

The Case Against Edward IV's Marriage and Offspring: Secrecy; Witchcraft; Secrecy; Precontract

H. A. KELLY

John Ashdown-Hill's recent article, 'Edward IV's Uncrowned Queen',¹ is very illuminating on the life of Eleanor Butler. But some of the legal subjects that he treats need clarification. This is particularly true of his opening paragraph:

Richard III's accession to the throne was based on the claim that the children of Edward IV were illegitimate. His case was that Edward IV's marriage with Elizabeth Woodville was both clandestine and bigamous and therefore invalid. If the two premises of clandestinity and bigamy were provable, Richard's case was a good one.

He cites as his authority Richard Helmholz's article on 'The sons of Edward IV'.² But Helmholz does not consider the full parliamentary justification in the so-called *Titulus regius*, specifically the charge of witchcraft. Furthermore, he does not claim that clandestinity would invalidate Edward's marriage. Secrecy made a marriage illicit but not invalid. Charles Ross is quite correct in saying that Edward IV's marriage 'was not made invalid because the lords had not assented, nor by the fact that it had been celebrated privately'.³ Helmholz does say, however, that the secrecy of a marriage, even though the marriage is valid, could have the effect of illegitimizing any children born to it.

Secrecy was, nevertheless, relevant to the marriage as well as to the question of legitimacy of offspring. Parliament in fact alleged two secret marriages of the king, the first to Eleanor Butler and the second to Elizabeth Woodville. If the first

marriage could be proved to have taken place — that is, if it were not so secret that there were no witnesses to it — then it could be alleged as an impediment, the impediment of ‘precontract’, to the second marriage. This, of course, is where the bigamy would come in. ‘Precontract’, by the way, means *previous marriage*, when alleged as a challenge to a subsequent marriage. Any previous marriage would do, whether secret or public. The word does *not* mean ‘preliminary contract’ or ‘betrothal’. A betrothal to one person did not invalidate a subsequent marriage to another person.

As noted, the *Titulus regius* alleged another impediment besides bigamy to the validity of the marriage between Edward and Elizabeth: namely, witchcraft. Secrecy, of course, was relevant to both of these impediments, because, as we will soon see, the purpose of non-secrecy was to make sure that any impediments to a proposed marriage could be brought to light and thereby prevent the marriage from taking place.

I have made some of these points earlier in *The Ricardian*, in my articles on the *Croyland Chronicle* (1985, 1987, 1990),⁴ but I think it is time to dust them off and expand upon them.

Titulus Regius: Four Premises and Two Conclusions

The Parliament held at the beginning of 1484 did not add any arguments to the ‘roll of parchment’ (the *Titulus regius*) that was presented to Richard six months earlier, just before his coronation, but simply made a formal endorsement of it. The document makes four statements or premises about Edward IV’s ‘ungracious pretended marriage’ to Elizabeth Grey.⁵ They are as follows:

Premises:

1. *Secrecy from the Lords*: ‘And here also we consider how that the said pretended marriage betwixt the above-named King Edward and Elizabeth Grey was made of great presumption, without the knowing and assent of the lords of this land’.
2. *Witchcraft*: ‘And also by sorcery and witchcraft committed by the said Elizabeth and her mother Jaquette, Duchess of Bedford, as the common opinion of the people and the public voice and fame is through all this land, and hereafter, if and as the case shall require, shall be proved sufficiently in time and place convenient’.
3. *Secrecy from the Church*: ‘And here also we consider how that the said pretended marriage was made prively and secretly, without edition of banns, in a private chamber, a profane place, and not openly in the face of the Church, after the law of God’s Church, but contrary thereunto and the laudable custom of the Church of England’.
4. *Precontract*: ‘And how also that at the time of contract of the same pretended marriage, and before and long time after, the said King Edward was and stood married and trothplight to one Dame Eleanor Butler, daughter of the old earl of

Shrewsbury, with whom the same King Edward had made a precontract of matrimony, long time before he made the said pretended marriage with the said Elizabeth Grey in manner and form abovesaid'.

These statements are then asserted to be true — 'Which premises being true, as in very truth they been true' — with the following effects.

Conclusions:

1. *Invalidity of Marriage*: 'It appeareth and followeth evidently that the said King Edward during his life and the said Elizabeth lived together sinfully and damnably in adultery, against the law of God and of His Church; and therefore no marvel that, the sovereign lord and the head of this land being of such ungodly disposition and provoking the ire and indignation of our Lord God, such heinous mischiefs and inconvenients, as is above remembered, were used and committed in the realm amongst the subjects'.

