

ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Litigating Jews: New Directions in the Study of Medieval English Jewry, c. 1190–1290

Emma Cavell 

Swansea University, Swansea, UK

Correspondence: Emma Cavell (e.cavell@swansea.ac.uk)

Received: 28 February 2025 | **Accepted:** 29 April 2025

ABSTRACT

This article seeks to map out possibilities for an intensive and wide-ranging study of Jewish litigation and legal agency within the English king's jurisdiction in the period c. 1190–1290. Despite a small number of studies of Jews and the king's law courts in England in recent years—including my own work on Jewish women litigants at the Exchequer of the Jews—this remains a neglected *desideratum* of medieval Anglo-Jewish history. Considering the potential of the records of all the king's law courts between 1190, from around which time the records begin to survive, and 1290, the year in which the Jews were expelled from England, this essay does two things. First, it reviews the developments, since 2015, in our understanding of Jews at law and in litigation in medieval England, as well as touching briefly upon the main cognate fields. Second, it provides a series of examples to demonstrate (just some of) the exciting new directions in the study of medieval English Jewry promised by the records of the king's law courts.

In his article for *History Compass* in 2011, the late Robin Mundill surveyed developments in scholarship on the Jews of medieval England.¹ His starting point was two previous surveys, from 1987 to 1991 (the latter his own work). At that point Anglo-Jewish history, though certainly more fulsome than it had been, was effectively—in Mundill's words—‘still only of interest to a few scholars on different continents and still in what might be termed “splendid isolation”’.² By 2011, it had emerged ‘out of the shadow and into the light’ to such an extent that Mundill was able to outline some 15 different, though interconnected, areas of development within the history of English Jewry. These areas included the publication of primary source materials from the institution known as the ‘Exchequer of the Jews’ (of which more presently), the study of taxation records, archaeological discoveries, and, most importantly for my own research, renewed interest in Jewish women. Where Jewish women were concerned Mundill referred to key developments in scholarship on female financiers in England and to then-recent studies of individual thirteenth-century lenders, like Licoricia of Winchester and Muriel of Oxford (Licoricia's

unhappy predecessor in marriage to David of Oxford), and of Jewish women's money-lending more broadly.³ Mundill's 2011 survey still serves as a valuable appraisal of the developments in scholarship on medieval English Jewry to that point and reveals the extent to which Anglo-Jewish history had by then broadened its remit and engaged the expertise of scholars of the non-Jewish (or ‘mainstream’) history of medieval Britain and Ireland.

By the end of 2015, however, a gap in the scholarship on the Jews of medieval England had become clear. I was then involved in a large-scale collaborative project investigating the relationships of different groups of women with the judicial process in medieval and early-modern Britain and Ireland.⁴ The surviving plea rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, one of the first ports of call for the study of the Jews of medieval England, had been well mined for insights into Jewish money-lending, including that by women. Yet although approximately one third of their content was devoted to in-court pleading and related activities, such as the appointment of attorneys, the plea rolls

I am the sole author of this piece.

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/) License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2025 The Author(s). *History Compass* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

had never really been exploited for evidence of Jews' use of, or summons to, this institution in its function as a legal tribunal. Much less had the appearance of Jewish suitors, male or female, in other secular law courts in England been scrutinised. The detrimental impact of this neglect on our knowledge of Jewish women in medieval England became clear when I ran a pilot study between 2018 and 2020 on Jewish litigation in the king's jurisdiction.⁵

Much later than originally intended, this brief survey will reflect on the critical importance of studying Jewish litigants in the courts of the king's jurisdiction in medieval England between c. 1190 (from around which point plea rolls from the king's law courts begin to survive) and the Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290. After briefly describing the tribunals available to Jews in England, it will review the post-2015 progress that has been made in this field, for we are fortunate that advances in the study of English Jews as litigants have been made in that time. It will then map out some of the ways in which a concerted and wide-ranging investigation of the litigation records generated by the courts of the English king's jurisdiction will provide new insights into medieval Jewry within Christian English society. This societal context includes the authority of the English king, whose jurisdictional monopoly over the Jews, unique among European monarchies of the day, was more or less complete by the 1230s. The exploitation of the rolls of the king's law courts as records of Jewish litigant activity, while acknowledging the documents' production by members of the dominant Anglo-Christian culture, remains a neglected *desideratum* of medieval Anglo-Jewish history.

