



Western European Jewry in the first age of expulsions 1182-1306

John Tolan, Université de Nantes

john.tolan@univ-nantes.fr

<Rough draft of work in progress; please do not cite>

1. Overview: age of expulsions?

Jews of Medieval Europe were peculiarly both members and outsiders of the Christian European societies in which they lived. They lived cheek by jowl with their Christian neighbors, with whom they conducted business, swapped gossip, and exchanged neighborly services. Yet European Jews inculcated into their children, through rite and reading, the notion that they were the people of Israel living in exile, far from their true home. Law and custom bade both Christians and Jews to avoid excessive promiscuity, in particular whatever could lead to sexual contact or apostasy: rabbis, churchmen, and lay legislators sought to define and reinforce the boundaries between Jews and Christians. Moreover, in many of the northern European kingdoms, Jews were fairly recent arrivals: this was in particular the case in England, where they had come in the wake of the Norman conquest of 1066.

This perceived otherness or foreignness of Jewish neighbors perhaps helps explain the wave of expulsions that struck Jewish communities in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In 1182, Philippe II expelled the Jews from the French Royal domain. In the following decades, Jews were expelled from Brittany (1240), Gascony (1287), Anjou (1289), England (1290), and France (1306). Some of these expulsions were short-lived, others long-lasting; the causes and consequences of each are different. Yet each would confirm the stereotype of the Jew as essentially rootless, a foreigner who, since he or she is not part of the community, can be expelled from it. While each of these events is different, they occur against a common background of economic and social upheaval and of growing violence against Jews.

Little comparative study of these expulsions has been undertaken, and no systematic attempt has been made to see how they fit into what is commonly portrayed as a rising tide of anti-Judaism. The contours of the latter are widely known, though the relative importance of its components have been and continue to be debated: the anti-Jewish violence that often accompanied the preaching of crusades and the departure of crusading troops (the best-known incidents are those of the Rhineland in 1096; the most significant for my study being those of York in 1190 and Brittany and western France in 1236).

Another index of increasing anti-Judaism is the emergence of the Blood libel accusation, according to which Jews ritually murder Christians (usually young boys), often crucifying them on Good Friday, and use their blood in rituals (putting it in Matzoh or Hamentasche, etc.). We find the accusations first in England: William of Norwich (1144); similar accusations in Gloucester (1168), Bury St Edmunds (1181) and Bristol (1183); Little Saint Hugh of Lincoln (1255; mentioned by Chaucer in the Prioress' tale, another story of Jews murdering a Christian boy—but not strictly a ritual murder). On the continent: Blois (1171), then, starting in the 13th century, widespread accusations (Germany, Spain...). Various popes, Emperors and others denounce such accusations and try to protect Jews from the ensuing violence.

Jews are also accused of host desecration: buying or stealing consecrated Eucharist hosts, usually in order to torture or crucify them. In these stories the hosts usually bleed or occasionally even turn into a child. The Jewish perpetrators are exposed: some of them convert; others are killed by Christians. Indeed these accusations led to violence against Jews and sometimes (local) expulsions. The first such accusation is from Paris in 1290; starting in 14th century, blood libel accusations become quite common across Europe, particular in Central Europe/Germany.

Another indication is increasing missionary activity, starting in the 13th century particularly by the new mendicant orders, Franciscans and Dominicans. Yet the extent to which these orders were involved in active missionary preaching in the thirteenth century is not clear, and most of the evidence is from Spain: there is little if any evidence of serious efforts to preach to Jews in England or France. Mendicants did succeed in targeting the Talmud, which was put on trial and burned in Paris in 1240; and Edward I took measures to require English Jews to listen to Dominican missionary sermons (but to what extent this was actually enforced is not clear).

All of this has led to debate over the causes of the increase in anti-Judaism and the perceived turning point: the 1st crusade? (Bernhard Blumenkranz); the emergence of a new clerical elite in the 12th-century that saw the Jews as potential rivals? (Bob Moore); 13th-century Mendicant missions? (Jeremy Cohen); the emergence of Blood libel and host desecration accusations? Are the causes to be sought in the doctrine or rites of Latin Christianity (increasing emphasis on the humanity and suffering of Jesus around the time of the first crusade; doctrine of transubstantiation and real presence [which became doctrine in the fourth Lateran Council of 1215]; attempts to affirm the rationality of Christianity and its harmony with classical philosophy)? In the attitudes of Jews (isolation/separation) or in their economic activities (money lending)? In the fact that an increasingly mobile, literate, numerate and mercantile Europe had less and less need for Jews to serve as its merchants and bankers? And is this growing Jew hatred and violence to be ascribed to the “Church”? To the Kings and other princes of Europe? Or to “popular” attitudes (whatever that means)?

All of these hypotheses correspond to the general schema that has been dubbed the “lachrymose” view of Jewish history as a vale of tears, a succession of persecutions, humiliation and violence. Much recent scholarship has nuanced this stereotyped vision: Elisheva Baumgarten on Jewish families in Ashkenaz (highlighting the often close and friendly relationships between Jewish and Christian neighbors). Robert Chazan (*Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe*) argues against the lachrymose view. In 1000, the vast majority of Jews lived in Islamic areas, substantial numbers lived in Byzantium; only small and scattered communities in Latin Europe. By 1500, Jewish demography in Europe has exploded, and by far the biggest Jewish communities in the world are in Central and Eastern Europe. Clearly a success story, for Chazan, in spite of the persecutions, expulsions, etc. This nuance is important, but the question of the rise and strengthening of anti-Jewish prejudice remains. We could add the short book by Jonathan Elukin (*Living together, living apart*), who emphasizes the “ongoing habits of a pragmatic tolerance” in Christian-Jewish relations in Medieval Europe, in despite of periodic violence.

David Nirenberg has reminded us that violence does not necessarily mean exclusion, that the periodic (and often ritualized) acts of violence against the *calls* of thirteenth-century Catalan cities are not inexorably leading to the violence of 1391 and

the expulsion of 1492.¹ Like those acts of violence, the expulsions are to be studied not as so many dots to be connected in the history of the rise of medieval anti-Judaism, but as individual events with specific and distinct causes.

In order to explain the expulsions from England and France, historians have offered many and divergent (though not mutually exclusive) explanations: rising popular hatred towards Jews (as shown in blood libel charges and massacres), resentment at the practices of Jewish money lending; financial opportunism on the part of kings, nobles or churchmen. It is the latter elements that I want to focus on here: while I certainly won't deny that broadly shared anti-Jewish attitudes and stereotypes may have contributed to some of the decisions to expel Jews, our sources point more towards immediate economic concerns. But here too, historians have been divided, some claiming that such and such a prince profited handsomely from the expulsion of Jews, others affirming that the same prince lost income, and thus clearly acted on principally religious motivations.

We will look at 5 expulsions: France 1182; Brittany 1240; Gascony 1287; Anjou 1288; and England 1290. As I continue my research, I will expand these reflections to include the expulsion of Jews from France in 1306.

2. Philippe II 1182

In 1180, Prince Philip (the future king Philip II) had all the Jews of the royal domain arrested and their goods confiscated; in 1182, he expelled them. What are the reasons for this expulsion, which marks a rupture from the traditional policy of royal protection of Jewish communities (in particular, during the reign of Philip's father Louis VII)? For William Jordan, the 1180 attack against French Jews shows Philip's will to affirm his difference, and his independence, from his father; this violence, along with the expulsion that he proclaimed once he became king, was meant to show his vassals and subjects that he could act firmly and decisively. Princely heirs and young kings often needed a show of force to dramatically affirm their authority: acts of aggression against Jews were a common way of doing so, since the risks involved were very low.²

¹ David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1996).

² William Chester Jordan, "Princely Identity and the Jews in Medieval France", *Wolfenbüttler Mittelalter-Studien* 11 (1996), 257-73, reprint in Jordan, *Ideology and Royal Power in Medieval France: Kingship, Crusades and the Jews* (Aldershot, 2001).

No expulsion order or other official document from 1182 explaining the expulsion survives. Our main source of information is the *Gesta Philippi Augusti*, by Rigord, monk of St. Denis and royal biographer.³ Rigord's original chronicle, which he dedicated to the king, covered the years 1179-1190. It is here that he praises Philip for having expelled the Jews. Rigord portrays the Jews as hostile and violent to Christianity: they hide in the catacombs during Holy Week and ritually kill a Christian: Rigord refers to the legend of Richard of Paris, a Christian child allegedly murdered by Jews during the reign of Louis VII.⁴ Rigord describes how Jews flocked to France during the reign of Louis VII because of the king's great liberality towards his subjects. They became rich through moneylending, impoverishing their debtors, seizing their possessions, even imprisoning them in Jewish homes in Paris. Worse, they accepted as pawn from churches sacred items: crucifixes and chalices: the latter, meant to receive the blood of Christ, they filled with wine and had their children dip cakes into: this allows Rigord to associate the Parisian Jews with the impious Babylonian king Balthazar, who drank out of the Jews' sacred vessels and who was then vanquished by the Persian kings Cyrus and Darius. Rigord accuses one of the Jews of having tossed a jeweled crucifix in a latrine.

Rigord describes how the king consults with a holy hermit, and decides to take action. First he releases Christians from their debts to the Jews, yet somehow keeps a fifth for himself. For Jordan, this means that he cancelled interest and kept to himself a fifth of the capital due; for Jordan, this in fact refers to the seizure of the Jews in 1180 by Prince Philip while his father Louis VII lay dying: a quick and easy means for him to enrich himself and assert his power. The fifth given for their ransom amounted to 15 000 marks, acc. to English chronicler Ralph de Diceto⁵.

