

WHO WAS DR JOHN MORE?

RICHARD H. TURNER

PART 1 – A MULTIFACETED CAREER

John More, a Catholic recusant physician, has been a footnote figure - having left behind almost no writings of his own, a somewhat shadowy bit-part player on the early Stuart public stage. This essay draws on contemporary national, local, ecclesiastical, medical and family records, as well as subsequent historical and biographical material, to establish his contribution to the social, political and economic context of his times. Again and again paradox is encountered, exemplifying Shakespeare's observation that - in the seventeenth century at any rate - 'one man in his time plays many parts'. Underlying Dr More's activities and aspirations can be detected ambition to advance both his religion and his kin.

Consequently he and his heirs became involved, over three generations, in numerous and contrasting fields of action – medicine, politics, commerce, military service, the Church, landholding. As with all human endeavour, the actual outcomes reflect the impact of unforeseeable events, social change, personal foibles, and mere chance. Part 2 of this essay examines this working out of his legacy – both religious and material – by his heirs, in search of a fuller answer to the question *Who was Dr John More?*

The early Stuart recusant physician John More came from Thelwall on the north Cheshire border, just south of the river Mersey and a few miles east of Warrington. His origins, like much in his life, are obscure, in the sense of indistinct - how far so in the Hardyian sense of undistinguished is difficult to pin down. His parents, Edward More and Alice Mar(tin)scroft, appear to have been, at most, local gentry, with few if any pretensions to armsⁱ - they were not listed as recusants, though Alice probably had recusant connections - and lacking wills or other documents to illuminate them. Little is known of John's life before middle age – not even his birth year. Only minor writings of his have been traced in drafting this essay - no will, inventory or other unique memorial directly conveying personality, temperament, convictions has yet come to light. Persistent allusions to a relationship with the family of Sir (St) Thomas More appear to lack evidential support. Yet in middle and later life John More made his mark in early Stuart circles at very high levels, and in strangely differing capacities. His motivations and priorities, in the absence of personal writings by or about him, must be inferred: however by piecing together traces left in official documents, medical sources and histories, religious memorials, biographical material, landholding deeds and family papers, a picture emerges of this paradoxical figure and the impact he and his heirs had on society at differing levels, national as well as local. John More's medical, political and local activities will be considered in that order.

ⁱ Dr More's parentage and armorial bearings are considered later in this essay. The name was frequently spelled Moore, but as documents originated by family members such as wills use the spelling More, this is adopted throughout the essay except where quotations from contemporary sources have it otherwise

DR JOHN MORE, PHYSICIAN

The later Stuart physician has been identified with the John More who, in 1583, two years after receiving his BA degree as a graduate of University College, Oxford, proceeded to MA. Not however until 1596 was he licensed, presumably by the University, to practise medicine.ⁱⁱ Where and how he spent the time between has not emerged. Anthony Wood, drawing on Gee's *Foot out of the Snare*, declared that

'Of the...college of University was one John More, who after he had taken the degree in arts, entred on the physic line, took one degree, therein 1596; afterwards he went to London, where he was called by the name of Doctor More, practised in St Bride's parish, and was numbred among the Popish physicians in the latter end of King James I, an. 1624, being then a man much employ'd, and insinuating with great persons in our State.'ⁱⁱⁱ

When More became, or 'came out', as a Catholic, is unclear. Despite his mother's recusant connections, his parents seem not to have been so listed, and More could hardly have been so perceived at Oxford, as he was allowed to graduate. After that, More lost no time in getting to work as a doctor: in June 1596, Lady Bacon, mother of Francis, sent secretly to 'Mr Moore', physician to Francis' brother Anthony, for his physic bill, asking Anthony why he was delaying payment.^{iv} That this was the John More of this essay is highly probable - no other physician of that name was recorded at this time. Whether More practised discreetly and privately during the next few years has not come to light. His subsequent progress hints at his having some patron or benefactor to provide funding and effect introductions, not least his sojourn at Padua. There in 1605 he was awarded the degree of MD - an event witnessed by Richard Willoughby, a Catholic convert and relative of Peregrine Bertie, a friend of Galileo and of Secretary Winwood. *Quondam* English consul at Padua, at this time Willoughby held a university post there.^v

Caraman says that More himself was appointed a lecturer at Padua after graduating there;^{vi} however he was soon back in England, as in 1606 he was identified as a recusant, being indicted at the London Sessions as Dr John Moore of the parish of St Faith, Farringdon ward.^{vii} This timing is supported by a Privy Council investigation - a Simon Wilks, accused before the Privy Council of consorting with Catholics, allegedly 'used Dr Moore in making my provisions'. Wilks' response was that 'Dr Moore came to Rome from Padua as an attendant on Sir Thomas Crampton for his health's sake, so as by that meanes wee had his company...'; he 'never saw him do anything other than physic'; believed More to be well-disposed to his countrymen; had never used him himself. In Rome at the same time were 'two sons of Sir Edward Moore, one being towards the Lord Treasurer, together with their tutor,'^{viii} but no hint of a kinship connection has been found. Sir Thomas Crampton, of the Inner Temple, died about 1607.^{ix}

More was by no means the first post-Reformation Catholic to practise medicine in London. Much detailed work on the subject has been published by Dr Margaret Pelling and others.^x One of the earliest was Thomas Fryer, a Cambridge graduate who took his doctorate at Padua in and was admitted to fellowship of the College of Physicians [CPh]^{xi} in the City of London in 1572, held office there, and was incorporated doctor of physic at Oxford in 1623, shortly before his death. Another well-known Catholic

practitioner was Dr George Turner of Balliol (MA 1575, MD overseas), made a fellow in 1588.

The husband of the Anne Turner later implicated in the Overbury Plot, Turner enjoyed royal favour, and was appointed CPh Treasurer in 1609.^{xii}

Nonetheless since 1606, in the aftermath of the Gunpowder Plot, recusants convict had been legally banned from the practice of physic or from acting as apothecaries, making admission to the CPh more problematic for those suspected of Catholic leanings.^{xiii}

Indeed, Dr More did not easily obtain admission to the CPh, which from 1612 accused him, as many others, of practising irregularly. The College aimed to control medical practice within a seven mile radius, by granting, for a fee, licences to men (only) whom it considered appropriately qualified. Others who sought to practise were often pursued and fined, in some cases quite heavily, even gaoled.

Medical practice embraced a wide range of occupations and educational backgrounds, including surgeons, apothecaries and midwives. A complex, sometimes overlapping web of episcopal and university licensing jurisdictions had evolved over preceding centuries. In London the CPh tended to regard itself as comparable in status and exclusivity with (for instance) Doctors' Commons, but in reality had no monopoly, or indeed effective control, of the practice of medicine - even in London itself.^{xiv} It was not a City incorporated company, so that its regulations and pretensions sat at odds with City custom and practice. Hence 'irregular practitioners' refused membership might well be viewed by external authorities and society sympathetically, and they themselves tended to regard paying fines as a fee justifying continued practice. Nor did the CPh of early Stuart times have significant educational or philanthropic functions. At most, it formed the apex of a rather ill-defined and shifting pyramid, which included university-educated doctors practising in provincial cities. It was in effect a self-perpetuating, self-limiting oligarchy, with fellowships limited to around thirty at a time – far too few to meet demand. Thus, though CPh licentiate status was sought after, university and diocesan licensing remained important, with overseas medical faculties - Padua foremost - competing with Oxford and Cambridge in prestige terms.^{xv}

The College nonetheless did view those not seeking, or refused, membership as irregular practitioners - a host of people from the well-qualified whose religious or other affiliations were objected to, such as More and Thomas Turner, to 'dangerous empirics', amateurs and quacks.^{xvi} Many even among CPh members and other licensed physicians came from an arts background, or also had legal, administrative, literary, even ecclesiastical careers.^{xvii} Of those pursued by the College as irregulars, one in twelve eventually did become licentiates, a few even fellows. Pelling observes that 'licensing was the preferred option when pressure from magnates became too great, or when a religious issue could be fudged', though strictly speaking, admission involved four examinations: even then, applicants could be 'kept waiting for years'.

^{xviii}

John More proved a prime example, accusations against him of irregular medical practice marching alongside allegations of papistry. **Appendix 1** details the resistance he encountered on both fronts, before and after his acceptance, 'pleasing to important men', in 1619 as a Licentiate of the College, and the

efforts he and other doctors made to obtain clearance for Catholic patients to travel abroad.

It gives also several illustrations of medical controversies and disputes in which he was involved.

Dr More, the papist practitioner

In 1624, having had his collar felt by Archbishop Abbot for attending the 'fatal vespers' at Blackfriars, the turncoat John Gee published his incendiary tract *The Foot out of the Snare*, a sensational and fairly comprehensive exposé of Catholic activists in every walk of public life.^{xix} This named More as a popish physician, revealing his political and religious affiliations.

