, as with Benedict at Richard's coronation, was not even a valid excuse for re-apostatising, and the decretal which was no doubt used to justify this stance was unambiguous on the matter: *oportet, ut fidem, quam vi vel necessitate susceperint, tenere cogantur*.[107] The contextual meaning of *fidem* here is perhaps ambiguous; the obvious meaning is the Catholic faith, but there may also be an implication, or at least an echo, of the faith which the Christian community had placed in the convert. *Sicut Judeis*, the papal bull that defined the church's policy towards the Jews also forbade forcible conversions, but made no mention of whether or not the unwilling convert would be forced to remain in the new faith.[108]

---

[106] *Annales Monastici*, iii, p. 265. There is a problem with the chronology in the annal—this incident with Henry is dated *eodem anno* as the entry above it, which discusses laws purportedly passed in 1275. However, the description of the laws passed more closely resembles those passed in 1271; see discussion on p. 59. The role of the official of Lincoln in this case is unclear.

[107] D.45, c.5.

[108] *Statuimus enim, ut nullus Christianius invitos vel nolentes eos ad baptismum venire compellat*;

Interestingly, the bull did allow that those converts who had come unwillingly to Chrisitanity were not true Christians.[109] The obvious extrapolation would be that they would thus be allowed to return to their previous faith if they so desired, given that they were not true Christians according to the definition contained in the bull, but this is obviously highly unlikely.

Those converts who did not—or perhaps could not—brook the idea of returning to Judaism might have thought that by choosing their Christian names to coincide with the names of royal functionaries, they might attain a measure of advantage on their convert brethren. Was this a realistic train of thought? Could converts with names matching those of Henry and Edward's favourites really expect to lead easier Christian lives, or expect continuing support? In 1246, a convert took the name Robert Grosseteste, presumably after his sponsor, the bishop of Lincoln. Despite his sponsor being a relatively powerful individual, the convert Grosseteste did not have an easy time post-conversion. He lived for a time in the *domus*,[110] but during the 1255 assigning of the converts to religious houses, he was separated from his wife and child. He was marked down to be sent to the Benedictines at Winchester Cathedral Priory at least four times,[111] while his wife Matilda and his child were marked down to be sent to the Cluniacs at Monks Horton,[112] or to the Benedictines at Hyde.[113] Depending on where Matilda and the child were actually sent in the end, the separated family might not have been too far from one another since Winchester Cathedral Priory and Hyde were both in Winchester. John of Darlington, a convert from 1255, presumably took the name of his ecclesiastical sponsor, a Dominican who was then a member of the king's council.[114] Evidence survives dating to 1255,

---

see Simonsohn, *The Apostolic See and the Jews*, i, no. 49.

[109] As above in Simonsohn: *Veram quippe Christianitatis fidem habere non creditur, qui ad Christianorum baptismum non spontaneus, sed invitus cognoscitur pervenire.*

[110] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 493. The record does not indicate that he had a wife or child—possibly meaning that he was married between 1246 and 1255.

[111] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 125, 981.

[112] Ibid., no. 53. The Fine Roll lists are unclear as to whether the child is named John or Joan.

[113] Ibid., nos. 124, 981.

[114] Darlington was appointed a member of Henry's council in 1256, and it is likely that he was the king's confessor prior to this; see William A. Hinnebusch, 'Diplomatic Activities of the English Dominicans in the Thirteenth Century', *The Catholic Historical Review* 28, no. 3 (October

and noting two converts named after, or perhaps who chose the names, of two royal functionaries: John Mansell and John de Plessis. There is little evidence surviving about the lives of either of these converts. On the 1255 Fine Roll lists, John Mansell was ordered sent to the Cluniacs at Lewes three times, and his daughter, Dionisia, was separately ordered sent to the Augustinians at Michelham three times.[115] John was undoubtedly named after the king's very rich and powerful counsellor of the same name, who was said by Powicke to have been 'concerned as a principal agent in nearly every public affair of importance, from the Scottish borders to Spain, as well as in England'.[116] The convert John de Plessis was ordered sent to the Cistercians at Roche three times,[117] but as with the convert John Mansell, no further evidence survives. His namesake, John de Plessis, was earl of Warwick by virtue of his marriage to Margery of Newburgh, countess of Warwick. The earl John de Plessis held the earldom only for his life, however, but was given the barony of Hook Norton in inheritance.[118] Interestingly, both John Mansell and John de Plessis were chosen as the king's two electors for the permanent council by the baronial faction at the Easter parliament of 1258.[119] The earl of Warwick died in 1263, and was buried at the Augustinian abbey of Missenden, Buckinghamshire,[120] where, in an interesting confluence of narratives, a convert named Sybilla of Chesham and her daughter, Agnes, had been sent in 1255.[121] These men who are named as having to do with converts all seem to have had close connections with Henry III; were they

---

1942), p. 313.

[115] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 124, 981. The separation of father and daughter might not have been overly harsh: Lewes and Michelham were very close, geographically, within Sussex.

[116] F.M. Powicke, *King Henry III and the Lord Edward: The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century*, i (Oxford, 1947), p. 295.

[117] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 124, 981.

[118] Emma Mason, 'The Resources of the Earldom of Warwick in the Thirteenth Century', *Midland History* 3 (1975-76), p. 71.

[119] *Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267*, no. 5 § 9, 23. For the workings of the committee of twenty-four, see Brand, *Kings, Barons, and Justices*, pp. 18-20.

[120] White Kennett, *Parochial Antiquities Attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, and Other Adjacent Parts in the Counties of Oxford and Bucks.*, new ed., i (Oxford, 1818), p. 367.

[121] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 39, 981. Incidentally, it is unclear whether or not Agnes was indeed a convert. In December 1243, Sybilla had been sent to the *domus conversorum* and given a robe, but there was no mention of her daughter. This raises the possibility that Agnes was born after Sybilla's conversion; see *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 146-47.

participating in Henry III's pet project of doing good for converts? The evidence does not indicate either way, but it is still entirely possible. Stacey believes that Henry III 'took evident pleasure in naming the new converts after members of his court, after the saint's day on which they were baptized, and especially after his father, King John'; while this might be true, the evidence for it is sparse.[122] There are two other reasons for converts being named after these men, both equally likely.[123] These men might have been standing as sponsors in the baptismal sense, as a natural extension of their royal service and friendship with the king. Another possibility may be that the names of these converts were chosen by whomever was administering the conversion process. It is not a stretch to assume that the converter picked the name of a high functionary in the hopes that the functionary might then pick up a sponsorship. Though the evidence does not point either way—except in the case of Henry of Winchester—two things are made very clear: not only did taking—or being given—the name of a 'sponsor' not imply any continuing economic support, but their post-conversion lives were in no way better than those of their fellow converts with less remarkable names.

In theory, the lack of support for converts was not an unfluctuating norm. The *domus conversorum* existed in order to provide converts both with a place to live, a pension by which to live, and food. Henry III's foundation charter for the *domus* dated to 1232, and promised 700*m.* per year in support, though in practice this was rarely received. The *domus* has been written on at length over the past century,[124] and though there exists little source material concerning the *domus* that has not

[122]Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 269.

[123]Evidence survives for other converts with potential sponsors' names, though much beyond their names is not immediately apparent: Richard of Ware was likely named after the abbot of Westminster from December 1258 to December 1283 (see *Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales, 1216-1377*, ii, eds. David M. Smith and Vera C.M. London (Cambridge, 2001), p. 78); Joan of Balsham was likely named after Hugh of Balsham, the Bishop of Ely from 1257 to 1286 (see Walter Ullman, 'The Disputed Election of Hugh Balsham, Bishop of Ely', *Cambridge Historical Journal* 9, no. 3 (1949), pp. 259-68); Hugh de Kendal, Juliana of Kendal, and Christina of Kendal were all presumably named after the king's clerk, Hugh de Kendal (the clerk had an interesting relationship with the Jewish community—see, *inter alia*, *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 297 and 337; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, pp. 227, 410, 417, and 419).

[124]The most useful research is *VCH*, London: i, pp. 551-554; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 279-379; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', *passim.*

found its way into the literature, there are some questions that have not been asked of it. One of these concerns the royal patronage of the *domus*. In what ways did Henry III, Edward I, and Edward II differ in their support for the house of converts? Where Henry appears to have at least attempted to provide the *domus* with capital and material aid, his son and grandson had rather different relationships with the house. Henry had given dozens of grants between 1233 and 1238, larger lump sums at various other points (most likely to allow for the cost of construction), a silver-gilt cup for the use of the chapel within the *domus*, and ornamented robes for the chaplains.[125] Stacey has noted that during the 1240s, the grants to the *domus* averaged about 180*m.* per year, and that the *domus* had fallen into a difficult financial position during the reign of Edward I;[126] under Edward, the *domus* held between eighty and one hundred converts at any given point.[127] The *domus* provided religious services for the converts resident there, and at least under Edward, was meant to teach converts a trade and instruct them in Christianity.[128] Whether converts not regularly resident in the *domus* returned there to attend church is impossible to say.

Was the nonchalance with which Edward interacted with the *domus*-bound converts perhaps an implicit admission that these converts were not fully Christian—and thus not deserving of attention? In 1305, this possible theory was brought to a head when he and his council were sent a petition which complained that for the previous eight years, the converts had not received the 202*l.* 4*d.* that they had been allotted earlier in his reign.[129] The petition implied that the delay in receiving their alms was so long and arduous that more than twenty converts had died as a result. The follow-up entry on the Patent Rolls strongly suggests a breakdown in the understanding of the original mandate by the chancellor, treasurer, and the barons of the Exchequer,[130] though this incident cannot be entirely written off as a

[125]The references are found in Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 286.
[126]Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 267.
[127]Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288.
[128]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 371-72.
[129]SC 8/99/4950.
[130]Though there is no date on the petition itself, the Patent Roll entry from November 1305 is in response, and makes reference to, the petition (see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 393). A

miscommunication; eight years seems to be an inordinately long time for this to be an ongoing concern. Did Edward really care about his subjects who had converted to Christianity? His limited interaction with them, especially as compared with that of his father, would suggest not. Conversely, the argument exists that Edward was otherwise engaged—fighting the Scots and Welsh—and the expenses for those exercises, both in time and money, were not small. It has been noted elsewhere that manifestations of Edward's concern in favouring conversion are evident in the episode in which he unsuccessfully attempted to convince Robert of Reading, the converted preacher, to return to Christianity.[131] This episode seems to be nothing more than a king shocked into intervening; Christian conversions to Judaism in England happened so infrequently that the king might be forgiven for taking an interest in and lending his wiles to a perceived noble cause.

Why would a convert choose to join the *domus*? There was certainly no requirement that a convert join. The answer appears to be, quite simply, that these converts joined because they had nowhere else to go. The *domus* was a space of last resort. Even during Henry's reign, the promised support was considerably diluted, a problem which only worsened as the century wore on. The potentiality of receiving even a small pension in the *domus* might have been seen as being better than a guarantee to receive nothing outside of it; the value of having somewhere to live might too have been a draw. The problem, as far as the evidence is concerned, is that converts entering the *domus* subsequently disappear from the records. The only time they reappeared was when they petitioned the king, they left, or they died. As a consequence, some interesting and pertinent questions remain unanswered, chiefly, how the careers of converts inside the *domus* differed from those outside of it, and how daily life for converts within the *domus* differed from life outside of it. That said, the evidence regarding the *domus* that does survive is really quite good.

---

transcription is found in Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 352-53, though he writes that it is a petition to Edward II, which it is not. The Patent Roll entry demanded that the officials view the entry from 16 February, 20 Edward I.

[131] Hyams, 'The Jewish Minority in Mediaeval England, 1066-1290', p. 275.

Moreover, this evidence tells us for certain that these people are converted Jews; nobody claimed to be a Jewish convert who was not in fact a Jewish convert. There were rare instances where non-converts were allowed to reside in the *domus*, but in these cases it was noted that while the people involved were related to converts, they were not themselves converts.

In December 1245, a woman named Susanna, who had been married to a convert named John of Lincoln, was ordered admitted to the *domus*, and was to be given necessities just as though she were a convert. The order was very clear about who Susanna was, ordering her admission and stating *non obstante eo quod predicta Susanna nunquam fuit Judea.*[132] Later, in 1320, there was a similar case involving a convert named Martin, a horse-dealer.[133] He led a relatively quiet existence, notable only for the occasional debts he owed and was owed.[134] He petitioned the king for sustenance for his wife and children, implying that this was not the first time he had done so (*qe solom les requestes qil lui ad fait auaunt ces heures*), and asked for any type of sustenance for him and his children that the king was willing to give (*commaunder aucune sustenaunce pur lui e ses enfauntz tiele come lui plerra de sa grace*). The endorsed response noted that the king wanted Martin to think about where exactly he wanted his sustenance, presumably a corrody, and to report it back to the king, who would then say what he willed (*Sauise en quel lieu e en certifie le Roy et il en dirra sa volunte*).[135] Martin must have died between the presentation of that petition and a subsequent petition, this time presented by his widow, Juliana. She noted that she was widowed (*prie Juliane qi fut le feme Martyn le Convers*), and asked for the king's grace that she and Martin's children might

[132] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 376. Carpenter, 'King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', p. 141, mistakes Susanna for a bona fide convert.

[133] *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, B*, p. 137.

[134] For money owed to Martin, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 319 and *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13*, p. 151. For money owed by Martin, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 332 and *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13*, p. 334. Interestingly, his debts were secured on lands and chattels in Middlesex and London; the ability to secure debts on land was certainly not the norm for converts.

[135] SC 8/4/154. A transcription and translation is found in *The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, Edward II: 1307-1327*, iii, ed. Seymour Phillips (London, 2005), no. 58, p. 395; see *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, i, p. 378 no. 66 for an older transcription.

have an income for their entire lives within the *domus* and permission to live in the house that she and Martin had occupied there. The endorsement on the petition is interesting: it stated that the children were not converts, but because they were the children of a convert, the king would consider the request (*Les enfantz ne sont mie convers mes pur ceo que il sont fiz a convers le Rei savisera*).[136] The arrangements for both Juliana and Susanna stand in sharp contrast to the policies on display in the mid-1250s, where the numerous examples of separation made it very clear that keeping a convert family together was in no way important. And, though Juliana and Susanna are but two examples, it seems as though those related to *bona fide* converts could occasionally enjoy the benefits accorded to converts with none of the more negative consequences of conversion.

How early did the *domus* become a house of last resort for converts? It is clear to historians of the topic that it was notoriously underfunded, but was this as obvious for contemporaries? An illustration from the 1270s might show the later years of that decade to have been the one by which the reputation of the *domus* as an overcrowded and neglected house had been confirmed. Agnes of St. Radegund was a convert likely associated with the Benedictine nunnery of St. Radegund's, Cambridge, prior to entering the *domus*,[137] and was noted in the 1308 inquisition as living in the *domus* at that time. Though nothing more is definitively known about her, two small biographical details can be divined. In the first instance, it is more than likely that she was named after the Prioress of St. Radegund's in 1274—a nun named Agnes Burgeylun.[138] The priory held extensive tenements in Cambridge's Jewry,[139] raising the possibility that Agnes was a local convert, and the subsequent possibility that she was then housed at St. Radegund's. In the 1308 inquisition into the affairs of the *domus*, she was noted as still living, and by extension, having been living in

[136]SC 8/103/5120.
[137]There was also an abbey dedicated to St. Radegund, a Premonstratensian house in Kent; see *VCH, Kent*: ii, pp. 172-75.
[138]Arthur Gray, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1898), p. 30. Gray gives a variation of the Prioress' name as 'Agnes Burgeillo' (*l.c.*).
[139]Gray, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge*, pp. 90-94.

the *domus* since at least 1292. What happened between 1274 and 1292 to cause her to enter the *domus*? St. Radegund's was notoriously poor at this time,[140] and would not have had the resources to care for a live-in convert, explaining why she moved into the *domus*; even living in a priory famed for its poverty was seen as a better option than the *domus*. Does this example show evidence that the *domus* was thought of a last resort by both converts and priories? It may very well. As the 1250s showed, priories did not take on convert corrodies willingly, and perhaps St. Radegund's did so in order to spare a new Christian the ignominy of life in the *domus*. Certainly things had changed by 1280, in that nobody expected converts to enter the *domus* after being allowed to keep a moiety of their goods and chattels.[141] This is of course conjectural, and there is no way of proving it one way or another. If it is true, how might this have changed the composition of the *domus*? If the lead up to 1280 saw the *domus* become increasingly marginalised, then 1280 must have sounded its death knell. No longer would converts join because they were destitute. Among the reasons for joining prior to 1280 might have been the availability of Christian instruction therein, or the small, albeit irregular, pension available. After 1280, converts of any means no longer required the pension safety net, and their Christian instruction, if indeed they thought they needed it, could likely be had elsewhere. The ideal situation for a convert outside of the *domus* might well have been something akin to that of William le Convers of Burgh. In 1302, he had been accustomed to receiving 6*d.* per week in alms from the issues of the manor of Burgh, Norfolk,[142] for at least twelve years,[143] though since the king had granted the manor of Burgh to Roger Bigod, earl of Norfolk in May 1302, the convert was no longer able to receive his weekly stipend, and the king ordered that this 6*d.* be assigned to him in another place.

The 1308 inquisition into the affairs of the *domus* was initiated by Edward II; it

[140] *VCH, Cambridgeshire and the Isle of Ely*: ii, p. 218.
[141] See discussion above, on p. 81.
[142] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 530.
[143] Ibid., p. 528. The entry mentions that William's alms 'as he was wont to receive in the said queen's life', and Eleanor had died in November 1290.

noted all converts resident in the *domus* since 1292, and whether they were alive or dead.[144] Why was 1292 used as the start date for the inquiry? In that year, there had been a grant to the house, authorising a reduction in the amount that was paid to the individual converts resident there. It stands to reason that the king wished to know how much, exactly, needed to be expended; the grant noted that the portion of every person dying was to be deducted from the total amount.[145] After 1308, the *domus* became increasingly less populated, though a surviving petition indicates that perhaps the converts still resident there were in receipt of a more regular pension than had been their forbears. Margery of Stamford had been too ill to appear in front of the 1308 commission of enquiry, and in June 1315 she stated that from 1308 to 1315 she had not received her convert's allowance.[146] This of course meant that the converts in the *domus* had been receiving something, however paltry, and was clearly enough to warrant Margery's royal petition; the upshot was that she was to be given her wages if the petition proved to be true.[147] That the converts resident in the *domus* might have had a marginally better life under Edward II is reinforced by the survival of another petition from 1308, which might have been the reason Margery's ilk had been receiving their allowances. The 1308 petition asked that the arrears of wages be paid, either in full or in part. It was endorsed that the converts were to show their charter in Chancery, and a corresponding writ of *liberate* would be issued.[148] There was indeed a writ issued, dated 15 January 1309, to Adam of Osgodby, the keeper of the *domus*, and the converts therein. It ordered that the keeper be given 123*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* twice a year, and continued to essentially repeat the terms of the original mandate to fund the *domus*.[149]

---

[144]Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b.

[145]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 478.

[146]*Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 184.

[147]SC 8/158/7875. I would date the petition to early 1315, as the Close Roll entry referred to Margery pleading her case 'by petition before the king and his council', which occurred on 11 June 1315, and because of the information contained in it about Adam of Osgodby, the keeper of the *domus conversorum* from 1307-16.

[148]SC 8/120/5978. The petition and subsequent endorsement look as though they were a direct follow-up to the 1308 inquiry into the affairs of the *domus conversorum*. That inquiry dated to 14 November 1308, and this write of *liberate* dated to 15 January 1309.

[149]C 62/85, m.5. The original terms and the mandate for 202*l.* 4*d.* were given in February 1292;

The *domus* was a halfway house; the idea that this mirrored the converts' actual position in society cannot be overstated. The very existence of the *domus* reinforced the liminality of conversion in medieval England. The converts resident therein belonged to an environment in which they were surrounded by their fellow converts and not integrated into a wider society; the only born-Christians regularly resident there were two chaplains. Converts living in the *domus* reinforced the fact that a conversion to Christianity—whatever it might have thought to have been achieving—was in fact nothing more than an agreement to enter a transitional stage between the two religions. By entering the *domus*, converts were branding themselves, and indeed, being branded, as *quondam* Jews. The obvious problem with the structure of the *domus*—receiving Christian instruction post-conversion, rather than prior—buttressed this liminality; how could a convert be truly Christian if his conversion was so minimally based on a solid knowledge of the religion he was joining?

Where canon law mandated that instruction in Christianity was to precede baptism for any wishing to convert,[150] and indeed, a letter from Innocent III to the Archbishop of Sens confirms such, there is a paucity of evidence for an English parallel. What little evidence as exists dates from the 1230s and 1240s. Was this the case because the king's interests in conversion were peaking during this time? It certainly seems plausible given that the establishment of the *domus conversorum* had occurred in 1232. At least twice, converts were handed over to Robert Bacon at Oxford, presumably for instruction, and once, in 1236, a Jewish boy who had been baptised and spirited away to Exeter was returned and placed into Bacon's custody.[151] Though an ecclesiastic was charged with this instruction, it was at the behest of the king. An obvious example actually proves to be something quite puzzling: in 1243, Martin of la Réole was the subject of a request by the king to the archbishop of York and the bishops of Carlisle and Worcester that he be conducted to a town where he might be instructed in the Catholic faith and the science of

see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 478.

[150] *De cons.* D.4, c.98; *De cons.* D.4, c.93.

[151] See previous discussion on p. 105.

letters (*faciant administrari in aliqua villa ubi possit tam de fide catholica quam litterarum sciencia feliciter erudiri*).[152] If Martin was already identified as a convert, why was he to required to receive ongoing instruction? It is possible that he was a minor since he was given a stipend of $8d.$ per week,[153] or in other words, $2d.$ less than the standard weekly stipend for a male convert living in the *domus*, and the same amount a female resident of the *domus* received. His minority might also be the reason for the ongoing instruction. Martin's case is one of only four with evidence of instruction post-conversion that occurred outside of the *domus conversorum*.[154] Two other examples survive from the early 1240s and concern two converts named Warin and John. At various points, the evidence that does survive is unclear, and seems to conflate these two converts. In February 1241, Warin was given $7s.$ out of the issues of the archbishopric of Canterbury's deanery at South Malling, Sussex,[155] and in January 1242, both Warin and John had been given $40s.$ out of the issues of the county of Oxford, as well as a mark for their robes.[156] A further $4m.$ were given to them for their expenses in 1241-42, noting that they were in the custody of Robert Bacon.[157] In October 1243, Bacon was given $2m.$ from the issues of Oxfordshire to defray the maintenance costs of the convert children in his custody (*pueris conversis quem habet in custodia sua*).[158] By February 1244 both Warin and the convert John were noted as studying at Oxford, as opposed to simply being in Bacon's

[152] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 12.

[153] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1240-45*, p. 173.

[154] Another was the case of Juliana the convert, who was given custody of the convert Roesia, in order to aid in her instruction of the Christian faith (see *PEJ*, ii, p. 209; discussion below on p. 101; discussion on p. 106).

[155] *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 278. Adler, *The Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288, misinterprets this entry as Warin owning the manor of South Malling, as well as stating that South Malling is in Essex. Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 148, and Fogle, *Jewish Converts to Christianity in Medieval London*, p. 204, reproduce both these mistakes. The deanery of South Malling was a peculiar jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury within the Archdeaconry of Lewes; see Thomas Walker Horsfield, *The History, Antiquities and Topography of the County of Sussex*, i (Dorking, 1974), p. 343; *VCH, Sussex*: ii, pp. 43-4.

[156] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1240-45*, p. 99. This entry also described the two converts as being in the 'keeping' of Robert Bacon.

[157] *Receipt and Issue Roll 26 Henry III, 1241-2*, p. 50.

[158] *Fine Rolls 27 Henry III, 1242-43*, no. 773. The scribe made a mistake in this entry: *pueris conversis* is plural, so the accusative pronoun *quem* should read *quos*.

'custody'.[159] By April 1245, Warin or John—the record is unclear—re-apostatised, and the order was given that Robert Bacon give the sheriff the convert's name (*cujus nomen ei scire faciet frater Robertus Bacun*) in order that he might be arrested and imprisoned.[160] It is unclear what kind of responsibility Bacon exercised over converts, and for what reasons he did so, but it is unsurprising that he likely had a specific mandate with responsibility over converts. The combination of being a regent in theology at Oxford and the perceived intellectual capital that came from being admitted to the Dominican Order having been excused his novitiate would have made him the ideal person to shepherd new members of the flock.[161] There would have been few men in England at the time who would either have been as qualified or perceived to have been as qualified to take charge over converts and their instruction.

Double-apostates—who, for the purposes of this thesis were Jews who converted to Christianity and subsequently returned to Judaism—make up one of the few categories where the existing evidence is fairly adequate. Solomon, a convert mentioned a single time in the surviving records, had converted and re-apostatised by 1247, and was ordered delivered to the constable of the Tower of London.[162] Later, in 1281, an investigation was begun by John Peckham, the Archbishop of Canterbury, into Jews who had converted to Christianity, but had subsequently returned to Judaism.[163] His language echoed the story of Benedict of York in 1189 when he described the re-apostasy again in terms of the Jews returning to their vomit.[164] The enquiry,

---

[159] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 161.

[160] Ibid., p. 298.

[161] A.B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, i, (Oxford, 1957), p. 87.

[162] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1245-51*, p. 133.

[163] This has been written about to great effect by Logan, in his 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity'. See discussion on p. 18.

[164] Charles Trice Martin, *Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham, Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis*, i (London, 1882), p. 239. See also discussion above, on p. 112. Double-apostasy was not only a concern for Peckham, but for the Pope as well; a letter survives from May 1282, from John de Greilly, Seneschal of Gascony, to Edward I, apprising him of the status of a Dominican mission sent by the Pope (*a sede apostolica deputati*) to investigate both Jewish apostasy and Christian heresy there. The Seneschal also used the trope of the dog returning to his vomit. See SC 1/18/58; a transcript is found in *Lettres de rois, reines, et autres personnages des cours de France et d'Angleterre depuis Louis VII jusqu'a Henri IV*, i, ed. Jacques Joseph

conducted by John de St. Denys, the Archdeacon of Rochester and keeper of the *domus conversorum*, uncovered fifteen alleged Jewish double-apostates, whom John Peckham then pursued for the better part of three years. Three letters survive from the archbishop to the king discussing the Jews in question,[165] and the number that had originally been identified as double-apostates dropped to thirteen. Two of the alleged converts, the unnamed daughters of Cresse son of Gente and Vives le Chantur, were crossed off the draft writ. Many of the converts are mentioned in previous surviving records, though their chief interest is due to Peckham's letters, which gives rise to a tendency to view these thirteen converts as existing only in the frame of reference into which they had been placed by Peckham. In at least two instances, Peckham was woefully behind the times in his accusations of double-apostasy; several of the other converts have points of evidence both before and after Peckham's accusations that serve to illuminate the kinds of lives they led. Milka, the wife of Sakerell, was noted in Trinity term 1275 as having converted, when the king claimed a messuage with appurtenances formerly belonging to her as his escheat, though the messuage currently belonged to Aaron Crispin, a Jew.[166] The case hinged upon whether Milka's property had been transferred to Aaron prior to her conversion, or after it. Aaron vouched to warranty Hagin, son of Master Moses,[167] though Hagin did not appear at his first summons in Michaelmas term of that year.[168] When he finally did appear later in the term, he warranted Aaron, but with a caveat: he did not deny that the messuage and appurtenances were the king's by right, but said that the king had already ratified the sale of the messuage to Aaron Crispin.[169] In

Champollion-Figeac (Paris, 1839), no. 242.

[165] The three letters are: C 85/3/71, from Peckham to the royal chancery; what Logan had referenced as C 47/109/1/38 was not entirely correct, and should have been referenced as C 47/109/1b/2/38, but has since been reclassified, and is now C 255/18/5b, and is the royal writ to the sheriffs and mayor of London—the draft of this writ (Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216, n. 2) was originally C 202/c.1/216, but was misplaced during reclassification; and SC 1/24/46, from Peckham to the royal chancellor, requesting a new writ *non obstante dicta libertate*. I am grateful to Dr. James Ross, formerly of the National Archives, for his help.

[166] *PEJ*, ii, p. 288. Aaron was a chirographer of the London *archa*; see Brand, *Earliest English Law Reports*, iv, p. 463.

[167] *PEJ*, ii, p. 295.

[168] *PEJ*, iii, p. 22.

[169] Ibid., pp. 34-5.

late Trinity term 1276, Hagin vouched to warranty Jornin, son of Abraham,[170] and by Trinity term 1277 there was finally a resolution: a jury of both Christians and Jews found that Milka had never actually converted and therefore remained Jewish, and Aaron was to retain the messuage.[171]

Another convert, Swetecote, wife of Moses of Hornden, was noted in February 1288 as having had 'certain of her enemies, maliciously feigning that she had been baptised between the two battles of Lewes and Evesham'.[172] Those particular battles had happened in 1264 and 1265, many years before Peckham levelled the same accusation. Though the evidence does not survive, it seems highly unlikely that Swetecote and her husband would have allowed a false charge of conversion to remain uncontested from 1264-65 to the point where John Peckham decided that it might be an issue. It is possible that this malicious accusation was in fact a clever attempt by Swetecote's enemies to use accepted convention against her. The Jewish community in England can hardly have been ignorant to the knowledge that a convert forfeited all her goods and chattels upon conversion. The potential escheat was used as a weapon by these 'enemies'; the affair smacks of politics that are not quite made explicit on the Close Roll. Other converts mentioned in Peckham's letters included Slemma of Bedford, who, along with her husband Bonevie, was involved in a plea charging a man with assault in Michaelmas term 1273,[173] and two brothers, Benet and Jacob of Bedford. Benet had served as an essoiner twice. The first time had been in Trinity term 1276 for Aaron Crispin, the same man who had held the disputed messuage after Milka's alleged conversion, who was involved in a plea of trespass against a man named William of Leyburn.[174] The second time was during Trinity

[170] *PEJ*, iii, p. 177.
[171] Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 99-100.
[172] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 500.
[173] *PEJ*, ii, pp. 94-5.
[174] *PEJ*, iii, p. 148. Interestingly, Slemma of Bedford's husband, Bonevie, was an essoiner for an identical plea at the same time, brought by a Jew named Hagin of Lincoln against the same William of Leyburn (*l.c.*). There was a history between Hagin and Aaron, accusing Hagin of having a charter for 800*m.* (Merton College Oxford MS. 321, ff. 40r-v has the amount as 800*m.*, but E 9/20, m.19 has it as 800*l.*; see both records in Brand, *Earliest English Law Reports*, iv, pp. 463-64) falsely made in William's father's name, and Aaron of falsely accepting the charter into the chest. Aaron claimed that he well recalled William's father placing the charter in the chest,

term 1277, for a Jew named Abraham Pernaz in a plea of debt against a man named William de Gouteby.[175] Both Benet and Jacob were also involved in a case shortly after Easter 1283, which presumably immediately precipitated their alleged conversion, and wherein they defrauded certain foreign merchants by pretending that they had plates made of coin-clippings for sale, to the value of 900*l.*[176] Jacob, Benet, and a third Jew, Joce Batecock, accepted a deposit of 40*m.* and a future obligation of 30 sacks of wool for the non-existent plates. They were committed to prison, having spent or given away the money they had received in deposit.[177] Rose of Dorking also appeared on Peckham's list, in a potential reappearance of one of the two kidnapped women from 1274.[178]

The incidences of what Stacey calls '"Tower experiences" of conversion'[179] are well documented in the surviving records, though as with the majority of the examples involving converts, somewhat meagre in number. One of the cases that had nothing to do with coin-clipping happened during the alleged ritual murder of a Christian boy, the eventual St. Hugh of Lincoln, late in 1255. A Jew subsequently named John converted in order to save his own life, after having been arrested and held in the Tower of London for his role in the alleged crucifixion.[180] He was pardoned at the instance of John of Darlington, the king's Dominican confessor,[181] and released. Generally speaking, the 'Tower conversions' were unsurprisingly linked with offences carrying a possible death sentence as punishment. Most often, the offence was coin-clipping. A Jew named Isaac of Norwich (or 'Hake') was awaiting trial in the Tower of London in November 1252 and converted, and the conversion was to be

---

and that the other five chirographers had also been read the charter (*l.c.*).

[175] *PEJ*, iii, p. 288.

[176] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 126.

[177] Ibid., p. 127.

[178] Ibid., p. 209. See also discussion above, on p. 106. Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 217, identifies the Rose of Dorking on Peckham's lists as the wife of Abraham of Dorking, one of the accused kidnappers. However, I would posit that the Rose of Dorking on Peckham's lists is identical to the 'Roesia' who was kidnapped by the Jews in 1274 along with Juliana and never seen again. If she is not the same, Logan's assertion that 'an astonishing volte-face' might have occurred is no doubt correct (Logan, *l.c.*).

[179] Stacey, 'Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271.

[180] Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 335. This is calendared in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 457.

[181] For discussion on John of Darlington, see p. 118.

investigated.[182] The two other quasi-Tower experiences that Stacey mentions were relatively straightforward: Jews convicted for coin-clipping converted to Christianity in order to be spared their lives.[183] A final convert who might be added to this category is John le Tannur, formerly known as Abraham of London. In Michaelmas term 1278 he was accused of selling plate made of clipped coin to William of Lynn (*...Willelmus de Lenn' emit predictas platas de Abr' de Lond' et Jacobo fratre ejusdem et quod conflate fuerunt de retonsura monete*),[184] and was captured and jailed at Dover.[185] By 1281, Abraham had converted, had become known as John le Tannur, and was involved in a suit with Matthew *aurifaber* of London who had accused John of offering to sell him clippings.[186]

It is difficult to discuss convert minors for the same reasons as it is difficult to discuss almost anything to do with converts, that being the general lack of available

---

[182] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 224. Stacey, 'Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 272, writes that this was for coin-clipping. While this is possible, there is no evidence for it, unless 'crimes affecting the king's peace and crown' is taken to mean coin-clipping. Lipman, *The Jews of Medieval Norwich*, p. 109, correctly interprets the record.

[183] Stacey, 'Conversion of Jews to Christianity', pp. 272-73 mentions Claricia la Converse's father, Jacob Copyn, as having been executed for coin-clipping. He was noted as having been 'lately hanged' (see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 278). Claricia was mentioned in the 1308 inquisition as living in the *domus* in 1292 but having since disappeared. It is possible that her conversion was caused by her father's execution and her presumed pauperdom as a result. For discussion of Jacob Copyn's life, see Michael Adler, 'Jews of Medieval Exeter', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art* 63 (1931), p. 234; the unnamed convert whom Stacey references is Menand of Bristol, though Rokeah makes the case that he was never accused of coinage offences, and was forfeiting his property as a result of conversion unrelated to coinage offences (see Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property, Part 2', pp. 74-5). The header of that account simply stated that it was the account of John le Faukener's executors, '*de bonis et catallis diversorum Judeorum dampnatorum fugitiuorum et ad fidem Christianam conversorum forisfactis Regi occasione monete Regis retonse*'. The ms. reference is E 372/123, mm. 44d-45.

[184] *PEJ*, v, no. 577, which was transcribed as being part of Trinity term, despite actually being part of Michaelmas term. The nearly identical entry is found in Michaelmas term, *l.c.* no. 888, presumably corrected by the scribe. The ms. references for the two entries are E 9/28, m.4 (Trinity term, 1278) and E 9/29, m.12d (Michaelmas term, 1278).

[185] This only appears in *PEJ*, v, no. 888 (*...predictus Abbr' fuit arestatus apud Dovere per preceptum regis et traditur in prisona constabulario castri et ballivis Dovar'*). The order to arrest Abraham appears *l.c.* no. 577 (*...predictos judeos capiat et corpora eorum habeat*).

[186] JUST 1/486, m.37d; JUST 1/493, m.38d; JUST 1/497, m. 48d. Both JUST 1/486 (the Rex roll) and JUST 1/493 (William of Saham's roll) refer to him as 'John le Tannur', but JUST 1/497 (John des Vaux's roll) refers to him as 'John de la Tur'. William of Saham had clerical status, and was therefore prohibited from shedding blood. Because of this, he most often heard civil pleas (see Brand, *Earliest English Law Reports*, iii, p. xciii, xcv) whereas John des Vaux, a layman, was relatively legally inexperienced, and most often heard crown pleas (*l.c.*, p. ciii) which coin-clipping certainly was. It is possible that Matthew *aurifaber* is the same man involved in Henry of Winchester's coin-clipping case; see discussion below, on p. 154.

evidence. No extant record mentions the age of a convert child. In the absence of concrete proof of any particular age, it is necessary to resort to the potential indicators. Most often, these are simply notes in passing that the convert was the son or daughter of someone, or the converts who were potentially minors were under the care of someone, as in the case of the converts under the care of Robert Bacon.[187] The Fine Roll lists of 1255 are the largest source of information about underage converts, if the parameters above are correct. Prior to 1255, there are very few indications of minors converting, or being caught up in the drama of a parental conversion. In 1235, Cecilia and Maud, daughters of William, a converted Jew, were involved in a case regarding 16 acres of land and one of meadow with appurtenances in Lambourne, Essex.[188] The case hinged upon the position of Cecilia and Maud's brother, Richard, who was born before his parents converted to Christianity. Cecilia and Maud, begotten after their parents' conversion, were to regain seisin. In May 1236, Fermins of Amiens and his wife converted, and were assigned to the *domus conversorum*,[189] and there was no mention of their children. By June, the children had been kidnapped by Jews of Northampton (*quidam Judei Norht' ei subtrahunt pueros suos*), and the sheriff was ordered to bring the children before their father so that they could choose whether or not to remain Jewish.[190]

The Fine Roll lists of 1255 have several examples of possible convert minors, all from the early months of that year. A single example explicitly identifies two converts as children: John, and Hodierna his sister, children of William, were sent to the Augustinians at Thornton.[191] Other entries list certain converts as being the son or daughter of somebody, or brothers and sisters with no mention of parents, which are presumably an indication of their minorities.[192] Interestingly, the incidences of presumed minor converts being refused by abbeys and convents seem to be much

[187] See discussion on pp. 105 and 127.
[188] JUST 1/80, m.3d.
[189] *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 264.
[190] Ibid., p. 358.
[191] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 124, 981. They also appear at no. 54, but are not mentioned as being children, but rather 'John and Odierna, daughter of William, converts'.
[192] These are present on all five lists; see *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III*, nos. 54, 124, 125, 204, and 981.

more pronounced than refusals for presumably adult converts. John and Hodierna, the children of William, seem to have had the worst of it. Hodierna was twice assigned to the Cluniacs at Monkton Farleigh[193] by herself, and with her brother John to the Augustinians at Tortington,[194] as well as to the Augustinians at Thornton and Trentham, both times with John.[195] Judging by the king's response to the lack of acceptance that his converts were receiving at the various religious houses,[196] it is a safe assumption that the financial burden that the houses were being mandated to undertake was so onerous that the converts were thus unwelcome. The convert minors were likely even less so. The king wished for the various religious houses to keep the converts for two years, or to pay them $3d.$ per day for their sustenance.[197] It might have been easy for the religious houses to cut loose an adult convert once the original two year period had finished, but it would have been markedly more difficult to cut loose a child simply because the abbey or priory was no longer obliged to provide for it. The financial obligation was clearly a longer term proposition in the case of convert minors—something the various religious houses would no doubt have realised.[198]

It is unclear how many of the minors on the Fine Roll lists were indeed converts. There are some entries that are not as straightforwardly interpreted because they are not both listed as being converts in the first instance, like William, brother of Geoffrey, convert, who was sent to the Benedictines at Durham.[199] Others are unclear because they might not have been convert minors at all, but rather simply minors. Simon son of Ysabell' and Sibilla his sister were assigned to the Cistercians at Flaxley in 1255,[200] but ten years earlier, Isabella and her son Simon had been assigned

[193] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III*, nos. 54, 981.
[194] Ibid., no. 54.
[195] Ibid., nos. 124, 125 for the first time; no. 981 for the second time.
[196] Ibid., no. 124.
[197] Ibid., no. 53.
[198] The Fine Roll lists are referenced in the appendix. The names of converts in bold typeface indicate their presence on the 1255 lists.
[199] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 125, though *l.c.* no. 981, both Geoffrey and William are listed as converts.
[200] Ibid., no. 124.

to the *domus conversorum* in London, with no mention being made of Sibilla.[201] Sibilla was presumably born between 1245 and 1255 to a mother who was already a convert, casting doubt upon the fact that she had ever actually converted. Likewise for Sibilla de Chesham and her daughter Agnes, who were assigned together twice to the Augustinians at Missenden in 1255,[202] but in 1243, Sibilla had been assigned to the *domus conversorum* and given a robe, neither entry mentioning a daughter, but both mentioning that she herself was a convert.[203] The example of Otto and his wife, Dionisia, and their unnamed daughter is similar, though problematic for a slightly different reason: when he was assigned to the *domus conversorum* in 1243, he had neither wife nor child.[204] By 1255, he had acquired both, with Dionisia and the daughter being assigned three times to the Augustinians at Huntingdon, and Otto being assigned to the Augustinians at Barnwell three times by himself.[205]

It is possible that some of the minors who converted did not have living parents. Those on the lists who were listed simply as being siblings, with no mention of any parents, might fit into this category, like William and Geoffrey, above, William and his sister, Julia, who were assigned to the Augustinians at Kirkham,[206] Thomas Hul' and his sister who were assigned to the hospital at Cockersand,[207] and William of London and Juliana, his sister, who were sent to 'Merluf'.[208] There are other groups of siblings on the lists, but these are listed as being sons or daughters of converts, not all of whom also appear on the lists. These include Walter and Helewisa, children of Muriel, who were assigned to Tapham,[209] Robert and Hugo, sons of Richard, converts, who were assigned to the Cistercians at Boxley,[210] Henry and Hawis, daughter of

---

[201] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 285.
[202] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125, 981.
[203] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 146-47.
[204] Ibid., p. 148.
[205] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 124, 981.
[206] Ibid., no. 204.
[207] The manuscript entry at no. 981 on *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, runs *Thom' Hul' soror ei con. apud kokersand*, which might properly be interpreted as 'Thomas Hul' and his sister, converts, at Cockersand'.
[208] Ibid. The writing is illegible on the manuscript.
[209] Ibid., nos. 125, 981. Both entries are unclear. The entry at no. 125 seems to be either 'Tapham' or 'Copham', and the entry at no. 981 seems to be 'Thoby'.
[210] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 54. This entry is cancelled *quia non habuerunt.*

Richard, converts, who were assigned to the Augustinians at St. Augustine's, Bristol, and Stephen and Geoffrey, sons of Thomas, who were assigned to the Cistercians at Coggeshall.[211]

Married couples who converted were numerous. It is fairly obvious why this might be the case: having only one person convert would necessarily mean the end of the relationship. Some married couples are more interesting than others, simply because it is possible to know more about their lives than those couples who were simply listed as X, husband of Y.[212] Alexander and Godwisa, his wife, were expelled from the *domus conversorum* along with their children in August 1234 for some unknown offense,[213] and were later assigned to the the Augustinians at Dunstable Priory in December 1247.[214] Where they had gone in the interim is unclear. Another convert, Adam Page, was married to a woman named Leticia, and they were both assigned to the Benedictines at Shaftesbury in April 1245.[215] Prior to this, Adam had been expelled from the *domus conversorum* in February 1244 along with William le Clerk *propter transgressionem aliquam.* For which offence exactly is unmentioned in the entry.[216] It is possible, however, that Adam's offence had something to do with his capture and detention in February 1242, along with a man named Henry Manel, for the death of Brice de Caen. They stated that the charge was made *de odio et atia*, and the sheriff of Essex was ordered to ascertain whether or not this was true, and if so, they were to be released.[217]

What have we learned about the act of conversion? Perhaps the most important revelation is that Jews converting to Christianity, regardless of motive or circumstance,

---

[211] *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 54.