Philip decrees the expulsion in April 1182 and gives Jews 2 months (until 24 June) to sell their moveable goods and leave. The king seizes all real estate. Bill Jordan, in his masterful survey, depends mostly on Rigord for his description of the expulsion and its consequences. About 2000 Jews were expelled from Paris, by far the largest community in Philip's domain. Many of the synagogues were given to ecclesiastical institutions and

³ Rigord, *Histoire de Philippe Auguste*, Elisabeth Carpentier, Georges Pon, and Yves Chauvin, eds. (Paris, 2006).

⁴Rigord, ch. 5; for a partial translation of Rigord's passages concerning the expulsion of the Jews, see Translation by Jacob Marcus, *The Jew in the Medieval World: A Sourcebook, 315-1791*, (New York, 1938), pp. 24-27. On Richard of Paris, see AASS III March 591-94; Jordan, *The French monarchy and the Jews: from Philip Augustus to the last Capetians*. (Philadelphia, 1989), 18.

⁵ Jordan, *The French monarchy and the Jews*, 30-31.

transformed into churches. Many of the houses, lands, vineyards, etc., were sold or rented out by the king. There is no pursuing of debtors, so it does seem that (after collection of the 5th) debts to Jews were forgiven.

Yet in 1198, Philip readmits Jews, much to the chagrin of Rigord and others. Rigord recounts in the second part of his Chronicle, dedicated to his abbot and clearly not meant for royal eyes, that Philip's decision to readmit Jews was presaged by apocalyptic signs (violent storms, rumors of the birth of the Antichrist in Babylon, poor harvests) and was punished by divine wrath (in the form of English victories over the French). Early 13th-century sources (echoed in bulls of Innocent III) reiterate Rigord's earlier complaints: Jews build synagogues higher than neighboring churches, impoverish widows and orphans through usury, employ Christian servants and wetnurses... As Jordan shows, the (smaller) number of Jews readmitted in 1198 are even more dependent on the king and more tied to the practice than money lending than those expelled in 1182 (who had owned lands, vineyards, etc.). This will create new cycles of resentment, restrictions, expulsions.

3. Brittany 1240

On April 10th, 1240, Jean le Roux (John the Red), duke of Brittany, expels the Jews from his duchy. For this expulsion (unlike that of 1182 and many later expulsions), we have the expulsion edict (document 1 in the appendix).

Several elements are striking about this edict. First of all, the duke claims to be acting "at the petition of the bishops, abbots, barons and vassals of Brittany". Second, he cancels all debts to Jews and has all pledges (either lands or items placed in pawn) return to their owners—excepting those items or land which have already been sold to other Christians. Third, he proclaims "no one shall in any manner be accused or summoned for the death of a Jew who has been killed before now". Fourth, in striking contrast to Philip II (who, as we have seen, readmitted Jews into his lands sixteen years after having expelled them), solemnly proclaims that Jews shall never be allowed in Brittany by either himself or his heirs, and takes drastic measures in order to assure this.

In order to understand this expulsion and the edict, we need to examine the brief and poorly-documented history of the small Jewish community in thirteenth-century

Brittany.⁶ Bill Jordan posited that the first Jews to come to Brittany were some of those expelled by Philip Augustus in 1182. This is plausible (though not provable): the first dated document clearly indicating a Jewish presence in the duchy is from 1209, concerning the repayment of a loan that a Breton noble, Guillaume de Mareuil, had contracted with Jewish lenders. The document does not mention the name of the Jews, but only records how Guillaume had raised money in order to “liberate himself from the Jews” (“ad liberandum se erga iudeos”).⁷

The second document that mentions Jews in Brittany dates from 23 February 1222; it concerns the reconciliation between Duke Pierre de Dreux (father and predecessor of Jean le Roux) and the bishop of Nantes, Étienne de la Bruyère. The duke, in confirming the bishop’s traditional privileges, says “I wish and concede that the bishop exercise, over the Jews living in his fief, the same jurisdiction that his predecessors had over them.” If the Jews do not wish to submit to his authority “they may go away and depart from his fief”.⁸ Not only does the duke recognize the bishop’s rightful lordship over Nantes’ Jews, it is already an “ancient” privilege exercised by his predecessors. The duke had been in conflict with the Breton bishops, who had excommunicated him in 1218 (and who would do so again in 1228).⁹ But clearly in 1222 there was an attempt at reconciliation between the duke and the bishop of Nantes, against whom Pierre had fought over the lordship of the city. Here he recognizes the bishop’s privileges, including his lordship over the Jews. This sort of direct lordship of bishops over Jews is found in other episcopal sees in Europe: it was the case in several cities of the Rhineland in the eleventh century.

We know that Nantes’ Jews had a cemetery: or at least that one of them bought land for the purpose of using it as a cemetery.¹⁰ We may suppose there was a synagogue there, though it has left no trace. There is today a “rue de la Juiverie” in Nantes, which perhaps preserves the memory of a Jewish quarter, but that is conjecture at best. We

⁶Tolan, « *Lachrymabilem judeorum questionem* ».

⁷ Nantes, Archives de la Loire Atlantique H 133 :1.

⁸ « volo etiam & concedo quod Episcopus in Judaeis in suo feodo manentibus eadem jurisdictionem obtineat quam antecessores sui habuerunt in eis, vel ipsi a feodo Episcopi abeant & recedant, &c. » text in P. Morice, *Mémoires pour servir de preuves à l'histoire ecclésiastique et civile de Bretagne, tirés des archives de cette province, de celles de France & d'Angleterre, des recueils de plusieurs sçavans antiquaires & mis en ordre par Hyacinthe Morice* (Paris, 1742-1746 ; reprint Farnborough, 1968), col. 846.

⁹ See J-L. Montigny, *Essai sur les institutions du duché de Bretagne à l'époque de Pierre Mauclerc et sur la politique de ce prince (1213-1237)* (Paris, 1961), 185-209 ; S. Painter, *The Scourge of the Clergy : Peter of Dreux, Duke of Brittany* (Baltimore, 1937) ; B. Pocquet du Haut-Jussé, « Pierre Mauclerc et le conflit politico-religieux en Bretagne au XIIIe siècle », *Revue d'histoire de l'Église de France* 15 (1929), 137-176.

¹⁰ Tolan, « *Lachrymabilem judeorum questionem* ».

know of no Hebrew manuscripts produced in Brittany. There are in all about a dozen documents concerning loans made by Jews to Christians in Brittany between 1209 and 1235. All of the debtors seem to be landed nobles, most of them vassals of the duke of Brittany, Pierre de Dreux. Some of them have to alienate large tracts of land in order to pay off their debts. We know from other sources that Pierre himself worked up a considerable debt to Jews.

Pierre de Dreux was close to Philip II Augustus: they participated together in the 3rd crusade. Brittany had long been a bone of contention between the Plantagenets and the Capetians. When Duke Arthur died without heir in 1202, Philip quickly recognized Arthur's half-sister Alix as duchess and married her to Pierre de Dreux. Pierre fought alongside Philip in his expeditions against the forces of King John in 1216. Alix died while giving birth to Jean le Roux in 1217. Hence from 1217 to 1236, Pierre acted as regent for his son. He was in constant struggle with Breton magnates, particularly with bishops (earning him the nickname "mauclerc"). Pierre adeptly navigated between Plantagenets and Capetians, first siding clearly with Philip Augustus, later making homage to Henry III (1229). He participated in baronial revolts against the child king Louis IX and ultimately had to make a humiliating submission in 1234. Weakened and disgraced, soon to lose any real power in Brittany, he went to Rome and found an unlikely ally in Pope Gregory IX: he became one of the chief leaders of what historians have dubbed the "Baron's crusade". Michael Lower describes how Pierre deftly used the new status of papal protégé to levy taxes on the clergy and to claim immunity from episcopal excommunication. With impunity, he refused to recognize the new Bishop of Nantes in 1236 and usurped the income from the episcopal lands. He finally left for the east in 1240 (and subsequently accompanied Louis IX's Egyptian crusade in 1248).

It is in the period for preparation of the crusade, probably in 1236, that there is extensive violence against Jewish communities in Brittany, Anjou and Poitou. There are brief mentions in Latin and Hebrew chronicles; these massacres are denounced by the bishops at the provincial council of Tours in 1236, and the same year in a papal bull, *Lachrymabilem Judeorum*, Gregory IX laments the fate of Jews brutally massacred, including women and children, and orders bishops and the French king to do whatever they can to put a stop to the violence. Yet sources give little detail; it is impossible to know how many Jews were killed (Gregory says 2500) and who did the killing.

Impossible to know also what role Pierre de Dreux and his vassals may have had in the massacres.

With this background, we can return to the expulsion order and try more fully to understand the context and motivation of Duke Jean. Jean himself affirmed, as we have seen, that he was expelling the Jews at the request of “the bishops, abbots, barons and vassals of Brittany”. Some historians, such as Michael Lower, affirm that he is acting under pressure from the Church.¹¹ Is the expulsion in some ways the fruit of ecclesiastical anti-Judaism? If so, why did the provincial council of Tours, in which the Breton bishops took part in 1236, staunchly condemn the anti-Jewish violence and proclaim *ecclesia judeos sustineat* “the Church preserves the Jews”?¹² Moreover, Jean le Roux was not easily cowed by pressure from churchmen: when he succeeded to the duchy in 1237 and made homage to Louis IX, he refused to swear to defend the liberties of the church, to the great annoyance of the king and his ecclesiastical counselors.¹³ Perhaps the expulsion of the Jews, rather than showing his will to submit to his bishops, was on the contrary a way to destabilize them by showing himself to be a more committed than they to fighting the enemies of the Church. This corresponds to what we know about this duke who, while he defended his prerogatives against Breton bishops as resolutely as his father, never was taxed with the sobriquet « Mauclerc ».