Over twenty other medical practitioners were also listed as proven or suspected papists - some were quite eminent, and brief biographical details are included in **Appendix 1**.

Gee's tract was sensationally effective in stirring up a hornet's nest, with four editions published within a year, and he lost no time in adding more material in *New Shreds of an Old Snare*. Inevitably all this further inflamed anti-catholic feeling in Parliament, turbulent enough already in the wake of the abortive negotiations for Prince Charles to wed the Spanish Infanta, subsequent overtures to France, and the sudden death of James I and the prospect of another Catholic queen. Religion notwithstanding, More was one of many doctors summoned to the bedside of the dying James I.^{xx} Nonetheless the CPh was obliged to supply the Parliamentary committee appointed to enquire into the state of religion with a list of Papist practitioners, and several identified by Gee were named, including More and Hicks. As Pelling observes, 'the case of John More.....demonstrates how issues of patronage and religion could bear down on the officers of the College and divide them not only from the ordinary members, but from each other'.^{xxi} Though accepted in 1619 on a single payment of £20, More was told he must henceforth pay £4 annually.^{xxii} Despite his licentiate membership, the conditional 'until either the King or [Privy] Councillors prohibit it' may have been revisited now that King James was dead. In the same month he was, as in 1606, indicted as a recusant, and found guilty by a jury at a Session of Gaol Delivery at Newgate.^{xxiii} No record of the penalty awarded has come to light, but this appears to be the conviction referred to by More when he was under further pressure in 1635.

Indeed there was no slackening of the authorities' vigilance, even when constrained in what they could actually do to remove the papist menace. In 1628 a return was made by the Lord Mayor to the Privy Council of all recusants resident in the City of London. Peers and other dignitaries were listed, and three doctors of physic named - More and Giffard, with 'Thomas Turner, a physician' (mentioned above) who had not been admitted to the CPh.^{xxiv} Munk says that, having already been returned in 1626 as a Catholic, More was now 'the first named of six, most if not all of whom were Catholics, who stand....with the heading "*sub nomine pænæ solventes*"'^{xxv} [payers of fines].

Undeterred, More and some of his colleagues ventured to seek relief not only for gentry wanting leave to take the waters, but also for prisoners, of whom some at least were priests active in the missions and thus dangerous clients. About 1633 appears the first clear evidence of deliberate intervention by More to assist a priest, with the potential hazards that that entailed. He and Dr Thomas Turner backed the petition of

Francis Smith, a prisoner in the Fleet, on grounds of age and infirmity, and Smith was released into Turner's custody. It was later recorded that

'in July last, by virtue of a certificate from John Moore, a recusant, the Lords [of the Privy Council], not suspecting (Henry Flood) to be a priest but only a debtor, granted him a warrant to take the air abroad - whereby he has exercised his functions in divers places.'^{xxvi}

Foley identifies him as Fr Henry Floyd SJ, a 73-year-old former secular priest who eventually died in London in 1641, stating that More and Turner certified him by the name of Francis Smith in 1637 also.
xxvii

Throughout the period, the only accounts of More's activities are those episodically recorded in official documents, and in drafting this essay only one letter has been seen using More's own words and written in his own firm, confident hand - involving a substantial bond for unstated purposes:

'To my noble frende Mr Edward Nicholas one of the Clerkes of his Ma[jes]ties Privie Councill.....

My noble frende - Mr Nicholas I have sent my man to youe with the bonde of Doctor Berrie and myselfe. If the scrivener have not put right the consideration it shall be so amended hereafter. I may deliver the fyve hundred poundes to him and let him sell it and deliver there to whom it is due And so hopinge to see youe to morrowe I end and rest ever Your most obliged frende John More fleetstreet this xiiijth of June 1637'.^{xxviii}

About then, More and Turner intervened in support of an important prisoner, the Jesuit Henry Morse: in a petition to Charles I himself they claimed that he was infirm in body, of a consumptive disposition, and that without fresh air his life would be in some danger.^{xxix} Morse, a convert, had spent four years in the New prison in Southwark before his ordination to the secular priesthood, four more in Newgate and York gaols as a Jesuit novice, and his health had suffered accordingly. Having related how, for month after month during the plague year 1636, Morse had worked unremittingly, while still suffering the after-effects of his own previous illness, Caraman says

'Morse's physician, Dr Thomas Turner, was a Catholic. He and another Catholic, Dr More, had attended the sick throughout the plague. These two men, with other Catholic physicians in London, worked in co-operation with Morse.....Turner had qualified at Padua, the best medical school in Europe, where Dr More had been appointed a lecturer on taking his degree.....he insisted on treating Morse, despite Morse's protestations that this could endanger Turner's own health, and returned the fee as alms for the sick....'

Following some very close encounters with the law, due in part to the zealous activities of priest-catchers out to profit from rewards offered under the penal laws, Morse was charged before the Privy Council with reconciling Protestants to the Catholic Church, and sent to Newgate in March 1638. Despite a tug-of-war between persons of influence hostile and sympathetic to Morse, in June he was still imprisoned and his health considerably worse, so he appealed direct to Charles I - Queen Henrietta Maria having already proved an influential intermediary in such suits - and Turner and More supported his petition, stating that Morse, being consumptive, was now so weak that until released into fresher air his life would be in danger. The petition succeeded and within days, Morse was pardoned and released 'at the instance of our dearest consort, the Queen'.^{xxx}

Meanwhile More and his colleagues were still assisting recusant gentry wishing to go abroad, citing health reasons; however not all of More's patients were Catholics: John (Tufton, second) Earl of Thanet, a

stout Cavalier and Anglican descended from William Cecil the first Lord Burghley, wrote to Windebank in 1639 asking if the King would accept £1000 from him as he had little to offer by way of horses or arms, and observing that 'Dr More will have told you of my state of health'.^{xxxix}

That year Viscount Chaworth, high sheriff of Nottinghamshire (of whom more later) was very sick, and More supported the King's physician Sir Theodore de Mayerne FCP in certifying that Chaworth's only hope was to take the waters of St Vincent's Rock at Bristol – however he died there.^{xxxix}

Unsurprisingly the clients of More and his colleagues were diverse socially. Geographical proximity helped ensure that Londoners of various backgrounds were treated, not solely courtiers. More 'regularly offered medical advice in consultation with the most celebrated London physicians.....this overlap of patients served a useful function because it allowed doctors to keep abreast of the medical ministrations of their colleagues and competitors and occasionally to copy them'.^{xxxix} Naturally they did not always agree - for instance, More and Giffard disagreed over how much of Sir James Evington's wife's blood to let - maybe this, like the wish for prisoners to be given fresh air, carries an echo of the Galenic v. Paracelsian controversy dividing medical thinking and practice at this period.^{xxxix} Evington was the nephew of Rev. Richard Napier, a popular healer who, though licensed to practise as a physician, was more of an astrologer, having indeed inherited Simon Forman's manuscripts. An ordained Anglican clergyman and member of Buckingham's circle, his

'mixture of orthodox medicinal remedies, religio-moral counsel, and astrological, quasi-magical intervention—from purgation and bleeding, to mutual prayer, horoscope casting, the provision of amulets and charms, and ritual exorcism'

appealed to a wide cross-section of society at a time when magic had not quite been abandoned as a tool to be tried by bewildered sufferers from ill-understood mental and physical maladies.^{xxxix} Nonetheless he was never a CPh member.

While Evington and Forman, the last of the dying breed of mages, left copious records of their cases, methods and ideas, little survives to illustrate the individual medical characteristics and orientation of such a mainstream figure as More. However a distinguished colleague, Baldwin Hamey junior, a man who held numerous offices in the CPh and proved its greatest benefactor, has left a brief but pointed summary of More's contribution:

'Dr Moore ritus moresque antiquos novis, vitam cœlibem conjugali, facetias austeritati, praxin aulicam urbanæ, atque æternitatem denique cæteris omnibus grandævus prætulit, exeunte mense Novemb. 1641'^{xxxix} - viz.,

'Dr Moore, who departed [this life] at a great age in November 1641, preferred ancient practices and customs to novel ones, a bachelor's life to the married state, wit to severity, outdoor life to urban, and in short, eternity to all things.'

In mentioning More's preference for the ancient over the novel, Hamey leaves it to us to guess whether he has in mind his medical or his religious precepts, or perhaps both: nonetheless More's governing motivation could hardly be more clearly summarised.

