

married sir Thomas Morley; 3. Eleanor, aged 20, who married sir Robert de Ufford.

The representative, in 1577, of dame Mary Curson, was Thomas Curson, who had two sons, William and Thomas, then living. The heir of dame Sibill Morley was, in 1500, Gregory Ratcliffe of Framsdon, in Suffolk, who had three daughters and co-heirs. The heir-general of dame Eleanor Ufford is Thomas Brand, now lord Dacre.

SIR
THOMAS
FELTON.

ARMS.

Gules, two lions passant in pale Ermine, ducally crowned Or.

CREST.

Out of a ducal coronet Or, two wings inverted, Gules, quilled of the first.

LXIX.

SIR JOHN HOLAND—EARL OF HUNTINGDON,
DUKE OF EXETER.

THE character of this celebrated person, who bore an active part in the public events of his time, is drawn in colours far from flattering by his compatriot Walsingham; whilst the foreign chronicler, Froissart, viewed it only in a chivalrous, and therefore, to him, favourable light, without caring to conceal or extenuate its defects.

JOHN
DUKE
OF
EXETER.

John Holand was the younger of the two sons of the Founder, Thomas earl of Kent, by Joan Plantagenet, and the uterine brother of king Richard II. Dugdale erroneously places his first military service in 1356,¹ as he was certainly born *after* 1350;² and there is no trace of his having been armed in the reign of Edward III.

In 1380 Richard appointed him justiciary of Chester for

¹ Baronage, vol. ii. p. 78.

² His mother was twenty-four years old at the death of her brother, John earl of Kent, in 1352, and

then the wife of sir Thomas Holand. *Esc.* 26 *Ed.* 3, *No.* 54. Her eldest son, Thomas, was ten years old in 1360.—*Esc.* 35 *Ed.* 3, *No.* 104.

JOHN
DUKE
OF
EXETER.

life;¹ and, in 1381, commissioned him, with Montacute and Burley, to receive queen Anne of Luxemburgh from the hands of her brother's ambassadors at Calais.²

After the death of sir Thomas Felton, 26th April 1381, he was elected into the Order of the Garter, and to the tenth stall on the Sovereign's side.

In 1384 the parliament was held in the episcopal palace at Salisbury; and Walsingham relates the following strange occurrence during its session. A Carmelite friar, having obtained access to the young king, delivered to him a paper which purported to disclose certain machinations of the most treasonable nature by the duke of Lancaster against the king's person and crown, and to designate the time and place when and where they were to be carried into execution. Upon this denunciation Richard sought advice, not from the peers and sages of the realm, but from Nicholas Slake and another of his chaplains. During his conference with these persons the duke entered; and, concluding from the expression of the king's countenance and the unwonted manner of his reception, that some thoughts adverse to himself occupied the royal mind, soon withdrew. Thereupon, the two councillors, from fear of the duke's resentment, or from respect for his person, recommended Richard to send for and communicate to him the contents of the paper. Lancaster, by various arguments, satisfied his nephew of his innocence; but requested that the friar might be detained, and a time appointed for the investigation of the case; adding his especial desire that the accuser might be committed to the custody of sir John Holand. In the night preceding the day fixed for the hearing, Holand, assisted by sir Henry Green, murdered the friar in the prison, after inflicting upon him the most cruel torments. On the day following he caused the corpse to be drawn publicly through the streets as that of a traitor. The narrative proceeds to state that William lord Zouche, having been denounced by the friar as the author of the accusation, was, although labouring at the time under severe illness, sent for to that parliament, to abide the judgment of the king and peers. When

¹ Pat. 4 Ric. 2, p. 2, m. 2.