The true motivations are to be sought elsewhere in the edict. First of all, he seems to be acting in his own interest and in the interest of his vassals: he cancels all their debts as well as those he has inherited from his father Pierre de Dreux. Moreover, he protects his vassals from any legal troubles they might have incurred from participation in anti-Jewish violence (in Anjou, on the contrary, royal inquests prosecuted those involved in killings of Jews). These key concessions to his vassals come at a moment when the 23-year-old duke needed to consolidate his authority over them. There were probably very few Jews left in Brittany after the violence of 1236; any remaining Jews or their heirs now have no legal recourse to prosecute the perpetrators of violence or to reclaim their heritage.

¹¹ “There are indications that John was under ecclesiastical pressure to issue the assize [i.e., the expulsion order]”, Lower, *Barons’ Crusade*, 126.

¹² Notice n°137043, RELMIN project, «The legal status of religious minorities in the Euro-Mediterranean world (5th-15thcenturies)», Telma Web edition, IRHT, Institut de Recherche et d’Histoire des Textes - Orléans <http://www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait137043/>.

¹³ Montigny, *Essai*.

We have seen that a number of Breton nobles had amassed debts towards Jews between 1209 and 1235: indeed they were at times forced to alienate large tracts of land in order to repay those debts. The edict of expulsion shows that Duke Pierre also had debts to Jews—debts which in theory accumulated no further interest since his departure on crusade, but for which the capital remained due. It is hence probable, as Michael Lower remarks, that the annulment of debt to Jews was financially more beneficial to the duke and his vassals than was the continued presence of Jewish lenders in the duchy.¹⁴ All the more so, we might add, from Jean's point of view, since Nantes' Jews were subject to the bishop : not only was the duke erasing his own (inherited) debt, he was depriving a rival of income, all while playing the role of defender of the faith.

There is only one document that elucidates the destiny of the Jews who were expelled. In May 1243, a charter in the name of the knights Pierre de Charurent and Hugues Lebruum mentions an extraordinary hearth tax (*fouagium*) which they received from the Cistercian abbot and convent of Saint Aubin des Bois.¹⁵ The two knights insist on the extraordinary nature of this tax, which gives them no rights in the future. They explain the purpose of the tax : *Dictum fouagium habuimus ab ipsis pro judeis a terra Pentheurie removendis* : « we have received this *fouagium* from them in order to remove the Jews from the land of Penthièvre ». This implies that there were still Jews in the county of Penthièvre in 1243, but that the authorities were taking actions to expel them. What was the role of the two knights, what justified this payment? Were they forcibly to expel the Jews? To escort them from the county? It is at any rate the last document to mention Jews in Brittany before the sixteenth century.

4. Gascony 1287

¹⁴ Lower, *Barons' Crusade*, 125-6.

¹⁵ « 1243. Universis Christi fidelibus ad quos presentes littere pervenerint, Petrus de Charurent, miles, allocatus domini Hugonis Lebruum, militis in Britannia, salutem in domino. Noverint universi quod Abbas et conventus Sancti Albini, Cist. Ord., Brioc. dioc. fouagium hominum suorum Briocensis diocesis nobis persolverunt ; nec dictum fouagium a dictis abbate et conventu per consuetudinem habuimus, nec illud de cetero de consuetudine repetemus. Sed dictum fouagium habuimus ab ipsis pro judeis a terra Pentheurie removendis. Et tenemur dictis abbati et conventui trader cartulam domini Hugonis Lebruum super premissis.

Et ut hoc ratum et stabile permaneat ... presents litteras sigillo nostro dictis ablate et conventai dedimus roboratas, in hujus rei testimonium et munimen. Datum die Jovis proxima ante Penthecosthen, anno domini M CC quadragesimo tercio, mense Maii. »

Geslin de Bourgogne et de Barthélemy, *Anciens évêchés de Bretagne* (Saint-Brieuc, 1864) 3 :101 ; see Brunschvicg, « Les juifs en Bretagne », 114.

Little research has been done on the expulsion of the Jews from Gascony in 1287¹⁶. Edward I was not only the King of England: he was also duke of Gascony. It has been suggested that the 1287 expulsion was a sort of “test run” for the expulsion of England. Be that as it may, the situation is different: in England, as we will see, Jews depended directly on the crown, and there was an elaborate royal bureaucracy devoted to their affairs (Exchequer of the Jews, justices of the Jews) and to keeping track of debts to Jews (the *archa* system). For these reasons and others, the two expulsions are different and the consequences are very different.

Edward became Duke of Gascony in 1252, at the age of 13, twenty years before ascending the throne of England. The substantial Jewish community of Gascony was an important source of revenue for the duke, who levied extraordinary tallages in 1275, 1281 and 1282. In a number of charters, the king issues privileges granting exemption from tallages to individual Jews in return for annual payments: no doubt a system that provided more reliable and regular income for the duke—and less arbitrary and more manageable payments for the Jews concerned. This revenue became all the more important as Edward amassed heavy debts to pay for his military and diplomatic adventures on the continent, particularly in his role in the negotiations with the Aragonese in his attempts to secure the freedom of Charles II of Anjou .

On Easter Sunday (April 7th) 1287, Edward was standing in a tower in Bordeaux when the floor collapsed: he and his entourage tumbled down 80 feet. Several knights were killed; Edward suffered a broken collarbone and other injuries and was in convalescence for months. In May, he took a crusading vow; soon thereafter, it seems, he decided to expel the Jews from the duchy. In autumn Jews were arrested and their goods seized; by November they are expelled.

The expulsion order is not extant, but a number of documents in the Gascon Rolls refer to Jews, their debtors, and their finances. While Richardson (and after him Chazan) had affirmed that financial need was the principal motor for the Gascon expulsion, Trabut-Crussac has shown that Edward profited little financially from the expulsion: usury was forgiven (debtors could plea abusive rates of usury and get off with paying only half of their debt).¹⁷ Revenues went principally to the mendicant orders.¹⁸ In other

¹⁶For an introduction to the subject, see Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 64-7 & 276-82.

¹⁷ Richardson, *English Jewry*, 225-7; Chazan, *Medieval Jewry of Northern France*, 184; Trabut-Crussac, 85-6.

¹⁸ See, for example, *Records of the Wardrobe and the Household, 1286-9*, no. 2578:

words Edward, heavily indebted though he was, chose not to profit financially from the expulsion, preferring to give the money he seized from the Gascon Jews to religious orders, perhaps not wishing to profit from Jewish usury. I have come across a pair of documents concerning one Jew in Gascony who was seized, imprisoned, his goods confiscated, and his letters of credit “perforated”. Yet this Jew, Bonomus of Bergerac, was a subject to the King of France. Edward orders his men to restore the letters and possessions of this Jew and to let him go free.¹⁹

There are various texts in the Gascon rolls in which the King notes that some Jews (some individuals are named) have returned to Gascony after 1290; he orders them expelled and reminds his deputies that no Jews should be allowed to live in the Duchy. Yet there is evidence that Jews continued to live in the duchy, as the duke issues repeated orders to assure their expulsion. They did so openly after the death of Edward in 1307; in 1318 Edward II ordered his seneschal to expel the Jews, saying that he is

Apud Leyburn' ni Vasconia universis Fratribus Minoribus in ducatu Aquitanie existentibus de pecunia proveniente de Judaismo Vasconie de elemosina regis, MMD li. Chipotensium.
 Et Fratribus Predicatoribus universis eiusdem ducatus de elemosina regis, MMD li. Chipotensium.
 Et Fratribus de Monte Carmeli universis in eodem ducatu de elemosina regis, Dcc li. Chipotensium.
 Et Fratribus de Sancto Augustino universis in eodem ducatu de elemosina regis, cc li. Chipotensium.
 Et Fratribus de Penitencia Jehsu Christi de eodem ducatu de elemosina regis, c li. Chipotensium.
 Summa Chipotensium in toto vj milia li. que valent in sterlingis M iijxx xv li. Xvij s. ix d. ob. Summa patet.
 Tercia summa totalis MM cccxlvij li. Iij d. ob. Probat.
 Summa totalis istius rotuli MMMiijxx ij li. Xix s. Probat. Summa totalis istius rotuli MDccciijxx v li. Sj s. vij d.