'Pleasing to important men'

While several CPh members might at any one time be Royal physicians or physicians-in-ordinary, the

College's status among the upper echelons of city and court remained generally quite low, as most of its members stemmed from relatively modest backgrounds - younger sons of provincial gentry and clergy, barely gentlemen at all by metropolitan standards.^{xxxvii}

Yet More stood out as a physician whose licensing 'would be pleasing to important men' even against the opposition of the (theoretically) foremost commoner in the land, the Archbishop of Canterbury – how? Those well-to-do patients so far noted do not constitute a clientèle any more aristocratic or powerful than that of colleagues in the CPh - simply being a College member and London practitioner would scarcely have made his activities memorable.

What adds peculiar interest and incident to More's career is that - quite how, is not clear - he became personal physician to George Villiers, first duke of Buckingham and from 1616 James I's favourite adviser.^{xxxviii} The connection may well have been in place before More's admission to the CPh in 1619 – the next year, according to Gee's *Catalogue of Popish Physicians*, More was arrested but released two days later, possibly 'in regard he is physician to the Marquis Buckingham'. Just possibly, Bacon had commended More to Buckingham at the time that those two noblemen were on good terms.^{xxxix} Geographical location was a factor in the connection, as will be shown, but was it causative?

Duchess Katherine's religion may have been a factor: only under great pressure did she renounce her Catholic faith on marriage to Buckingham^{xl}; Buckingham's own mother became a Catholic in 1622.^{xli} As Lockyer states, 'it is not easy to know who Buckingham's advisers were', and when Buckingham was ill in 1624 the King's physician de Mayerne attended him.^{xlii} However, Duchess Katherine, having mentioned More in a letter of 1625 to her cousin, wrote to More himself two years later whilst he was attending Buckingham at the ill-fated expedition to the island of Ré, regretting that More had been ill, praying him not to leave Buckingham who she hoped would not go into La Rochelle, and urging More in quite personal terms to prevent her husband from taking risks!^{xliii} More's sick absence troubled others - Dr William Lewis told Edward Nicholas, then one of Buckingham's Admiralty officials, how he wished that 'honest Dr Moore had been with them instead of his Scots Doctor, who put the whole army in alarm every other night'.^{xliv} More's close involvement with the Buckingham family is confirmed by John Holles earl of Clare:

'Dr Moore was once here since I came, he's much and daily employed by his great Lord and Lady [the Buckingham family], that he cannot intend others'.^{xlv}

Dr More, the political fixer

Dr Pelling's wide survey shows that the CPh harboured many more crypto-Catholics than other religious dissidents. She observes that

'Medical practitioners in general, and physicians in particular, were peculiarly well positioned for subsidiary involvement in covert operations as well as diplomacy; by contrast they were rarely well placed to resist pressures to this effect.'

In other words, government officers and dignitaries would not scruple to utilise members of the College to do their dirty work. Highly placed officials had of course been making covert use of agents' Catholic

affiliations throughout the preceding century.

'Practitioners were...liable to act as "state servants" in assessing the condition of...prisoners of state...[whose] illness was a widely used pretext for association, travelling, refusing to travel, going into hiding, or contact with the outside world'.^{xlvi}

Dr More was not only Buckingham's personal physician but that statesman's trusted agent in some very controversial activities. These can prove somewhat challenging to explore, for a variety of reasons. Difficulties in pinning down Buckingham's more covert enterprises have been noted; equally, pitfalls exist in distinguishing one John More from another, the name with its variants being quite common in various strata of society, and problematic to search for, not least electronically.

Given some of Dr More's later activities, it is tempting to recognise him in a warrant issued under the royal sign manual in November 1617, just after the CPh was told that his licensing would be 'pleasing to important men', concerning the provision of confidential intelligence to Buckingham: however, that warrant was more likely issued to a different John More, known as 'little More' - a future clerk to the signet, who had acted as a man of business for Secretary of State Sir Ralph Winwood until his recent death – **Appendix 2** shows details.

Be that as it may, More's non-medical activities attracted notice and landed him in hot water from time to time. Late in 1620 More and Thomas Hicks – the apothecary with whom he lodged? - 'having been sent for by Warrant from Their Lordships, ..are... enjoined to remain in the custodie of the messengers [of HM Privy Chamber] until further order'. Sir John Digby informed Buckingham that 'Dr More was apprehended, because his writing was found among some notes of debtors' during a blitz on Sir Edward Carvell who was under suspicion of raising money from Catholics to support the staunchly Catholic Emperor Ferdinand II, foe of James I's son-in-law the Elector Palatine.^{xlvii} John Chamberlain told Sir Dudley Carleton that

'Sir Clement Edwards is sent with a serjeant to Norfolk to fetch up Sir Edward Carvell, a recusant, and suspected treasurer of certain Papists. Dr Moore, *suspected to be a priest*,^{xlviii} was committed on Tuesday last about the same business but released on Thursday morning, whether by his own innocency which could hardly appear in so short a time, or in favour of the Spanish Ambassador, to whom he is very near and dear, or else in regard he is physician to the Marquis Buckingham'.^{xlix}

In fact, according to the Venetian ambassador, the King himself was in the picture and appears to have known about More and his activities.¹ Girolamo Lando, Venetian Ambassador to the court of St James, reported to the Doge and Senate that

'The Spanish ambassador....took upon himself to recommend some cavaliers and others who have recently been imprisoned on the charge of having begun to make a collection among the Catholics of money for the emperor, it being considered that they had got together a good sum and hope to obtain £100,000....and more. The king answered brusquely...calling these men rebels and traitors. And whereas the ambassador, in recommending a Doctor More, also implicated, but less than the others, put his hand on his breast and said: Sire, I swear to God that he is as innocent of all trace of treason as I am myself, the king replied: I fully believe it, and after the audience he laughed heartily over this with his Councillors.....'

More's release followed, but not that of the others. The report goes on to say:

'Their trial is being continued by some of the ministers and it is thought that the case may even go before the Parliament.

Whatever happens is bound to strike a hard blow not only at these individuals, but at the whole body of these poor Catholics, as the result of the action of those who pretend to defend and assist them, but who in reality do nothing more than precipitate disaster and punishment, what they consider medicaments frequently proving blows at the heart.'

In the Commons, at the start of the *Foot out of the snare* furore, Sir Robert Harley commented that

'ther is a certayn thing in the town calld a popish phisitian, let him be restraynd to his hows, and go to no patient, but lett them that can take phisick of no boddy else go to him if they will'

- meaning by this, Dr More. ^{li} With other Catholic physicians mentioned above, More was not deterred from seeking to ameliorate the conditions of Catholic patients by the personal risks and hazards entailed, given the anti-catholicism rife in Parliament and elsewhere, shared by many key officers of church and state - a climate in which even the highest in the land might prove treacherously and suddenly fickle if their own fortunes collapsed or priorities changed.

By 1620, amid renewed speculation over a possible marriage alliance between Charles Prince of Wales and the Infanta Maria of Spain, the Venetian ambassador wrote that in England

'The rage against the Spaniards is extreme....There are endless discussions in which one hears that they....want to break off all negotiations for a Spanish marriage and help the Palatinate.....' ^{lii}

James and Charles were hoping that such an alliance would result in the relief of the Palatinate; three years later, tired of the slow tortuous negotiations, Charles resolved to travel to Spain to finalise the matter, and James required Buckingham to escort him. They took with them Endymion Porter, who had been testing the waters, and Francis Cottington, who also had experience of Spanish diplomatic affairs. ^{liii}

Whether More was also a member of the entourage is not known, but in August 1624, after the marriage negotiations had foundered, Lord Haughton (John Holles) wrote to the former Spanish ambassador, Gondomar, in Madrid, in somewhat idiosyncratic Spanish, saying *inter alia*

'Most illustrious Sir

'Not long ago I dared write you a letter, which... Don Francis Cottington promised me that he would place in your illustrious hands, and I trusted that he would do just that, so that it would remain a private letter, sent on behalf of an individual and containing nothing to do with matters of state....'

- he continues, floridly and somewhat sycophantically, to stress that all he's seeking to do is to express his gratitude for favours past, and to proffer future service in gratitude. Clearly nervous lest his address go astray, be misconstrued and land him in hot water, Holles adds that

'...as a sign of greater security [this letter] is to be presented by means of our Doctor Moore.....to say that I would be of service, should I be of any use at all....'

Later he mentions that

'It is also said that, in search of friends, they say that the count of Gondomar has promised them more than he wishes or can deliver. Our doctor knows much more than I have written here, and many other details. I know...he is a very great servant to you, most illustrious sir.' ^{liv}

This is silent on why Haughton was intervening, if he was simply fishing for some benefit or recognition, for himself or for others also - and if and how More was still available to assist, months after Buckingham

himself had moved on to explore the scope for a French alliance for Charles.^{lv} What does seem clear is that Haughton trusted More's reliability and discretion as a go-between in dangerous waters.