It is axiomatic that the Exchequer of the Jews had cognizance of Jewish financial and legal business, and of Jews' involvement in serious crime and other injuries to the king's peace. With its roots in developments of the 1180s and 90s, the Jewish Exchequer of 1218/19 (the year from which the earliest of its plea rolls survives) was both a product and instrument of the king's increasing authority over his Jewish subjects. It had general oversight of the Jewish community of England, responsibility for collecting Jewish debts that had fallen to the king (although not for collecting tallages), and a central function as a judicial tribunal, principally for litigation between Jews and Christians. It was managed by chiefly Christian 'Justices assigned to the custody of the Jews' (*Justiciarii ad custodiam Judeorum assignati*), or simply 'Justices of the Jews', who sat at Westminster on a termly basis and were advised by the Chief Rabbi of England. Its plea rolls look much like those of the other royal law courts, except that they cover more than litigation, and it operated in a similar, though not identical, fashion to the nascent common law courts. Indeed, the Jewish Exchequer was born of the same processes as were driving the rapid development of common law under Henry II and his sons.⁶

Even after the emergence of the Jewish Exchequer in recognisable form, Jewish litigants theoretically still had access to courts of common law. Hannah Meyer has shown, too, that local secular tribunals beyond the king's purview, like the Exeter mayor's court, might also host Jewish suitors.⁷ The king's Jewish subjects had no right to common law itself in the thirteenth century but were governed by what scholars call 'Jewry law', namely the (changing) product of fixed privileges granted

by successive kings of England. Despite this legal peculiarity, Jewish civil pleading could still be commenced in the other royal forums: at the Bench (an early name for the Court of Common Pleas); before the itinerant justices (justices 'in eyre'); or *coram rege* ('before the king'), a peripatetic tribunal known as the King's Bench by the mid-thirteenth century. With the emergence of the Exchequer of the Jews, however, Jews' civil litigation was liable to be moved by writ into that institution. Felony jurisdiction over Jews belonged to the normal criminal justice system in England. Appeals of felony (private criminal prosecutions brought by the victims or their family) involving Jews were seemingly initiated either in the Exchequer of the Jews or, more often, in the county courts, whence they were transferred by special writ to the Jewish Exchequer for determination. The king's Jewish subjects also contributed to some of the standard royal peace-keeping systems, such as the hue (a deliberate uproar designed to bring people to the scene of a crime); but they were excluded from others, such as the frankpledge, a system of mutual oversight and law enforcement in which only Christian men participated.

Scholarship on the Jews of medieval England and the king's law in the broader sense is, of course, not neglected. Mundill's 2011 survey, in a short section entitled 'Legal Records', rightly focussed on the work of the eminent legal scholar Paul Brand, whose many contributions included the reinvigoration of a programme of publishing the surviving Jewish Exchequer plea rolls (an endeavour begun by J.M. Rigg in 1905) and further elucidation not only of the nature and functions of the Exchequer of the Jews and its personnel, but also of the Jews' status under the king's law, particularly in the latter half of the thirteenth century.⁸ We now eagerly await the publication of the final volume of the plea rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews. Likewise, Judith Olszowy-Schlanger has curated two hugely valuable volumes (with another forthcoming) of Hebrew and Hebrew-Latin documents from medieval England. Her work has also revealed what the legal instruments—genuine and forged—of Jewish business reveal of Jewish-Christian encounters in court and beyond.⁹ Royal decrees concerning the Jews, and their effects on the Jewish community, have likewise been subject to scrutiny in the last decade and a half by historians of medieval English Jewry. Indeed, the prominence given to English royal policy toward the Jews in the thirteenth century, and to the Jews' (decreasing) economic value to the Crown, has arguably contributed to that 'lachrymose conception' of medieval Anglo-Jewish history captured in monograph titles promising tales of 'Massacre', 'Exodus', 'Violence' and 'Expulsion'.¹⁰ This conception may well be softened, though it can never be negated, by the light refracted through the prism of the litigation record.