¹⁹ *Records of the Wardrobe and the Household, 1286-9*, nos. 4464

Univeris presente literas inspecturis Guillelmus de Luda thesaurarius illustris regis Anglie salute in Domino sempterternem. Noveritis quod cum Judei de Vasconia per preceptum domini regis capti fuereunt et detenti et eius bona similiter arestata una cum instrumentis omnibus et cartis de quibuscumque debitis cum eis inventis Bonomus de Brigeriaco Judeus domini regis Francie inter alios captus erat bonis et cartis singulis cum ipso inventis similiter arestatis et quia carte sue quas habuit de diversis debitis per ministros dicti domini regis ad hoc deputatos non in loco inspecto fuerant perforate nos per preceptum dicti domini regis Anglie prefatas cartas et instrumenta eidem fecimus liberari testificantes quod dictus Bonomus in predictis debitis suis levandis causa perforacionis cartarum predictarum nullum dampnum habere debeat seu detrimentum. Et nos in testamentum premissorum presentibus literis sigillum nostrum apposimus. Datum ut proximo supra. <4463: Datum Burd' die Veneris proxima post festum Nativitatis Beati Johannis Baptiste anno domini M cc octogesimo septimo.>

4465

De noble home et a sun tres cher ami mon sire Nichol de Gras, Guillaume de Lue salut et bones anuses pur ceo ke Boninum de Bregerak' jeu le rei de Francie portur des lettres nus ad fet entendre ke aukune gent nostre senyur le rei de Engleterre en le mens ke les jeux esteient pris prestrent de ses bons xxv li. de Chipotes en deners et dient ke il les ad recens arrere et le devient verement sun argent et il rei vu ke ne resust si come il indist vos primus nus et requoimus ke vos a plus cost ke vos poet facet prendre une enqueste des bone gens saver ... dit bonum ad recen cel argent ou nonn et si vos crouet ke il ren ne li rendirent ke vos les fecit rendre hast menient ke ceo est la volunte le rey et Deu. Data ut supra.

very surprised that it has not yet been done, since he as ordered it done many times: if he cannot expel them, he should at least let him know why.²⁰

5. Anjou 1289

Two years later, on December 8th, 1289, Charles II, count of Anjou, expels the Jews from his county. We have the full expulsion decree (below, document 3), which is our principal source of information.

Charles presents himself in 1289 as “king of Jerusalem and Sicily, prince of the duchy of Apulia and the principality of Capua, count of Achea, Anjou and Forcalquier”. As these titles indicate, he laid claim to far-flung domains, over many of which his rights were contested: hence his policies in Anjou are in part subservient to his broader political and military ambitions. His father had purchased in 1277 the title of King of Jerusalem from Mary of Antioch; hence Charles’ claim to the title. In 1288, he had been released after five years in captivity: he had been captured by Catalans in the conflict following the Sicilian Vespers. As a condition of his release, he had relinquished his claim to Sicily (accepting to be called only king of Naples), yet shortly after gaining freedom, Pope Nicholas IV released him from his vow and crowned him King of Sicily. Charles was to pursue this claim until 1302, when he finally renounced it in the Peace of Caltabellotta. His other titles reflect lands over which he had some real power (Apulia and Capua in Southern Italy, Forcalquier in Provence) as well as ones in which his overlordship was recognized in theory but brought him little practical power or benefit (Achaea, a crusader duchy in the Peloponnese).

In 1289, when Charles arrives in Anjou for the first time as count, he seeks of course to affirm his authority over the county. He is also preoccupied with making good his claim to the throne of Sicily, a preoccupation shared by his French and papal allies. He also is deeply in debt, not least to King Edward I, who had played a key role in mediating to obtain Charles’ release from prison—and who had advanced considerable sums of money to obtain it. Charles of course knew of Edward’s Gascon expulsion.

²⁰“Order to the seneschal of Gascony, or his lieutenant, to expel the Jews from the duchy, and not to permit them to live there subsequently, or to certify the king of the reasons why this has not been done, so that the king will be certified by the following Easter of what has been done. The seneschal is not to omit to do this, since the king has ordered it to be done many times, but nothing has been done about which he is greatly surprised.” *Gascon Roll for the 11th year of the reign of Edward II, son of King Edward I*, no. 304 (24 August 1318); translation online http://www.gasconrolls.org/edition/calendars/C61_32/document.html#it032_11_13f_075 .

Whether or not he knew that Edward had not profited financially from that expulsion, Charles, in need of money to pursue his claim to Sicily through war with Aragon, would use the expulsion to obtain new taxes from his subjects.

In the expulsion order of 1289, Charles affirms that the Jews of Anjou and Maine are guilty of “many enormities and crimes”. He cites “sacred authority”, in fact a bull of Innocent III, which had applied to the Jews an adage warning against trusting those who were “like the mouse in a pocket, like the Snake around one's loin, like the fire in one's bosom.”²¹ In particular, he accuses them of “despoiling” Christians through the practice of usury and of cohabiting with Christian women. Charles presents the expulsion as his own initiative, the result of his “compassion” for the Christian victims of Jewish perfidy. He says that he consulted with bishops and vassals, implying that the decision to expulse was based on a broad consultation.

The edict orders expulsion of all Jews from Anjou and Maine. The expulsion is permanent, engaging both count and his successors. Any of the Count's men who exercise authority in his name are allowed (and indeed required) to arrest and despoil and beat any Jew who does not respect expulsion order; they are then to expel them. Any other subject may arrest and despoil them and bring them to a judge.

Yet the Jews are not the only objects of the expulsion order, which clearly is aimed at usurers more generally: he orders that “the aforesaid expulsion be extended to all Lombards, Cahorsins, and other foreigners who engage in public usury without public contracts and who are properly considered usurers”. This is also a permanent expulsion; their goods to be seized & handed over to “the lords of those places” (which had not been specified for the Jews).

Like John the Red of Brittany (and unlike the kings of France or England), Charles emphasizes the permanent nature of this expulsion which places penalties on himself or any of his successors in the event that they allow Jews (or other foreign usurers) to return to the county: the count's domain is to be put under interdict and he is to forfeit the special tax that was authorized in the expulsion order.

It is this tax that is the real innovation in this edict: a one-time tax of three shillings (*solidi*) per hearth and six pennies per worker is accorded to count to recompense his loss of income (or what is presented as such). In 1182, Philippe II

²¹“Mus in pera, serpens in gremio et ignis in sinu” Innocent III, Etsi Iudeos, <http://www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait30352/>.

profited from the expulsion primarily through seizure of Jews' land and houses (since they were allowed to take moveable property with them); in 1240, John the Red and his barons profited through the canceling of their debt and the reclaiming of items (and land) in pawn; and (as we have seen), Edward I made little if any financial gain from the expulsion from Gascony. Charles took advantage of the expulsion to obtain this exceptional levy, which suggests that the expulsion was a popular move for which his subjects were prepared to pay.

Yet several questions remain unanswered about this expulsion. What became of the expelled Jews' possessions? Their land? Their movable property? The order does not say whether they have the right to sell land or other property and what they may take with them into exile. Further research will perhaps throw light onto these questions. And what about outstanding debts? Were they taken over by count? Was interest forgiven? Capital? Charles says that any future contracts made by Jews are null and void: but what about contracts already established? And the broader question remains of why his Angevin vassals and churchmen would have been favorable to this expulsion of usurers, both Jews and non-Jews. The capital that these lenders made available is not seen as an advantage, but as a means to exploit through the exaction of heavy payments of interest. To understand this resentment, we need to turn to a far better-documented community of Jewish moneylenders, those of thirteenth-century England.

6. England 1290

The expulsion of 1290 has been studied extensively, most recently by Robin Mundill. How does it compare to the four other expulsions we have studied?

Debts are not forgiven, but taken over by the king. We do indeed have some documents, over the following decades, in which the king (Edward or his successors) frees individual debtors from debts contracted to Jews (or at times, simply from the interest). This suggests that in other cases debtors were pursued by the fisc. Great care was taken to recover the *archae* (the special chests in each town that contained the loan contracts) and bring them in safe-keeping to London. Edward II finally granted a general amnesty for all debts to Jews 36 years later, in 1326. Various royal decrees specify that Jews should be able to leave in peace and with their property. Several chroniclers relate the story of a boat captain who robs his Jewish passengers, then

abandons them on the sands of the Thames estuary, where they are submerged by the rising tide: he and his associates are hanged. Various entries in the Gascon rolls, all dated 1294, are letters of remission for people who had robbed and killed English Jews at sea.²²

Historians had long posited that by 1290 the Jews weren't worth much, that they had been bled so much through tallages that they had little wealth and so that they were expendable: Edward had few qualms about granting their expulsion as a sop to his people, who were motivated by anti-Jewish prejudice.²³ Yet recent work, in particular by Robin Mundill and Robert Stacey, has shown that this was not the case. Mundill, in particular, has examined the records of the Exchequer of the Jews and of the various *archae*: copious documentation, which contains records of thousands of loans made by Jews. We know who loaned how much to whom, how and when it was paid back, etc. Mundill shows that in spite of heavy tallages, some Jews manage to thrive and accumulate wealth.

Robert Stacey has examined the negotiations in parliament that led up to the decision to expel: he shows that the expulsion of 1290 cannot be understood in isolation, but as part of these negotiations, which centered on the King's huge debt and the need to raise funds. Edward had indeed accumulated considerable debts, notably 110 000 pounds to the Riccardi of Lucca. It was difficult to justify taxing English subjects, or the Church (via a crusading tithe), to repay the king's Gascon debts. In February, 1288, nevertheless, Edward, who was in Gascony, sent a request for new taxation; the barons refused, saying that he must submit his request in person in England. Edward returned to England on 12 August 1289 after 3 consecutive years in Gascony. The 1290 parliament was the occasion for the airing of substantial grievances against the king: from bishops who resented encroachment by royal justice, from Londoners who resented lack of self-government (since power was held by royal bailiffs). Moreover there was considerable resentment against the king's brother Edmund of Lancaster and against Queen Eleanor, who acquired (and enforced) Christian debts to Jews;

²²M. Francisque, C. Bémont, and Y. Renouard, eds., *Roles gascons* (Paris, 1885), entries no. 3048, 3049, 3063, 3090, 3092.

