JEWBS, JURATS AND THE JEWRY WALL: A NAME IN CONTEXT

Oliver D. Harris

The name of the Jewry Wall, Leicester, has never been satisfactorily explained. This paper reviews the several hypotheses which have been proposed for its origin, and argues, drawing on comparative evidence from elsewhere in England, for an interpretation based on the site's history as a quarry for building materials, and on late medieval and early modern folk-attributions of enigmatic antiquities to Jews. An appendix outlines the history of the Jewish community in medieval Leicester.

The Jewry Wall in Leicester is one of the most impressive fragments of standing Roman masonry in Britain. It is now firmly identified as a relic of the palaestra, or exercise hall, belonging to the town's public baths complex.¹ Its name, however, despite much speculation, continues to defy explanation.

The earliest known occurrence of the name dates from about 1665, when, in response to an attempt by the borough authorities to have the ruin removed, Edward Hunt asserted that 'he hath a right unto the Jury Wall and hee is very loath for to demolish it for Antiquitye Sake'.² Among antiquaries, travellers and topographers, Martin Lister alluded in 1683 to 'the Jews Wall';³ Celia Fiennes in 1698 to 'the Jury wall as its called';⁴ Roger Gale in 1709 to 'Judaorum murus' and 'Jews Wall';⁵ Samuel Carte in c.1712 to 'Jewry Wall';⁶ William Stukeley in

¹ For the archaeology, see K. M. Kenyon, Excavations at the Jewry Wall Site, Leicester, Soc. Antiq. London Res. Rep. 15 (Oxford, 1948); with modified interpretations in Max Hebditch and Jean Mellor, 'The Forum and Basilica of Roman Leicester', Britannia, 4 (1973), pp. 1–83. A speculative suggestion that the wall was 'part of a bath' had been made by the late eighteenth century: John Throsby, The Memoirs of the Town and County of Leicester, 6 vols (Leicester, 1777), 1, p. 34; J. Throsby, Letter to the Earl of Leicester on the Recent Discovery of the Roman Cloaca, or sewer, at Leicester; with some thoughts on Jewry Wall (Leicester, 1793), pp. 7; 26. Joseph Priestley (whose antiquarian interests were in fact slight) concurred with the bath theory on a visit to Leicester in 1786: William Gardiner, Music and Friends; or, Pleasant Recollections of a Dilettante, 3 vols (London, 1839–53), 1, p. 63; and cf. R. E. Schofield, The Enlightened Joseph Priestley: a Study of his Life and Work from 1773 to 1804 (University Park, Pennsylvania, 2004), pp. 257–8.
² RBL, 4, p. 503. It is unclear why the authorities wanted the wall removed. Was it for reasons of public safety, suggested by their declaration that what Hunt ‘doth therein shall be at his perill’? Or were they simply wanting to recover its materials?
³ Martin Lister, 'Some Observations upon the Ruins of a Roman Wall and Multangular-Tower at York', Philosophical Transactions, 13 (1683), pp. 238–42 (at p. 241).
⁶ Bodl. MS Willis 85, fol. 41, Samuel Carte, ‘Some Account of the Town of Leicester’ (copied by Browne Willis); published in John Nichols, The History and Antiquities of the County of Leicester, 4 vols in 8 (London, 1795–1811), 1/1, p. 5. Nichols (p. 6) dates Carte’s text to 1712, though his grounds for this precise dating are not apparent.

1724 to ‘Jewry wall’ and ‘Iury Wall’;7 John Horsley in 1732 to ‘the Jews or Jewry wall’;8 and Thomas Roberts in 1741 to ‘Iury Wall’.9 By the end of the eighteenth century, the name was not in doubt, and it was as ‘Jewry Wall’ that the ruin was discussed by John Throsby and Thomas Robinson.10 Outsiders occasionally dubbed it ‘Old Jewry Wall’, probably under the influence of the London street-name Old Jewry.11

Two alternative names, however, both arguably with longer pedigrees than Jewry Wall, were also sometimes applied to the site: ‘Janus’ Temple’ and ‘Holy Bones’. The association with Janus was taken from Geoffreys of Monmouth’s account, written in the 1130s, telling how Leir, the town’s legendary founder, was buried by his daughter Cordelia in an underground chamber beneath the Soar, which was dedicated to Janus.12 It has been suggested that the story was inspired by the arches and recesses of the Jewry Wall itself, or by other Roman ruins in the vicinity.13 The name Holy Bones is documented from the mid-fourteenth century onwards, and was usually given to the land or thoroughfare to the immediate east of St Nicholas’s church: on occasion, however, its application drifted to the Jewry Wall site to the west, and it has now been assigned by the vagaries of twentieth-century town planning to a minor road to the north.14 William Burton in his Description of Leicester Shire (1622) drew on both the Janus and the Holy Bones traditions, referring to ‘the ancient Temple heere dedicated to Ianus, ... in which place great store of bones of beasts (which heer have beene sacrificed) have bin digged up and found, and the place yet called thereof, the holy bones’.15