2. *Illegitimacy of Offspring*: 'Also it appeareth evidently and followeth that all the issue and children of the said King Edward been bastards and unable to inherit or to claim anything by inheritance, by the law and custom of England'.

The accepted view is that Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, was the author of the petition. He was a trained canonist, having received his doctorate in Roman civil law (which included, of course, the mastery of canon law) from Oxford by June 1443.⁶ His case is made carefully, and each element should be given due weight. We should note especially that there is no claim that each of the two conclusions depends on all four of the premises. The claim is only that, given the four premises, the two conclusions follow.

The Church Law on Clandestine Marriage

If it was true that Edward concealed his marriage to Elizabeth from the lords of the land, this circumstance had no effect whatsoever on the validity or invalidity of the union. This was a question reserved to the Church courts, which followed canon law. If it was also true that he disobeyed canon law and married without the reading of banns and not *in facie ecclesiae*, 'in the face of the Church', as canon law phrased it, he was liable to punishment; but the marriage was not therefore invalid.

The law on the point was given in the title *De clandestina desponsatione* of the *Liber Extra* of Gregory IX (1234). The third chapter in this title, *Cum inhibitio*, one of the decrees of the Fourth Lateran Council (1215), confirmed earlier strictures against secret marriage and required that notice of any forthcoming marriage be posted in church, so that any possible impediments could be raised by anyone who knew about them (for instance, a person already married to one of the proposed spouses). Fitting penances were to be imposed on all who violated these rules. The first chapter of the title, *Si quis clam*, decreed that if one of the parties to a secret

marriage denied it, the burden of proof would be on the one who asserted it. The second chapter, *Quod nobis*, provided that if one or both secret spouses deny the marriage, it cannot be enforced without proof that it took place; if both spouses make the secret marriage public, then it must be approved by the Church as if contracted in the view of the church (*in ecclesiae conspectu*) from the beginning.⁷

Acceptance and enforcement of the Lateran decree was immediate in England. Diocesan statutes from the 1220s say that the notices, or banns, of marriage were to be published on three successive Sundays or holydays before the public marriage was to take place. William Lyndwood, writing in the 1420s, attributed this rule to the Council of Oxford in 1322, and excerpted it in his *provinciale* in the first title of book 4, *De sponsalibus et matrimonio*.⁸ In title 3, *De clandestina desponsatione*, he excerpts the constitutions of Archbishop Simon Mepham, 1329, ordering the Lateran decree to be made known to all the faithful. He decreed that priests who participated in marriages without publication of banns or outside of the spouses' parish were to be suspended, and the spouses themselves duly punished as well.⁹ Lyndwood then presents an excerpt from the 1342 constitution of Archbishop Stratford, *Humana concupiscentia*, imposing *ipso facto* excommunication on all who forced priests to conduct a wedding service for a secret marriage, and ordering other penalties against all who celebrated marriage clandestinely.¹⁰ Lyndwood's work, with his glosses and index (dated 1433), was one of the first books to be printed at Oxford in the 1480s (and the largest book to be printed there for a hundred years more),¹¹ and it was undoubtedly a standard reference work in 1483.

Witchcraft as an Impediment to Marriage

Witchcraft could be an impediment in one of two ways: as causing impotence and as affecting marital consent. The first impediment was included in a title of Book 4 of the *Liber Extra*: title 15, *De frigidis et maleficiatis, et impotentia coeundi* ('Concerning the frigid and the bewitched, and inability to have intercourse'); and though none of the eight chapters of the title deal explicitly with witchcraft, the Ordinary Gloss does treat the matter.¹² The Gloss also refers us to Gratian's *Decretum*: Case 33 is about a man who cannot render the debt to his wife because impeded by witchcraft; and chapter 4, *Si per sortiarias* ('If by witchcraft'), of the first question, along with Gratian's comment before it, deals explicitly with the matter.¹³ The accepted law was that, if a man was impotent with respect to all women, it was diagnosed as a natural defect; if, however, he was impotent only with one woman, that is, his wife, the conclusion was that witchcraft was the cause, and the marriage could be annulled.

