

**WILLIAM LLOYD, BISHOP OF NORWICH,
'A VERY ABLE AND WORTHY PASTOR.'**

by Amos C. Miller

SUMMARY

William Lloyd (1637-1710), the Nonjuror Bishop of Norwich, held the see from 1685 to 1690. His greatest talent lay in church government; and in his attempt to raise clerical standards he set his face against the sale of licences for clandestine marriages and against the negligence of officials and clerical laxity. Despite his adherence to the doctrine of the divine right, he supported the Seven Bishops in their opposition to James II's Second Declaration of Indulgence. He refused, however, to swear allegiance to William III, and he later became leader of the Nonjuror church. Honesty, ability and integrity were the characteristics of his episcopate.

In July 1685 William Lloyd was elected Bishop of Norwich, an office which he held for nearly five years until his expulsion as a Non-Juror in 1690.¹ It is the purpose of this paper to study his character and activities during this neglected period of his life.² By birth Lloyd was a man of modest origins who had risen rapidly in the service of the Church. After receiving his M.A. from St. John's College, Cambridge in 1662, he embarked on a varied and interesting career.³ He became chaplain to the English factory at Lisbon and wrote a description of the revolution which resulted in the deposition of the Portuguese king in the autumn of 1667.⁴ Later he obtained appointments as prebendary of St. Paul's, vicar of Battersea, and then chaplain to Thomas, Lord Clifford, Charles II's Catholic Lord Treasurer. In 1679, at the unusually early age of 38, he became Bishop of Llandaff and three years later, Bishop of Peterborough.⁵

Lloyd acquired an excellent reputation as a preacher. In February 1673 John Evelyn heard him give a sermon and noted that he 'spoke admirably well.' Early in February 1684 he heard him preach again, and with even greater enthusiasm reported that Lloyd had shown 'in a most elegant and practical discourse what it was to walk worthy of the Glory to be revealed, namely to live religiously and holily and such a life as becomes the Ends and design of God to exalt us to his heavenly kingdom.'⁶

It was in the practical sphere of church government, however, that Lloyd's greatest talent lay. Though no theologian or scholar, he proved himself an able administrator, strict in matters of discipline and in his dealings with Papists and sectaries. He was also interested in raising the standards of men receiving ordination. In 1685 he and Thomas Ken, Bishop of Bath and Wells, joined in an attempt to secure greater vigilance in the admission of candidates to holy orders.⁷ Especially valuable to Lloyd was his close friendship with William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury. Like Sancroft he was a High Churchman and a devoted servant of the monarchy. Though cautious by temperament, he was a person of independent spirit ready to defend his Church's interest against threat from any quarter.

Two episodes reveal him in a characteristic light. In July 1684, as Bishop of Peterborough, Lloyd suspended a minister for administering the sacrament to a parishioner sitting in his pew. When the clergyman begged him to lift his punishment and promised conformity in the future, Lloyd told him that it was expedient to suspend him

'to let the trimming tribe know that it is not always safe upon their own prudential motives to be a fooling with the laws which are the public wisdom of the nation.'⁸ In April 1685, two months before he was elected Bishop of Norwich and shortly after James II ascended the throne, Lloyd learned that the new King had issued a pardon to all persons who had been excommunicated. This measure, he warned Sancroft, would 'at one blow dash into pieces all that hath been done for their reformation' in recent years. He asked the Archbishop to persuade the King to pardon only those who submitted to the orders of the Church and had paid the fines assessed against them. 'I know full well,' he concluded, 'that your Grace hath business enough upon your hands at this time, and that it would become me to be silent rather than add to your troubles, but my Lord I cannot sit still when the case of God's Church seems to be slighted.'⁹

In September 1685 Lloyd set out from London to undertake his duties as Bishop. On entering the county of Norfolk he was greeted with an enthusiasm that seemed to auger well for his future success. At Attleborough 28 miles further on the Norwich road his coach was met by Sir John Holland and by other members of the local gentry and clergy. So numerous were his well-wishers that by the time Lloyd had come within two miles of Norwich his company had swelled to over 300, and when he entered the city the mayor and aldermen dressed in their robes of office conducted him to the Cathedral. There three of the prebendaries and the choir accompanied him to his seat where he remained until the conclusion of evening service.¹⁰

In the weeks that followed Lloyd received so many visits from local people that, he complained to Sancroft: 'Their great kindness becomes, in a manner, a great burden or at least such a debt that I do not know well how to discharge it.'¹¹ Perhaps he considered such treatment to be a positive embarrassment since he soon found numerous individuals in the diocese against whom he needed to take sharp corrective action. His Chancellor, Dr. Robert Pepper, was engaged in a dispute with the commissaries who were important judicial officers in the archdeacons' courts. The quarrel evidently related to the fees charged by ecclesiastical courts, and in this matter Lloyd found that clerical officials were guilty of grave abuses. 'The plain truth is,' he told Sancroft, 'they are all faulty, running after sordid lucre to the oppression of the country [county] and dishonour of the Church and its regular discipline.'¹²