7 William Stukeley, Itinerarium Curiosum (London, 1724), p. 103; pl. 92. The name is misengraved on Stukeley’s map (pl. 92) as ‘Lury Wall’.
9 Thomas Roberts, A True Plan or Ground-Plot of the Antient Corporation of Leicester (1741).
10 Throsby 1777, as n. 1, 1, pp. 34–53. John Throsby, The History and Antiquities of the Ancient Town of Leicester (Leicester, 1791), pp. 2–8. Throsby 1793, as n. 1. T. Robinson, An Historical Narrative of that Renowned Piece of Antiquity, the Jewry Wall, in Leicester (Leicester, 1793).
he did not explicitly mention the wall in this passage, he did so in the draft text for his unpublished second edition, describing it as ‘[p]art of the wall of the Temple ... a wonderfull antient peece of worke as any (I thinke) to be sene in this kingdom’. Later visitors, evidently influenced by Burton, made similar allusions to Janus: John Evelyn in 1654 referred to ‘the ruins of an old Roman Temple, thought to be of Janus’; and Thomas Baskerville in c.1675 to ‘an old piece of building which they call Janus’ temple’. Celia Fiennes made a further conflation of the Holy Bones tradition with the Jewry Wall name, describing the ruin as ‘a place where the Jews burnt their sacrifices’. John Foxcroft, rector of Wiverby, referred in c.1693 to ‘some ruins of ancient Brick-work well known by the name of the Holy Bones, & generally concluded to be part of a Temple built there by the Romans, & dedicated to Janus’: slightly adapted, his description passed into the 1695 edition of Camden’s Britannia. In c.1712, however, Samuel Carte, vicar of St Martin’s, expressed ‘wonder at what Mr Burton writes ... concerning Janus’s Temple here. That which he so calls is Commonly known by the name of Jewry Wall’. Carte also distinguished Holy Bones as a separate site, which he believed had been occupied by a church, demolished soon after the Conquest, dedicated to St Augustine and St Columba. Stukeley in 1724, though he used the Jewry Wall name, elsewhere described the ruin as ‘commonly called the Temple of Janus’ (Fig. 1); while Holy Bones, he said, lay ‘not far off’. Nathaniel Salmon in 1726 eschewed the Romans entirely, referring instead to ‘some Traces of [a] British Temple ... found in the Place, called Holy-Bones, where the Bones of Oxen sacrificed have been frequently upon digging turned up’. The idea of a place of sacrifice proved irresistible to more popular writers, and from the mid-eighteenth century onwards several are found assuring their readers of the presence of ‘an old wall here, called the Jewry-Wall, where the inhab[abitants] say the Pagans used to

16 Staffs. RO D649/4/1, fol. 154. Burton’s description reads in full: ‘Part of the wall of the Temple is yet to be seene standing at the west end of St Nicholas churche, a wonderfull antient peece of worke as any (I thinke) to be sene in this kingdom made of Roman large brickes & small flintes bound with so hard a morter, that with an ordenary toole it cannot be pierced, which well may be perceived in that the foundation thereof it hath, (though uncovered) withstood the fury of tyme almost 1700 yeares, the wall is betweene 4 & 5 foote thicke, about 23 or 24 foote high with arch[es] vaulted in the walles which I have viewed & well observed not without much admiration thereof.’


18 Morris 1949, as n. 4, p. 162. William Bickerstaffe later made a similar suggestion: Throsby 1791, as n. 10, p. 18.


20 Bodl. MS Willis 85, fol. 41; published in Nichols 1795–1811, as n. 6, 1/1, p. 5.

21 Throsby 1777, as n. 1, 1, p. 36. Nichols 1795–1811, as n. 6, 1/1, p. 6.

22 Stukeley 1724, as n. 7, p. 103; pl. 55.

Fig. 1. ‘The Roman Building commonly called the Temple of Janus at Leicester’. William Stukeley’s engraving of the Jewry Wall, drawn in 1722 and published in his *Itinerarium Curiosum* in 1724. © The British Library Board.
offer up their children to Moloch’.24 The various strands of evidence, physical, linguistic and folkloric, were by now hopelessly intertwined, and in 1777 John Throsby made some attempt to disentangle them. ‘A temple, dedicated to Janus, I have not a doubt, was built in St Nicholas’s Church-yard, probably where the church stands: Jewry-Wall I think was never part of that Temple; but yet was built for a place of sacrifice for the idolatrous worshippers of Janus; and that the holy bones was a place set apart for depositing the bones of the sacrifices.’25 However, Thomas Robinson in 1793, and James Thompson as late as 1850, continued to insist that the ruin belonged to a Roman temple of Janus.26

The Janus name also played its part in the emergence of an alternative interpretation of the ruin as that of a Janua, or gateway, of the Roman town. This idea seems to have originated with William Bennet, Bishop of Cork and Ross, in about 1790.27 Throsby was converted, and with his endorsement the theory proved tenacious.28 Despite a series of robust challenges by nineteenth-century writers, including Susannah Watts, E. Curtis and J. F. Hollings, who argued that neither structure nor location were suggestive of a town gate, the claim was still being confidently asserted by G. E. Fox in the Victoria County History as late as 1907.29 Only in 1918 was it conclusively refuted by Francis Haverfield.30

It is clear from the quotations given above, however, that while both Janus’ Temple and Holy Bones continued to spawn speculation and interpretation, neither ever seriously challenged Jewry Wall as a name; and it is to that name that we shall now return.

The earliest attempt to explain the designation was made by Throsby in 1791: he surmised that it ‘might happen from the circumstance of the Jews, some centuries ago, being compelled to live together in certain districts of every city in England: in Leicester, they might be compelled to live together, in habitations, near this wall’.31 This notion of a Jewish quarter was subsequently accepted by the great majority of nineteenth and early twentieth-century commentators, and indeed for a time an interpretive plaque was fixed to the wall presenting it as the

24 Quoted from Stephen Whatley, England’s Gazetteer, 3 vols (London, 1751), 1, s.n. ‘Leicester’. The story is repeated in several later gazetteers. In one version, the sacrifices were made in the niches in the wall: England Illustrated, or, a Compendium of the Natural History, Geography, Topography, and Antiquities Ecclesiastical and Civil, of England and Wales, 2 vols (London, 1764), 1, p. 394.

25 Throsby 1777, as n. 1, 1, p. 52.

26 Robinson 1793, as n. 10. James Thompson, The Jewry Wall, Leicester: a Paper Read at the Late Congress of the British Archaeological Association at Manchester (Leicester, 1850).