[212] The couples listed on the 1255 Fine Roll lists are uniformly listed like this. For a complete list of inter-convert relationships, see the appendix, *passim.*

[213] *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 503.

[214] *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100.

[215] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 418. That they were both assigned here is slightly odd: Shaftesbury was all-female, and the largest nunnery in England. It is possible that they had been assigned to the hospital of St. John the Baptist, which was under the patronage of the abbey, and was for resident poor, aged, or sick men; see David Knowles and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses: England and Wales* (London, 1953), pp. 218, 305.

[216] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 165.

[217] *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 389.

were rarely seen as *bona fide* Christians, but rather as non-Christians who had left Judaism. Why might this have been the case? Surely conversion was just that—a move from one religion to the other? The answer may lie in the absence of the phenomenon of forced conversion in England. Where the forced conversions of eleventh century Jews in places like the Rhine valley, Northern Europe, and Rouen implied a 'You *must* become a Christian' attitude towards the Jews resident in those areas, the English norm for the entirety of their two and a half century stay in the country was the polar opposite: 'You *may not* become Christian'. This, despite the fact that they were certainly allowed, and even encouraged to leave Judaism. The evidence supports the idea that leaving Judaism and joining Christianity could be mutually exclusive propositions. English Jews, no matter how much they might have wished to convert to Christianity, were ultimately doomed to a threshold existence—neither Jew nor Christian. The existence of the *domus* too confirms this contention that the converts entering it merely became 'former Jews', and by living in the house for converts agreed to their liminality. They had self-defined as 'not Christian', and likely had done so for no other reason than poverty. Converts outside of the *domus* were rarely better off, seemingly forever being suspected of suddenly changing their minds and backtracking to Judaism. Even converts who thought they were Christians, and indeed who had spent their entire lives believing this to be true, were liable to be informed of their error. Converts to Christianity appeared incapable of shaking off their Judaism. Thus, 'convert' and 'Jew' were practically synonymous and apparently interchangeable terms.

5 Apostasy and Administration: The Life and Times of Henry of Winchester, Convert

Henry of Winchester was one of the most notable Jewish converts of the entire thirteenth century, and one whose mentions in the records are among the most numerous. Both his actions and the perceptions noted of him by others confirm that he is perhaps the best example of a convert who had left Judaism while not simultaneously having joined Christianity. He appears to have been converted, and thus baptised, in the early 1250s, and was named after the king himself, who was also known as Henry of Winchester after his place of birth.[1] Unusually for a convert, detailed evidence about his baptism survives. It occurred at Westminster 'in the presence of the king and a great gathering of magnates' and was administered by bishop Richard Wich of Chichester, who was later canonized as St. Richard of Chichester. It was noted that with the king's permission, Richard gave the convert the name of the king.[2] The baptism's audience and its location suggest that it may have coincided with a parliament. If the last parliament held at Westminster immediately preceding the first reference to Henry as quondam Jew (July 1252, see discussion below) is taken as the parliament at which he was baptised, it must have occurred at that held between 9 May and 11 June 1252.[3] Richard Wich, bishop of Chichester was present, as were John Mansel and John de Plessis, who would later give their own names to converts.[4] In July 1252, the first definite reference to Henry of Winchester, the convert, is given in a Close Roll, when he was granted a stipend of 12*d.* per day for life (*quo ad vixerit*) from the first escheats assigned to alms.[5] This amount was a large increase over the standard sum of money given to a

[1] CP 21/1/7, m.25, an essoin roll, where the king is referred to as *H. de Wynton' regem Anglie.*
[2] *Saint Richard of Chichester*, ed. David Jones (Sussex Record Society 79)(Lewes, 1995), p. 209. See *l.c.* p. 133 for the untranslated Latin. Even though this appears to connect Henry's pre-conversion years with Sussex, there were never any Jewish communities there, making it unlikely that he was a native of that county.
[3] J.R. Maddicott, *The Origins of English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford, 2012), p. 468.
[4] *The Royal Charter Witness Lists of Henry III (1226-1272), from the Charter Rolls in the Public Record Office*, ii ed. M. Morris (List and Index Soc. 291-2)(Kew, 2001), p. 66.
[5] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 131.

convert—10*d.* per week was the going rate in 1252 for males—[6] and shows the favour with which he clearly started his life as a Christian. Later in 1252, he was also made the king's scribe who wrote pleas and starrs in Hebrew at the Exchequer of the Jews.[7] This detail is important mainly because being made the king's scribe specifically for writing in Hebrew suggests that, initially at least, Henry had been intended to play a role traditionally reserved for non-converted Jews.[8] It is interesting to see that though he was a converted Jew, he was still seen as being very useful to the king. Beginning in November 1252, Henry was also given 10*l.* yearly in two instalments by the king, 'until he [the king] shall provide for him otherwise'.[9] Showcasing his court-wide favoured status, the writ was authorised not only by the king, but other royal administrators as well. These included Robert Walerand and the prior of Newburgh, the latter being a fairly active royal administrator in the early 1250s.[10] This sum superseded the payments of 12*d.* per day from July of that year which were never recorded as actually having been paid to Henry.[11] This brought Henry's stipend down to roughly $6\frac{1}{2}d.$ per day all told, which was still far in excess of what the typical Jewish convert was receiving at the time. That same month, Henry received a robe of the king's gift, which was directed to be made in the same fashion as the robes made for the king's wards.[12] Henry seems to have been very well taken care of and he was either quite young at this point, necessitating being grouped with the king's wards, or more likely, had simply received the robe as a matter of course. Such a gift was a common favour for those in the king's service.[13]

In May 1253 the convert Henry was given 100*s.* from the king for his mainte-

[6] Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 277.
[7] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 164. See also *PEJ*, vi, p. 45, where doubt is cast upon the fact that Henry ever actually took up this position.
[8] See discussion in *PEJ*, vi, pp. 44-5.
[9] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 84.
[10] Robert C. Stacey, 'Schipton, John of (*d.* 1256)', *ODNB*.
[11] At least not at this point; see discussion below on p. 164.
[12] *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 275. Henry also received a robe in January 1265, along with twelve other people; see *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 13.
[13] See *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, pp. 274-76 for various examples of robes, tunics, and deacon's vestments being gifted.

nance,[14] which was perhaps the first of his two instalments that he had been granted the previous year, and in June 1253, Henry's wife Clarice was also granted 100*s.* yearly for life. This entry also states that she was to get her stipend for life 'as dower'.[15] It is possible that Henry did not quite believe that the generosity of the king, or perhaps the standing that he currently enjoyed at court, would really be as permanent as it was at that point, because he took the trouble to acquire in advance a writ for his Easter payment in 1253.[16] If this was indeed the case he need not have worried, because in February 1254 his privileged position was again confirmed when he was allowed to collect for his maintenance (*ad sustentacionem suam*) the remaining balances on two debts that some of his former Christian clients had owed him from the time of his Jewishness (*tempore judeitatis sue*).[17] They totaled ten and eleven marks each, and Henry was allowed to collect the debts under the condition that he not charge or receive any interest. The writ authorising this arrangement was endorsed by the queen in the king's absence overseas. It seems unlikely that this was not what the king wanted however, because the writ was also authorised by Philip Lovel, a justice of the Jews and the treasurer of the royal exchequer.[18] Had the queen done something not in keeping with the king's wishes, it seems likely that Lovel would have stepped in, but the fact that he also authorised the debt-collection arrangement seems to point to complete harmony in the royal couple's viewpoints regarding Henry. The fact that Henry was allowed to collect these two debts is also of increased significance because he was one of the few exceptions to the long-standing legislative rule that provided that all a convert's chattels were forfeited to the king upon conversion.[19] It is unclear when this practice began,[20] but it did not change until 1280, and even then a convert was only allowed to keep a moiety of his or her

[14] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 123.
[15] Ibid., p. 136. This is referred to on the relevant Liberate Roll as *dotis de dono nostro*; see C 62/29, m.3.
[16] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 86.
[17] *Close Rolls, 1253-54*, p. 24.
[18] Meekings, 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-68', p. 186. For the writ appointing Lovel as a justice of the Jews, see *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 234.
[19] *Rot. Lit. Claus.,* i, p. 139b. See also Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 281.
[20] Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 266.

property.[21]

Interestingly, evidence about Henry's pre-conversion past can be gleaned from the entry detailing the arrangement whereby he was allowed to recover two of his debts. The debt of 11*m.* was owed to Henry by Christiana de Verdun of Kent,[22] where Henry held land.[23] In 1262-3, Christiana put in a claim to a messuage with 15 acres of land and 7*s.* of rent in St. Lawrence, Ramsgate, Kent,[24] and in 1270, still in Kent, was involved in a suit of trespass with Vives of Winchester, of Canterbury.[25] This second entry is telling for two reasons: it places Christiana in Kent eighteen years after her original debt to Henry was contracted, meaning that she was likely a longtime resident of Kent. Secondly, Vives' name lends credence to the idea that Henry, styled 'of Winchester' though he had clearly spent time in Kent, was not in fact from Winchester and had simply been named after the king upon conversion. It is also possible that this indicates a family connection with Winchester, with Henry's family having originally come from there but now resident in Canterbury. The second debt, of 10*m.*, was owed to Henry by Thomas, son of Peter Picot of Ratcliffe, Nottinghamshire. Two of Thomas' later debts involved Pictavin of Winchester, a Jew,[26] again possibly indicating a Winchester connection. Regardless, Henry's original place of residence and his non-converted Jewish relatives remain unclear.

By July 1261, Henry had become something of a royal operative, at least in the sphere of Jewish policy and finance, when along with George of Dover, he was mandated to investigate the Jewish *archae* at Canterbury, Colchester, Sudbury, Norwich, and Cambridge, and received a payment of 10*l.* for this.[27] Henry was sent to help enrol the debts that he found in the *archae* in these towns, as the other men who

[21] Legislation concerning the escheat of the entirety of the convert's goods is consistently referenced in the thirteenth century, but that concerning the moiety appears in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 371-72. For specific cases, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, pp. 25, 28. See also *PEJ*, vi, no. 914. A translation of this entry can be found in Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 114.

[22] *Close Rolls, 1253-54*, p. 24.

[23] See p. 144, below.

[24] *Calendar of Kent Feet of Fines to the End of Henry III's Reign* eds. Irene Churchill et al (Kent, 1956), p. 341.

[25] *PEJ*, i, p. 241.

[26] Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, nos. 299, 653.

[27] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, p. 51.

were also enjoined to investigate other chests were to do. The king wished to know the 'quantity of their [the Jews'] debts and chattels' and so launched an inspection.[28] The normal procedure in a case like this was for the investigators to distinguish between the bonds that had been paid in full, those that had been partially paid, and those that had had no payments recorded against them. The typical purpose of an investigation into the *archae* was to prepare for a tallage, in order for the 'assessment' to be based on the sums still owed to individual creditors.[29] Henry was the only identifiable convert among the six men who were sent.[30] Simon Passelewe had been a justice of the Exchequer of the Jews for the previous two years,[31] and Roger de la Legh would later become the Treasurer of England.[32] Another, Ralph de Hotot, was a former justice of the Jews and a household official,[33] who would later become the constable of Northampton.[34] It seems safe to say that a high opinion of Henry the convert was in vogue at court, given the company he was bidden to keep. Henry very nearly did not end up on this investigative excursion, though. When the original mandate was drawn up on 17 July 1261, Henry was not on the list of investigators. But, four days later, he replaced William Hasilbech,[35] a current justice of the Jews,[36] and was sent off with George of Dover, having received 10*l.* for his trouble. This would not be the last time that Henry would be commissioned to re-engage fairly deeply with the Jewish community on behalf of the crown, and later his responsibilities—and the risks associated with them—would increase.

Henry's post-conversion life continued to be drastically different from those of his fellow converts, especially in the area of property ownership. Jews were not

---

[28] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, p. 186.
[29] *PEJ*, vi, p. 7.
[30] The only other possible convert is George of Dover. He appears suddenly in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, p. 46 (21 October 1259), and disappears after *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, p. 51 (21 July 1261). He appears to have been a combination quartermaster-money transporter for the king.
[31] Meekings, 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-1268', p. 187.
[32] 'Lord treasurers of England (*c.*1125-1742)', *ODNB*.
[33] Meekings, 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-1268', p. 186.
[34] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, p. 315. Meekings does not mention this in his article.
[35] Ibid., p. 186; compare with *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, p. 51.
[36] Meekings, 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-1268', p. 185.

allowed to own property outside of towns,[37] and the nature of conversion (at least to 1280) made it difficult for a convert to do so. Henry may have been in possession of property in Stockbury, Kent, as early as 1254,[38] and had royal confirmation of his lease of the mill of Felton, Northumberland, from Roger Bertram of Mitford for a period of thirteen years beginning in 1257.[39] At some point prior to 1257, Henry was in possession of the manor of Scawby, Lincolnshire, having received it for a term of eighteen years from Roger Le Peytevin, but had given it over in fee to Robert Walerand in that year.[40] Beginning in 1262, Henry held the manor of Wickham and Pettistree, Suffolk, for life of John de Lymare in return for 30*l.* per year, but the rent was annulled for a period of fourteen years, effectively making it a lease of that duration.[41] Henry gave up land in Holton, Lincolnshire in March 1262 to Robert Walerand,[42] and in 1268 the justices were mandated by the king to allocate 10*l.* worth of redeemable land in Northamptonshire to Henry under the Dictum of Kenilworth.[43] It appears as though Henry also held lands in Lincolnshire in 1270, as a debt to William de Valence was acknowledged by Henry as being owed on the security of his lands there and in Middlesex,[44] and this was further corroborated when it was the sheriff of Lincolnshire who was mandated to have Henry appear at the Exchequer of the Jews.[45] He held land in Northumberland in 1270, and Lincolnshire again in 1272 when the Prior of Brooke brought suit against him in

[37] *Liber de Antiquis Legibus*, ed. Thomas Stapleton (London, 1846), pp. 235-36; see also reference in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 598 to Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 489.
[38] *Close Rolls, 1253-54*, p. 148.
[39] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 548.
[40] CP 40/91, m.271. This may in fact have been a life-grant to Henry. See discussion below, on p. 161.
[41] KB 26/166, m.6. Ralph of Lymare had quitclaimed to his brother John, who in turn granted the lands to Henry. In October 1270, Ralph owed Henry 24*m.* secured on lands and chattels in Lincolnshire, which may indicate that Henry later held this land in Lincolnshire; see *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 296. In a separate transaction, Norman d'Arcy, lord of the barony of Nocton, Lincs., owed Henry 12*m.* secured on lands and chattels in Lancashire; see *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 562. However, it is likely that 'Lanc' is a misreading of 'Linc', given the extensive d'Arcy family holdings in Lincolnshire.
[42] *Close Rolls, 1261-64*, pp. 35-6.
[43] *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 455. The Dictum of Kenilworth provided that land be seized from those who had played roles in the de Montfort-led rebellion; Henry was to be allocated 10*l.* worth of this seized land, and the ransom due on that land was to be paid to him.
[44] *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, pp. 252-3.
[45] *PEJ*, ii, p. 35.

order to be acquitted of a debt of 100*s.*[46] The Prior of Thurgarton held part of the lands in Lincolnshire that Henry no longer held in 1273.[47] Henry was also demised some tenements and lands at some point prior to 1273 in Sussex,[48] held lands in Norfolk in 1276,[49] in Devon in 1277,[50] and held the manor of Romford, Essex from 1279[51] until his death in 1299.[52]

Henry was one of the few converts, if not the only one, who was knighted. The fact that he was a Jewish convert in the latter half of the thirteenth century and somehow managed to be knighted may be as much a testament to his luck as to his skillful social climbing. The earliest reference to Henry as a knight occurred in 1262, when he owed the king 12*l.* by way of Vives, son of Moses of Clare, and the entry noted that Henry was a knight of the county of Lincolnshire.[53] After this entry, the references to his knighthood between 1262 and the late 1270s are few and far between.[54] There are several possibilities regarding when and how Henry was knighted,[55] all of which are problematic for one reason or another.[56] The most

[46] *PEJ*, i, p. 227. The identical entry, though untranslated, can be found in *PEJ*, iv, p. 4; see previous discussion, above, on p. 144.

[47] *PEJ*, ii, pp. 87, 94.

[48] Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 623.

[49] *PEJ*, iii, p. 194.

[50] Ibid., p. 266. This entry is not indexed under 'Henry de Winchester' (or 'Wynton' or any variation thereof), but rather under 'Henry de la Pigmeraye', whose lands form the main subject of the entry. The identical entry, though untranslated, can be found in *PEJ*, v, no. 141.

[51] *Feet of Fines for Essex*, ii, ed. R.E.G. Kirk (Colchester, 1928), no. 131. See also *Parliamentary Writs*, i/i: p. 273, no. 4, where Henry is described as a knight who held lands in Essex but was non-resident in that county.

[52] *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, iii, no. 506. The writ from 26 September 1299 ordering the seizure of Henry's lands is found in *Cal. Fine rolls, 1272-1307*, p. 418.

[53] *PEJ*, iv, no. 460.

[54] The scarcity of evidence regarding knighting in general necessitates a somewhat varied approach. It is possible that Henry was knighted in the early 1250s, perhaps upon conversion. The king gave gifts, including robes, to newly dubbed knights (see *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 275) as well as monetary gifts (see *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 230; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 340; see also *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 363 for a later example). Henry's gift of 100*s.* (see *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 123) was an annuity—the other examples are not. Coss describes gift-giving by the king to favoured individuals who were about to become knights (see Peter Coss, *The Knight in Medieval England, 1000-1400* (Stroud, 1993), p. 60).

[55] See the first theory in the footnote above. The second theory relies on the 1262 entry describing Henry as 'knight of the county of Lincolnshire' (*PEJ*, iv, no. 460) as being incorrect or backdated. It is possible that Henry was knighted in a group knighting, which had begun to appear in the mid thirteenth century (see *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 213; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 331; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 237). This would have happened late in Henry III's reign, because the first reference to Henry the convert as 'knight' after the original 1262 reference occurred in Easter term, 1268; see *PEJ*, i, p. 159.

[56] The third theory supposes that Henry was knighted by someone other than the king. Henry's later

likely theory supposes that the convert Henry was knighted in September 1268, after Henry III distrained to knighthood all those in the county of Lincoln who had '20*l.* yearly of land or one whole knight's fee of that value and who ought to be knights and are not...'[57] This is the most likely explanation of Henry's knighting because he did indeed hold land in Lincolnshire and elsewhere.[58]

If this is in fact correct, it would seem that Henry was no more special than any other would-be knight, and his knighthood was simply a reinforcement of the idea that he was fully a member of the society that he had joined in the early 1250s. His knighting would have filled a void in the knightly class that had become increasingly apparent.[59] Knighthood from the 1250s into Edward's reign seems to have been less about bestowing 'honour' upon the recipient of the knighthood as a reward, though this certainly was not an alien concept,[60] and more about arresting the by-then obvious decline in the number of knights.[61] Given Henry's career as a royal administrator this does not seem a completely inappropriate theory. Coss elaborates: 'Knighthood in Angevin England carried social status, but it did so without entirely displacing the earlier ideas of knighthood as a function and as a particular form of service'.[62] Henry's service to the crown was sporadic, and Coss is undoubtedly referring to regular, local service, not the kind of service Henry provided. Coss does, however, mention the intermittent service of knights in the later thirteenth century: 'But if few county knights in the time of Edward I exercised regular office, many others were in receipt of irregular commissions...they continued to figure...in a variety of *ad hoc* commissions both judicial and administrative'.[63] The unpredictability of

---

relationship with Gilbert de Clare, Earl of Gloucester and Hertford (see pp. 153 and 160) might be indicative of this having happened. There is other evidence of knighthood being bestowed by someone other than the king; Roger d'Arcy had agreed to knight Ingram of Oldcotes in October-November 1272; see Paul Brand, 'Oldcotes vs. D'Arcy', in R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post (eds.) *Medieval Legal Records: edited in memory of C.A.F. Meekings* (London, 1978), p. 64.

[57] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 260.

[58] See discussion above, on p. 143.

[59] Peter Coss, *The Origins of the English Gentry* (Cambridge, 2003), p. 94.

[60] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, p. 636.

[61] Coss, *The Knight in Medieval England*, p. 70: 'In the end, the system of distraint probably did have an effect in stabilizing the situation'.

[62] Ibid., p. 46.

[63] Coss, *The Origins of the English Gentry*, p. 150.

Henry's service to the king, both in nature and scale, might indicate the accuracy of this theory over the others. Though there was undoubtedly an element of social prestige attached to knighthood, Henry's knighthood seems to have been the result of a political gambit on the part of the king to increase his available administrators, and not a result of anything particularly unique to him.

The land in Sussex that Henry had held was the cause of much legal wrangling for roughly fifteen years—though there was a prologue of sorts. In late 1258 Henry was vouched to warranty by the Prior of Reigate, concerning 189 acres of land, 5*s.* of rent, and 18 quarters of barley in Southwick, in a suit brought against the Prior by Beatrice de Valle.[64] Reigate was a small priory in Surrey, whose main properties were its site in Reigate, as well as the manor of Southwick, in Sussex.[65] The Prior vouched Henry to warranty for the lands and tenements in Southwick, and Henry conceded the lands and associated rent and tenements to the Prior which was itself unusual, since normally, a final concord would show Beatrice granting the land to the Prior. Bringing an end to this prologue, Henry then paid Beatrice 100*m.*[66] This payment to Beatrice reinforced the atypicality of Henry's experience as a convert; 100*m.* was an astronomical sum for anyone to have in hand, let alone a fairly recent Jewish convert who, in theory at least, was supposed to have given up the entirety of his possessions.[67] Nothing regarding this land in Southwick appeared again until Hilary term 1273 when the Prior of Reigate was distrained to answer Cokerel of Winchester, a Jew, concerning a plea of debt.[68] By Trinity term 1273, Cokerel of Winchester had brought suit against the Prior of Reigate, demanding payment of a share of the arrears of a debt owed by Beatrice of $10\frac{1}{2}$*m.* that dated from 1254-55.[69] Interestingly, it appears as though Beatrice owed two creditors for two separate

[64] *An Abstract of Feet of Fines Relating to the County of Sussex*, ii, ed. L.F. Salzmann (SRS VII)(London, 1908), no. 632.
[65] *VCH, Surrey*: ii, p. 105. Reigate was both a hospital and a priory. See Knowles and Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales*, p. 171.
[66] Salzmann, *Feet of Fines Relating to the County of Sussex*, no. 632.
[67] Henry does not seem to have been held to this: he was allowed to keep two debts *tempore judeitatis sue.* See discussion above, on p. 141.
[68] *PEJ*, ii, p. 2.
[69] Ibid., p. 35.

loans made on the security of the same piece of land: one, a Jew, and the other a new Christian who pursued his business interests very much in the manner of a Jew. Suing a third-party for a share of a debt owed to a creditor by a living debtor was not terribly unusual, and does give one further indication of the nature of this suit: 'third parties were normally only liable for such a share if the debtor was insolvent and they had acquired the lands from him [the insolvent debtor] after he had contracted the debt'.[70] Cokerel demanded 'of the said Prior, in respect of the said lands, 50*s.* with interest'.[71] As a result, in Michaelmas term 1273 Henry was again vouched to warranty by the Prior of Reigate.[72]

The following two years were filled with intense legal procedure, and the case was not actually heard until Hilary term, 1275, when it was judged that the Prior of Reigate was to have his recovery against Henry for the 50*s.* remaining on the debt, as well as 14*l.* of interest.[73] This sum was actually money owed to Cokerel, who was to have his recovery against the Prior; the sheriff of Surrey was mandated to have this sum levied from the goods and chattels of Henry, then paid over to the prior, who would then pay it to Cokerel.[74] Henry brought a writ of error, and the king ordered the barons to investigate and summon the justices of the Jews.[75] The case is difficult to unravel, however, we might tend to suspect that the land that Henry had bestowed was indebted as a result of a loan he himself had made on the security of that land; his conversion does not appear as though it interrrupted any business activity. It is well within the realm of possibility that Henry had lent a sum to Beatrice on security of a percentage of her land, and upon Beatrice's default, Henry paid her 100*m.* for her the balance of her land, and then transferred it to the priory. This might explain why Henry's payment of 100*m.* to Beatrice for 189

[70]See discussion in *PEJ*, vi, pp. 12-13.
[71]*PEJ*, ii, p. 2. 50*s.* was likely to have been the remaining amount owed on the original $10\frac{1}{2}m.$
[72]Ibid., p. 89.
[73]Ibid., p. 204; the manuscript reference for this entry is E 9/17, m.11d, where Beatrice's name seems added to the entry almost as an afterthought; this entry also indicates that she was still very much alive. See also *PEJ*, vi, p. 13.
[74]*PEJ*, ii, pp. 219, 231, 238.
[75]Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 623; *PEJ*, ii, p. 284.

acres seems incredibly cheap: the land was worth far more than this, but she had already received a payment in the form of the previous loan. Land-as-gage was a hallmark of the Jewish credit economy in England. Henry's conversion, however apparently religiously motivated, seems in no way to have terminated the lending strategies which he had presumably honed as a Jew. Following this line of thought, it is possible to see Henry's grant of land to the priory as not an especially religious act and done in return for prayers for his immortal soul, for example, but rather as an attempt to be seen as integrating himself in Christian landed society.[76] The idea that his conversion was not particularly profound is brought into stark relief in this instance, and becomes an increasingly prevalent narrative the further his life is examined.

Henry continued to associate with some of his former co-religionists, namely Moses of Clare,[77] though this seems to have been mostly limited to Henry acquiring lands indebted to Moses. In Easter term, 1268 Henry acted as a surety for Isaac, son of Manser, when he was sued by Richard de Vylers at the Exchequer of the Jews,[78] which suggests that Henry was still around the Exchequer of the Jews at this point, and often enough to be able to act as a surety. How might Henry have been perceived by his former co-religionists? He does not seem to have been ostracised by Jews, though there was a sense that officially, at least, he had left Judaism, the reference to *tempore judeitatis sue* providing ample evidence of said leaving. With Jews he seems to have had no problem continuing his business relationships, or indeed, perhaps creating new ones; there survives evidence from 1279 indicating that he was to be allowed to sell the goods of condemned Jews, both in England and abroad. Why would Jews deal with him at all? Were they subscribers to Rashi's point of view concerning apostates—'although he has sinned, he remains a Jew'?[79] This is hardly

[76] It is of course entirely possible that this was simply a land sale to the priory; this would suggest that the priory had paid Henry in advance rather more for the land than the 100*m.* that Henry had paid to Beatrice.

[77] *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, p. 40; *Close Rolls, 1261-64*, p. 36; *PEJ*, iv, no. 460, all as a debtor. For other transactions, see *PEJ*, v, nos. 238, 352, 392, 694, 760.

[78] *PEJ*, i, p. 159.

[79] Hyams, 'The Jewish Minority in Medieval England, 1066-1290', p. 276.

likely to have been the case; jealousy runs deeply, and Henry's new life as a Christian was a continuation of his old life as Jew, without the more objectionable aspects of Jewish life in England. Was there, perhaps, a feeling that Henry was a crypto-Jew, and doing business with him was a defensible standpoint? There is no surviving evidence for crypto-Jews in the convert community in England, even where we might expect to find accusations. It is impossible to fathom why, then, he was tolerated. He did not seem to be bothered, continuing to enjoy his special status in society. He does not seem to have attempted to actively disengage himself from his former co-religionists, though he was not always the instigator of these relationships. In a case from Hilary term 1270 involving one William Herun, a charter for a 10*l.* annual payment that had been recently found in the London *archa* was assigned to him in continuation of his 10*l.* yearly fee. However, the debtor, William Herun, who had been distrained to pay Henry, had claimed to have already satisfied in full the Jew to whom the original debt was owed, one Abraham, son of Josce. On a Memoranda Roll, it was recorded that an inquiry had been ordered in the king's name.[80] This case in itself is not terribly surprising considering Henry was still in favour at court, and the king (or the justices of the Jews, in this case) would presumably have known about Henry's fee, and might have been instructed to act to complete the favour that had originally been bestowed upon him in 1252. But, legislation put forward on 20 January 1269 prohibited the creation of these types of charters.[81] This legislation was repeated in May 1270, with the addition that any charters that were found or discovered in the chirograph chests or outside of them that had not already been given or sold to Christians were deemed to have no value, and all chirographs that recorded debts that related to fees were to be cancelled at the Exchequer.[82] The charter newly in Henry's possession would certainly have qualified for cancellation at the Exchequer. By Easter 1270, in this same case the king had seised Henry of lands in Northumberland which had formerly belonged to William Heyron, who had

[80] Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 257.
[81] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 376.
[82] *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 268.

defaulted on the debt to Abraham, son of Josce, which had been secured against the lands in Northumberland. This fee-rent had been given to Henry by the king in lieu of the 10 librates of land that Henry had formerly held in 'Horton' and which he had ceded to Robert Walerand eight years earlier. William had commanded men to eject Henry from his seisin and 'beat, and wounded and evilly entreated his men, against the peace', and when the sheriff was ordered to compel their appearance at the Exchequer of the Jews the assailants did not appear as instructed.[83] It seems unlikely that this incident garnered William any goodwill in future; assaulting the king's favourite convert cannot have been a wise choice.

Between 1270 and 1272, Henry was again involved in financial transactions with Jews. A tallage of 6,000*m.* had been assessed on the Jews of England in 1270 in order to defray the expenses of the Lord Edward who was going on crusade.[84] This tallage was to be collected by Hagin, son of Master Moses, and his brother Elias.[85] Henry had lent Hagin and Elias four marks of gold in 1270 in order that they might pay their tallage, and in 1272 was attempting to have it paid back.[86] That Henry had four marks of gold in hand is simply astounding; as in 1258, his financial position was atypical for a Jewish convert.[87] Though the request does not survive, it seems that Henry had asked the king for his help in trying to collect on this debt. In response, the king levied sums to Henry's use on fifteen communities of Jews, totalling 2*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.*[88] Only 11*s.* got to Henry;[89] another 8*s.* was paid but never got to him.[90] With the exception of the Jews of Arundel and Lewes who had 'nought except some empty houses, and are not found in his [the sheriff's] bailiwick',[91] and the Jews of

[83] *PEJ*, i, p. 227. 'Horton' refers to Holton, Lincs., the land in which Henry had given up in 1262. See discussion on p. 144.
[84] *PEJ*, vi, p. 72.
[85] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 716.
[86] Rigg, *Select pleas* p. 68.
[87] See discussion on p. 147.
[88] Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 68-70.
[89] Ibid., p. 69. Cambridge paid 8*s.* and Huntingdon paid 3*s.*, both to Richard of Wykeham, Henry's attorney.
[90] Guildford paid 3*s.* to its former constable who was not to be found in the country (see Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 69) and Gloucester paid 8*s.* to Ursel, a Jew, who did not turn over the money on the appointed day; see *l.c.*, p. 70.
[91] Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 70.

Hereford (Aaron le Blund was responsible for the largest portion of the $\frac{1}{2}m.$ assessed on the Hereford Jews but was currently in prison), the other communities refused to pay the assessed sums because they were located within various liberties.[92] In the cases of Wilton, Cricklade, and Devizes, the justices of the Jews ruled that the Jews were not in fact within the jurisdiction of any Liberty, and therefore were to pay the assessed amounts (*Et quia constat Justiciariis, quod predicti Judei sunt in potestate ipsius Vicecomitis, et non in potestate ballivorum aliquarum Libertatum*).[93] Henry's standing with the king, never in doubt, had clearly not weakened since the early 1250s; he had the king's administrative apparatus enforcing debt repayments on his behalf.

Into Edward's reign, Henry the convert continued to be heavily involved in the lives of the adherents to the religion that he had forsaken, but he also operated in the highest Christian circles as well. In October 1275, continuing in his role as a royal operative, he began to be moved away from his role of the previous decade as a solely Jewish policy and finance specialist and into mainstream royal affairs. A fifteenth had been granted as a subsidy to Edward I, and Henry was sent as an assessor to Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire, along with Simon de Gatton.[94] A large portion of the fifteenth was paid to merchants of Lucca, including 1,127*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* from Buckinghamshire and Bedfordshire,[95] out of a total of 2,707*l.* 18*s.* $4\frac{1}{2}d.$ for the two counties.[96] The job of assessor might not have been an easy one, considering that twenty-two counties raised complaints concerning 'errors alleged to have been made by the taxers and collectors of the fifteenth lately granted',[97] but the counties for which Henry was an assessor did not appear on the list. It seems as though he

[92] Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 60-70. In Cambridgeshire these were Bottisham and Holm; in Wiltshire these were Wilton, Cricklade, and Devizes; in Surrey and Sussex these were Chichester, Seaford, and Hatcham.

[93] Ibid., p. 69.

[94] *Parliamentary Writs*, i/i: p. 4, no. 12. See also *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 250-51.

[95] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 172.

[96] Figures adapted from James F. Willard, 'The Taxes Upon Moveables of the Reign of Edward I', *English Historical Review* 28, no. 11 (July 1913), p. 519. The total assessed for all counties in 1275 was 81,054*l.* 2*s.* $8\frac{1}{4}d.$; see Michael Prestwich, *War, Politics, and Finance under Edward I* (London, 1972), p. 179.

[97] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 183.

was a fairly competent royal administrator, and these skills would serve him well by the end of the decade. In 1276, he was twice given the power to make attorneys on behalf of Gilbert de Clare, earl of Gloucester and Hertford who was going overseas. The original power lasted from 9 June 1276 until Michaelmas of that year,[98] at which point it was renewed on 16 November for a further year.[99] That Henry revolved in the same circles as did Gilbert de Clare not only points to a high level of trust, but is also astonishing given his background, though in future his status as a convert would serve to hinder his socio-professional advancement.[100] Regardless, it seems fairly clear that Henry continued to lead a life that, for a convert at least, was completely out of the ordinary, though glimpses of normality did occasionally arise.

In 1259, Henry owed 40*s.* for disseisin in Lincolnshire,[101] and between 1272 and 1275 he owed 40*s.* for disseisin in Northumberland.[102] In 1275 we see the first indication that Henry was in fact in debt to the king, when he was listed as owing 30*l.* along with the tenants of his lands.[103] This debt surfaced again at Easter 1277, when Henry was essoined concerning this plea of debt by Adam of Stockland whom he presumably knew from his land holdings in Devon 'because he [Henry] was in the king's service'.[104] Henry was also in debt to the king as a result of a separate transaction in Hilary term, 1277. The tallage owed by Moses of Clare was in arrears, and it was ordered that these arrears be paid from his bonds in the treasury, one of which was worth 40*l.*, and owed by Henry.[105]

What 'the king's service' actually entailed is quite possibly the most interesting

[98] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 344.
[99] Ibid., p. 359.
[100] See discussion regarding the canonization dossier of Bishop Thomas de Cantilupe on p. 155.
[101] Richard Cassidy, *The 1259 Pipe Roll*, ii (King's College London, University of London, PhD thesis, 2012) no. 1498.
[102] Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 736. Rokeah points out in a footnote that this entry likely refers to a monastic lay brother given that the entry is found in the account for Northumberland, and few Jews were to be found in that area of the kingdom. However, Henry did hold the mill of Felton, Northumberland, meaning this entry refers almost certainly to Henry the convert.
[103] *PEJ*, iii, p. 61. The original debt had been owed to Moses of Clare but had since passed to the king.
[104] Ibid., p. 239. This entry is not indexed under 'Henry of Winchester' (or 'Wynton' or any variation thereof), but rather under 'Adam of Stoklond'.
[105] *PEJ*, iv, no. 460.

facet of Henry's career. Beginning in 1278, he was commissioned to go around the country buying silver up to a total weight of 3080lbs.[106] One of the benefits of being employed by the king may have involved Henry and his household being given a house to use for the duration of the time that he was on the king's business. In August 1278 Antony Bek, the constable of the Tower of London, was mandated to provide Henry and his household with 'a competent house...in which he may stay or dwell as often as he shall be required by the said Antony to do so for the purpose of doing the service which the latter owes the king'.[107] It appears that Henry was to be working directly under Bek while on the king's business. Given that Bek was the constable of the Tower of London in 1278, he would have been in charge of the imprisonment of the many Jews indicted during the coin-clipping trials. It would be interesting to know whether Henry came into contact with any of his former co-religionists there. In any case, though it was indeed silver that Henry was purchasing on behalf of the king, the order to Philip de Willoughby and William de Luda to audit Henry's account in October 1279 simply states that Henry and Matthew, the man with whom Henry was enjoined to purchase the silver, were purchasing 'certain things' for the king's use, and makes no mention of the fact that he had bought a massive amount of silver.[108] Why the silver was referred to as 'certain things' and not simply 'silver', especially to Philip of Willoughby, who had been involved in the silver-buying project from the start, is unclear. In any case, as noted by Brand, at first glance this seems simply to have been a slightly curious way of buying up silver in order to have it melted down, and then recoined.[109] However, in the actual account, the silver that they had been buying was referred to as melted silver,[110] indicating that 'what they may really have been doing is acquiring evidence of the capital offence of coin-clipping on

[106]Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1149. See also Rokeah, 'Money and the hangman in late-13th century England: (Part I)', p. 88. The 'Matthew Checker' to whom both Brand and Rokeah refer is the same as 'Matthew de Sandecroft' mentioned in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 328.
[107]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 276.
[108]Ibid., p. 328.
[109]Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1149.
[110]C 47/4/1.

the part of those from whom they bought the plate'.[111] This fits nicely with the idea that Henry had become something like a royal operative,[112] moving back and forth between the Jewish and Christian communities seemingly at will. This movement raises an interesting question: did anybody really know—or care—who Henry was? It would stand to reason that someone as publicly-noticeable as Henry would have at least been known by reputation, if not by sight; his conversion and royal service were certainly no secret. In a community as small as the medieval Anglo-Jewry, both his apostasy and the excellent subsequent treatment he received from the king was unlikely to have been a secret. Did the Jews from whom Henry and Matthew were buying the silver not pause and reflect on the provenance of this man who could slip back and forth between Hebrew and French? Surely this would have engendered some questions and would have been some cause for suspicion; after all, he certainly would not have appeared to be a cleric—members of the only subset of the Christian community who might have been expected to know some Hebrew.