Scholars have now, like Olszowy-Schlanger, begun to consider the Jews of medieval England not just as (passive) subjects of royal law but as active participants in the negotiation of that law and its legal processes. For example, Sara Butler contributed an online post in 2018 on a Jewish woman's appeal of murder (for the death of her father, Josce) brought against the Christian women with whom Josce may or may not have been having an affair.¹¹ The following year, Rebecca Searby completed a doctoral dissertation at the University of York (UK) dedicated to the exploration of Jews as litigants, witnesses and office-holders

in the king's law courts during the period c.1216 to 1235—a critical point in the intensification of royal oversight of the Jews.¹² An article by Henry Summerson in 2021 explored the treatment, by royal law courts and by their own communities, of Jewish victims and perpetrators of felonies in the thirteenth century.¹³ Each of these works sheds light on Jewish legal subjectivity and agency, as well as on Jewish-Gentile relations in thirteenth-century England. My own article-length study from 2021, of Jewish women litigants at the Exchequer of the Jews, sought to counter the enduring historiographical tropes that Jewish women in England enjoyed greater freedom and status at law than their Christian counterparts and that the Exchequer of the Jews was a bastion of women's rights.¹⁴ Doctoral scholars at other UK universities have now taken up the challenge of investigating Jewish litigation at the English king's courts.

These developments do not stand in 'splendid isolation,' of course. My article on Jewish women litigants in medieval England was only possible because of huge developments, particularly (though not exclusively) in the new millennium, in our understanding of Christian women's lived experiences of the law in the British Isles and beyond during the medieval and early modern periods. The result has been immeasurably greater insight into the practical realities of women engaging with the law and firm evidence that Christian women in England could find their way around any theoretical legal restrictions they encountered. A first investigation of Jewish women litigants in medieval England revealed greater parity, at law and in court, between Jewish and Christian women in medieval England than traditionally imagined. Development in understanding of Jewish litigants, both women and men, in the English king's jurisdiction is also hedged about by, and ought to be conversant with, scholarship on Jewish litigants and legal engagements in continental Europe. This includes the pioneering work by Rachel Furst on Jewish litigants, especially women litigants, in medieval Ashkenaz.¹⁵ For medieval England itself, Pinchas Roth has demonstrated that professional Jewish courts, staffed by some of the Jewish community's leading legal scholars, convened right up to the Expulsion in 1290. In Roth's words, these courts 'maintained a mutual relationship of limited respect with the much larger royal judiciary'.¹⁶ Extant studies of Jews' engagement with the law in medieval southern Europe, the Near East and North Africa also offer much that is instructive for the present quest.¹⁷

The litigation records of this 'much larger royal judiciary' to which Jews had access will open the door to a range of new directions in the study of English Jewry and its integral place in the history of medieval England. What follows is a brief introduction to just some of those avenues of enquiry. My focus is on the king's jurisdiction, but further exploration of non-royal jurisdictions will also be essential. It is worth noting, first, that the study of the English litigation record is not the only path to new insights into the Jews of medieval England. English Jewry is now an exciting and fertile field generating new and complementary research all the time, as exemplified by the work of the literary scholar Adrienne Williams Boyarin on Jewish women in medieval England and that of Dean Irwin in the UK (to name just two examples).¹⁸ Irwin's tireless efforts to advance our knowledge of Jews in medieval England, get beyond their characterization in much of our historiography as 'the king's Jews' and, with his

doctoral students, place them in their urban environmental contexts, has resulted in recent publications fostering new perspectives on medieval English Jewry, such as the special issue of the journal *Jewish Culture and History*, co-edited with Toni Griffiths, and a forthcoming volume of collected writings on the Lincoln Jewry.¹⁹ Irwin is currently also working with Judith Olszowy-Schlanger on the third volume of Hebrew and Hebrew-Latin documents from medieval England. In addition, Rowan Dorin's work on expulsion in medieval Europe, a weapon not solely deployed against Jews, but which came by degrees 'to entrench itself in medieval thought and practice', explores the place of medieval English Jewry, among others, in European leaders' growing resolve to move against usury.²⁰

The most obvious utility of the plea rolls produced by the royal law courts for studying the Jewish communities of medieval England is precisely that they are records of law-in-action. In contrast to the blunter pronouncements on rights and responsibilities offered by legal treatises, royal statutes and the like, plea rolls represent what we call 'descriptive' legal texts—records generated by and for the lawyers to capture court proceedings, resolve questions, document jury *verdicta* (facts presented as true in a trial) and more. Notwithstanding the limitations of the ritualised pleading in the English king's courts, mediated through French, and the formulaic Latin shorthand in which the business of the court was recorded (by Christian, male court clerks), plea-roll entries respond to individual actors and specific actions. This alone makes them invaluable sources of information on those legal consumers documented therein. The legal consumers at the law courts within the king's jurisdiction between 1190 and 1290, and indeed the jurors, witnesses and others who played a part included not only men and women of the Christian majority but also members of the Jewish minority.