An especially lucrative practice was the issuance of blank licences for the performance of clandestine marriages for which the officials involved including the clergyman who conducted the ceremony would normally receive ample payment. Such marriages often took place without the publication of banns and without the knowledge of the couples' family and friends. This abuse was especially widespread in the late seventeenth century following the unstable social and religious conditions of the Interregnum.¹³

Lloyd encountered his first example of a clandestine marriage in the diocese two weeks after his arrival. Embarrassingly enough, the man married was a kinsman of the Archbishop of Canterbury, but Lloyd immediately suspended two officials for issuing the licence and told Sancroft that he would have inflicted the same punishment on the person who had performed the ceremony but that he had escaped him temporarily by going to King's Lynn.¹⁵ To curb this practice he commanded officials of the diocese to bring in the numerous blank licences so that he might cancel them. He also directed that an order dealing with clandestine marriages be posted in every parish church.¹⁵ In the autumn of 1686 nevertheless Richard Hughes, a minor canon of his own cathedral, secretly married a girl who lived with her aunt in the cathedral close. Had she first

obtained the consent of her family, Lloyd reported, she might have had a dowry of £4000 to £5000. He excommunicated the canon and his bride, the minister who had conducted the service, and the registrar who issued the licence. A few days after he had imposed these penalties, a Suffolk gentleman came to Norwich to complain that his daughter had clandestinely married his coachman. The registrar who had issued the licence was the same man who had done so in the case of Richard Hughes.¹⁶

One of his prebendaries gives a brief but vivid account of Lloyd's efforts to suppress clandestine marriage. On his arrival in Norwich clerical officials were hawking blank licences like tradesmen selling their wares in the market place. When he tried to halt these abuses, commissaries and registrars who profited from them came 'with open mouths' to complain that he was depriving them of a valuable perquisite and that clandestine marriage was tolerated both by the archbishops and their bishops throughout the kingdom. Lloyd, however, persisted with some success until he discovered that high officials of the Archbishop of Canterbury were sending blank licenses into his diocese. He then gave up the struggle 'lest', as he said, 'it appear a ridiculous singularity in me.'¹⁷

In addition to misconduct by his lesser clergy Lloyd was confronted by what he considered gross negligence on the part of his principal subordinates. His chancellor was continually absent in London; his four archdeacons failed to assist him in administering ordinations as required by cathedral statutes. John Spencer, Archdeacon of Sudbury and Master of Corpus Christi, Cambridge, had also neglected to give the Advent sermon required of him at the Cathedral. The result of such behaviour, Lloyd complained, was to leave 'the whole weight of a confused diocese' to fall on his shoulders.¹⁷

His reaction to these affronts was prompt and vigorous, but the conflict that followed was one all too common in human affairs: the zealous new administrator shocked and disillusioned by the laxity confronting him and determined to set his house in order; his subordinates equally shocked to find their easy going habits suddenly under challenge. Lloyd threatened to summon the archdeacons before his consistory court and to suspend them from their offices.¹⁹ They immediately sent him letters pleading that former bishops had not required their presence on these occasions, and that since they resided some distance from Norwich, the bad roads and the cold and wet of winter made travel especially difficult. They also mentioned various physical ailments: the Archdeacon of Norfolk claimed that he was afflicted with hemorrhoids, the Archdeacon of Sudbury that he suffered such infirmity of body that he had been unable to ride a horse for the past five years.²⁰

Lloyd accepted the excuses of all these men except John Spencer for he had not only failed to give his Advent sermon but had sent as his deputy, Clement Scott, a young Fellow of the College, towards whom Lloyd seems to have taken an immediate dislike.²¹ We have Spencer's account of the meeting between Scott and Lloyd, and it provides a mordant portrait of the Bishop of Norwich. According to Spencer, Lloyd launched into a pompous tirade: 'Every man is to preach his own course [sermon] in person and not by deputation. The Master of Benet [Corpus Christi] is he? He's Dean of Ely too, I think, but he's not bishop here though not yet and has nothing to do to put up preachers or send his Fellows hither.'²²

Scott tried to excuse Spencer's absence, but Lloyd refused to listen and called it 'a great indecency' that Spencer had not bothered to write a letter of apology. He also refused to permit Scott to preach in Spencer's place because he did not carry his letters of ordination with him. Scott, in fact, had been ordained a few years earlier in Norwich and

held a curacy in the diocese, but Lloyd's suspicions of him were quickly confirmed; within two weeks of their meeting he learned that Scott had made pro-Catholic statements and comments derogatory to the Church of England.²³

