WILEY

Review

Author(s): W. Cunningham

Review by: W. Cunningham

Source: *The Economic Journal*, Vol. 6, No. 21 (Mar., 1896), p. 91

Published by: Wiley on behalf of the Royal Economic Society

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2956772>

Accessed: 26-06-2016 20:20 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Wiley, Royal Economic Society are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Economic Journal*

Yet despite its numerous defects Mr. Adams has written an interesting essay. It is impossible to accept his hypothesis of a unique 'law' which will be to human phenomena what the 'law' of gravitation is in physics. But we shall look forward with pleasure to Mr. Adams's next work, for if he fails to convince his readers he always succeeds in making them think.

C. GRANT ROBERTSON

The Expulsion of the Jews from England in 1290. By B. L. ABRAHAM'S.

MR. ABRAHAM'S "Arnold Prize Essay" is an admirable monograph on a very interesting episode. He has made good use of the abundant materials which have recently been brought to light, and has dealt in a judicial spirit and in well-weighed language with events which were the outcome of strong antipathies, and lend themselves readily to passionate declamation. He appreciates the political necessity for the expulsion; it 'was a piece of independent royal action made necessary by the impossibility of carrying out the only alternative policy that an honourable Christian king could adopt. And the impossibility was not of Edward's making' (p. 74). The incompatibility of temperament between Christian and Jew rendered it impossible for both to live at peace under the same political and municipal institutions. The anti-Semitic feeling among the English public is a matter of common knowledge, but Mr. Abrahams has done well to call attention to the fact, which is too often forgotten, that the aversion was mutual. 'The whole character of the Jews, their religious beliefs and their national hopes were such as to make repellent to them those close relations with Christians and Englishmen which would have been necessary if they had entered into the feudal or municipal organisations of the Middle Ages. . . . Their isolation caused them no sorrow. Rather must it have been dear to them as a sign that they were faithful members of the one race to which in truth they belonged, the race of Israel' (p. 79). This pride in their isolation may account for the alleged fact that they were not members of the gilds-merchant; for the religious and friendly society side of these bodies was so little developed that it is difficult to see why membership should have been impossible to a conscientious Jew; and *forinseci* of other races appear to have been admitted in large numbers. Mr. Abrahams remarks, in passing, that in Italy, the municipal and gild organisations were easier to enter, and less narrow and exacting in their constitution than those of England' (p. 78). Such a comparison is not easy to make, and the authorities he quotes for Italy hardly suffice to justify this statement. Though the English Jews were the mere chattels of the king, they appear to have been amply protected by the Exchequer and favourably considered in all other relations of life. (*Cf.* Pollock and Maitland, i. 455.)

W. CUNNINGHAM