

## HENRY VIII'S PROGRESS THROUGH YORKSHIRE IN 1541 AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR NORTHERN IDENTITIES

**Tim Thornton**  
**University of Huddersfield**

In a personal monarchy, the progresses of a king were vital in shaping political relationships in his territories. Two recent papers have significantly advanced our understanding of the progress made by Henry VIII to Yorkshire in 1541. The journey was, by any standards, a remarkable event. The only recent precedents in Henry's reign had been journeys that halted no further north than Boston; this was the longest and most extravagant progress to occur in Henry's reign; and it had no successor for over fifty years.<sup>1</sup> R. W. Hoyle and J. B. Ramsdale have reinforced earlier accounts of the progress as part of Henry's diplomacy towards Scotland and France; C. J. Sansom, rehearsing themes underlying his recent novel *Sovereign*, by contrast returned to the emphases of earlier work by A. G. Dickens, considering the domestic context for the journey and in particular its implications for possible threats of rebellion against the Crown – and their ruthless suppression.<sup>2</sup> In re-addressing Henry's 1541 progress, this contribution aims to look behind the immediate exigencies of the early 1540s and consider the impact of this visit on the shaping of northern identity, and the relationship of the North with the rest of the King's dominions. Relatively simple models of integration, or of the subordination of regions to national State diplomacy, so common in the Whig and Marxist historiography, will be challenged.

The almost unanimous interpretation of the progress amongst historians over the last two centuries, and the one returned to by Sansom, has been that it was an immediate and angry response to rebellion.<sup>3</sup> If this was so, then it was not without

precedent. Going back into previous reigns, we find that Edward IV had come to Yorkshire in 1461, 1462, 1463-4, 1469, 1470, 1471, and 1478, and only on the latter occasion could it be said that it was not in the context of Lancastrian or Neville uprisings against him.<sup>4</sup> Henry VII had visited the shire three times, on each occasion during or in the immediate aftermath of rebellion, in 1486<sup>5</sup> and 1487,<sup>6</sup> and in 1489.<sup>7</sup> Henry's reception might have appeared rapturous, as in 1486, but the protestations of loyalty on the part of York, for example, were distinctly uncomfortable.<sup>8</sup> Given the sorrow the city famously expressed at Richard III's death in 1485, there is an irony to the way Ebraunke, the legendary founder of the city, called the audience

. . . to mynd how this Citie of old and pure affeccion

Gladdith and injoith you high grace and commyng,

With oon concent, knowing you ther Sufferaine and King.<sup>9</sup>

Richard III apart, it is reasonably safe to say that kings had chiefly come to York in the years after 1400 to deal with rebellion.<sup>10</sup>

Henry's visit in 1541 too was usually interpreted in this light by ambassadors at his Court, who explained the visit in terms of a sudden and violent reaction to renewed trouble in the North.<sup>11</sup> A.G. Dickens, in an article published in the *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal* in 1939, described this event, which he called the Wakefield plot, in which during the course of March 1541 several laymen and churchmen planned a rising at Pontefract.<sup>12</sup> It is to this work that Sansom's very recent contribution most obviously looks.<sup>13</sup> There are signs that Henry's initial reaction to news of the conspiracy was indeed extremely violent – he said he had an evil people to rule and promised to make them so poor that they would never be able to rebel again.<sup>14</sup> For J. J. Scarisbrick, too, the royal party accompanying Henry in 1541

smacked of an army of occupation.<sup>15</sup> Further, there is no doubt that the memory of 1536 and the involvement of Yorkshire men and women in the Pilgrimage of Grace was fresh in many people's minds. Lacey Baldwin Smith dramatically described the memories of swinging corpses in the minds of northern folk, which he says produced the 1541 plot.<sup>16</sup>

A further important context for the progress was undoubtedly the King's diplomacy in relation to Scotland and to the wider European stage. Hoyle and Ramsdale have recently demonstrated the extent to which the progress had been foreshadowed as long previously as in 1534, as the King tentatively considered a possible meeting with the Scots and then, making little headway and frustrated over issues such as the presence of English exiles in Scotland, increasingly looked to ways to build pressure on the Scots. By the spring of 1541, it may have been that the King wished to bring his personal intervention to bear in any conflict that might be precipitated, and he was eager to rally support in Yorkshire and the North with a view to possible military activity.<sup>17</sup> Whether this was intended by Henry to result in outright war with the Scots, or simply to close down the threat to his northern frontier so he could turn immediately to the more attractive prospect of war with France, is a matter of debate among historians but, given our prime concern with the impact of the progress on the North, of only tangential significance here.<sup>18</sup>

The medium- to long-term consequence of the progress for the North of England itself, whatever its immediate intent, is generally seen as being decisive and unifying, however: Dickens argued that it crystallized the tendency by which the 'official classes, gentry, clergy, and civic heads, who had much to lose by resistance

and a good deal to gain by obedience, were now realising the necessity of making their peace with the king'. Their submission was coloured by self-interest.<sup>19</sup> This theme is echoed in the same author's treatment of the experience of the city of York in the *Victoria County History*, which pointed out that from this time on York was unfailingly loyal to the ruling monarch and that Henry's actions contributed 'so powerfully to the religious and political unity of the nation'.<sup>20</sup> And so we have Henry's visit crystallising a self-interested coalition of loyalism, and Yorkshire beginning its career as fundamentally and closely married to the newly emerging national unity represented by the Tudors and then by the Stuarts and by their central political institutions. Sansom's recent account, while drawing heavily on Dickens, is admittedly less optimistic in tone. His York is a city of walls, thinly-veiled resentment, rain and mud; his Tudor England is a country of brooding tyranny, with the North more acutely a victim of the trend even than the south and most subjects of Henry's more united realm there coerced rather than co-opted. 'The rituals of submission and forgiveness, repeated at place after place, bound the ruling elites firmly to the King.'<sup>21</sup> These are still, of course, just alternative manifestations of the tendency in both Whig and Marxist historiography to see the sixteenth century as the time of the birth of the bourgeois alliance between gentry and Crown which provided the basis for national unity and the field, ultimately, for the victory of that bourgeoisie in the struggle for control of England and Britain – whether for good or ill depending purely on one's predilections.<sup>22</sup> Hence, for example, earlier authors who argued explicitly that the creation of the Council in the North 'must not be regarded as a concession of what we may call Home Rule, but as a strengthening of the royal authority in a distant and somewhat unruly part of the kingdom'.<sup>23</sup> For these authors,

then, 1541 held a key place in the story of the ending of the territorial diversity of the middle ages and the emergence of the unified English nation State.