John Spencer, on the other hand, was a distinguished scholar, who had just completed a brilliant and original work on Hebrew law. In seventeen years since he had been appointed Archdeacon of Sudbury he had never once set foot within the precincts of the city or Cathedral of Norwich but had been allowed to perform most of his duties by deputy.²⁴ He considered Lloyd's demand that he journey 46 miles from Cambridge without regard to his own health or the conditions of travel 'an arbitrary imposition.' He informed him that a statute of Henry VIII exempted masters of colleges from 'that strict personal attendance on their dignities which is incumbent on other persons,' and he wrote a nine page letter justifying his conduct to the Archbishop of Canterbury.²⁵

Such behaviour only made Lloyd more determined to bring this cloistered, complacent academic to book. Archbishop Sancroft, however, seems to have advised a more lenient course, while Spencer refused to admit any error on his part and invoked his privilege as a member of Convocation to halt whatever legal action the Bishop of Norwich might take against him.²⁶ It soon became depressingly clear to Lloyd that his plan to discipline the Archdeacon of Sudbury had little hope of success. He wrote Sancroft a letter in which there is a note of spiritual masochism, combined perhaps with irony and a veiled reproach to his friend for not supporting him in this matter. 'My Lord,' he said, 'I have one request . . . and it is to desire your Grace will be pleased to let me see my pincers drawn by Archdeacon Spencer. It may be a good way to teach me a most necessary lesson viz humility, and with all it may instruct me how far an archdeacon may depend upon the privilege of the Convocation.'²⁷ At any rate, Lloyd did not suspend his defiant subordinate, and there is no evidence that the latter ever had to interrupt his scholarly activities to make a journey to Norwich.²⁸ Lloyd was probably unreasonable in suddenly enforcing regulations that had long fallen into disuse, but whatever the merits of the dispute he had clearly overreached himself – possibly because his temper had been inflamed by overwork and ill health.²⁹

Though the circumstances were very different, it is amusing to note that soon after he had refused to accept Spencer's plea of ill health or his right to send a deputy to give his Advent sermon, Lloyd himself asked Sancroft's permission to have a deputy preach for him in the King's chapel at Whitehall. Lloyd complained that he was so sick that he could 'not ride on horseback or sit in a coach three days together.'³⁰

Despite this defeat at the hands of John Spencer, Lloyd did not desist in efforts to correct the faults of his clergy. The most outrageous malefactor was Francis Buxton, M.A. of Caius College, Cambridge who had already suffered suspension and excommunication by Lloyd's two predecessors as Bishop of Norwich. Buxton had recently been imprisoned in Norwich Castle for picking up wenches on the highway and sleeping with them in alehouses, for firing a brace of pistols at one man and striking another with a weapon called a 'Protestant flail.'³⁰ In March 1686 he and several other clergymen were released from gaol because of a general royal pardon. 'The famous Buxton,' Lloyd informed Sancroft, 'had the confidence to come to me (two hours after he had pleaded the pardon) to desire a licence to teach schools.' Lloyd indignantly replied that before Buxton received a licence from him, he would have to make a public recantation of his scandalous conduct.³¹

Late in June 1686 Buxton submitted a written confession to Lloyd in which he

acknowledged himself guilty of sexual incontinence, swearing, cursing, drunkenness and fighting. In the presence of the Bishop in Norwich Cathedral he professed his sorrow for such misconduct and pledged that he would bring no further disgrace upon the Church.³² His remorse was short lived. Early the following year Buxton performed a clandestine marriage for five guineas. The bride was an orphan with a dowry of £1500. 'I do not know what to do with the villain,' Lloyd added, 'for he hath neither benefice or cure and therefore no suspension but that of the civil magistrate can reach him...'³³

Lloyd could show compassion as well as rigour in dealing with an errant clergyman. In some instances he seems generous and trusting to a fault. In December 1686 he asked Sancroft to approve the appointment of a young man named Rively as deacon of a church in Norwich despite the fact that he was five months short of his twenty third birthday, the minimum age for this post. Lloyd justified his request on the grounds that the candidate was a senior bachelor at Corpus Christi and an individual of sober and studious character. He also mentioned that the youth's father, a Norwich minister, was unable to maintain him any longer in the College.³⁴ Sancroft gave his consent but then discovered that the individual in question was younger than the age which Lloyd had given. When he heard of the Archbishop's annoyance over this matter, he informed Dr. Humphrey Paman, an acquaintance of Sancroft, that Mr. Rively had misrepresented his son's age, adding: 'I do beg his Grace's favour with this assurance, that I will never be an advocate in that nature again, and I trust his Grace will not have any occasion to repent of his kindness...'³⁵