There survives a story from the *Acta Sanctorum* entry in the canonization dossier of Bishop Thomas Cantilupe, wherein Edward, on the advice of members of his council, sought to have Henry given *testimonium sive recordum super Christianos*.[113] One of the witnesses to this event, Ralph Hengham, at the relevant time Chief Justice of the King's Bench,[114] related that Edward had proposed this somewhat unusual arrangement. There is some debate as to what exactly was meant; Stacey believes that Edward was attempting to install Henry as a justice with the power of life and limb over Christians,[115] whereas Brand maintains that Edward was simply trying to give Henry's proposed evidence against the coin-clippers 'the same quality as the record of the King's courts...that of established fact that could not be denied by

[111]Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1149.
[112]In his account, Philip of Willoughby noted that Henry was given 10*l.* for his expenses 'while in the king's service'. See Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls, Part 3', p. 58. Rokeah references E 352/73.
[113]*Acta Sanctorum, Octobris*, i, p. 547, as in Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1152.
[114]Paul Brand, 'Hengham, Ralph (*b.* in or before 1235, *d.* 1311)', *ODNB*.
[115]Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 277.

those against whom it was given'.[116] Stacey and Brand's positions are reconcilable: in either situation, Henry was to be given the power of record, and whether it was as a royal justice, as Stacey maintains, or simply as a star witness, as Brand maintains, it would have been tantamount to the same thing. There would have had to have been a change in the normal legal rules that would have benefited Henry, and not necessarily those whom he was either judging or testifying against. Either way, Thomas de Cantilupe had confirmed to Henry and to the other members of the king's council that Henry's conversion had certainly not made him a Christian. As the bishop likely argued, Henry was going to be one of the principal agents in the cases involving Christians—something that, irrespective of his conversion, could not be allowed. Cantilupe's reaction to the king's proposal clearly indicated that as far as he was concerned, Henry could never be fully a Christian, despite having been baptised. It reinforces the notion that conversion was not a dual stage Jewish-to-Christian process, but rather involved a significant degree of liminality.

Thomas de Cantilupe could hardly have been the only bishop who thought this way. His judgment of Henry's Jewish-ness, as distinct from Judaism, was not equivalent to John of Peckham's favourite accusation of insincere conversion; for Cantilupe, Henry's conversion might as well never have happened. Cantilupe reportedly said 'it was not proper that this convert and Jew should have such power over Christians'.[117] No doubt it would have been surprising to Henry—and to more than a few other converts—to hear that he was simultaneously a Jew and a convert. Why did Cantilupe take this view? Canon Law was fairly clear on the matter, the Fourth Lateran Council decreeing that 'it would be too absurd for a blasphemer of Christ to exercise power over Christians...we forbid Jews to be appointed to public offices, since under cover of them they are very hostile to Christians.'[118] According

[116] Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1152.
[117] Ibid.
[118] *Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, p. 266. This was not a new train of thought: see D.54, c.14, which dated to between 1139 and 1150, which specifically warned against Jews having public office where they might be afforded the opportunity to harm Christians: *Nulla officia publica Iudeis iniungantur, per que eis occasio tribuatur penam Christianis inferre.* For previous discussion of the relevant canon law, see p. 66.

to Cantilupe, Henry still being a Jew disqualified him. Cantilupe's reported tears might lend credence to the idea that his feelings were borne of religiosity;[119] were there a lack of an overt display of religious authenticity, we might be forgiven for thinking that it was simply the bishop's careerism at stake. The Fourth Lateran Council had also decreed that 'if anyone does commit such an office to them let him, after an admonition, be curbed by the provincial council'.[120] If he was still a Jew, as Cantilupe claimed, then there was no clearer case for the application of this conciliar canon; it was intended that Henry have the power of life and limb over born-and-bred Christians. What might Henry have thought of this assessment of his status? From a career point of view, it is obvious to a historian that this did not affect him in any way since he continued his sporadic royal service for decades. At the time it must have been a blow. Henry had been baptised by a bishop who was canonized within a decade of dying—if that man could not wash away Henry's Judaism in the font and confer the 'proper' amount of Christianity upon him, who could? It must have been quite shocking, and not only to Henry, to hear that after twenty years he was not yet considered Christian enough.

Henry carried on, and was arrested in Bury St. Edmunds in March 1278 while on the king's 'special business', the result being that the king's business was not done,[121] and he was arrested again, this time by the constable of Bristol apparently by accident, in the final days of 1278.[122] The king was certainly aware of the situation concerning Henry, as he recalled in May 1278—the phrasing suggests with fondness—how the convert had been knighted by Edward's father, King Henry.[123] While in Bristol Castle, Henry had been credited 26*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* in his account for 'expenses and courtesies' given to both Jews and Christians (*pro donis et alijs curialitatibus datis tam christianis quam Judeis*).[124] All of the silver (and various other things relating

[119]Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1152.
[120]*Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils*, i, p. 266.
[121]CP 40/28, m.30d.
[122]Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1150.
[123]Rymer's *Foedera*, i/ii: p. 557. For discussion of Henry's knighting, see above on p. 145.
[124]E 352/77, m.21d, as in Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, Part II', p. 88. Rokeah suggests that 'courtesies' be read as 'bribes' but also notes that both the purpose of the bribes and the person

to the clipping of coin) was ordered to be sent to London to Philip of Willoughby, and the order was worded very particularly: everything was to be sent to the Tower of London, including certain causes of suspicions concerning the clipping of the king's money that were to be delivered to Stephen of Penchester.[125] There are two possibilities as to what exactly was afoot: either there was a spectacular breakdown in communication and the trickle of information from the higher echelons of the royal government down to its purveyors of justice was not as flowing as the king had thought, or as Brand postulates, Henry was involved in a very well-organised sting operation.[126] It was an operation so well organised and secretive, in fact, that its protagonist temporarily fell victim to its secrecy.

Regardless, it appears that a Jew named Isaac who was also in jail in Bristol was the main reason for Henry's arrest. Isaac was apparently making an attempt to ingratiate himself with either the constable of Bristol or the king, but in any case this seems to have backfired on him spectacularly, as his request to be released from prison was summarily denied.[127] Henry seems to have had quite enough of prison at this point, because he took the trouble to sue for a pardon granted on 5 January 1279 from 'all suits, appeals, trespasses and excesses' by the king, and he also had included in this pardon a clause that 'if he be appealed by any one the appeal be heard and determined before the king'. A day later, Henry also received a writ of simple protection for life, 'with a clause that if he demand a safe-conduct at any time it is to be given to him'.[128] Suing for these two writs was an entirely pragmatic consideration on Henry's part, because even though he had been purchasing illegal goods on behalf of the crown he was still engaging in an illegal activity, and given his trips to numerous prisons, likely would not have wished to take any more chances with his future. At some point in Michaelmas term 1279, Henry was transferred to the Fleet prison in London by the auditors of his account,

---

or people being bribed are unclear.

[125] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 517.

[126] Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1151.

[127] SC 8/218/10892, as in Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', p. 1150.

[128] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 297.

and was released to mainpernors on the king's order.[129] In the original order to audit Henry's account, dated 22 October 1279, only Philip of Willoughby and William of Louth were enjoined to investigate the account.[130] But, when Henry was released to his mainpernors later in Michaelmas term, Roger of Northwood and Nicholas de Castello were listed as auditors in addition to Philip of Willoughby and William of Louth.[131] As well as being one of Henry's auditors, Roger of Northwood was also one of his mainpernors; the other mainpernor was Adam de Creting, of whom Henry held the manor of Romford, Essex, and who also apparently held lands in Norfolk.[132] His auditors were fairly high-powered individuals: Roger of Northwood was a baron of the Exchequer[133] and former investigator of the Jewish *archae* in Canterbury,[134] Philip of Willoughby was the king's former escheator North of Trent[135] and a baron of the Exchequer,[136] William of Louth was a cofferer of the wardrobe and would later be elected Bishop of Ely,[137] and Nicholas de Castello was a remembrancer of the Exchequer.[138] In any case, Henry was not travelling the country on the king's business for free. He did receive what might have been a fairly substantial reward for his troubles. In July 1279, he had received a writ of aid that allowed him the favour of selling the goods of the Jews that he had essentially helped to have hanged for their coinage trespasses. He was allowed to dispose of them both in England and abroad, and the list of what he had acquired is quite extensive: books of Christians and of Jews, copper lamps, furs, robes, cloths, and girdles of silk.[139] It is not unlikely

[129]Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 847. The original order to audit Henry's account is found in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 328.

[130]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 328. Earlier that year, William of Louth and John de Reda were noted as owing Henry 10*l.* secured on their lands and chattels—it is interesting that one of Henry's investigators should be in debt to him. See *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 559. In an unrelated transaction, Henry was also owed 20*m.* by John of Felsham in Trinity term, 1279. See *PEJ*, vi, no. 156.

[131]Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 847.

[132]Ibid. The relationship between Adam de Creting and Henry of Winchester was apparently mutually beneficial; for an example of Henry seemingly acting as a financial surety for de Creting, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 581.

[133]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 311.

[134]A.J. Musson, 'Northwood, Roger of (*d.* 1285)', *ODNB*.

[135]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 57.

[136]Ibid., p. 311.

[137]G.H. Martin, 'Louth, William of (*c.*1240-1298)', *ODNB*.

[138]*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 311.

[139]Ibid., p. 320. For evidence that Henry sold cloth in Michaelmas term 1279 that might have been

that, certainly for the books of Jews, and perhaps for the other items as well, he was going to be selling to Jews. Henry's conscience does not seem to have been bothered, if indeed he knew what he might have done to hasten the deaths of the Jews who had formerly owned these goods. It was perhaps assuaged by the fact that he was not the only person involved in the coin-clipping sting who was given licence to sell the goods of the condemned Jews. Philip of Willoughby was also allowed to make a profit from the goods of certain condemned Jews of Oxford, goods which had been forfeited for coinage trespasses.[140]

Irrespective of the state of his conscience, Henry's status at court seems not to have been diminished by the coin-clipping affair. In Easter term 1279 his standing at court was sufficiently high that he requested the pardoning of a payment to be made by Richard of Hedon for a licence to concord.[141] Hedon was Gilbert de Clare's steward, and had been nominated as his attorney from January until Easter, 1279.[142] Clearly Henry still moved in the higher circles of society if he was still involved with de Clare to the extent that he was able to request a pardon for Hedon. He thus brought to a close what was likely to be the most exciting period of his life, both from his own perspective, as well as that of history.

By 1280, Henry was once again in debt to the king, this time for 43*l.* allegedly for the money he had received out of the wardrobe,[143] and he was put on a repayment plan of 10*m.* per year.[144] This was in itself a favour, given its fairly lenient terms. Beginning in 1281, Henry was involved in an incredibly complicated and drawn-out

---

received out of the chattels of condemned Jews, see *PEJ*, vi, no. 239.

[140] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 363.

[141] CP 40/29, m.2. See also previous discussion, above on p. 153.

[142] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 298.

[143] *Fine Rolls, 1272-1307*, p. 135. Fogle has misinterpreted this entry, and believes that the king owed Henry 43*l.*, see Fogle, *Jewish Converts to Christianity in Medieval London*, p. 105: 'In 1278, the king granted Henry forty-three pounds...' The Memoranda Roll entry in Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 881, clearly states the opposite: 'The king has granted Henry de Wynton' that, of the £43 he owes the king...Henry is to pay the king 10 marks each year...until the £43 be paid in full'.

[144] Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 881. Incidentally, Rokeah matches this reference with the writ of aid in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 320. The dates do not match up, however: the Memoranda Roll entry references the 'money he [Henry] received of the profit of the issues of the Jewry' in year 6, which would have been November 1277 to November 1278, but the *Patent Rolls* entry dates from 7 July 1279.

case concerning land law. It was to last through the 1280s and into the early 1290s, but had its origins in the 1250s. At some point prior to 1257, Henry had received Scawby, a manor in Lincolnshire, for a term of eighteen years, from Roger le Peytevin. In 1257, Henry conveyed Scawby to Robert Walerand in fee. Roger le Peytevin, the erstwhile holder of Scawby, then undertook to warrant it to Walerand.[145] Robert Walerand then granted the land to John de la Lynde, whose heir, Walter, inherited it and held it still in 1281. The problem, as it concerned Henry, was the conveyance of Scawby in fee to Walerand in 1257. Henry had been a termor, and therefore had no right to give the land in fee.[146] However, when Roger le Peytevin had granted Scawby to Henry for eighteen years, 'Roger had added to the deed a special provision that after the term Henry might hold on if he liked for the rest of his life at an annual rent of £30'. In the eyes of the law, this made Henry a life tenant, and not in fact a termor. So, in 1281, Roger le Peytevin brought an assize of novel disseisin in the Lincolnshire eyre, charging that Henry le Convers, Clarice de la Lynde, and Walter de La Lynde had disseised him of Scawby.[147] Henry asked of the justices whether or not it was a disseisin when a termor granted over in fee, because if it was not, Roger would have to seek his right by a writ of entry, not of disseisin.[148] Sutherland writes that 'the law had no certain solution, and the justices in eyre were not anxious to provide their own', and the case was put off several times, eventually being interrupted by the second Welsh war. In July 1284, Roger obtained a new writ of novel disseisin, and a commission was brought before the justices at Boston. Henry argued the same thing as he had argued three years earlier, and the justices 'were no more willing to give judgment than had been the justices in eyre three years before', and the case was adjourned to the King's Bench.[149] This is hardly surprising; John

[145]Donald W. Sutherland, 'Peytevin *v.* La Lynde: A Case in the Medieval Land Law', *Law Quarterly Review* 83 (1967), p. 529.

[146]Sutherland, 'Peytevin *v.* La Lynde', p. 531.

[147]Ibid., p. 536. Clarice was John's widow, who held part of the tenements in dower (as *l.c.*, n. 42). As *l.c.*, the mss. references for the eyre are JUST 1/485, m.6; JUST 1/487, m.7; JUST 1/489, m.7d; JUST 1/492, m.7; JUST 1/494, m.4; and JUST 1/495, m.9. The justices were Roger Loveday, John of Mettingham, William of Saham, Master Thomas of Siddington, and John des Vaux.

[148]Ibid., pp. 537-38.

[149]Ibid., p. 538. The assize justices were John Bek and John of Mettingham. As *l.c.*, the mss.

of Mettingham had been a justice on the assize the previous time the case had been heard, and, as now, had been unwilling to render a judgment. The king's council ruled that the case should proceed, and after some legal wrangling between Roger le Peytevin and Walter de la Lynde, Roger brought a third assize of novel disseisin against both Henry and Walter, in Spring 1291.[150] Walter argued that Henry had held Scawby for life, not as a termor, and therefore regardless of what Henry did with the land, it was not a disseisin, and Roger should not be entitled to recover by that writ. Roger's counter-arguments convinced the justices that the assize be taken.[151] Walter convinced the jurors that Henry had been a life tenant,[152] proving *ipso facto* that Henry had not committed disseisin in 1257. Henry's role in the case was thus brought to a close, and though the case continued to be argued until Hilary term, 1294, his name did not reappear.[153] In an unrelated plea concerning disseisin that was subsequent to the beginning of this case, in June 1281, Henry owed the king 40*s.* for disseisin in Essex,[154] and his debt problems continued into 1282, when he was put on another repayment plan for 46*s.* 8*d.* concerning two debts that he owed the king.[155] In November 1283 it was noted that Henry had not kept his repayment terms from the previous debt, and the sheriff of Essex and Hertfordshire was to distrain for the whole debt.[156]

---

references are KB 27/92, m.12d (for the proceedings down to Trinity term, 1285), and KB 27/98, m.23 (for the proceedings down to Easter term, 1286).

[150]Sutherland, 'Peytevin *v.* La Lynde', p. 541. The justices were John of Mettingham, and Ellis of Beckingham.

[151]Ibid., pp. 541-42.

[152]Ibid., p. 543. As *l.c.*, the mss. references are CP 40/91, m.271, and JUST 1/1291, mm.1-1d; both contain the proceedings down to Hilary term, 1292.

[153]The post-Hilary term, 1291 mss. that refer to the case but not to Henry are CP 40/92, m.64d; CP 40/93, m.154d; CP 40/96, m.277; CP 40/98, m.47; CP 40/100, m.69; CP 40/101, m.140; CP 40/102, m.92d; and CP 40/103, m.120.

[154]Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 903. For previous discussion of Henry's debts for disseisin, discussion above on p. 153. In September 1281, a man named Henry of Winchester, who was perhaps not the same person as the current subject, was arrested along with several other men for 'divers trespasses, homicides, robberies, and assaults, and for being nightwalkers after curfew in the City with swords and bucklers, and for setting up games near the City'. This Henry was eventually released to twelve mainpernors, among whom was William of Kelvedon—this may indicate an Essex connection, where Henry had just acquired Romford. See *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, B, 1275-1312*, ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1900), pp. 1-3.

[155]Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 909.

[156]Ibid., no. 987.

In 1284, Henry was involved in a suit with Roger Loveday who claimed that he had himself been rightfully seised of a fairly large holding of a messuage, complete with 300 acres, 10 acres of meadow, 20 acres of wood, and 100*s.* of rent in Hornchurch, Essex during the reign of Henry III. This holding was clearly the manor of Romford. Henry the convert responded that he had held the said manor of Adam de Creting and his wife Nichola since 1279, and Loveday's claim was a moot point because a final concord had been levied, and Loveday had not made his claim in time. Loveday of course disputed this version of the facts, and countered that the fine that was levied, an action of covenant, was not one that barred him from putting in a claim to the lands.[157] Loveday, a professional lawyer and subsequently a royal justice,[158] had inherited lands in Suffolk,[159] and had acquired lands in Essex and Hampshire.[160] Given his professional and personal background it seems safe to say that he was well versed in the minutiae of property law, but regardless, Henry still held the manor of Romford at his death in 1299.

Later in 1284, Henry rendered his account at the wardrobe completely, apart from the original 43*l.* from 1280,[161] and by 1293 when he was in arrears on this debt by 36*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* he was put on a new repayment plan of 40*s.* yearly.[162] The fact that he was required to keep to these terms of repayment seems to have been lost on Henry, because in 1297 he still owed the identical amount—though it was not terribly uncommon not to pay—a fact that was noted on a Close Roll: 'the king, wishing to show favour to Henry, although he has not kept his terms, has granted to him that he may recover his terms, and he therefore orders them to cause him to have these terms again...'[163] Between November 1285 and November 1287, Henry

[157] CP 40/55, m.107d.
[158] *Earliest English Law Reports*, iii, ed. Paul Brand (London, 2005), p. lxxxiii.
[159] Ibid., p. lxxxi.
[160] Ibid., p. lxxxii.
[161] Rokeah, *Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials*, no. 1259. Rokeah points out that this entry occurs amidst entries from 1292, and also notes that it remains unclear why it appeared so long after the event to which it refers.
[162] *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1272-1307*, p. 332. Fogle, *Jewish Converts to Christianity in Medieval London*, pp. 105-6, misidentifies this entry as Henry receiving money from the king.
[163] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 56.

was in debt to Simon Caritati, merchant of Pamplona, for 23*l.* The debt had been divided in two for the purposes of repayment, 14*l.* of which was due at Boston fair in 1286, and the remaining 9*l.* of which was due at Boston fair in 1287.[164] This is interesting for two reasons: it shows that Henry was in debt not only to the king but privately as well, and secondly and more importantly, it shows that Henry was likely active as a merchant. Attending Boston fair and having fairly large debts to a foreign merchant seems indicative of import-export activity. The way the debt was structured seems meant to allow for goods to be sold after the first down payment had been made, in order to allow for the outstanding balance to be raised.

The only recorded indication that Henry ever received the the 12*d.* per day that he had been granted in 1252 occurred in November 1289, when he was given this money for his sustenance (*pro sustentacione sua*). The entry also stipulated that Henry not receive his stipend for 19 days out of the previous 99, because he was away from court on his own business (*vacavit quia fuit extra curiam in negociis propriis*). This suggests that there was a separate grant relating to service in the king's household. Henry's sustenance was certainly not being put on hold while he was away from court. This entry is interesting mainly because it assumes that the original grant from 1252 was not in fact a grant out of the goodness of the king's heart, but rather a grant in return for service. It also suggests that Henry was in receipt of some regular payment, the fact that there survives no other mention of his receiving this 12*d.* daily notwithstanding. This entry does, however, refer to the aforementioned grant (*sicut prius dicitur*) or possibly another, similar grant between 1252 and 1289.[165] This entry also implies that Henry enjoyed the good graces of both Henry III and Edward. A grant was only good for the life of the king who gave it, meaning that another grant would have been given to Henry after Edward's coronation in 1273. Henry's status at court does not seem to have been diminished

[164] C 241/8/381. I am grateful to Dr. Henry Summerson for the reference.

[165] *Records of the Wardrobe and Household, 1286-1289*, ed. B. Byerly and C. Byerly (London, 1986), no. 4373. The ms. reference is to E 101/352/32. See discussion of the original grant above, on p. 139.

in the least, even with his unsettled debts to the king.[166] In 1290, Henry owed 4*m.* to Hugh de Vienne, secured on his lands and chattels in Essex,[167] presumably Romford. In November 1290, in an attempt to either ingratiate himself with the royal family, or perhaps in a genuine act of Christian charity, Henry received a payment of 40*s.* for the decoration of an ecclesiastical vestment purchased from him for the use of the queen.[168] Henry's debt problems were temporarily stayed in November 1293 when his 100*s.* fine for assart in Essex—again, most likely Romford—was pardoned by the king.[169] On New Year's Eve, 1294, he also received a prest from the king at St. Alban's for 10*l.* against his annual fee.[170] Vestiges of Henry's presumed previous career as a Jewish money-lender or trader continued to manifest themselves even into this last decade of his life. Henry was again owed money, this time by Ranulph de Friskney, knight of Lincolnshire: 20*m.* was payable to Henry in June 1294,[171] and another 40*m.* was payable to Henry in October of that year.[172] These were not the only transactions involving the two men since Ralph also owed Henry a debt of 37*l.* over two terms in 1296.[173]

---

[166] In April 1288, a man named Henry of Winchester, who was perhaps not the same person as the current subject, was accused of the murder of Thomas de Blake of Brocton, and was imprisoned at Worcester as a result. Henry claimed that the charge was made out of hatred and malice (*de odio et atia*), and was bailed 'to appear before the justices at their first assizes.' (See *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 306). The fact that he was bailed indicates that the returned writ had found that the accusation had indeed been malicious. He surrendered himself to prison prior to the assizes in order to obtain swift justice, (see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 306) but nothing further seems to have come of this charge—perhaps because the inquisition that followed had found that three men—Simon Fraunceys and William Kelus of Upton Snodsbury, and John, son of Osbert of Bryghlaston—had killed Thomas during a quarrel, and though 'many others were present...none of them are guilty'. (See *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, i, no. 2292.) Charles Moor, *Knights of Edward I*, v (London, 1932), p. 201, believes the subject of this case and our current subject to be one and the same.

[167] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 118.

[168] *The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290*, ed. John Carmi Parsons (Toronto, 1977), p. 127.

[169] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 307.

[170] *Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-95, presented to J.G. Edwards*, ed. E.B. Fryde (Oxford, 1962), p. 152. Henry's annual fee was indeed 10*l.* (see previous discussion on pp. 140 and 150), but in the left margin below Henry's name, '16*li.*' is written. The introduction to the volume states that this series of prests 'was compiled by the wardrobe for the purposes of its internal accounting and serious efforts were made to correct and amplify it when additional information was forthcoming...it was being corrected and annotated for at least five years' (see *l.c.*, p. xxvi), so it is entirely likely that Henry might have received 16*l.*, and not 10*l.* The ms. reference is E 36/202, f.34^{r}.

[171] C 241/25/102.

[172] C 241/25/74.

[173] C 241/7/92. 25*l.* was payable in April 1296, and the remaining 12*l.* was payable in October of

The Household Account of Henry de Lacy, Earl of Lincoln, for 24 May 1299 to 7 June 1299 mentions one 'Henrico le Converse' receiving alms,[174] but there is no indication that this man is the same as Henry of Winchester the convert.[175] It is of course entirely possible that it might be, given Henry's land holdings in Lincolnshire and the social sphere that he seems to have inhabited. However, having been quite notable throughout the majority of his life as having been a knighted convert, as well as the fact that at this point in his life he was almost uniformly referred to as 'Henry of Winchester, knight', and that he would have had no business in France negotiating the future Edward II's marriage along with Henry de Lacy, undermines the claim that this might be Henry of Winchester, the knighted convert.[176] Henry was still in debt when he died, as there is no record of his having paid off the 36*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* that he still owed the king in 1297, and he still owed 10*l.* to Nicholas of Wheathampstead that was due in May 1300.[177] It appears that this sum was never paid.

Henry had died by September 1299, and apparently held only the manor in Romford, Essex, as the inquisition post mortem explicitly stated that he held no other lands this side of Trent.[178] There is no evidence that his heir, Thomas,

---

that year.

[174] *Household Accounts from Medieval England*, i, ed. C.M. Woolgar (Oxford, 1992), p. 164.

[175] A man named Henry of Winchester, again, perhaps not the same as the current subject, appeared briefly in 1298 on a roll of the horses of the English army in Scotland during the Falkirk campaign. He was marked down as having a bay-coloured horse of inferior status to a charger, worth 10*m.* There were two rolls listing horses: one which concerned those belonging to the 'bannerets, simple knights, esquires, and valets attached to the Household of the King' and a second roll which concerned those belonging to 'bannerets and officers of lower rank who were not of the Royal Household'. Henry and his horse appeared on the latter. If this is indeed the same Henry as is the subject of this paper, then he would have been incredibly ancient at this point. See *Scotland in 1298, Documents Relating to the Campaign of King Edward I*, ed. H. Gough (London, 1888), pp. 160, 225.

[176] Fogle, *Jewish Converts to Christianity in Medieval London*, pp. 108-9, believes that these two men were one and the same—the convert Henry of Winchester. There is also a question, brought by Hillaby, about whether or not Henry of Winchester and Henry de Dernegate were one and the same. Hillaby believes they are, though there is a lack of evidence; see Joe and Caroline Hillaby, *The Palgrave Dictionary of Medieval Anglo-Jewish History* (Basingstoke, 2012), pp. 125-26.

[177] C 241/34/57.

[178] *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, iii, no. 506. The date of the writ was 26 September 1299, and the date of the inquisition was 5 October 1299. See also *VCH, Essex*: vii, pp. 64-5. The inquisition also noted that upon his death, he owed Joan of Cambridge 40*s.* See C 133/87/12. NB: This is Henry's inquisition post mortem, which was in response to the *diem clausit extremum.*

succeeded him there. During the inquiry, the inquisition noted the final wrinkle for which Henry was to be responsible, even in death: there was a question about whether or not his marriage to his wife, Clarice, was legitimate. The marriage was only to be considered legitimate if it had survived conversion, its 'survival' hinging upon the legitimacy of Jewish marriages under Canon Law. The inquisition post-mortem noted that 'The said Henry married a wife under the Jewish law, and afterwards they were converted to the Christian law...if the marriage contracted before they were converted may duly stand'.[179] If it was found as having been valid—that is to say 'legitimate' under Canon Law—then presumably Thomas, their son, was to be considered Henry's legitimate heir. For marriages contracted prior to the conversion of one of the two Jewish spouses the applicable canon laws were muddled. Innocent III 'reflected common canonistic opinion when he held that Jews could validly contract marriages among themselves according to their own rights and customs, and that their marriages were not cancelled if one party later received baptism'; marriages were generally found valid if the non-Christian spouse also received baptism.[180] Because Clarice had converted shortly after her husband, it is not surprising that their marriage was found valid. Thomas was noted as being aged '30 years of age and more';[181] Henry's first mention was in July 1252, which means either that Thomas might have been born around the date of his father's conversion in the first half of the 1250s and was thus well over 30 years of age, or more likely, he was simply born well after his parents had converted. In March 1282, he was recorded as being in debt for $5m.$ for a horse that had been previously purchased,[182] and by 1284 he had been old enough to hold land in his own name;[183]

[179] *CIPM*, iii, no. 506. This is also found in *Calendarium Genealogicum: Henry III and Edward I*, ii, ed. Charles Roberts (London, 1865), p. 563.

[180] James A. Brundage, 'Intermarriage Between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law', *Jewish History* 3, no. 1 (Spring, 1988), p. 27. It seems likely that the investigation was launched because of the confusion stemming from Innocent III's rulings in *Quanto te*; see *l.c.*, p. 29.

[181] *CIPM*, iii, no. 506. In Trinity term, 1279, Thomas was old enough to be owed $10m.$ by John of Felsham, who incidentally also owed money to Henry of Winchester. See *PEJ*, vi, nos. 156 and 157.

[182] *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London, A, 1275-98*, ed. R.R. Sharpe (London, 1899), p. 48.

[183] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 300. Thomas was heavily in debt between 1288 and 1301; the

in any case, the matter regarding Thomas' legitimacy as Henry's heir seems to have been sorted by 23 October, when the king ordered the escheator this side Trent not to 'intermeddle further until otherwise ordered with the lands that belonged to Henry de Wynton[ia]' as the king had learned by inquisition that 'Henry at his death held nothing of the king in chief...and that Thomas de Wynton[ia], son of Henry, is his next heir and is of full age.'[184] The prime concern of the investigation was whether or not Henry had been a tenant-in-chief when alive; had he been, the inquisitor would have held the lands until Thomas' legitimacy was ascertained through the investigation into his parents' marriage. The record ended there for Henry, and nothing further appeared. There was a reference to a 'Henry of Winchester' which occurred in the 1308 inquisition on the affairs of the *domus conversorum*, which listed Henry as living in 1292 but since dead,[185] but it is unlikely that this Henry and our convert Henry were one and the same, our Henry having held the manor at Romford beginning in 1279, and it would not have made sense for him to be living in the *domus conversorum* while simultaneously holding a fairly large manor and its lands. Henry of Winchester, convert, had thus disappeared from the record in the same manner in which he had entered it: quite suddenly, and with little context.

Henry nearly encountered the complete range of convert life experiences, save the fact that he was never a resident in the *domus conversorum*. He was alternately fêted and reviled by well-heeled Christians; his life was filled with debt, legal battles, and prison, but also knighthood and royal service. That there was a split world can hardly be debated: suits involving a Jew and a Christian were decided by evenly split juries. A Jew in medieval England was part of a Jewish community which was a legally-mandated other. Richard and John had given the Jews charters of privilege which they had requested allowing for intra-communal disputes to be decided among themselves. The majority of the Christian community must have

following Certificates of Statute Merchant and Statute Staple refer to him as the son of Henry of Winchester, knight: C 241/2/243, C 241/2/72, C 241/56/136, C 241/56/138, C 241/49/127, C 241/35/175.

[184] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 281.

[185] Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62a.

been happy with this separation; no doubt this happiness was the result of heightism, but it was present nevertheless. There was a dichotomy: good and evil, Christian and Jew. There was nothing remotely approaching a grey area between the two until the act of conversion. Once a Jew converted, however, there was suddenly a liminality in this formerly black-and-white world: it was possible to be neither Christian nor Jew. Perhaps this transitional state was seen as enough reason to not convert to Christianity. There was no guarantee of acceptance, certainly from former fellow-Jews, and quite possibly from the Christians. This likely played into Henry's integration into Christian society; though only Bishop Cantilupe voiced his opinion, he is unikely to have been the only one who thought that 'Jew' and 'convert' were one and the same. Henry does not seem to have been a terribly sincere convert. The only acts of religiosity for which evidence survives—paying for the decoration of an ecclesiastical vestment and bestowing land on a priory—might not have been acts of religious conviction after all. His business life continued in the manner which we are most accustomed to see in wealthy Jewish businessmen of the period: land transfers, loans, debts, and fines. Henry had left Judaism, certainly, but had not quite joined Christianity.

6 The Convert, the Paymaster, and the Priest: The Many Lives of Alexander the Convert

Whereas Henry's life showed a simultaneous lack and abundance of integration, Alexander's life, with nearly as many reference points as Henry's, indicates that he suffered no prejudice. In fact, Alexander integrated so successfully that he was nominated as a bishop. This happened near the end of his life, after nearly three decades of royal service. In this respect, both Henry and Alexander can be said to have followed the same career path. However, Alexander's life and career show something far different: where there was an absence of bias against a convert, a position in the church was a valid goal. Was there perhaps bias against him originally, which dissipated as he proved himself increasingly worthy? He might have suffered similarly to Henry, but no evidence survives. Like Henry, Alexander likely had no notion of what life might have been like in the *domus conversorum*; though the *domus* remained a home for converts long beyond the Expulsion, the first reference to Alexander in the extant records dates to 1294, which is slightly too late for him to have been an inmate on Chancery Lane. Alexander was far more involved in the day-to-day administration of the kingdom than was Henry, and the majority of the references to Alexander are of this administrative nature.

Though it is unclear whether or not he was indeed a Jewish convert, it seems likely that he was. His career was dotted with activities that might be expected of, among others, a high-status Jewish convert, including money management in the first instance, followed by administrative tasks. However, I have been unable to find incontrovertible evidence of his conversion;[1] it is then entirely possible that the surname 'le convers' was simply that of his father, and had been passed on to him.[2] However, if Alexander was in fact a convert himself, his life is the exception

[1]Implications for the distinction between Alexander's possible conversion versus that of his father are discussed below, on p. 189.

[2]There is an undated entry in *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland*, ed. Sir F. Palgrave, vol. i (London, 1737), p. 314, no. 77 that reads, 'Item Alisandre le Conversus ad demande pur Thomas le Conuers son frere le droit des terres Mons[ieur] James de Lyndeseye fuiz et heir Sire Waut [Walter] de Lyndeseye 'en' le Manoir de Thureston en Conte de Berewyk.' This

that proves the rule: it was indeed possible for certain converts to entirely avoid any semblance of liminality and fully become Christians. The following mass of information on Alexander's life can thus be read in two different ways. Either Alexander's life proves that a convert having apostatised out of conviction might legitimately expect to end up in a church position, or, that a convert's apostasy was a reasonable careerist manoeuvre, designed to gain great measures of advancement in royal service. The surviving evidence does not point definitively in one direction, but either hypothesis might be valid. Regardless, the first reference to Alexander in the surviving records dates to October 1294, when he was mandated to hold pleas of the market in Ireland, and to inspect the weights and measures there, in order to ensure uniformity throughout the kingdom.[3] The king's wardrobe account for 1294-5 makes reference to administrative tasks assigned to him, as well as the monies disbursed to him for these tasks. By 10 May 1295, Alexander had travelled from Ireland to Chester with three of the king's horses, and was given 40*s.* to cover his expenses, those of the horses, and those of Radulph Hurle, *garcionis J. le Convers*.[4] It is interesting that Alexander was using what might have been one of his father's boys.[5] This perhaps indicates an ongoing relationship. In June, Alexander received a prest of 12*s.* in wages *pro farrina frumenti etc*, possibly while at Merthyr Tydfil.[6] In July, he was given lump sums three times from which to allocate wages of 74 Welsh hostages that he was conducting from Caernarfon to England in the first instance,[7] 19 hostages from Conwy to England in the second, and 100 hostages in the

---

either indicates that Alexander and his brother Thomas were given the last name 'convers', or that they both converted at the same time. Siblings converting at the same time was not unusual in the thirteenth century: see *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 124; various pairs within *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*: nos. 54, 124, 125, 981.

[3] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland, 1293-1301*, ed. H.S. Sweetman (London, 1881), no. 174. A nearly identical entry occurs in *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, p. 99. This entry is not indexed in the volume. In both entries he is referred to as 'Alexander, clerk of London'. More than twenty entries between 1298 and 1322 refer to Alexander both as convert and clerk, meaning these two previous entries almost certainly refer to Alexander the Convert.

[4] *Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-5*, p. 78.

[5] See discussion below, on p. 173.

[6] *Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-5*, p. 150.

[7] Ibid., p. 85. That Alexander was leaving from Caernarfon might indicate a sea-voyage; he received 20*l.* to disburse to Caernarfon hostages, and 100*s.* to disburse to the Conwy hostages.

third, who were in the care of Reginald de Grey.[8] In mid-September, there were two entries, referring to Alexander in a paymaster's capacity: both involved 300*l.* sent from London to Plymouth, where Alexander was to remain with John of Gloucester in order to disburse wages for the sailors there.[9] A third entry concerning the wages of sailors at Plymouth occurred on 2 October of that year; it involved 400*l.* and was again directed at both Alexander and John of Gloucester.[10]

Alexander's Irish connection is made clear from Michaelmas term 1294 to Trinity term 1295, when he was reimbursed as 'Alexander of London' for his expenses 'in taking the goods of aliens into the king's hands'; in that span of time, there was also an entry recording that Alexander had bought two destriers from William the Treasurer and had them sent to the king in Wales.[11] At roughly the same time, Alexander was mentioned in a petition presented to the king and council, which concerned one John Boutetourte attempting to recover the chattels he had bought from Gilbert de Chesterton at Hoxton in Middlesex.[12] Boutetourte was once thought to be the illegitimate son of Edward I, but this has since been disproven by Prestwich.[13] The interesting thing to come out of this petition is not necessarily what the petition addressed, but rather how it referred to Alexander: 'Alissaundre le fils de Johan le convers'.[14] Though this seemingly proves that the name 'le convers'

---

[8] *Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-5*, p. 86. He received 35*l.* for these hostages. For an entry summarising these three preceding transactions and that involving the king's horses, see *l.c.*, p. 140, though this summary entry allots 36*l.* in two instalments to Alexander for the 100 hostages in the keeping of Reginald de Grey, rather than the 35*l.* originally allocated. A follow-up entry notes that Alexander had accounted for the entirety of the monies disbursed to him, except for 6*s.*; see *l.c.*, p. 141.

[9] Ibid., pp. 92-3. Both entries had notes vacating them. The first entry was noted *vacat quia inferius* (*l.c.*, p. 92), referring presumably to the following entry, which was itself noted *Cancellatur quia P. de Everdon' audivit compotum et* [two words illegible] *et computavit inter facta sua de Plummuth'* (*l.c.*, p. 93).

[10] Ibid., p. 115. This entry was also vacated. It was noted *Cancellatur quia Ph. de Everdon' audivit compotum et exinde responderunt apud Plummuth'*. Philip Everdon was the cofferer of the wardrobe under Walter Langton (see *l.c.*, p. 228).

[11] *Irish Exchequer Payments 1270-1446*, ed. Philomena Connolly (Dublin, 1998), p. 125. William the Treasurer had been owed a debt by Adam of Creting—the same Adam who was connected with Henry of Winchester—and these two destriers were the payment of that debt, out of Adam's estate.

[12] SC 8/323/E566.

[13] Michael Prestwich, *Edward I* (London, 1997), pp. 131-32.

[14] SC 8/323/E566.

as it related to Alexander was a carryover from his father's conversion, in actuality it proves only that Alexander's father was a convert. It is entirely possible that Alexander was born before his father's conversion, and converted at some point before 1290. There are numerous possibilities as to which 'John le Convers' might have been Alexander's father, with the most likely candidates based on the dates they were active being numbers 59, 244, and 254. A secondary reason for the inclusion of these three converts is their lack of family names.[15] John #59 was the convert who had studied at Oxford under Robert Bacon, and who had possibly re-apostatised,[16] though the fact that he was only mentioned in the 1240s may make him slightly too old to be Alexander's father. Perhaps the most plausible likelihood was John #254, a serjeant-at-arms who was active from the late 1260s to 1317,[17] and was also the father of Ralph le Convers, another of the king's serjeant-at-arms.[18] There is no mention of this John's fathering of any other sons, nor of any brothers of Ralph. John #244 was the convert involved in the crucifixion of Hugh of Lincoln, and who accepted baptism in order to save his own life.[19] This occurred in 1256, perhaps also making him slightly too old to be Alexander's father.

In August 1295, the enrolled account of Walter Langton, Keeper of the king's wardrobe, mentioned that Alexander had 59*l.* 7*s.* 4*d.* in his hands, from an original 250*m.* given to him while he was at the Exchequer, in order that he might arrange for the transportation of 25,000*l.* to Sutton, near Plymouth, as well as for the wages of the sailors transporting that sum to Bayonne, Aquitaine.[20] By 1296-1297, Alexander

[15] Numbers refer to the assigned reference numbers in the appendix. Other, less likely candidates are #133, #145, #181, #211, and #223. Though #223 seems slightly too early—1255—to be Alexander's father, this John was noted as being the son of Thomas (see *Fine Rolls 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 where he was assigned to the Augustinians at Lilleshall) which was the name of Alexander's brother (see *Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland*, i, p. 314, no. 77). It is possible that Alexander's brother might have been named after his paternal grandfather—John the Convert's father.