27 Nichols 1795–1811, as n. 6, 1/1, p. cl. Bennet’s notes are undated, but he was appointed to Cork and Ross in 1790, and his material was known to Throsby by 1791.

28 Throsby 1791, as n. 10, pp. 17–18; 393–5. Throsby 1793, as n. 1, pp. 7; 20–26.


30 Haverfield 1918, as n. 13, p. 18.

31 Throsby 1791, as n. 10, p. 394; repeated in Throsby 1793, as n. 1, pp. 26–7.
name’s origin. A lone voice of dissent came from Thomas Robinson in 1793, who suggested that the term was ‘more likely to be a transition from Janus, than from the Jews inhabiting thereabout’, but his view gained few adherents. Then, in 1936, H. W. Hawkins offered a more ingenious theory, arguing that the name might be a form of the word jury, in allusion to the medieval borough’s government by a council of twenty-four jurats, whose early meeting place had allegedly been situated next to the wall in St Nicholas’s churchyard. A fourth intriguing hypothesis, which has never been formally argued, but which at the time of writing appears on the Jewry Wall Museum’s web page, is that the wall is named by analogy with the ‘Wailing’ (or Western) Wall in Jerusalem.

None of these explanations, however, is really satisfactory. A philological shift from Janus to Jewry is highly implausible: far more likely is that antiquaries merely exploited the coincidence of initial letter to bolster their wish to link the Janus tradition to the ruin. The ‘Wailing Wall’ theory is equally unconvincing, given that the wall in Jerusalem has only held an iconic significance for Jews since the early nineteenth century, making knowledge of it in early modern England most improbable. The idea of the name commemorating the Jewish quarter is at first sight more attractive, but less so when we consider the history of the Jews in medieval Leicester (see Appendix). The settlement lasted only a few decades and was always small-scale, so that the likelihood of its having left a permanent legacy in the town’s stock of place-names is remote.

This leaves Hawkins’s jurat/jury explanation. The hypothesis is certainly the most persuasive of those mentioned so far, and has won the cautious support of a series of modern luminaries, including Kathleen Kenyon (excavator of the Roman site), Nikolaus Pevsner, Jack Simmons and most recently Barrie Cox for the English Place-Name Society. The suggested shift in spelling from Jury to Jewry is inherently plausible, and is paralleled in minor place-names


33 Robinson 1793, as n. 10, pp. 42–3. Although Throsby gave the names independent derivations, he did acknowledge their superficial similarity, referring to ‘the Janua-Wall, called Jewry-Wall’: Throsby 1791, as n. 10, p. 407.


36 In a comparable exercise in forced etymology, Benjamin Langwith in the early eighteenth century suggested (as one of two possibilities) that the York street-name Jubbergate might come from Dui or Ju, a British form of the Roman Jovis or Jupiter. Francis Drake, Eboracum: or the History and Antiquities of the City of York (London, 1736), p. 322.


elsewhere.\(^{39}\) The theory nonetheless has its difficulties. Hawkins’s belief that the jurats had met in St Nicholas’s churchyard rested on Mary Bateson’s 1899 reading of the word *coumecherchiam* in a twelfth-century charter as a corruption of either *tounerchiam* or *communecherchiam*, indicating the town churchyard.\(^{40}\) However, Robert Latham subsequently suggested that the word should more properly be read as a contraction of *communiam serchiam*, the duty of searching for strayd beasts, thereby entirely altering the meaning of the charter passage and seriously undermining Hawkins’s argument.\(^{41}\)

A fifth theory, proposed by Cecil Roth in 1951, has received little attention, partly because it appeared as little more than an aside in a broader discussion of ‘Jewish’ attributions, and partly, perhaps, because of its very simplicity. It nonetheless deserves closer consideration. Roth believed that the use of such a designation implied simply an ‘ancient building of unknown origin’.\(^{42}\) His arguments came largely from continental parallels: from France, Germany and Poland, where names such as *Villejuif*, *Judenberg* and *Żydaczów* are found in locations where no historical Jewish connection is documented or probable; from Spain, where the monumental walls of Tarragona appear to have led the twelfth-century geographer al-Idrisi to call it a ‘city of Jews’; and, most persuasively, from Greece, where the name *Evraiókastro*, meaning ‘Jews’ Castle’, or some similar formation, has been assigned to a number of ancient sites.\(^{43}\) However, he was unable to develop his hypothesis to the point of explaining why these attributions might have been made in the first place. We cannot, of course, expect a high degree of consistency or logic in folk traditions of this kind, and a universal explanation may be beyond reach; but it is nonetheless possible to go a little further than Roth in placing the English evidence, at least, against a broader backcloth of popular perceptions linking antiquities with Jews.

\(^{39}\) Jury (later Lower Jury), a farm and dispersed hamlet in the parish of Abbey Dore, Herefordshire, has been conventionally so spelled since at least 1500 (lease: TNA E 303/5/99); however, in the late nineteenth century the spelling changed temporarily to *Jewry* (*Littlebury’s Directory and Gazetteer of Herefordshire* (London, 1876), p. 52; OS 25” Herefs. sheets 38.16, 44.3 and 44.4 (1888)). The Jewry, a house in Martley, Worcestershire, appears as *The Jewy* in 1714 (glebe terrier: Worcs. RO BA 11398, Class 899:1110), but *The Jewy* in 1736 (glebe map and terrier: Worcs. RO BA 3717, Class r850 Martley), and has fluctuated between the two spellings ever since. Jury’s Gut, a landdrainage sluice at Broomhill, Sussex, on Romney Marsh, appears as *Jurisgote* in 1394 (account roll: Bodl. MS DD.All Souls.c.183 (51b)), *Juresgutte* in 1572 (expeditors’ account: East Kent Archives Centre Ly 15/4/13/2), and had settled locally in its modern form by the mid-seventeenth century: however, it also appears as *Iewes Gutte* in 1589 (map: All Souls College, Oxford CTM 226/64), and was commonly known to mariners in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries as *Jew Gut* (e.g. *Lloyds List*, no 3017 (11 Dec 1764); John Outhett, *Chart of the English Channel* (1814)). Conversely, names with unambiguous Jewish roots, such as Old Jewry, London, Jewry Lane, Canterbury, and Jewry Street, Winchester, are often spelled *Jury* in the early modern period: Jury Street, Warwick, retains that spelling.