The canons and canonists do not speak to the second kind of invalidity caused by witchcraft, but it would fall under the category of 'force and fear,' which prevents adequate consent. The decretal *Cum locum* begins: 'Since consent does

not take place where there is fear or coercion, it is necessary for all coercion to be eliminated when someone's assent is required. Now marriage is contracted by consent alone, and, when it is sought, the person whose intentions are in question should enjoy full security, lest he say out of fear that he is pleased by something he hates, with the result that usually follows from unwilling nuptials'.¹⁴

Royal Witchcraft Encounters in England

In my 1977 essay in *Mediaeval Studies*, 'English Kings and the Fear of Sorcery', I showed that every sovereign from Edward III to Elizabeth I was affected by witchcraft claims or charges.¹⁵ The most significant episode for our purposes here is the alleged plot against the life of Edward IV's immediate predecessor, Henry VI, by Eleanor Cobham, Duchess of Gloucester, and her accomplices. In the ecclesiastical trial of Eleanor that took place in 1441, one of the charges upon which she was convicted was that she 'had enforced the foresaid duke of Gloucester to love her and wed her.' Accordingly, the judge, Archbishop Chichele, 'divorced and departed the duke of Gloucester and Dame Eleanor Cobham, as for matrimony made before between them two'. Accompanying the archbishop when he passed sentence was Cardinal Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester (1404-47); Cardinal Kemp, Archbishop of York, who eventually became archbishop of Canterbury (1452-54); the three bishops who had conducted the trial by Chichele's appointment, namely, Robert Gilbert, Bishop of London (1436-48), William Alnwick, Bishop of Lincoln (1436-49), and Thomas Brown, Bishop of Norwich (1436-45); and also William Ayscough, Bishop of Salisbury (1438-50), 'with divers doctors and masters of divinity', including Adam Moleyns, the judges' 'promotor' during the trial, who later became bishop of Chichester (1445-50).¹⁶

I detail all the prelates who participated in the trial and approved of the sentence of annulment, on grounds that it was coerced by witchcraft, to show that annulment by reason of witchcraft was considered a real possibility. We must remember that Robert Stillington at this time was coming to the end of his doctoral studies in canon and civil law. This trial occurred not long before the time that Jacquetta of Luxemburg allegedly used witchcraft to induce Edward IV to marry her daughter, Elizabeth, in 1464, even though he was already allegedly married to Eleanor Butler. Jacquetta was no stranger to secret marriages. A year after her first husband, John of Lancaster, Duke of Bedford, died in 1435, she surreptitiously married Richard Woodville, and had to pay the large fine of £1000 for marrying without the king's license.¹⁷ A witchcraft charge was brought against Jacquetta a few years after Edward IV's marriage to Elizabeth had been made public. A man named Thomas Wake accused her of making magic images, specifically an image of Edward IV and another of her daughter Elizabeth. She was cleared of the charge on 22 January 1470,¹⁸ and she died on 30 May 1472.

We note that the author or authors of the *Titulus regius* offer to prove the claim against her, if the need should arise in the future, an offer not made with respect to the claim that Edward had previously married Eleanor Butler. We may also note that witchcraft was taken seriously just before this time. The Croyland Chronicler, a doctor of canon law whom I previously took to be John Russell, Bishop of Lincoln, but whom I now identify as Richard Lavender, Archdeacon of Leicester and Official of the Consistory Court in Lincoln,¹⁹ in discussing George, Duke of Clarence, says that Clarence's servant, Thomas Burdett, was in league with Master John Stacy, a person who was called an astronomer but was also a great necromancer ('dictus astronomus cum etiam magnus necromanticus extiterat'); when Stacy was examined under torture concerning his damned art, on a charge of attempting to murder Richard Lord Beauchamp by means of leaden images, he implicated Burdett, and both were executed; Clarence protested the next day, and finally he himself was convicted of treason.²⁰

Stacy and Burdett were convicted of witchcraft plots against the life of the king; they were executed on 20 May 1477. Among the charges that Clarence was convicted upon in February of 1478 was that he had accused Edward of himself using lethal witchcraft against his subjects.²¹ Robert Stillington was also implicated in his treason and imprisoned in the Tower, being released in June only after paying a large sum of money. When historians assert that Stillington impugned Edward's marriage to Elizabeth out of motives of revenge,²² we are doubtless being invited to question the existence of the alleged previous marriage between Edward and Eleanor.