[16] *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 298.

[17] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, p. 296; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-18*, p. 463.

[18] *Calendar of the Letter-Books of the City of London, D*, p. 77.

[19] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 457.

[20] *Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-5*, p. 213. This is an amalgam of two sources: the enrolled account of Walter Langton, and E 101/624/51, p. 10, which is part of a book of household payments and receipts from the Wardrobe and Household.

had submitted an account of cabins made for the ships of the Duchess of Brabant.[21] This was likely for the king's daughter's journey to Brabant in January 1297,[22] which she was undertaking presumably in order to live there with her husband, the Duke of Brabant. She had been married to the duke in 1290.[23] In February 1297, Alexander was part of a commission with John de Kirkeby, authorised by Walter Langton, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield and treasurer of England, the same man who had received the destriers from Adam de Creting's will in 1294-95. The commission was to investigate the lands and tenements in Tynedale that had been taken into the king's hand.[24] Between 1297 and 1299, Alexander was responsible for sending stores and victuals to the castles of Edinburgh and Stirling,[25] and between 1297 and 1298 received 100*l.* for the 'carriage of victuals for provisioning Stirling castle'.[26] On 1 September 1298, Alexander's horse was valued at 10*m.*, which he received in alms.[27] There is no indication, unlike for the horses belonging to others on this roll, that Alexander's horse had died at Falkirk a few months earlier. Alexander continued in his role as victualler to the king's Scottish castles in October 1298, when he transported the carcasses of twenty cows to Edinburgh by ship, for which he received 10*d.*,[28] and at the same time was given an indenture at Berwick to transport victuals to Edinburgh.[29] By 2 December of that year, he received another

[21] E 101/6/22.
[22] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 80.
[23] Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 317. The marriage had been negotiated in 1278, when Margaret was three years old.
[24] *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, i, no. 1764. The lands held by tenants of the bishop of Durham had been taken into the king's hand by John de Aykescogh because these tenants had followed John de Balliol into rebellion. In total: eight manors, a barony, and a quarter of the town of Hetherington, Northumberland.
[25] E 101/7/9.
[26] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 191.
[27] *Scotland in 1298, Documents Relating to the Campaign of King Edward I*, ed. H. Gough (London, 1888), p. 178. There are two rolls concerning the valuation of the horses used by the English during the campaign at Falkirk; the valuation concerning Alexander's horse appears on the roll concerning the horses belong to the 'bannerets, simple knights, esquires, and valets attached to the Household of the King', and not the second roll, which concerned the horses belonging to 'bannerets and officers of lower rank who were not of the Royal Household. See Gough, *Scotland in 1298*, p. 160. Additionally, the index refers to Alexander, along with John the Convert and Ralph the Convert, as 'no doubt, converted Jews', *l.c.*, p. 292.
[28] *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, ii, p. 326.
[29] Ibid., p. 327.

indenture of commission to victual Stirling castle,[30] and was to go to Edinburgh and return with a barge full of the required stores for Patrick, the Earl of Dunbar.[31] The Earl had previously been the captain of the Berwick garrison, and had just been appointed as the chief commander of the English forces in southern Scotland.[32] On 3 December 1298, it was noted that provisions had been delivered to Edinburgh castle with the exception of what Alexander had been tasked with supplying,[33] and on 4 December, it was noted that he had delivered corn, barley, and oats to Stirling castle.[34]

In 1299, Alexander's duties as victualler and supplier to the king and his armies were not yet finished, as he was appointed in November to take 'ships, barges, and other vessels fit for carrying victuals which he can find on the seaboard between the town of Hartlepool and Berwick-on-Tweed' and have them brought to the king.[35] The sheriff of Northumberland was also commanded to aid Alexander.[36] Between 1299 and 1300, Alexander had become a paymaster to Edward's army in addition to his duties as supplier to the king's forces in Scotland,[37] and he continued in this capacity when he also paid out money to soldiers at Carlisle who had not yet gone to Scotland.[38] Between February and March 1301, Alexander received a horse worth 50*s.* that had been bought for him in order that he might go to Wales, as well as 6*m.* for another horse for the same purpose: the king's magnates that were in Wales were to affix their seals to a letter to the pope 'touching the business of Scotland'.[39] Edward had received a bull from Boniface VIII, where, among other things, the pope had claimed that 'Scotland belonged to the Roman church, and was

[30] C 47/22/2/44.
[31] *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, ii, pp. 341-2. This is also briefly mentioned in *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1037.
[32] Fiona Watson, 'Dunbar, Patrick, seventh earl of Dunbar or of March (1242-1308)', *ODNB*.
[33] *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, ii, p. 345.
[34] Ibid., p. 347.
[35] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, p. 455.
[36] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1112.
[37] E 101/8/17.
[38] E 101/8/18.
[39] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 250.

not feudally subject to the English king'.[40] Edward's reply 'took the form of a letter from the English Barons' and 'rejected the idea that the king should answer the pope regarding his claims in Scotland, for the matter concerned the hereditary rights of the crown, and the dignity of the king'.[41] This letter from Edward's magnates had been 'sealed by seven earls and sixty-four barons, but it is not clear that all were present at Lincoln, as a clerk was later sent round to have additional seals affixed to the document'.[42] Alexander's purpose in travelling to Wales is thus explained. In June, Alexander had been commanded to send letters to 'certain people of the county of Lincoln, whose summons was forgotten' to go to Scotland to join the king's service there,[43] and by September of that year, Alexander had been appointed to help Sir John de Drokenesford, who was keeper of the Wardrobe at the time,[44] to 'collect as much as he can everywhere' and have it sent to Scotland.[45]

By October 1301, the king's financial situation in Scotland had not improved. Intending to spend the winter there, he tasked Alexander with verbally informing the barons of the exchequer of his financial situation, and to ask them to send 'as much money as possible'.[46] The barons of the exchequer replied to the king later that month, sending 1,000*l.* with Alexander, though it also noted that 'part of this sum had to be borrowed in York'; John de Drokenesford had apparently gone to London to collect the money from the tenth in response to the previous order, and money from the fifteenth in various counties was also to be sent to the exchequer.[47] Alexander's career, which had thus far been focused on military administration, was temporarily moved away from these roots in November 1301 when he was presented as parson of the church of Leatherhead in Surrey, in the diocese of Winchester.[48] It seems

[40] Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 490.
[41] Ibid., pp. 490-92.
[42] Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 492.
[43] *Calendar of Chancery Warrants, A.D. 1244-1326*, p. 127.
[44] M.C. Buck, 'Droxford, John (*d.* 1329)', *ODNB*.
[45] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1230.
[46] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 262. Below this entry is the note that another copy of the writ is found on E 159/75, m.10 'with a note that Alexander delivered it to Philip de Wylugby, chancellor of the exchequer, on 25 Oct'.
[47] Ibid., no. 265.
[48] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 164. The date of Alexander's admission to the rectory of Leather-

doubtful if he was ever intended to actually serve as parson in Leatherhead, and this presentation was more than likely made in order to entitle Alexander to collect the tithe income associated with it.[49] Between 1302 and 1304, Alexander continued in his role as paymaster to the king's forces, and he spent time in Scotland in the king's employ.[50] February of 1304 saw Alexander receiving 55*s.* for the cost of arranging the transportation of 5,000*m.* from Berwick-on-Tweed to Queensferry,[51] and in March he received 12*s.* to rent two boats to transport himself, P. de Colingbourne, and his horses and men, and 2,000*m.* originating in North Berwick from Earlsferry to Dunfermline.[52]

In September 1303, Alexander was present for Aymer de Valence's briefing about the military and financial situation in Scotland, something that was well in keeping with his role as paymaster and supplier.[53] In a draft request from April 1304, the king requested that Alexander receive the taxes of Newcastle-upon-Tyne,[54] and in June of that year, Alexander was reimbursed the 10*s.* that he had paid to the carpenters who were building the 'war wolf'.[55] The Warwolf was a massive trebuchet that was being constructed by five master carpenters and fifty men,[56] with the aim to cause the surrender of the castle at Stirling. Even though the castle was surrendered by 20 July, Edward still wanted to see how effective his new siege engine was, and willed that 'none of his people enter [Stirling castle] till it is struck with the Warwolf...; and that those within defend themselves from the said 'wolf' as they best can'.[57]

Alexander disappeared from the record briefly in 1305, but re-emerged between February and March 1306 as the 'clerk of works of the new castle of Tolibothvill'

---

head was later, on 12 December 1303. See *Winchester Register of Pontissara*, i, p. 160.

[49] See discussion on p. 178. Michael Adler, in *The Jewish Chronicle*, August 5, 1898, pp. 21-22, has Alexander pursuing 'religious duties' at Leatherhead several times. I can find no evidence of this.

[50] E 101/11/18, E 101/12/22, E 101/12/27.

[51] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, iv, p. 460. 19*s.* of this sum was paid to William de Muschauns and the nine men he had used for the purpose.

[52] Ibid., p. 461.

[53] *Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland*, ii, pp. 452-54.

[54] C 47/22/3/71. This is a draft. See also *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1524.

[55] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, iv, p. 476.

[56] Prestwich, *Edward I*, p. 502. Prestwich cites E 101/11/15 and E 101/12/25.

[57] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1560.

(likely Tullibody castle, in Clackmannanshire), and was reimbursed 65*l.* 2*s.* 6*d.* for payments made to various people, the largest groups of which were balisters and archers; the entry noted that 'they were ejected by the king's enemies'.[58] The following entry noted that Alexander had lost two horses in the king's service, witnessed by the marshal of the army,[59] losses which were presumably at Tullibody when the king's forces were 'ejected'. Alexander was still a paymaster in February 1306, receiving 55*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.* for the arrears of wages presumably to be paid to various soldiers, 20*l.* in May for his own expenses at Tullibody castle, and another 20*l.* for unidentified expenses in July.[60] A writ witnessed by the king was sent to Leatherhead in June 1306, stating that Alexander not be required to be present in Leatherhead because he was 'continually busy with the king's service'.[61] Perhaps it was only clear to Alexander and the king that the appointment as parson was not a functional one. In September 1306, there is an illegible name on a list of prests, but as it ends in 'le convers', it is likely to be Alexander.[62] Regardless, the prests place him at Fettercairn. In February 1307, Alexander was back at Tullibody castle, and he was informed, along with the constables of various other castles, of the death of John Comyn, as well as being given unidentified directives 'concerning the safekeeping of these castles'.[63] John Comyn had been a Scottish magnate loyal to Edward who sat on an advisory council for John of Brittany, the king's lieutenant in Scotland.[64] He had been murderered in a church at Dumfries by Robert Bruce on 10 February 1306,[65] at the culmination of a long-standing feud. Payments, presumably for the defences of the castle in which Alexander found himself were distributed to him between July and September 1307.[66] In Trinity term, 1307, an inquiry was held as

[58] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 492-xii.
[59] Ibid., no. 492-xiii.
[60] Ibid., no. 492-iii.
[61] *Winchester Register of Woodlock*, ii, p. 913. The writ stipulated that Alexander not be 'compelled by sequestration or otherwise to personal residence in his benefice'.
[62] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 492-xvi.
[63] Ibid., no. 492-xvii.
[64] Alan Young, 'Comyn, Sir John, lord of Badenoch (*d.* 1306)', ODNB.
[65] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 492-xvii. Why Alexander et al. were informed of Comyn's death more than a year after it occurred is unclear.
[66] Ibid., no. 521-f.

to the losses incurred by John Sampson in 1299 when he had lost Stirling castle, and Alexander is mentioned as having paid money to John in order for him to outfit his valets with robes.[67] Alexander is recorded as acknowledging a debt, along with Gilbert de Tutesham, of 25*m.* to Henry of Guildford in March 1308.[68] Between July 1308 and 1309, Alexander was paid 20*l.* for taking 2,000*l.* to Berwick.[69] He was appointed to give instructions to the sheriffs of various parts of Scotland in August 1308,[70] and the valuations of various Scottish towns were taken by Alexander and Robert de Barton before Easter 1310.[71]

The first mention of Alexander travelling to Ireland on the king's business since his original trip in October 1294[72] occurred between 1309 and 1311, when he received 43*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* for expenses 'in going to Scotland and Ireland'.[73] This entry implies that between his valuations of the Scottish towns in 1310 and travelling to Ireland, he was no longer in Scotland. The king took care to provide Alexander with a protection with the clause *volumus* for his travels to Ireland in June 1310.[74] The purpose of his visit to Ireland was in keeping with the rest of his career, that is, to 'bring money from the king's treasury there to the king in Scotland' amounting to 1,000*l.*[75] A petition was addressed to the king and his council concerning a seizure that Alexander had made on a merchant of Bruges in Ireland, allegedly taking 'sacks of wool and money from him which was not to the king's profit and was to Bruere's [the merchant's] damage', but Alexander denied that he had taken the money and the wool on the king's behalf.[76] Alexander had appointed Alexander Dromleye

[67] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1949.
[68] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13*, p. 54. Henry was the Chancellor of the Liberty of Durham under Edward I; see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 331-32.
[69] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 527.
[70] *Parliamentary Writs*, ii, p. 378 no. 11. This is also found in Rymer's *Foedera* ii/i: p. 57.
[71] *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, ii, no. 76.
[72] See discussion on p. 171.
[73] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 566-a.
[74] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, p. 233.
[75] *Irish Exchequer Payments 1270-1446*, p. 601.
[76] SC 8/36/1791. The National Archives' note to this petition states 'Dated to *c.*1307 on the guard. The dating is very tentative.' I would date it either between 1310-11 as Alexander had travelled to Ireland at that point, or to 1294, which was the last time Alexander seems to have been in Ireland prior to 1310-11.

and Richard Cane as his attorneys in Ireland on 21 October 1310.[77] The attorneys Dromleye and Cane appear nowhere else in the records, apart from this one instance. In August 1310, Alexander was commanded to make payments to the fleet that was at the Isle of Man.[78] An indication of Alexander's possible past as a Jewish moneylender surfaced in May 1311 when Alexander was distrained to appear in a suit concerning 14*l.* owed to him by Jordan of Hameldone. This writ of *alias venire facias* distrained Alexander to appear 'on pain of greater excommunication'.[79] Why Alexander was the one being distrained to appear is unclear—generally, the debtor was the one distrained, not the creditor. This confusion is perhaps why, over a year later in July 1312, the case was still ongoing, and Cicely de Wyke and Jordan de Hamelden acknowledged that they owed Alexander 14*l.*[80] The case was still not resolved by March 1313.[81]

In July 1313, Alexander was again tasked by the king to collect ships for the navy, thirty in number, from around Norfolk and Suffolk, and to fill them with footmen and have everything assembled at Sandwich. These ships and men were to follow William de Montacute 'in obedience to further orders from the king'.[82] The chamberlain of North Wales accounted, a year later, for 8*l.* spent by Alexander between July 1313 and July 1314 for the freightage of two ships at Conwy, North Wales, used to transport John de Ergail and his men to Ireland in the king's service.[83] It is likely that this was John MacDougall, lord of Argyll, the sometimes admiral of a fleet of English ships, and loyal magnate to both Edward I and Edward II.[84] By March 1314, Alexander was back in Ireland, having been sent there to convince the 'native chieftains' to help the English king in his war against the Scots,[85] and was given 300*l.*

[77] *Rotulorum Patentium et Clausorum Cancellariae Hiberniae Calendarium*, i:i (Dublin, 1828), p. 16, no. 36.
[78] *Parliamentary Writs*, ii, p. 401, no. 13.
[79] *Winchester Register of Woodlock*, ii, p. 966.
[80] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1317-13*, p. 542.
[81] *Winchester Register of Woodlock*, ii, p. 1021.
[82] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 6.
[83] *Cal. Memoranda Rolls, Michaelmas 1326-Michaelmas 1327*, no. 2148.
[84] W.D.H. Sellar, 'MacDougall, John, lord of Argyll (*d.* 1316)', *ODNB*.
[85] *Parliamentary Writs*, ii, p. 423, nos. 11, 13. No. 11 is also found in Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 245.

for the wages of the men he was bringing from Ireland to Scotland, as well as his own expenses.[86] The king borrowed 1,000*l.* from a Genoese merchant, Anthony Pessaigne, through Alexander in April 1314,[87] and the entry reads as though it was intended to pay wages for Irish troops who had not yet left for Scotland. All issues of the tenth for the following six years, as well as 'other dues imposed by papal authority on the clergy of Ireland' were to be delivered to Alexander beginning in May 1314.[88] Possibly in reference to his new debt to Anthony Pessaigne, the king then issued a writ promising to pay those to whom he was indebted who had delivered money to Alexander.[89] In July, Alexander received 1,200*l.* from the Exchequer in order to pay the wages of the sailors leaving from Bristol and going to Scotland and Ireland, and had had correspondence with the 'Lords the Archbishop and Treasurer...concerning the sailing of the fleet upon the affairs of the Lord the King' at Bristol.[90] These were presumably the Archbishop of Canterbury, Walter Reynolds, and the Treasurer of England, John de Sandale. At some point in 1314, Alexander was robbed of 'a great sum out of the money which the king was sending to Ireland for his business',[91] while he was passing through Denbigh, Wales, which might have been a portion of either the 1,000*l.* that had been borrowed from the Genoese merchant, or the 1,200*l.* that he had received from the Exchequer.[92]

In February 1315, Alexander was reimbursed over 10*l.* for his costs and expenses from a trip conducting the king's business in Connacht and Munster, as well as more than 12*l.* along with William Somery after they had supervised the purveyance of

[86] *Irish Exchequer Payments 1270-1446*, p. 225. See also Philomena Connolly, 'List of Irish Entries on the Memoranda Rolls of the English Exchequer, 1307-27', *Analecta Hibernia* 36 (1995), p. 197.
[87] *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1307-19*, p. 194.
[88] *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1307-19*, p. 197.
[89] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 117.
[90] *Issues of the Exchequer, Henry III to Henry VI*, p. 127. Alexander's letters taken from Bristol, to the Archbishop and Treasurer, and the ensuing response to Alexander at Bristol, were carried by one Stephen le Convers, who received 20*s.* for his expenses.
[91] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 234.
[92] In J.R.S. Phillips, 'The Mission of John de Hothum to Ireland, 1315-1316', *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages*, ed. James Lydon (Blackrock, 1981), p. 66, Phillips cites SC 1/63/192 and C 255/16/1 no. 4, and provides the amount as 1,000*m.* He does not cite SC 8/155/7738, where Alexander asked for the king's grace concerning the robbery by Alcok de Hirlaund and various others. Joining Alcok was presumably Vivian de Staundon the younger, who was the subject of the writ of aid issued for Nicholas of Audley.

victuals and other things for the king's Irish and Scottish wars.[93] Halfway through 1315, Alexander was given a safe-conduct by the king until Christmas of that year, having been sent to Ireland again in order to pay the wages of the king's troops there. On the same day as he received his safe-conduct in July, the justiciary of Ireland was mandated to present Alexander to any vacant prebend in the church of Dublin or in the rest of Ireland which was free before Christmas.[94] Alexander was clearly still well in favour with the king since he was receiving this prebend, which was presumably for the same reason as he had received the benefice at Leatherhead. An oddity occurred at this point: Alexander was not presented to any vacant prebend in Dublin or elsewhere before Christmas, as the justiciary of Ireland had been mandated to do. Rather, it appears as though this was a standing order, or at least perceived as such, because seven years later in 1322, Alexander was 'designated' bishop of Ardagh.[95] There is confusion as to whether he ever took possession of the see. Both Cotton and Lascelles allow that from 1322 until 1331—the entire period during which he might have been bishop—the revenues of the see were received by the king's escheator in Ireland.[96] More recent scholarship makes no mention of Alexander or the nine years of escheated temporalities. Instead, the succession list has Robert Wirsop, O.S.A. being provided on 5 April 1323 upon the death of the previous bishop, and makes note that he did not get possession but rather was translated to Connor on 20 June 1323.[97] Seoán Mág Eóaigh, the archdeacon of Ardagh (Ware and Cotton render the name as 'John Mageoi'), whom Ware and Cotton imply did not succeed until 1331, was elected in March 1324, consecrated in May, and the temporalities of the

[93] J.T. Gilbert, *Historic and Municipal Documents of Ireland, A.D. 1172-1320* (London, 1870), p. 332.

[94] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 333.

[95] *Fasti ecclesiae Hibernicae: the Succession of the Prelates and Members of the Cathedral Bodies in Ireland: vol. iii, the Province of Ulster*, ed. Henry Cotton (Dublin, 1849), p. 180.

[96] Sir James Ware, *A Commentary on the Prelates of Ireland, From the First Conversion of the Irish Nation to the Christian Faith Down to our Times* (Dublin, 1704), p. 64. In *Liber Munerum Publicorum Hiberniae, Ab An. 1152 usque ad 1827*, ii, ed. Rowley Lascelles (London, 1852), p. 20, no mention is made of Alexander after the death of the previous bishop, Matthew O'Heothy. The entry simply states 'From the death of Matthew, the temporalities of this see were received by the king's escheators, till 1331, that is, for nine years...'

[97] *A New History of Ireland*, ix, eds. T.W. Moody, F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne (Oxford, 1984), p. 272.

see were restored in October.[98] No mention is made of Alexander or the supposed nine years of escheated temporalities.[99] Having Alexander appointed to this vacant bishopric without intending him to be consecrated may have been by design, as the king attached great importance to 'securing the feudal revenues of the colony, particularly those arising from vacant bishoprics and religious houses'.[100]

Alexander was the only convert in England for whom there is any definitive evidence that he became a priest. Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster from 1085 to *c.*1117, mentioned a convert-monk in his *Disputatio* in passing;[101] there is no further evidence of his existence, even though it would stand to reason that a former Jew becoming a monk would have been noteworthy. In addition to this convert-monk, there are two further examples, which might also be discounted because of the lack of reliable evidence. The first dates to the 1140s during the matter of Little St. William of Norwich; the monk 'Theobald', the informant and possible creator of the blood libel accusation in Western Europe, was alleged to be a converted Jew.[102] It is accepted that his evidence was a fabrication.[103] It is very obviously what a monk might expect of the Jews at this point,[104] arousing the suspicion that his *quondam* Judaism too might have been a fabrication. The second instance dates to

---

[98] *A New History of Ireland*, ix, p. 272.

[99] Both Ware and Cotton relied on the Birmingham's Tower Records, still extant at the time they published their works. *A New History of Ireland*, ix, was not published until 1984, after many of the records had been lost to fire. This may help to explain the lack of reference to Alexander in *A New History of Ireland*, ix, but it does not explain why Ware and Cotton made no reference to Robert Wirsop, nor the differences in opinion as to how long the temporalities had escheated to the king. The list contained in *Handbook of British Chronology*, ed. E.B. Fryde et al. 3rd ed. (Cambridge, 1996) seems to be an exact copy of that contained in *A New History of Ireland*, ix.

[100] *Medieval Ireland: An Encyclopedia*, ed. Sean Duffy (New York, 2005), p. 120.

[101] *Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Iudei et christiani*, ed. Bernhard Blumenkranz (Antwerp/Utrecht, 1956), p. 28. There is also brief discussion in Robinson, *Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster: a study of the Abbey under Norman Rule*, p. 32.

[102] *The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth*, eds. Augustus Jessop and Montague Rhodes James (Cambridge, 1896), p. lxxi.

[103] Ibid., p. xiii.

[104] 'He told Thomas that the Jews had a written tradition that in order to regain their freedom and their fatherland they must sacrifice a Christian every year. In order to select their victim the leading Jews of Spain assembled annually at Narbonne, where they were exceedingly influential, and cast lots for all the countries of the world where any Jews lived. The country which was selected by lot had in turn to cast lots for all its cities, and the city thus selected had to furnish the victim. Theobald asserted that it was within his knowledge that in 1144 the lot had fallen on Norwich' (see ibid., p. lxxi).

1208, and is found in a *disputatio* by Peter of Cornwall, then a canon of Holy Trinity Aldgate, an Augustinian Priory in London. It records an alleged dialogue between a Christian and a Jew, with the result that the Jew, Symon, converted to Christianity and became a canon at Holy Trinity, Aldgate. The treatise borrows heavily from previous anti-Jewish polemics, and given the unlikely conversion at the end, seems more aspirational than factual.[105]

Alexander continued supplying the king with men and ships, hiring three ships from Bristol on the king's behalf,[106] and clearly with the king's best interests at heart, refused to pay wages without the permission of both the justiciar of Ireland and the treasurer.[107] In an indication that Alexander was an important character both to the king and to the overall war effort, he was mentioned later in 1315 in a warrant from Thomas de Mandeville to the king which discussed the state of affairs in Ireland. Mandeville was apprising the king of his personal losses in lands, goods, and castles after the Bruce invasion.[108] The wages that Alexander had refused to pay in September 1315, totalling 466*l.* 13*s.* 4*d.*, were distributed to the 'sailors of the fleet of ships from the Cinque Ports and elsewhere' who were going to Ireland, then on to Scotland in the king's service.[109]

In May 1316, Alexander had apparently lent 130*m.* to the treasurer of Ireland out of the prebend of John de Sandale which were ordered to be paid back,[110] and in June he was directed to discuss restitution with the count of Porcéan who had seized a ship and taken it to Calais.[111] Nothing is heard from Alexander for nearly two

[105] R.W. Hunt, 'The Disputation of Peter of Cornwall Against Symon the Jew', in R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, and R.W. Southern (eds.), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederick Maurice Powicke* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 143-156.

[106] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 238.

[107] *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, iii, no. 447.

[108] G.O. Sayles, *Documents on the Affairs of Ireland Before the King's Council* (Dublin, 1979), no. 95.

[109] *Irish Exchequer Payments, 1270-1446*, p. 233. See also Connolly, 'List of Irish entries on the Memoranda Rolls of the English Exchequer', p. 197.

[110] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 289.

[111] Ibid., pp. 345-46. The count of Porcien at this time was Gaucher de Châtillon II. The difference in spelling seems to have been the case even at the time: Gaucher's entry in *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse...de France*, iv, 2nd ed., ed. François-Alexandre Aubert de la Chenaye Desbois (Paris, 1772), p. 363, mentions it: '...Seigneur de Châtillon, Comte de Porcéan, dit depuis Porcien, &c.' He had traded Philip le Bel, King of France, the land of Châtillon-sur-Marne for Chateau-Poricen

years, but he resurfaced in June 1318 having been given safe-conduct to Flanders while on the king's business.[112] He (along with Giles de Hertebergh) had apparently smoothed things over adequately, because in July of that year he returned to the king having secured the count of Flanders' desire for 'friendly reformation'.[113] In April 1320, Alexander was paid wages and reimbursed his expenses along with Robert Cotegrave for again having supervised the purveyance of military goods for the king.[114] Five days later, he was again reimbursed, this time in wheat, for his payments of wages to sailors as well as for having supervised the purveyance of goods.[115] In May, Alexander was confirmed as still being the parson of Leatherhead when he was referred to as such, in an acknowledgement of his debt to Adam to Rokesle, roper, of London, for 20*l.* It also noted that this debt was secured on Alexander's 'lands and chattels and ecclesiastical goods in cos. Surrey and Kent'.[116] By 1322, Alexander was once again back to his usual tasks of naval administration, having been sent to various counties in England to 'take measures in those counties for the naval subsidy for the Scotch expedition'[117] and was to be given credence by the abbot of King's Beaulieu as well as the bailiffs of Bristol for the same reason.[118] The ships were to go to Ireland to collect men there, and take them to Carlisle.[119] There was apparently some confusion as to whether the maritime towns of Cornwall had already granted the king his naval subsidy, and Alexander was called upon to verify whether or not this was the case in May 1322.[120]

In Michaelmas term 1322, Alexander appeared before the barons of the Exchequer to account for the money he had received and expended when he had been assigned to pay the wages of various sailors and other men in Bristol and the Cinque Ports.[121]

---

in 1303 (see *l.c.*, p. 313).
[112] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1317-21*, p. 154.
[113] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-23*, pp. 92-3. This is also found in Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 367.
[114] Gilbert, *Historic and Municipal Documents of Ireland*, p. 349.
[115] Ibid., p. 345.
[116] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-23*, p. 229.
[117] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1321-24*, p. 102.
[118] *Cal. Close Rolls, 1318-23*, p. 531. This was Beaulieu Abbey, a Cistercian house in Hants.
[119] Ibid., p. 534.
[120] Ibid., p. 548; *Parliamentary Writs*, ii, p. 568 no. 144.
[121] Connolly, 'List of Irish Entries on the Memoranda Rolls of the English Exchequer', p. 197.

He was found to be owing 52*l.* 12*s.* 11*d.* in wages to William de Croye, the admiral of several of the ships that were leaving for the king's service in Ireland and Scotland, which was presumably to be disbursed to the other sailors and soldiers. He also owed a further 33*l.* 6*s.* 8*d.* to the same William, which was the remaining balance on a 100*m.* grant that the king had given William in order that he might procure arms for himself and his men.[122] Alexander had also received 100*m.* out of the twentieth and fifteenth from Sussex, which he had used to pay the wages of various sailors.[123] Nothing more appears in the records that would indicate that Alexander was active in England past this point. There were two references to him in inquisitions post mortem,[124] but nothing indicating any sort of activity in England. The only references to him are those few entries in the Irish records, where he may or may not have been bishop in Ardagh from 1322 onwards. It seems more than coincidental that he disappeared from the English records the very year that he was to become an Irish bishop. He might not have died before February 1330, when William de Melburn was presented to the church of Leatherhead.[125] This presentation proved problematic for unknown reasons. Melburn was presented in February 1330, but his presentation was revoked on 16 March and he was replaced a day later by Stephen le Blound.[126] Le Blound had formerly been a parson in the diocese of Coventry and Lichfield, and had been presented to the church at Leatherhead on an 'exchange of benefices' with Robert de Hoton.[127] It is possible that William de Melburn, the original appointee was simply not well-connected enough to be appointed to this benefice; le Blound had formerly been appointed as one of the bishop of Coventry and Lichfield's attorneys while the bishop was going beyond seas.[128] It is also possible that the king had a

[122] Connolly, 'List of Irish Entries on the Memoranda Rolls of the English Exchequer', pp. 197-98.
[123] Ibid., p. 198.
[124] *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, vii, no. 467; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, viii, no. 214.
[125] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1327-30*, p. 488. Adler, in his article in *The Jewish Chronicle*, states that Alexander died in 1327, but as with the rest of the article, there is no reference. I have been unable to find this.
[126] Ibid., p. 497.
[127] Ibid., p. 498.
[128] Ibid., p. 177.

certain type in mind for the benefice at Leatherhead. Alexander's career as royal clerk and general facilitator of supplies and wages was mirrored by le Blound's, who had in May 1329 also been described as 'king's clerk', and been appointed to provide ships for the passage of the king and his company beyond seas'.[129] It is also very possible that Alexander might not have died until slightly later, in 1331, when he was succeeded as Bishop of Ardagh by Matthew Mageoi.[130] The see was not vacant between the end of Alexander's tenure and the beginning of Mageoi's.

Does Alexander's biography look any different if it is assumed that he was not a convert, but rather the son of a convert? A similar question asked of the material concerning Henry might well be asked here: did anybody know or care that he was the son of a convert? It does not seem likely. Royal patronage of the children of converts is also on display in other converts' lives. What John *conversus* received over the course of his life is astounding. He was most definitely the son of a convert, though whether or not he was a born Christian or in fact converted along with his father is unclear.[131] Like Alexander, John pursued royal service, and was most often referred to in the surviving records as *serviens noster*,[132] king's yeoman,[133] or king's serjeant-at-arms.[134] He appears to have been a sort of money-manager to the king, being trusted with very large sums,[135] and he fulfilled various duties that might be expected of a king's serjeant.[136] A position that likely came with no small amount of responsibility was that of keeper of the palace of Westminster, which he held November 1289.[137] John was amply rewarded materially as well. Between October 1267 and April 1292, he was given 100*s.* to buy himself a horse to replace one lost in

[129] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1327-30*, p. 386.
[130] Cotton, *Fasti ecclesiae Hibernicae*, iii, p. 180.
[131] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, no. 1516.
[132] *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 410, though this entry refers to him as *serviens noster ad arma*. See also *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 26.
[133] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 331.
[134] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, no. 401; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 173.
[135] E 101/12/31; *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, iv, p. 464.
[136] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 368, 448; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, pp. 148, 238.
[137] *Cal. Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, i, no. 1529; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 171. The custody of the palace reverted to John and Joan Shench in March 1305; see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 244. The petition relating to this is SC 8/266/13253.

the king's service at least four times,[138] 6*d.* per day for life,[139] quittance of livery of the king's marshals or households in his houses in Westminster,[140] four oak trees from the forest of Aliceholt, four oak trees from the forest of Havering, six oak trees from the forest of Windsor, six oak trees again from Havering,[141] 18*l.* 10*s.* as ransom from land allocated by the Dictum of Kenilworth,[142] was forgiven half of a 40*m.* fine he had made for having the marriage of a tenant in chief minor,[143] was given two tuns of wine per year from April 1305 onwards,[144] and was allowed to purchase the wardship of a minor's land for 40*l.* in 1305,[145] along with various regular wages and arrears of wages.[146] This list of temporal benefits certainly does not look as though it might belong to somebody who was suffering for the sins of his father. Likewise, Alexander's surname aside, not a single piece of evidence indicates that he was considered anything other than a Christian. If this is in fact correct, was this the case simply because the stakes were so low? Both Popes Gregory VI and Anacletus II had Jewish blood, and certainly upon Anacletus' election—though he lost the eventual power struggle and is thus an anti-Pope—his great-grandfather's conversion was used against him. It was said that Anacletus' 'Jewishness' was visible in his face, and that his family had still not been purified from the yeast of Jewish

---

[138] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, p. 296; *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, nos. 883, 1557, 1997.

[139] *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 410; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 173. The Patent Roll entry was a result of the *irrotulari faciatis* order on the Close Roll. Proof that he was actually paid this comes in later years; see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 464; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 18.

[140] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 455.

[141] *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, pp. 224, 313, 379, 504.

[142] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, no. 1516; this was given to his father as well. The entry does not make sense, however: they were given 18*l.* 10*s.* as arrears of a ransom from land worth only 100*s.* Another convert, Henry of Winchester, had also been allocated the ransom on some redeemable land in 1268. See discussion on p. 144.

[143] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, p. 615; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 473.

[144] *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 331. It was specifically noted that one tun be of the vintage season, and the other be of the racking season. This grant was renewed by Edward II in November 1307; see *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, p. 12, and for later confirmations of wine being dispensed, *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 176-77, 287, 483-84.

[145] *Cal. Fine Rolls, 1272-1307*, p. 527.

[146] *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, nos. 633, 1721. For a debt assigned to John in partial satisfaction of the arrears of his wages, see *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 458 and *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 696-97. The Patent Roll entry was a result of the *irrotulari faciatis* order on the Close Roll. Henry and Edward may not have agreed on the assigning of this debt to John; for a possible problem, see *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 380, where Edward ordered recompense to be made to the estate of the Jew whose debt had been assigned to John.

corruption.[147] This serves to illuminate a different sort of idea that has not been discussed thus far: assuming that Alexander is in fact a second generation 'convers', it would appear then that the stigma of his father's conversion lasted but a single generation. Alexander does not seem to have had any interaction with Jews. Was this because he knew none intimately, having been born a Christian and simply having an unfortunate last name? Or was this because he had devoted himself so fully to his new faith after conversion that he eschewed all members of his former faith? If the latter proves to be true, was this then why he was rewarded with a bishopric? The position had likely been awarded to others in the past for far less. There was a scripturally-sanctioned ambiguity at work when it came to a second generation convert; the Vulgate contradicted itself, simultaneously sanctioning and prohibiting the punishment of the son for the sins of the father.[148] St. Bernard certainly advocated that the sins of the father be visited upon the son; in a letter to the Emperor Lothair regarding Anacletus, he wrote 'Just as it is to the injury of Christ that a man of Jewish race has seized for himself the See of Peter, so it is against the interests of Caesar that anyone should make himself the King of Sicily.'[149] Contrasted with Henry of Winchester, Alexander looks to have been a paragon of hard work and virtue, but more to the point: the liminality on display in Henry's life is in no way evident in Alexander's. Did Alexander perhaps occupy the Christian threshold prior to 1294? It is entirely possible, and, if true, suggests that by dint of perseverance and devotion—both to one's new religion and one's royal service—a convert might in fact acquire the 'proper' amount of Christianity.

---

[147] Mary Stroll, *The Jewish Pope: Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130* (Leiden, 1987), p. 161. Both Gregory and Anacletus were related to the House of Pierleone, which descended from a wealthy Jewish convert named Baruch. Though it has also been claimed that Gregory VII was descended of the same family, recent scholarship has shown this evidence to be unconvincing; see Demetrius B. Zema, 'The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century', *Traditio* 2 (1944), pp. 169-171, and more recently, H.E.J. Cowdrey, *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford, 1998), pp. 27-8.

[148] *Inter alia*, verses allowing inter-generational punishment include Exodus 20:5, Exodus 34:7, Numbers 14:18, and Isaiah 14:21; those prohibiting it include Deuteronomy 24:16, Jeremiah 31:29-30, and Ezekiel 18:20.

[149] *The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux*, trans. Bruno Scott James (Stroud, 1998), no. 142.

Conclusion

This thesis has provided an analysis of the phenomenon of Jewish converts and conversion to Christianity in medieval England. Its starting point was the modern work on the subject by Donald Logan, Robert Stacey, and Lauren Fogle. Each has made invaluable contributions to the literature on Jewish conversion in medieval England. The overall question posed at the beginning of the thesis—did baptised Jews in England remain essentially Jews?—has been answered in the affirmative; certainly this was true in the eyes of the Christian community, though perhaps not for their fellow-Jews. Jews converting to Christianity rarely became a part of the wider Christian community, and were rarely treated as such. Why then did these converts remain essentially Jews? It would appear that 'Jew' was a nuanced term; until conversion, one was a Jew, or one was not a Jew; there existed no in-between state. Conversion changed this reality. Judaism was a religion—until conversion, at which point it acquired ingrained characteristics that could not be changed by leaving the religion. This thesis has also shown an unavoidable bias to the evidence, insofar as we know little about Jews who converted and successfully integrated. Those who can be found in the records are generally those who did not successfully integrate, and although it is possible that others did, we will never know about them.

The current thesis differs from previous work by suggesting that the laws, rules, and regulations to which Jews were subject in medieval England created the main impetus towards conversion. The second chapter argued that the relative legal position of Jews in England deteriorated so significantly over the course of the thirteenth century that conversion may have seemed the best escape. The oldest surviving rules and laws regulating the Jewish community had as their purpose the granting of privileges, and the confirmation of rights; by the end of the thirteenth century, these privileges and rights were nothing but distant memories, having been replaced by measures largely concerned with social control, and restrictions on business and trade. By the end of the Jews' stay in England, the Church found itself in the position of being more tolerant towards the Jews in England than was the

royal administration.

The third chapter of this thesis argued that Jewish converts in England inhabited a legal and social grey area; converting Jews who might have thought that their conversions meant that they had joined the Christian community were in fact mistaken. Becoming Christian and being perceived and treated as Christian were two different things; had they not been, the converts would no doubt have been subject to the same laws and rules as their born-Christian neighbours. The fourth chapter looked at what the surviving material can tell us about the varieties of convert experience. The conclusions of the chapter are that evidence suggests a lack of engagement with a king or member of the royal family, both before and after conversion, was detrimental to the convert's post conversion life; that there was a Christian concern that Jews would re-apostatise were they not given temporalities; that the liminality of the conversion experience existed not only for those Jews who had willingly converted to Christianity, but also for those Jews who had been forced out of Judaism; that the Expulsion was unlikely to have been the *terminus ad quem* for anti-convert sentiment, and it in fact continued well into the fourteenth century; that the reasons for denying royal corrody requests for converts were varied, and not exclusively religious in nature; that the taking of a convert's baptismal name from a sponsor or royal official did nothing to improve post conversion life; and that it was possible for those with a family connection to a convert to take up residence in the *domus conversorum*. 'Convert' and 'Jew' were apparently interchangeable terms, as the converts inhabiting this social grey area were no doubt pained to learn.

Liminality is a key concept for understanding the life and career of the best attested Jewish convert of thirteenth century England, Henry of Winchester. As chapter five shows, in formal terms a convert could become a Christian via baptism, though being perceived as a Christian, or legitimately joining Christianity, was something far different. Henry was enough of a Christian to be knighted, and becoming a knight looks to have been a mark of integration into a wider Christian world. But, his knighthood in no way detracted from his liminality; he moved

to and fro between the different worlds in which he existed. Confronted with the Thomas de Cantilupe debacle, we might be forgiven for wondering whether Henry was actually present when it was decided that he was both convert and Jew. Was Henry informed by Edward I that he was going to be made a justice, or a star witness with *testimonium sive recordum super christianos*, with the offer subsequently rescinded?