²³See, for example, P. Elman, "The Economic Causes of the Expulsion of the Jews in 1290," *The Economic History Review* 7 (1937), 145-154

according to one chronicler: “The king desires to get our gold; the queen, our manors fair to hold”²⁴

This issue deserves a closer examination, because it seems to be a key for understanding why, in these parliamentary negotiations, pressure would be put on the king to expel the Jews—to the point, as we will see, that the barons will, just as Charles II’s Angevin vassals two years earlier, accept the imposition of new taxes in return for the expulsion of the Jews. What explains this? The causes often evoked are first of all “popular” anti-Judaism, as seen in the accusations of host desecration, ritual murder, etc. This is not to be dismissed, but nothing suggests that in 1290 there was any more anti-Jewish resentment than there had been in 1144 (ritual murder accusation for the death of William of Norwich) or 1190 (massacre of the York Jewry). What had indeed changed was that recent expulsions had placed the option on the table, and the Angevin expulsion had shown that it could help raise new taxes. And a key element is the resentment of nobles who had lost their lands to barons (and to members of the royal family) through their debt to Jews.

This issue was not new in 1290. As Robert Bartlett has said, “Given the close entanglement of Jewish and royal finance, it is not surprising that the Jews were seen as the ugly tools of greedy kings”.²⁵ Let us look at one important piece of evidence. The 1258 parliament of Oxford, when it drew up grievances to be submitted to King Henry III, listed among them the following:

Jews sometimes transfer their debts, and the lands pledged to them, to magnates and other persons powerful in the kingdom, who on this pretext enter the lands of minors, and although those who owe the debt are ready to pay it, with the interest, the magnates put off the matter, in order that by hook or by crook the lands and holdings shall remain in their hands, saying that without the Jew to whom the debt was owed they cannot do anything, and that they know nothing, and thus they continually put off the repayment of the borrowed money so that, by the intervention of death or of some other mischance, evident peril and manifest disherison plainly threaten those to whom the holdings belonged.²⁶

What was happening? Jews were lending money to landowners who mortgaged their lands. When the Jews needed to raise cash (particularly in response to tallages or other exceptional royal impositions), it was quicker and more effective to sell their debts (at a

²⁴ J. Parsons, *Eleanor of Castile: Queen and Society in Thirteenth-century England* (NY 1995), 2, who is translating Walter of Guisborough, *Chronicle*, H. rothwell, ed. Camden Soc. 3rd ser 89 (1957), 216.

²⁵ R. Bartlett, *England under the Norman and Angevin Kings* (Oxford, 2000), 353.

²⁶ R. Treharne & I. Sanders, eds., *Documents of the Baronial movement of reform and rebellion, 1258-67* (Oxford, 1973), p. 86-7; see J. Tolan, “Petitio baronum”, <http://www.cn-telma.fr/relmin/extrait252151/>.

discount) to Christians in order to raise quick cash. These Christians, often monasteries, but (as here) also lay magnates, had more efficient means of persuasion and coercion than did the Jewish lenders. As Barnett Ovrut has shown, many small landowners lost their lands through this process: their resentment is natural; that the Jews (rather than the aristocrats or monasteries) should become the object of their resentment will surprise no-one.

Edward was very much aware of the situation: his father Henry III had granted him the income from England's Jewry when he was still crown prince. Early in his reign, in the 1275 statutes of the Jewry, Edward had prohibited Jews from practicing usury. This has at times been presented as a concession to pressures from churchmen, which to some extent it may be. But also it seems to be an attempt to resolve the problem of small tenants who loss land through this practice. Already in 1233, Henry III had proclaimed "Nullus Iudeus remaneat in regno nostro nisi talis sit quod regi possit seruire et bonos plegios inueniat de fidelitate," reaffirming the principle that Jews were present in England through royal privilege and directly dependent on the king. This law has been seen by some as an example of Henry's increasingly restrictive policy towards Jews, but perhaps it is best understood as a testimony to the fact that he felt that his monopoly on lordship over Jews was in danger. During his reign, he on a number of occasions vigorously opposed the attempts of various bishops and church councils to limit the activities of Jews and their contacts with Christians, or to make them pay tithes to the Church.²⁷ Not that either Henry or Edward faced direct challenges to their claims of royal lordship over the Jews from either church (bishops or monasteries) or lay magnates. Yet clearly the status of Jewish moneylenders, and the wealth generated through their activities, was not completely under royal control. This was already clear, as we have seen, in 1258, when knights complained of how magnates exploited the situation to legally seize lands.

Edward had tried to deal with the problem, then, in 1275, by simply prohibiting the practice of usury—that is, of lending money for interest. Mundill shows that there is subsequently a major shift from money loans to commodities trade: either disguised money loans (as some think) or real commodities trading (as Mundill thinks), most likely some mix of both. In June 1290, the royal administration was making major

²⁷ Tolan, research in progress.

preparations for a tallage of Jews, showing (for Stacey) that Edward did not yet plan on expelling them.

While there is no extant expulsion decree, we do have a royal writ from November 1290 (document 3 in appendix) Here Edward justifies the expulsion by affirming that the Jews had not respected the prohibition of usury, but had invented a pernicious new form of usury, which they called *curialitas*. In this writ, he cancels all interest and penalties on loans made by Jews—but the capital was still due, and was now to be paid to the king. He instructs his exchequer to pursue these debts and to schedule repayment schemes with the debtors. This was of course a considerable windfall for the king, at least in theory: in practice the debts were difficult to collect, and were eventually forgiven, as we have seen, by Edward II in 1326. But the principal economic benefit that Edward gained from the expulsion was nothing less than the largest single grant of taxation conceded by parliament to any English medieval king: a staggering £160 000.

By expelling the Jews, Edward was making a gesture to the lesser knights and undermining the power of a number of the magnates (including, admittedly, queen Eleanor). There is nothing to suggest that religious prejudice was in any way a direct cause of the expulsion, much less that the church took any role in it. As Sophia Menache has shown, English monastic chronicles do not show enthusiasm for the expulsion: the *Annals* of the Cistercian monastery of Waverly are critical, and attribute the expulsion to the anti-Jewish scheming of the Queen Mother.²⁸

7. Conclusions

I hope that in this brief comparative study I have shed a bit of light on the issue, and have managed to contextualize these expulsions. Earlier studies have focused mainly on the major royal expulsions (1182, 1290, 1306, 1492...), but the study of the 13th-century expulsions from Brittany, Gascony and Anjou is important in understanding what was happening. Further work needs to be done, among other things in taking into account a flurry of small-scale expulsions, often from individual cities. In England, for example, Simon of Montfort expelled the Jews of Leicester in 1231; there were expulsions from various English towns and districts in 1234, 1236-7, 1242-3, and

²⁸ Menache, "The King, the Church and the Jews", 226-7, citing the *Annals of Waverly*, H. Luard, ed., *Annales Monastici* 1 (London, 1864): xxx-xlv.

1275.²⁹ In France there was a wave of expulsions at the end of the thirteenth century: 1290: St. Pierre sur Dives; 1291: St. Pair (Cotentin); 1300 Angy. For Robert Chazan (p. 183): “all of these actions seem to represent royal acceding to local sentiments”. And of course the story has to be brought up to the 1306 expulsion by Philip IV.

Yet some preliminary and tentative conclusions can be drawn from this comparative look at five expulsions. I have concentrated on financial/political considerations. Other issues (blood libel accusations, etc.) may indeed have played some role in creating a mood receptive to the expulsion of Jews, but there is little or no direct evidence for this. Indeed, as Sophia Menache has shown, no evidence that these expulsions were widely popular, or that they were approved by (much less motivated by) church institutions, whether monasteries, bishops or the papacy. What’s more (as Menache notes), in both England and France in the fourteenth centuries, royal usurpation of tithes on church property is going to be one of the chief ways that kings of England and France will raise money, now that they can no longer make extraordinary tallages on Jews: many a churchman may have had good reason to regret the expulsions.

Resentment of Jewish usury does clearly, though, play an important role in all five expulsions. In Anjou, Cahorsins & Lombard usurers are also expelled, showing that this is major concern (even though other concerns, such as Christian-Jewish cohabitation, are also evoked). In many cases, the debt of groups of Christians is presented as heavy or intolerable: Rigord dramatizes the consequences in France; we know that Pierre de Dreux and some of his vassals had accumulated considerable debt to Breton Jews; and the complaints of the English (particularly the lesser knights) have been amply documented. These expulsions are best understood as expressions of these monarch’s efforts to consolidate and affirm their powers and to maximize their revenues.

Appendix: principal documents:

1. Decree expelling Jews from Brittany (10 April 1240):

Universis presentes litteras inspecturis Johannes, dux Britanniae, comes Richemundiae, salutem.

Noveritis quod nos ad precessionem episcoporum, abbatum, baronum ac vassallorum Britanniae et pensata voluntate tocius terrae, ejecimus omnes Judeos de Britannia, nec nos nec haeredes nostri tenebimus in Britannia ullo unquam tempore, nec sustinebimus quod aliqui de subditis nostris ipsos teneant in terris suis in Britannia.

²⁹ Roth, *A History of the Jews in England*, 58.

Praeterea omnia debita que debentur dictis Judeis in Britannia constitutes, quocumque modo et qualitercumque eis debentur, penitus remittimus et quietamus; et terrae eisdem Judeis obligatae et quaecumque pignora mobilia et immobilia ad debitores vel eorum heredes revertentur, exceptis terris et aliis pignoribus quae jam vendita sunt Christianis per iudicium curiae nostrae.

Praeterea nullus de morte Judeorum interfectorum usque modo accusabitur vel convenietur.

Praeterea bona fide pro posse nostro rogabimus et inducemus dominum regem Franciae quod istam ordinationem sive assisiam velit et confirmet per litteras suas.

Praeterea manucapimus pro nobis et pro patre nostro quod nullis Judeis in terra patris nostri debita jam contracta in Britannia nullatenus persolvantur.