As we have seen, the *Titulus regius* accuses Elizabeth as well as her mother Jacquetta of the witchcraft that led to Elizabeth's marriage to Edward. This circumstance may lend credence to Polydore Vergil's report that on 19 June 1483, that is, just about the time that the *Titulus* was presented to him, Richard accused Elizabeth of being a witch (*illa maga*) and afflicting his body with witching-poisons (*veneficia*). Thomas More has a different version of the incident, in having Richard associate Elizabeth with Shore's wife and other witches (*praestigiatrices*) in making his body bewitched (*fascinatum*) with their magic poisons (*magica veneficia*). I have discussed in my early article whether Bishop Morton was somehow implicated in a witchcraft plot, noting that the 1484 Parliament condemned Morton along with a 'nigromancer', Thomas Nandyk, late of Cambridge, for instigating Buckingham's rebellion.²³

Finally, let me recall that an argument against the validity of marriage because of witchcraft was contemplated by Henry VIII, shortly after the death of Catherine of Aragon in 1536, but with regard to his second marriage, to Anne Boleyn. Eustace Chapuys reported on good authority that Henry had confided to one of his intimates at court, like a man going to confession, that 'he had entered into this

marriage seduced and constrained by witchcraft, and for this reason he believed that he was able to take another wife', which he desired to do; moreover, God had proved the invalidity of the marriage (as He had with his first marriage) by refusing to grant him any male children.²⁴

The Impediment of Previous Marriage

The Croyland Chronicler, when reporting on the original presentation of the *Titulus regius* (he says that everyone knew the identity of the author), sums up the claim against Edward IV's sons by mentioning only the precontract with Eleanor Butler, with no allusion to the witchcraft charge.²⁵ When he reports the ratification by Parliament at the beginning of 1484, he simply says that the validity of marriage was denied, without mentioning the impediment or impediments at issue. He does say, however, that it was beyond the power of that lay court ('*curia illa laicalis*') to decide the matter — meaning, of course, that it fell within the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts. But in spite of their lack of jurisdiction, he says, Parliament went ahead and acted, 'because of the great fear that affected the most constant men' ('*propter ingentem in constantissimos cadentem metum*').²⁶ He is alluding to the canonistic criterion that invalidates matrimonial consent. The decretals *Veniens* and *Consultationi* specify *metus qui posset in virum constantem cadere*, 'fear that could affect a constant man'.²⁷

Ross, following Mortimer Levine, is mistaken to attack the parliamentary case against the marriage on the grounds that 'if a precontract existed, making the marriage of 1464 invalid, there was nothing to prevent Edward and Elizabeth going through another ceremony of marriage after the death of Eleanor Butler in 1468'. If no such validation of marriage took place, then the marriage would still be invalid.²⁸ (Helmholz notes that a remarriage could only have taken place validly if Elizabeth had been unaware of Edward's first marriage when she married him.) In short, if Edward had made a present-tense contract of marriage with Eleanor Butler, even if he had not consummated it, he would not have been able to marry Elizabeth Woodville while Eleanor was still alive, and he would not have been considered married to her after Eleanor died.²⁹

Conclusion

It follows, then, that, as the *Titulus regius* asserts, if Edward IV married Elizabeth Woodville when already married or when befuddled by the aphrodisiacs or other bewitching devices of Elizabeth and her mother, the marriage was not valid, and the three sons and seven daughters that Elizabeth bore the king were illegitimate. Helmholz notes that the clandestinity of the invalid marriage between Edward and Elizabeth would have prevented the automatic legitimization of the children born after Eleanor's death. He concludes that the lack of jurisdiction, pointed out by the

Croyland Chronicler, is the strongest argument against the parliamentary case, and he believes that the statement that the marriage's invalidity was common knowledge throughout the land, coupled with an offer of proof, 'was evidently meant to anticipate the argument that Parliament was without authority to decide the question of legitimacy'. But in fact the statement of common knowledge and offer of proof was the standard formula in charges made in an ecclesiastical tribunal.³⁰ Furthermore, this formula is used only concerning the witchcraft charge and not the precontract allegation.