The sixth and final chapter, outlining what is known of the career of Alexander le Convers, discusses two possibilities. Either he was a convert about whose pre-conversion life we know nothing and who integrated so successfully into Christian society that he ended up as a priest, or, he was a second-generation convert in England whose only mark of Judaism was a surname and who suffered none of the disadvantages of the original convert. A second generation convert might pursue whatever career he wished, free from any assumptions about his character brought on by a conversion from Judaism. The use of the surname 'convers' branded converts in a way that other surnames simply did not; even Henry of Winchester was occasionally referred to as Henry le Convers, rather than by his baptised name. But, it appears that a convert might carry the 'convers' surname with pride after a suitable period of time had elapsed; when Alexander le Convers was designated a bishop, this period of time lasted a generation. If he was a convert himself, then his life proves that it was possible to avoid the threshold existence that seems to have been common for Jewish converts.

Henry III and Edward I had greatly different relationships with converts and conversion. Was the reason that Henry was such an avid proponent of conversion one borne of guilt? He had promised to go on crusade a number of times, but never actually got around to doing so. Edward, on the other hand, was a crusader at the time of his accession. Was this difference manifested at home in England, particularly in his interactions with converts? It would have been difficult for converted Jews to fit in to Christian society. They had no family ties, no friends or relatives in the Christian community, no property, and no history with the Christian community. They may even have had difficulty in speaking the language of their neighbours.

They must have seemed alien in the truest sense of the word. Moneylending and pawnbroking would have been singularly useless once they converted from Judaism, particularly if they had nothing left to lend. If a convert was lucky enough to have a trade, there was a slim likelihood that he could continue plying it post conversion. There were converts who remained goldsmiths and jewellers, but they were a small minority. There is also something to be said about Jewish appearance: if Anacletus' 'Jewishness' was visible in his face, was too every other convert's? The anti-pope was not a convert himself, but he was descended from one. Not only that, but he was descended from what must have been perceived as the worst kind of Jew: a banker. The very first article of the Statutes of Jewry of 1275 explicitly prohibited both future usury, and ordered that usury cease on old loans. The primacy of place of this directive was likely not accidental. Usury, and more specifically the Jewish practice of it, was seen as the most objectionable aspect of Judaism in England. This was obviously an attempt to change the behaviour of unconverted Jews, but was there a residual effect on attitudes towards converted Jews? Were those Jews who had engaged in moneylending more suspect upon conversion than other converts who had not? Though the evidence as I have found it does not point either way, future work focusing on the vast amount of unpublished source material might prove fruitful in answering these questions.

This thesis promised an analysis of Jewish converts and conversion to Christianity, and has lived up to its title. In light of the content, however, I begin to wonder whether it might have been better to have chosen as my title '*Between* Jew and Gentile'; this might have better encapsulated the true nature of Jewish conversion to Christianity in medieval England. Converts were in a kind of limbo between the two major social and cultural groups, and *between* much more approximates what actually happened.

Appendix: A Catalogue of Jewish Converts in England, *c.*1066-*c.*1290

The catalogue that follows contains entries for every convert for whom I have been able to find references. The first column has a number, unique to each convert, used to cross-reference to other converts within the catalogue. The next two columns list each convert's family name or toponymic, and given name. Within these two columns, there are various typefaces, denoting particular attributes. Names in bold typeface are an indication that a particular convert is present on the Fine Roll lists of 1255.[1] Names in italic typeface and parentheses are not specifically mentioned in any surviving records, but rather are implied through relationships with other converts. Names marked with an asterisk indicate that this was the convert's Jewish name, and not his or her Christian name.

The inter-convert relationships are noted in the following column, and are cross-referenced to other converts by use of the number assigned to each one in the first column. The following two columns have references to as many of the surviving records as possible; in the case of the primary sources, these are as many as I have been able to find, and in the case of the secondary sources, these contain the most relevant discussion. In most cases, however, the secondary sources that are listed contain the only mention of a particular convert, without offering any information that is particularly enlightening. In the secondary source column, entries marked (MR) indicate a mis-reference in the material—generally a wrong source or mistaken page number. The penultimate column has a biography of each convert gleaned from the surviving primary source material, and in some instances, some notes on pertinent issues with the secondary literature. The final column contains a reference to the first date on which the relevant convert appears in the surviving records. These dates range from specific days to more general terms, and in some cases, single years or a range of years.

[1] *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54, 124, 125, 204, 981.

There are 421 entries in the catalogue, though it is uncertain that all are converts. Those that might not be are indicated as such in their biographies. It is important to get a sense of not only who Jewish converts were and what they were doing, but also an idea of when they were active. What follows serves this function.

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
1	(*unnamed*)	(*unnamed*)		*Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster: A Study of the Abbey under Norman Rule*, pp. 32, 82; *Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Iudei et christiani*, p. 28	Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', pp. 3-4; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 31	Gilbert Crispin mentions the convert to Anselm when he sent him a copy of the *Disputation*; the convert had lived in London, had converted at Westminster, and became a monk	*c.*1096
2	(*the Convert*)	Robert		*The Letters of St. Anselm of Canterbury*, iii, nos. 380, 381 (1105-1106); *Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster: A Study of the Abbey under Norman Rule*, pp. 66-7 (Robinson dates this to between 1096 and 1107—as in above entry, 1105-1106 is accurate)	Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', pp. 3-4; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 31; Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, pp. 7-12	Letter from St. Anselm to Ernulf, prior of Canterbury, and William, Archdeacon of Canterbury, asking them to provide for Robert; second letter, to Gundulf, Bishop of Rochester, asking him to take care of Robert if the previous two fail to do so	1105-1106

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
3	Conversus	Nicholas		*Pipe Rolls, 26 Henry II, 1179-80*, p. 147; *Pipe Rolls, 27 Henry II, 1180-81*, p. 150; *Pipe Rolls, 28 Henry II, 1181-82*, p. 152; *Pipe Rolls, 34 Henry II, 1187-88*, pp. 23, 30; *Pipe Rolls, 1 Richard I, 1189-90*, pp. 20, 216; *Pipe Rolls, 6 Richard I, 1194*, p. 177 (Michaelmas term, 1194)	Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, pp. 72, 96; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 29	Owed $\frac{1}{2}m.$ for default from 1179-80 to 1181-82, paid in the third year, received $30s.$ $5d.$ in alms along with John (#5) , and again received $45s.$ $7\frac{1}{2}d.$ along with John and a new convert, Peter (#6)(the alms were presumably split two or three ways), and a third time in 1189-90 ($30s.$ $5d.$ twice, with John), given one mark as a gift in 1194 out of the rent of London	1179-1180
4	Conversa	Isabella		*Pipe Rolls, 26 Henry II, 1179-80*, p. 129	Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, p. 72; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 29	Was imprisoned by one Jeremiah, who was subsequently fined a mark	1179-1180
5	Conversus	John		*Pipe Rolls, 34 Henry II, 1187-88*, pp. 23, 30; *Pipe Rolls, 1 Richard I, 1189-90*, pp. 20, 216; *Rot. Chart., 1199-1216*, p. 97b (∼4-10 July 1200)	Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, pp. 96; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 29	Received $30s.$ $5d.$ in alms along with Nicholas (#3) in 1187-8 and again received $45s.$ $7\frac{1}{2}d.$ along with Nicholas, and a new convert, Peter (#6)(the alms were presumably split two or three ways), and again in 1189-90 with Nicholas ($30s.$ $5d.$ twice), had letters from the king in 1200	1187-1188

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
6	Conversus	Peter		*Pipe Rolls, 34 Henry II, 1187-88*, p. 30	Jacobs, *Jews of Angevin England*, pp. 96; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 29	Received $45s.$ $7\frac{1}{2}d.$ in alms along with Nicholas (#3) and John (#5)presumably split three ways	1187-1188
7	of York	Benedict (William)		*Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene*, iii, ed. William Stubbs, p. 12 (3-4 Sept 1189)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 129-30; Jacobs, *The Jews of Angevin England*, pp. 101, 105-6, 118-19, 340; Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', p. 29	While having gone to London to present gifts on behalf of the York Jewry to Richard on his coronation (3 Sept 1189), wounded, accepted baptism from William, the Prior of the Church of St. Mary of York, took the name William, the next day (4 Sept 1189) renounced his conversion in front of the king, died at Northampton on his way back to York; chronicler claims that neither Jewish nor Christian cemetery would accept his body	1189-09-03
8	*Conversus*	Henry		*Pipe Rolls, 3 Richard I, 1191, 1192*, p. 135 (Michaelmas term, 1191)	Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, pp. 29-30 (MR)	Informed against Deulesalt of London, along with Richard(#9); received $5m.$, presumably to be split with his co-informant	Michaelmas term, 1191

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
9	*Conversus*	Richard		*Pipe Rolls, 3 Richard I, 1191, 1192*, p. 135 (Michaelmas term, 1191)	Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, pp. 29-30 (MR)	Informed against Deulesalt of London, along with Henry (#8); received 5*m.*, presumably to be split with his co-informant	Michaelmas term, 1191
10	(*of Canterbury*)	Thomas		*Pipe Rolls, 10 Richard I, 1198*, p. 208 (Michaelmas term, 1198)	Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30	Assessed one mark for tallage; evidence that a convert was likely liable for unpaid tallage despite conversion	Michaelmas term, 1198
11	(*Conversa*)	Constance		*Memoranda Roll, 1 John*, p. 24 (Michaelmas term, 1199)	Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30	She had married Gerin the tailor and expected to obtain her father's property in York, which had escheated to the Crown.	Michaelmas term, 1199
12	of Gloucester	John		*Pipe Rolls, 1 John, 1199*, p. 32 (Michaelmas term, 1199)	Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30	Associated with a number of Jews in an appeal against Elias the Jew	Michaelmas term, 1199
13	(*conversus*)	Robert		Apostolic Letters, Innocent III (5 Dec 1199)→ Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century*, pp. 96-99; *Curia Regis Rolls, Richard and John*, p. 459 (Easter Term, 1201)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 280; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30.	Assigned to the convent of St. Mary de Pré in Leicester in 1199 at the request of Pope Innocent III, holds land in Buckinghamshire in 1201	1199-12-05

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
14	le Convers	Richard		*Pipe Rolls, 13 John, 1211*, p. 112 (Michaelmas term, 1211); *Curia Regis Rolls, 15-16 John, 1213-15*, pp. 279 (Michaelmas term, 1214), 300 (Michaelmas term, 1214); *Curia Regis Rolls, 5-6 Henry III, 1221-22*, p. 190 (Michaelmas term, 1221)		Relatively unkown, mentioned in two cases in the *Curia Regis*, received 50*s.* along with another convert, Henry (#15)	Michaelmas term, 1211
15	le Convers	Henry		*Pipe Rolls, 13 John, 1211*, p. 112 (Michaelmas term, 1211)		Received 50*s.* along with another convert, Richard (#14)	Michaelmas term, 1211
16	le Convers (*fil Isaac)	Alberic (Ailberic, Aubrey) (*Joscepin)		*Rot. Lit. Claus.*, i, pp. 139b (17 November 1213), 263a (16 April 1216); *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1226-57*, p. 76 (9 May 1228); *Close Rolls, 1227-31*, p. 48 (10 May 1228); *Fine Rolls, 12 Henry III, 1227-28*, nos. 176 (∼13 May 1228) (cancelled), 191 (∼26 May 1228) (cancelled), 212 (∼2 July 1228)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 10-12, 15, 86, 161, Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 281; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, p. 135	Name before conversion was Joscepin f. Isaac, papal legate in England Nicholas of Tusculum intervenes on behalf of Alberic who is then allowed to keep his houses upon conversion, in arrears by 10*m.* on his tallage in 1215, mansion with stone chamber confiscated (worth 40*l.*), flees country	1213-11-17

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
17	of Winchester	Emma		*Curia Regis Rolls, 1213-15*, pp. 70 (Hilary term, 15 John), 245 (Trinity term, 16 John)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 279; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 30	Convert, married to Reiner son of Vitalis, involved in a suit to claim her dower from her late husband; it was allegedly withheld by two Jews against Isaac the Jew (a chirographer) and Chera his wife, they do not appear or essoin, the king takes the dower until the second summons, where Isaac and Chera claim that they are not holding back any dower; all parties place themselves in inquest	Hilary term, 15 John
18	le Convers	William		*Curia Regis Rolls, 15-16 John, 1213-15*, pp. 133 (Trinity term, 1214), 302 (Michaelmas term, 1214)		Relatively unknown, mentioned in a single case in the *Curia Regis*; probably a lay-brother	Trinity term, 1214
19	Conversus	Philip		*Rot. Lit. Claus.*, i, p. 317 (25 July 1217); *Curia Regis Rolls, 14-17 Henry III, 1230-32*, no. 755 (Michaelmas term, 1230)		Mentioned in Oldcotes, Notts. in 1217, and again in Notts. in 1230; was the defendant in a case concerning 6*s.* of rent as someone's dower in Nottingham	1217-07-25

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
20	le Convert	Henry		*PEJ*, i, p. 17 (Hilary term, 1219)		Was a pledge for the defendant, Gerebert de Sancto Claro, in a case concerning an allegedly false chirograph	Hilary term, 1219
21	the Crossbowman (le Balestier)	Philip		*Rot. Lit. Claus.*, i, pp. 512 (9 Oct 1222), 524 (1 Dec 1222), 535 (12 Feb 1223), 541b (10 April 1223), 550 (5 June 1223), 557b (4 Aug 1223), 573b (28 Oct 1223), 579 (19 Dec 1223), 582b (23 Jan 1224); *Rot. Lit. Claus.*, ii, pp. 9 (3 Dec 1224), 68b (27 Oct 1224), 44 (6 June 1225), 50 (7 July 1225), 50 (8 Aug 1225), 88b (11 Dec 1225), 140b (7 Oct 1226); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1226-40*, pp. 4 (6 Nov 1226), 8 (13 Dec 1226), 15 (7 Jan 1227), 24 (22 March 1227), 32 (6 May 1227), 39 (18 June 1227), 44 (22 July 1227), 67 (8 Feb 1228), 80 (10 May 1228), 93 (20 July 1228), 111 (29 Nov 1228), 130 (15 May 1229), 170 (2 March 1230), 182 (1 May 1230), 184 (12 July 1230), 191 (30 Nov 1232), 259 (23 March 1237), 470 (28 May 1240); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1240-45*, pp. 7 (20 Nov 1240), 122 (25 April 1242), 149 (15 Oct 1242), 167 (25 Jan 1243), 177 (27 April 1243), 185 (25 June 1243), 194 (29 Oct 1243), 225 (31 March 1244); *Close Rolls, 1227-31*, p. 49 (10 May 1228); *Close Rolls, 1234-37*,, p. 425 (23 March 1237)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 296-97	Convert who became a soldier, converted before the opening of the *domus* (according to Adler), in charge of the armoury and the repair of crossbows. From the Liberate Rolls he seems to have become relatively wealthy in this line of work	1222-10-09

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
22	Conversus	Edmund		*Rot. Lit. Claus.*, i, p. 579b (29 Dec 1223)		Is given various garments by the king in 1223 (tunic, cope, lambskin-lined hooded cloak)	1223-12-29
23	Converse	Thurbern		*Curia Regis Rolls, 7-9 Henry III, 1223-24*, no. 1713 (Trinity term, 1224)		Relatively unknown, mentioned in a single case in the *Curia Regis*; probably a lay-brother	Trinity term, 1224
24	le Convers	Bennet (Benedict)		*Curia Regis Rolls, 7-9 Henry III, 1223-24*, nos. 2420 (Michaelmas term, 1224), 2574 (Michaelmas term, 1224)		Relatively unknown, mentioned in a single case in the *Curia Regis*; probably a lay-brother	Michaelmas term, 1224
25	le Convers	Peter		*Curia Regis Rolls, 9-10 Henry III, 1225-26*, no. 33 (Hilary term, 1225)		Mentioned in a single case in the *Curia Regis*, along with his wife Juliana—no reason to think that she is a convert	Hilary term, 1225
26	Conversus	Richard		*Curia Regis Rolls, 9-10 Henry III, 1225-26*, no. 1583 (Michaelmas term, 1225)		Mentioned as being a juror in a single case in the *Curia Regis*	Michaelmas term, 1225

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
27	(*of Canterbury*)	Augustine		*Rot. Lit. Claus.*, ii, 1227, p. 167a (18 Jan 1227); *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 555 (5 April 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 32, 67-8, 292-3 (MR); Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271; Tovey, *A History of the Jews in England*, p. 87; Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, p. 144; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 146-47; Richardson, *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings*, p. 36	Converted by 1227, king allowed him to keep his house (contrary to custom), Augustine gave the house to the monks who then sold it to Isaac le Gros; ex-wife Chera sued Isaac for her dower, court disallowed plea on grounds that she should have followed her husband into conversion	1227-01-18
28	of Parton (Lincoln)	Roger		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 77 (20 June 1232); *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 139 (4 Sept 1235); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283, 288; Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 141	One of the first converts to be admitted into the *domus* in its first year of opening, later listed to Cluniacs at Louth Park in 1255 (twice)	1232-06-20
29	of Lincoln	William		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 246 (11 Aug 1233)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283, 288 (MR)	Admitted to *domus*, mentioned in same Close Roll entry as Christiana of Oxford (#30)	1233-08-11
30	of Oxford	Christiana		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 246 (11 Aug 1233)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283, 288 (MR)	Admitted to *domus*, mentioned in same Close Roll entry as William of Lincoln (#29)	1233-08-11

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
31	**of Lincoln**	**John**		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 346 (29 Nov 1233); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283, 288	Admitted to *domus*, married a non-convert named Susanna (*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 376), entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1233-11-29
32	the Convert	William	Father to Cecilia (#46), and Maud (#47)	*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 380 (20 Feb 1234); JUST 1/80, m3.d (1235); *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, pp. 396 (23 Nov 1236), 486 (18 Aug 1237)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 20 February 1234; in Hertforshire eyre of 1235, case is brought forward as to the position of the two children having been born before their parents converted to Christianity	1234-02-20
33	of Norwich	Letitia		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 383 (2 March 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 2 March 1234	1234-03-02
34	of Reading	Philip		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 415 (1 May 1234)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 135; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 285, 288 (MR)	Both converted and baptised in the king's presence in 1234, subsequently admitted into the 'college' of converts	1234-05-01
35	of Norwich	Hugh		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 440 (2 June 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283, 288	Admitted to *domus* 2 June 1234, wardens were directed to investigate whether his conversion had been sincere as well as the standard of his reputation	1234-06-02

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
36	of Ipswich	Emma		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 441 (2 June 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 2 June 1234, admittance came in same Close Roll entry as Isabel de Cantebrigia (#37), and Mariota (#38)	1234-06-02
37	of Cambridge	Isabel		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 441 (2 June 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 2 June 1234, admittance came in same Close Roll entry as Emma of Ipswich(#36), and Mariota (#38)	1234-06-02
38	(*conversa*)	Mariota		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 441 (2 June 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 2 June 1234, admittance came in same Close Roll entry as Emma of Ipswich (#36), and Isabel of Cambridge (#37)	1234-06-02
39	(*conversa*)	Joan		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 469 (6 July 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 6 July 1234	1234-07-06
40	of Bristol	Isabel	Mother to unnamed son (#41)	*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 494 (9 Aug 1234)		Admitted to *domus* 9 August 1234 with her son	1234-08-09
41	of Bristol	(*Unnamed*)	Son of Isabel (#40)	*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 494 (9 Aug 1234)		Admitted to *domus* 9 August 1234 with his mother	1234-08-09
42	(*conversa*)	Maud		*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 499 (16 Aug 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 16 August 1234	1234-08-16

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
43	(*conversus*)	Alexander	Husband to Godwisa (#44)	*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 503 (18 Aug 1234); *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283-84, 288	Expelled from *domus* along with wife and children in 1234, sent to Augustinians at Dunstable Priory with wife Godwisa (#44) on 13 December 1247	1234-08-18
44	(*conversa*)	Godwisa	Wife to Alexander (#43)	*Close Rolls, 1231-34*, p. 503 (18 Aug 1234); *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 283-84, 288	Expelled from *domus* along with husband and children in 1234, sent to Augustinians at Dunstable Priory with husband Alexander (#43) on 13 December 1247	1234-08-18
45	(*conversa*)	Maud		*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 29 (15 Dec 1234)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 15 Dec 1234	1234-12-15
46	(*the Convert*)	Cecilia	Daughter of William (#32), sister of Maud (#47)	JUST 1/80, m3.d (1235)		Case from 1235 Herts. eyre on whether or not Cecilia and her sister Maud (#47) were to regain seisin of land given that they were both born after their parents' conversion to Christianity and their brother Richard was not	1235

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
47	(*the Convert*)	Maud	Daughter of William (#32), sister of Cecilia (#46)	JUST 1/80, m3.d (1235)		Case from 1235 Herts. eyre on whether or not Maud and her sister Celia (#46) were to regain seisin of land given that they were both born after their parents' conversion to Christianity and their brother Richard was not	1235
48	of Bristol	John	Brother of Joan (#49)	*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 124 (30 July 1235)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 184, 288	Converted with his sister Joan, (#49), admitted to *domus* on 30 July 1235	1235-07-30
49	of Bristol	Joan	Sister of John (#48)	*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 124 (30 July 1235)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 184, 288	Converted with her brother John (#48), admitted to *domus* on 30 July 1235	1235-07-30
50	of Amiens (de Amyens)	Fermins (Fermi-nus)	Husband to unnamed (#51)	*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 264 (12 May 1236), p. 358 (∼3-8 June 1236)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 280; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 284, 288	Admitted to *domus* with unnamed wife on 12 May 1236; upon conversion, several Jews of Northampton kidnapped his children, and after complaining to the king, the children were brought face to face with their father so as to have the opportunity to also convert or persist 'in the Jewish perfidy'	1236-05-12

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
51	(*convert*)	Unnamed	Wife to Fermins (#50)	*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, p. 264 (12 May 1236), p. 358 (∼3-8 June 1236)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 280; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 284, 288	Admitted to *domus* with husband Fermins on 12 May 1236; upon conversion, several Jews of Northampton kidnapped her children, and after complaining to the king, the children were brought face to face with their father so as to have the opportunity to also convert or persist 'in the Jewish perfidy'	1236-05-12
52	of Oxford	John		*Close Rolls, 1234-37*, pp. 323, 383 (both 4 Nov 1236), 436 (28 April 1237)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 24-5 (Roth also indexes him on p. 148—debatable if this is the same person or not); Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jew to Christianity', p. 267	Baptized without family's consent, smuggled away by community of Jews, child traced to Exeter, sent back and placed in custody of Robert Bacon, admitted into *domus* in the following year; **NB:** Roth indexes this John and John #59 as being one and the same	1236-11-04

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
53	**of Canterbury**	**Martha**	Wife to Richard (#98)	*Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 9 (1 Dec 1237); *Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 194 (16 Aug 1249); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255→ preamble to the list), 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', pp. 271, 280; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 32, 68, 288, 290, 293	Converted by 1237, given dowry of 30*m.* by her father, Josce son of Sampson; she and her husband Richard (#98) converted, and her father took back her dowry in 1249 as a result; upon application to the court, king mandates that her father be compelled to give her back the dowry; listed to Benedictines at Abingdon in 1255 with husband Richard, mentioned in the preamble to 39/124 with husband Richard	1237-12-01
54	of Huntecumbe	William		*Cal. Charter Rolls, 1226-57*, p. 237 (20 Jan 1238)		Converted Jew who held land in Winchester which escheated to the king	1238-01-20
55	of York	Nicholas		*Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 97 (3 Sept 1238)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to the *domus* in 1238 'until the king's arrival'	1238-09-03
56	Conversus	Baldwin		*Curia Regis Rolls, 21-26 Henry III, 1237-42*, nos. 1190 (Michaelmas term, 1240), 2347(Michaelmas term, 1242)		Acted as a pledge in two cases in the *Curia Regis*	Michaelmas term, 1240

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
57	de Warenne	William		*Fine Rolls, 25 Henry III, 1240-41*, no. 66 (26 Nov 1240)		Known as the conversus of Stamford, was given 10*m.* by the king for his sustenance, from the debts which were owed to him from the time when he was a Jew; possibly named after the 5th Earl of Surrey who had died in May 1240	1240-11-26
58	(*conversus*)	Warin		*Close Rolls, 1237-42*, p. 278 (22 Feb 1241); *Pipe Roll, 26 Henry III, 1241-42*, p. 50 (1241-42); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1240-45*, p. 99 (2 Jan 1242); *Fine Rolls, 27 Henry III, 1242-43*, no. 773 (Oct 1243); *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 161 (18 Feb 1244), 298 (6 April 1245)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 148; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288-89; Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 224	Under Robert Bacon's tutelage at Oxford, possible that primary sources not mentioning a name refer not to him, but to John (#59), also a convert that studied at Oxford at the same time. Warin or John repented his apostasy after being made an acolyte, refused to continue studying, went into hiding, sheriff ordered to ascertain his name and arrest him (Roth, *JMO*)	1241-02-22
59	(*conversus*)	John		*Pipe Roll, 26 Henry III, 1241-42*, p. 50 (1241-42); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1240-45*, p. 99 (2 Jan 1242); *Fine Rolls, 27 Henry III, 1242-43*, no. 773 (5 Oct 1243); *Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 161 (18 Feb 1244), 298 (6 April 1245)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 148; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288-89; Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 224	Studied at Oxford with fellow convert Warin (#58) under Robert Bacon, possibly re-apostasized and refused to continue studies; see conversus, Warin (#58)	1241-1242

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
60	Conversus	Maurice		*Curia Regis Rolls, 26-27 Henry III, 1242-43*, no. 1249 (Hilary term, 1243)		Appears in a single case in the *Curia Regis*, acting as a pledge	Hilary term, 1243
61	of La Réole	Martin		*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 12 (3 Feb 1243); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1240-45*, p. 173 (3 March 1243)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 285; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271; Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, p. 169; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 164-65; Tovey, *Anglia Judaica*, p. 115	Convert, had letter from the king to Archbishop of York, Bishop of Carlisle, and Walter de Cantilupe (Bishop of Worcester) asking that he be sent where he could be taught in the Catholic faith and the science of letters, was given 8*d.* per day; **NB:** Stacey has this Martin and Martin #92 as being one and the same	1243-02-03
62	Conversus	Philip		*Curia Regis Rolls, 26-27 Henry III, 1242-43*, no. 2184 (Easter term, 1243)		Sent to *Curia Regis* in the place of the Prioress of Steinfeld	Easter term, 1243
63	le Clerk (Clericus)	William		*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 141 (11 Dec 1243), 165 (25 Feb 1244)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288, 291	Expelled from *domus* along with Adam Page (#68) for misconduct	1243-12-11
64	(*Capellanus*)	Hugh		*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 147-48 (18 Dec 1243); *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 154-55 (26 Nov 1265), 217 (6 Nov 1265), 279 (28 Dec 1266); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, pp. 503 (12 Nov 1265), 515 (28 Nov 1265)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 286, 295, 310	Convert chaplain of the *domus*, held office of chaplain (a two-person office) in conjunction with John (#65); possible connection with Hugh #418	1243-12-18

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
65	(*Capellanus*)	John		*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 147-48 (18 Dec 1243); *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 154-55 (26 Nov 1265), 217 (6 Nov 1265), 279 (28 Dec 1266); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, pp. 503 (12 Nov 1265), 515 (28 Nov 1265)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 286, 295	Convert chaplain of the *domus*, held office of chaplain (a two-person office) in conjunction with Hugh (#64)	1243-12-18
66	**of Chesham**	**Sibilla (Sybilla)**	Mother to Agnes (#191)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 146 (18 Dec 1243), 146-47 (18 Dec 1243); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288, 290	Admitted to *domus* 18 Dec 1243 by herself, listed to Augustinians at Missenden twice in 1255 along with her previously unmentioned daughter, Agnes (#191); given a robe in 1243	1243-12-18
67	**(*conversus*)**	**Otto (Otho, Otes, Otonem)**	Husband to Dionisia (#135), Father to unnamed daugther (#136)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 148 (18 Dec 1243); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255) twice, 981 (No date) twice	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288, 290	Admitted to *domus* 18 Dec 1243, listed to Augustinians at Barnwell in 1255 three times by himself, and mentioned in conjunction twice with Dionisia, his wife (who was being sent to Huntingdon)	1243-12-18
68	Page	Adam	Husband to Leticia (#74)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, pp. 165 (25 Feb 1244), 418 (28 April 1245)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 136; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288, 291	Expelled from *domus* along with William le Clerk (#63); sent to Abbey of Shaftesbury in 1245 with wife Leticia, odd that he should go to Shaftesbury, given that it was an all-female convent	1244-02-25

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
69	(*conversus*)	William	Husband to Joan (#70)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 224 (24 Aug 1244)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 24 Aug 1244 with his wife Joan (#70)	1244-08-24
70	(*conversa*)	Joan	Wife to William (#69)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 224 (24 Aug 1244)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 24 Aug 1244 along with her husband William (#69)	1244-08-24
71	**of York**	**Laurence**	Husband to unnamed (#192), father to unnamed son (#193)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 224 (24 Aug 1244); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288, 290	Admitted to *domus* 24 Aug 1244, listed twice in 1255 to Hospital of St. Leonard, York along with his unnamed wife and son (#192 and #193)	1244-08-24
72	(*conversa*)	Isabella	Mother to Simon (#73) and Sibilla (#188)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 285 (27 Jan 1245)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 27 Jan 1245 with her son Simon (#73); mentioned in 39/124 Fine Rolls as being the mother of Simon (#73) and Sibilla (#188)	1245-01-27
73	**(*conversus*)**	**Simon**	Son to Isabella (#72), brother to Sibilla (#188)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 285 (27 Jan 1245); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 27 Jan 1245 with his mother Isabella (#72); listed to Cistercians at Flaxley in 1255, along with his sister Sibilla (#188)	1245-01-27
74	(*Page*)	Leticia	Wife to Adam (#68)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 418 (28 April 1245)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 290	Sent to Abbey of Shaftesbury in 1245 with husband Adam	1245-04-28

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
75	de Wilton	Roger		*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 316 (21 June 1245)		Admitted to *domus* 21 June 1245	1245-06-21
76	le Convers	William		*The Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide at Oxford*, i, no. 501 (*c.*1240-50)		Mentioned in a demise of land *c.*1240-50 in the parish of Saint Mary Magdalene in Oxford	*c.*1240-50
77	(*conversus*)	William	Father to Agnes (#78)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 423 (8 May 1246)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 8 May 1246 with his daughter Agnes (#78); **NB:** Adler refers to Agnes as William's wife	1246-05-08
78	(*conversa*)	Agnes	Daughter of William (#77)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 423 (8 May 1246)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 8 May 1246 with her father William (#77); **NB:** Adler refers to Agnes as William's wife	1246-05-08
79	(*of Winchester*)	Joan		*Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1245-51*, p. 70 (31 July 1246)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271	Left her husband Deulebeneie in 1246 in order to convert to Christianity, king enforced her dower right and awarded her 34*m.*; odd, because the king credited Deulebeneie this sum in his debts (husband ended up paying nothing, the king ended up paying 34*m.*); given a robe by the king	1246-07-31

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
80	of Hereford	Christiana		*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 460 (8 Sept 1246)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 8 Sept 1246	1246-09-08
81	le Eveske* (l'Eveske) (*conversus*)	Elias* (Henry)	Father to Nicholas (#246), and Adam (#247)	*Close Rolls, 1227-31*, pp. 55 (12 June 1228), 420 (17 July 1230), 551 (29 Aug 1231); *Curia Regis Rolls, 1230-32*, no. 1027 (Michaelmas term, 1230); *Close Rolls, 1231-34*, pp. 87 (19 July 1232), 376 (6 Feb 1234); E 371/3, m.13 (20 Henry III) twice; *Curia Regis Rolls, 1233-37*, nos. 1112 (Trinity term, 1234), 1115 (Trinity term, 1234), 1117 (Trinity term, 1234), 1124 (Trinity term, 1234); *Close Rolls, 1234-37*, pp. 41 (25 Jan 1235), 83 (28 April 1235), 234 (28 Jan 1236), 255 (6 April 1236), 269 (25 May 1236), 433-34 (22 April 1237), 464 (28 June 1237), 490 (22 Aug 1237); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1232-47*, pp. 178 (8 April 1237), 228 (28 July 1238), 359 (26 Jan 1243), 397 (17 Oct 1243), 488 (10 Sept 1246); *Close Rolls, 1237-42*, pp. 48 (4 May 1238), 109 (19 Oct 1238), 170-71 (24 Jan 1240), 354 (14 May 1241), 355 (14 May 1241), 402 (12 March 1242); *Fine Rolls, 23 Henry III, 1238-39*, no. 387 (∼22 Oct 1239); *Fine Rolls, 25 Henry III, 1240-41*, no. 631 (∼24 Aug 1241); *Fine Rolls, 26 Henry III, 1241-42*, no. 220 (22 March 1242); *Fine Rolls, 27 Henry III, 1242-43*, nos. 29 (∼11 Nov 1242), 48 (∼16 Nov 1242), 389 (25 Jan 1243); E 371/12, m.4 (29 Henry III); (***...continued below***)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 67; Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, pp. 46-7; Stokes, *A Short History of the Jews in England*, pp. 6, 12, 38; Stokes, *Studies in Anglo-Jewish History*, pp. 4-6, 18, 19, 24, 30-33; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 272; Stacey, '1240-1260: A Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations', pp. 141-42; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 29-30, 32, 40, 137, 139, 145, 152, 156-58, 161, 283, 293-93; Lipman, 'The Anatomy of Medieval Anglo-Jewry', p. 70; Cohen, 'The Oxford Jewry in the Thirteenth Century', pp. 313-14; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 191-92	Son of Benedict le Eveske; was archpresbyter of the English Jewry from 1243-1257, appealed for permission for Jews to leave England in 1254 (Roth, *JMO*), converted in 1259 (Stokes, *SHJE*), had a brother (not a convert) named Jacob, another brother, Salomon, two sons named Nicholas and Adam (#246 and #247) who both converted with him, and a daughter named Henna who did not convert	1246-09-10

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
				Close Rolls, 1251-53, pp. 46 (4 Feb 1252), 152 (1 Sept 1252), 233 (30 July 1252), 271 (2 Nov 1252) twice, 326 (4 March 1253), 494 (24 July 1253); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, pp. 48 (17 May 1252), 65 (9 Aug 1252), 195-6 (16 Feb 1255), 466 (8 July 1259), 497 (26 Feb 1260); *PEJ*, i, pp. 113 (Easter term, 1253) twice, 114 (Easter term, 1253), 116 (Easter term, 1253) three times (see also Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 15), 126 (Easter term, 1253), 221 (Easter term, 1270), 264 (Easter term, 1270)(see also Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 60), 265 (Easter term, 1270)(see also Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 61), 280 (Easter term, 1272); *Close Rolls, 1254-56*, pp. 187 (8 May 1255), 189 (16 May 1255); JUST 1/1187, m.10 (29 Dec 1258); *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 494 (24 July 1253); E 159/32 m.7d (Hilary term, 1258); *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, pp. 8 (24 Feb 1258), 16 (8 Jan 1259); *Close Rolls, 1256-59*, pp. 356 (10 Jan 1259), 420 (6 Aug 1259); *Fine Rolls, 43 Henry III, 1258-59*, nos. 116 (∼22 Jan 1259), 423 (∼2 June 1259), 427 (∼4 June 1259), 661 (2 Aug 1259), 886 (∼25 Oct 1259); *Close Rolls, 1259-61*, p. 16 (22 Nov 1259); *PEJ*, ii, p. 5 (Hilary term, 1273); *PEJ*, iv, no. 25 (Easter term, 1273); Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. xxxiii			

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
82	**Grosseteste (Grosstest, Grosetest)**	**Robert**	Husband to Matilla (#112), Father to John/Joan (#113)	*Close Rolls, 1242-47*, p. 493 (17 Dec 1246); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255) twice, 124 (6 Feb 1255) twice, 125 (No date), 981 (No date) twice	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 136, 139; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 288, 290	Had lived for a time in the *domus* before being listed to Benedictines at Winchester Cathedral Priory in 1255 (four times); presumably named after his sponsor, Robert Grosseteste, great intellectual, scientist, theologian, and later Bishop of Lincoln	1246-12-17
83	(*le Convers*)	Solomon*		*Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1245-51*, p. 133 (18 July 1247)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 224	Relapsed convert; order was given to have him delivered to the constable of the Tower of London	1247-07-18
84	(*conversus*)	William		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 138; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Sent to Cluniacs at Bermondsey in 1247	1247-12-13
85	of Oxford (*conversa*)	Alicia (Alice)		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 25, 161	Assigned in 1247 to the Hospital of St. John, Eastgate, Oxford, entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1247-12-13

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
86	**le Clerk (Clericus)**	**Henry**		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25, 148	Assigned to the Benedictines at Hyde in 1247 (possibly to the hospital associated with the Abbey), then to the brethren of the hospital of St. John the Baptist, Oxford three times in 1255	1247-12-13
87	(*convert*)	Philip	Husband to unnamed (#88)	*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25	Sent to Eynsham in 1247 with unnamed wife	1247-12-13
88	(*convert*)	*Unnamed*	Wife to Philip (#87)	*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25	Sent to Eynsham in 1247 with husband Philip	1247-12-13
89	(*conversus*)	Alban		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Augustinians at Merton Priory, Surrey	1247-12-13
90	Prior	William	Husband to unnamed (#91)	*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Benedictines at St. Augustine, Canterbury, along with his unnamed wife (#91)	1247-12-13
91	(*Prior*)	Unnamed	Wife to William (#90)	*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Benedictines at St. Augustine, Canterbury, along with her husband William (#90)	1247-12-13

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
92	(conversus)	Martin		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 273	Assigned in 1247 to Augustinians at Holy Trinity, London; **NB:** Stacey has this Martin and Martin #61 as being one and the same	1247-12-13
93	(*conversus*)	Alban		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to St. Mary's, Southwark	1247-12-13
94	**(*conversus*)**	**Hugh**		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date) twice	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Wilton Abbey, Wiltshire, named in Close Rolls as 'son of Phillip'; listed to Benedictines at Horsham St. Faith in 1255 (twice), listed a second time on 39/981 to Premonstratensians at Beeleigh; unknown whether his father Phillip was also a convert	1247-12-13
95	(*conversa*)	Edith		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Benedictines at Pershore, Worcester, named in Close Rolls as 'daughter of Thomas'—unknown whether Thomas was also a convert	1247-12-13
96	(*conversa*)	Alice		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Benedictines at Winchcombe, Gloucestershire	1247-12-13

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
97	(*conversus*)	Richard		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 100 (13 Dec 1247)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 289	Assigned in 1247 to Benedictines at Bardney, Lincolnshire	1247-12-13
98	**of London**	**Richard**	Husband to Martha (#53)	*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, p. 194 (16 Aug 1249); *Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255→ preamble to the list), 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 280; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 290, 293	Listed to Benedictines at Abingdon in 1255 with wife Martha, mentioned in the preamble to 39/124 (the king complaining to the abbots about their lack of respect for his requests)—converts in or before 1249 because of wife's Close Roll entry	1249-08-16
99	(*de Northbrok*)	Alice		*Close Rolls, 1247-51*, pp. 271 (11 March 1250), 565 (8 Oct 1251)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 278; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Admitted to *domus* 11 March 1250, married a non-Jew named Gilbert de Northbrook (like Martha of Canterbury did, #11), allowed to keep her convert's allowance even after she married her Christian husband	1250-03-11

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
100	of Norwich	Simon		*Close Rolls, 1251-53*, pp. 201 (11 March 1252), 84 (2 May 1252), 457 (20 March 1253)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 137; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 183-84	Ordered arrested along with John the Convert (#101), both accused of rape of Orframia de Gratlesden, she does not prosecute, both converts released, left Abbey of Thorney in 1253 with wife and children, king writes letter of thanks and exoneration to abbot	1252-03-11
101	Conversus	John		*Close Rolls, 1251-53*, pp. 201 (11 March 1252), 84 (2 May 1252)	Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 183-84	Accused of rape of Orframia of Gatlesden along with Simon of Norwich (#100); Orframia does not prosecute, both converts are released	1252-03-11
102	of Winchester	Henry	Husband to Clarice (#106), father to Thomas (#306)	***Chapter 5 of this thesis makes use of every available primary-source reference for Henry***	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', pp. 276-77, 279; Brand, 'Jews and the Law in England', pp. 1149-53; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 285-6, 292, 294, 296; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, p. 202	***See chapter 5 of this thesis***	*c.*9 May-11 June, 1252
103	de Hayles	Hamone		*Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 164 (9 Oct 1252); *Close Rolls, 1254-56*, p. 275 (16 Feb 1256); *Close Rolls, 1256-59*, p. 170 (7 Dec 1257)		Is given robes by the king on three separate occasions	1252-10-09