Although Sansom's recension has highlighted the degree to which few recent scholars have departed significantly from Dickens's interpretation, there have been since the 1940s some significant variations in emphasis in accounts of this episode which suggest the need for a more fundamental re-evaluation of the evidence. R.B. Smith stated that Henry 'decided to *appease* the northerners by going to Yorkshire himself [my emphasis]'.<sup>24</sup> Lacey Baldwin Smith called the event a theatrical invasion, thereby implying two themes, the first, close to Dickens's interpretation, the intimidation implied by the transmission by sea of the King's artillery to York, and the second the display involved to impose a spectacular image of Henry on the people (and he mentioned the transport of tapestries, plate and apparel from London).<sup>25</sup> Appeasement and the projection of an image of splendour imply a more open exchange between ruler and ruled than a simple act of repression and submission.

Further doubts might arise from a reconsideration of the 'rebellion' or Wakefield plot itself. Other conspiracies of a similar scale did not produce a royal visit, even if they occurred in locations which suggested they might be dangerous. The significance and potential of the Walsingham conspiracy is increasingly well understood, and there were other such events: for example, from January 1541 to August 1543 three parish priests from the area between Sleaford and Bourne in Lincolnshire planned a rebellion against the Crown. They were tried and executed, of course, in 1544, but there was no further action to impose royal authority on the locality.<sup>26</sup> The Wakefield plot involved just eight or nine priests and a handful of

laymen, the five most prominent being William Legh of Middleton (the only one qualifying for the title of gentleman), Thomas Tattersall of Milnthorpe, Gilbert Thornton, James Diamond of Wakefield and Robert Boxe.<sup>27</sup> With the possible exception of the former abbot of Croxton in Leicestershire, they all came from a relatively small area around Wakefield itself, no doubt in part through the connections provided by the honour of Wakefield and through the church there. No major gentlemen played a leading role. Sir John Neville of Chevet was executed, and, although Sansom sees good grounds for doubting this was simply for misprision, he is aware of the difficulty of dismissing Marillac's evidence that Neville died only for not revealing his first knowledge of the conspiracy and speculates that his involvement might have been described, as Legh's was by one source, as 'assent' alone.<sup>28</sup>

It is therefore useful to attempt a more comprehensive re-examination of the contemporary evidence for the progress into Yorkshire to assess the intentions of the regime as they related to the region and the reactions of local people. This seems to show that, while the King was motivated, spasmodically, by overweening anger and vindictiveness, the local implications of the visit of 1541 were not dictated or required by a need for the direct and immediate suppression of revolt and repression of rebellious spirits, but a deliberate attempt by at least some members of the regime to tackle the negotiation of a new identity for Yorkshire and the North in general as an element in the King's dominions. It will be argued here that this attempt was serious and that local people enthusiastically participated; but that for a number of reasons this negotiation broke down and a new more integrated identity was not forged. This had serious implications not just for the North but for other territories such as Wales.

This approach to the history of Yorkshire and the North requires us at this point to take a step back to 1536, and this time not because of the Pilgrimage of Grace. 1536 had seen a suite of measures which challenged existing constitutional relationships in these islands. The first ‘act of union’ with Wales had resulted, for example, in the extension of justices of the peace on the English model. Writs now ran in the king’s name – a reform effected elsewhere through the act for recontinuing liberties in the crown of the same year. This meant that in Durham, where previously writs ran in the bishop’s name, the bishop appointed commissions, and it was the bishop’s peace that stood to be breached, now these things were done or defended in the king’s name. Further, in Ireland Henry was established as head of the Church.<sup>29</sup>

1536 was therefore a momentous year, for the North of England lost many of its semi-independent liberties as well as effectively losing the struggle to defend its monasteries and many aspects of spiritual life which retained the commitment of large numbers of northerners. In addition, the destruction of the Percies left something of a political vacuum. In a sense, in both the religious and constitutional spheres, during 1536 the king’s authority had been projected into the North in a manner more direct than had ever been seen before. The northern council had been revived under Norfolk. Yet many structures, especially constitutionally, had not been fundamentally reconstructed – they had either been swept away, or it was simply the king’s authority which had now been stamped upon them.

The task which Henry’s regime faced in the North in 1541 was therefore not simply to put down rebellion or regain loyalty – the limited conspiracies of the period were no longer a real threat. In 1541, major reconstruction work was in progress, for

example in the diocesan map of England and Wales, the kingship of Ireland, and the structures of Welsh government.<sup>30</sup> Most importantly for our purposes here, Henry had to explain and win agreement in the North for the reality of the sovereignty which had been so clearly proclaimed over the previous five years. So much detail remained to be established, and a personal visit by the monarch was the best way to achieve this.

There are strong signs that many in the locality and some at the heart of the regime were fully committed to this objective. The Pilgrims' request for a parliament in Nottingham or York suggests their approach to its resolution.<sup>31</sup> A royal visit to the North had been proposed in 1537, in the aftermath of the Pilgrimage; this was postponed in June.<sup>32</sup> Eventually the decision to go north was taken in April 1541 – but the journey did not begin until the last day of June. Speculation was rife about the cause of display and pageantry associated with the progress. Was Queen Catherine pregnant with a new prince? Some elements at Court deliberately cultivated this rumour, associating it with the promise that a new prince would be made duke of York.<sup>33</sup> This demonstrates the nature of the new relationship which some close to the Crown wanted to forge – not one of subjection, uniformity and integration but of a distinct identity, expressed in part through a branch of the dynasty carrying the identity of Yorkshire. On the local level, there was a natural realisation that a royal visit would be the opportunity for the clarification of jurisdictional and political arrangements. There was nothing like the appearance of the fount of sovereign power to make all subordinate authorities address their positions. This was shown even before Henry reached Yorkshire, for example in the precedence dispute which arose in Stamford between the sheriff of Northamptonshire, the alderman of Stamford and



the bailiff of Peterborough over whether a white rod or mace should be carried before the King.<sup>34</sup> The council in York, too, were keen for the visit to be a success. Their instinct was to model their welcome on that elaborate display provided for Henry VII over fifty years before, but they were sensitive enough to seek advice from the Duke of Norfolk and Archbishop Lee when they realised this might not be what the King desired.