The exploration of the relationship of Jewish suitors in England to the judicial process in the king's courts invites a broad range of questions, beginning with consideration of the interplay of cultural and religious identity with access to (and experience of) justice. We must also ask, among other things, what knowledge Jews had of the king's law, and how they acquired it—in other words, seek to capture their 'legal consciousness' in the context of the king's jurisdiction.²¹ To this end, for example, Pinchas Roth has explored the Jews' participation in the system of legal textuality within this jurisdiction.²² We must also ask where the contexts of advantage and disadvantage lay and how far, and how, Jews' access to justice changed in the century from 1190 to 1290. The emergence of the Exchequer of the Jews is an obvious manifestation and driver of change, but the availability of actions and remedies to Jews could hardly have remained constant against the increasingly interventionist Jewry statutes and edicts issued by Henry III and Edward I. The dynamic interrelationship between Jewish consumers of the king's justice and royal authority is key, for there is more to be said here—more, that is, that gives the Jews themselves effective agency in negotiating that relationship. Searby's important doctoral study aside, Jewish agency within the legal process remains underexplored. Yet, as Searby's work demonstrates, a close examination of Jewish litigant agencies suggests that Jewish legal consumers actively contributed more than financial reward to their relationship with the Crown.

Rather than essentializing Jews as subjects, we should consider the differences and similarities of their experiences in particular contexts, perhaps the most obvious being gender. Within the broader framework of the 'litigating Jew,' sits the compelling question of how Jewish women negotiated the king's justice, what knowledge they had and whence it came, and how they fared in their actions. Gender presumably intersected with cultural and religious identity, socio-economic status, and more, to shape Jewish women's legal consciousness and to produce success and failure, advantage and disadvantage and, of course, complex, varied experience. Therefore, Jewish men and Christian women will be the principal comparators, not only for the differences in their experiences but also for what they shared and contributed equally to the conversation with royal justice.²³ My 'trial trench' investigation of Jewish women litigants at the Exchequer of the Jews has suggested that Jewish women before the law were not necessarily in a position of advantage over Christian women and their in-court experiences broadly similar; but a wider-ranging, more thorough excavation of the surviving roles of the Jewish Exchequer and of the rolls of the common law courts, central and itinerant, will be critical to our understanding of Jewish women and the law in England. Moreover, it is only by engaging with Jewish women that we can pretend to have a holistic impression of women litigants in medieval England. Christian women cannot continue to be the default, or 'unmarked', category of female litigant in twelfth and thirteenth-century England.

The litigation evidence captured in the plea rolls of the royal law courts also serves as a key indicator of Jews' awareness and use of the Christian legal calendar. In 2015, Elisheva Baumgarten explored the extent to which the Jews of continental northwest Europe were familiar with the Christian calendar of saints' feasts and holidays—not least because a small number of Jewish artisans were involved in the production of manuscripts containing Christian calendars written entirely in Hebrew letters.²⁴ Within limits, this knowledge was also critical for a Jewish suitor to the courts of the king of England. The law terms, during which the formal business of the courts was transacted, were entirely governed by the Christian calendar, as were the vacation periods. This calendar furnished the dating conventions used by the court and its personnel and records, and the Christian feast days and canonical hours functioned as the 'pegs' on which hung the memory of events described in the pleading. In a particularly harrowing case from Warwick, a brutal assault by fellow Jews on the rabbi's wife Bessa was recorded as having taken place, before the door of the synagogue, on 'Monday next before the feast of St Matthew the Apostle, a little after none' (Monday 19 September, just after 3p. m.) in 1244.²⁵ This may, in fact, have been Yom Kippur, the holiest day of the Jewish calendar, during which the men and women of Warwick's Jewish community would have been at the synagogue throughout the day. Although it was the Christian clerks who advised on forms of action and wrote the submissions, to pursue legal redress for the attack on his wife R. Elias is likely to have needed some knowledge not only of actions (he chose an appeal of felony) and pleading but also of those saints' days and liturgical hours of Christian time-keeping that framed and sustained his suit. At very least he must have come away from his suit with such knowledge. In addition, Jews' engagement with older, superstitious forms of proof still

hanging on in certain actions within the king's jurisdiction, if largely as legal fiction, requires consideration: Elias cited battle as a one (theoretically) possible means of proving his case against his co-religionists.