Istam assisiam taliter ordinatam juravimus bona fide in perpetuum servare, et si contra ordinationem juravimus bona fide in perpetuum servare, et si contra ordinationem istam nos venire contigerit, episcopi Britanniae communiter vel sigillatim possunt nos excommunicare et terras nostras in suis diocesibus supponere interdicto, non obstante aliquo privilegio impetrato vel impetrando.

Insuper gratamus et concedimus quod heredes nostri qui pro tempore nobis succedent, postquam advenerint ad legitimam aetatem, jurabunt hanc assisiam prout superius ordinata est se fideliter servaturos. Et dicti barones, vassalli vel alii quicumque qui debeant fidelitatem comiti Britanniae, non jurabunt fidelitatem nec facient homagium dictis heredibus nostris, donec ipsi sufficienter requisiti per duos ad minus episcopos, vel per duos barones ad minus nomine aliorum, istam assisiam se juraverint fideliter servaturos; quo jurato a dictis heredibus, ipsi barones et alii qui debent fidelitatem comiti Britanniae ex tunc jurabunt fidelitatem et facient hommagium dictis heredibus sicut debuerint sine mora.

Praeterea episcopi et barones et vassalli juraverunt et concesserunt quod nullo unquam tempore Judeos tenebunt sive permittent teneri in terris suis in Britannia.

Datum apud Plairmel, die Martis ante resurrectionem Domini anno gratiae MCCXXXIX.

Source of text : M. Planiol, *La très ancienne coutume de Bretagne : avec les assises, constitutions de parlement et ordonnances ducales, suivies d'un recueil de textes divers antérieurs à 1491* (Rennes, 1896), 329-30.

English translation:

To all who may read these letters, John, duke of Brittany, count of Richmond sends greetings:

Know that, at the petition of the bishops, abbots, barons and vassals of Brittany, and having in mind the good of all of Brittany, we expel all the Jews from Brittany. Neither we nor our heirs shall have them in Brittany at any time in the future, nor shall we tolerate that any of our subjects have them in their lands which are in Brittany. Moreover, all debts due the said Jews from any who live in Brittany, in whatsoever manner and form these are due them, we completely remit and nullify. Lands pledged to the said Jews and all other pledges of movable or real property shall revert to the debtors or their heirs, except for lands and other pledges which have already been sold to Christians by the judgment of our court. Moreover, no one shall in any manner be accused or summoned for the death of a Jew who has been killed before now. Moreover, in good faith and as much as in our power lies, we shall ask and urge the lord king of France by his letters to agree to and confirm this order and decree. Moreover, we promise for ourselves and for our father, that no debts at one time contracted in Brittany shall be paid to Jews who live in the lands of our father.

This edict thus decreed we swear to observe in good faith forever. If it ever happens that we act contrary to this decree, the bishops of Brittany may individually and collectively excommunicate us and place under the interdict our lands in their dioceses, notwithstanding any privilege to the contrary obtained or to be obtained. Furthermore, we grant and concede that our heirs, whenever they succeed us, shall, after coming of age, take an oath faithfully to observe this decree as above ordained. The said barons and vassals and whoever else owes fealty to the count of Brittany shall not swear fealty and do homage to the said heirs, just as they

are supposed to do and without delay. Moreover, the bishops, barons, and vassals have sworn and granted that at no time will they hold or permit the holding of Jews in their lands in Brittany.

Given in Ploermel, the Tuesday before Easter in the year of our Lord MCCXXXIX. [= 10 April 1240]

Source of translation: S. Grayzel, *The Church and the Jews in the XIIIth Century* (New York, 1966), 344-5 (modified)

2. Decree expelling Jews from Anjou (8 December 1289):

xxiv. Copie de certaines lettres du Roy Charles II, roy de Hierusalem et de Sicile, par lesquelles les juifs, Lombard, Caorsins, et autres gens usuraires, furent deboutez, et mis hors des citez et bonnes villes des pais d'Anjou et du Maine, et l'an 1289.

Karolus secundus, Dei gratia rex Jerusalem, Siciliae, ducatus Apuliae, et principatus Capuae princeps, Achaiae, Andegaviae et Foncarquerii comes, tenore praesentium notum facimus universis, quod nos auctoritatis sacrae pensantes eloquia, qua cavetur, nus, vipera, serpens in gremio, et ignis in sinu retributionem iniquam hospitibus consueverunt exhibere: ac comitatum andegaviae et Cenomaniae, qui Deo volente nostro subsunt regimini, conditions et mores, diligent inquisitione habita, propensius agnoscentes, invenimus statum dictae terrae et comperimus multis enormitatibus et dehonestatibus Deo odibilibus et fidei christianae abhorribilibus subjacere. In multis siquidem locis ipsius terrae plerique Judaei vivificae crucis, totiusque christianitatis nostrae inimici, christianos passim et publicae commorentes, plures utriusque sexus, eorum qui christiana professione censentur, a via veritates deviantes perfide subverterunt; et adhuc subvertere videbantur omnes quos poterant: bonis eorum mobilibus et immobilibus, exquisitis fallaciis, usurarum voragine spoliantes, et mendicare turpiter compellent, et quod horribilius censetur, cum multis mulieribus christianis se nefarie commiscebant. Propterea nos, quibus incumbit provincias nobis subditas malis purgare hominibus, compassionis debitae percussi jaculo, cum reverendis patribus episcopis et pluribus clericis, ac etiam fidelibus comitibus et proceribus, aliisque fide dignis, tam per nos quam fideles apocryphos nostros fuimus super his collocti; ut morbis hujusmodi invalescentibus obviare, fraudesque praelibatas ab eisdem locis totaliter extirpare valeremus. Demum Celsitudini nostrae, Deo, ut credimus, disponente, placitum est, ut per praedictorum expulsionem Judaeorum, et etiam posterorum, praedictis nostris comitatibus, personisque inter ipsorum comitatum fines degentibus consulere debeamus.

Igitur ad honorem Dei, locorumque praedictorum tranquillitatem, nos vivificae crucis zelum gerentes, licet quamplurima emolumenta a praedictis Judaeis temporalia habeamus; malentes tamen subditorum quieti providere, quam iniquitatis mammona nostros sacculos implere; maxime ubi pro temporalium amissione, spiritualia commoda expetentur, omnes, singulosque Judaeos, masculos et foeminas, adultos, impuberes, pueros et infantes, cujuscumque sexus conditionisve fuerint progeniti, ac etiam educati, a praedictis nostris Andegaviae, Cenomaniae, comitatibus expellimus, expellique praecipimus; et a locis omnibus et singulis comitatum eorundem, non solum pro praesenti, sed pro omni in posterum tempore, tam nostro, quam successorum nostrorum quorumcumque, ad quos dictos comitatus, et eorum quemlibet contigerit devenire. Itaque nec morari, nec habitare, nec habere vel quasi, ipsis ipsorumque cuicumque liceat in memoratis locis de caetero, nec jam natis, nec in posterum nascituris; nec ... [sic] valeant, nec in hoc deffendi a nobis nostrisve successoribus, quos ad haec damnamus, et etiam afficimus observanda. Contractus vel quasi, si quos fecerint, decernimus esse nullos; et, quatenus in nobis est, et ad jurisdictionem nostrum spectat, eis per loca praedicta venire non liceat, vel transire. Praecipientes sub obtestatione firmissima, et sub poena amissionis nostrae gratiae, omnibus baillivis, vicariis et allocatis, ut visis his nostris apicibus, si quem Judaeum reperiant in aliquo locorum praedictorum, ipsum capiant, et statim expellant. Concedimus insuper et auctoritatem praestamus irrevocabilem omnibus baronibus, militibus, magistris, ac aliis jurisdictionem, altam vel bassam, in praedictis comitatibus habentibus, ut si post haec aliquem sectae judaeicae existentem, cujuscumque sexus vel conditionis existat, reperiant in aliquo loco in dictis comitatibus sibi subdito, ipsum, ipsam, ipsos, ipsasve capientes, morantes,

morantem, habitantem, habitantes, conhabentem, conhabentes, vel quasi, nudos spolient et depellent ; volentes et inhibentes, quantum ad nos et jurisdictionem nostram spectat, ne contractus eorum in dictis locis facti, post datam praesentium in potestate faciendi alicui executioni demandentur. Si vero inveniens Judaeum, vel Judaeam, morantem in locis praefatis, contrahentem vel quasi, jurisdictionem aliquam, vel vilicariam, non habeant, etsiam plebeius, vel rusticus, vel alterius christiani existat status, nihilominus volumus, concedimus et auctoritatem praestamus capiendi personas praedictas judaeas temporibus in posternum quibuscumque, judaeasque hujusmodi personas spoliandi, et ad iudicem loci mediate vel immediate ducendi cum spoliis : qui ipsas statim verbaratas si oportet, absque inflictione vulnerum, a dictis comitatibus expellat et de praedictis spoliis cum consilio tenentis locum nostrum ordinet et disponat.

Sane ut nostrae intentionis sinceritas liberalior luculentius elucescat, ne per nequitas excogitatas in toto vel in parte eidem munificentiae fraus fieri valeat, sancientes praecipimus, ut expulsio praedicta extendatur ad omnes Lombardos, Caourcinos, aliquos personas alienigenas, usuras publice exercentes, sine contractus publicos qui usurarii merito sunt censendi ; ipsasque personas tam natas, quam in posteris temporibus nascituras, a praedictis locis expellimus ex nunc et ex tunc, expellique et expulsas haberi praecipimus in futurum, tam per successores nostros, quam per omnes et singulos barones, milites, et nobiles comitatum praedictorum, nulla alia a nobis vel posteris licentia requisita ; bonis nihilominus eorum omnibus locorum dominis applicatis. Quod si locorum domini in praemissis inveniantur negligentes vel remissi, bonorum publicationem nostro dominio reservamus.