There were even signs that the King himself might warm to his northern lands. At Hatfield, Henry indulged in a quite spectacular hunt. The bag included two hundred stags and does, young swans, two boats' full of river birds and as much of great pikes and other fish.<sup>35</sup> There were few things more likely to delight the King, and this entertainment must have been all the more pleasing given the interest aroused in no less an observer than the French King Francis I himself.<sup>36</sup> Henry clearly remembered this event with pleasure, for he returned to the issue after he travelled back to the south-east in the autumn, with a proclamation enlarging Hatfield Chase issued on 3 November 1541.<sup>37</sup>

Yet crucially the King ultimately showed himself utterly inflexible and unwilling to participate in the central negotiation. Henry's attitude to the venture became clear early on, when his progress through the Home Counties was perceived as being agonisingly slow. The weather may have provided one excuse, and hunting and his attractive young wife others, but fundamentally Henry made it clear that he saw no urgency in getting to and beyond the Trent.<sup>38</sup> Once he reached the North, Henry's intentions became evident – rather than negotiation he adopted a posture of outright confrontation. His itinerary, breaking from that initially intended, was such

as to point up his awareness of the rebellion of 1536, his victory over the Pilgrims, and his domination of the Percy inheritance.<sup>39</sup> He entered Yorkshire through Barnsdale, receiving the gentry's submissions in the very same area where the rebels had assembled to make their demands.<sup>40</sup> The manner in which he did this was significant. The chronicler Edward Hall describes 200 gentlemen in velvet and 4000 yeomen and serving men making their submission on their knees through the person of Sir Robert Bowes. Then a further submission was made by the Archbishop and 300 priests and more.<sup>41</sup> Marillac, the French ambassador who witnessed the events, makes clear that there was more than one meeting, implying that individual wapentakes gathered separately, and giving a total of 5000 or 6000 horsemen. He also indicates that those who had remained loyal in 1536 were greeted separately ('ont tenu leur renc à part') from those who had rebelled, with the latter making a long harangue in submission.<sup>42</sup> The dynamic of the occasion therefore emphasized division amongst the local communities and loyalty (or disloyalty) directly to the Crown. Further, the contents of the submission were not chosen by the repentant rebels, allowing them to explain themselves and promote their positive new-found loyalism, but were written by the Council in the North, of which Bowes was a member, and had been submitted for correction at the hands of the council travelling with the King.<sup>43</sup> Bowes himself had been marked by the Pilgrims for his leading role as an agent of the King during the rebellion.<sup>44</sup>

From then on the King's movements continued to enact his belief in his unconditional defeat and surrender of local resistance. The Privy Council met at Pontefract from 24 August to 3 September, at the castle where Lord Darcy had gone over to the rebels. Henry then passed on to Cawood, the palace of his Archbishop of

York whose role in 1536 had been so equivocal. The next two stops, clear departures from the original plan, at Wressle (6-7 September) and Leconfield (8-9 September) took the King to the heart of the former Percy interest in Yorkshire, now under his own control.<sup>45</sup> Then at Hull on 11-12 September the King was able to visit one of the few centres of loyalism in the North in 1536, although even here he later demonstrated his uncompromising attitude, on his return to the town in early October unseating the recently elected mayor, John Johnson, in favour of Sir John Eland. The latter had achieved a mascot-like status for loyalists in the North following his role in the capture of a rebel, John Calkhill, who was trying to enter Hull.<sup>46</sup> The King then returned via Leconfield on 13-14 September before finally coming to York.

The much delayed entry to York exemplifies the forces at work in this progress, and in particular Henry's determinedly confrontational attitude.<sup>47</sup> Within the city, and especially amongst the authorities, the intention was clearly to promote an image of the city and its loyalism. There was a search in the city's records, and particularly cited were the examples of visits by Henry VII and by Richard III and his Queen. The joiners who worked on the scaffold at Micklegate Bar were given the material from the first visit of Henry VII as a precedent.<sup>48</sup> This was not followed slavishly, however, for a meeting between the civic authorities and the commons of the city resulted in the mayor being empowered to call together 'certen joyners and paynters of this City and commaundyd them immedyatly to tack ther counsaill and devyse togydder to maike a show at Mikellyth barr where that the Kyngs said majestie was supposyd to entre, and so they promysyd to doe'.<sup>49</sup> The decorations there included the arms not just of the King but of the Queen, Prince and the city itself.<sup>50</sup> There were to be speeches at the entry of the King, not simply a submission, and the

task of devising them was allocated to Ralph Clayton, clerk; Henry Smyth, clerk of St William's chapel on Ousebridge had the responsibility for organising 'a showe of syngyng and other mellody after the best facon as he could devyse'.<sup>51</sup> The intended negotiation, reflecting the circumstances of 1541, was taking shape. The merchants' pageant was to be staged at Ousegate; another two were to happen in Coney Street 'with melody'.<sup>52</sup> Although their nature was not specified, it is likely that the event was intended to be similar to the entry of 1486. As then, the loyalty of the city was emphasized, although now in 1541 the choice of the merchants' play indicated the threatening context within which the council knew it was planning. This play took as its subject Doomsday. The civic authorities almost certainly hoped that, although execution upon the guilty had been rapid and terrible, they themselves might be taken as amongst the blessed – for the message of the play was ultimately an optimistic one of forgiveness and redemption, that the way to mercy is open for those who 'mendid þame whils þei moght'.<sup>53</sup>

Whatever the plans, the event did not pass off as intended. The York council had to pursue some of the carvers employed on Micklegate who had not completed their task as promised, 'where of thay made a plat before the commyng of the Kyngs majestie where through thay put this City in diswurship'; the council also had to deal with the fall-out from the theft of some of the King's silver.<sup>54</sup> More importantly, the council became increasingly perplexed in the days before the King's entry as to what approach to adopt and whether to make a submission, consulting the Duke of Norfolk and Archbishop Lee as well as sending to examine the strategy adopted by Lincoln.<sup>55</sup> Above all, perhaps deliberately, the King approached the city through Fulford, meaning that the focus of his planned reception was missed and the city therefore lost

control of the event. Instead of entering through a carefully choreographed statement of the city's loyalty at Micklegate, in which the King would have been made complicit, the corporation, many of the leading citizens, and the gentry of the Ainsty were left to kneel ignominiously around the cross at Fulford, while the Recorder read out a submission.<sup>56</sup> The potentially awkward meeting of 1486 had been successfully orchestrated by the citizens of York to emphasize their alleged loyalty to the Tudors; in 1541 events were controlled by the King to ensure the unalloyed humiliation of the city.<sup>57</sup>

Another sign of the unwillingness of Henry to brook any negotiation in his approach to the North came in his unequivocal support for the Council in the North. An initial show of what may have appeared conciliation saw an invitation of complaints against the council, with an offer of free access for the aggrieved.<sup>58</sup> Yet when, predictably, more than seventy complaints duly came in, all were rejected.<sup>59</sup> Henry's implacable unwillingness to bend was even more clearly displayed.