² Rot. Franc. 5 Ric. 2, m. 11, Dec. 1.

brought in a litter, being disabled by the gout from riding on horseback, he was compelled, disarmed and with uncovered head, as if a thief or traitor, to answer to all the charges against him. But having firmly, and on the sacrament, denied all knowledge of the matter, he was acquitted, and allowed to return to his home, having been by this proceeding made an enemy for ever to the religious order to which the accuser belonged, and all others. The historian adds that it had been asserted (but whether truly, or merely out of love or hatred towards the parties concerned, he knew not,) that the hurdle, on which the friar's body was drawn through the city, had miraculously blossomed and leaved; and that a blind man had, by touching it, been restored to sight. It had, moreover, been reported that Thomas of Woodstock rushed into the king's chamber, and overawed the affrighted monarch by threatening, amidst dreadful imprecations, to kill any one, were it even the king himself, who should accuse his brother of treason.¹

JOHN
DUKE
OF
EXETER.

This singular narrative, which, so far as we have seen, rests upon the sole authority of Walsingham, has been repeated by modern historians, and lastly by Dr. Lingard, without any expression conveying a doubt of its truth. Such, however, we think may reasonably be entertained, when it is considered that the improbable story of the murder is not corroborated by Knyghton or any contemporary writer;² and that the extant roll of the Salisbury parliament, whilst it contains no allusion to the charge against Lancaster (who is thereby stated to have arrived from Scotland during the sitting of the 9th of May), and is silent respecting the alleged humiliating examination of Zouche, distinctly records the appointment of that nobleman, on the 4th of May, the first day of the king's

¹ Wals. ed. 1574, p. 334-5.

² The chronicle by a monk of Tynemouth, ending about 1410, has the following passage:—"Dux Lancastrie accusatus a fratre Francisc. laese majestatis in parlamento Sarum."—*Lel. Coll. ed.* 1770, vol. i. p. 184. Walsingham, a monk of

St. Alban's, wrote about the year 1440. The horror with which the Lollard heresy had inspired him, is evident at every mention of its factors, to whom the duke of Lancaster is known to have extended his protection.

JOHN
DUKE
OF
EXETER.

presence, to be one of the committee to try or investigate the petitions, or bills, to be presented in that parliament.¹

Sir John Holand was retained² to accompany the king on his grand expedition to Scotland in 1385; and it was on this journey, if not shortly before its commencement, that he gave a fatal proof of the violence of his disposition by slaying the young lord Stafford; of the circumstances of which outrage, as related by the historians of the period, we have elsewhere offered a succinct statement.³

In 1386 our knight, accompanied by his consort Elizabeth, the second daughter of the duke of Lancaster, attended the latter on his Spanish expedition, as constable of the host;⁴ and, previously to his embarkation at Plymouth, he gave his evidence in the Scrope and Grosvenor controversy.⁵ Froissart dwells with his usual delight on the chivalrous feats of Holand during the peninsular campaign, particularly at the siege and capture of Ribadavia. His praises are unbounded of the joyous revelry at the nuptials of Philippa of Lancaster and the king of Portugal; and of the splendid tilting at Be-tanços, in presence of that sovereign; at which sir John Holand accepted the challenge of the renowned sir Reginald de Roze, and was successful in every encounter.

During his absence in Spain, Richard elevated him, on the 2nd June 1387, to the peerage by the title of earl of Huntingdon.⁶ On his return to England he was, upon the removal of the earl of Arundel,⁷ appointed admiral of the fleet in the western seas.⁸ In 1390 he crossed over to Calais with sixty knights and esquires to tilt with Boucicaut, Saint-Py, and his former opponent, de Roze. The jousts were held with all due pomp and circumstance at the abbey of St. Inghelbert.⁹ In the same year he had a further opportunity of exhibiting his prowess at the tournament in Smithfield.¹⁰ In 1391-2 he accompanied Lancaster to France, as ambassa-

¹ Rot. Parl. vol. iii. p. 167.

² Vincent's "Exitus," No. 29, p. 32, in Coll. Armor.

³ See p. 214.

⁴ Froissart, tom. x. p. 124.

⁵ Scrope and Grosvenor roll, p. 56.

⁶ Rot. Cart. 11 Ric. 2, No. 23.

⁷ Holinshed, p. 467.

⁸ Rot. Franc. 12 Ric. 2, m. 4, 18 May 1389.

⁹ Froissart, tom. xii. p. 125.