By the time that the claim for the illegitimacy of Edward's offspring was ratified in the Parliament of 1484, the two princes were assumed to be dead, so that the argument at that time would affect only the five surviving daughters. It may have been partially Richard's worry over the legitimacy of the parliamentary declaration, because not supported by a decision of the competent church court, that lay behind his plan to annul his marriage to Anne Neville and marry Edward's eldest daughter, his niece Elizabeth. Then it would not matter whether they were to be considered legitimate. He could have graciously legitimized all of the daughters, with regard to temporal affairs, even without applying to the pope for spiritual legitimation.³¹ A century earlier, Richard II had thus legitimized his cousins the Beauforts, illegitimate children of his uncle John of Gaunt by Catherine Swinford.

The Croyland Chronicler knew that a papal dispensation was possible for an uncle-niece marriage (which did not fall among the Levitical degrees), but he reported that Catesby and Ratcliffe persuaded Richard it was not, for fear that young Elizabeth would take revenge upon them for causing the death of her uncle Anthony and her brother Richard.³² Therefore, since Richard abandoned any thought of annulling his marriage to Anne and marrying Elizabeth, the question of the legitimacy of Elizabeth and her surviving siblings (that is, her four sisters), was not revisited, not by Richard III and certainly not by Henry VII, whose claim rested on his descent from one of the Beaufort bastards; for Henry knew only of their re-legitimation by their half-brother Henry IV, who added the rider that their rehabilitated status did not include the right to inherit the throne. Elizabeth's bastardization by Parliament was therefore ignored by Henry VII's first Parliament, and it continued to be ignored when Henry married her with a papal dispensation for consanguinity.

Something similar happened in the case of Elizabeth I. Henry VIII had gone ahead and effected an annulment between himself and Anne Boleyn, and, though the grounds for the action were left unstated in Cranmer's sentence of divorce, the judgment was taken as sufficient to bastardize young Elizabeth, and Parliament accordingly declared her illegitimate. The first Parliament convened by Elizabeth I left this act of 1536 unrepealed, not deliberately, as perhaps was the case with Henry VII's Parliament, but by way of oversight. By another oversight, they

resurrected the act of 1540, as emended under Edward VI, which included yet another declaration of the queen's illegitimacy.³³

NOTES AND REFERENCES

1. John Ashdown-Hill, "Edward IV's uncrowned queen: the Lady Eleanor Talbot, Lady Butler," *The Ricardian*, vol. 11 no. 139, December 1997, pp. 166-90.
2. Richard Helmholtz, "The sons of Edward IV: a canonical assessment of the claim that they were illegitimate", in P. W. Hammond, ed., *Richard III: Loyalty Lordship and Law*, London 1986, pp. 91-103.
3. Charles Ross, *Richard III*, Berkeley 1981, p. 91.
4. H. A. Kelly, "The last chroniclers of Croyland", *The Ricardian*, vol. 7 no 91, December 1985, pp. 142-77, see esp. pp. 145-47 and 166-67, nn. 33, 43; "The Croyland Chronicle tragedies", vol. 7, no. 99 December 1987, pp. 498-515; and "Croyland observations", vol. 8 no. 108, March 1990, pp. 334-41, esp. pp. 340-41.
I should mention with respect to Alison Hanham's article, 'Author! Author! Crowland Revisited', *The Ricardian* vol. 11 no. 140, March 1998, pp. 226-38, esp. p. 237 n. 12, where she doubts my interpretation of 'tragedy' and supposes that the term was not as rare and peculiar as I think, that I have continued my researches on medieval tragedy and have published three books on the subject: *Tragedy and Comedy from Dante to Pseudo-Dante*, Berkeley 1989; *Ideas and Forms of Tragedy from Aristotle to the Middle Ages*, Cambridge 1993; and *Chaucerian Tragedy*, Cambridge 1997. See especially the last-named book. pp. 40-45, in the section, "'Tragedy" in Late-Medieval England', for the mere handful of uses of the term, whether in Latin or English, that I have uncovered in fifteenth-century England. Readers of my articles will recall that I find the term to be important in the Croyland Chronicle because it helps to establish that the secular and monastic sections of the Second Continuation were written by the same author.
5. *Rotuli Parliamentorum*, vol. 6, pp. 240-41. I modernize the spelling and punctuation of the text. See also the edition by Mortimer Levine, *Tudor Dynastic Problems, 1460-1571*, London 1973, pp. 135-37.
6. See A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500*, 3 vols, Oxford 1957, vol. 3, pp. 1177-79. Emden takes Stillington to be the author of the *Titulus regius*, citing H. C. Maxwell-Lyte, *The Registers of Robert Stillington, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1466-1491, and Richard Fox, Bishop of Bath and Wells, 1492-1494*, Somerset Record Society, vol. 52 (1937), p. xi. Kelly, 'Last chroniclers', p. 145, notes that a Yearbook of 1486 names Stillington as author, citing Mortimer Levine, 'Richard III — usurper or lawful king?' *Speculum*, vol. 34 (1959), pp. 391-401, esp. pp. 392-93 n. 8.
7. *Liber Extra* 4.3.1-3, *Corpus iuris canonici*, 2 vols., ed. Emil Friedberg, Leipzig 1879-81, cols 679-680.
8. William Lyndwood, *Provinciale, seu Constitutiones Angliae*, Oxford 1679, repr. Farnborough 1968, pp. 270-71 and appendix, pp. 39-40. Lyndwood, writing in the 1420s, assigned the constitution he cites to Archbishop Reynolds in 1322, and was followed by his seventeenth-century editors, and by me in *My Love and Marriage in the Age of Chaucer*, Ithaca NY 1975, p. 167 n. 18. But C. R. Cheney, 'William Lyndwood's *Provinciale*', *Medieval Texts and Studies*, Oxford 1973, pp. 158-84, at p. 170, says that the constitutions in question "are all descended from synodal statutes of an unknown English diocese probably composed between 1222 and 1225'.
9. Lyndwood, pp. [273]-274.
10. *Ibid.*, pp. 274-77.
11. Cheney, pp. 179-80.
12. *Liber Extra* 4.15.1-8, Friedberg, 2:704-08. For the gloss, see *Corpus iuris canonici*, 3 vols., Rome, 1582 (I use the edition of Lyons 1606), vol. 2, cols. 1518, 1520, 1521, 1523, 1525-26.

