

(ib. n. 19) about the possibility of 'uacell' being another form of 'Vacarius' were but too well founded. This judge at Mantua, who is certainly not to be identified with the English Vacarius, is probably, as Professor Patetta shows, the author of the '*Contraria Legum Longobardorum*.' The theory that Vacarius came from Mantua or had written about Lombardic law must therefore be abandoned.

F. LIEBERMANN.

THE FORGED BULL TO ST. AUGUSTINE'S, CANTERBURY.

WHARTON, in his '*Anglia Sacra*' (ii. pp. v-vi), selects, as a specially bad case of charters forged to secure exemption from episcopal jurisdiction, the papal bull which, in the twelfth century, St. Augustine's abbey at Canterbury claimed to possess, and in virtue of which its abbots refused profession of canonical obedience to the archbishops. He printed a charter (containing two documents) which related to the forgery; and the same charter (now 'Cart. Ant. A. 62' at Canterbury) is printed in the appendix to Dr. Sheppard's '*Literae Cantuarienses*' iii. 367. It appears to me that his comments upon it (i. pp. lix-lxi), are based upon misapprehension.

The charter, as I have said, contains two documents, both dated by the editor '*circ. 1155*.' It will, I think, be found that they are widely different in date and occasion. The first is a letter from Hugh, archbishop of Rouen, to Adrian IV, and must therefore belong to 1154-1159. It seems to me most natural to connect it with Silvester's obstinate appeals to the holy see concerning his benediction, as abbot of St. Augustine's, which was eventually carried out by archbishop Theobald '*iuxta mandatum Domini Papae Adriani*' ('*Literae*' iii. 367). It would thus be the archbishop of Rouen's letter which influenced the pope in his decision.

The bishop of Evreux's letter to Alexander III, which is the second of the two documents, must obviously be much later. For the facts that he was bishop and that he speaks of '*Beatum Thomam*' prove that it cannot in any case be earlier than 1170. Dr. Sheppard's conclusion (i. pp. lx, lxi) is that

It is probable that the process took something of the following form: (1) the narrative written down in the very words of the archbishop and bearing his seal was sent to Christchurch. Then (2) the bishop of Evreux must have been armed with papal authority to enable him to compel the production. (3) Lastly, as the command of the king is so clearly insisted on as a condition for the burning, the bishop must have carried the forged privilege to the king's presence, and there destroyed it, &c.

For, according to the writer,

The abbot of St. Augustine's, upon being required to do so, produced his privilege of exemption, which, being recognised as the bull forged by

Guernon, was by command of the king, and by the hand of the bishop of Evreux, handed over to be burnt' (p. lx).

Now of all this there is not a word in the document as I read it. The bishop of Evreux (Giles) merely says:—

Privilegia [sic] autem quae ex confessione Gaufridi Catalaunensis episcopi, in praesentia sanctae recordationis Innocentii Papae, adulterina probata sunt, et praedicto Domino nostro Archiepiscopo reddita, de mandato eiusdem Domini nostri igni comburenda propriis manibus tradidimus.'

The king, it will be seen, is not mentioned. The *mandatum* was that either of Becket or of the archbishop of Rouen. I gather from the document that it was the latter, and that he gave his nephew the 'privilegia' to burn. I see no evidence that Giles visited Canterbury, or that he compelled the production of the bull to St. Augustine's, or indeed that it was burnt. And I think this letter of his to the pope was probably written in connexion with the renewed struggle on Roger becoming abbot of St. Augustine's in 1178.

J. H. ROUND.

A FIFTEENTH-CENTURY ASSESSMENT OF WAGES.

In an earlier number of this Review,¹ I ventured to suggest that the discovery of assessments among unpublished records might show that the justices of the peace had acted upon their legal powers before the days of Elizabeth. A fortunate accident enables me now to point to one instance, printed indeed over forty years ago, but buried in a local archaeological journal² until a short time ago, when in modernised form it reappeared in the 'Notes' of a local weekly newspaper.³ In 1853 a note relative to labourers' wages, as fixed by the justices of the peace for Norfolk in 9 Hen. VI, was communicated to the Norfolk and Norwich Archaeological Society by Sir Henry Ellis, who derived his information from a volume in the British Museum.⁴ He merely gives the text of the ordinance, and it may therefore be of interest to indicate the connexion in which it is found. Among various treatises bound together is one in a fifteenth-century hand described in the catalogue as a '*registrum chartarum de villis, terris, maneriis, libertatibus, privilegiis, aliisque ad iura episcopi et conventus Eliensis spectantibus.*' It deals more particularly with the manors of the hundred and a half of Mitford in Norfolk, held by the bishop of

¹ ENGLISH HISTORICAL REVIEW, ix. 318.

² *Norfolk Archaeology*, iv. 362.

³ *Norfolk and Norwich Chronicle*, 30 Oct. 1897. I am much indebted to J. C. Tingey, F.S.A., Hon. Curator of the Norwich archives recently placed in the Castle Museum, who drew my attention to the 'Note.'

⁴ Cott. MSS. Dom. A. xv. f. 187b.