Another example of Lloyd's good nature is revealed in his treatment of the minister whom he had suspended for performing the marriage of Richard Hughes and Sarah England. Learning that the poor man received only an income of £10 to £12 a year from his living, he suggested to Sancroft that the penalty ought to be lifted since this clergyman was living in extreme poverty.³⁶ A worse case was Francis Barber who made himself a perpetual nuisance by engaging in law suits against other clergymen. Lloyd persuaded Barber to end a dispute with another minister by offering him £3 out of his own pocket, but this 'exceeding rash and passionate' man, as Lloyd called him, immediately began another suit against Lloyd's chancellor. Once more Lloyd gave him some money and bade him live in peace with his neighbours.³⁷

This kindness only whetted Barber's appetite; a week later he charged the Chancellor and three minor canons with holding fourteen livings contrary to the law against pluralism. When Barber appeared in the Consistory Court, he behaved in such an obstreperous manner that a constable was summoned to take him before a justice of the peace. Later Lloyd received a visit from Barber's wife, and he warned her that her husband would be arrested unless he discontinued a law suit in which he was now engaged. 'I suppose I shall hear no more of him,' he told Archbishop Sancroft wearily, 'till towards Michaelmas term, for then his house rent is to be paid, and then out comes another remonstrance.'³⁸ Concerned as he was with such misconduct on the part of his clergy, Lloyd recognized where the real cause of much of it lay. In January 1686 he reminded Sancroft of the small and precarious incomes of the clergy in Norwich and asked him to persuade the King to write a letter to the Corporation urging the provision of a settled maintenance for them.³⁹

Despite the many anxieties and irritations he suffered on their account, Lloyd did gain respect and cooperation from many of his clergy. Humphrey Prideaux, a newly appointed prebendary of Norwich Cathedral wrote to a friend in October 1686: 'We have

here a very excellent person for our bishop which is a great comfort to us.⁴⁰ During the Lenten season of 1686 Lloyd reported that he and his clergy were persuading many people to undergo confirmation. His ministers, he said, were so diligent in the matter 'that there was a kind of commendable emulation who shall most to be confirmed.'⁴¹ He himself confirmed numerous substantial citizens, including three aldermen and their families. By Easter over 7000 confirmations had been performed, 1200 of whom were under sixteen years of age.⁴²

In the summer of 1686 Lloyd and the other bishops received orders to organize a collection of funds for impoverished Huguenots who had fled France as a result of Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Within a few weeks' time, assisted by the archdeacons and clergy of his diocese, he was able to send more than £1000 to London, and he continued to transmit money for this purpose thereafter. At the same time he solicited aid from the government on behalf of an impoverished Huguenot community which had resided in Ipswich since the reign of Elizabeth.⁴³

Lloyd's relationship with the laymen of his diocese was generally excellent. At dinner with the mayor, sheriffs and aldermen of Norwich he reproached them with laxity in religious matters, saying that it was very odd to see them come to church every Sunday and not take the sacrament. The rebuke was well received, and two weeks later Lloyd had the pleasure of seeing them arrive in a body 'with becoming reverence and devotion' to take communion at the Cathedral.⁴⁴ In March 1686 he was shocked to hear that a fair was regularly held near the Cathedral churchyard on Good Friday. He protested to the mayor and council but had little hope that his words would be heeded. 'Present [immediate] profit is a prevailing argument with tradesmen,' he growled. Nevertheless, a proclamation was issued which altered the date of the fair.⁴⁵

Occasionally Lloyd's benevolence had unexpected results. On first becoming bishop, he ordered the collection of alms at the Cathedral doors on Wednesdays and Fridays in Lent and on other important days of the Church calendar. This task was given to the lay clerks of the Cathedral and was regularly performed until Easter Sunday 1688. On this occasion Lloyd especially exhorted the congregation to be generous in their charity, but after the service when 'many well disposed persons' came to the doors with their money ready, no one was there to receive it. The clerks were asked why they had failed in their duty, but they denounced it as slavery and declared that they would never do it again. On being formally admonished by the Chapter for their disobedience, they refused to apologize, and one of the clerks told a verger who had reported the incident that 'he would crack his crown and bump his brich (buttocks) against the ground.'⁴⁶

This episode illustrates a violence characteristic of all classes at this time. Lloyd's contemporary Thomas White, Bishop of Peterborough, in his younger days, won a fist fight with a trooper who had insulted him. Delighted at this display of clerical pugnacity, Charles II jokingly threatened him with a charge of high treason for assaulting a member of the King's Guard.⁴⁷

Lloyd also used his influence to settle personal problems of people in his diocese. He heard that a gentleman named Spilman had discovered his wife in bed with another man. Spilman appears to have given her a jointure of £1000 and made a deed of the same amount to be paid her upon his death. Now he feared for his life because he believed his 'naughty consort,' as Lloyd called her, wanted to be rid of him so that she could enjoy her pleasure and her husband's money. Lloyd offered to act as a mediator between Mr. Spilman and his wife if they both submitted their differences to him.⁴⁸