¹⁰ Ibid. p. 291.

dor, to negotiate a truce.¹ He is mentioned as being captain of Brest in 1392-3.² In 1394 he undertook a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, and to the convent of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai; and having learnt, on his passage through Paris, that war was proclaimed between Sigismund king of Hungary and Bajazet I, he determined to return by a route which should bring him into contact with the belligerents;³ and he obtained with that view letters of protection, dated the 18th January 1393-4.⁴ But he hastened home without awaiting the issue of the contest; and we find him present with the king at Eltham at the time of the visit of Robert the Hermit in 1395.⁵ In 1397 he took part with the king against the duke of Gloucester, and was one of the lords appellants against that prince and the earl of Arundel.⁶ On the 29th September in that year he was created duke of Exeter by the king in parliament,⁷ and after the exile of Norfolk in the following year he was appointed governor of Calais.⁸ In 1399 he accompanied the king on his fatal expedition to Ireland; and after Richard's return he was sent from Conway to his brother-in-law, Henry duke of Lancaster, in order to effect if possible a reconciliation between him and the unfortunate monarch.⁹

JOHN
DUKE
OF
EXETER.

After the deposition of Richard, the appellants of the year 1397 were severally heard in parliament on 6th October 1399¹⁰ to justify themselves for the part taken against the duke of Gloucester; when they declared that they had acted in the matter of the appeal under the special orders of the late king; but that they had not been cognisant of, or aiding in, the death of the duke. They were, however, adjudged to forfeit the ducal and other dignities conferred in 1397, together with all grants of lands made to them subsequently to the arrest of Gloucester.¹¹ Soon after this sentence, Holand entered into an abortive conspiracy against Henry IV; and,

¹ Rot. Franc. 15 Ric. 2, m. 7, Feb. 22.

² Ibid. 16 Ric. 2, m. 9.

³ Froissart, tom. xiii. p. 202.

⁴ Rot. Franc. 17 Ric. 2, m. 11.

⁵ Froissart, tom. xiii. p. 268.

⁶ Rot. Parl. vol. iii. p. 374.

⁷ Ibid. p. 355.

⁸ "Joh'es Quynnton arm^r. qui in comitiva Joh. Holand ducis Exonie Capt. Cales. moratur," &c.; Rot. Franc. 22 Ric. 2, m. 11.

⁹ Archæol. vol. xx. pp. 109. 119, *et sequen.*

¹⁰ Rot. Parl. vol. iii. p. 449.

¹¹ Ibid. p. 451.

JOHN
DUKE
OF
EXETER.

after making two attempts to escape by sea,¹ was apprehended, committed to the Tower of London,² and beheaded. Walsingham states that he suffered on St. Maur's day³ [15th January], 1399-1400, and at Pleshy, near the spot where the arrest of Gloucester had taken place; but his committal to the Tower (as attested by a record) renders that statement improbable.⁴ His head was probably sent for exposure to Pleshy; for the king granted to his sister, Holand's widow, a precept dated 20th February, and directed to the churchwarden of that parish, ordering its delivery to her for interment.⁵ The forfeiture of his estates was declared in parliament on 2nd March 1400-1.⁶

The earl of Huntingdon left issue by Elizabeth of Lancaster three sons,—Richard, who died without issue in 1416; John, who was restored to the earldom of Huntingdon and finally to the dukedom of Exeter, and was also a knight of the Order; and sir Edward, who died without issue: also a daughter, Constance, first the wife of Thomas Mowbray earl marshal, secondly of John lord Grey de Ruthyn. The representation of John Holand having, in 1473, devolved to the house of Nevil, it is now vested in the co-heirs of Charles the sixth earl of Westmorland, who died in 1584.⁷

ARMS.

The arms of England, within a bordure Or, semée of fleurs de lis Azure.

¹ Wals. p. 404. ⁵ Rot. Claus. 1 Hen. 4, p. 1, m. 16.
² Rymer, vol. viii. p. 121. ⁶ Rot. Parl. vol. iii. p. 459.
³ Wals. *ut supra*. ⁷ See page 168.
⁴ See Carte's Hist. of England, vol. ii. p. 646.