At this same period Dr More began amassing property, in an area and a manner very relevant to his non-medical work for Buckingham - the sale of peerages.

Within quite a short period, More established himself as a landowner within the East Midlands area, not far from the locality from which Buckingham himself originated and from which he took to wife a rich Catholic heiress, even though under duress she for a time renounced her faith.^{lvi} As Lawrence Stone notes, 'Dr Moore seems to have been frequently employed by the duke as an intermediary for the sale of titles'.^{lvii} He might have added, 'in the East Midlands', as this locality does indeed appear to have been the unifying factor. Did Buckingham use More because he was handily placed geographically, or did he plant him there?

Appendix 3 explores these topics and exemplifies More's involvement in this highly political activity. Clearly More was no shrinking violet in pursuing Buckingham's aims – whether he ever stopped to consider what the consequences might be for him should his patron fall as dramatically as he had risen, is impossible to know. For various reasons hostility to Buckingham steadily grew, to the extent that Charles had to dissolve the 1626 Parliament to stave off his impeachment.^{lviii} On 23 August 1628, one of the soldiers who had served at Ré stabbed Buckingham to death. Clare wrote to his son Lord Haughton six days later, telling him that

'Dr Moore and George Markham came hither (Stukeley, Norfolk) on Tuesday, dined, and went their way, and though I knew of the duke's death [the preceding Wednesday], the news being at Tuxford Monday night and spread into many places of Notts, yet I said nothing thereof to the Doctor, both because I was loath he should hear anything at my house that might trouble him such news as those, besides I was uncertain of their truth, and I could not believe them: so the Doctor went away hence ignorant, but understanding them the same night, the next day he posted to London, for I sent to Kirklington, and he was gone.'

lix

This suggests recognition of some degree of personal feeling in More's relations with the Buckingham, as might be inferred also from Duchess Katherine's request to More to try to stop the Duke from taking risks. That noted, doubtless at base the connection was essentially a symbiotic patron/client deal. More's Catholicism could assist in the manipulation of his co-religionists in the shadowy and shifting world of confidential and personal diplomatic manoeuvrings; the Buckingham could secure More's access to influential circles, personal gain, immunity from religious pursuance.

What did Buckingham's death mean for More?

His wife, his father-in-law, his mother may have been Catholics, but Buckingham himself 'had an equal dislike of ideological polarisation' with James I, at the end of whose reign Abbot remained the crypto-Puritan Archbishop of Canterbury, even as Sir George Calvert was a crypto-Catholic Secretary of State.

Buckingham may have intended all sectors to benefit from patronage, to avoid the creation of a closed clique fomenting general opposition; in the event, his domination of the arena inevitably resulted in the

emergence of rival groups, all owing something to him but in competition with each other. This could work, as 'divide and rule', for a time but only until rivalry was overborne by general resentment – a mechanism affording neither patron nor clients any degree of security.^{lx}

Thus, while More's relationship with the Buckingham's does appear underpinned by genuine loyalty and affection, his position among Buckingham's array of underlings was relatively modest, and he was not named in Buckingham's will, either as administrator or as beneficiary.^{lxi}

More had his own aspirations, as will be shown, but it would have suited both him and his patrons that he remain in the background, without title or appointment other than his professional medical ones. He clearly made quite a profit from his activities. The mechanics of this, what was formalised, how far his gains were fees allowed by Buckingham or some government agency, what deals were done on the side with aspiring clients and so on, are unclear in the absence of more detailed records, and it is not possible to assess the specific effects on his fortunes and prospects of Buckingham's death. The sale of peerages was in any case discontinued until the onset of the Civil War.^{lxii}

One curious appointment is documented in a field in which More had no obvious knowledge or interest. In 1632 there was set up under royal protection a Society for Fishing: as Carr puts it,

'The keen personal interest of Charles I (SP Dom. 203, 54) led him to set up in 1632 a body (part Board of Fisheries, part Regulatory Company, and part Joint Stock) by the name of *Concilium et communitas piscationis Domini Magne Britanniae et Hibernie*. The Lord Treasurer (Weston), Arundel and Pembroke were among the *conciliarii*, and a number of persons were named *primi et moderni socii de communitate*.....The council was to be half English and half Scot[tis]h. There were proclamations for the regulation of fishing (prohibiting trawls), for the better observance of the old laws as to fish diet, and for the restriction of foreign fishermen on our coasts.'

Minutes record that in 1633 several new Society of Fishing members took the oath, among them Dr More, Edward Robinson who was one of the Six Clerks of Chancery, and a couple of merchants.^{lxiii} One of the Society's secretaries was Sir Edward Nicholas, More's earlier correspondent, their acquaintance doubtless having grown in Buckingham's service. In 1637 Dr Matthew Nicholas, an Anglican clergyman, thanked his brother Sir Edward 'for his affectionate care of the writer's wife and child, in consulting Dr More'.^{lxiv}

Each member of the Society contributed towards the costs of setting up and equipping its fishing fleet, presumably expecting a return on this investment. Sums advanced ranged upwards from fifty pounds. Among the largest was £3000 from Katherine duchess of Buckingham^{lxv} - suggesting the possibility that More had been charged with keeping an eye on developments for her and supporting her interests in her widowhood.

This apart, the loss through his untimely death of Buckingham's protection did apparently make More's position distinctly vulnerable. No evidence has come to light of his being directly pursued in respect of his activities on Buckingham's behalf, but pressure on him as a recusant increased significantly. In June 1635, More was driven to petition Charles I in person. He deponed that in 1628, when indicted for

recusancy (as shown above), he

'had permitted himself to be convicted on his Majesty's promise to the petitioner's lord and master the late duke of Buckingham, that by reason of the said conviction he should not be at all damnified. Of late, the petitioner has been questioned by the Commissioners for Recusants on the said conviction and his recusancy. Prays a pardon, and also lease of his Majesty's part of his lands and goods at rent of £3 or £4 per annum.'^{lxvi}

Secretary of State Sir Francis Windebank (who was received into the Catholic Church shortly before his death)^{lxvii} recorded that the King told the Commissioners to uphold this promise, and grant More the 'lease prayed for,...with as much favour as they may, His Majesty intending it as a special mark of goodness to the petitioner, being a person whom for his services he is pleased to respect, but in no wise to be drawn into a precedent for others.' A further minute refers to the demand on More to pay composition, but 'in regard of his Majesty's promise, as also of More's faithful service', instructs the Commissioners to lease him the King's part of his assets 'for such term.. as leases...are granted to other recusants, and other terms stated in Moore's petition' above.^{lxviii} The editors of the documents of the northern commission for compounding with recusants commented that Charles I intervened to ease the burden on some individuals, while 'others were practically allowed to fix their own rents (Dr John Moore, William Stanford)'.^{lxix}

Nonetheless the religious climate was fast becoming much harsher for such as More, and in 1641, just a few months before his death, he was named by the Commons Committee concerning Recusants Convict:

'Mr. *Whittaker* reports from the Committee concerning Recusants convict:

...'Half Recusants - Sir *Edw. Yates*, Doctor *Moore*, *Godfrey*, a Priest:Doctor *Moore* took the Oaths of Allegiance and Supremacy; but goes not to Church...

'That the Committee appointed to prepare a Bill for Fining of such Recusants as have stayed in Town contrary to the Proclamation, shall take into Consideration, to insert a Clause into the Bill for the Prohibiting and Restraining Popish Recusants to practice Physick or Surgery in and about the City of *London*.'^{lxx}

The passage does not make clear where or when More took the oaths: Dr Pelling mentions that subscription to the Oath of Allegiance was a formal requirement of CPh membership.^{lxxi}

Hamey's epitaph, mentioned above, gives November 1641 as the month of More's death, and the burial register of St Bride's, Fleet Street records his interment on 28th of that month: 'November 28 Doctor John Moore - in the vault'. Whether he had purchased this himself, or his heirs did so, remains unknown. In any event his earthly remains were not to rest for long in peace, as before twenty-five years had passed the building was completely destroyed in the Great Fire.

- so who was Dr John More?

From about 1616 until his death, John More lodged with the Catholic apothecary Thomas Hicks in Fleet Street – on the face of it simply a single, childless London-based physician. Yet for much of that quarter century More pursued an ambitious programme of country estate-building. Attuned to furthering his privy activities on behalf of Buckingham, this no less embodied his own dynastic ambition of leaving his heirs

much more highly placed socially than the family's origins would have suggested.

In Dugdale's 1662 Visitation of Nottinghamshire, the pedigree of More of Kirtlington (Kirklington) was certified by John More, great-nephew of Dr More, who had died at about the time John was born.

