

and acquittance, and a royal conveyance whereby his goods and, arguably, he himself were granted to the Queen. The Exchequer enforced the law "according to the customs of the Jewry" for nearly a century until the expulsion in 1290. Over time, the alien ways of the Jews had become the subject of everyday litigation in the King's courts.

#### IV. CONCLUSION: THE EXODUS AND WHAT THE JEWS LEFT BEHIND



*Interdicta est iudeis  
licentia usurandi -*  
Illustration of Jew wearing  
badge required by  
1275 Statute forbidding  
Jews the practice of usury.  
(MS British Museum)

Ruling during an era of socio-economic change (1272-1307), Edward was wont to legislate accordingly. And Edward was weary of the Jews.<sup>166</sup> Thus he issued laws forbidding the Jews from holding real property, denying them usurious practice, and ordering them to wear distinctive dress and identifying badges.<sup>167</sup>

Even as he restricted Jewish moneylenders, Edward expanded the universe of non-Jewish moneylending. He had before him a model of secured debt contracts, enforced for centuries by the royal courts for the royal usurers. In the Statute of Merchants of 1285,<sup>168</sup> Edward extended to creditors the forms of registry, remedy, and enforcement that had previously been the substance of the Exchequer of the Jews.<sup>169</sup> Under the Statute, a debtor acknowledged the existence of his debt before the Mayor and one of the recording clerks. The clerks recorded the debt in two rolls, one to remain with the Mayor, one with the clerks. In his own recognizable handwriting, the clerk prepared a debt instrument, to which the debtor affixed his seal and the officials affixed the King's seal. This instrument was given to the creditor, who would present it to the Mayor and the clerks to prove his rights if the debtor defaulted.<sup>170</sup>

More than the enrollment procedures paralleled the structures of the Exchequer of the Jews. The remedies also extended to Christian creditors the relief formerly available only to Jews.<sup>171</sup> No longer was a Christian creditor's

166. See T. TOUT, *EDWARD THE FIRST 161* (1909) ("Edward disliked the Jews both on religious and economical grounds").

167. *Id.* at 160-62. Edward was following Henry III's precedent, issuing special restrictions for Jews. See J.M. RIGG, *supra* note 13 at xlvi-lxi (provisions of Henry III and Edward I). Additionally, Edward's Statutes of Jewry of 1275, *see supra* note 28 (dating statute), denied legal process for the recovery of interest and limited execution on the principal due to one-half of the debtor's land and chattels. J.M. RIGG, *supra*, at xxxviii. English practice no longer required Jewish jurors in cases involving Christians and Jews. Articles Touching the Jewry (undated statute of Edward I, which internal evidence indicates was issued after 1284) *printed in* J.M. RIGG, *supra*, at liv, xli.

168. Statute of Merchants, 1285, 13 Edw., Stat. 3. The Statute of Acton Burnel, 1283, 11 Edw., which was enacted two years before the Statute of Merchants, had been intended to establish a speedy remedy for merchant creditors. Because the sheriffs had failed to apply the statute correctly, the Statute of Merchants of 1285 re-enacted and expanded its provisions. I A.W. RENTON, *ENCYCLOPAEDIA OF THE LAWS OF ENGLAND* 116 (1897).

169. Statute of Merchants, 1285, 13 Edw., Stat. 3.

170. *Id.*

171. See *supra* text accompanying notes 97-109 (comparing remedy available to Jewish creditor under shetar with remedy available to Christian creditor under early common law). In the same year that the Statute of Merchants was enacted, a Christian creditor, for the first time in English law, was