Alongside the evidence of Jews' engagement with the king's courts and their Christian ethos, the details within some of the plea-roll entries themselves function as windows, albeit imperfect, onto Jewish-Christian interactions and Jewish everyday life in the towns and cities of the conspicuously Christian host society. There were no Jewish ghettos in medieval England. This was a world in which the Jewish town-dweller stepping outside her front door cast her eyes upon the spires, crosses and iconography of the Christian majority, and on occasion heard the chants and smelled the incense of Christian worship. She might even witness, at least from the safety of her own dwelling, a feast-day procession, or the performance of a mystery play—with every possibility that a Jew was represented in grotesque caricature. (These realities alone were reason enough, as Baumgarten noted, for Jews in medieval north-west Europe to familiarise themselves with the Christian ritual calendar).²⁶ Incidental details of a suit recorded on a plea roll cut across the idea that relations between Gentiles and Jews in medieval England centred chiefly around business. Moneylending was certainly a 'major point of contact,' but the glimpses of Jewish life in the ritual pleading and formulaic recording demonstrate more mundane, unavoidable, and often sympathetic interactions. The plea-roll evidence complements, and provides an additional English dimension to, the insights of scholars like Jonathan Elukin, Elisheva Baumgarten and others who have explored what Baumgarten termed Jewish-Christian 'entanglements' in medieval Europe.²⁷ The image of mutual aloofness, suspicion and separation (at least in aspiration) contained in our principal full-length studies of medieval English Jewry should be tempered.²⁸

It is the plea-roll entries relating to crime, like Elias of Warick's appeal, or to violent trespass, rather than the more numerous entries for debt and detainee (wrongful detention of moveable property), which furnish the best insights into Jews in urban contexts. With the plaintiff, defendants and jurors in the Warwick case all offering similar details about the affray and its aftermath, we learn the following: it occurred, very publicly, in the middle of a Monday afternoon on the high street; Bessa was leaving her husband's *scola* on the high street when she encountered her adversaries, a group of men and women from one Jewish family, who were walking in the direction of the synagogue; Bessa was adorned with rings and a belt buckle of gold worth as much (said Elias) as 10 marks; the gory aftermath of the attack was witnessed by people gathered around Bessa's bed; and those witnesses related what they had seen to the Christian jurors. When, in 1220, a Jew Solomon Turbe fell from the tower of Gloucester Castle, where he had been imprisoned, his fall was observed by Christian men (including the sheriff) as they approached the castle gate on a business errand, and Jews and Christians (including his wife Comitissa, the constable of the castle and the coroner) attended and spoke to Solomon as he slowly died, confused and incoherent, over the day or two that followed. Similar evidence of multiple Jewish-Christian contacts and entanglements can be read in the lengthy and colourful trespass suit brought by Juliana 'the convert' in 1274 against

members of her former Jewish community in the heart of London.²⁹ The plea rolls are not the sole source of such information: for example, the patent roll for 1278 contains a short notice of a public altercation between a Christian and a Jewish woman at a Nottingham market.³⁰ Yet the lawsuit evidence of Jews' interactions not only with other townspeople and civic and county officials but also with the very urban spaces they inhabited, and the details in these entries of Jews' movements through and between England's towns and cities, cannot be ignored.

Where Jewish women are concerned, too, the plea rolls enable us to see beyond the female financiers who loom largest in the small pool of extant scholarship on Jewish women in medieval England. The litigation evidence provides access to more than just the Jewish women who financed Christian enterprise and could afford the expense of English royal justice. It also illuminates, however faintly, women whose appearance in the plea rolls as victims and perpetrators of felony and trespass, or as third-party accomplices and informal witnesses, may be the only record we have of their existence.³¹ The same may be true of Jewish men, but far fewer women than men appear in any of our records of medieval English Jewry. The ratio of Jewish women to Jewish men among the litigants at the Exchequer of the Jews was never more than about 1:5 across the period for which the rolls survive.³² Among the non-elite or non-lending Jewish women recorded on the plea rolls are perhaps some of the servants of wealthier Jews mentioned by Barrie Dobson. It is almost certainly true, too, that women's involvement in the widespread but hidden business of pawnbroking, which did not in itself require an official paper trail, is to be found among the relatively numerous detainee suits and, perhaps too, in the accusations of church robbery periodically levelled at Jews. The latter may be cases of church items pawned to Jews. As I have suggested elsewhere, too, the increase in Jewish widows pursuing detainee suits in the period 1279–80 probably reflects the aftermath of the terrible coin-clipping prosecutions of 1278–9. Hundreds of Jewish men were hanged, and many widows were left to recover items hurriedly lodged with others, presumably friends, associates and neighbours, for safekeeping. The evidence suggests that many of those entrusted with their valuables by frightened Jews were Christians.³³