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
104	(*Batecok**)	Amitia*, Amitee		*Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 276 (14 Nov 1252); *Fine Rolls, 37 Henry III, 1252-53*, no. 72 (14 Nov 1252)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 292; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, p. 186	Formerly wife of Abraham Batecok, Jew, converted, her property should have escheated to the king, Abraham protested, the king eventually accepted Abraham's offer of half a gold mark to have the case decided by the justices of the Jews; Abraham, but not Amitia is mentioned on *Fine Rolls 37 Henry III, 1252-53*, no. 65 (*c.*12-13 Nov 1252)	1252-11-14
105	of Norwich	Isaac* (Hak, Hake)		*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 224 (27 Nov 1252); *Close Rolls, 1251-53*, pp. 395 (22 July 1253), 494 (24 July 1253); *Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey*, ed. Ann Causton, 157 WAM 6886 (13 Nov 1253)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 292; Lipman, *Jews of Medieval Norwich*, p. 109; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 272	Isaac's father Moses died, with Elias l'Eveske (#81) taking charge of the property, but after Isaac converted the king ordered an inquiry concerning his inheritance in order that it might be paid over the the Treasury in the usual way (both the king and Elias l'Eveske believed they were entitled to the property)	1252-11-27

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
106	(*of Winchester*)	Clarice	Wife to Henry (#102), mother to Thomas (#306)	*Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 136 (12 June 1253)		Wife of Henry of Winchester; the king gives her 100*m.* yearly as a dower after her conversion	1253-06-12
107	(*conversa*)	Mabilia		*Close Rolls, 1251-53*, p. 509 (13 Sept 1253)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 137, 138	Sent to Cluniacs at Bermondsey in 1253	1253-09-13

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
108	le Convers (le Convers of Kelewedon) (*Kelvedon Hatch*)	Roger	Father to John le Convers (#414), Roger le Convers (#311), husband to Agnes (#415)	*Close Rolls, 1253-54*, p. 213 (15 Feb 1254); *Close Rolls, 1254-56*, pp. 58 (26 March 1255), 89 (22 May 1255), 91 (29 May 1255), 434 (28 July 1256); *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, i, no. 2055 (30 July 1256); *Close Rolls, 1256-59*, pp. 53 (12 May 1257), 57 (24 May 1257), 165 (16 Nov 1257), 278-79 (9 Nov 1257); *Ancient Deeds*, i, no. A1493 (43 Henry III); *Close Rolls, 1259-61*, pp. 69 (7 July 1260), 104 (20 Aug 1260), 105 (29 Aug 1260), 252-53 (10 April 1260), 355 (7 March 1261); Close Rolls, 1261-64, pp. 236 (4 June 1263), 239 (6 June 1263), 253 (24 Aug 1263), 351 (9 July 1264); *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 214 (25 Sept 1266), 513 (13 Jan 1268); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 417 (12 April 1276); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, pp. 228 (22 June 1255), 526 (25 Aug 1260); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, pp. 22 (20 Feb 1261), 30 (4 May 1261), 99 (8 July 1262), 104 (11 July 1262), 189 (10 Dec 1265), 222 (4 July 1266); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, no. 1516 (15 May 1271); *Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, p. 33 (3 Dec 1260); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1258-66*, pp. 13 (5 March 1259), 134 (1 Jan 1261), 177 (2 Oct 1261), 209 (2 April 1262), 222 (10 July 1262), 266 (17 July 1263), 300 (30 Nov 1263), 310 (6 April 1264); *Feet of Fines for Essex*, i, no. 1527 (October, 1262); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, pp. 123 (24 Oct 1267), 716 (8 Nov 1272); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, p. 74 (20 Dec 1274); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 597; *Rotuli Hundredorum*, i, pp. 173 (2 Edward I), 178 (4 Edward I), 469 (3 Edward I)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 294-96, 298 (MR); Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', pp. 276, 279	King's sergeant-at-arms, 1 of 20 constituting king's bodyguard, 1 of 5 picked to protect him in the field in Gascony, entrusted with diplomatic mission to Spain, somewhat of paymaster to the army, excused from paying taxes on London property, received many gifts from Henry, great benefactor to *domus*	1254-02-15

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
109	le Cumvers	Martin		*Close Rolls, 1253-54*, p. 121 (2 March 1254)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 291; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271	Troublesome individual—received letters from the king in Gascony under false pretences; letters directed to the Abbot of Hyde from whom he received 1*m.*, then went to St. Swithun's, Winchester claiming to have been newly baptised and given the king's name, ordered to be arrested and imprisoned if he appeared in Hampshire	1254-03-02
110	Belet	John		*Fine Rolls, 38 Henry III, 1253-54*, no. 890 (16 Oct 1254)		Married a woman named Emma Oliver (presumably Gentile) without the king's licence, is disseised of his lands and tenements (Emma had held them in chief of the king), is fined 20*l.* to regain possession	1254-10-16
111	**(*conversus*) Philip**			*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 53 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255)		Listed to Augustines at St. Mary of Walsingham in 1255; mentioned but subsequently crossed out in 39/53, which seems to be a preamble for 39/54	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
112	(***Grosseteste***)	**Matilla (Matilda)**	Wife to Robert (#82), Mother to John/Joan (#113)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 125 (No date), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 140	39/53 list has her going to Cluniacs at Monks Horton in 1255 with son John, but 39/124 list has her going to Benedictines at Hyde with son John, 39/981 repeats the latter	1255-01-20
113	(***Grosseteste***)	**John/ Joan**	Son/daughter to Matilla (#112) and Robert (#82)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 125 (No date), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 140	Child; listed with Mother Matilla on lists	1255-01-20
114	**Maunsell (Mansell)**	**John**	Father to Dionisia (#115)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 136, 139; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 290	Listed to Cluniacs at Lewes in 1255 three times; presumably named after his sponsor, John Maunsell, important member of Henry's council	1255-01-20
115	(***Maunsell***)	**Dionisia**	Daughter of John (#114)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 139	Child; listed separately from father on list, listed to Augustinians at Michelham in 1255 three times	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
116	**Plessetis (de Plessey, de Plessitis)**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 136; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 290	Listed to Cistercians at Roche in 1255 three times; presumably named after his sponsor, John de Plessis, 7th Earl of Warwick, sometimes constable of the Tower of London and later constable of Devizes	1255-01-20
117	**of Gloucester**	**Christiana**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 138	Listed to Augustinians at St. Oswald's, Gloucester (Nostell) in 1255 on all except for the second half of 39/981, where she is listed to Benedictines at St. Guthlac's, Hereford	1255-01-20
118	**de Wigorn'/of Worcester**	**William**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 138	Listed to Benedictines at Worcester in 1255	1255-01-20
119	**of Reading**	**Constance**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', pp. 139-9	Listed to Benedictines at Reading in 1255, entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
120	**Windour (Windsor)**	**Robert**	Husband to Isabella (#121)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 139	Listed to Cistercians at Abbey Dore with wife Isabella on 39/52 and 39/124, but on 39/981 is listed to Augustinians at Bridlington	1255-01-20
121	**(*Windour*)**	**Isabella (Ysabell)**	Wife of Robert (#120)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255) twice, 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 139	Listed to Cistercians at Abbey Dore with husband Robert on 39/52 and 39/124, but on 39/981 is listed to Augustinians at Bridlington; also listed by herself on 39/124 to Abbey Dore	1255-01-20
122	**of Kent**	**William**	Father to Henry (#261), and John (#262)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date); *Close Rolls, 1256-59*, p. 262 (17 Jan 1260); *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 524 (∼10-17 Sept 1272)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 139	Listed to Battle Abbey in 1255 three separate times, but appears on Close Roll when king tries to send him to Fécamp in 1260 (Greatrex) unsuccessfully, and then to Cormeilles (Greatrex); sent to Premonstratensians at West Dereham Abbey in 1272 with his son John (#262), but not his son Henry (#261); **NB:** Fécamp and Cormeilles are English subordinate houses, not Norman houses	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
123	**of Canterbury**	**William**	Father to John (#124)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255) twice, 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) three times	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 139	Listed to Cistercians at Stanley with son John three times in 1255, and also listed by himself to the Premonstratensians at Lavendon (39/124), the Cistercians at Croxden (39/125), the Cistercians at Hailes (39/981), and the Benedictines at St. James, Bristol (39/981); noted in 39/125 that he had a second writ	1255-01-20
124	**(*of Canterbury*)**	**John**	Son of William (#123)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 139	Listed to Cistercians at Stanley with father William in 1255	1255-01-20
125	**de Hynegeshey (Hinksey, Kyngesby)**	**Joeta**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25	Listed to Benedictine nuns at Godstow in 1255 twice	1255-01-20
126	**(*convert*)**	**Richard**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25	Listed to Augustinians at St. Frideswide's, Oxford in 1255 twice	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
127	**le Debonere (le Debonair)**	**Gilbert**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 291	Listed to Benedictines at Bath in 1255 (twice); **NB:** Roth has Gilbert going to Augustinians at Barton Priory, Hampshire—unlikely; it was an abnormal Augustinian priory composed of a prior, five chaplains, and a priest	1255-01-20
128	**le Seriant**	**William**	Husband to Cristiana (#173)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		William's name is struck through on 39/54, but left intact on 39/981, where Cristiana is listed as going to Malmesbury by herself; unclear if William is actually a convert	1255-01-20
129	**(*conversa*)**	**Margery (Margeria)**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Waltham in 1255 (twice)	1255-01-20
130	**(*conversa*)**	**Elena**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Bruern in 1255 (twice)	1255-01-20
131	**(*conversa*)**	**Mabilia (Mabilla)**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at St. Gregory's, Canterbury in 1255 (three times)	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
132	**of Canterbury**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Benedictines at Rochester in 1255 (three times)—called simply 'John, *conversus*' on 39/54, but 'John of Canterbury' on 39/125 and 39/981; also on 39/981 he is mentioned a second time, but not actually sent anywhere—sentence simply says 'John of Canterbury, convert'	1255-01-20
133	**(*conversus*)**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Fountains in 1255 (twice)	1255-01-20
134	**(*conversus*)**	**Robert**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Byland in 1255 (twice)	1255-01-20
135	**(*conversa*)**	**Dionisia (Dyonisia)**	Wife to Otto (#67), mother to unnamed daughter (#136)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date); *Rotuli Hundredorum*, ii, pp. 455a (7 Edward I), 456a (7 Edward I)		Listed to Augustinians at Huntingdon in 1255 (three times) along with unnamed daughter; later held a messuage and land of $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres worth $3s.$ $6d.$ yearly, as well as 1 toft made up of an acre worth $5d.$ yearly	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
136	**(*conversa*)**	***Unnamed***	Daughter to Otto (#67) and Dionisia (#135)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Huntingdon in 1255 (three times) along with her mother Dionisia	1255-01-20
137	**de Dunton**	**Richard**	Husband to Richold (#138)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Buildwas in 1255 (three times), all three times with his wife Richold	1255-01-20
138	**(*de Dunton*)**	**Richold**	Wife to Richard (#137)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255) twice, 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Buildwas in 1255 (four times), three times with her husband Richard (39/54, 39/124, 39/981), and once by herself (also on 39/124)	1255-01-20
139	**de London**	**Augustinus**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Boxley in 1255 (twice)	1255-01-20
140	**(*conversus*)**	**Robert**	Brother to Hugo (#141)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 54 (20 Jan 1255)		Listed to Cistercians at Boxley in 1255, along with brother Hugo (#141), also noted that he is the son of Richard—unknown whether father is also a convert	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
141	(*conversus*) **Hugo**		Brother to Robert (#140)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 54 (20 Jan 1255)		Listed to Cistercians at Boxley in 1255, along with brother Richard (#140), also noted that he is the son of Richard—unknown whether father is also a convert	1255-01-20
142	(*conversus*) **Geoffrey**		Father to Richard (#143)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Leicester in 1255 (three times); assertion that he is the father of Richard is based on the fact that both times 'Richard, son of Geoffrey, convert' appears, it is directly after Geoffrey's entry	1255-01-20
143	(*conversus*) **Richard**		Son of Geoffrey (#142)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255) twice, 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Cistercians at Rievaulx in 1255 (twice), both times he appears as 'Richard, son of Geoffrey, convert' directly after Geoffrey's entry, basis for assertion that they are related, also listed to Premonstratensians at Dale later on 39/981 as well as on 39/54, and to Benedictines at Tewkesbury on 39/124	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
144	**(*conversa*)**	**Hodierna**	Sister to John (#145)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255) twice, 124 (6 Feb 1255), 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) three times		Listed to Cluniacs at Monkton Farleigh in 1255 (39/54) by herself, to Augustinians at Tortington (39/54) with her brother John, to Augustinians at Thornton with John (39/124), to Augustinians at Trentham (39/125) with John, again to Monkton Farleigh (39/981) by herself, and to Trentham and Thornton again (both on 39/981); **NB:** ms. is unclear—'Farnleye' might not be Monkton Farleigh, but rather 'Farley'; 'Trentham' might not be Thornton, but rather 'Tortington'	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
145	**(*conversus*)**	**John**	Brother to Hodierna (#144)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255) twice, 124 (6 Feb 1255), 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Augustinians at Tortington (39/54), to Augustinians at Thornton in 1255 twice (39/124, 39/981) and to Trentham twice (39/125, 39/981), every time with his sister Hodierna; **NB:** ms. is unclear—'Farnleye' might not be Monkton Farleigh, but rather Farley; 'Trentham' might not be Thornton, but rather 'Tortington'	1255-01-20
146	**de Hereford**	**John**	Husband to Matilda (#147)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cluniacs at Much Wenlock in 1255 with his wife Matilda (twice)	1255-01-20
147	**(*de Hereford*)**	**Matilda (Maud)**	Wife to John (#146)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cluniacs at Much Wenlock in 1255 with her husband John (twice)	1255-01-20
148	**of Lincoln**	**Mary**	Mother to unnamed (#149)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 141; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 273	Listed to Cluniacs at Kirkstead in 1255 (three times), with unnamed daughter	1255-01-20
149	**(*of Lincoln*)**	***Unnamed***	Daughter of Mary (#148)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)	Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 141	Listed to Cluniacs at Kirkstead in 1255 (three times), with mother	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
150	**de Lamburn**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Walden in 1255 (twice)	1255-01-20
151	**de St. Swithun**	**Richard**	Husband to Matilda (#152)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Colchester in 1255 twice, both times with Matilda his wife; called 'clerk' on 39/54, and 'convert' on 39/981	1255-01-20
152	(***de St. Swithun***)	**Matilda**	Wife to Richard (#151)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Colchester in 1255 twice, both times with Richard her husband	1255-01-20
153	**of Exeter**	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255)		Listed to Benedictines at Bury St. Edmunds in 1255	1255-01-20
154	(***conversus***)	**Matthew**	Husband to Cecla (#155)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Norwich in 1255 twice, along with his wife Cecla (or Tecla)	1255-01-20
155	(***conversa***)	**Cecla (Tecla)**	Wife to Matthew (#154)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Norwich in 1255 twice, along with her husband Matthew	1255-01-20
156	**of Worcester**	**Richard**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Glastonbury in 1255 three times	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
157	(*conversa*)	**Joan**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Stratford Langthorne in 1255 twice, noted on both 39/54 and 39/981 as being the 'daughter of Richard'—this could potentially be the Richard mentioned immediately before her (Richard #156)	1255-01-20
158	(*conversa*)	**Muriel**	Mother to John (#181)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255) twice, 124 (6 Feb 1255) twice, 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Cistercians at Pipewell in 1255 three times, and to Augustinians at Keynsham with her son John twice	1255-01-20
159	(*conversus*)	**Richard**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Owston in 1255 twice	1255-01-20
160	(*conversus*)	**Henry**	Brother to Hawis (#161)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at St. Augustine's, Bristol in 1255 three times along with sister Hawis; mentioned as being child of Richard—possibly Richard #159	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
161	(*conversa*)	**Hawis**	Sister to Henry (#160)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at St. Augustine's, Bristol in 1255 three times along with brother Henry; mentioned as being child of Richard—possibly Richard #159	1255-01-20
162	(*conversa*)	**Helewisa**	Sister to Walter (#194)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Premonstratensians at Bayham in 1255 three times (39/54, 39/124, 39/981) and to Thoby and Copham/Tapham with her brother Walter twice (39/125 and 39/981); her brother, Walter, is noted as being the son of Muriel	1255-01-20
163	(*conversus*)	**Philip**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cluniacs at Montacute in 1255 three times	1255-01-20
164	(*conversus*)	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Byland in 1255 three times	1255-01-20
165	**de Staunford**	**Richard**	Husband to Joan (#222)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Augustinians at Shelford in 1255 four times	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
166	(*conversus*)	**Stephen**	Brother to Geoffrey (#167)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Coggeshall in 1255 twice, both times with his brother Geoffrey; both he and his brother are noted as being the sons of Thomas	1255-01-20
167	(*conversus*)	**Geoffrey**	Brother to Stephen (#166)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Cistercians at Coggeshall in 1255 twice, both times with his brother Stephen; both he and his brother are noted as being the sons of Thomas; listed to Bukenham by himself later on 39/981—could be misreading of 'Buckingham'	1255-01-20
168	(*conversa*)	**Dionisia**	Mother to Juliana (#169)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Boxgrove in 1255 three times, every time with her daughter Juliana	1255-01-20
169	(*conversa*)	**Juliana**	Daughter of Dionisia (#168)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Boxgrove in 1255 three times, every time with her mother Dionisia	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
170	(*conversus*)	**Thomas**	Husband to Juliana (#171)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Dunkeswell in 1255 twice, both times with his wife Juliana	1255-01-20
171	(*conversa*)	**Juliana**	Wife to Thomas (#170)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Dunkeswell in 1255 twice, both times with her husband Thomas	1255-01-20
172	(*conversus*)	**Stephen**	Son of Thomas (#171)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Tilty in 1255 twice, noted as being the son of Thomas	1255-01-20
173	(*conversa*)	**Cristiana**	Wife to William (#419)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Malmesbury in 1255 twice; on 39/54 she is noted as being the wife of William le Seriant whose name is crossed out but was presumably going to be sent to Malmesbury as well, but on 39/981 his name is left intact and she is listed as going to Malmesbury by herself	1255-01-20
174	(*conversus*)	**Sibilla**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Worksop twice in 1255	1255-01-20
175	**of Nottingham**	**Juliana**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Premonstratensians at Newsham in 1255 twice	1255-01-20

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
176	**of Welbeck**	**Peter**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Premonstratensians at Welbeck in 1255 twice; noted as being the son of William	1255-01-20
177	**of Lincoln**	**Matilda**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)	Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 141	Listed to Benedictines at Holy Trinity, York in 1255 twice	1255-01-20
178	**de Hereford**	**Geoffrey**	Husband to Alice (#179)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Swineshead in 1255 twice, both times with Alice his wife	1255-01-20
179	**(*de Hereford*)**	**Alice**	Wife to Geoffrey (#178)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 54 (20 Jan 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Swineshead in 1255 twice, both times with Geoffrey her husband	1255-01-20
180	**of Oxford**	**Matilda**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25	Listed to Augustinians at Osney in 1255	1255-02-06
181	**(*conversus*)**	**John**	Son of Muriel (#158)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Keynsham in 1255 twice, both times with his mother Muriel	1255-02-06
182	**(*conversa*)**	**Juliana**	Mother to unnamed (#183, #184)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)		Listed to Benedictine nuns at Elstow in 1255 with her two unnamed daughters, noted that she is the wife of 'Roger' (unclear which)	1255-02-06

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
183	**(*conversa*)**	***Unnamed***		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)		Listed to Benedictine nuns at Elstow in 1255 with her mother and unnamed sister (#184)	1255-02-06
184	**(*conversa*)**	***Unnamed***		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)		Listed to Benedictine nuns at Elstow in 1255 with her mother and unnamed sister (#183)	1255-02-06
185	**de St. Laurence**	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)		Listed to Cistercians at Combe in 1255	1255-02-06
186	**of Winchester**	**Cristiana**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 124 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at St. Bartholomew's Smithfield in 1255 (39/124), as well as to Cistercians at Rufford (39/981)	1255-02-06
187	**of Canterbury**	**Richard**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 124 (6 Feb 1255), 204 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Bath in 1255 (twice)	1255-02-06
188	**(*conversa*)**	**Sibilla**	Daughter of Isabella (#72), sister to Simon (#73)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 124 (6 Feb 1255)		Listed to Cistercians at Flaxley in 1255 along with her brother Simon (#73)	1255-02-06

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
189	**of Darlington**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 125 (No date)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 136; Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 140	Listed to Augustinians at Darley in 1255; presumably named after his sponsor, John of Darlington, the king's dominican confessor who later became Archbishop of Dublin; Carpenter claims that this John of Darlington is the same as 'John the Convert' who was pardoned for his role in the crucifixion of Saint Hugh of Lincoln, but as the Fine Roll lists were created in 1255, and the pardon and conversion of 'John the Convert' who was involved in the crucifixion and subsequently imprisoned in the Tower of London did not happen until January of 1256, this is unlikely; see *John Conversus*, #244	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
190	**of London**	**Isabella (Ysabella)**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date); Close Rolls 1259-61, p. 101 (13 Aug 1260)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 286, 289, 290	Listed to Benedictines at Abbotsbury twice in 1255, noted that she received a special gift from the king of a tunic of russet brown cloth in 1260 (witnessed at Windsor)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
191	(*of Chesham*)	**Agnes**	Daughter of Sibilla (#66)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Missenden two times with her mother in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
192	(*of York*)	***Unnamed***	Wife to Laurence (#71) and mother to unnamed (#193)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed twice in 1255 to Hospital of St. Leonard, York, along with her husband Laurence of York (#71), and unnamed son (#193)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
193	(*of York*)	***Unnamed***	Son to Laurence (#71) and unnamed (#192)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed twice in 1255 to Hospital of St. Leonard, York, along with his unnamed mother (#193) and his father, Laurence (#71)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
194	(*conversus*)	**Walter**	Brother to Helewisa (#162)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (6 Feb 1255), 981 (No date)		Listed to 'Thoby' and 'Tapham'/'Copham' (unclear writing on MS) in 1255, both times with his sister Helewisa; noted as being the son of Muriel	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
195	(*conversa*)	**Alice**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to 'Surgeston' (unclear writing on MS) twice in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
196	(*conversus*)	**William**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Durham in 1255 twice; noted both times as being 'William, brother of Geoffrey'	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
197	**of Northampton**	**William**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date) twice, 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Benedictines at Belvoir in 1255 twice, as well as to Cistercians at Vaudey twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
198	**(*conversus*)**	**Robert**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Garendon in 1255 twice; noted that he was the son of Geoffrey	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
199	**of London**	**Richard**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Merevale in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
200	**(*conversus*)**	**Drogo**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Stoneleigh in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
201	**of Lincoln**	**Alice**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)	Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 141	Listed to Augustinians at Dunstable in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
202	**(*conversa*)**	**Cecilia**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Flaxley in 1255 twice, is noted as being the wife of William	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
203	**(*of Northampton*)**	**Agnes**	Daughter of William (#197)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Smithfield in 1255 twice, noted as being the daughter of William of Northampton	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
204	**Clerk**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Premonstratensians at Beauchief in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
205	**(*conversa*)**	**Agnes**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Sawtry in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
206	**of York**	**Henry**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Tynemouth in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
207	**of Oxford**	**Joan**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Milton Dorset in 1255 twice, noted in 39/125 that 'afterwards she had a second writ'	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
208	**of Gloucester**	**Edith**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 125 (No date), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Benedictines at Little Malvern in 1255 twice, and to Cistercians at Tintern Abbey later on 39/981	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
209	**of Northampton**	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Homcultram in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
210	**of York**	**Petronilla**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date) twice, 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Hexham in 1255 twice, and second time on 39/204 she is listed to Gilbertines at Bullington	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
211	**(*conversus*)**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 204 (No date)		Listed to 'Encresey' (writing illegible on MS) in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
212	**de St. Albans**	**John**	Husband to Sabina (#213)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to 'Culburn' (writing illegible on MS) in 1255 twice, and to Cistercians at Bishop's Cleeve (39/981)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
213	**(*de St. Albans*)**	**Sabina**	Wife to John (#212)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date), 981 (No date) twice		Listed to Cistercians at Kingswood in 1255 twice, and to Cistercians at Bishop's Cleeve (39/981)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
214	**of London**	**Joan**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Eynsham in 1255 twice	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
215	**(*conversa*)**	**Claremunda**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 204 (No date)		Listed to Benedictine nuns at Elstow in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
216	**de Sutton**	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 204 (No date)		Listed to Cluniacs at Daventry in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
217	**of Northampton**	**John**	Husband to Mabilla (#218)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 204 (No date)		Listed to Premonstratensians at Easby in 1255 along with his wife	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
218	**(*of Northampton*)**	**Mabilla**	Wife to John (#217)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 204 (No date)		Listed to Premonstratensians at Easby in 1255 along with her husband	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
219	(***conversus***)	**William**	Brother to Julia (#220)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Kirkham in 1255 with his sister Juliana (39/204), writing illegible on 39/981—looks like 'Merluf'	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
220	(***conversa***)	**Julia**	Sister to William (#219)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, nos. 204 (No date), 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Kirkham in 1255 with her brother William (39/204), writing illegible on 39/981—looks like 'Merluf'	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
221	**of Oxford**	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 25	Listed to Benedictines at Bury St. Edmunds in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
222	(***de Staunford***)	**Joan**	Wife to Richard (#165)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Tutbury in 1255 (mentioned with her husband Richard but sent to Tutbury alone)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
223	(***conversus***)	**John**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Lilleshall in 1255, noted as being the son of Thomas	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
224	(***conversa***)	**Joan**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Notley in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
225	**(*conversa*)**	**Emma**	Mother to Hawis (#226) and Hodierna (#227)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date) twice		Listed to 'Brethemhuh' in 1255 (writing illegible on MS), along with her daughters Hawis and Hodierna, and a second time on 39/981 she is listed to Premonstratensians at Langdon; noted on both entries that she was the wife of Richard	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
226	**(*conversa*)**	**Hawis**	Sister to Hodierna (#227) and daughter to Emma (#225)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to 'Brethemhuh' in 1255 (writing illegible on MS), along with her mother and sister	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
227	**(*conversa*)**	**Hodierna**	Sister to Hawis (#226) and daugther to Emma (#225)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to 'Brethemhuh' in 1255 (writing illegible on MS), along with her mother and sister	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
228	**of Winchester**	**Philip**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Little Wymondley in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
229	**of Nottingham**	**William**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to 'Markel' in 1255 (writing illegible on MS)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
230	(***conversus***)	**Peter**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Gilbertines at Newstead on Anchcolm in 1255; noted as being the son of William—possibly William of Nottingham (#229) because he is mentioned directly after	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
231	(***conversus***)	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Lancaster in 1255, along with Ingramus; possibly related to Ingramus (#232) because they are mentioned in the same entry	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
232	(***conversus***)	**Ingram**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Lancaster in 1255, along with Thomas; possibly related to Thomas (#231) because they are mentioned in the same entry	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
233	**Hul**	**Thomas**	Brother to unnamed (#234)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Hospital at Cockersand in 1255 along with his unnamed sister	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
234	(***unnamed***)	(***unnamed***)	Sister to Thomas (#233)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Hospital at Cockersand in 1255 along with her brother Thomas	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
235	(*conversus*)	**Nicholas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Bradenstoke in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
236	(*conversus*)	**Henry**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at St. James, Northampton in 1255, is noted as being the son of Cristiana	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
237	**of Derby**	**Juliana**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Cistercians at Haverholme in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
238	(*conversus*)	**Richard**	Husband to Elizabeth (#239)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Whitby in 1255 along with his wife Elizabeth	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
239	(*conversa*)	**Elizabeth**	Wife to Richard (#238)	*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at Whitby in 1255 along with her husband Richard	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
240	**of Norfolk**	**Thomas**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Benedictines at St. Nicholas, Exeter in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
241	**of London**	**Stephen**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Augustinians at Breamore in 1255	*c.*Hilary term, 1255
242	**of London**	**Robert**		*Fine Rolls, 39 Henry III, 1254-55*, no. 981 (No date)		Listed to Cluniacs at St. Helens, Isle of Wight in 1255 (alien priory dependent on Much Wenlock)	*c.*Hilary term, 1255

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
243	le Convers	William		*Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1251-60*, p. 204 (5 April 1255)		Convert, archer in the king's service in Gascony in 1255	1255-04-05
244	(*conversus*)	John		*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1247-58*, p. 457 (10 Jan 1256); Rymer's *Foedera*, i/i: p. 335 (10 January 1256)→ complete version of calendared *Patent Rolls* entry	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 287; Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion', p. 136; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, p. 190; Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 271	Imprisoned in the Tower of London for his role in the crucifixion of Hugh, the boy saint of Lincoln, saved his own life by accepting baptism; confused with convert John of Darlington in Carpenter, 'Crucifixion and Conversion' (see #189); no evidence that this convert, despite being converted by John of Darlington, was actually given 'of Darlington' as a name; Stacey calls him 'John of Lincoln', but he cannot be the same as John of Lincoln #31—they converted at different times	1256-01-10

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
245	of London	William		SC 1/2/79 (15 April 1258); *Calendar of Wills*, i, p. 58 (24 May 1282); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, A, p. 51 (24 June 1282)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141	Accepted by Augustinians at Leeds, Kent in 1258, with son, noted as being 'recently deceased' in 1282 reference, his will appears around that time as well; from Calendar of Wills reference, his son was named Hugh, and his wife Agnes; Wills entry refers to 'Hugh, his wife's son', possibly indicating a post-conversion marriage for William	1258-04-15
246	(*l'Eveske*)	Nicholas	Son to Elias (#81), brother to Adam (#247)	JUST 1/1187, m.10 (29 Dec 1258)		Converted at the same time as his father and brother	1258-12-29
247	(*l'Eveske*)	Adam	Son to Elias (#81), brother to Nicholas (#246)	JUST 1/1187, m.10 (29 Dec 1258)		Converted at the same time as his father and brother	1258-12-29
248	of London	Henry		*Close Rolls, 1259-61*, p. 324 (27 Dec 1260); *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 13 (11 Jan 1265)		Given a robe by the king in 1260 and again in 1265	1260-12-27

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
249	of Norwich	John		*Close Rolls, 1259-61*, p. 373 (25 April 1261)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 288	Allocated 8*d.* per week	1261-04-25
250	de Turri	Henry		*Close Rolls, 1259-61*, p. 397 (14 June 1261)		Given a robe by the king in 1261	1261-06-14
251	of Westminster	Richard		*Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 109-10 (1 April 1265)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141	King writes to abbot of St. Osyth's in 1265 demanding provision for Richard; **NB:** Greatrex refers to him as 'Roger' of Westminster	1265-04-01
252	of Grimsby	Matilda		*Close Rolls, 1264-68*, pp. 154-55 (13 Dec 1265)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 298	Convert who lived in the *domus*, committed a felony, fled the kingdom, money that had previously been paid to her was then paid to Hugh and John, chaplains (#64 and #65)	1265-12-13
253	(*the Convert*)	Samuel		*PEJ*, i, p. 132 (Trinity term, 1266)		Noted as being the son of Leo; involved in suit brought against him by the king as to whether debts of at least 40*s.* owed to him were discharged before or after his conversion; **NB:** debt was apparently to escheat to the king's son Edward, not the king himself as per custom	Trinity term, 1266

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
254	le Convers	John	Father to Ralph le Convers (#313)	*Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1260-67*, p. 296 (21 Oct 1267); *Cal. Liberate Rolls, 1267-72*, nos. 401 (26 Aug 1268), 633 (10 March 1269), 883 (5 Nov 1269), 1516 (15 May 1271), 1557 (8 July 1271), 1721 (10 Nov 1271), 1997 (12 July 1272); *Close Rolls, 1264-68*, p. 410 (4 Dec 1267); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, pp. 173 (10 Dec 1267), 328 (3 April 1269), 455 (17 Aug 1270), 464 (9 Oct 1270), 696 (28 March 1272); *Close Rolls, 1268-72*, pp. 26 (3 March 1269), 224 (3 Sept 1270), 313 (18 Dec 1270), 379 (28 Sept 1271), 458 (28 Jan 1272), 504 (8 Aug 1272); *Rotuli Hundredorum*, i, p. 469 (3 Edward I); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 18 (30 June 1273), 380 (30 April 1277); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 309 (28 April 1279), 368 (1 May 1280), 448 (6 July 1281); SC 1/45/28 (idem in *Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales*, p. 206) (8 Dec 1283); SC 1/48/74 (*c.*1284); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, pp. 148 (24 Dec 1284), 238 (26 April 1286); *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, i, no. 1529 (20 Nov 1289); E 101/468/2 (1289-92); E 101/468/4 (1290-92); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, pp. 171 (8 May 1291), 261 (1 April 1292); E 101/97/18 (1293-94);(***...continued below***)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 276; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 296	Convert granted sixpence a day for life, given houses in Westminster, lands in Middlesex, a wardship, annual supply of two tuns of wine (regranted in September 1309), paymaster to the army, also granted wardship of a minority estate in 1305, father of Ralph le Convers (*Letter-Books* reference from 1311), noted as being deceased in an entry in 1317	1267-10-21

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
				Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-95, pp. 157 (7 Dec 1294), 74 (17 Dec 1294), 59 (30 Dec 1294), 75 (14 Feb 1295), 66 (22 Feb 1295), 79 (22 Feb 1295), 219 (22 Feb 1295), 68 (22 March 1295), 78 (10 May 1295), 159 (22 June 1295), 198 (Aug-Oct 1295), 162 (4 Sept 1295), 163 (4 Sept 1295), 161 (6 Oct 1295); C 47/3/32/1 (1296-97); C 47/3/31 (1298-99); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, pp. 479 (21 Nov 1299), 495 (13 March 1300)(vacated), 615 (1 Nov 1301); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, pp. 473 (27 Oct 1301), 586 (11 June 1302); E 101/478/25 (1301-02); E 101/468/9 (1302-03); E 101/11/18 (1302-04); E 101/12/31 (1303-04); *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, iv, pp. 464 (13 April 1304), 466 (6 Sept 1304); *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1522 (27 April 1304); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 244 (12 March 1305)—For the petition relating to this see SC 8/266/13253; *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 331 (10 April 1305); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 12 (8 Nov 1307), 368 (25 April 1311); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 176 (14 Sept 1309), 287 (23 Oct 1310), 483 (17 Oct 1312); *Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous*, ii, no. 110 (25 April 1311); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, D, p. 77 (21 Sept 1311); *Fine Rolls, 1272-1307*, p. 527 (17 Oct 1305); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 216 (7 Feb 1315); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, pp. 463 (12 May 1317), 515 (31 Nov 1317); SC 8/50/2487 (1318)			

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
255	(*of Marlborough*)	Joiette*		Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 42 (Hilary term, 1268)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 66-7; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 33; Cohen, 'The Oxford Jewry in the Thirteenth Century', p. 311; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 213-14	Married to Solomon, Son of Lumbard of Cricklade, conversion caused lawsuit between her father and the Exchequer—father (Lumbard of Marlborough) had a new chirograph made for a debt originally in her name, Exchequer claimed that this credit should have escheated to the king as a result of conversion (Roth, *JMO*); for further references to the lawsuit that do not mention Joiette by name, see *PEJ*, i, pp. 131, 294	Hilary term, 1268
256	(*conversus*)	Isaac*		*PEJ*, i, p. 194 (Hilary term, 1268)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 68	Converted in 1262 while the Jewry was in the Lord Edward's hand; had a debt of 10*l.* escheat to Edward upon his conversion	Hilary term, 1268
257	(*the Convert*)	Solomon*		*PEJ*, i, p. 265 (Easter term, 1270)		Noted as being the son of Leo; a debt of 10*m.* had apparently escheated to the lord Edward, presumably after Solomon's conversion; debt was owed by Robert of Punchardon	Easter term, 1270

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
258	the Goldsmith	Nicholas	Husband to Maud (#259)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 645 (18 April 1272); *PEJ*, ii, p. 43 (Trinity, 1273); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, pp. 123 (11 June 1274), 107 (2 Nov 1274); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1272-81*, pp. 73 (3 Dec 1274), 74 (20 Dec 1274), 255 (18 Jan 1278); *Rotuli Hundredorum*, i, p. 428 (3 Edward I); E 101/249/22 (1274-77); *PEJ*, iii, pp. 57-8 (Michaelmas, 1275); *The London Eyre of 1276*, nos. 288, 306 (1276); *PEJ*, iv, pp. 151, 159, 174, 182 (all identical, ∼6 June 1277-25 Dec 1279); *PEJ*, vi, nos. 343 (Hilary, 1280), 1146 (Trinity term, 1281);*Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, B, pp. 4(8 Sept 1281), 5 (8 Sept 1281), 9 (21 Sept 1281), 13 (∼6 Dec 1281), 103 (∼15 Feb 1300-1); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, A, p. 45 (30 Nov 1281);*Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, C, pp. 49 (13 Oct 1299), 67 (6 May 1300)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 279; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 293-4, 296 (MR); Hillaby, 'The London Jewry: William I to John', p. 8; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 222-23	Granted convert's wages with his wife Maud despite never residing in the *domus*, imprisoned in 1274 for 'usurious extortion and for communication with usurers', while imprisoned he was fined because his servants fought in the Jewry, accused in London eyre of 1276 of robbery of horses and usury, extortion, and communicating with usurers, arrested in 1278 along with large portion of English Jewry on coin-clipping charges, released after finding mainpernors, sued in 1280 on behalf of Queen Consort; had a daughter named Margery	1272-04-18
259	(*the Goldsmith*)	Maud	Wife to Nicholas (#258)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1266-72*, p. 645 (18 April 1272)		Known only through her association with her husband Nicholas, mentioned once as receiving the typical female converts' allowance of 8*d.* per week	1272-04-18

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
260	(*conversus*)	Benedict*		E 401, no. 1567 (1272)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 285	(Per Adler) Participated in the paying of a tallage in 1272 and is recorded as being a Jew despite his last name; possibly a Jew who had converted and then re-apostasized	1272
261	(*of Kent*)	Henry	Son of William (#122), brother of John (#262)	*Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 524 (10-17 Sept 1272)		Sent to Cistercians at Biddlesden Abbey by himself in September 1272, was to be given the necessities of life *quo ad vixerit*	1272-09-10
262	(*of Kent*)	John	Son of William (#122), brother of Henry (#261)	*Close Rolls, 1268-72*, p. 524 (10-17 Sept 1272)		Sent to Premonstratensians at West Dereham Abbey with his father, William (#122) in 1272	1272-09-10
263	of Bedford	Slemma*		*PEJ*, ii, pp. 94-5 (Michaelmas term, 1273); C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216, 217	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, involved in a plea charging a man with assault in 1273 (prior to conversion)	Michaelmas term, 1273

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
264	of Worcester	Alice		SC 1/16/63 (∼1274) (this is printed in Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 347; Tanquerey, *Recueil de Lettres Anglo-Françaises (1265-1399)*, no. 61) (Tanquerey dates this to 1289); SC 1/24/201 (post-Jan 1275); Bodleian Library, MS. Bodley 692, fol. 89v (no date); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141, 142; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 290	Three letters survive about her case: first written to Edward in 1274 in French, second in Latin, third is from Edward to monks at Worcester, reprimanding them for their disobediance to his father (all Greatrex); entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292; Alice had a son—unknown whether or not he was a convert	1274
265	(*conversa*)	Roesia		*PEJ*, ii, pp. 209-10 (Michaelmas term, 1274)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 217	Mentioned along with Juliana, convert (#266), as having converted and being placed in the custody of Juliana, subsequently kidnapped by Jews and never heard from again; **NB:** Could be identical to Rose #293	Michaelmas term, 1274

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
266	la Converse	Juliana		*PEJ*, ii, pp. 209-10 (Michaelmas term, 1274); *PEJ*, iii, pp. 18 (Michaelmas term, 1275), 41-2 (Michaelmas term, 1275); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 482 (7 Nov 1278); SC 1/16/177 (26 July *c.*1275-85)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 33, 88 (MR); Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 280	Claimed to have been abducted by Jews after her conversion, tormented, was apparently sent to France by her abductors but the ship stopped at Sandwich, Juliana escaped, attempted to claim 1,000*m.* in damages from the London Jewry, failed	Michaelmas term, 1274
267	(*de Hamslap*)	Joan		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1272-79*, p. 159 (19 March 1275)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 284	Entered *domus* on 19 March 1275 with her entire family, received house within enclosure of the *domus* as well as the daily alms due to converts; 'Hamslap' is likely Hanslope, Buckinghamshire	1275-03-19