Porro quia secundum sancti spiritus donum prophetium omnes a minimo usque ad majorem avaritiae student, verentes ne aliquis successorum nostrorum, quod avertat idem spiritus, ad praedictas revocandas personas propter iniquitatis mammonae promissionem moveatur, volumus et nos singulos mediatos successores nostros in dictis locis obligamus ad non faciendam revocationem aliquam de personis praedictis, et ad non consentiendum habitationi, moerae et contractui, vel quasi, aut adventui dictorum Judaeorum, ut de ipsis Judaeis superius est expressum ; etiam si quis niteretur attentare. Et quia accedente consensu reverendorum in Christo patrum dominorum Nicolai Andegavensis, Durandi Nannetensis episcoporum, capitulorumque dictorum locorum, nec non capitulorum Cenomanensis, Pictaviensis, Sancit Martini Turonensis, abbatum, hospitaliorum, templariorumque, baronum, comitum, militum, aliorumque fide dignorum, inter metas et fines eorumdem comitatum terras habitantium, sive degentium, nobis gratiose sine debito est concessum, ut uno per alium computato, a quolibet foco tres solidos semel tantum, et a qualibet serviente mercedam lucrante sex denarios semel tantum, et a qualibet serviente mercedem lucrante sex denarios semel duntaxat, ad aliquam emolumentum ejus quem amittimus pro expulsionibus praelibatis recompensationem, percipere et habere debeamus, juxta tractus cum eis habitos et fidelem nostrum Mauritium dominum de Credonio senescallum et vicarium nostrum in comitatibus supradictis. Confitemur quod hoc gratis faciunt, et absque debito : nec per hoc volumus eis, eorumve alicui, etiamsi sit plebeius, praepjudicium generari ; nec per hac nobis, successoribusve nostris aliquam obligationem acquiri foagia amplius petendi, vel levandi ab eis, nec ab aliquo eorumdem, occasione hujusmodi levationis, salvo nostris taliis et aliis juribus nostris, quae habemus et habere debemus secundum modum et consuetudinem comitatum praedictorum.

Insuper nos, haeredes, successores nostros quoslibet obligantes ad reddendam episcopis, capitulis, abbatibus, hospitaliariis, templariis, eorumque subditis, et nostris etiam subditis immediate, si qui sunt, omnem pecuniam quam ex dicto foagio et servientium mercede lucrantium habebimus, si contingat, quod absit, nos, vel successores nostros, aliquem seu aliquos, Judaeum vel Judaeos revocare ad aliquem locorum praedictorum, aut revocationi, moerae, vel adventui eorum alicujus, ut praemittitur, consentire, sive usuras exerceat, sive non ; aut etiam Lombardorum, Caoucinorum, aut aliorum alienigenarum, postquam nobis vel nostris successoribus appareret eos publice vel ... [sic] contractus usuarios exercere ; liberalitate tamen supra institutum dominorum super praedictarum personarum expulsionem per nos factam in suo robore remanente : ad quod servandum volumus per nostros superiores tam nos quam successores, etiam reducta pecunia compelli : consentientes ut, si per nos et successores nostros

haec infringi, revocationem aliquam faciendo, vel revocationi consentiendo praedictarum personarum contingat ad aliquem praedictorum locorum, quae omnia domania nostra, et etiam consentientium nobilium nobis vel successoribus nostris quoad hoc consentientium et faventium, nobis tamen nostrisque haeredibus, seu successoribus nostris, aut aliis personis praedictis primo sufficienter monitis seu requisitis, quod absit, ecclesiastico praelati locorum supponant interdicto, et interdicto teneant usque ad satisfactionem condignam ; et quod ad hoc nullus superiorum nostrorum nos vel successores nostros vel procuratores audiat appellantes, quamdiu praedictae personae, vel eorum aliqua remanserit in locis predictis, vel aliquo eorum.

In cujus rei testimonium praesentis litteras fieri, et pendenti sibillo majestatis nostrae jussimus communiri. Datum Andegavo, anno Domini millesimo ducentesimo octuagesimo nono, octava die decembris, III indict., regnorum nostrorum anno quinto.

From Pierre Rangeard, *Histoire de l'Université d'Angers: XIe-XVe siècle* (Angers, 1877), vol. 2, p. 183-7.

Charles II by the grace of God king of Jerusalem and Sicily, prince of the duchy of Apulia and the principality of Capua, count of Achea, Anjou and Forcalquier:

We have given notice to all by the contents of the present letter that we have considered the fine words of sacred authority, in which it is warned that a mouse or a viper or a serpent in the lap or a fire in the bosom tend to confer unjust retribution on their hosts. When careful investigation has been made, we readily recognized the condition and situation of the counties of Anjou and Maine, which by divine will are subject to our authority. We have ascertained the state of the aforesaid land and have found that it is subject to many enormities and crimes odious to God and abhorrent to the Christian faith. In many locales of that land, numerous Jews, enemies of the life-giving Cross and of all Christianity, dwelling randomly and publicly among Christians and deviating from the way of the truth, subvert perfidiously many of both sexes who are considered adherents of the Christian faith. They seem to subvert whom they can. They despoil these Christians of their movable and immovable goods by their devious deceit and by the endless abyss of usury, and thus they wickedly force these Christians to beg for alms. What is most horrible to consider, they even cohabit with many Christian maidens.

Since it is our responsibility to purge the territories subjected to us of evil men, we, pierced by the arrow of compassion, have consulted about these matters with our reverend fathers the bishops and many clerics and with our faithful barons and nobles and with others deserving of trust, sometimes directly and sometimes through faithful deputies, so that we might have the strength to overcome powerful maladies and to uproot totally the above-examined from those places. Indeed it pleases our majesty, we believe with the assent of God, that we should provide for our aforesaid counties and for those living within the confines of those counties by an expulsion of the aforesaid Jews and of their descendants.

Although we enjoy much temporal profit from the aforesaid Jews, we prefer to provide for the peace of our subjects rather than to fill our coffers with the mammon of iniquity, especially since by the loss of temporal goods spiritual gains are achieved. Therefore, exhibiting zeal for the life-giving Cross, we have, for the honour of God and the peace of the aforesaid areas, expelled and ordered expelled from our aforesaid counties of Anjou and Maine all Jews, male and female, adults and young people, children and infants, of whatever sex or condition they might have been born and raised. We have expelled them from all areas of these counties not only for the present but for all times, both for our time as well as that of our successors upon whom the said counties may happen to devolve.

Thus they are prohibited from residing or living henceforth in the aforesaid places, both those already alive and those yet to be born ... We shall hold contracts, if they make them, null. Insofar as it pertains to us and relates to our jurisdiction, they shall be prohibited from entering the aforesaid areas or crossing through them. We order all our bailiffs and vicars and officials by the firmest adjuration and under threat of the loss of grace that, after this letter has been seen, should they find any Jew in any of the aforesaid places, they must seize him and expel him immediately. We grant and extend irrevocable authority to all our barons, knights, judges and

others exercising high and low jurisdiction in the aforesaid counties that, if, after this, they find any remnant of the Jewish sect, of whatever sex or condition, in any areas of the aforesaid counties subject to them, they shall seize him or her or them, shall despoil them utterly, and shall drive them out. We wish and demand, insofar as it pertains to us and our jurisdiction, that their contracts, drawn up in the said places, shall henceforth be executed. If a common man or a rustic finds a Jew or a Jewess dwelling in the aforementioned places and lacks jurisdiction or authority, we wish and grant and extend nonetheless authority for seizing the aforesaid Jews at any time in the future, for despoiling them, and for bringing them along with their goods before the local judge. He shall immediately expel these Jews from the said counties, properly beaten without the inflicting of wounds, and shall order and dispose of the said goods with the advice of our official.

In order that the sincerity of our intention show forth more openly and more clearly and lest fraud wickedly be Perpetrated on our munificence, we decree and order that the aforesaid expulsion be extended to all Lombards, Cahorsins, and other foreigners who engage in public usury without public contracts and who are properly considered usurers. We expel from the aforesaid places now and forever those persons, both those already living as well as those to be born subsequently. We order that they be expelled in the future both by our successors and by all barons, knights and nobles of the foresaid counties, with no other permission required of us or of our heirs. Their goods shall be turned over to the lords of those Places. If the lords of those places prove negligent or remiss in this regard, we reserve the confiscation of goods to our authority.

Since, according to the prophetic gift of the Holy Spirit, all, from the most significant to the most important, pursue desire, we fear lest—Holy Spirit forbid!—any of our successors be moved to recall the aforesaid persons because of the lure of wicked Mammon- We wish and oblige ourselves and all our successors in those places not to recall any of the aforesaid persons and not to allow the dwelling or settling or advent of the aforesaid Jews, as has been stipulated above in regard to these Jews.

With the assent of our reverend fathers in Christ, Nicholas, bishop of Angers and Durrand, bishop of Nantes, of the chapters of Le Mans and Poitiers and Saint Martin of Tours, and of the abbots, Hospitaliers, Templars, barons, counts, knights, and others worthy of trust who live and dwell within the confines of those counties, it has been conceded to us freely and without duress that we ought to receive from each hearth three shillings once only and from each wage earner six pence once only, as some recompense for the profit which we lose through the aforesaid expulsions. This has been granted according to agreements made between them and our faithful Maurice, lord of Craon, our seneschal and vicar in the aforesaid counties. We note that they do this freely and without duress. We wish that, by act, no prejudice be generated against them, even if they are commoners and that no other right be acquired thereby by us or our successors of further seeking or levying hearth taxes beyond these taxes and dues which we have and should have according to the custom of the foresaid counties.