The study of medieval English Jewry has come a long way, very quickly, in the past decade and it continues to develop in exciting new directions; and yet there remains a rich seam of evidence, the litigation record, still to be intensively mined. From insights into Jewish legal consciousness or the role of gender and social status (e.g.) in success and failure in court, to glimpses of Jewish lives within, and between, Christian urban contexts, there is much to be gained from a large-scale study of Jewish litigant activity within the English king's jurisdiction in the last century of the Jewish community's existence. Indeed, there is far more to be gained than I have been able to discuss in the present essay. The task to which I now turn, the mining of that seam, the marshalling of the principle source materials, and the evaluation of the evidence contained within, represents an exciting challenge. There are over 1000 rolls or partial rolls from the chief royal venues to which the Jews had access between 1190 and 1290: the Jewish Exchequer, the court *coram rege*, the Bench, and the courts of the travelling justices. The evidence of

Jewish lives preserved within the membranes of these rolls has the potential to open up whole new areas of understanding of medieval English Jewry. In due course, too, this understanding could be further deepened by the more uncertain task of searching for Jewish legal consumers in the records left by tribunals which, like the Exeter mayoral court, do not fall within the king's purview and whose records do not survive quite so well for the period before 1290.

Endnotes

- ¹ Robin Mundill, 'Out of the Shadows and into the Light', *History Compass* 9/8 (2011), 572–601.
- ² Mundill, 'Out of the Shadows', p. 572. The earlier surveys are Robert C. Stacey, 'Recent Work on Medieval English Jewish History', *Jewish History* 2 (1987), 61–72 and Robin Mundill, 'English Medieval Ashkenazim—Literature and Progress', *Ashkenaz*, 1 (1991), 203–10.
- ³ for example Suzanne Bartlett, 'Three Jewish Businesswomen in Medieval Winchester', *Jewish Culture and History*, 3 (2000), 31–54; idem, 'Women in the Medieval Anglo-Jewish Community', in Patricia Skinner (ed.), *Jews in Medieval Britain: Historical, Literary and Archaeological Perspectives* (Woodbridge: Boydell, 2003), pp. 113–27; idem, *Licoricia of Winchester: Marriage, Motherhood and Murder in the Medieval Anglo-Jewish Community* (London and Portland, OR: Valentine Mitchell, 2009); Charlotte Goldy, 'A Thirteenth-Century Jewish Woman Anglo-Jewish Woman Crossing Boundaries': Visible and Invisible', *Journal of Medieval History*, 34 (2008), 130–45; Victoria Hoyle, 'The Bonds that Bind: Money-Lending between Anglo-Jewish and Christian Women in the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, 1218–1290', *Journal of Medieval History*, 34 (2008), 119–29. This work built on scant but precious foundations, including: M. Adler, 'The Jewish Woman in Medieval England' in M. Adler (ed.), *The Jews of Medieval England* (London: JHSE, 1939), 17–45; Cheryl Tallin, 'Medieval Jewish Widows: Their Control of Resources', *Jewish History*, 5 (1991), 63–74; R.B. Dobson, 'The Role of Jewish Women in Medieval England' in D. Wood (ed.), *Christianity and Judaism. Studies in Church History*, 29 (Oxford, 1992) and idem, 'A minority within a minority: the Jewesses of thirteenth-century England', in S. J. Ridyard and R. G. Benson (eds.), *Minorities and Barbarians in Medieval Life and Thought*, Sewanee Mediaeval Studies, 7 (Sewanee, TN, 1996), pp. 27–48.
- ⁴ 'Women Negotiating the Boundaries of Justice: Britain and Ireland, c. 1100–c. 1750', UK Arts and Humanities Research Council (AH/L013568/1).
- ⁵ 'Discord and Dispute Resolution: Litigating Jews in England, c. 1150–1290', British Academy/Leverhulme Small Research Grants, SRG18R1\181016.
- ⁶ See Robert C. Stacey, 'Massacres of 1189–90 and the Origins of the Jewish Exchequer, 1186–1226' in Sara Rees Jones and Sethina Watson (eds), *Christians and Jews in Angevin England: the York Massacre of 1190, narratives and contexts* (Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer, 2013), pp. 106–24, p. 107.
- ⁷ Hannah Meyer, 'Gender, Jewish Creditors and Christian Debtors in Thirteenth-Century Exeter', in Cordelia Beattie and Kirsten Fenton (eds), *Intersections of Gender, Religion and Ethnicity in the Middle Ages* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010), pp. 104–24.
- ⁸ Paul Brand, 'The Exchequer of the Jews, 1265–1290' in Paul Brand (ed.), *Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, Volume VI: *Edward I, 1279–81* (2005); idem (ed.), *The Earliest English Law Reports*, vol IV: *Eyre Reports 1286–9 and Undated Eyre Reports; Exchequer of the Jews Reports; pre-1290 Assize Reports; pre-1290 Reports from Unidentified Courts and Additional pre-1290 Common Bench Reports* (London: Seldon Society, 2007); 'Jews and the Law in England, 1275–1290', *English Historical Review*, 115 (2000), 1138–1158. See also idem, 'The