It shows Dr More, 'a learned Dr. of Phisick [who] died unmarried', and his younger brother William as sons of Roger Moore esq. of 'Hasilden', and his unnamed wife, daughter of a Duncalfe esq. of Moberley, both in Cheshire.^{lxxii} However, this is erroneous, involving a garbled reference to the parents of William's wife. Seventeenth-century manuscripts passed down within the family confirm that John and William's father was Edward More of Thelwall - a small township near the Lancashire border, in the Cheshire parish of Runcorn, though at the time served mainly by the church at neighbouring Grappenhall. Their mother, Edward's wife, was Alice, daughter of Robert Martinscroft – sometimes abbreviated to Marscroft.

No birth record of John or William has come to light - John's first degree in 1581 suggests birth around the early 1560s, fitting Hamey's comment that he was 'of great age' at his death in 1641.^{lxxiii} George Ormerod's detailed history of Cheshire says nothing about the More family prior to Dr John's purchase of part of Thelwall manor in 1621. He lists Martinscroft as an established ('ancient') Thelwall freeholder family,^{lxxiv} but nothing has come to light of Edward's parentage, of kinship networks outside the Cheshire-Lancashire border area, or of any significant wealth, influence, or indeed notoriety (such as overt recusancy) on his and Alice's part. That said, links can be shown to recusant, and relatively prominent, Martinscrofts not far away. Fuller details are given in **Appendix 4**.

Weaknesses in the suppression of Catholicism in Cheshire, mentioned later, and its notorious strength in Lancashire, are well enough known. Reinforcing that, the locality is a prime example of a fairly secluded corner on the borders of two counties, where to be fully effective in detecting and countering recusant activity the officers of different parishes and the shrievalties and commissions of the peace of both counties would have had to maintain close and regular co-operation – something in tune with neither the organisational practices, nor indeed the social attitudes of the period.^{lxxv}

Was Dr More related to Sir Thomas' line?

Mention was made at the beginning of this essay of 'intriguing hints of a relationship with the family of Sir (St) Thomas More'. Details of this from the aspect of Dr More's armorial bearings, partly drawn from family papers, are given in **Appendix 5**, and appear to argue against kinship with Sir Thomas' line.

The forebears of Sir Thomas on the More side were resident in the London area for at least three generations before Dr John was born into a Cheshire family. No kinship links are evident between them, or with Sir Thomas' mother's side, the Graungers; with his wife's family, the Colts and Elringtons; with the Ropers, into whom his daughter Margaret married - or with the Mores of Loseley, St Thomas'

stepmother Alice's family who claimed descent from the Mores of Norton in north-east Derbyshire.^{lxxvi}

Yet despite all that, in January 1625 St Thomas More's great-great-grandson Thomas Roper, informed the English clergy agent at Rome, Thomas More *alias* West, who was his second cousin once removed, that

'Our cosen the doctor goethe with the duke, and is makeinge ritch clothes of pluche and velvette with many yardes of satten lace.'^{lxxvii}

Was this satirical - had Dr More's ambition, vanity maybe, led him to claim an unwarranted relationship? In fact, Professor Questier observes, four months later Dr More stood as godfather to St Thomas' great-great-grandson Thomas Roper's second son, Thomas.

Moreover, Gee's recent *Foot out of the snare* refers to the clergy agent as 'F[r] Moore a secular priest, kinsman to Dr Moore the popish physician'.^{lxxviii}

Was there a link through the family of M(o)ore of Little Haddon, Oxfordshire, into which the clergy agent Thomas' sister Mary married, and which favoured the name Edward? Again, their armorial bearings betray no similarity with any of Dr John's.^{lxxix} Nonetheless, this kinship theme, while currently lacking proof, will recur, and will be shown to persist over generations to come.

- and had he a patron?

Dr More's seemingly rather modest background might well imply the support of a patron, someone with greater wealth and influence than either of his parental lines. Unless and until tangible evidence emerges, any hypothesis can only be conjectural. That said, the most plausible candidate near home is arguably Lady Mary Egerton of Ridley. Splendidly incorrigible as a recusant, she wore down the officials seeking to suppress recusancy in Cheshire, which for geographical reasons was seen as vulnerable to invasion by Irish or other subversives.

Those officials included not only the somewhat ineffective Bishop Chadderton of Chester, but Lord Chancellor Bromley, his brother George, chief justice of Chester, Sir Christopher Hatton, and not least her illegitimate stepson, Lord Chancellor Sir Thomas Egerton – all cowed into drumming their fingers on the grounds of her social standing, age, and infirmity until she died in 1599.^{lxxx}

Mary was a Grosvenor of Eaton by birth: two sisters became nuns, and another, Eleanor, had married Thomas Reddish of Grappenhall. Their daughter and heiress Maude was married to William Marbury esq. of Marbury, a part-owner of the manor of Grappenhall, whose St Wilfred's parish church was the local mother church for next-door Thelwall.^{lxxxi} Although a direct family relationship has not emerged, it will be shown that a More who enrolled at the English College in Rome took Marbury as his *alias*. Furthermore, two of Lady Mary's granddaughters married members of the prolific Brereton family, several of whom acted as trustees for Dr John and his successors. Lady Mary's voluminous will^{lxxxii} makes no mention of More, but then her benefactions appear restricted to kinsfolk, with discretion probably precluding any bequests risking suspicion of Catholic intentions. The hypothesis is attractive,

but without any documentary support, purely speculative.

A More dynasty?

The start of More's acquisition of property in north Nottinghamshire in 1618 coincided closely with Buckingham's rise and More's involvement in the sale of peerages in the north and east midlands, most specifically in Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire.

Buckingham himself was buying lands in his native Leicestershire and neighbouring Rutland at much the same time. Born the son of a knight, at Brooksby between Leicester and Melton Mowbray, his family had no more than local influence, and he needed to work his way into Court circles.

Nonetheless in 1617, within a year from the start of his meteoric rise, and despite having received estates in Buckinghamshire from the king, Buckingham purchased an estate in Leicestershire. Three years later he married the daughter of the earl of Rutland, one of the greatest and most powerful landowners of the Midlands, buying Burley on the Hill in Rutland soon afterwards.

The strain this put on his finances, at a time when buying property nearer London was a priority, surely argues strongly his determination to establish an influential presence in his native region. ^{lxxxiii}

More's principal land purchase took place in November 1618, when he bought the manor of Kirklington, some twelve miles north-east of Nottingham, with several nearby holdings north of Southwell and Newark upon Trent, from William the son and heir of Marmion Hasilwood who had left the area. The main holdings - Kirklington manor and Roughay - in 1619 totalled just under 1700 acres, less than a quarter being occupied by freeholders, yielding £620 pa and with capital value over £10,000. ^{lxxxiv}

Associated with Dr More in the bargain and sale was Anthony Dormer of Grove Park, grandson of Anthony Browne, first viscount Montagu. This again hints at a link with the family of Sir (St) Thomas More - Anthony Dormer was the great-nephew of Thomas Roper, Sir Thomas More's grandson, and second cousin to the Thomas Roper to whose son Dr More stood godfather. However, Anthony's recently widowed sister-in-law Lady Alice Dormer had a manor at Kneeton, ten miles away. Did she and Anthony help locate a suitable estate for Dr More to buy? Were they connected to him by family, social contacts or religion - or was this just a commercial relationship? ^{lxxxv}

There may even have been some tenuous earlier family connection, as there were Mores at Kirklington, and Marcroftes at nearby Halloughton, in the previous century - however no direct link is evident, and the families concerned were of modestly comfortable farming stock rather than even minor gentry. ^{lxxxvi} Dr More's attachment to family roots is shown by his purchase in 1621 of the manor of Thelwall, his native village, from the Brookes of Norton, near Runcorn in Cheshire, who had owned it for the preceding sixty years ^{lxxxvii} - More was thus consolidating rather than jettisoning his holdings in his native north Cheshire. Whatever his intent there, by this time More was very well placed socially and geographically to assist Buckingham's enterprises in the north and east midlands area - the properties purchased for £280 from

Lawrence Leeke, gent. in 1621 were also at Kirklington and so consolidated his holdings there.^{lxxxviii}

Indeed the acquisition process continued for a while after Buckingham's death; for instance in 1631 More paid the appreciable sum of £6000 to Nicholas Askwith, a London mercer, for half of the manor of Langford, another small village near to Newark.^{lxxxix} However in 1633 he borrowed £500 from a London gentleman, William Linsey, in a leaseback of some of his Kirklington properties: this might well imply the need of ready money, in view of the increased recusancy pressures already noted.^{xc}

Dr More never married: why therefore build up landholdings? He had, it seems clear, high ambitions which he aimed to achieve through his heirs, the offspring of his brother William; and in 1634 he became enmeshed in negotiations relating to the marriage of his eldest nephew Edward, on whom his family ambitions centred.