We oblige ourselves, our heirs, and our successors to return to the bishops, chapters, abbots, Hospitaliers, Templars, their subjects, and our subjects, whoever they might be, all the money which we have from the aforesaid hearth tax and wage earners tax, if it happen that—God forbid!—we or our successors recall any Jew or Jewess to the aforesaid places or consent to the recall, settling, or advent of any these, whether he engages in usury or not, or consent to the settling or advent of the Lombards, Cahorsins, or other when it is clear to us or our successors that they publicly engage in usury . . . We wish that we and our successors be compelled to observe all this by our superiors, even by financial loss. We agree that, if it should happen that these stipulations be broken by our successors, by instituting a recall of the aforesaid persons to any of aforesaid places, which are all part of our domain, when we or our heirs or our successors or the other aforesaid persons had sufficiently warned and reproached, then —God forbid! — the prelates of the area shall burden all our domain with an ecclesiastical interdict and they shall continue with that interdict until proper satisfaction has been made. We agree that none of our superiors shall hear us or our successors or our officials as claimants, so long as the aforesaid persons shall remain in the aforesaid places.

In testimony of this matter we have ordered the present letter to be drawn up and to be strengthened by the appended seal of our majesty.

Given at Angers, 1289 A.D., December 8, in the third indiction, in the fifth year of our reign.

Translation from R. Chazan, *Church, State and Jew in the Middle Ages*, p. 314-17; reproduced by Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution*, 299-302. Translation corrected J. Tolan.

3. Edward I, writ of November 1290, annulling debts of interest and justifying the expulsion of the Jews from England.

Edwardus, etc., Thesaurario et Baronibus de Scaccario salutem. Cum dudum in Parlamento nostro apud Westmonasterium in quindena S. Michaelis anno regni nostri tercio, ad honorem Dei et populi regni nostri utilitatem, ordinaverimus et statuerimus quod nullus Judeus ejusdem regni extunc aliquid sub usura Christiano alicui mutuaret super terris, redditibus seu rebus aliis, set per negotiationes et labores suos ducerent vitam suam; ac iidem Judei, postmodum maliciose inter se deliberantes, usure genus indeterius quod curialitatem nuncuparunt inmutantes, populum nostrum predictum sub colore hujusmodi circumquaque depresserint, errore ultimo priorem dupplicante; per quod Nos ob scelera sua et honorem Crucifixi Judeos illos tamquam perfidos exire fecimus regnum nostrum: Nos priori opcioni nostre fieri nolentes inconformes, set potius eam imitantes, penas omnimodas, et usuras, et quodlibet genus earundem que actionibus racione quibuscumque, totaliter dissipamus et annullamus. Nolentes quod aliquid a Christianis predictis racione debitorum predictorum modo aliquo exigatur quorum quidem debitorum quantitatem volumus quod Christiani predicti per sacrementum trium proborum et legalium hominum, per quos rei veritas melius sciri poterit, verificent coram vobis, et eas extunc Nobis solvant terminis competentibus eis per vos statuendis. Ei ideo vobis mandamus quod gratiam nostram predictam sic pie factam in Scaccario predicto legi, et in rotulis ejusdem Scaccarii irrotulari, et firmiter teneri faciatis, juxta formam superius annotatam. Teste Me ipso apud Kyngesclipstonam, v. die Novembris anno regni nostri xvijmo.

J. Rigg, ed., *Select Pleas, Starrs, and other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, A.D. 1220-1284* (London, 1902), xl-xli.

Edward, etc. To the Treasurer and Barons of the Exchequer, greeting. Whereas in our Parliament holden at Westminster on the quindene of St. Michael in the third year of our reign, We, moved by the solicitude for the decree that no Jew should thenceforth lend to any Christian at usury upon security of lands, rents, or aught else, but that they should live by their own commerce and labour; and whereas the said Jews did thereafter wickedly conspire and contrive a new species of usury more pernicious than the old, which contrivance they have termed curialitas, and have made use of the specious device to the abasement of our said people on every side, thereby making their last offence twice as heinous as the first; for which cause We, in requital of their crimes and for the honour of the Crucified, have banished them from our realm as traitors: Now We, being minded in nowise to swerve from our former intent, but rather to follow it, do hereby make totally null and void all penalties and usuries, and whatsoever else in those kinds may be claimed from the said Christians on account of the said debts except only the principal sums which they have received from the said Jews; of which debts We decree that the said Christians do verify the amount before you by the oath of three true and lawful men, by whom the truth of the matter may the better be known, and thereafter pay the amount to Us at such convenient times as may be determined by you. And to that intent We command that you cause this our grace so benevolently granted to be read, and to be enrolled in the said Exchequer, and strictly observed, according to the form above indicated. Witness Myself at King's Clipstone, 5 Nov., in the 18th year of our reign.

All texts and translations taken from the RELMIN database: <http://www.cn-telma.fr/remlin/index/>

Preliminary Bibliography

- A. Abulafia, *Christian-Jewish Relations, 1000-1300: Jews in the Service of Medieval Christendom* (Harlow, 2011).
- Adler, M., *The Jews of medieval England* (London, 1939).
- C. Balasse, *L'Expulsion des juifs du royaume de France* (Bruxelles, 2008).
- E. Baumgarten, *Mothers and children: Jewish family life in medieval Europe* (Princeton, 2004).
- K. Barkey & I. Katznelson, "States, regimes, and decisions: why Jews were expelled from Medieval England and France" *Theory and society* 40 (2011), 475-503.
- H. Birkett, ed., *The Jewish Communities of Medieval England – The Collected Essays of R. B. Dobson* (York, 2010).
- P. Brand, "Jews and the law in England, 1275-90", *English Historical Review* 115 (2000), 1138-1158.
- L. Brunschvicg, « Les juifs en Bretagne », *Revue d'Etudes Juives* 49 (1904), 110-15
- L. Brunschvicg, *Les juifs de Nantes et du pays nantais* (Nantes, 1890).
- R. Chazan, *Reassessing Jewish Life in Medieval Europe* (Cambridge, 2010). S. Einbinder, *No place of rest: Jewish literature, expulsion, and the memory of medieval France* (Philadelphia, 2009)
- J. Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 2007).
- P. Hyams, "The Jewish Minority in Medieval England, 1066-1290", *Journal of Jewish Studies* 25 (1974), 270-93.
- W. Jordan, *The French monarchy and the Jews: from Philip Augustus to the last Capetians*. (University of Pennsylvania press, Philadelphia, 1989).
- W. Jordan, *Ideology and Royal Power in Medieval France: Kingship, Crusades and the Jews* (Aldershot, 2001).
- G. Langmuir, "The Jews and The Archives Of Angevin England: Reflections On Medieval Anti-Semitism", *Traditio* 19 (1963), 183-244.
- M. Lower, *The Barons' Crusade: a call to arms and its consequences* (Philadelphia, 2005).
- S. Mechoulam, « The Expulsion of the Jews from France in 1306: a Modern Fiscal Analysis », *Journal of European Economic History* 33.3 (2004): 555-584.
- S. Menache, « The king, the church and the Jews: some considerations on the expulsions from England and France », *Journal of Medieval History* 13 (1987), 223-236.
- G. Mentgen, "Die Vertreibungen der Juden aus England und Frankreich im Mittelalter", *Ashkenas: Zeitschrift für Geschichte und Kultur der Juden* 7 (1997), 11-53.
- R. Mundill, *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262-1290* (Cambridge, 1998).
- R. Mundill, *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England* (London, 2010).
- R. Mundill, "Out of the Shadow and into the Light – the Impact and Implications of Recent Scholarship on the Jews of Medieval England 1066–1290", *History Compass* 9 (2011), 572–601.
- David Nirenberg, *Communities of Violence: Persecution of Minorities in the Middle Ages* (Princeton, 1996).
- B. Ovrut, "Edward I and the expulsion of the Jews", *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, 67 (1977), 224-235.
- C. Richmond, "Englishness and medieval Anglo-Jewry", in S. Delany, ed., *Chaucer and the Jews* (London, 2002), 213-227.

- R. Rist, "The Power of the Purse: Usury, Jews, and Crusaders, 1198-1245", in B. Bolton & C. Meek, eds., *Aspects of Power and Authority in the Middle Ages* (Turnhout, 2007), 197-213.
- C. Roth, *History of the Jews in England* (Oxford, 1964).
- P. Skinner, ed., *The Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge, 2003).
- R. Stacey, "Parliamentary negotiation and the expulsion of the Jews from England" *Thirteenth century England* 6 (1997), 77-101.
- J. Tolan, « *Lachrymabilem judeorum questionem*: la brève histoire de la communauté juive de Bretagne au XIIIe siècle », http://www.academia.edu/1271718/Lachrymabilem_judeorum_questionem_la_breve_histoire_de_la_communaute_juive_de_Bretagne_au_XIIIe_siecle1
- N. Vincent, "Two papal letters on the wearing of the Jewish badge, 1221 and 1229", *Jewish Historical Studies* 34 (1996), 209-224.
- J. Watt, "The English Episcopate, the State and the Jews" the Evidence of the Thirteenth-Century Conciliar Decrees", *Thirteenth-Century England* 2 (1988), 137-47.