\(^{40}\) *RBL*, 1, p. 4.


\(^{43}\) Roth’s French and Greek evidence is taken from, respectively, Robert Anche, *Les Juifs de France* (Paris, 1946), pp. 41–57; and Walter Ettinghausen, ‘Castles in Greece’, *Jewish Quarterly Review*, n.s. 36 (1946), pp. 419–21; both of which provide additional examples.
In late medieval art, an iconographic distinction was sometimes drawn between Judaism and Christianity by representing the former in association with consciously archaic cultural motifs, such as scrolls as opposed to books, or Romanesque as opposed to Gothic architectural details. Roman cameos and engraved gems were occasionally known in medieval England and France as ‘stones of Israel’, or otherwise associated with Jews. Excavated coins were sometimes called ‘Jews’ money’: John Leland noted the term at Hay on Wye in the late 1530s, and William Harrison, a generation later, implied its more widespread use. D’Bloisssiers Tovey in 1738 reported how ‘[t]he Common People imagine that great Treasures might be found by digging, which the Jews left behind them in Hopes of a speedy Return’. A Leicestershire echo of this tradition is found in Burton’s conjecture that a hoard found at Higham on the Hill in 1607, including medieval and Roman coins and a ring with an Arabic inscription, had been the ‘treasure of some Jew’. In Cornwall, a persistent belief had developed by the end of Elizabeth I’s reign that the county’s tin-mines had been worked in the remote past by Jews, an idea substantiated by contrived linguistic evidence and by primitive tools ‘daily found among the rubble of such works’. At a more erudite level, Jewish and Hebrew antecedents were traced by seventeenth-century scholars for the Welsh language, for the Tartars, for native Americans, and for the very name of Britain.


45 Thomas Wright, ‘On Antiquarian Excavations and Researches in the Middle Ages’, *Archaeologia*, 30 (1844), pp. 438–57. There may be a connection with *jeestone*, an alternative name (found in the seventeenth century) for marcasite, a crystallised form of iron pyrites sometimes used as a gem: *Oxford English Dictionary*, s.v. ‘Jews’ stone, *Jewstone*.


47 D’Bloisssiers Tovey, *Anglia Judaica: or the History and Antiquities of the Jews in England* (Oxford, 1738), p. 245.

48 Burton 1622, as n. 15, pp. 131–3.


John Aubrey gathered his pioneering collection of English folk lore under the title ‘Remaines of Gentilisme and Judaisme’.  

Cultural historians have shown how the idea of the Jew in the late medieval and early modern Christian imagination was polarised between the positive stereotype of the Old Testament and the negative stereotype of the post-scriptural era: on the one hand a venerable and divinely-chosen line of patriarchs and prophets, the spiritual forebears of Christians; on the other a clan of blasphemous, bestial and rapacious child-murderers and usurers. In broad terms, the tradition of viewing antiquities as ‘Jewish’ rests a little on the second of these paradigms, in its representation of Jews as hoarders and concealers of treasure, but far more on the first, in its projection of the Jewish people as an ancient, noble and exotic

race, their mystery and remoteness enhanced in an English context by knowledge of their expulsion from the realm by Edward I, and their consequent absence from the contemporary social landscape. The Jewish attributions noted here may therefore fairly be placed alongside other folk attributions of antiquities to fairies, giants or Danes, as reflecting a sense of a long-departed and enigmatic ‘other’.53

More specifically, then, we find a spurious Jewish identity assigned to ancient ruins, and above all to sites known as productive sources of building materials. At St Albans, where the builders of the Norman abbey church had obtained much of their material, notably brick, from the site of Roman Verulamium, William Lambarde reported in the late 1560s that the church ‘was buylte at the first with a thicke Tyle, which they call a Jewe’s Tyle’.54 The Roman shore fort at Burgh Castle, Norfolk (formerly Suffolk), was similarly exploited for its materials, and re-used brick remains visible in the parish church: here Sir Henry Spelman in the early seventeenth century recorded a local tradition that the fort had been occupied by Jews, adding that ‘an ancient way leading to its entrance, today called “of the Jews”, strengthens one’s faith (fidem auget) in the story’.55 This ‘Jews’ Way’ originally ran south-east from the fort in a leisurely curve for over 4 km, and the name Jews Lane remains in use for a surviving fragment to the present day.56 At the Roman fort and settlement site at Ribchester, Lancashire, where remains in the form of ‘great squarid stones, voultes, and antique coynes’ were regularly found, Leland reported ‘a place wher that the people fable that the Jues had a temple’.57 Silver Street, a steep lane in Newcastle upon Tyne, was sometimes known in the early modern period as Jewgate or Templegate: no authentic Jewish


54 William Lambarde, Dictionarium Angliae Topographicae & Historicum: an Alphabetical Description of the Chief Places in England and Wales (London, 1730), p. 5 (written c.1567–70). The attribution may also have been coloured by thoughts of the brick-making labours of the Israelites in their Egyptian captivity (Exodus 5). Thirty years earlier, Leland (perhaps drawing on a variant local tradition) thought that the Verulamium bricks were (ancient) ‘British’: cf. Oliver Harris, ‘John Leland and the “Briton Brykes”’, Antiquaries Journal, 87 (2007), pp. 346–56.