Amidst all this, however, events did not permit Henry unalloyed indulgence in his triumphalism. As Hoyle and Ramsdale have demonstrated, James V's attempt to defuse the tense stand-off between England and Scotland by reopening the prospect of a meeting which Henry had so long been seeking – but had until then recently given up hope of achieving – led to the late adoption of a plan for a conference, and York was the intended venue.<sup>60</sup> Yet even if it was conceived relatively late, the meeting soon grew to bulk large in Henry's calculations. Arrangements were made for the safe passage of the Scottish King and his attendants; the remains of St Mary's abbey were refurbished at great cost as the site for the meeting.<sup>61</sup> James, of course, did not

attend, so Henry was left feeling aggrieved by this slight<sup>62</sup> – and his sentiment towards Yorkshire soured still further.

If this was not enough, it seems that Henry's interest in matters theological was aroused as he travelled north, and unfortunately he found what he saw to be unacceptable and to require reform. From Northampton on 22 July 1541 he issued a proclamation restricting even more rigorously the observation of feast and fast days, and once in York the council commanded Archbishop Lee to act against images that might be seen as idolatrous.<sup>63</sup> Matters were to become yet worse soon after Henry's return to the south-east. As the evidence with which Henry was so soon to be confronted showed, Catherine Howard had met with her alleged lover Thomas Culpeper at Lincoln, Hatfield, Pontefract and York; on one occasion Culpeper picked the lock of the queen's suite and on another waited on the back stairs. At Hatfield Catherine's infatuation with Culpeper was apparent to her servants; late at night she would bar the door to all her ladies but her closest confidantes, Katherine Tilney and Jane Boleyn (née Parker) Lady Rochford – and Culpeper.<sup>64</sup> The formal indictment, found later at Doncaster, alleged that on 25 August at Pontefract she procured the retaining of Francis Dereham, and on 29 and 30 August had unlawful meetings with Thomas Culpeper, on the latter occasion saying she loved him more than the King.<sup>65</sup> Although Henry deliberately passed the handling of the adultery allegations to a commission so as not to have to confront his fears directly, for him the summer's progress had marked the end of a blissfully happy period in his personal life when he appeared to have recovered his youth and vigour. The association between the progress and Henry's cuckolding was even stronger in the popular imagination. In the published chronicle accounts, Grafton and Hall referred to just one meeting between

Catherine and Culpeper and placed it in Lincoln, with Holinshed adding another at Pontefract.<sup>66</sup> The failures of Henry's confrontational posturing in the North had been compounded by embarrassment there in his foreign policy and disaster in his marriage.

Whatever the intention of some of those involved, therefore, Henry VIII's progress in 1541 did not produce a new carefully negotiated place for the North amongst the King's dominions. Neither, however, did it result in the unconditional surrender which Henry VIII intended. The predominant local response was, strikingly, to choose to forget or at least largely ignore the fact that the event had occurred at all.

Henry's visit made little impact on the local consciousness. A good example is provided by Robert Parkyn, writing at Adwick-le-Street in the vicinity of Doncaster (and so on the route of the King's recent progress) in the late 1540s and 1550s. His brief account of the events of the Reformation does not mention Henry's visit to the North; neither does his verse account of the kings of England written in 1551.<sup>67</sup> The chroniclers of York, who might have been expected to recall the King's visit with pride, show little if any interest. By the time Drake produced his *Eboracum* in 1736, a tradition had been established which apportioned only the briefest mention to the visit of 1541 and spent considerably longer on the passage of Margaret Tudor through the city in 1503, and even on the 'coronation' of Richard III and investiture of his son there.<sup>68</sup> Henry's stock stood very low indeed, as a king 'with the terrible character of neither sparing man in his anger, nor woman in his lust'.<sup>69</sup> The nineteenth-century visitor, too, would have found more about Margaret Tudor than about her brother in

his or her guidebook,<sup>70</sup> and through most of the twentieth century Margaret and Richard III were magnified to obscure Henry VIII's visit almost completely.<sup>71</sup>

In one way, the events of 1541 epitomize an important reason for the Tudors' problems in their relationships with their territories: they were unable to develop them as they wished because of their lack of royal kin to take a representational role. The prince who some clearly expected might become a new duke of York and so take on the role of representing the king's northern territories within his dynasty was never born. Henry Fitzroy, the Duke of Richmond and the King's illegitimate son, had headed the Council in the North before the Pilgrimage, suggesting the way that royal offspring might have given the area a political focus, but his premature death left a vacuum that was never filled, until, possibly, the arrival of Elizabeth I's kinsman and potential heir, Henry Hastings, Earl of Huntingdon.<sup>72</sup>

Continental European parallels are not inappropriate in placing these events in context. After several decades of confusion and war, in the early sixteenth century the French Crown succeeded in bringing the duchy of Brittany under its control through the marriage of its heiress Anne. Henri II, her grandson, was never created duke, but François III was crowned at Rennes in a spectacular ceremony in August 1532.<sup>73</sup> Only after that date did such creations cease, and the duchy began its long career as one of the *pays d'états* under the French Crown. The North of England had never had such independence, but when the Tudors chose or were forced to change its status, there was no attempt to negotiate a similar transition, partly through circumstance and partly through the personal determination of Henry VIII to impose his victory and authority.



So what emerged from the 1541 progress, in terms of the identity of Yorkshire and the North of England? Whatever the intentions of the various parties, Yorkshire retained a self-conscious cultural and political identity, and one which was perceived with growing clarity by other parts of the King's dominions. One sign of the way the royal journey had in fact crystallized new provincial identities can be found in the chronicle accounts of Hall, Grafton, and Holinshed. In Hall and Grafton, the King is described simply as passing from Hull, over the Humber, through Lincolnshire and back to Hampton Court. By the time the story was told by Holinshed, however, the subtle commentary was added that he returned 'toward the south parts'.<sup>74</sup> The result of the progress, ironically given Henry's attitude, was a reinforcement of localist sentiment.

The progress had wider implications. In the following year, for example, a planned expedition to Wales was suddenly dropped, and this may have had something to do with the problems encountered in the North in 1541.<sup>75</sup> It might be suggested the slow and organic changes in Welsh government during the early 1540s parallel those in Yorkshire and the North, and result in large part from the consequences of the 1541 progress. Welsh governmental reforms, which were still in process in 1541, did not receive the King's direct attention and were only partially addressed in 1543.