We next hear of the case six months later. By this time the couple had separated. The husband sent a friend to present his side of the case, and Lloyd summoned his wife by letter. Accompanied by her father, she came to the Bishop's residence early in June 1687. Lloyd gives an affecting account of the meeting which followed. 'It grieved my heart,' he wrote, 'to see the old gentleman introducing his daughter full of grief and sorrow, and she herself scarce able to speak, being overwhelmed with tears and passion . . . the poor woman utterly denies the thing charged upon her, but confesseth that she was not as prudent in her demeanor as she ought to have been, considering her husband's temper. My desire is to prevent extremities and to endeavour a reconciliation.'⁴⁹ Unfortunately nothing more is heard of the case.

While Lloyd's correspondence is primarily devoted to the affairs of his diocese, there are hints of his growing fears for the welfare of the Church as a whole. On ascending the throne in February 1685 James II announced his intention of maintaining the existing government in church and state. Within a month's time, however, he threatened to withdraw his promise unless the bishops put a stop to anti-Catholic sermons by their clergy. He also suspended the operation of penal statutes against Catholic recusants. The apparent contradiction between the King's words and actions inevitably made the clergy uneasy. As a High Churchman and as a committed adherent of the doctrine of divine right and of non-resistance to royal authority, Lloyd undoubtedly believed that the correct course under present circumstances was to give such an unqualified demonstration of loyalty that James would have no excuse to reconsider his pledge to the Established Church.

Two days after the King's birthday in October 1685 Lloyd gave Sancroft a detailed description of the enthusiastic celebrations that had taken place on that occasion. He also asked a friend in London whether they ought to be reported in the London Gazette, the government's semi-official newspaper.⁵⁰ Other clergymen under Lloyd's authority were not so discreet. In January 1686 a minister named Wharton gave a sermon in Norwich Cathedral in Lloyd's presence which cast doubt on the King's intention to defend the Church of England. Lloyd was so disturbed by this incident that he wrote three letters concerning it to the Archbishop of Canterbury. He told Sancroft that he immediately summoned the minister and rebuked him for his folly and imprudence in questioning the promise of a ruler famous throughout Europe as a man of his word. Yet he added a comment that intimated his own doubts concerning that promise and the common sense of peril which both men shared. 'Mr. Wharton,' he said, 'sin no more in this kind lest a worse thing befall you and me.' Lloyd then ordered that every clergyman who preached in the Cathedral should submit his sermon before hand for his inspection.⁵² His letter to Sancroft also suggests his fears concerning the spread of Catholicism now that it enjoyed royal patronage. Wharton, he reported, had claimed that his sermon had been inspired by the fact that his son, a student at Caius College, Cambridge had fallen under the influence of several young Catholic proselytes, one of whom was his room-mate. Significantly Lloyd concluded by begging the Archbishop to 'burn this letter after the perusing of it.'⁵²

Whatever anxiety he may have felt for his own safety, Lloyd was ready to strike at those who voiced Catholic opinions or questioned Anglican teachings. Learning that Archdeacon Spencer's deputy, Clement Scott, had openly defended prayer to the Virgin Mary and had made a ribald comment about the Book of Homilies in the Common Prayer Book, he immediately threatened him with excommunication. Scott only escaped

this punishment by a humble apology and by declaring his unqualified acceptance of the doctrines and liturgy of the Church of England.⁵³

In addition to his fellowship at Corpus Christi Scott held the position of curate at All Saints, King's Lynn. There his vicar was Mordaunt Webster, a clergyman who had once been minister to two other churches in the town. Violent quarrels with their congregations had resulted in his dismissal more than ten years before, but he still remained vicar of All Saints. Late in the reign of Charles II he spent some time in the Catholic seminary of St. Omer's in the Netherlands. On returning to England about the time James II came to the throne he joined in a campaign against the Church of England and on behalf of Catholicism in London and in King's Lynn, Norwich and elsewhere in Norfolk.⁵⁴ However, he did not give up his vicarage immediately, and Lloyd first refers to him there in January 1686 as one who was attacking the doctrines and discipline of the Church of England.⁵⁵

Three months later he had a long conversation with Webster in order to discover the exact nature of his beliefs. The vicar of All Saints was a very different man from his curate. Though deeply embittered by his past experience as an Anglican clergyman, Webster was a person of strong and resourceful character. He took care not to declare his Catholic beliefs openly at this time. Instead he told Lloyd that he upheld the doctrine of the Church of England as stated in the Thirty nine Articles and as it was understood by Lancelot Andrewes, John Overall and Richard Montague. Andrewes was the foremost Arminian theologian of the Church of England; Overall and Montagu were men of the same views and Lloyd's predecessors as Bishop of Norwich. However, Webster declared that he refused to accept Anglican doctrine as interpreted by Edward Stillingfleet and John Tillotson, two prominent churchmen whose anti-Catholic sermons had offended James II. For the moment Lloyd decided to take no action against so astute an opponent. He told Sancroft that Webster had given him no certain grounds for accusation and that none of his neighbours in King's Lynn would testify that they had heard him attack the Church of England.⁵⁶