- Jewish Community of England in the Records of the English Royal Government', in Skinner (ed.), *Jews in Medieval Britain*, pp. 73–81. Previous scholarship on the Exchequer of the Jews, some of it very early, includes: Alice Carver Cramer, 'The Jewish Exchequer: An Inquiry into its Fiscal Functions', *The American Historical Review*, 45 (1940), 327–337; idem, 'The Origins and Functions of the Jewish Exchequer', *Speculum* 16 (1941), 226–9; Reva Berman Brown and Sean McCartney, 'The Exchequer of the Jews Revisited: The Operation and Effect of the *Scaccarium Judeorum*', *The Medieval History Journal* 8 (2005), 303–21.
- ⁹ Judith Olszowy-Schlanger (ed.), *Hebrew and Hebrew-Latin Documents from Medieval England: A Diplomatic and Palaeographical Study*, *Monumenta Palaeographica Medii Aevi*, 2 vols (Turhout: Brepols, 2016); idem, 'Hebrew Documents and Justice: Forged Quitclaims from Medieval England', in *Religious Minorities in Christian, Jewish and Muslim Law (5th–15th centuries)*, ed. by Nora Berend, Youna Hameau-Masset, Capucine Nemo-Pekelman & John Tolan (RELMIN, 8), pp. 413–438; idem, 'Meet you in Court: Legal Practices and Christian-Jewish Relations in the Middle Ages'; idem, 'The Money Language: Latin and Hebrew in Jewish Legal Contracts from Medieval England'.
- ¹⁰ John Tolan, *England's Jews. Finance, Violence and the Crown in the Thirteenth Century* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2023); Robin Mundill, *The King's Jews: Money, Massacre and Exodus in Medieval England* (London: Bloomsbury, 2010) and idem, *England's Jewish Solution: Experiment and Expulsion, 1262–1290* (London: CUP, 1998); Richard Huscroft, *Expulsion: England's Jewish Solution* (Stroud: Tempus, 2006). The idea of a 'lachrymose conception' of, and its distorting effects on, Jewish history comes from Salo W. Baron, 'Newer Emphases in Jewish History', *Jewish Social Studies* 25 (1963), 245–58.
- ¹¹ Sara Butler, 'A Jewish Woman's Appeal of Murder in the Thirteenth-Century England' (17 August, 2018) on the platform 'Legal History Miscellany. Posts on the History of Law, Crime, and Justice', established by Sara Butler, Krista Kesselring and Katherine D. Watson: <https://legalhistorymiscellany.com/2018/08/17/a-jewish-womans-appeal-of-murder-in-thirteenth-century-england/> [last accessed, 12 January 2025].
- ¹² Rebecca Searby, 'England's Jewish Community in the Royal Courts, c. 1216–1235', unpublished PhD dissertation (York, 2019).
- ¹³ Henry Summerson, 'Jews and Felony in English Communities and Courts', 1190–1290, *Jewish Historical Studies*, 52 (2021), 70–117.
- ¹⁴ Emma Cavell, 'The Measure of Her Actions: A Quantitative Assessment of Anglo-Jewish Women's Litigation at the Exchequer of the Jews, 1219–81', *Law and History Review*, 39 (2021), 135–72.
- ¹⁵ Rachel Furst, 'Striving for Justice. A History of Women and Litigation in the Jewish Courts of Medieval Ashkenaz', unpublished PhD thesis (Jerusalem, 2014) 'Their Husbands' Agents and Emissaries: Talmudic Theory and Lived Law in Medieval Ashkenaz', *Diné Israel*, 38 (2024), 57–76; idem with Sophia Schmitt, 'The Right to Light: Jews, Christians and Shared Legal Practices in Medieval Ashkenaz', *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 31 (2024), 136–159 and 'Law and Disorder in Medieval Ashkenaz: a Rabbinic Response in Local Context' in Jörg R. Müller (ed.), *Medieval Ashkenaz: Papers in Honour of Alfred Haverkamp Presented at the 17th World Congress of Jewish Studies, Jerusalem 2017* (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2021), 285–303; idem, 'Marriage Before the Bench: Divorce Law and Litigation Strategies in Thirteenth-Century Ashkenaz', *Jewish History*, 31 (2017), 7–30; See also Ephraim Shoham-Steiner, *Jews and Crime in Medieval Europe* (Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 2020).