55 Sir Henry Spelman, ‘Ticenia: sive Norfolciae Descriptio Topographica’, in Reliquiae Spelmannianae (Oxford, 1698), pp. 133–62 (at pp. 155–6); paraphrased in Camden 1695, as n. 19, col. 381 (where the route is called ‘the Jews-way’). Roger Gale argued that the Jews Way might have been a Roman road, using the analogy of the Jewry Wall: ‘An Essay towards the Recovery of the Courses of the Four Great Roman Ways’, in Thomas Hearne (ed.) The Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary, 9 vols (Oxford, 1710–12), 6, pp. 93–122 (at p. 120).

56 Jews Way appears (as a bridleway and footpath to be discontinued) on the Burgh Castle enclosure map and award, 1819; Suffolk RO (Ipswich) B/150/1/2.6; published in L. H. Dahl, The Roman Camp and the Irish Saint at Burgh Castle: with Local History (London, 1913), pp. 223–4 and plate opp. p. 220. Jews Lane, the further end of the route south-east of Bradwell, appears on the enclosure maps and awards for Bradwell, 1814 (Suffolk RO (Ipswich) B/150/1/6.1), and Gorleston, 1813 (at parish: microfilms at Suffolk RO (Ipswich) and Norfolk RO); and on OS 1” ‘Old Series’ sheet 67 (1837). Jews Lane was partially realigned in the later nineteenth century, and now survives for most of its length only as a footpath, but retains the name.

57 Toulmin Smith 1906–10, as n. 46, 2, p. 21.
connection is known, and the lane’s route alongside the robbed-out line of Hadrian’s Wall points to a more plausible derivation in the area’s reputation as a stone-quarry. In York, the street-name Jubbergate, recorded as Jubrettagae as early as 1287, derives from Middle English Jewe: however, although medieval York was indeed home to an important Jewish community, there is no reason to believe that any Jews lived in Jubbergate, and it may be more pertinent to observe that the street flanked the decayed wall and southern angle tower of the Roman legionary fortress. William Hargrove reported in 1818 that on the north side of High Jubbergate (that is, close to the fortress wall) there survived ‘the remains of several ancient walls, which tradition states were formerly part of a Jewish Synagogue’. At Gestingthorpe, Essex, site of a putative Roman small town, where much re-used brick survives in the church, there was a field named Jews Vent, the second element probably meaning a void or rift in the ground: a large Roman amphora was excavated here in the nineteenth century, and the name may reflect an earlier history of discovery.

Other minor place-names which might bear closer investigation include Jews Meadow, Appleton, Cheshire, approximately 1 km from a Roman road and from a cluster of early bronze age burials; Jury Farm, Donnington, West Sussex, recorded as Jewrye and Giwerye in the early fourteenth century, close to a


62 Tithe apportionment, 1847: TNA IR 29/5/17, plot 553. The road is ‘King Street’: Margery 70a. For the burials, see A. Hume, ‘Notes on a Roman Road, near Warrington’, *Historic Soc. Lancashire and Cheshire Proc. and Pap.*, 2 (1849–50), pp. 27–34 (at pp. 33–4); and *VCH Cheshire*, 1, pp. 67; 82.
Roman road, and in an area south of Chichester dotted with Roman sites; Jews Land, Weston under Penyard, Herefordshire, 3 km from the Roman industrial settlement of Ariconium; Jews Farm, Little Ilford, Greater London (formerly Essex), located directly across the river Roding from the great iron age defended settlement of Uphall Camp; and the enigmatic Jews Bridge, Bovey Tracey, Devon, first named as ponti Iudeorum in 1406. Various tentative suggestions have been made to explain the name of Jews Mount (also reportedly known as ‘Pharaoh’s Mount’), a substantial earthwork formerly standing outside the ditch of Oxford Castle: none are entirely convincing, and a popular attribution for a mysterious antiquity would seem a plausible alternative. Further consideration might also be given to ideas in Warwick, where Jury Street, recorded as le Iuerie in 1347 and le Juwera in 1388, is believed to mark the focus of the medieval Jewish quarter. This derivation is probably correct, but is challenged by the sixteenth-century tradition, reported by Leland, that ‘the Jewes sometyme dwellyd’ in Smith Street, the extramural suburb beyond the East Gate. It may be, therefore, that by this period Jury Street was no longer perceived as the site of the Jewry; but as the street that led towards the Jewry; and the presence in the same eastern suburb of a Romano-British cemetery raises the possibility of this notion being shaped in part by archaeological finds.


65 Jews Farm first appears on John Chapman and Peter André, A Map of the County of Essex (London, 1777), pl. 21. For Uphall Camp, see Pamela Greenwood, ‘Uphall Camp, Ilford, Essex: an Iron Age Fortification’, London Archaeologist, 6 (1989), pp. 94–101; and James Kemble, Prehistoric and Roman Essex (Stroud, 2001), pp. 140–1. Jews Farm Lane (now East Avenue) formed the Little Ilford/East Ham parish boundary, and seems to have been part of an ancient ‘portway’ running from West Ham, via ferry across the Roding, to Uphall Camp: Katharine Fry, History of the Parishes of East and West Ham, ed. G. Pagenstecher (London, 1888), p. 3. An unconvincing suggestion has been made that the farm was named from a Jew recorded in East Ham in 1766: VCH Essex, 6, p. 3.