A stronger reason for Lloyd's hesitation in proceeding against the vicar of All Saints soon became clear. In addition to his vicarage Webster held the position of schoolmaster in the parish of Clement Danes in London where he appears to have gained access to the King and his court at St. James. In September 1686 Lloyd informed a friend that Webster had returned to King's Lynn, and was trying to win converts among the people there.

He had also forbidden the clerk at All Saints to sing psalms. The churchwardens and parishioners complained to Lloyd that when Webster read the second service, he stood in the chancel where they could neither hear nor see him. After Lloyd had confirmed the truth of these charges, he ordered Webster to give the second service from the reading pew, where he could be heard by the congregation, except when he was administering the communion. 'With this,' Lloyd wrote, 'Mr. Webster chafed and spake great things of what he would do to me: he had complained of me at St. James, and he was sure my work was done for me.' 'This is the short account of Mr. Webster's playing the Bishop at Lynn, but for all Mr. Webster's menaces I am yet in being, and will not (by the grace of God) be wanting to my duty as far as I understand it.'⁵⁷ Lloyd's anxiety and his reluctance to deal with Webster at this moment can be easily understood. In May 1686 his subordinate, John Sharp, Dean of Norwich, had been suspended by the King as rector of St. Giles in the fields, for making anti-Catholic sermons. His friend, Archbishop Sancroft, had been excluded from the Privy Council two months later for refusing to join the Ecclesiastical

Commission which was being used by James II to suspend clergy who attacked Catholicism and to compel the universities to admit non-Anglican students and teachers.⁵⁸ Clearly the King was abandoning his policy of conciliation towards the Church of England.

On 4 April 1687 he published his First Declaration of Indulgence granting freedom of conscience to Catholics and Dissenters. This grant of toleration to its enemies was certainly another blow to the Church of England, but Lloyd does not seem to have been unduly disturbed concerning its consequences, at least as far as Dissenters were concerned. Ten days later he told Sancroft that the principal result of the measure in Norwich was the opening of a Dissenting conventicle, but that the Dissenters themselves had not yet decided whether it was to be for Presbyterians or Independents. Lloyd added that a Presbyterian minister, Dr. John Collinges had recently written him submissive letters. Now because of the Declaration, he had 'grown very pert and pragmatical and tells some of the clergy in this city that now he stands upon a level with them and well remembers the horrid persecution of the saints, and that he had rather enjoy the kindness of the Indulgence than submit to the unreasonable terms of the Church of England.' 'The truth is, Lloyd said, 'the poor man is made up of spleen and choler;' and so little regarded by some of his own proselytes that they had turned to Lloyd for counsel with the result that he had been able to persuade them to return to the Church of England.⁵⁹

Unlike many of his fellow clergy, Lloyd did not openly express disapproval of the Indulgence, but his real opinion is suggested by his wry comment that although he had placed more than a dozen ministers under threat of punishment, he could only 'between jest and earnest court them to a sober demeanor.'⁶⁰ At the instigation of the government an address to the King thanking him for the Indulgence was promoted by some whom Lloyd called the 'court bishops,' but he and the majority of the bishops and clergy refused to have anything to do with this proposal.⁶¹

Lloyd had far more serious difficulties with local Catholics. William Smith, a prebendary in his own cathedral was suspected of leanings towards Popery, and Catholics in Norwich petitioned the Corporation for the use of the old Dominican church. Their request was refused, but later as a result of the King's intervention, they received a lease of a place called the Graineries where Dissenters had formerly met.⁶² A man named Acton, described by a later writer as the 'chief mass priest of a Popish conventicle,' and Mordaunt Webster were trying to win converts in Norwich and carrying on a propaganda campaign on behalf of Roman Catholicism. Webster was especially zealous in his efforts to convert an attorney named Lambert by convincing him that no one could gain salvation within the Church of England because it was not part of the Catholic Church. To prove his point he offered to debate the matter with the Bishop of Norwich.⁶³

Lloyd accepted the challenge, and a meeting followed at the Bishop's Palace on 29 August 1687. Lambert, Acton, and two clergymen chosen by Lloyd were present. Fearing that Webster might later misrepresent his words to the King, Lloyd had stipulated that the conference be limited to an exchange of written statements. When Webster insisted on presenting his views verbally, Lloyd refused to hear him and both men lost their tempers. Lloyd declared that he would 'not enter the dung cart [debate] with an apostate curate of my own diocese.' Webster retorted that he might with equal justice call the Bishop a heretic and threatened to report him to the King. Soon thereafter the meeting broke up, and Lloyd appears to have had no further dealings with Webster, but so heated had their discussion become that later each man charged that the other had threatened to strike him.⁶⁴