13. Gratian, *Decretum*, Causa 33, questio 1, cap. 4; Friedberg, 1:1148, 1150.
14. *Liber Extra*, 4.1.14 (Friedberg, 2:666): 'Quum [=Cum] locum non habeat consensus ubi metus vel coactio intercedit, necesse est ut, ubi assensus cujusquam requiritur, coactionis materia repellatur. Matrimonium autem solo consensu contrahitur, et, ubi de ipso queritur, plena debet securitate ille gaudere cujus est animus indagandus, ne per timorem dicat sibi placere quod odit, et sequatur exitus qui de invitis solet nuptiis provenire'.
15. H. A. Kelly, 'English kings and the fear of sorcery', *Mediaeval Studies*, vol. 39 (1977), pp. 206-38.
16. *Ibid.*, pp. 219-27.
17. See the *DNB* s.v. Richard Woodville.
18. Kelly, 'English kings', p. 233; for details, see George Lyman Kittredge, *Witchcraft in Old and New England*, Cambridge, Mass. 1929, p. 84.
19. See my articles listed in n. 1 above.
20. *The Crowland Chronicle Continuations: 1459-1486*, ed. Nicholas Pronay and John Cox, London 1986, 144-46.
21. Kelly, 'English Kings', pp. 230-33.
22. Emden, p. 1778, citing Maxwell-Lyte.
23. *Ibid.*, pp. 234-35.
24. H. A. Kelly, *The Matrimonial Trials of Henry VIII*, Stanford 1976, pp. 241-42.
25. Crowland Chronicle, p. 160.
26. *Ibid.*, pp. 168-70.
27. *Liber Extra*, 4.1.15, 28, Friedberg, 2:667, 671 (the second text has *potuit for posset*).
28. Kelly, 'Last chroniclers', p. 166 n. 33.
29. For more details, see Kelly, 'Crowland observations', pp. 340-41.
30. See the example I give from Henry VIII's legatine trial of his marriage: 'English kings', p. 233 n. 105; cf. *Matrimonial Trials of Henry VIII*, p. 90.
31. For the possibilities, see my 'Canonical implications of Richard III's plan to marry his niece', *Traditio*, vol. 23 (1967) 269-311, esp. p. 383, and 'Shades of incest and cuckoldry: Pandarus and John of Gaunt', *Studies in the Age of Chaucer* 13 (1991), pp. 121-140, esp. p. 137.
32. Kelly, 'Canonical implications', pp. 271-74. Pope Pius II had recently given such a dispensation to a count of Piacenza, *ibid.*, pp. 303-06; see also *Matrimonial Trials*, pp. 12-13.
33. Kelly, *Matrimonial Trials*, pp. 241-60, 281-82.