67 H.E. Salter (ed.), Oxford City Properties, Oxford Hist. Soc. 83 (1926), pp. 207–14. Cecil Roth, The Jews of Medieval Oxford, Oxford Hist. Soc. n.s. 9 (1951), p. 110. Salter gives Faros Mount as a name found in one lease of the site, but I have failed to locate his source. The only other suggested explanation which seems at all plausible is that the name derived from iuvis or iuewe, meaning justice or its instrument, in reference to a gallows on the mount’s summit: Herbert Hurst, Oxford Topography: an Essay, Oxford Hist. Soc. 39 (1899), pp. 97–8. A tower of the castle was named as le Jouyntour in 1420: TNA E 364/54, rot. 1, foreign accounts roll.


69 Toulmin Smith 1906–10, as n. 46, 2, p. 45.

Elsewhere, popular tradition seems to have combined with misjudged antiquarian reasoning to produce further spurious Jewish attributions. In the seventeenth century, two churches and a chapel, located respectively in Cambridge, Northampton, and Oxford, were identified as ancient synagogues largely on the basis of their unusual ground-plans (round at Cambridge and Northampton; octagonal at Oxford). The thinking at Cambridge seems to have stemmed from Holy Sepulchre church’s site in the old Jewish quarter, it and its parish often being termed in Judaism or ‘in the Jewry’: this name, combined with a longstanding belief that the Temple in Jerusalem had been a round building, helped shape the synagogue attribution. The conceit was then transferred to Holy Sepulchre, Northampton, and probably also lay behind the attribution at the octagonal chapel of Our Lady, Oxford. In London, speculation about a Jewish presence in Roman Britain was prompted by the suggestion of Richard Waller, secretary of the Royal Society, that an ornamental brick, excavated in the 1670s and erroneously believed to be Roman, might have come from a Jew’s granary: Waller’s arguments were iconographic, but may have been underlain by preconceptions about archaeological material and Jews.

Finally, a brief word should be said about the attribution of urban stone houses to Jews. The topic is in many ways peripheral to the main theme of this paper, because in this case the tradition does possess an element of historical foundation. It would be fatuous, of course, to suggest that all medieval Jews lived in stone houses, or that all stone houses in towns were occupied by Jews. Nevertheless, in an age when in most parts of England domestic buildings in stone were exceptional and worthy of notice, a number of affluent Jews, for the greater security of their persons and their wealth, did choose to build or live in them. Several Jewish stone houses are documented in London, and others in Canterbury,
Oxford, Worcester, Hereford, Colchester, and Cambridge.\textsuperscript{74} The twelfth-century chronicler William of Newburgh described two Jewish magnates of York as having erected ‘houses of the largest extent in the midst of the city, which might be compared to royal palaces’; while Ralph de Coggeshall reported that during the political tumult of 1215, the baronial faction in London reinforced the city walls with materials taken ‘from the stone houses of the Jews’.\textsuperscript{75} Two surviving medieval stone houses, the Jews’ House in Lincoln and the Music House in Norwich, are both associated with Jews on secure documentary grounds.\textsuperscript{76} A stone house in Cambridge, probably with an authentic Jewish history, was sometimes known in the sixteenth century as ‘the Jews’ house’ (\textit{Judaeorum aedes}), but had been demolished by the early years of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{77} Another house in Lincoln, now named the Norman House, was known for much of the twentieth century as ‘Aaron the Jew’s House’: this attribution was quite groundless, and dated from no earlier than the 1870s, but recent documentary research has indicated that the house was in fact owned, and perhaps built, by another Jew, Josce of York.\textsuperscript{78} For two other claimed survivors, however, Jews’ Court in Lincoln, and Moyse’s Hall in Bury St Edmund’s, the evidence for any authentic


Jewish connection is much flimsier: at the former, it rests largely on the presence of a niche which has tentatively, but far from conclusively, been identified as the Ark of a synagogue; at the latter on the name, which, though it may be a form of the Jewish Moses, may equally derive from the Suffolk surname Mose or Moyse.79 In short, then, those stone houses identified as Jewish range from the highly convincing to the highly questionable. However, in none of the more doubtful cases does the attribution appear to rest on any sort of folk tradition of the kind considered elsewhere in this paper: rather it seems to have grown from the over-fertile minds of nineteenth-century antiquaries, drawing unjustified parallels with the better-documented examples.

There undoubtedly exist a number of distinct explanations for the appearance of the elements Jew or Jewry in minor English place-names. There are, in the first instance, places with authentic Jewish connections, both medieval (including past or present street-names in London, Bristol, Canterbury, Gloucester, Hereford, King’s Lynn, Nottingham, Oxford, Warwick, and Winchester) and modern (similar names of eighteenth-century coinage on the fringes of London at Bethnal Green, Sydenham, and Wandsworth, and in Brighton).80 Some names are derogatory in origin: Jews Row, Chelsea, named in the eighteenth century, was a street with an unsavoury reputation as a haunt of swindlers and prostitutes; while some field-names may allude to nondescript or unproductive land.81 Jews Hollacombe and Jews Moor, Crediton, Devon; Jews Farm, Wiveliscombe, Somerset; and Jury Farm, Send with Ripley, Surrey, all appear to derive from the family names of medieval landholders (le Jew or Jewe in Devon and Somerset; Diry or Dyry in Surrey).82 It is also entirely conceivable that some names are indeed from the word ‘jury’ or its cognates, though I have failed to identify any


convincing cases.83 Alongside all these derivations, however, a folk attribution of ancient ruins and their materials to the ‘virtual Jews’ of the gentle imagination is another possibility to be considered.84 Leicester’s baths and forum site supplies a textbook case of quarrying and re-use of materials from decayed ancient buildings, with Roman bricks remaining much in evidence in the Saxon and Norman fabric of St Nicholas’s church.85 This is the context which would seem to afford the most plausible explanation for the name of Jewry Wall.