Lloyd continued to be troubled by the priest, Acton, and by a faction with him who were working for the spread of Catholicism. Both Lloyd and his able prebendary, Humphrey Prideaux strove to counter their activities, but the Bishop preserved a cautious silence on this subject in his correspondence except on one occasion. On 6 February 1688 he informed Sancroft that Papists were holding frequent meetings in Norwich in which they attacked those who would not consent to the repeal of the penal laws. The past week, he continued, they had intended 'to draw articles against me for somewhat I preached here last Christmas day. They have had several meetings about it, as I am well informed by one who is one of their gang. How far they will proceed besides drinking my confusion a little time will tell. They have spies in all our churches and watch all opportunities for our ruin.'⁶⁵

In April 1688, when James II issued his Second Declaration of Indulgence, the apparent threat to the Church finally caused the Archbishop of Canterbury to abandon his caution in its defence. Sancroft, 'who had the greatest confidence in his wisdom and integrity,' summoned Lloyd to London to consult with the other bishops concerning the Declaration. To avoid having his letter intercepted Sancroft told his servant to carry it to the first post office on the Norwich road and have it placed in the bag destined for that city. Due to an error by the postmaster the letter was delayed with the result that Lloyd did not reach London until after Sancroft and six bishops had sent a petition to the King on 18 May against the Declaration, and against his order that they instruct their clergy to read it from the pulpit. Five days later, however, following his arrival in London, Lloyd not only added his signature to the petition but gave counsel and assistance to the bishops in their defence against the charge of seditious libel brought against them by the government.⁶⁶

On 1 June he informed Sancroft that he had secured the services of Henry Pollexfen, a prominent attorney, on their behalf. After their imprisonment he visited Sancroft and the bishops in the Tower and continued to correspond with the Archbishop.⁶⁷ He also contributed a gift of £8 to the expense of their trial.⁶⁸ So determined were Lloyd's efforts that the government threatened that he might join the other bishops in the Tower. Nevertheless he did not limit his activities to matters relating to the trial. Prior to 3 June, the date on which the Declaration was to be read, he sent 2000 copies of a letter attacking it, probably written by the Anglican divine, William Sherlock, to Humphrey Prideaux for distribution to all the clergy in the diocese. As a result of Prideaux's endeavours, the Declaration was only read in four of five out of 1200 parishes.⁶⁹

Lloyd returned to Norwich prior to the trial of the seven Bishops on 30 June, and it was there two days later that he received word of their acquittal. Immediately he wrote Sancroft a glowing letter in which he asked him 'to give me leave among the thousands of others in these parts heartily to congratulate with you and your late companions in trouble for the most joyful and most acceptable news we had this day by the post, namely your acquittal from the crimes endeavoured to be fixed upon you. I do assure your grace it hath mightily revived our drooping spirits, and I beseech God to make us . . . sincerely thankful for so great a mercy.'⁷⁰

During the summer and autumn of 1688, while the prospect of invasion by William of Orange lay over the country, Lloyd remained in Norwich. He took no further part in affairs of state but kept an anxious eye on events on a local and national level. Late in September he informed Sancroft of rumours of invasion and of military preparations in his area to deal with it. He also described the King's efforts to pack the coming

Parliament with members favourable to his religious policies. Among the boroughs of the county only Norwich, he said, was likely to elect men devoted to the Church of England, but after his bold actions of the previous spring Lloyd was now prepared to speak his mind more clearly. At the end of his letter he added this tart comment: 'I hear that some of the bishops are called on to consider of some snide overtures from the Court. And I hope that no court holy water shall be able to slacken or shake the present good understanding among the nobility, clergy and gentry of the Church of England.'⁷¹

On 5 November, the day of William's landing at Torbay, Lloyd, like Sancroft and several other bishops, denied that he had any part in inviting the Prince of Orange to England.⁷² Unquestionably, his denial was sincere. If he had lost his faith in James as a man, he still preserved his loyalty to him as King. Indeed, he had viewed the invasion with forboding, and as a Christian and a clergyman he had no liking for soldiers or warlike proceedings of any kind. The previous spring he had commented with wry humour on the conduct of some troops in Norwich: 'This day the dragoons marched away; they left behind them much of their baggage, I mean a number of big bellied women.' Now, in the autumn of 1688, he noted the activities of a regiment training nearby: 'The noise of drums with some volleys of small shot is our present melancholy entertainment.'⁷³