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
268	(*la Converse*)	Milka* (Milca, Milcana, Milkana)		*PEJ*, ii, pp. 288 (Trinity term, 1275), 295 (Trinity term, 1275); *PEJ*, iii, pp. 22 (Michaelmas term, 1275), 34-5 (Michaelmas term, 1275), 177 (Trinity term, 1276); Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 99-100 (Trinity term, 1277); C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216, 218	Allegedly relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, involved in suit with the Crown which was attempting to recover her property because of her conversion (case hinged on whether her property had been transferred to Aaron Crispin prior to her conversion or after it), jury found she had never converted; noted as being the wife of Sakerell	Trinity term, 1275
269	*Conversus*	Henry		*Annales Monastici*, iii, p. 265 (1275)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 280; Greatrex, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts', p. 141	Arrived at Dunstable priory in 1275 with a letter from the Pope asking for necessities for him and his family, prior denied the papal request (letter from the Pope is not extant), arranged for him to be provisioned elsewhere; Dunstable Priory could be either Augustinian or Dominican—both were in Bedfordshire	1275

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
270	of Bedford	Benet*	Brother to Jacob (#295), father to Pucella (#297)	*PEJ*, iii, pp. 148 (Trinity term, 1276), 288 (Trinity term, 1277); C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282); E 101/249/22 mm.5, 6 (1274-1277); Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 125-27 (Easter term, 1283)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216, 217	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, brother of Jacob (#295); appears as an essoin twice in the late 1270s (prior to conversion), payments by him were entered in *domus* accounts (from Logan, re: E 101 reference) despite the fact that he was never actually there; involved in a case where he and his brother confessed to committing fraud against foreign merchants in Bedford	Trinity term, 1276
271	Conversus de Riseburn	Richard		*Rotuli Hundredorum*, i, p. 128 (4 Edward I)		Appears on a witness list in the Hundred Rolls in 1275-6	4 Edward I

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
272	le Tanur (de la Tur)(*of London)	John (*Abraham)		*PEJ*, v, nos. 577 (Michaelmas term, 1278), 888 (Michaelmas term, 1278); JUST 1/486, m.37d (1281); JUST 1/493, m.38d (1281-84); JUST 1/497, m.48d (1282)	Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, part II', p. 169	Formerly known as Abraham of London, Jew, involved in a suit with one Matthew *aurifaber*, who attested that Abraham had converted to Christianity; Matthew appealed Abraham and then did not turn up, but the jury attested that everything was true; Abraham was an accused clipper of coin, jailed at Dover castle in 1278	Michaelmas term, 1278
273	of Bristol	Menand* (Mendaunt)		E 372/123, mm.44d-45 (Michalmas term, 1278)	Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, part II', pp. 159, 203; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 223-4; Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls', ii, pp. 74-6 (reproducing E 372 reference)	Converted Jew who forfeited chattels worth 177*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.* upon his conversion	1278-10-01
274	of Bristol	Meir*		*Accounts of the constables of Bristol Castle in the thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries*, ed. Margart Sharp, pp. 11, 23, 29, 38, 48, 57—mss refs. contained therein include E 372/124/m.24 (1278-79); E 372/126/m.6 (1280-81); SC 6/851/1 (1284-85)		Deceased by 1278-79; owned a house/tenement in Bristol later farmed out at 5*s.* per year	Michaelmas term, 1279

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
275	le Convers of Oxford	William		Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 113 (Easter term, 1280); *PEJ*, vi, no. 492 (Easter term, 1280)→ untranslated version of same plea printed in Rigg, *Select pleas*, above; *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, A, p. 43 (13 Oct 1288); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 397 (8 Feb 1290)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 162; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 301, 303; Lipman, 'The Anatomy of Medieval Anglo-Jewry', p. 64	Was a chaplain of the *domus*, sent to collect chevage in 1278 with John le Clerk (goldsmith, #276), accounts in 1280 for collected amounts, is assaulted in 1290 by Jews, oyer ordered	Easter term, 1280
276	le Clerk (Bele, le Bel, Goldsmith, *aurifaber*)	John		Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 113; *PEJ*, vi, no. 492 (Easter term, 1280)→ untranslated version of same plea printed in Rigg, *Select pleas*, above; E 101/249/24 (1280); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 447 (10 Aug 1295); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Stokes, *Studies in Anglo-Jewish History*, p. 65; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 301, 303, 304	Chaplain of the *domus*, sent to collect chevage in 1278 with William le Convers (#275), accounts in 1280 for collected amounts, owned lands in London and Middlesex; entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1280-04-01

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
277	(*of Oxford*)	Belaset* (Belasez)	Sister to Hittecote (#278)	*PEJ*, vi, nos. 653 (Trinity term, 1280), 691 (Trinity term, 1280), 914 (Easter term, 1281)→ repeat of entry in Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 114 (Easter term, 1281)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 36, 133, 161; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 300-1, 303; Margoliouth, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain*, pp. 254-55; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 242-43	Wife/Widow of Solomon of Alecetre, converted by 1280 along with her sister Hittecote (#278), and Floria Tapay (#279), had nine books worth 2*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*, even though she entered the *domus* before the order whereby converts were allowed a moiety of their property (with the other half being given to the *domus*), the king allowed her to retain half, contrary to the existing arrangement (all property escheated); **NB:** Margoliouth renders her as a male named 'Belager'	Trinity term, 1280

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
278	(*of Oxford*)	Hittecote*	Sister to Belaset (#277)	*PEJ*, vi, nos. 653 (Trinity term, 1280), 691 (Trinity term, 1280), 914 (Easter term, 1281)→ repeat of entry in Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 114 (Easter term, 1281)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 36, 133, 161; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 303; Saltman, *The Jewish Question in 1655*, pp. 242-43	Baptized in the reign of Edward I along with her sister Belaset (#277),and Floria Tapay (#279), had nine books worth 2*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*, even though she entered the *domus* before the order whereby converts were allowed a moiety of their property (with the other half being given to the *domus*), the king allowed her to retain half, contrary to the existing arrangement (all property escheated)	Trinity term, 1280
279	Tapay	Floria*		*PEJ*, vi, nos. 653 (Trinity term, 1280), 691 (Trinity term, 1280)		Converted at the same time as Belaset (#277) and Hittecote (#278), wife/widow of Solomon of Brubrok', special grace given by the king to Belaset and Hittecote regarding the escheat of their property applied to Floria as well	Trinity term, 1280

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
280	le Convers (of Winchester)	Henry		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, pp. 22-23 (8 June 1280); *Ancient Deeds*, i, no. A1651 (no date); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 293 (MR)	Converted, all property escheated to the crown as per usual, a Jew named Sampson of Staunden claimed some of the convert Henry's escheated chattels as his, after an inquiry showed this to be correct, the king ordered the goods to be returned to Sampson; Ancient Deeds reference has him married to a woman named Margaret	1280-06-08
281	of Northampton	Barnabas	Husband to Agnes (#282), father to Joan (#283)	*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, pp. 25 (27 June 1280), 28 (25 July 1280); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 300 (MR)	Barnabas, wife, and daughter all convert; allowed to keep all of their property upon conversion, contrary to custom; entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1280-06-27
282	(*of Northampton*)	Agnes	Wife to Barnabas (#281), mother to Joan (#283)	*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, pp. 25 (27 June 1280), 28 (25 July 1280)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 300	Converts along with husband and daughter, allowed to keep all property upon conversion, contrary to custom	1280-06-27

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
283	(*of Northampton*)	Joan	Daughter of Barnabas (#281) and Agnes (#282)	*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 28 (25 July 1280); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 300	Same as Agnes and Barnabas, above (#281 and #282); she specifically was to have restitution of the goods and chattels that she held prior to her conversion; entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1280-07-25
284	(*of Northampton*)	Mabel		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 29 (26 July 1280)	Stacey, 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity', p. 280; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 31, 293	Daughter of the Jew Sadekin, converted, father left her 20*m.* in his will, Jewish friends of her father (Jacob de Bedeford and Gena his wife) withheld the inheritance because of her conversion, king ruled that she should receive it	1280-07-26
285	the Convert (*of London*)	Laurence		E 101/249/24 (1280)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 303	Son of Josce of London, had converted by 1280; noted that he had chattels worth 40s. upon his conversion	1280
286	de Holm	Mannyng*		*Cal. Charter Rolls, 1257-1300*, p. 246 (5 Dec 1280); E 9/67, m.1 (Michaelmas term, 1283)	Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, part II', p. 201	Forfeited houses in Stanford in 1280, mentioned as a convert in 1283	1280-12-05

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
287	(*Conversus*)	Salomon*		E 9/37, m.13 (Easter term, 1281), m. 10; *PEJ*, vi, no. 1216 (Trinity term, 1281)	Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, part II', pp. 177, 210	Noted as being the son of Jornin of Norwich; has a son named Cok who is convicted of trespasses concerning money, is fined, and abjures England for three years when he is unable to pay his fine	Easter term, 1281
288	(*Conversa*)	Floria		E 9/39, m.4d (Hilary term, 1282)		Mentioned simply as being a recent convert	Hilary term, 1282
289	of Caversham	John		E 9/39, m.6 (Hilary term, 1282)		Sues John Gerard, monk of Chamberlan of Reading for detention of a horse	Hilary term, 1282
290	(*la Converse*)	Bessa*	Sister-in-law of Swetecote (#291)	C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted as being the wife of Abraham	1282-11-14

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
291	(*la Converse*)	Swetecote*	Sister-in-law of Bessa (#290)	C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 500 (10 Feb 1288)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216, 218	Allegedly relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted as being the sister of the same Abraham to whom Bessa (#290) was married; mentioned elsewhere that she was the wife of Moses de Horndon and that she had been 'maliciously charged' by an enemy as having been baptized, but in fact had not been	1282-11-14
292	(*la Converse*)	Anigote*		C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted as being the wife of Mendinus le Petit	1282-11-14
293	of Dorking	Rose		C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan,' Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216, 217	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters; **NB:** Could be identical to Rose #265	1282-11-14
294	of Bristol	Bela*		C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters	1282-11-14

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
295	(*of Bedford*)	Jacob*	Brother to Benet (#270), uncle to Pucella (#297)	C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282); Rigg, *Select pleas*, pp. 125-27 (Easter term, 1283); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 500 (10 Feb 1288); E 101/119/12; E 372/123, m.22 (Michaelmas term, 1278)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216; Rokeah, 'Money and the Hangman, part II', p. 193; Rokeah, 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls', i, p. 33 (reproducing E 372 reference)	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted as being the brother of Benet (#270); owed money for Jews' books that had been sold to him; involved in a case where he and his brother confessed to committing fraud against foreign merchants in Bedford (relapse of conversion appears on C 255/18/5B); **NB:** Rokeah believes Jacob of Bedford to be the same person as Jacob son of Peytevin of Bedford (see Rokeah, 'Money and the hangman, part II', p. 194)	1282-11-14
296	of Winchester	Belia*		C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters	1282-11-14
297	(*of Bedford*)	Pucella*	Daughter of Benet (#270), niece of Jacob (#295)	C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters	1282-11-14

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
298	(*of Alemeyn*)	Motta*		C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', p. 216	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted as being the daughter of Isaac Alemeyn	1282-11-14
299	(*la Converse*)	Hennecote*		C 255/18/5B (14 Nov 1282); C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)		Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted as a 'Jewess living *in domo Elie*'	1282-11-14
300	(*Unnamed*)	(*Unnamed*)		C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216-17	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted only as being the 'daughter of Creisse son of Gente' who was himself a very active Jew in both juries and litigation	1282-11-18
301	(*le Chauntur*)	(*Unnamed*)		C 85/3/71 (18 Nov 1282)	Logan, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity', pp. 216, 217	Relapsed convert; mentioned in John of Peckham's letters, noted only as being the 'daughter of Vives le Chauntur'; name was crossed off of the draft writ	1282-11-18

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
302	(*of Pavely*)	Samuel*		Rigg, *Select pleas*, p. 125 (Easter term, 1283)		Noted as being son of Moses of Pavely; Involved in a suit after his conversion, wherein the king was attempting to claim a debt of 10*m.* owed to Samuel by several men, they in turn claimed that they had paid it before his conversion	Easter term, 1283
303	le Convers (of Babbingleye)	Nicholas	Father to Thomas (#321)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 76 (30 Sept 1283); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 506 (25 May 1288); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 118 (16 Jan 1290); Cal. *Fine Rolls, 1272-1307*, pp. 523 (11 July 1305), 527 (26 Sept 1305); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 257 (8 April 1305); *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, iv, no. 259 (21 July 1305); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 371 (27 July 1305); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 597 (24 Feb 1318)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 297 (MR)	Keeper of the forest of the Peak, died in 1305, mentioned in PR entry (16 June 1310) as being the deceased former keeper of the forest of the Peak	1283-09-30
304	le Convers (aurifaber)	Stephen	Father to Peter (#305)	*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 450 (27 May 1287); E 13/13, m.6 (Michaelmas term, 1288)		Imprisoned in the Tower of London with his son for treasure found by them in Reading in 1287; local resistance to his arrest by the Chamberlain of the Abbot of Reading	1287-05-27

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
305	(*le Convers*)	Peter	Son of Stephen (#304)	*Cal. Close Rolls, 1279-88*, p. 450 (27 May 1287); E 13/13, m.6 (Michaelmas term, 1288)		Imprisoned in the Tower of London with his father for treasure found by them in Reading in 1287; local resistance to his arrest by the Chamberlain of the Abbot of Reading	1287-05-27
306	of Winchester	Thomas	Son of Henry (#102) and Clarice (#106)	C 241/2/243 (1288); C 241/2/72 (1291); C 241/56/136 (1295); C 241/56/138 (1295); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, pp. 434 (24 Aug 1299), 617 (16 Oct 1301); C 241/49/127 (1300); C 241/35/175 (28 March 1301); *Parliamentary Writs*, ii, p. 590 no. 263 (20 June 1322)		Pardoned in 1299 for breaking out of prison in London where he was for an unpaid debt, pardoned in 1301 for a litany of charges; mentioned in both entries as being the son of Henry the Convert of Winchester; summoned to perform military service in person against the Scots in 1322; not likely a convert	1288
307	Ridelestre	G.		*The Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide at Oxford*, i, no. 511 (*c.*1284-94)		Had hereditary lands in 'Yrissemannestrete' in Oxford, in the parish of St. Mary Magdalene; lands given to John Sewy and Agnes his wife	*c.*1284-1294

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
308	of St. Paul	Eleanor		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1288-96*, p. 27 (8 Nov 1289); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 300, 309	Was allowed to keep the entirety of her property upon conversion at the instance of the king's daughter; entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time (Alienora Conuers and Eleanor are one and the same, given the subsequent entry); was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1289-11-08
309	le But (of Cricklade)	Philip		*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 398 (18 Feb 1290)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 301	Referred to as 'proctor' in the Patent Rolls, is a chaplain (according to Adler), sent with John (#310) to collect the chevage for 1289, 1290, as well as the arrears for 1287 and 1288	1290-02-18

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
310	of Havenaked (Havenak)	John	Father to John (#342)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1281-92*, p. 398 (18 Feb 1290); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 301, 315	Referred to as 'proctor' in the Patent Rolls, is a chaplain (according to Adler), sent with Philip (#309) to collect the chevage for 1289, 1290, as well as the arrears for 1287 and 1288, entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; Adler writes that his name was changed to John le Ebreu, but no reference; E 101 reference is to John le Ebreu; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34; 'Havenak' is likely Halnaker, Sussex	1290-02-18
311	le Convers	Roger	Son of Roger (#108), Agnes (#415)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1291-1301*, p. 80 (13 July 1294); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 417 (28 Jan 1301); *Feet of Fines for Essex*, ii, no. 75 (Trinity term, 1309); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 597 (24 Feb 1318); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1317-21*, p. 140 (10 May 1318)		Appeared on a list of mainpernors in 1294, acquitted of 6*s.* 8*d.*, releases the rights he held on lands in Kelewedon, Essex, to his mother Agnes (#415), and her new husband, Miles de Mounteny	1294-07-13

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
312	(conversus)	Alexander		*****Chapter 6 of this thesis makes use of every available primary-source reference for Alexander*****	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 296; McNamee, *The Wars of the Bruces*, p. 175; Cotton, *Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae*, iii, p. 180; Ware, *A Commentary on the Prelates of Ireland*, p. 64	*****See chapter 6 of this thesis*****	1294-10-24
313	(*conversus*)	Ralph	Son of John le Convers (#254)	*Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-95*, p. 131 (Michaelmas term, 1295); *Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, ii, no. 1600 (12 Oct 1304); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 458 (22 July 1306); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 139 (14 Oct 1308), 428 (5 Feb 1312); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, D, p. 77 (21 Sept 1311); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, pp. 93 (10 March 1314), 636 (2 March 1317); SC 8/50/2486 (1318); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1317-21*, pp. 497 (9 Aug 1320), 561 (11 Feb 1321); SC 8/227/11317 (∼1327—perhaps not this Ralph)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 296	Purchased jewels on behlf of the king, was a king's sergeant-at-arms, entrusted with enforcing the prohibition against holding a tournament at Leicester in 1308, acted as somewhat of a quartermaster to the king, granted an office of tronage in Newcastle-upon-Tyne in 1317; son of John le Convers (#254) according to Letter-Books reference; was perhaps a goldsmith	Michaelmas term, 1295

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
314	le Convers (gold-smith)	Robert		*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1292-1301*, pp. 361-62 (15 Sept 1298)—for similar petition, see SC 1/30/91 (Sept 1298); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, C, pp. 67 (6 May 1300), 188-9 (28 May 1301); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 115 (12 Feb 1303); *Rot. Parl.*, i, p. 474, no. 84 (No date, but likely 1302-3); *Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls, 1298-1307*, pp. 147 (14 Sept 1303), 171 (27 March 1305), 238 (22 Feb 1305-6); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 296 (26 Oct 1305)—For the petition relating to this see SC 8/10/468; *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 361 (20 Jan 1306); *Calendar of Wills*, i, p. 214 (25 July 1310); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, D, pp. 184-6 (28 June 1321), 188 (24 June 1314), 214 (13 Jan 1309-10), 234 (3 Aug 1310)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 297	Convert jeweller and goldsmith, had queen as a client, at various points she owed him 27*l.* 5*s.* 8*d.* and 54*l.* 11*s.* 4*d.*; mentioned in various other places along with wife and several children—no reason to assume any of these are converts; reference in *Letter-Books, F* discusses daughter, Katharine, and her goldsmith husband (1345)	1298-09-15
315	le Convers (brewer)	Nicholas		*Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls, 1298-1307*, p. 19 (7 Nov 1298)		Summoned in an entry in the mayor's court roll in 1298	1298-11-07

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
316	the Convert	Martin	Husband to Juliana (#401)	*Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 319 (5 Oct 1299); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, B, p. 137 (1 May 1304); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 332 (12 May 1305); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 151 (3 May 1309), 334 (15 Oct 1310); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 356 (6 Oct 1315); SC 8/4/154 (1320)→ also found in *Rot. Parl.*, i, p. 378 no. 66; SC 8/103/5120 (1320)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 310-13 (MR)	Horse-dealer convert; has a wife named Juliana, petitions king for sustenance for him and his family	1299-10-05
317	la Converse (*le Ireys*)	Alice		*Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls, 1298-1307*, p. 98 (12 Nov 1300)		Appears in a plea of eloignment in 1300, married to William le Ireys	1300-11-12
318	la Converse	Margery		SC 1/28/93 (Mar-Dec 1303)		King's corrody request is denied by David, Abbot of St. Osyth's	March, 1303

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
319	of Oxford	Richard		*Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, B, p. 106 (11 June 1301); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, C, p. 105 (21 Dec 1301); Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 356 (6 Oct 1315); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, p. 309	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time, acted as a witness to an indenture along with John the Skinner (#337); indenture involved Martin le Convers (#316), and Hugh le Convers, chaplain of the *domus* (#64); reference in letter-books indicates he was married to a woman called Christina; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34; **NB:** Adler misidentifies the toponymic as 'of Exeter'; notes that Richard was a tailor (no source), and also refers to him as 'Richard the Elder'; E 101 reference is to 'Ricardo Cissori'	1301-06-11
320	le Convers of Burgh	William		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1296-1302*, p. 530 (15 June 1302)		Received 6*d.* in alms per week from the issues of the manor of Burgh, regranted these alms elsewhere after the manor was granted to the Earl of Norfolk, Roger Bygod	1302-06-15

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
321	le Convers	Thomas	Son to Nicholas (#303)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1301-07*, p. 196 (17 Oct 1303); *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem*, iv, no. 259 (21 July 1305); Cal. *Fine Rolls, 1272-1307*, p. 527 (26 Sept 1305); *Feet of Fines for Essex*, ii, no. 64 (Hilary term, 1309); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, p. 461 (24 May 1312); *Calendar of Wills*, i, p. 524 (22 Feb 1348); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, A, p. 210 (No date);		Heir of Nicholas, performed homage to the king in order to receive his inheritance, later involved in a suit against John le Convers (#414), is left a tenement in 1348	1303-10-17
322	le Convers of Chalford	Roger		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 343 (5 Aug 1305)		Mentioned as being the husband of Alice in a case concerning replevin of land; no evidence that Alice is also a convert	1305-08-05
323	le Convers	William		*Cal. Close Rolls, 1302-07*, p. 348 (6 Oct 1305)		Witness to an enrolment of release in chancery	1305-10-06
324	le Convers	Thomas		*Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 485 (12 Feb 1307; 17 June 1307)		Soldier; lost horses in king's service in Scotland; first horse valued at 10*m.*, lost at Sanquhar, Dumfs., on 8 May 1307; second horse valued at 10*l.*, lost at the abbey of Fail in Ayrs., on 17 June 1307	1307-02-12

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
325	(*le Convers*)	Robert	Son of Stephen (#326) and Matilda (#327)	C 143/68/8 (July 1307-July 1308); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1330-34*, p. 259 (17 March 1332); C 143/220/6 (Jan 1332-Jan 1333); *Rotulorum Originalium*, ii, p. 74 (no date)		Appears in a confirmation that the manor of West Barming will pass to him on the death of Stephen (presumably his father, #326); possibly not a convert	July 1307-July 1308
326	le Convers	Stephen	Husband to Matilda (#327), father to Robert (#325)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 61 (12 March 1308), 68 (12 May 1308); C 143/68/8 (July 1307-July 1308); C 143/220/6 (Jan 1332-Jan 1333); *Rotulorum Originalium*, ii, p. 74 (no date)		Granted the manor of West Barming, Kent, and the advowson of the church there, along with his wife Matilda	1308-03-12
327	of Huntingdon	Matilda	Wife to Stephen (#326), mother to Robert (#325)	*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1307-13*, pp. 61 (12 March 1308), 68 (12 May 1308); C 143/68/8 (July 1307-July 1308); C 143/220/6 (Jan 1332-Jan 1333); *Rotulorum Originalium*, ii, p. 74 (no date)		Granted the manor of West Barming, Kent, and the advowson of the church there, along with her husband Stephen, which was to be passed down to her heirs	1308-03-12

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
328	of Oxford	Nicholas		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1327-30*, p. 445 (17 March 1329); *Feet of Fines for Essex*, iii/i, no. 50 (Michaelmas Term, 1329); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 162; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 316, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time, survived until at least 1331, occasionally acted as attorney for the Warden of the *domus*, married to a woman named Sarah; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34; entry referencing a Nicholas le Convers in *The Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide at Oxford*, i, no. 506 is dated to 1260-1270, making it slightly too early—editor advances the possibility that the entry refers to a lay-brother; **NB:** Roth believes these two to be one and the same	1308-11-24
329	of Oxford	Isolda		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 162; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
330	la Converse (of Oxford)	Hawisia (Havisa)		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1321-24*, p. 270 (3 April 1323); *Liber Albus Civitatis Oxoniensis*, ed. W.P. Ellis, p. 13 (Aug-Oct 1332)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 105, 162; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Sold property to Thomas de Hereford, Common Sergeant of the University, entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; given protection with clause volumus in 1323	1308-11-24
331	de Merton	Peter		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, pp. 161-2	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
332	of Cricklade	Robert		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 167; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Possibly part of the same family as Thomas of Cricklade (#333) and William of Cricklade (#334), as the family was the only one known to be associated with Cricklade (Wiltshire) in the Middle Ages (Roth, *JMO*); entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
333	of Cricklade	Thomas		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii/i: p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 167; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Possibly part of the same family as Robert of Cricklade (#332) and William of Cricklade (#334), as the family was the only one known to be associated with Cricklade (Wiltshire) in the Middle Ages (Roth, *JMO*); entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
334	of Cricklade	William		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 228 (11 June 1315); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Roth, *The Jews of Medieval Oxford*, p. 167; Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 311, 312, 350-52	Possibly part of the same family as Robert of Cricklade (#332) and Thomas of Cricklade (#333), as the family was the only one known to be associated with Cricklade (Wiltshire) in the Middle Ages (Roth, *JMO*); entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time, also mentioned as being one of two convert chaplains of the *domus* (the other being John of Northampton, #370) involved in a suit against the keeper of the *domus*, Adam de Osgodeby, regarding the allotment of lettings within the *domus*, found by royal inquiry to be a generally disreputable person and his complaints to be false; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
335	of Bristol	Christiana (Christina)		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 184, 350-52	Convert, still living at the time of the 1308 inquiry into the affairs of the *domus*; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34; Adler states that Christina was one of three known Bristol Jews to have converted (including John #48 and Joan #49)—untrue, as Isabel #40 was also from Bristol	1308-11-24
336	of Stamford (de Staunford, de Estaunfort)	Margery (Margaret)		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 184 (11 June 1315); SC 8/158/7875 (*c.*1 June 1315)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 309, 350-52 (MR)	Granted her convert's allowance which had been discontinued, as during the 1308 inquiry into the affairs of the *domus* she had been too ill to appear before the inquiry, and therefore was entered in that inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
337	le Philiper (the Skinner)	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 356 (6 Oct 1315)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 309, 310, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time, was a witness to an indenture involving Martin le Convers (#316) and Hugh le Convers, chaplain of the *domus* (#64)	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
338	of Oxford (clericus)	Henry		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Calendar of Letter-Books of the City of London*, D, p. 310 (No date); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 309, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; acted as an Arbalester between 1309 and 1314; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34; **NB:** Adler misidentifies his toponymic as 'of Exeter'	1308-11-24
339	la Bossue	Juliana		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 309, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
340	Furberesse	Petronilla		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 309, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
341	of St. Paul	Isabella		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Patent Rolls, 1330-34*, p. 122 (13 April 1331); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 309, 350-52	God-daughter of Queen Isabella (wife of Edward II), given 8*d.* from the queen of the issues of Ponthieu, entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
342	(*of Havenaked*)	John	Son of John of Havenaked (#310)	Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
343	of Havenaked	Alice		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time, presumably related to John (#310) and his son John (#342)	1308-11-24
344	of Winchester	Bartholomew		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
345	of Winchester	Reginald		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
346	of Lincoln	Thomas		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
347	of St. Saviour	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
348	of Sudbury (*Southbery*)	Robert		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; **NB:** Adler misidentifies the name as 'Robert of Sutherby'	1308-11-24
349	of Bury	John	Father to William (#350)	Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
350	(*of Bury*)	William	Son of John (#349)	Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
351	of Stamford	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
352	of Chichester	Richard		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; perhaps named after the bishop?	1308-11-24
353	of Rochester	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; **NB:** Adler misidentifies the name as 'Johannes de Rossa'	1308-11-24
354	of Lincoln	Laurence		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
355	of Belsham	Joan		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; presumably named after her sponsor Hugh of Balsham, Bishop of Ely as of September 1256	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
356	of St. Helen	Alice		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
357	of Wallingford	Agnes		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
358	of Northampton	Juliana		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
359	la Converse	Edith		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
360	la Converse	Claricia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 313, 314, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
361	of Northampton	Lecia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; **NB:** Adler misidentifies her as 'Letitia'	1308-11-24
362	of Northampton	Amicia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; possible related to Amicia #392 **NB:** Adler misidentifies her as 'Anne'	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
363	of Gellingham	Christina		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; **NB:** Adler misidentifies her toponymic as 'Gillingham'	1308-11-24
364	of Stamford	Agnes		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
365	of Lincoln	Petronilla		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
366	of Norwood	Petronilla		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; **NB:** Adler identifies the toponymic as 'Morwood'; it seems likely that the scribe mis-heard 'Norwood'	1308-11-24
367	of St. Denis	Emma		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24
368	of Norwich	Joan		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
369	of Merwelle (I)	Richard		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62a (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* in 1292 but since dead; 'Merwelle' is Marwell, Hampshire	1308-11-24
370	of Northampton	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 228 (11 June 1315); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 311, 312, 315, 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time, one of the convert chaplains of the *domus* along with William of Cricklade (#334), involved in a suit against the keeper of the *domus*, Adam de Osgodeby, withdrew charges before the suit was finished; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
371	of Ware	Richard		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; presumably named after his sponsor, Richard of Ware who was Abbot of Westminster beginning in 1258	1308-11-24
372	of Arches	Ralph		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; possible connection with the Court of Arches	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
373	of Kent	Gregory		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; **NB:** Both Rymer and Adler misidentify the toponymic as 'Canterbury'	1308-11-24
374	Betere	Reginald		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; **NB:** Both Adler and Rymer identify the last name as 'Beccer' and 'Becere', respectively	1308-11-24
375	(*conversus*)	Saier		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
376	Burd	Roger		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34; **NB:** Adler misidentifies the last name as 'Bard'	1308-11-24
377	of Paris	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
378	of Canterbury	Robert		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
379	of Soudan	William		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; **NB:** Adler misidentifies the toponymic as 'of Sounden'	1308-11-24
380	de Kendal	Hugh		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)		Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; presumably named after his sponsor, Hugh de Kendal, who was a Clerk of the Chancery under Edward I	1308-11-24
381	of Merwelle (II)	Richard		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; 'Merwelle' is Marwell, Hampshire	1308-11-24
382	of Arundel	William		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
383	of Winchester	William		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
384	of Arundel	Mabel		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
385	of Norwich	Juliana		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
386	of Leicester	Joan		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
387	de Brugge (*de Ponte; Bridgewater*)	Alice		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34; possibly named after John de Ponte	1308-11-24
388	of Winchester	Alice		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
389	of Canterbury	Elena		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
390	of St. Radegund	Agnes		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; associated with the house of St. Radegund, Cambridge	1308-11-24
391	of Warwick	Christina		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
392	of Northamp-ton	Amicia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; possibly related to Amicia #362 **NB:** Adler omits Amicia from his transcription of the list on pp. 350-52	1308-11-24
393	of Oxford	Alice		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34; **NB:** Both Adler and Rymer identify her toponymic as 'of Exeter'	1308-11-24
394	of Kendal	Juliana		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34; presumably named after her sponsor, Hugh de Kendal, who was a Clerk of the Chancery under Edward I	1308-11-24
395	of Kendal	Christina		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; presumably named after her sponsor, Hugh de Kendal, who was a Clerk of the Chancery under Edward I	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
396	of Nottingham	Joan		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
397	of Canterbury	Ermentrude		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; **NB:** both Adler and Rymer trascribe her given name as 'Ermedruta'; this seems likely to be the scribe misspelling or mishearing 'Ermentrude'	1308-11-24
398	of Winchester	Matilda		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); E 101/250/15 (1331-34)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
399	of Kent	Matilda		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; **NB:** Both Adler and Rymer misidentify her toponymic as 'of Canterbury'	1308-11-24
400	of Rochester	Mariota		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; **NB:** Rymer misidentifies her surame as 'de Rosa', and Adler changes the name completely to 'Maria of Ross'	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
401	the Convert	Juliana	Wife to Martin (#316)	Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); SC 8/103/5120 (1320)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time; petitions king in 1320 as Martin's widow, asking for sustenance for her and her children; given house in *domus* as well as income for life	1308-11-24
402	of Merwelle	Matilda	Mother to Matilda (#403)	Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
403	of Merwelle	Matilda	Daughter of Matilda (#402)	Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
404	the Convert	Letitia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as living in the *domus* at that time	1308-11-24
405	of Winchester	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
406	of Goring	Walter		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
407	of Croyland	John		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
408	of Bury	Juliana		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
409	of Ludgershall	Cecilia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
410	of Norwich	Basilia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
411	of Bingham	Elizabeth		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292	1308-11-24
412	of Exeter	Claricia		Rymer's *Foedera*, ii, p. 62b (24 Nov 1308); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1330-33*, p. 64 (22 Oct 1330); E 101/250/15 (1331-34); *Calendar of Plea and Memoranda Rolls of the City of London, 1323-1364*, i, p. 125 (1 July 1340)	Adler, *Jews of Medieval England*, pp. 350-52	Entered in 1308 inquiry as having disappeared from the *domus* since 1292; daughter of Jacob Copyn, involved in a dispute with the keeper of the *domus* about her wages; was paid her *domus* wages between 1331-34	1308-11-24
413	le Convers	Edmund		*Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland*, v, no. 527 (July 1308-July 1309)		Was prested money along with four others for staying in the march for the keeping of the truce between the king and Robert Bruce	July 1308-July 1309

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relationships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
414	le Convers	John	Son of Roger le Convers (#108), Agnes (#415)	*Feet of Fines for Essex*, ii, no. 64 (Hilary term, 1309); *Feet of Fines for Essex*, iii/i, no. 159 (Michaelmas, 1331)		Involved in a suit with Thomas le Convers (#321) in 1309, mentioned as being married to 'Joan', puts in a claim in a suit in 1331 to a property in Little Kelwedon, Essex; unknown whether his wife is also a convert; **NB:** Unsure if he is actually the son of Roger #108 and Agnes #415	Hilary term, 1309
415	le Convers	Agnes	Wife of Roger le Convers (#108), mother of John (#414)	*Feet of Fines for Essex*, ii, no. 75 (Trinity term, 1309); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1313-18*, p. 597 (24 Feb 1318)		Involved in a suit in 1309, has a son named Roger, seems to have remarried (new husband: Miles de Mounteny), is released the rights held by her son Roger (#311) on property left by her former husband Roger (#108)	Trinity term, 1309
416	le Convers	Stephen		*Issues of the Exchequer, Henry III to Henry VI*, p. 127 (30 July 1314)		Was paid 20*s.* for his expenses in delivering the correspondence of Alexander le Convers (#312) before the Battle of Bannockburn	1314-07-30

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
417	le Convers	Andrew		SC 8/279/13929 (*c.*1315)		Baptised at the age of two during reign of Henry III, lived at Bradenstoke for reigns of Henry III and Edward I, granted maintenance for five years after coronation of Edward II, prior and convent expelled him, accused of theft of silver and of saying mass as a Jew, imprisoned at Salisbury, released, was refused maintenance	*c.*1315
418	le Convers	Hugh		*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1313-17*, p. 356 (6 Oct 1315)		Noted as 'Sir Hugh le Convers, chaplain', bequeathed a tenement to *domus*; unclear if actually a convert; possible connection to Hugh #64	1315-10-06
419	le Convers	Richard		*Calendar of Wills*, i, p. 285 (13 Oct 1319)		Appears in *Calendar of Wills*, leaves his 'mansion house' to his wife Cecilia in 1319	1319-10-13

#	Family Name	Given Name	Relation-ships	Primary Sources	Secondary Sources	Notes	Date
420	of Merwelle	Anne		E 101/250/15 (1331-34)		Was paid *domus* wages between 1331-34; appears nowhere else—it seems likely that this was the scribe mishearing 'Matilda of Merwelle'—could be either #402 or #403, or that she was admitted post-1308	*c.*1331-34
421	Convers of Notting-ham	Walter		*Cal. Patent Rolls, 1330-34*, p. 82 (6 March 1331); E 101/250/15 (1331-34); *Cal. Close Rolls, 1333-37*, p. 614 (3 Oct 1336)		Was paid his *domus* wages between 1331-34, allowed to go overseas on private business with protection from the king; returned by Michaelmas term, 1331—noted as receiving his wages at the *domus* at that point; order to the keeper of the Conversi is put through in order to have Walter paid the arrears of his wages in 1336	1336-10-03

Bibliography

Manuscript and archival sources

The British Library

ADDITIONAL MSS.
25005

32085

38821

62534

HARLEIAN MSS.
79

323

Bodleian Library, University of Oxford

BODLEY MSS.
692

Cambridge University Library

Mm.1.27

Lincoln's Inn Library

HALE MSS.
140

Merton College, Oxford

321

The National Archives

RECORDS OF CHANCERY

C 47 — Chancery Miscellanea

3/31 → 27 Edward I

3/32/1 → 25 Edward I

4/1 → 6-7 Edward I

22/2/44 → May 1296

22/3/71 → 28 April 1304

C 52 — *Cartae Antiquae* Rolls

21 (W)

C 60 — Fine Rolls

27 → 12 Henry III

37 → 25 Henry III

40A → 27 Henry III

51 → 38 Henry III

52 → 39 Henry III

56 → 43 Henry III

C 62 — *Liberate* Rolls

29 → 37 Henry III

85 → 2 Edward II

C 85 — Significations of Excommunication, Canterbury Province

3/71 → 18 November 1282

C 133 — Inquisitions *post mortem*

87/12 → 27 Edward I

C 143 — Inquisitions *ad quod damnum*

68/8 → 1 Edward II

220/6 → 6 Edward III

C 241 — Certificates of Statute Merchant and Statute Staple

2/72 → 1291

2/243 → 1288

7/92 → 1286

8/381→ 1287

25/74 → 15 October 1294

25/102 → 1294

34/57 → 1300

35/175 → 28 March 1301

49/127 → 1300

56/136 → 1295

56/138 → 1295

C 255 — Chancery Miscellaneous Files and Writs

16/1 no. 4 → 1314

18/5b → 14 November 1282

RECORDS OF THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS

CP 21 — Essoin Rolls

1/7 → 52/53 Henry III, Michaelmas term (John de Cobham's roll)

CP 40 — Plea Rolls

28 → 7 Edward I, Hilary term (Sir Thomas Weyland's roll)

29 → 7 Edward I, Easter term (Sir Thomas Weyland's roll)

55 → 12/13 Edward I, Michaelmas term (Rex roll)

91 → 19/20 Edward I, Michaelmas term (John of Mettingham's roll)

92 → 20 Edward I, Hilary term (John of Mettingham's roll)

93 → 20 Edward I, Easter term (John of Mettingham's roll)

96 → 20/21 Edward I, Michaelmas term (John of Mettingham's roll)

98 → 21 Edward I, Hilary term (John of Mettingham's roll)

100 → 21 Edward I, Easter term (John of Mettingham's roll)

101 → 21 Edward I, Trinity term (John of Mettingham's roll)

102 → 21/22 Edward I, Michaelmas term (John of Mettingham's roll)

103 → 22 Edward I, Hilary term (John of Mettingham's roll)

RECORDS OF THE COURT OF COMMON PLEAS AND KING'S BENCH

KB 26 — Early Plea and Essoin Rolls

115b → 18 Henry II, Trinity term (William of Raleigh's roll)

166 → 46 Henry III, Easter term (John Blundel's roll)

RECORDS OF THE COURT OF KING'S BENCH

KB 27 — Plea and Crown Sides: *Coram Rege* Rolls

92 → 13 Edward I, Trinity term (Ralph de Hengham's roll, Westminster)

98 → 14 Edward I, Easter term (Ralph de Hengham's roll, Canterbury)

RECORDS OF THE EXCHEQUER

E 9 — Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews

17 → 2/3 Edward I, Michaelmas term

20 → 3 Edward I, Trinity term

28 → 6 Edward I, Trinity term (Hauteyn)

29 → 5/6 Edward I, Michaelmas term (Hauteyn)

37 → 9 Edward I, Easter term

39 → 10 Edward I, Hilary term

67 → 11/12 Edward I, Michaelmas term

E 13 — Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of Pleas

13 → 16 Edward I

E 36 — Miscellaneous Books of the Treasury of the Receipt

202 → 22-23 Edward I

E 101 — King's Remembrancer: Accounts Various

6/22 → 25 Edward I

7/9 → 26/27 Edward I

8/17 → 28 Edward I

8/18 → 28 Edward I

11/15 → 31/32 Edward I

11/18 → 31/32 Edward I

12/22 → 32 Edward I

12/25 → 32 Edward I

12/27 → 32 Edward I

12/31 → 32 Edward I

97/18 → 22 Edward I

119/12 → 11-17 Edward I

249/22 → 3-5 Edward I

249/24 → 8-15 Edward I

250/15 → 5-7 Edward III

352/32 → 17 Edward I

468/2 → 18-20 Edward I

468/4 → 19/20 Edward I

468/9 → 31 Edward I

478/25 → 30 Edward I

624/51 → 17-23 Edward I

E 159 — Memoranda Rolls and Enrolment Books

32 → 42-43 Henry III, Michaelmas term - Trinity term

75 → 29-30 Edward I, Michaelmas term - Trinity term

E 352 — Pipe Office: Chancellor's Rolls

73 → 8 Edward I

77 → 12 Edward I

E 371 — Lord Treasurer's Remembrancer: Originalia Rolls

3 → 20 Henry III

12 → 29 Henry III

E 372 — Pipe Office: Pipe Rolls

123 → 7 Edward I

E 401 — Exchequer of Receipt: Receipt Rolls and Registers

1568 → 3 Edward I, Michaelmas term

Records of Itinerant Justices

JUST 1 — Rolls and Files of Justices in Eyre, of Assize, of Oyer and Terminer, and of the Peace

80 → 19 Henry III, Hertfordshire, Middlesex, Cambridgeshire, and Huntingdonshire eyres

485 → 9-10 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (Rex roll)

486 → 9/12 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (Rex roll)

487 → 9-10/12 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (Roger Loveday's roll)

489 → 9-10 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (John of Mettingham's roll)

492 → 9-10/12 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (William of Saham's roll)

493 → 9-10/12 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (William of Saham's roll)

494 → 9-10/12 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (Master Thomas of Siddington's roll)

495 → 9-10 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (John des Vaux's roll)

497 → 9-10/12 Edward I, Lincolnshire eyre (John des Vaux's roll)

1187 → 42-43 Henry III (Hugh Bigod's roll)

1291 → 18-20/22 Edward I (special assize roll for John of Mettingham et al.)