APPENDIX: THE JEWES OF MEDIEVAL LEICESTER

In Leicester, as in England more generally, much of the detailed history of medieval Jewry can only be traced through the affairs of those wealthier members of the community who were active as moneylenders, and whose dealings from time to time attracted the interest of the financial and legal arms of the state. The record is clearly incomplete and unbalanced, but these scattered insights into the lives of the affluent minority do at least give us some sense of a Jewish presence in particular places at particular times.

The earliest evidence we have for Jews in the town therefore dates from 1185, when we find mention in the pipe rolls of a pledge of 7 marks (£5 6s. 8d.) made by William de Georz to ‘the Jews of Leicester’.86 The first Jew actually to be named is Aaron the Jew of Leicester, recorded in 1193 as owing sums totalling £21 17s. to the estate of the fabulously wealthy Jewish financier Aaron of Lincoln, who had died seven years earlier: it was by no means unknown for Jews to be borrowers as well as lenders of money, but it is also possible that the Leicester Aaron had been

83 Jury’s Gut, Broomhill, Sussex, has been related to the thirteenth-century terrae perjuratae (forsworn lands) in the same vicinity, but the fourteenth-century spellings in Jurdi- make this unlikely as a derivation: VCH Sussex, 9, p. 149; and see n. 39 above. The Jewry (or Jury), Martley, Worcestershire, was at one time a public house, and one local tradition gives its full name as ‘The Judge and Jury’, but the name appears to predate this function: Lissa O’Grady, ‘The Buildings of Martley’, in David Cropp (ed.), Martley at the Millennium (Upton upon Severn, 2000), pp. 97–116 (at pp. 113–4); TNA IR 29/39/92, plot 405, tithe apportionment, 1843, for Jury Public House; and see n. 39 above. A suggestion that Jury Street, Warwick, was named from the room in which the juries were empanelled is certainly false: William Field, An Historical and Descriptive Account of the Town and Castle of Warwick (Warwick, 1815), p. 54; and see n. 68 above. Jury Lane, Oxford, undoubtedly took its name from its medieval Jewish residents, but some blurring of associations arose from the presence here of the magna schola juris civilis, or civil law school, named as Jure Schole or Cywyll Schole in 1546, and sometimes known as Jewry Hall: Roth 1951, as n. 67, pp. 103–4; N. Denholm-Young (ed.), Cartulary of the Mediaeval Archives of Christ Church, Oxford Hist. Soc. 92 (1931), p. 196; Hurst 1899, as n. 67, p. 193. For the suggested derivation of Jews Mount, Oxford, from jusi or jewise, see n. 67.
85 The earliest antiquarian recognition of the bricks in St Nicholas’s seems to have been by John Foxcroft in c.1693: Bodl. MS Eng. b. 2043, fol. 36b; Camden 1695, as n. 19, col. 451. For recent comment on the relationship between church and Jewry Wall, see Courtney 1998, as n. 41, pp. 130–3.
86 PR 31 Hen. II, PRS 34 (1913), p. 104. William owed 20s. to the Exchequer for his acquittal by Hugh de Berch from his pledge. The last instalment of the debt was paid in 1189–90.
a local agent for his Lincoln namesake. It was probably the same Aaron of Leicester whose son Samson witnessed a grant in Canterbury in c.1180; and very possibly again the same Aaron whose daughter Gigonia contributed to the Lincolnshire quota of the Jewish tallage of 1223, and whose son Fanlon, ‘a Jew of Canterbury’, is found acting as a moneylender in 1224. A Jew named Josce of Leicester contributed to the Nottinghamshire quota of the 1194 tallage; and another named Benedict of Leicester is recorded as a moneylender in 1205. The evidence of locative bynames does have to be used with caution, as, while they appear to suggest present or past residence, it has been argued in Jewish contexts that they may indicate no more than the use of a place for business purposes. This point remains debatable, however, and does not invalidate the clear evidence that a small Jewish community existed in Leicester by the closing decades of the twelfth century. The settlement had been made without licence, but in 1226 Ranulf, Earl of Chester, who then held half the honour of Leicester, including the lordship of the town, obtained royal authority for the Jews to remain unmolested. Joe Hillaby has suggested that the Jewish community of Warwick, which disappears briefly from the record in the 1220s, may have moved to Leicester, attracted by the greater level of protection offered by Ranulf: this must, however, remain speculative.

Ranulf’s regime of benign paternalism was not to last, as his tenure of the half-honour was only temporary: he held it in custody for the young Simon de Montfort (seen as primarily a vassal of the French Crown, and so of questionable loyalty). Montfort recovered his estates in August 1231, and within a matter of months had issued a charter banishing Jews from living in the liberty of the town, ‘in my time or in the time of any of my heirs to the end of the world’ (Fig. 3). His