So it is the development of Yorkshire's identity, altered and strengthened, for which 1541 is chiefly notable: this was a key stage in the formation in particular of Yorkshire identity as loyalist but different. The record of Henry's passage through the North rapidly faded from the collective memory, the grovelling submissions

which were his government's chief contribution to the event disappearing into the obscurity of a few manuscript copies. If Yorkshire remembered a Tudor royal visit then it preferred to look back to that of Margaret in 1503. More durable proved to be the ideas represented in a text preserved by the Vavasor of Hazelwood family, which deserves more notice than the little it has received, despite its publication in Hearne's editions of John Leland's *Itinerary*. This grafted a self-conscious paean to Yorkshire virtues onto the memory of the 1541 visit.<sup>76</sup> The text takes the form of a discussion between Henry VIII and his Bishop of Durham, Cuthbert Tunstall, on the occasion of the King's entry to the shire. There, from the natural vantage point the location provided, Tunstall sets out the beauties and qualities of the Vale of York stretching ahead of them. This was the spot where the Pilgrims had gathered – it was now the spot on which Tunstall laid out the reasons for accepting Yorkshire's loyal but distinct identity. Some of the themes this text took up were old ones being given new life, others were relatively new. There was discussion of the region's resources, especially the increasingly extensively exploited deposits of coal and iron. There was a distinct emphasis on St Helena and Constantine, representing York and Yorkshire's connection with the Roman and early Christian heritage. The text emphasized particularly the proximity of Hazelwood to the Roman site of Tadcaster, where finds had allegedly included coins and medals of Helena and Constantine. This was a medieval theme, as evidenced by local devotion to the cult of the saint, but was to come in the succeeding centuries to be developed through the antiquarian study of the physical remains of the Roman period<sup>77</sup> into a legitimation of the status of York and Yorkshire as no conquered province but, at its most extravagant, the birthplace of the Christian west.

## References

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Lacey Baldwin Smith, *A Tudor Tragedy: The Life and Times of Catherine Howard* (1961), pp. 174-75; Neil Samman, 'The Progresses of Henry VIII, 1509-1529', in *The Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. Diarmaid MacCulloch (Basingstoke, 1995), pp. 59-73, 259-62.
- <sup>2</sup> R. W. Hoyle and J. B. Ramsdale, 'The Royal Progress of 1541, the North of England, and Anglo-Scottish Relations, 1534-1542', *Northern History*, XLI (2004), 240-65; Christopher J. Sansom, 'The Wakefield Conspiracy of 1541 and Henry VIII's Progress to the North Reconsidered', *NH*, XLV (2008), 217-38.
- <sup>3</sup> The previous major accounts of the journey are: Joseph Hunter, 'Account of King Henry the Eighth's progress in Yorkshire', in *Memoirs Illustrative of the History and Antiquities of the County and City of York, Communicated to the Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, Held at York, July, 1846* (1848), pp. 1-9; A. G. Dickens, 'The Yorkshire Submissions to Henry VIII, 1541', *English Historical Review*, LIII (1938), 267-75.
- <sup>4</sup> Charles Ross, *Edward IV* (1974), pp. 45, 51, 55, 57, 61-62, 135, 144-45, 152, 163, 271.
- <sup>5</sup> Apr. 1486: *York Civic Records*, ed. Angelo Raine, I, *House Books 1475-87*, Yorkshire Archaeological Society, Record Series, XCVIII (1938), 155-59 (House Book vi, fols 15v.-18). Sydney Anglo, *Spectacle, Pageantry, and Early Tudor Policy* (1969), pp. 22-28; idem, *Images of Tudor Kingship* (1992), pp. 49, 82-85, 90, 91; Rhoda Edwards, *The Itinerary of King Richard III, 1483-1485* (1983), pp. 40-41; E. Cavell, 'Henry VII, the North of England, and the First Provincial Progress of 1486', *NH*, XXXIX (2002), 187-207.

---

<sup>6</sup> July-Aug. 1487: *York Civic Records*, ed. Angelo Raine, II, *House Books 1487-1504*, YASRS, CIII (1941), 27-30 (House Book vi, fols 107-09v.; Henry commanded a performance of the play of Corpus Christi (pp. 27-28)). Edwards, *Itinerary of Richard III*, pp. 40-41.

<sup>7</sup> 1489: Michael Bennett, 'Henry VII and the Northern Rising of 1489', *English Historical Review*, CV (1990), 34-59; Michael Hicks, 'The Yorkshire Rebellion of 1489 Reconsidered', *NH*, XXII (1986), 39-62. The problems of the city can be traced in *York Civic Records*, II, 45-53 (House Book vi, fols 149v.-60v.)

<sup>8</sup> For Richard's visit, see *York Civic Records*, I, 77-79 (House Books ii, iii, iv, fols 93v.-96).

<sup>9</sup> *York Civic Records*, I, 157.

<sup>10</sup> S.J. Gunn, *Early Tudor Government, 1485-1558* (1995), p. 63, states that Henry VII came to York only once, in his early years, 'to lay the spectre of its Ricardian loyalties' and Henry VIII only in 1541 'in response to the Pilgrimage of Grace'. His theme is of London merchants and Court careerists tying together the realm.

<sup>11</sup> *L(etters and) P(apers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII, 1509-47)*, ed. J. S. Brewer, J. Gairdner and R. H. Brodie (1862-1910); *Addenda*, i (1929-32), XVI, 852, 864. A direct link was argued by Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, pp. 173-74.

Some as good as ignore the progress: David Starkey, *The Reign of Henry VIII: Personalities and Politics* (1985), p. 127, refers to it in passing while talking of the fate of Catherine Howard, 'after an unusually long and distant progress in the north'.

<sup>12</sup> 'Sedition and Conspiracy in Yorkshire in the Later Years of Henry VIII', *Yorkshire Archaeological Journal*, XXXIV (1939), 379-98.

<sup>13</sup> Sansom, *NH*, XLV, esp. 222-27.

<sup>14</sup> *LP*, XVI, 903.

---

<sup>15</sup> J.J. Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII* (1968), p. 428, relying on Marillac (*Correspondance politique de MM de Castillon et de Marillac*, ed. Jean Kaulek (Paris, 1885), pp. 309-10; *LP*, XVI, 868).

<sup>16</sup> Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, pp. 173-74.

<sup>17</sup> Hoyle and Ramsdale, *NH*, XLI, 240-65, esp. pp. 252-53 (relying on *The Hamilton Papers: Letters and Papers Illustrating the Political Relations of England and Scotland in the XVIth Century*, i: *A.D. 1532-1543*, ed. Joseph Bain (Edinburgh, 1890), pp. 71-74); effectively contradicted, at least in so far as they allege Henry's prime objective was to provoke the Scots, by Sansom, *NH*, XLV, 228-30. Other recent accounts have suggested that Henry wanted and expected a conference from the very start of his progress (e.g. M. Merriman, *The Rough Wooings: Mary Queen of Scots, 1542-1551* (East Linton, 2000), p. 59) but the evidence seems to contradict this.

<sup>18</sup> Examples of the latter would be D. M. Head, 'Henry VIII's Scottish Policy: a Reassessment', *Scottish Historical Review*, LXI (1982), 15-16; Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, p. 427; and of the former, E. A. Bonner, 'The Genesis of Henry VIII's "Rough Wooing" of the Scots', *NH*, XXXIII (1997), 42; David L. Potter, 'Foreign Policy', in *Reign of Henry VIII*, ed. MacCulloch, p. 107.