In fact it took three generations for the consequences of Dr More's actions to play out, involving much family conflict and many ups and downs in widely differing fields of activity. Part 2 of this essay depicts this, in examining Dr More's legacy, in regard both to his dynastic and his recusant ambitions, to shed further light on the question *Who was Dr John More?*

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My thanks are due to Dr Margaret Pelling for valuable guidance on the medical aspects of this essay, and to several other distinguished experts as acknowledged in the Notes below, any errors being my own.

ABBREVIATIONS

APCE	Acts of the Privy Council of England
CRS	Catholic Record Society Records Series
CSP (Dom.)	Calendar of State Papers (Domestic)
CSP (Ven.)	Calendar of State Papers (Venetian)
CALS	Cheshire Archives and Local Studies - quotations by permission
HD	Heneage Deeds, Lincolnshire Archives - quotations by permission
NA	Nottinghamshire Archives - quotations by permission
SP	State Papers
TNA	The National Archives: Public Record Office

-
- ii Joseph Foster, *Alumni Oxonienses: The Members of the University of Oxford, 1500-1714*, 1891 - listed as Moore; see also Wood, next endnote
- iii Anthony Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses* II, 193 (1818 edition); T. H. B. M. Harmsen, *John Gee's Foot out of the snare (1624)*, 1992 edition of John Gee, *The foot out of the snare: with a detection of svndry late practices and impostures of the priests and Iesuites in England: Whereunto is added a catalogue of Popish bookes lately dispersed in our kingdome. The printers, binders, sellers and dispersers of such bookes. Romish priests and Iesuites resident about London. Popish physicians practising about London*, 1624. It is of course possible that More had come under Catholic influence whilst at Oxford. To give just one example - Tony Hadland, *Thames Valley Papists from Reformation to Emancipation 1534 – 1829*, online at https://hadland.files.wordpress.com/2012/06/tv_online.pdf [accessed 20 July 2013] draws attention to the energetic activities of William Hartley, a seminary priest, in distributing copies of Campion's *Decem Rationes* around the university – see also G. Anstruther, *The Seminary Priests* vol. I, 1968
- iv L. Jardine and A. Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune: the troubled life of Francis Bacon 1561-1626*, 1998, p.203 and note 83, p. 555, ref. Lambeth Palace Library MS 657 art. 113
- v HMC, *Buccleuch and Queensbury MSS* vol. I, 131; Jonathan Woolfson, *Padua and the Tudors: English students in Italy 1485-1603*, 1998, pp.283-4
- vi Philip Caraman, *Henry Morse: Priest of the Plague and Martyr of England*, 1957
- vii Hugh Bowler (ed.), CRS 34, 1934: *London Sessions Records 1605-85*, pp. 377-379
- viii Anthony G. Petti (ed.), *Recusant Documents from the Ellesmere Manuscripts*, CRS 60, 1968: ex Ellesmere MSS, EL2195- presumably More, Edward (c.1555-1623), of Crabbet, Worth, Suss., Canon Row, Westminster and Odiham, Hants.; knighted 1600; kin to Sir George More of Loseley. *The History of Parliament: the House of Commons 1558-1603*, (ed.) P.W. Hasler, 1981 comments that 'It has been suggested that (Edward) More shared the Viscount (Montagu)'s Catholicism, and indeed he had many Catholic contacts, including Lady Dacre, the Stourtons (into which family his second wife had previously been married), and members of several leading Sussex families,

but as he was on the commission of the peace for three counties, he conformed outwardly to the Elizabethan church.

ix Will of Sir Thomas Crampton, proved 13 February 1607: TNA PROB 11/109

x see especially Margaret Pelling (with Frances White), *Medical Conflicts in Early Modern London: Patronage, Physicians and Irregular Practitioners 1550-1640* - Oxford Studies in Modern History, 2003; M. Pelling and Frances White, *Physicians and Irregular Medical Practitioners in London 1550-1640*, database online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/no-series/london-physicians/1550-1640> [last accessed 10 April 2018]; also Elizabeth Lane Furdell, *Royal Doctors 1485-1714: Medical Personnel and the Tudor and Stuart Courts*, 2001; Woolfson, op. cit.

xi the College of Physicians was only made Royal towards the end of Charles II's reign: Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...* The abbreviation CPh is used in this essay in preference to CP as the latter commonly denotes the (Court of) Common Pleas; however FCP, as an established abbreviation, is used to denote Fellowship of the CPh

xii Stanfield, R. and Hansom, J.,S. (ed.), CRS 9, 1911: *Official papers relating to six Catholics 1596-1637* - in Miscellanea 9

xiii Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*, p.325

xiv Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*, p.298

xv for a very detailed and informative account see Margaret Pelling and Charles Webster, *Medical practitioners in Health, medicine and mortality in the sixteenth century*, ed. Webster, 1979. For details of fining of irregulars, see esp. Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*, p.303. Padua's primacy is affirmed in Katharine Park, *Doctors and medicine in early Renaissance Florence*, 1985

xvi for an overview of mountebanks and quackery in Britain from the fourteenth century on, see Leslie G. Matthews, 'Licensed Mountebanks in Britain', *Journal of the History of Medicine*, January 1964, pp. 30-45

xvii Pelling and Webster, op. cit., p.189; Pelling, *The common lot: sickness, medical occupations and the urban poor in early modern England*, 1998, p.243

xviii Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*, p.284; also Pelling and Webster, op. cit., p.189

xix Harmsen, op. cit.

xx the many physicians attending the dying James I included David Bethune, Henry Atkins, Sir William Paddie, John Moore, William Harvey, Matthew Lister, John Cragg, James Chambers, Alexander Ramsey 'and others': John Holles, earl of Clare to Robert Carr, earl of Somerset, March 1625 - letter 414, *Letters of John Holles* [written in] 1587-1637, Thoroton Society, 3 vols., 1975-86

xxi Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*, pp. 325-327

xxii Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*, pp. 325-327

xxiii CRS 34, 1934: London Sessions Records 1605-85, pp. 377-379

xxiv CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CXXII, no. 48, 16 Dec. 1628. Turner refused the Oath of Allegiance and sought but was not admitted to CPh membership: Pelling and White, op. cit. By about 1630, the CPh was taking a hard line on admissions: those with purely overseas qualifications, even from Padua, were not being allowed to proceed beyond the licentiate ship, and the Oath of Allegiance enforced as a membership requirement: Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*

xxv W. Munk – for details see Part 1 Appendix 1, endnote ³

xxvi CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCLV, p. 349, no. 35, 19 July 1633; CSP (Dom.), Charles I, Addendum 1625-49, vol. DXXXIV, pp. 458-9, no. 50, September 1633