87 PR 5 Rich. I, PRS n.s. 3 (1927), p. 105. The debt remained on the pipe rolls until 1199, when it was transferred to the account of Benedict of Talmont, further details of which do not survive. Aaron of Lincoln’s vast wealth had been confiscated by the Crown on his death. The one county roll of his bonds to survive is that for Rutland: TNA E 101/241/1; published with commentary in H. G. Richardson, The English Jewry under Angevin Kings (London, 1960), pp. 68–70; 115–7; 247–53.
91 Hardy 1833–44, as n. 89, 2, p. 123. The order applied to Jews in both Leicester and Coventry, the latter town being among Ranulf’s own possessions.
93 The charter is now ROLLR BR I/11: published in Nichols 1795–1811, as n. 6, 1/1, Appx, p. 38 (text); and in Levy 1908, as n. 32, pp. 39–41 (text, translation and photograph, but misdated to post-1253). Cf. J. R. Maddicott, Simon de Montfort (Cambridge, 1994), pp. 15–17. The charter is undated, but (as Maddicott shows) must have been enacted between August 1231 and October 1232. If the expulsion sparked the dispute between Simon and the countess of Winchester it can have been enacted no later than January 1232.
action, which he characterised as being ‘for the good of my soul, and the souls of my ancestors and successors’, was clearly fuelled by his own religious zealotry, combined with discontent at the economic power popularly conceived to be wielded by Jewish moneylenders. His views were probably shaped by increasingly hardline attitudes in France, where in 1217 his own mother had given the Jews of Toulouse a stark choice of conversion or death; and he may in addition have been
swayed by the intellectual arguments of the scholar Robert Grosseteste, then archdeacon of Leicester. The expulsion can also be seen as an ominous portent of events thirty years later, when resentment at financial indebtedness to Jews was one factor behind the baronial rebellion headed by Montfort, and when, in London and several provincial centres, his partisans looted Jewish property, destroyed Jewish records, and slaughtered Jews themselves.

The Jews ejected from Leicester found refuge on the lands of Montfort’s great-aunt, Margaret de Quincy, the widowed countess of Winchester, who held the other half of the honour of Leicester. A territorial argument now surfaced between Simon and Margaret over the details of the partition of the honour (originally made in 1204–7): the point at issue was which of them lawfully held the eastern suburb of Leicester, the town’s communal bread-ovens (probably those outside the gates), the manors of Belgrave and Glenfield, and rents in Desford and Whetstone. The matter was settled in January 1232, when the King decided in Margaret’s favour. While we cannot be certain, it seems likely that this dispute was triggered by the Jewish question, Simon’s intention of cleansing Leicester of its Jews having been undermined by Margaret’s provision of sanctuary on the town’s outskirts. Archdeacon Grosseteste now stepped into the fray, penning a strongly-worded letter to Margaret on how the refugees should be treated. In a lengthy text replete with biblical quotation he argued vehemently that the Jews, as murderers of Christ and obdurate unbelievers, were cursed to wander the earth; and that it was a lord’s duty, while preserving their lives, to hold them in captivity, to prevent them from oppressing Christians through usury, and to steer them towards a livelihood founded on physical labour. How far Margaret may have heeded this advice is unknown.

We hear nothing more of the community as such, but a few Jews with roots in the town are subsequently found elsewhere. Josce of Leicester was based in

---


Nottingham in 1241–2; and Moses of Leicester appears in Lincolnshire in 1244.\(^99\) Another (or the same?) Josce of Leicester was living in Canterbury, perhaps by 1249: he had died by 1254, but his sons, Aaron and Salle, became prominent in the Jewish community there.\(^100\) Yet another Josce of Leicester was active as a moneylender in Kent and (again, if the same individual) in Warwickshire in the 1270s.\(^101\) There is also evidence from this period of a few Jews living in other parts of Leicestershire. There seem, for example, to have been some in Market Harborough: the town bailiffs were found to have been usurping royal authority over them in 1274; and a few years later a Jew named Cressant of Harborough (\textit{Hauerberg'}) was hanged for coinage offences.\(^102\) Cressant's execution was part of a wider clampdown on Jews for coin-clipping and forgery in the late 1270s and early 1280s, and at about this date a 'treasure' of silver plates and clippings worth over £15, discovered at Melton Mowbray, was treated as the hoard of a Jewish moneyer.\(^103\) A mention of Solomon of Bosworth (\textit{Boseworth'}) in 1279 indicates a Jewish presence in either Husbands or Market Bosworth; while another of Abraham of Oakham (\textit{Ocham}) in 1275 suggests there was at least one Jew in Rutland.\(^104\) But the days of English Jewry were now numbered: Montfort’s action at Leicester had ushered in a series of local expulsions, Jews were subjected to increasing burdens, restrictions and abuses, and in 1290 Edward I expelled the entire community from the realm.\(^105\) A convert to Christianity named Joan of Leicester was resident in the \textit{Domus Conversorum} in London by 1280, and remained there for over sixty years until her death in the early 1340s: her son, William of Leicester, who had become a king's clerk, also died there in 1349.\(^106\) Another William of Leicester lived in the same institution from 1401 to 1417, but in this case was probably of Spanish origin.\(^107\)

It is evident that Leicester's Jewish community was always a small one. Even at its peak, it probably numbered no more than a handful of families. Leicester was never among those Jewish settlements formally recognised for purposes of

\(^99\) H. L. Cannon (ed.), \textit{The Great Roll of the Pipe for the Twenty-Sixth Year of King Henry the Third} (New Haven, 1918), pp. 91; 183. \textit{CPREJ}, 1, p. 69.


\(^104\) \textit{CPREJ}, 4, p. 25. \textit{CPREJ}, 5, pp. 177; 182.


\(^107\) Adler 1939, as n. 74, pp. 323–4; 367; 372–3; 377.
taxation, or provided with an *archa*, a chest for the secure deposit of moneylending bonds, and in this it ranked well below its counterparts in, for example, Northampton, Nottingham, Warwick and Coventry. It is also likely that Montfort’s expulsion was largely effective, and that in 1231, barely a generation after it had been established, the Leicester Jewry ceased to exist.

### ABBREVIATIONS

Bodl.  Bodleian Library  
CCR  *Calendar of Close Rolls*  
JHS  *Jewish Historical Studies*  
OS  Ordnance Survey  
PN  *The Place-Names of ...* (volumes of the English Place-Name Society)  
PR  *Pipe Roll ...* (editions published by the Pipe Roll Society: cited by regnal year)  
PRS  Pipe Roll Society  
RO  Record Office  
TJHSE  *Transactions of the Jewish Historical Society of England*
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