<sup>19</sup> Dickens, *EHR*, LIII, 271.

<sup>20</sup> A. G. Dickens, 'Tudor York', in *The Victoria History of Yorkshire: The City of York*, ed. P. M. Tillott (1961), pp. 145-46. The exception of 1688 is allowed as being part of an almost universal desertion of James II. NB his statement that Robert Holgate, President of the Council in the North, 'played a noteworthy part in guarding the emergence of the modern English state', which he explicitly referenced to comparison with Geoffrey Elton's *Tudor Revolution in Government*; see *Robert*

---

*Holgate, Archbishop of York and President of the King's Council in the North*, St Anthony's Hall publications, 8 (1955), p. 31.

<sup>21</sup> Sansom, *Sovereign*, p. 633 (the North subject to 'common rogues like Maleverer') and cf. pp. 5, 7, 101; *NH*, XLV, 238 (quotation).

<sup>22</sup> Classic examples in the northern context being, from the Whig perspective, Rachel R. Reid, *The King's Council in the North* (1921); and from a more Marxist influenced perspective, the papers in M. E. James, *Society, Politics and Culture: Studies in Early Modern England* (Cambridge, 1986); and his *Family, Lineage and Civil Society: A Study of Society, Politics and Mentality in the Durham Region, 1500-1640* (Oxford, 1974).

<sup>23</sup> James Raine, *York* (London & New York, 1893), p. 105.

<sup>24</sup> R. B. Smith, *Land and Politics in the England of Henry VIII: The West Riding of Yorkshire 1530-46* (Oxford, 1970), p. 210.

<sup>25</sup> Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, p. 174.

<sup>26</sup> C. E. Moreton, 'The Walsingham Conspiracy of 1537', *Historical Research*, LXIII (1990), 29-43; S. J. Gunn, *Charles Brandon, Duke of Suffolk, c. 1484-1545* (Oxford, 1988), p. 153; cf. G. R. Elton, *Policy and Police: The Enforcement of the Reformation in the Age of Thomas Cromwell* (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 67-71.

<sup>27</sup> Dickens, *YAJ*, XXXIV. Stow mentions Leigh, whom he calls 'a Gentleman', Tattersall 'a Clothyer', and Thornton, 'a yeoman', executed at London, and Neville and 'a tenne persons or moe, were put to death at Yorke': *The Chronicles of England, from Brute vnto this present yeare of Christ. 1580* (1580), p. 1020. Legh's brother Thomas's will is *Testamenta Eboracensia: Or, Wills Registered at York, Illustrative of the History, Manners, Language, Statistics, &c., of the Province of York, from the year 1300 Downwards*, V, ed. James Raine [junior] (Surtees Society, LXXIX), p. 164

---

(1523): Thomas left no children, constituting his wife executrix, and Sir Robert Neville, his brother-in-law Thomas Wentworth, esq., and his cousin Ralph Hopton supervisors of his will. Thomas's connection with the Wentworths is evident in his service as a feoffee and executor for Thomas Wentworth of North Elmsall, esq.: *ibid.*, pp. 144-46.

<sup>28</sup> Sansom, *NH*, XLV, 224; the reference to Legh is from Edward Hall, *Chronicle, Containing the History of England, During the Reign of Henry IV and Succeeding Monarchs to the End of the Reign of Henry VII*, ed. G. Ellis (1809), p. 841.

Scarisbrick errs in saying Neville *led* the rebellion (*Henry VIII*, p. 427), Smith in saying that it was 'genuinely the work of the commons' (*Land and Politics*, p. 210).

Sansom's device in his novel of making the rebellion ultimately about a highly sophisticated dynastic threat to Henry himself (*Sovereign*, pp. 630-38, 658, 661) has echoes in his article's emphasis on its threat to the king rather than his ministers: *NH*, XLV, 227.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. the best account of the changes in Wales remains P. R. Roberts, 'The "Acts of Union" and the Tudor settlement of Wales' (unpub. Ph.D. thesis, Cambridge Univ. 1966). Christopher Kitching, 'The Durham Palatinate and the Courts of Westminster under the Tudors', in *The Last Principality: Politics, Religion and Society in the Bishopric of Durham, 1494-1660*, ed. David Marcombe (Nottingham, 1987), pp. 49-70; G. A. Hayes-McCoy, 'The Royal Supremacy and Ecclesiastical Revolution, 1534-47', in *A New History of Ireland*, ed. T. W. Moody, F. X. Martin and F. J. Byrne, vol. 3, *Early Modern Ireland, 1534-1691* (Oxford, 1976), pp. 46-47, 55-58.

<sup>30</sup> In summer 1540 grants of certain Welsh offices for terms of lives were discontinued with the intention of reappointing sheriffs on an annual basis; 28 June 1541 saw the appointment of four justices, one to serve in each of the four judicial

---

circuits to be set up in Wales, and by the same year justices of the peace had been appointed: esp. “‘A breviat of the effectes devised for Wales”, c. 1540-41’, ed. P. R. Roberts, in *Camden Miscellany XXVI*, Camden Society, 4th series, xiv (1975), 31-47. Even the position of the Isle of Man was in question: *P(roceedings and Ordinances of the) P(rixy) C(ouncil of England)*, ed. Sir Harris Nicolas, 7 vols (1834-37), VII, 249 (*LP*, XVI, 1213).

<sup>31</sup> Cf. other elements of the Pilgrims’ demands, for example relating to subpoenas directed to the north, and the jurisdictional implications of the abolition of religious franchises: Hoyle, *Pilgrimage*, pp. 460-63.

<sup>32</sup> *LP*, XII(1), 399, 1118, 1313; XII(2), 22. The mayor of York produced a certificate of the beds and stabling available in the city: *York Civic Records*, ed. Angelo Raine, IV, *House Books 1536-48*, YASRS, CVIII (1945 for 1943), 21-22 (House Book xiii, fols 96v.-97); he also assured the Privy Council that there was no plague in York (24 May 1537): *ibid.*, fol. 97. Postponement: *LP*, XII(2), 77 (*State Papers Published under the Authority of His Majesty's Commission: King Henry the Eighth* (1830-52), I, 551-55). Dickens, *EHR*, LIII, 267.

<sup>33</sup> *Correspondance de Marillac*, pp. 337-38 (*LP*, XVI, 1183). It is interesting to compare this with the possible use of a queen’s coronation in a similar manner in Cromwell’s plans for a northern progress in 1537: Raine, *York*, p. 101.

<sup>34</sup> *PPC*, VII, 227-9 (*LP*, XVII, 1066). Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, p. 176, trivializes this as an episode in which the symbolism and etiquette of these displays was beyond the comprehension of locals; it was precisely their understanding of the niceties which made them important.