-
- xxvii H. Foley, *Records of the English Province of the Society of Jesus*, vol. I, 1st series, 1877, pp. 512-513; T.M. McCoog, *English and Welsh Jesuits 1555-1650* part 1, 1994; G. Anstruther, *The Seminary Priests* vol. 1, 1968
- xxviii Egerton MS. 2533 f.79. Dr More had an interest in a complicated property arrangement under which Berry leased some land associated with the manor of Longford and also involving Lady Grace Cavendish and the earl of Pembroke and Montgomery: HD HEN 6/5 dated 20 June 1635. In regard to items in Dr More's own hand, *Calendar of the Clarendon State papers preserved in the Bodleian Library*, vol. 1, (ed.) O. Ogle & W.H. Bliss, 1872, p. 61, no. 462 records a brief letter dated 27 February 1634/5 from More in reply to a plea for medical advice from one Matthew Wilson, recommending that he 'return to his native air' to be rid of his ailments; there is also a receipt signed by him, mentioned in Appendix 3, endnote ⁷
- xxix CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCCXLI, no. 20, 5 June 1637; quoted in Foley, op. cit., p. 608
- xxx Philip Caraman, op. cit., for this topic - also Anstruther, Bellenger, also McCoog, op. cit. (under the reference Henry Claxton *vere* Morse)
- xxxi CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCCCXII, p. 466, no. 139, 15 February 1639
- xxxii CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCCCX, p. 151, no. 133, I, II, 10 May 1639
- xxxiii Ronald C. Sawyer, *Patients, Healers and Disease in the south-east Midlands, 1597-1634*: unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1986
- xxxiv the CPh was strongly Galenic, upholding the traditional view of medicine as based on balancing the four humours, bloodletting being integral to this, whereas the Paracelsians had glimpsed the truth that diseases have their own existence and are not solely the effects of bodily imbalance. The approach to treatment may also be seen as taking an incremental step forward with the recognition that simplification of medication was needed to reveal which ingredient was most effective in any instance
- xxxv Sawyer, op. cit.; Jonathan Andrews, *Napier, Richard (1559-1634), astrological physician and Church of England clergyman*: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004
- xxxvi quoted by Munk, op. cit. I am indebted to Dr Stephen Heyworth of Wadham College, Oxford for the translation
- xxxvii M. Pelling, 'Compromised by gender - the rôle of the male medical practitioner in early modern England' in (eds.) H. Marland and M. Pelling, *Task of healing: medicine, religion and gender in England and the Netherlands*, 1996: Pelling quotes a study by William Birken (1987): Social problems of the English Physician in the early seventeenth century, in *Medical History* vol. 31, in regard to the frequency of close ties between physicians and clergymen
- xxxviii Roger Lockyer, *Buckingham: life and political career of George Villiers, first Duke of Buckingham 1592-1628*, 1981. Villiers, a son of Sir George Villiers and Mary [Beaumont] of Brooksby, Leics.; entered the court, knighted 1615; master of the horse, KG, baron and viscount, replaced Robert Carr, earl of Somerset as king's favourite adviser 1616; earl and privy councillor 1617, marquess 1618; married in 1620 Lady Katherine Manners, daughter and heiress of the earl of Rutland and a Catholic, persuaded to renounce her Catholicism; duke of Buckingham 1623
- xxxix according to Lisa Jardine and Alan Stewart, *Hostage to Fortune - the troubled life of Francis Bacon*, 1998, p. 389, in 1616 when Bacon became a privy councillor, and Lord Keeper the year following, Villiers was 'at once his patron and his protégé', though the relationship soured later; also Lockyer, op. cit.
- xl Lady Katherine Manners, heiress of her father Francis 6th earl of Rutland who was opposed to the alliance and to her conformity (effected by John Williams, chaplain to James I, who married them in 1620 and who for his services was appointed dean of Westminster - a step on the way to the archbishopric of York and Lord Chancellorship) - Lockyer, op. cit.
- xli David L. Smith, *Villiers, Mary, suo jure countess of Buckingham (c.1570-1632)*, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2005

-
- xlii Lockyer, op. cit.. Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...* p.245 mentions that Buckingham was 'frequently in poor health', referring to G.P.V.Akrigg, *The letters of King James VI and I*, 1984. de Mayerne was a Huguenot: Elizabeth Lane Furdell, *Royal Doctors 1485-1714: medical personnel and the Tudor and Stuart courts*, 2001
- xliii CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. LXXXII, p. 400, no. 42, 20 October 1627. The entry reads
'Katherine Duchess of Buckingham to Dr Moore. Regrets his illness. Prays him not to leave the Duke until he brings him into England. Hopes when he has heard from hence he will alter his intention of going into Rochelle, and hasten homewards, for it is high time he were here. If he goes into the main land he were utterly undone, and she the most miserable woman in the world, for though God has blessed him hitherto, yet she hopes he will not still run on in that hope to venture himself beyond discretion, and trusts this journey has not made him a Puritan, to believe in predestination. Prays him to keep the Duke from being too venturous, for it does not belong to a general to walk trenches. He is not by this action any whit the more popular man than when he went, therefore the Doctor may see whether these people be worthy for him to venture his life for. State of her health.'
- xliv CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. LXXXI, p. 390, no. 61, 16 October 1627. Mention has already been made of a letter sent by More to Nicholas ten years later
- xlv Thoroton Society Record Series Volume XXXV, 1983 (ed.) P.R. Seddon : *Letters of John Holles, 1587-1637*, vol. II, Letter 441, March 1626
- xlvi Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...Medical Conflicts...* pp. 328-9; in 'Compromised by gender..' (cit. sup.), she says (p. 105) that 'physicians in England as elsewhere had an often shadowy rôle as diplomatic go-betweens, conspirators & even poisoners'....
- xlvii CSP (Dom.), Eliz. I and James I, Addenda 1580-1625, vol. XLII, p. 628, no. 22, 4 November 1620. The Thirty Years' War having recently begun following the acceptance of the crown of Bohemia by Elector Frederick V, any such report would be seriously investigated
- xlviiii CSP (Dom.), James I, vol. CXVII, p. 190. no. 59. Italics mine. This is the only instance encountered to date of speculation that More was a priest, and it would be most helpful to know where Chamberlain got the idea from; Gee mentions kinship with a priest, but does not assert that More himself was one. His unmarried status hardly seems sufficient basis to feed such a suspicion : see Pelling in Marland and Pelling, op. cit.: 'We can note as a result of Birken's work that College (of Physicians) members in the early seventeenth century tended to marry late, or not at all, and were often childless. Birken attributes this to the lengthy period of education necessary for degrees in physic, and pointed to a compensatory tendency for physicians to be dynastic, or even nepotistic, whenever young male relatives were available.' This theme is very relevant in exploring More's family and social affiliations
- xlix letter quoted in Harmsen, op. cit. John Chamberlain was a copious writer of letters to Sir Dudley Carleton 1574-1632, keeping him up to date with home news: P. J. Finkelppearl, *Chamberlain, John (1553-1628)*: Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004. Was this the John Chamberlain esq. for whom More and Giffard had spoken up in 1618? Carleton, an orthodox Calvinist, was a career diplomat and politician, a confidant of the Elector and Electress Palatine; soon after this incident he hitched his wagon to Buckingham's star: L. J. Reeve, *Carleton, Dudley, Viscount Dorchester (1574-1632)*, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004
- ¹ CSP (Ven.), James I, 1619-21, pp. 479-480, no. 631 - re 20 November 1620
- li Harmsen, op. cit., quoting from C. Thompson, *The Holles Account of Proceedings in the House of Commons in 1624*, 1985. Sir Robert Harley of Brampton Bryan was member for Herefordshire, an avowed Puritan. His attack on More is noteworthy in that he served in the Commons as aide to his father-in-law and Secretary of State Sir Edward Conway, who was a Buckingham protégé: Jacqueline Eales, *Harley, Sir Robert (bapt. 1579, d. 1656)*, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004
- lii CSP (Ven.), James I, 1619-21, pp. 479-480, no. 631, as above
- liiii *Letters and papers of the Verney family down to the end of the year 1639*: (ed.) John Bruce, Camden Society Old Series, vol. LVI, p. 107, 1853

liv 'Sennor illustrissimo, no ha mucho que he tenido atrevimiento de escrebirle una carta, la qual el Cavallero Don Francisco Cottington me promieto dar en las mano de vuestra Signoria illustrissima, y me fié en el que haria assy, para ser ella carta particular, embiada de la parte de hombre particular, no teniendo que hazer con cosas de estado.'

'....Esta, con rostro levantado en sennal de mayor seguridad, para se presentada por el medio de nuestro Doctor Moore, se ofresce a los ojos de vuestra Sennoria illustrissima sin otro fruto, pero, que con la confirmacion de lo que he dicho en la otra; y que por qui hiziera su servicio, si yo valiera algo para el...'

' Se dize tambien, que buscando amygos, dize que el Conde do Gondomar ha prometido mas a ellos, que quiere, y puede complir. El nuestro dotor sabe mucho mas, que yo he escrito aqui, y muchas otras particularidades: yo lo se que es muy gran servidor de vuestra Sennoria illustrissima.'

These are excerpts from *Letters of John Holles, 1587-1637*, vol. II (cit. sup.), Letter 404, which gives the original Spanish text in full but without translation or editorial comment. I am grateful to Dr Glyn Redworth of the University of Manchester for translating this rather obscure passage for me: I am responsible for any shortcomings arising through my having limited the extracts quoted, both from the letter itself and from Dr Redworth's rendering

lv (ed.) Michael Questier, *Stuart dynastic policy and religious politics 1621-1625*, Camden Society 5th Series, vol. 34, 2009, especially pp. 89-129. Patricia Crawford, *Denzil Holles 1598-1680: a study of his political career*, 1979 refers to the continuing friendliness between John Holles and Gondomar even after the Spanish marriage negotiations had foundered - see also endnote ⁵⁷ for more on relations between Holles and Buckingham. Walter Yonge recorded in May 1622 that Gondomar 'got divers sums of money from the papists about London, promising them to procure a toleration of the King for them within his realm; and is gone, and hath not effected it...whereupon the papists about London do much exclaim against him' - *Diary of Walter Younge, Esq., Justice of the Peace, and M.P. for Honiton, written at Colyton and Axminster, Co. Devon, from 1604 to 1628*, (ed.) George Roberts, Camden Society Old Series vol. XLI, 1848, p. 58