- ¹⁶ Pinchas Roth, 'Jewish Courts in Medieval England', *Jewish History*, 31 (2017), 67–82.
- ¹⁷ For example: Oded Zinger, '"She aims to harass him": Jewish women in Muslim legal venues in medieval Egypt', *AJS Review* 42.1 (2018), 159–92; Rena N. Lauer, 'Jewish Law and Litigation in the Secular Courts of the Late Medieval Mediterranean', *Critical Analysis of Law*, 3 (2016), 114–132; Uriel Simonsohn, 'Communal boundaries reconsidered: Jews and Christians appealing to Muslim authorities in the medieval Near East', *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 14 (2007), 328–363. Lauer, *Colonial Justice and the Jews of Venetian Crete*.
- ¹⁸ For example: Adrienne Williams Boyarin, *The Christian Jew and the Unmarked Jewess. The Polemics of Sameness in Medieval English Anti-Judaism* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2021).
- ¹⁹ Toni Griffiths and Dean Irwin (eds), *New Approaches to Medieval Anglo-Jewish History*, special issue of *Jewish Culture and History*, 23 (2022); Dean Irwin (ed), *The Medieval Lincoln Jewry* (York: Arc Humanities Press, forthcoming 2026).
- ²⁰ See especially, Rowan Dorin, *No Return: Jews, Christian Usurers, and the Spread of Mass Expulsion in Medieval Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2023).
- ²¹ For which the insights of Anthony Musson will be invaluable: Anthony Musson, *Medieval Law in Context. The Growth of Legal Consciousness from Magna Carta to the Peasants' Revolt* (Manchester & New York: Manchester University Press, 2001).
- ²² Pinchas Roth, 'Words and Seals: Multivalent Language and Jewish Legal Literacy in Medieval England', *Jewish Culture and History*, 23 (2022), 56–66.
- ²³ As for Baumgarten, 'A separate people'? Some directions for comparative research on medieval women', *Journal of Medieval History* 34 (2008), 212–228.
- ²⁴ Elisheva Baumgarten, 'Shared and contested time: Jews and the Christian ritual calendar in the late thirteenth century', *Viator* 2 (2015), 253–76.
- ²⁵ *Select Pleas, Starrs and Other Records from the Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews, AD 1220–1284*, ed. by J.M. Rigg (London: Selden Society, 1902), p. 11; *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, vol. 1: *Henry III, A.D. 1218–1272*, ed. by J.M. Rigg (London: Macmillan, 1905), pp. 103–4.
- ²⁶ Baumgarten, 'Shared and contested time'.
- ²⁷ For example: Jonathan Elukin, *Living Together, Living Apart: Rethinking Jewish-Christian Relations in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Baumgarten, 'Shared and Contested Time'; idem 'Space and Place in Medieval Ashkenaz: an Everyday Perspective', *Jewish Studies Quarterly*, 28 (2021), 245–58.
- ²⁸ See note [10] above for titles.
- ²⁹ *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, vol. 2: *Edward I, 1273–1275*, ed. by J.M. Rigg (London: Macmillan, 1910), pp. 209–10; *Calendar of the Plea Rolls of the Exchequer of the Jews*, v. 3: *Edward I, 1275–1277*, ed. by Hilary Jenkinson (London: Macmillan, 1929), pp. 18, 41–2.
- ³⁰ *Calendar of Patent Rolls, 1272–81*, p. 290.
- ³¹ Dobson, 'Minority within a Minority', pp. 35–6.
- ³² Cavell, 'Measure of Her Actions', pp. 145–9.
- ³³ Cavell, 'Measure of Her Actions', pp. 166–7.