<sup>35</sup> Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, p. 176. A more general comment on the slaughter, Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, p. 428.



---

<sup>36</sup> *Correspondance de Marillac*, pp. 336-37 (*LP*, XVI, 1181).

<sup>37</sup> *Tudor Royal Proclamations, I: The Early Tudors (1485-1553)*, ed. Paul L. Hughes and James F. Larkin (New Haven & London, 1964), pp. 303-05 (no. 205).

<sup>38</sup> *Correspondance de Marillac*, pp. 320-22 (*LP*, XVII, 1011; 18 July, by which time Henry should have reached Lincoln but was still at Grafton); *Calendar of State Papers, Spanish*, VI(1), 175 (*LP*, XVI, 1031; 25 July).

<sup>39</sup> *LP*, XVI, 677(viii); the abandonment of the original plan, which included a visit to Wakefield and to Neville's seat at the Chevet, indicates the limited significance of the 'Wakefield conspiracy' to the progress once it was in the North, *pace Sansom, NH*, XLV, 231, 235.

<sup>40</sup> M. L. Bush, *The Pilgrimage of Grace: A Study of the Rebel Armies of October 1536* (Manchester, 1996), pp. 378-79, 382. The liminal quality of this locality in the late medieval and early modern imagination has not been sufficiently stressed. Some testimony to it can be found in the location of many early Robin Hood references in the area: *The Itinerary of John Leland in or about the Years 1536-1539*, ed. Lucy Toulmin Smith, 5 vols (1906-10), IV, 13; Michael Wood, *In Search of England: Journeys into the English Past* (Penguin edition, Harmondsworth, 1999), pp. 84-85; Stephen Knight, *Robin Hood: A Complete Study of the English Outlaw* (Oxford, 1994), pp. 23, 27, 29, 32, 264, 266, 273, 283.

<sup>41</sup> Edward Hall, *Chronicle* (1548), fol. 244v.. Henry and his council showed a pronounced interest in the past misdemeanors of the clergy, for example conducting examinations to establish who wrote the Pilgrims' Pontefract articles: *PPC*, VII, 248, 249 (*LP*, XVI, 1211, 1213).

<sup>42</sup> *Correspondance de Marillac*, p. 334 (*LP*, XVI, 1130). The speech is probably Bodleian Library, MS Ashmole 862, pp. 231-32 (numbered pp. 227-28; a slightly

---

later copy is Bodl. MS Top. Gen. c. 69/2, fols 258-59, the former being printed in Dickens, *EHR*, LIII).

<sup>43</sup> *LP*, XVI, 1099.

<sup>44</sup> At the York conference on 21 Nov. 1536 he was asked to leave when a captured letter to Sir Ralph Eure, revealing Henry's true intentions, was about to be read: *LP*, XI, 1032 (Hoyle, *Pilgrimage*, p. 329).

<sup>45</sup> *PPC*, VII, 240-41 (*LP*, XVI, 1153, 1155, 1158, 1168, 1172); Hoyle and Ramsdale, *NH*, XLI, 263-65.

<sup>46</sup> *PPC*, VII, 249-50 (*LP*, XVI, 1227); cf. *LP*, XII(1), 141, 142, 279; S. T. Bindoff, *The House of Commons, 1509-1558*, 3 vols (1982), II, 88-89; *VCH, York, East Riding*, I, *The City of Kingston upon Hull*, ed. K. J. Allison (1969), pp. 91-93. Edward Gillett and Kenneth A. MacMahon, *A History of Hull* (Oxford, 1980), p. 102, mistakenly call him Sir William.

<sup>47</sup> The nature of the pageantry at York has been passed over by most, as Dickens, *EHR*, LIII, 269, noted. The best previous account is Raine, *York*, pp. 102-03.

<sup>48</sup> *York Civic Records*, ed. Angelo Raine, IV, *House Books 1536-48*, YASRS, CVIII (1945 for 1943), 56 (House Book xv, fols 29v., 30). Aside from the material preparations described here and below, there was also a systematic attempt to cleanse and improve the streets, removing everything from the 'cloggs' of wood on which shopkeepers customarily sat outside their shops to the beggars and vagrants: *ibid.*. This resulted in action from e.g. the churchwardens of St Michael, Spurriergate: *Churchwardens' Accounts of St. Michael, Spurriergate, York, 1518-1548*, vol. 2, *1538-1548*, Borthwick Texts and Calendars, 20 (1997), pp. 233-34.

<sup>49</sup> *York Civic Records*, IV, 59 (House Book xv, fol. 34).

<sup>50</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 61 (House Book xv, fol. 38v.).

---

<sup>51</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 60 (House Book xv, fol. 36). Clayton does not seem to have been a graduate of either Oxford or Cambridge: A. B. Emden, *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford to A.D. 1500* (Oxford 1957-59); *A Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501-1540* (Oxford, 1974). Clayton was also used, for example, to give the sermon in the Minster chapter house on the day after Corpus Christi: York City Archives, CC:4, Chamberlains' Accounts, 1542-43. Possibly connected to William Clayton, DCL, prebend of Holme 1530-32, and chaplain to the king: Joyce M. Horn and David M. Smith, *York Diocese, Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae, 1541-1857*, 4 (1975), p. 57; Emden, *Biographical Register of the University of Oxford, A.D. 1501-1540*, p. 121.

<sup>52</sup> *York Civic Records*, IV, 60 (House Book xv, fol. 36).

<sup>53</sup> *The York Plays*, ed. Richard Beadle (1982), pp. 406-15, esp. ll. XLVII. 379-80 at the very end of the play. Richard J. Collier, *Poetry and Drama in the York Corpus Christi Play* (Hamden, Conn., 1978), pp. 189-257, esp. 254-55; Clifford Davison, *From Creation to Doom: The York Cycle of Mystery Plays* (New York, 1984). The play was referred to as the mercers' or merchants' interchangeably: see, for example, *Records of Early English Drama: York*, ed. Alexandra F. Johnston and Margaret Rogerson, 2 vols (Manchester, 1979), I, 24, 26, 55, 64, 105, 107, 258, 260-61, 272, 401, 685.

<sup>54</sup> *York Civic Records*, IV, 68, 70-71 (House Book xv, fols 56, 59v., 60v.).

<sup>55</sup> *York Civic Records*, IV, 55-56, 60-61, 62-63, 64-65 (House Book xv, fols 29-29v., 37v., 43, 43v., 48v.); Dickens, *EHR*, LIII, 269. A description of the events at Lincoln is printed in Frederic Madden, 'Account of King Henry the Eighth's entry into Lincoln, in 1541', *Archaeologia*, XXIII, 336-38, from British Library, Additional MS

---

6113, fol. 179v.; they are described by Marillac (*Correspondance de Marillac*, pp. 326-27; *LP*, XVI, 1089).