lvi for Buckingham's marriage see endnote ⁴⁰ above

lvii Lawrence Stone, *The Crisis of the Aristocracy 1558-1641*, 1965

lviii Conrad Russell, *Parliaments and English politics 1621-1629*, 1979. Walter Yonge recorded in February 1626 that Parliament intended Buckingham to answer charges [*inter alia*] as to 'whether recusants be not borne out and increased by reason of the Duke's mother and father-in-law being known papists; whether the sale of favours, offices and places of judicature and ecclesiastical livings and promotions...be not through the Duke': *Diary of Walter Younge, Esq.*, cit. sup., p. 91

lix *Letters of John Holles, 1587-1637*, vol. II (cit. sup.), Letter 508, 29 August 1628. Holles and More appear to have been on good terms, professionally and personally. In 1622/3 he asked his son to keep More informed about land that More had his eye on; More carried messages between Clare and his son; and in 1631 there was the sad episode of the death of Holles' daughter Arbella, wife of Thomas Wentworth earl of Strafford, during her fifth pregnancy: More had warned Arbella to take it easy, and Holles believed Wentworth had failed to act accordingly, though Gervase Holles thought that Arbella had overridden More and her husband - Letters 369, 373, 533, 563, 629

lx Conrad Russell, op.cit., for the comment on ideological polarisation. He quotes Sir Thomas Wentworth and Sir John Saville as a Yorkshire example of rival clients. Whether in local politics or in religion, 'keep them hungry, keep them hopeful'

lxi TNA PROB 11/167/353

lxii Mayes, 'The sale of peerages....' - see Appendix 3, endnote ⁵

lxiii CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCXXXIV, p. 577, no. 15, 19 March 1633; Cecil T. Carr (ed.), *Select Charters of Trading Companies 1530-1707*, Selden Society vol.28, 1913, p. cv. Barry Supple, *Commercial Crisis and Change in England 1600-1642*, 1959 mentions that fish were being exported by royal licence in 1628. Dutch fishermen were prominent competitors in the seas around England and Scotland and beyond, e.g. off Iceland

lxiv CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCCLIV, p. 25, no. 90, 25 April 1637; S. A. Baron, *Nicholas, Sir Edward (1593-*

-
- 1669), Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004
- lxxv John R. Elder, *The royal fishery companies of the seventeenth century*, 1912
- lxxvi CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCXC, p.113, no. 49, 8 June 1635
- lxxvii Brian Quintrell, *Windebank, Sir Francis (bap. 1582, d. 1646)*, Oxford Dictionary of National Biography, 2004
- lxxviii CSP (Dom.), Charles I, vol. CCXCI, p.159, no. 93, 30 June 1635: from the King, presumably to the Commissioners for Recusants
- lxxix CRS vol. 53 (Miscellanea): *Northern book of compositions 1629-32. Documents concerning the Northern Commission 1627-42.* (eds.) Clare Talbot, Hugh Aveling. Even so it would appear that if only for form's sake, More's lands had to be kept at arm's length - HD HEN 6/4, 13 June 1636 refers to a pardon granted to More as a recusant convict and grants two parts of his lands to two of the Breretons, Cheshire men in origin and regulars among his trustees - a family with several members recusant or suspected Catholics over generations - see K.R. Wark, *Elizabethan recusancy in Cheshire*, Chetham Soc. 1971, and the Brereton of Shocklach and Malpas pedigree in George Ormerod, *The History of the County Palatine and City of Chester: Compiled from Original Evidences.....*, 2nd edition, 1882, which shows intermarriages with Throckmortons, Pershalls etc. The Stanford referred to is William Stanford of Handsworth, Staffs. In 1631 Dr More attended Arbella the daughter of John Holles earl of Clare and wife of Thomas Wentworth earl of Strafford - see endnote ⁵⁹ above
- lxxx *Journal of the House of Commons: volume 2: 1640-1643* (publ. 1802), pp. 168-169, 5 June 1641. Online at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=4701> [accessed 12 May 2014]
- lxxxi Pelling, *Medical Conflicts...*p. 324
- lxxxii *The Visitation of Nottinghamshire begun in 1662 and finished in 1664:* (ed.) G.D. Squibb, Harleian Society New Series vol. 5, 1986
- lxxxiii the consensus seems to be that there was no standard age for admission to the universities in this period, but that around 16 would not have been unusual - see for instance L. Stone, 'The age of admission to college in 17th century England', *History of Education* vol. 9, 1980, pp. 97-100. Dr Pelling gives 'c.1559' in her online database, derived from the college records (assuming that the subject of this essay is indeed correctly identified as the John More who graduated in the early 1580s)
- lxxxiv Ormerod, op. cit., p. 748
- lxxxv see for example Richard H. Turner, '*A More Convenient and Unobserved Location*': *a Derbyshire School reopened*: *Recusant History* vol. 29 no.2, 2008
- lxxxvi the present writer is descended from the marriage in 1565 of Jane More of Norton
- lxxxvii Questier, op. cit., letter 70 (from Archives of the Archbishop of Westminster B47, no. 184, fo. 209r-v), and in footnote 1059, pp. 340-341, quotes in relation to the baptism (ed.) A. Hamilton, *The Chronicle of the English Augustinian Canonesses Regular of the Lateran, at St Monica's in Louvain*, vol. II, pedigree of Roper. I am grateful to Prof. Questier for his kind guidance on this topic
- lxxxviii Harmsen, op. cit., p.294. Incidentally, no evidence has been found of a connection with the uncle and nephew Edward and George More involved in covert activities - the latter 'turned' by Walsingham? - mentioned in e.g. SP 12/168 no. 14, Feb. 1583/4, and SP 14/1/55, April 1603
- lxxxix J.W. Papworth, (ed.) A.W. Morant, *An alphabetical dictionary of coats of arms...forming an...ordinary of British armorials.....*, vol. II, 1874, p 774, gives *argent, a fess dancetty compony sable and gules between three pierced mullets sable, a martlet for difference*
- lxxx *Wark, op. cit.*; CRS vol. 53, *Cecil Papers* p.72,1961; Ormerod, op. cit., pp. 160-162; Francis Peck, *Desiderata curiosa*, vol. I, Lib. I-IV, 1779
- lxxxii Ormerod, op. cit., pp. 399, 458, 749; earlier Reddish, Marbury, Grosvenor and Egerton alliances and dealings

are summarised on p. 457; see also pp. 635-6. *The Visitation of Cheshire in the year 1580* (ed.) J.P. Rylands, 1882 is online at <https://archive.org/details/visitationofches00glov> [accessed 4 February 2014] and *Pedigrees made at the visitation of Cheshire 1613* (ed.) Record Society for the publication of original documents relating to Lancashire and Cheshire 1879, at <https://archive.org/details/recordsociety58recouoft> [accessed 4 February 2014]. Grappenhall's own church of All Saints was at that time classed as a chapel-of-ease of Daresbury parish church in Runcorn; Wark, op. cit. p. 16, mentions that Catholic vestments were still extant at Grappenhall in 1578

lxxxii CALS, WS 1599

lxxxiii Lockyer, op. cit.

lxxxiv HD HEN 6/1 - documents dated August 1619

lxxxv For Dr More's purchase, HD HEN 6/5 - deed dated 10 Nov. 1618; see also Thoroton's *History of Nottinghamshire* vol. 3: republished with large additions by John Throsby, 1796 at <http://www.british-history.ac.uk/report.aspx?compid=76935> [accessed 10 April 2014]. Lady Alice Dormer was the daughter of Sir Richard Molineux of the presbyterian Sefton family; her first husband Sir John Gilbert of Devon having died in 1608, she married Sir William Dormer who died in 1616 - see *Historical Collections of the Essex Institute*, vol. XVII, Essex., Mass., 1859, Gilbert pedigree opposite p. 40 - online at <https://archive.org/details/essexinstitutehiv17esse> [accessed 15 March 2014]. Her lands suffered sequestration for both delinquency and recusancy, and six months after her death, given by G. Oliver, *Collections illustrating the history of the Catholic religion in the counties of Cornwall, Devon etc.*, 1857, p. 213 as 2 July 1650 (no will has been found), Sir Henry Moore bart. of Fawley had to seek confirmation of his title to Kne(v)eton Manor, which he had acquired

lxxxvi see for instance NA PR/SW/3/24, PR/SW/2/8

lxxxvii 'Chronicles of Thelwall, co. Chester.....' - see Part 1 Appendix 5

lxxxviii HD HEN 6/5 - deed dated 3 Dec. 1621

lxxxix HD HEN 6/5 - deed dated 26 Jan. 1631. Askwith had acquired this property from Jane Talbot, the late dowager of Edward 8th earl of Shrewsbury

xc HD HEN 6/5 - deeds dated 25-31 Oct. 1633