Special Collections

SC 1 — Ancient Correspondence of the Chancery and Exchequer

2/79 → 15 April 1258

16/63 → 1274

16/177 → 26 July 1275-85

18/58 → 19 May 1282

24/46 → 9 January 1283

24/201 → 1275-1292

28/93 → 1 April 1303 - 31 December 1303

30/91 → September 1298

45/28 → 8 December 1283

48/74 → 1284

63/192 → 1314

SC 8 — Ancient Petitions: Petitions to the King, Council, Parliament

4/154 → 1320

10/468 → 1305

36/1791 → 1307

50/2486 → 1318

50/2487 → 1318

97/4813 → 1290

99/4950 → 1305

103/5120 → 1320

120/5971 → 1290

120/5978 → 1308

155/7738 → 1314

158/7875 → 1307-1316

180/8966 → 1290

218/10892 → 1279

227/11317 → 1327-1350

266/13253 → 1305

279/13929 → 1315

SC 8 — Ancient Petitions: Exchequer Series

323/E566 → 1293-1295 (Petition to King and Council)

Printed Primary Sources

An Abstract of Feet of Fines Relating to the County of Sussex, vol. ii, ed. L.F. Salzmann (Sussex Record Society vol. 7) (London, 1908).

Accounts of the Constables of Bristol Castle in the Thirteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries ed. Margaret Sharp (Bristol Record Society vol. 34) (Bristol, 1982).

Acta Sanctorum Octobris, vol. i (Paris/Rome, 1866).

Annales Monastici, vol. iii, ed. Henry Richards Luard (London, 1866).

The Apostolic See and the Jews, vol. i, ed. Shlomo Simonsohn (Toronto, 1988).

Book of Prests of the King's Wardrobe for 1294-5, Presented to John Goronwy Edwards, ed. E.B. Fryde (Oxford, 1962).

Borough Customs, vol. i, ed. Mary Bateson (Selden Society vol. 18) (London, 1904).

Calendar of Ancient Correspondence Concerning Wales, ed. J. Goronwy Edwards (Cardiff, 1935).

Calendar of Chancery Warrants, A.D. 1244-1326, ed. Sir H.C. Maxwell Lyte (London, 1927).

Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, A.D. 1226-1257 (London, 1903).

Calendar of the Charter Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III - Edward I, A.D. 1257-1300 (London, 1906).

Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward I, 1272-1307 (5 vols., London, 1900-06).

Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward II, 1307-1327 (4 vols., London, 1892-1898).

Calendar of the Close Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, 1327-1337 (3 vols., London, 1896-1898).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Ireland, 1293-1301, ed. H.S. Sweetman (London, 1881).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, vol. ii, ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh, 1884).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, vol. iii, ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh, 1887).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, vol. iv, ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh, 1888).

Calendar of Documents Relating to Scotland Preserved in Her Majesty's Public Record Office, vol. v, eds. Grant G. Simpson and James D. Galbraith (London, 1986).

Calendar of Early Mayor's Court Rolls: Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall, A.D. 1298-1307, ed. A.H. Thomas (Cambridge, 1924).

Calendar of Entries in the Papal Registers Relating to Great Britain and Ireland A.D. 1198-1304, vol. i, ed. W.H. Bliss (London, 1893).

Calendar of the Fine Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward I, 1272-1307, vol. i (London, 1911).

Calendar of the Fine Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward II, 1307-1319, vol. ii (London, 1912).

Calendar of the Fine Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward II, 1319-1327, vol. iii (London, 1912).

Calendarium Genealogicum: Henry III and Edward I, vol. ii, ed. Charles Roberts (London, 1865).

Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery) Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. i (London, 1916).

Calendar of Inquisitions Miscellaneous (Chancery) Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. ii (London, 1916).

Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and Other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. iii (London, 1912).

Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and Other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. iv (London, 1913).

Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and Other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. vii (London, 1909).

Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and Other Analogous Documents Preserved in the Public Record Office, vol. viii (London, 1913).

Calendar of Kent Feet of Fines to the End of Henry III's Reign, eds. Irene Adler et al (Kent, 1956).

Calendar of Letter-books Preserved among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall, vols. A-D, ed. Reginald R. Sharpe (London, 1899-1902).

Calendar of the Liberate Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III (6 vols., London, 1916-1964)

Calendar of Memoranda Rolls (Exchequer) Preserved in the Public Record Office,

Michaelmas 1326-Michaelmas 1327, ed. R.E. Latham (London, 1968).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Henry III, 1232-1272 (6 vols., London, 1906-13).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward I, 1272-1307 (4 vols., London, 1893-1901).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward II, 1307-1327 (5 vols., London, 1894-1904).

Calendar of the Patent Rolls Preserved in the Public Record Office: Edward III, 1327-1334 (2 vols., London, 1891-1893).

Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. i, ed. J.M. Rigg (London, 1905).

Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. ii, ed. J.M. Rigg (London, 1910).

Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. iii, ed. Hilary Jenkinson (London, 1929).

Calendar of the Plea & Memoranda Rolls of the City of London Preserved Among the Archives of the Corporation of the City of London at the Guildhall, A.D. 1323-1364, vol. i, ed. A.H. Thomas (Cambridge, 1926).

Calendar of Wills Proved and Enrolled in the Court of Husting, London: Part 1: 1258-1358, vol. i, ed. Reginald R. Sharpe (London, 1889).

The Cartulary of the Monastery of St. Frideswide at Oxford, vol. i, ed. Spencer Robert Wigram (Oxford, 1895).

Chronica de Mailros, eds. Sir John Hay and Alexander Pringle (Edinburgh, 1835).

Chronica Magistri Rogeri de Houedene, vol. iii, ed. William Stubbs (London, 1870).

The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century: a Study of Their Relations During the Years 1198-1254, Based on the Papal Letters and the Conciliar Decrees of the Period, ed. Solomon Grayzel (rev. ed) (New York, 1966).

The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century, 1254-1314, ed. Solomon Grayzel and Kenneth R. Stow (New York, 1989).

Close Rolls of the Reign of Henry III, 1227-1272 (14 vols., London, 1902-38).

Collectanea, vol. iii, ed. Montagu Burrows (Oxford Historical Society vol. 32) (Oxford, 1896).

Collectanea, vol. iv (Oxford Historical Society vol. 47) (Oxford, 1905).

Councils & Synods With Other Documents Relating to the English Church II, Part I (1205-1265), eds. F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964).

Councils & Synods With Other Documents Relating to the English Church II, Part II (1265-1313), eds. F.M. Powicke and C.R. Cheney (Oxford, 1964).

The Court and Household of Eleanor of Castile in 1290: An Edition of British Library, Additional Manuscript 35294 with Introduction and Notes, ed. John Carmi Parsons (Toronto, 1977).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 5 and 6 Henry III (London, 1949).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 7 to 9 Henry III (London, 1955).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 9 to 10 Henry III (London, 1957).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 14 to 17 Henry III (1230-1232) (London, 1961).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 17 to 21 Henry III (1233-1237) (London, 1972).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 21 to 26 Henry III (1237-1242), ed. L.C. Hector (London, 1979).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: 26 to 27 Henry III (1242-1243), ed. Alexandra Nicol (London, 1991).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reigns of Richard I and John Preserved in the Pubic Record Office: 15-16 John; Appendix, 7 Richard I-1 John (London, 1935).

Curia Regis Rolls of the Reigns of Richard I and John Preserved in the Public Record Office: Richard I-2John (London, 1922).

Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, vol. i, ed. Norman P. Tanner S.J. (London, 1990).

A Descriptive Catalogue of Ancient Deeds, vol. i, ed. H.C. Maxwell Lyte (London, 1890).

Documents on the Affairs of Ireland Before the King's Council, ed. G.O. Sayles (Dublin, 1979).

Documents of the Baronial Movement of Reform and Rebellion, 1258-1267, eds. R.F. Treharne and I.J. Sanders (Oxford, 1973).

Documents Illustrative of the History of Scotland: From the Death of King Alexander the Third to the Accession of Robert Bruce, 1286-1306, vol. ii, ed. Rev. Joseph Stevenson (Edinburgh, 1870).

Documents and Records Illustrating the History of Scotland, vol. i, ed. Sir F. Palgrave (London, 1737).

Earliest English Law Reports, vol. i, ed. Paul Brand (Selden Society vol. 111) (London, 1995).

Earliest English Law Reports, vol. iii, ed. Paul Brand (Selden Society vol. 122) (London, 2005).

Earliest English Law Reports, vol. iv, ed. Paul Brand (Selden Society vol. 123) (London, 2006).

English Historical Documents 1189-1327, vol. iii, ed. Harry Rothwell (London, 1996).

Fasti Ecclesiae Hibernicae: the Succession of the Prelates and Members of the Cathedral Bodies in Ireland: vol. iii, the Province of Ulster, ed. Henry Cotton (Dublin, 1848).

Feet of Fines for Essex, vol. i, ed. R.E.G. Kirk (Colchester, 1899).

Feet of Fines for Essex, vol. ii, ed. R.E.G. Kirk (Colchester, 1928).

Feet of Fines for Essex, vol. iii, ed. R.C. Fowler (Colchester, 1929-1949).

Foedera, Conventiones, Litterae, et Cujuscunque Generis Acta Publica, ed. Thomas Rymer and Robert Sanderson, rev. ed. Adam Clarke and Frederick Holbrooke (2 vols., London, 1816-1818).

Gisleberti Crispini Disputatio Iudei et Christiani, et, Anonymi Auctoris, Disputationis Iudei et Christiani Continuatio: Ad Fidem Codicum Recens, ed. Bernhard Blumenkranz (Antwerp/Utrecht, 1956).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the First Year of the Reign of King John: Michaelmas 1199 (Pipe Roll 45) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 48, New Series vol. 10) (London, 1933).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the First Year of the Reign of King Richard the First, A.D. 1189-1190, ed. Joseph Hunter (London, 1844).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Ninth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First: Michaelmas 1197 (Pipe Roll 43) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 46, New Series vol. 8) (London, 1931).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Sixth Year of the Reign of King John, Michaelmas 1204 (Pipe Roll 50) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 56, New Series vol. 18) (London, 1940).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Sixth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First: Michaelmas 1194 (Pipe Roll 40) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 43, New Series vol. 5) (London, 1928).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Tenth Year of the Reign of King Richard the First: Michaelmas 1198 (Pipe Roll 44) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 47, New Series vol. 9) (London, 1932).

The Great Rolls of the Pipe of the Third and Fourth Years of the Reign of King Richard the First: Mich. 1191 and Mich. 1192 (Pipe Rolls 37 and 38) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 40, New Series vol. 2) (London, 1926).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirteenth Year of the Reign of King John, Michaelmas 1211 (Pipe Roll 57) (Pipe Roll Society vol. 66, New Series vol. 28) (London, 1953).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Thirty-Fourth Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1187-1188 (Pipe Roll Society vol. 38) (London, 1925).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Twenty-Eighth Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1181-1182 (Pipe Roll Society vol. 31) (London, 1910).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Twenty-Seventh Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1180-1181 (Pipe Roll Society vol. 30) (London, 1909).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Twenty-Sixth Year of the Reign of King Henry the Second, A.D. 1179-1180 (Pipe Roll Society vol. 29) (London, 1908).

The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Twenty-Sixth Year of the Reign of King Henry the Third: A.D. 1241-42 (London, 1918).

Handbook of British Chronology, 3rd ed., ed. E.B. Fryde et al (Cambridge, 1996).

Household Accounts from Medieval England, vol. i, ed. C.M. Woolgar (Oxford, 1992).

Historic and Municipal Documents of Ireland, A.D. 1172-1320, ed. J.T. Gilbert (London, 1870).

Irish Exchequer Payments 1270-1446, ed. Philomena Connolly (Dublin, 1998).

Issues of the Exchequer, Being a Collection of Payments Made Out of His Majesty's Revenue, From King Henry III to King Henry VI Inclusive, ed. Frederick Devon (London, 1837).

The Letters of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, eds. F.A.C. Mantello and Joseph Goering (Toronto, 2010).

The Letters of Saint Anselm of Canterbury, vol. iii, ed. Walter Fröhlich (Cistercian Studies Series 142) (Kalamazoo, 1994).

The Letters of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, trans. Bruno Scott James (Stroud, 1998).

Lettres de Rois, Reines, et Autres Personnages des Cours de France et d'Angleterre Depuis Louis VII Jusqu'a Henri IV, vol. i, ed. Jacques Joseph Champollion-Figeac (Paris, 1839).

Liber Albus Civitatis Oxoniensis: Abstract of the Wills, Deeds, and Enrolments Contained in the White Book of the City of Oxford, ed. William Patterson Ellis (Oxford, 1909).

Liber de Antiquis Legibus: Cronica Maiorum et Vicecomitum Londoniarum, ed. Thomas Stapleton (London, 1846).

Liber Munerum Publicorum Hiberniae, Ab An. 1152 usque ad 1827, vol. ii, ed. Rowley Lascelles (London, 1852).

The Life and Miracles of St. William of Norwich by Thomas of Monmouth; now first edited from the unique manuscript, with an introduction, translation, and notes, eds. Augustus Jessop and Montague Rhodes James (Cambridge, 1896).

The London Eyre of 1276, ed. Martin Weinbaum (London Record Society 12) (Leicester, 1976).

Medieval English Jews and Royal Officials: Entries of Jewish Interest in the English Memoranda Rolls, 1266-1293, ed. Z. Entin Rokeah (Jerusalem, 2000).

Medieval Jewish Documents in Westminster Abbey, ed. Ann Causton (London, 2007).

The Memoranda Roll for the Michaelmas Term of the First Year of the Reign of King John (1199-1200): Together With Fragments of the Originalia Roll of the Seventh Year of King Richard I (1195-6), the Liberate Roll of the Second Year of King John (1200-1), and the Norman Roll of the Fifth Year of King John, 1203 ed. H.G. Richardson (Pipe Roll Society vol. 59, New Series vol. 21) (London, 1943).

The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, Edward I: 1275-1294, vol. i, ed. Paul Brand (London, 2005).

The Parliament Rolls of Medieval England, Edward II: 1307-1327, vol. iii, ed. Seymour Phillips (London, 2005).

The Parliamentary Writs and Writs of Military Summons, ed. F. Palgrave (2 vols., London, 1827-1834).

Patent Rolls of the Reign of Henry III Preserved in the Public Record Office: A.D. 1216-1232 (2 vols., London, 1901-1903).

Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. iv, ed. H.G. Richardson (London, 1972).

Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. v, ed. Sarah Cohen (London, 1992).

Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, vol. vi, ed. Paul Brand (London, 2005).

Receipt and Issue Rolls for the Twenty-Sixth Year of the Reign of King Henry III, 1241-2: Now First Printed From the Originals in the Public Record Office, ed. Robert C. Stacey (Pipe Roll Society vol. 87, New Series vol. 49) (London, 1992).

Receipt Rolls of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Years of the Reign of King Henry III, Easter 1220, 1221, 1222 (Receipt Rolls 3b, 4, and 5), ed. Nicholas Barratt (Pipe Rolls Society New Series vol. 52) (London, 2003).

Receipt Rolls of the Seventh and Eighth Years of the Reign of King Henry III, Easter 1223, Michaelmas 1224 (Receipt rolls 6 and 7), ed. Nicholas Barratt (Pipe Roll Society New Series vol. 55) (London, 2007).

The Records of the City of Norwich, i, ed. Rev. William Hudson and John Cottingham Tingey (London, 1906).

Records of the Wardrobe and Household, 1286-1289, ed. B. Byerly and C. Byerly (London, 1986).

Recueil de Lettres Anglo-Françaises (1265-1399), ed. F.J. Tanquerey (Paris, 1916).

Regesta Pontificum Romanorum, vol. i, ed. Augustus Potthast (Berlin, 1874).

Registrum Epistolarum Fratris Johannis Peckham, Archiepiscopi Cantuariensis, vol. i, ed. Charles Trice Martin (London, 1882).

Registrum Johannis de Pontissara, Episcopi Wyntoniensis, A.D. 1282-1304, vol. i, ed. Cecil Deedes (London, 1915).

Registrum Henrici Woodlock, Diocesis Wintoniensis, A.D. 1305-1316, vol. ii, ed. A.W. Goodman (Oxford, 1941).

Registrum Simonis de Gandavo, Diocesis Saresbiriensis, A.D. 1297-1315, vol. ii, eds. C.T. Flower and M.C.B. Dawes (Oxford, 1934).

Rotuli Chartarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati, 1199-1216, ed. T.D. Hardy (London, 1837).

Rotuli Hundredorum Temp. Hen. III. & Edw. I. in Turr' Lond' et in Curia Receptae

Scaccarij Westm. Asservati, vol. i (London, 1812).

Rotuli Hundredorum Temp. Hen. III. & Edw. I. in Turr' Lond' et in Curia Receptae Scaccarij Westm. Asservati, vol. ii (London, 1818).

Rotuli Litterarum Clausarum in Turri Londinensi Asservati, ed. T.D. Hardy (2 vols., London, 1833-44).

Rotuli Litterarum Patentium in Turri Londinensi Asservati, 1201-1216, ed. T.D. Hardy (London, 1835).

Rotuli de Oblatis et Finibus in Turri Londinensi Asservati, Tempore Regis Johannis, ed. Thomas Duffus Hardy (London, 1835).

Rotulorum Originalium in Curia Scaccarii Abbreviato: Tempore Regis Edwardi III, vol. ii (London, 1810).

Rotuli Parliamentorum ut et Petitiones et Placita in Parliamento Tempore Edwardi R. I, vol. i (London, 1767).

Rotulorum Patentium et Clausorum Cancellariae Hiberniae Calendarium, Hen. ii - Hen. vii, vol. i, pars. i, ed. E. Tresham (Dublin, 1828).

The Royal Charter Witness Lists of Henry III (1226-1272), from the Charter Rolls in the Public Record Office, vol. ii, ed. M. Morris (List and Index Society vol. 292) (Kew, 2001).

S. Anselmi Cantuariensis Archiepiscopi Opera Omnia, vol. v, ed. Franciscus Schmitt (Edinburgh, 1951).

Saint Richard of Chichester, ed. David Jones (Sussex Record Society vol. 79)(Lewes, 1995).

Select Cases in the Court of King's Bench Under Edward I, vol. iii, ed. G.O. Sayles (Selden Society vol. 58) (London, 1939).

Select Cases of Procedure Without Writ Under Henry III, eds. H.G. Richardson and G.O. Sayles (Selden Society vol. 60) (London, 1941).

Select Charters and Other Illustrations of English Constitutional History, ed. William Stubbs, rev. ed. H.W.C. Davis, 9th ed. (Oxford, 1921).

Select Pleas, Starrs, and Other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, A.D. 1220-1284, ed. J.M. Rigg (London, 1902).

Select Pleas of the Crown, ed. F.W. Maitland (Selden Society vol. 1) (London, 1888).

Scotland in 1298, Documents Relating to the Campaign of King Edward I, ed. H.

Gough (London, 1888).

The Statutes of the Realm, vol. i, ed. Alexander Luders (London, 1810).

Printed Secondary Works

Abrahams, B. Lionel, 'The Economic and Financial Position of the Jews in Mediaeval England', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 8 (1918), pp. 171-188.

- - -., 'The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 1 (October 1894), pp. 75-100.

- - -., 'The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290 (Continued)', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 2 (January 1895), pp. 236-258.

- - -., 'The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290 (Concluded)', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 7, no. 3 (April 1895), pp. 428-458.

Adler, Michael, 'Aaron of York', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 13 (1932-35), pp. 113-155.

- - -., *Jews of Medieval England* (London, 1939).

- - -., 'Jews of Medieval Exeter', *Transactions of the Devonshire Association for the Advancement of Science, Literature, and Art* 63 (1931), pp. 221-240.

- - -., 'The Testimony of the London Jewry Against the Ministers of Henry III', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 14 (1935-39), pp. 141-185.

Aubert de la Chenaye Desbois, François-Alexandre, ed., *Dictionnaire de la Noblesse, Contenant les Généalogies, l'Histoire & la Chronologie des Familles Nobles de France, l'explications de leurs armes, & l'état des grandes Terres du Royaume aujourd'hui possédées à titre de Principautés, Duchés, Marquisats, Comtés, Vicomtés, Baronnies, &c. soit par création, par héritages, alliances, donations, substitutions, mutations, achats ou autrement*, vol. iv, 2nd ed. (Paris, 1772).

Barnett, Arthur, 'The Rev. Michael Adler, D.S.O., S.C.F., B.A. (1868-1944)', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 15 (1939-45), pp. 191-194.

Biancalana, Joseph, 'Monetary Penalty Clauses in Thirteenth-Century England', *The Legal History Review* 73, no. 3-4, pp. 231-265.

Boddens, Hosang, *Establishing Boundaries: Christian-Jewish Relations in Early Council Texts and the Writings of Church Fathers* (Boston, 2010).

Brand, Paul, 'The Jewish Community of England in the Records of English Royal Government', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 73-83.

- - -., 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275-90', *English Historical Review* 115, no. 464 (November 2000), pp. 1138-1158.

- - -., *Kings, Barons, and Justices: The Making and Enforcement of Legislation in Thirteenth-Century England* (Cambridge, 2003).
- - -., 'Oldcotes vs. D'Arcy', in R.F. Hunnisett and J.B. Post (eds.), *Medieval Legal Records: Edited in Memory of C.A.F. Meekings* (London, 1978), pp. 63-118.

Brundage, James A., 'Intermarriage Between Christians and Jews in Medieval Canon Law', *Jewish History* 3, no. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 25-40.

Carpenter, David, 'Crucifixion and Conversion: King Henry III and the Jews in 1255', in Susanne Jenks, Jonathan Rose, Christopher Whittick (eds.), *Laws, Lawyers, and Texts: Studies in Medieval Legal History in Honour of Paul Brand* (Leiden, 2012), pp. 129-148.
- - -., 'King Henry III's 'Statute' Against Aliens: July 1263', *English Historical Review* 107, no. 435 (October 1992), pp. 925-944.
- - -., *Magna Carta* (London, 2015).
- - -., *The Minority of Henry III* (London, 1990).

Chaplais, Pierre, *English Royal Documents: King John-Henry IV 1199-1461* (Oxford, 1971).

Chazan, Robert, *Church, State, and Jew in the Middle Ages* (New York, 1980).
- - -., *Daggers of Faith: Thirteenth-century Christian Missionizing and Jewish Response* (Berkeley, 1989).
- - -., 'Ephraim ben Jacob's Compilation of Twelfth-Century Persecutions', *The Jewish Quarterly Review* 84, no. 4 (April 1994), pp. 397-416.
- - -., *Fashioning Jewish Identity in Medieval Western Christendom* (Cambridge, 2004).
- - -., *God, Humanity, and History: the Hebrew First Crusade Narratives* (Berkeley, 2000).
- - -., *Medieval Jewry in Northern France: a Political and Social History* (London, 1973).
- - -., *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* (New York, 2010).

Cheney, C.R., *Hubert Walter* (London, 1967).
- - -., *Pope Innocent III and England* (Stuttgart, 1976).

Cohen, Jeremy, 'A 1096 Complex? Constructing the First Crusade', in Michael A. Signer and John Van Engen (eds.), *Jews and Christians in Twelfth-Century Europe* (Notre Dame, 2001), pp. 9-26.
- - -., *The Friars and the Jews: the Evolution of Medieval anti-Judaism* (Ithaca, 1982).

Cohen, Sarah, 'The Oxford Jewry in the Thirteenth Century', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 13 (1932-35), pp. 293-322.

Connolly, Philomena, 'List of Irish Entries on the Memoranda Rolls of the English Exchequer, 1307-27', *Analecta Hibernia* 36 (1995), pp. 163-218.

Coss, Peter, *The Knight in Medieval England, 1000-1400* (Stroud, 1993).

- - -., *The Origins of the English Gentry* (Cambridge, 2003).

Cowdrey, H.E.J., *Pope Gregory VII, 1073-1085* (Oxford, 1998).

Dobson, Barrie, 'The Jews of Medieval Cambridge', in Helen Birkett (ed.), *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the Collected Essays of R.B. Dobson* (York, 2010), pp. 101-126.

- - -., 'A Minority Within a Minority: the Jewesses of Thirteenth-century England', in Helen Birkett (ed.), *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the Collected Essays of R.B. Dobson* (York, 2010), pp. 149-166.

- - -., 'The Role of Jewish Women in Medieval England', in Helen Birkett (ed.), *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England: the Collected Essays of R.B. Dobson* (York, 2010), pp. 127-147.

Doubleday, H.A., *The Victoria County History of the County of Bedford*, vol. i (London, 1904).

Duffy, Sean (ed.), *Medieval Ireland: An Encyclopedia* (New York, 2005).

Duggan, Anne, 'Conciliar Law 1123-1215: The Legislation of the Four Lateran Councils', in Wilfried Hartmann and Kenneth Pennington (eds.), *The History of Canon Law in the Classical Period, 1140-1234: from Gratian to the Decretals of Pope Gregory IX* (Washington, 2008), pp. 318-366.

Emden, A.B., *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, vol. i (Oxford, 1957).

Fifoot, C.H.S., *The Letters of Frederic William Maitland* (Selden Society Supplementary Series 1) (London, 1965).

Finestein, Israel, '*In Memoriam*: Vivian David Lipman, CVO, DPhil, FSA, FRHistS, 1921-1990', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 31 (1988-90), pp. xii-xviii.

Fogle, Lauren, 'The *Domus Conversorum*: the Personal Interest of Henry III', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 41 (2007), pp. 1-7.

Gilchrist, John, 'The Perception of Jews in the Canon Law in the Period of the First Two Crusades', *Jewish History* 3, no. 1 (Spring, 1988), pp. 9-24.

Golb, Norman, *Les Juifs de Rouen au Moyen Âge: Portrait d'une Culture Oubliée* (Mont-Saint-Aignan, 1985).

Gray, Arthur, *The Priory of Saint Radegund, Cambridge* (Cambridge, 1898).

Greatrex, Joan, 'Monastic Charity for Jewish Converts: The Requisition of Corrodies by Henry III', in Diana Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism: Papers Read at the 1991 Summer Meeting and the 1992 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History*

Society (Oxford, 1992), pp. 132-143.

Hillaby, Joe, 'A *Domus Conversorum* at Bristol?', *Jewish Historical Studies* 42 (2009), pp. 1-6.
- - -., 'Jewish Colonisation in the Twelfth Century', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 15-40.
- - -., 'London: the 13th Century Jewry Revisited', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 32 (1990-92), pp. 89-157.
- - -., 'The London Jewry: William I to John', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 33 (1992-94), pp. 1-44.
- - -., 'A Magnate Among the Marchers: Hamo of Hereford, His Family and Clients, 1218-1253', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 31 (1988-90), pp. 23-82.

Hillaby, Joe and Caroline, *The Palgrave Dictionary of Medieval Anglo-Jewish History* (Basingstoke, 2012).

Hinnebusch, William A., 'Diplomatic Activities of the English Dominicans in the Thirteenth Century', *The Catholic Historical Review* 28, no. 3 (October 1942), pp. 309-339.

Horsfield, Thomas Walker, *The History, Antiquities and Topography of the County of Sussex*, vol. i (Dorking, 1974).

Hunt, R.W., 'The Disputation of Peter of Cornwall Against Symon the Jew', in R.W. Hunt, W.A. Pantin, and R.W. Southern (eds.), *Studies in Medieval History Presented to Frederck Maurice Powicke* (Oxford, 1948), pp. 143-156.

Huscroft, Richard, *Expulsion, England's Jewish Solution: Edward I and the Jews* (Stroud, 2006).

Hyams, Paul, 'Faith, Fealty and Jewish 'infideles' in Twelfth-Century England', in Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson, eds., *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 125-147.
- - -., 'The Jewish Minority in Mediaeval England, 1066-1290', *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25, no. 2 (1974), pp. 270-293.

Jacobs, Joseph, *The Jews of Angevin England: Documents and Records* (New York, 1893).

Jenkinson, Hilary, 'The Records of the Exchequer Receipts From the English Jewry', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 8 (1918), pp. 19-54.

Jordan, William Chester, 'Christian Excommunication of the Jews in the Middle Ages: A Restatement of the Issues', *Jewish History* 1 (Spring 1986), pp. 31-38.

- - -., *The French Monarchy and the Jews: From Philip Augustus to the Last Capetians* (Philadelphia, 1989).
- - -., 'Why "Race"?', *Journal of Medieval and Early Modern Studies* 31, no. 1 (2001), pp. 165-173.

Joshel, Sandra R., *Slavery in the Roman World* (Cambridge, 2010).

Julius, Anthony, *Trials of the Diaspora: A History of Anti-Semitism in England* (Oxford, 2010).

Katz, Jacob, *Exclusiveness and Tolerance: Studies in Jewish-Gentile Relations in Medieval and Modern Times* (Oxford, 1961).

Kennett, White, *Parochial Antiquities Attempted in the History of Ambrosden, Burcester, and Other Adjacent Parts in the Counties of Oxford and Bucks.*, New Ed., i (Oxford, 1818).

Knowles, David, and R. Neville Hadcock, *Medieval Religious Houses, England and Wales* (London, 1953).

Langmuir, Gavin I., *Toward a Definition of Antisemitism* (Berkeley, 1990).

Lipman, Vivian D., 'The Anatomy of Mediaeval Anglo-Jewry', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 21 (1962-67), pp. 64-77.
- - -., 'Jews and Castles in Medieval England', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 28 (1981-82), pp. 1-19.
- - -., *The Jews of Medieval Norwich; With an Appendix of Latin Documents from the Westminster Abbey Muniment Room; and the Hebrew Poems of Meir of Norwich* (London, 1967).

Loewe, Herbert, 'Canon Dr. Henry Paine Stokes, LL.D., D.Litt., F.S.A., 1849-1931', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 12 (1928-31), pp. 267-269.

Logan, F. Donald, 'Thirteen London Jews and Conversion to Christianity: Problems of Apostasy in the 1280s', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 45, no. 112 (November 1972), pp. 214-229.

Maddicott, J.R., *The Origins of English Parliament, 924-1327* (Oxford, 2012).
- - -., *Simon de Montfort* (Cambridge, 1994).

Madox, Thomas, *The History and Antiquities of the Exchequer of the Kings of England*, 2nd ed., vol. i (Cambridge, 1911).

Maitland, Frederic William, *The Collected Papers of Frederic William Maitland: Downing Professor of the Law of England* (Cambridge, 1911).

Maitland, Frederic William, and Sir Frederick Pollock, *The History of English Law Before the Time of Edward I*, 2nd ed., vol. i (Cambridge, 1911).

Malden, H.E. (ed.), *The Victoria County History of the County of Surrey*, vol. ii (London, 1905).

Margoliouth, Moses, *The History of the Jews in Great Britain* (London, 1851).

Mason, Emma, 'The Resources of the Earldom of Warwick in the Thirteenth Century', *Midland History* 3 (1975-76), pp. 67-76.

Martin, C.T., 'The *Domus Conversorum*', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 1 (1893-94), pp. 15-24.

McKechnie, W.S., *Magna Carta: A Commentary on the Great Charter of King John, with an Historical Introduction*, 2nd ed. rev. (Glasgow, 1914).

McNamee, Colm, *The Wars of the Bruces: Scotland, England and Ireland, 1306-1328* (East Linton, 1997).

Meekings, C.A.F., 'Justices of the Jews, 1218-68: A Provisional List', *Bulletin of the Institute of Historical Research* 28, no. 78 (1955), pp. 173-188.

Moody, T.W., F.X. Martin, and F.J. Byrne, eds., *A New History of Ireland*, vol. ix (Oxford, 1984).

Moor, Charles, *Knights of Edward I*, vol. v (London, 1932).

Mundill, Robin R., 'Christian and Jewish lending patterns and financial dealings during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries', in P.R. Schofield and N.J. Mayhew, eds., *Credit and Debt in Medieval England, c.1180-c.1350* (Oxford, 2002), pp. 42-67.

- - -.,'Edward I and the Final Phase of Anglo-Jewry', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 55-70.

- - -., *England's Jewish Solution, 1262-1290: Experiment and Expulsion* (Cambridge, 1998).

- - -., *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England* (London, 2010).

Page, William (ed.), *The Victoria County History of the County of Buckingham*, vol. iii (London, 1925).

- - -., *The Victoria County History of the County of Kent*, vol. ii (London, 1926).

- - -., *The Victoria County History of the County of Sussex*, vol. ii (London, 1907).

Pakter, Walter, *Medieval Canon Law and the Jews* (Ebelsbach, 1988).

Parkes, James, *The Conflict of the Church and the Synagogue: A Study in the Origins of Anti-Semitism* (New York, 1974).

Phillips, J.R.S., 'The Mission of John de Hothum to Ireland, 1315-1316', in James Lydon (ed.), *England and Ireland in the Later Middle Ages: Essays in Honour of Jocelyn Otway-Ruthven* (Blackrock, 1981), pp. 62-85.

Plucknett, T.F.T., *A Concise History of the Common Law*, 5th ed. (London, 1956).

Powell, W.R. (ed.), *A History of the County of Essex*, vol. vii (London, 1978).

Powicke, F.M., *King Henry III and the Lord Edward: The Community of the Realm in the Thirteenth Century*, vol. i (Oxford, 1947).

Prestwich, Michael, *Edward I* (London, 1997).
- - -., *War, Politics, and Finance Under Edward I* (London, 1972).

Prynne, William, *A Short Demurrer to the Jewes Long Discontinued Remitter into England.: Comprising an Exact Chronological Relation of Their First Admission into, Their Ill Deportment, Misdemeanors, Condition, Sufferings, Oppressions, Slaughters, Plunders, by Popular Insurrec- tions, and Regal Exactions in; and Their Total, Final Banishment by Judgment and Edict of Parliament, out of England, Never to Return Again: Collected out of the Best Historians and Records* (London, 1656).

Richardson, H.G., *The English Jewry Under Angevin Kings* (London, 1960).
- - -., 'Glanville Continued', *Law Quarterly Review* 54 (1938), pp. 381-399.

Robinson, J. Armitage, *Gilbert Crispin, Abbot of Westminster: A Study of the Abbey Under Norman Rule* (Cambridge, 1911).

Rodocanachi, Emmanuel, *Le Saint-Siège et les Juifs: Le Ghetto à Rome* (Paris, 1891).

Rokeah, Z., Entin, 'Money and the Hangman in Late-13th Century England: Jews, Christians and Coinage Offences Alleged and Real (Part I)', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 31 (1988-90), pp. 83-109.
- - -., 'Money and the Hangman in Late-13th Century England: Jews, Christians, and Coinage Offences Alleged and Real (Part II)', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 32(1990-92), pp. 159-218.
- - -., 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls', *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 1 (1973), pp. 19-42.
- - -., 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls, Part 2', *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 2 (1974), pp. 59-82.
- - -., 'Some Accounts of Condemned Jews' Property in the Pipe and Chancellor's Rolls, Part 3', *Bulletin of the Institute of Jewish Studies* 3 (1975), pp. 41-66.

Roth, Cecil, *A History of the Jews in England*, 3rd ed. (Oxford, 1964).
- - -., *The Jews of Medieval Oxford* (Oxford Historical Society New Series 9) (Oxford, 1951).

Saltman, Avrom, *The Jewish Question in 1655: Studies in Prynne's Demurrer* (Bar-Ilan, 1995).

Salzmann, L.F., *The Victoria County History of the County of Cambridge and the Isle of Ely*, vol. ii (London, 1948).

Sanders, I.J., *English Baronies: A Study of their Origin and Descent, 1086-1327* (Oxford, 1960).

Sayles, G.O., 'Henry Gerald Richardson, 1884-1974', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 61 (1975), pp. 497-521.

Simpson, A.W. Brian, *A History of the Common Law of Contract: the Rise of the Action of Assumpsit* (Oxford, 1987).

Smith, David, and Vera C.M. London (eds.), *Heads of Religious Houses: England and Wales, 1216-1377*, vol. ii (Cambridge, 2001).

Stacey, Robert C., '1240-1260: A Watershed in Anglo-Jewish Relations?', *Historical Research* 61, no. 145 (1988), pp. 135-150.
- - -., 'The Conversion of Jews to Christianity in Thirteenth-Century England', *Speculum* 67, no. 2 (April 1992), pp. 263-283.
- - -., 'The English Jews Under Henry III', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003), pp. 41-54.
- - -., 'The Massacres of 1189-90 and the Origins of the Jewish Exchequer, 1186-1226', in Sarah Rees Jones and Sethina Watson (eds.), *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: The York Massacre of 1190, Narratives and Contexts* (Woodbridge, 2013), pp. 106-124.
- - -., 'Recent Work on Medieval English Jewish History', *Jewish History* 2, no. 2 (Fall 1987), pp. 61-72.
- - -., 'Royal Taxation and the Social Structure of Medieval Anglo-Jewry: The Tallages of 1239-1242', *Hebrew Union College Annual* 56 (1985), pp. 175-249.

Stokes, H.P., 'The Relationship Between the Jews and the Royal Family of England in the Thirteenth Century', *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England* 8 (1918), pp. 153-170.
- - -., *A Short History of the Jews in England* (London, 1921).
- - -., *Studies in Anglo-Jewish History* (Edinburgh, 1913).

Stow, Kenneth R., *Alienated Minority: the Jews of Medieval Latin Europe* (Cambridge, 1992).
- - -., *Popes, Church, and Jews in the Middle Ages: confrontation and response* (Aldershot, 2007).

Stroll, Mary, *The Jewish Pope: Ideology and Politics in the Papal Schism of 1130* (Leiden, 1987).

Sutherland, Donald W., 'Peytevin *v.* La Lynde: A Case in the Medieval Land Law', *Law Quarterly Review* 83 (1967), pp. 527-546.

Thomson, R.M., and M. Winterbottom, *William of Malmesbury: Gesta Regum Anglorum, The History of the English Kings*, vol. ii (Oxford, 1999).

Tovey, D'Blossiers, *Anglia Judaica: Or the History and Antiquities of the Jews in England,: Collected From All Our Historians, Both Printed and Manuscript, As Also From the Records in the Tower, and Other Publick Repositories* (Oxford, 1738).

Ullman, Walter, 'The Disputed Election of Hugh Balsham, Bishop of Ely', *Cambridge Historical Journal* 9, no. 3 (1949), pp. 259-268.

Vincent, Nicholas, 'Two Papal Letters on the Wearing of the Jewish Badge, 1221 and 1229', *Jewish Historical Studies* 34 (1994-96), pp. 209-224.

Ware, Sir James, *A Commentary on the Prelates of Ireland, From the First Conversion of the Irish Nation to the Christian Faith Down to our Times* (Dublin, 1704).

Watt, John A., 'Jews and Christians in the Gregorian Decretals', in Diana Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism: Papers Read at the 1991 Summer Meeting and the 1992 Winter Meeting of the Ecclesiastical History Society* (Oxford, 1992), pp. 93-105.

Willard, James F., 'The Taxes Upon Moveables of the Reign of Edward I', *English Historical Review* 28, no. 11 (July 1913), pp. 517-521.

Wood, Susan, *English Monasteries and their Patrons in the Thirteenth Century* (London, 1955).

Yarrow, Simon, *Saints and their Communities: Miracle Stories in Twelfth Century England* (Oxford, 2006).

Zema, Demetrius B., 'The Houses of Tuscany and of Pierleone in the Crisis of Rome in the Eleventh Century', *Traditio* 2 (1944), pp. 155-175.

Unpublished Theses

Cassidy, Richard, *The 1259 Pipe Roll*, vol. ii, 2012, King's College London, University of London.

Fogle, Lauren, *Jewish Converts to Christianity in Medieval London*, July 2005, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, University of London.