<sup>56</sup> *York Civic Records*, IV, 69-70 (House Book xv, fols 57v.-58v.).

<sup>57</sup> It is intriguing that some York sources predate the arrival of the King to 14 Sept., not 18 Sept. as actually occurred (Dickens, *EHR*, LIII, 270; *Correspondance de Marillac*, pp. 337, 341; *LP*, XVI, 1183, 1208); this may indicate their frustration and embarrassment at the delay and its implications. The analysis by Neil Murphy, in 'Receiving Royals in Later Medeval York: Civic Ceremony and the Municipal Elite, 1478-1503', *Northern History*, XLIII (2006), 241-55, describes the ways in which ceremony had reinforced the power of the elite and hence suggests the extent of its overthrow in 1541.

<sup>58</sup> *PPC*, VII, 245 (*LP*, XVI, 1190, 20 Sept.); Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, p. 177; Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, p. 428.

<sup>59</sup> Thus the Privy Council register record: *PPC*, VII, 246 (*LP*, XVI, 1191, 21 Sept.). One complaint against the Archbishop of York, possibly connected to the appeal, was discussed in that day's business.

<sup>60</sup> Hoyle and Ramsdale, *NH*, XLI, 252-57. Marillac's first mention of the meeting came when he was at Pontefract in a letter of 23-30 Aug.; they were to wait there for 10-12 days 'et se dict communément que le roy d'Escoce se doibt trouver à Yorc', the wait giving Henry 'commodité de faire l'appareil plus grand': *Correspondance de Marillac*, p. 335. Scarisbrick sees this as a reason for the journey which was added once already conceived, but again part of a plan to sort out issues before re-embarking on war: Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, p. 427.

---

<sup>61</sup> Henry's faith in the arrangement is clear from his message to Chancellor Audley of 29 Aug., in which he asked for the news to be kept even from the rest of the council: *LP*, XVI, 1125.

<sup>62</sup> *Correspondance de Marillac*, pp. 347-50 (*LP*, XVI, 1253).

<sup>63</sup> *Tudor Royal Proclamations*, I, 301-02 (no. 203); *PPC*, VII, 247 (*LP*, XVI, 1192, 22 Sept.).

<sup>64</sup> Smith, *Tudor Tragedy*, pp. 177-78; *LP*, XVI, 1339; Scarisbrick, *Henry VIII*, pp. 429, 431.

<sup>65</sup> *Third Report of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records* (1842), appendix II, pp. 261-65.

<sup>66</sup> Richard Grafton, *Grafton's Chronicle; or, History of England, to Which is Added his Table of the Bailiffs, Sheriffs and Mayors of the City of London, from the Year 1189 to 1558 Inclusive*, 2 vols (1809), II, 476; Raphael Holinshed, *Chronicles of England, Scotland and Ireland*, 6 vols (1807), II, 822.

<sup>67</sup> A. G. Dickens, 'Robert Parkyn's narrative of the Reformation', *EHR*, LXII (1947), 58-67, esp. p. 66. The verse account is in Bodl. MS Lat. Th. d. 15, fols 131-131v..

<sup>68</sup> Francis Drake, *Eboracum: Or the History and Antiquities of the City of York* (1736), pp. 126-28. For example, the seventeenth-century writer Sir Thomas Widdrington had shown even less interest: *Analecta Eboracensia: Some Remaynes of the Ancient City of York*, ed. Caesar Caine (1897). The same is true of [Christopher Hildyard], *A List, or Catalogue of all the Mayors, and Bayliffs, Lord Mayors, and Sheriffs, of the Most Ancient, Honourable, Noble, and Loyall City of Yorke, from the Time of King Edward the First, until this Present Year, 1664. being the 16<sup>th</sup> Year of the Most Happy Reign of our Most Gracious Sovereign Lord King Charles the Second. Together with Many, and Sundry Remarkable Passages, which Happened in*

---

*their Severall Years* (York, 1664), pp. 31-37; James Torr, *The Antiquities of York City, and the Civil Government Thereof* (York, 1719), pp. 63 (an especially fulsome account of Richard III's visit), 67, 74; and T[homas] G[ent], *The Ancient and Modern History of the Famous City of York* (York & London, 1730), pp. 215-16, 218.

<sup>69</sup> Drake, *Eboracum*, p. 128. For Drake, the Council in the North strangely becomes a form of 'amends' for the city's losses at Henry's hands.

<sup>70</sup> E.g. William Hargrove, *History and Description of the Ancient City of York*, 2 vols (York, 1818), I, 123-24, 127-29; *The Stranger's Guide Through the City of York, and its Cathedral* (4th edn, York, 1832), p. 11; *The New Guide for Strangers and Residents in the City of York* (York, [1838]), pp. 18, 87 (Henry mentioned only in connection with how York 'suffered' at the dissolution and the pilfering of statues from the Minster chapter house); *York and its Vicinity: A Guide for the Resident and the Tourist* (York, 1854), pp. 27-30, 33; *Sampson's Hand-book for the City of York* (York, [1875?]), pp. 20-21.

<sup>71</sup> *York Illustrated: A Literary, Historical and Scenic Souvenir* (official guide of the York City Council, 2nd edn, 1907); A. P. Purey-Cust, *Picturesque Old York: Chapters Historical and Descriptive* (Leeds, [1909]), pp. 37-40, 151-53. Raine, *York*, pp. 100-05, provides an honourable exception.

<sup>72</sup> Claire Cross, *The Puritan Earl: The Life of Henry Hastings, Third Earl of Huntingdon, 1536-1595* (1966), pp. 7-8, 159-95.

<sup>73</sup> Patrick Galliou and Michael Jones, *The Bretons* (Oxford, 1991), p. 282.

<sup>74</sup> Hall, *Chronicle*, p. 842; *Grafton's Chronicle*, II, 476; Holinshed, *Chronicles*, II, 822.

<sup>75</sup> Mentioned in *Correspondance de Marillac*, p. 426 (LP, XVII, 415; 20 June 1542).

---

<sup>76</sup> John Leland, *De rebus Britannicis collectanea*, ed. Thomas Hearne, 6 vols (Oxford, 1774), VI, 302. It had previously been quoted by Thomas Fuller in his *History of the Worthies of England* (1662), p. 105 (2<sup>nd</sup> pagination). Hunter, ‘Account of Henry the Eighth’s progress’, pp. 3-4, used the piece.

<sup>77</sup> Compare the sources extracted in David and Mary Palliser, *York as they Saw It: From Alcuin to Lord Esher* (York, 1979), pp. 21sq., where Roman origins are frequently cited, with those before.