By this time far more disturbing events were taking place in Norwich. In October 1688, even before William's landing, a mob estimated to be a thousand in number attacked a Catholic chapel in the city.⁷⁴ Once he had entered the country and James's authority began to disintegrate anti-Catholic riots broke out in London, Norwich and other cities. According to Humphrey Prideaux's biographer, on 7 and 8 December a mob burned all the furniture in the Catholic chapel and pillaged several houses belonging to Catholics in Norwich. Finally they were dispersed by the trained bands. The following Friday, when the King was preparing to flee from London, the mob in Norwich assembled again and threatened to plunder the Bishop's residence, the Cathedral and its close. 'Having timely notice of their design,' Dr. Prideaux 'ordered the gates of the Close to be shut up and the inhabitants arming themselves for their defence, repulsed the rabble who attacked them to the number of 500 men and made them desist from their enterprise.' The following night when the mob rose again, citizens all over the city, taking courage from Prideaux's example, 'stood to their defence' and put an end to the disorders.⁷⁵

Nothing of these disturbances is mentioned in Lloyd's letters at this time. In December 1688 he went to London to attend the meeting of the Convention Parliament. After William's arrival in England Lloyd had joined most of the bishops in congratulating him for delivering the country from the threat of 'Popery and arbitrary power.'⁷⁶ It soon became clear, however, that most of the Whigs and many Tories were likely to offer the throne to William of Orange now that James had fled to France. To Lloyd, Sancroft and several other bishops this would violate the principles of divine right and hereditary succession to which they still adhered. On 27 December Lloyd and Francis Turner, Bishop of Ely dined with Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon, and discussed with him the possibility of giving William royal authority as regent while allowing James the actual title of King. Then they broached the matter to the Tory leader, Thomas Osborne, Earl of Danby and later told Clarendon 'his lordship was very reserved and that they could not make any discovery of his mind.'⁷⁷

Danby's coolness towards this proposal was a forewarning of its fate in Parliament.

When a bill for the establishment of a regency was introduced into the House of Lords late in January 1689, it was defeated, though Lloyd and eleven other bishops voted for it.⁷⁸ Lloyd's position remained unaltered by Parliament's action in offering the crown to William and Mary. In February, just before they were proclaimed King and Queen of England, he dined at Lambeth with several of the bishops. According to the diarist, Edmund Bohun, Lloyd mentioned that he had been appointed to preach at court the following Wunday. He then asked Henry Compton, Bishop of London, 'how it was expected he should pray, observing that he was willing to pray for the King and Queen and all the royal family without naming any, but he should not pray for King William and Queen Mary.'⁷⁹

Later Lloyd asked Sancroft what action he should take if he received a summons requiring his presence at the coronation where those in attendance would be asked to swear an oath to the new King.⁸⁰ The view of Lloyd and other officials who upheld the principle of indefeasible hereditary succession was that having given an oath to James II as their rightful king and to his son as his lawful successor, they could not acknowledge another in his place without committing perjury. When a bill was passed requiring an oath of allegiance in April 1689, Lloyd, Sancroft and four of the Seven Bishops who had gone to the Tower in June of the previous year refused it. Under the terms of the Act they and other clergymen in the same position were first suspended for six months when they did not take the oath and then deprived of their offices in February 1690.⁸¹ By nature Lloyd was not a man who lightly put his career at risk for any cause. In March 1689 before he took this final step, he wrote to Sancroft with mingled apprehension and fatalism: 'The clouds are thick and the storms ready to fall upon us, but I trust that divine goodness will enable us to submit to his holy and wise dispensation.'⁸² However great his anxiety, Lloyd never showed the slightest doubt afterwards concerning the decision he had taken.

During his final two years as Bishop of Norwich while these events were taking place, Lloyd continued to face a variety of human problems in his diocese. In November 1688 he informed Sancroft concerning the case of John Gibbs, rector of Gissing for the past twenty years, who had gone over to Rome but now came to Lloyd 'with bitter tears,' and offered to give any satisfaction that would enable him to gain reconciliation with the Church of England. Lloyd required him to give a written statement of the motives which led him to embrace Catholicism and then to desire reunion with the Anglican Church. With his usual kindness, however, he asked that Gibbs not be compelled to publish it in his own church: 'I do not desire to be counted severe in exacting that which may be considered too much for a humble penitent Christian.' But he was compelled to give a sermon denouncing the errors which had caused him to leave the Church.⁸³

Like Lloyd, Gibbs became a Nonjuror and for this reason was expelled from his living. Thereafter he was allowed to live in the north porch chamber of his church and lay upon the stairs that went up to the rood loft between the church and the chancel, 'having a window at his head so that he could lie in his narrow couch and see the altar.' He remained there many years until his death at an advanced age.⁸⁴

Far more serious were two other cases with which Lloyd had to deal at this time. In February 1689 he received a letter from Edward Wharton, vicar of Shotesham concerning a chaplain of his parish named Daniel who confessed to him the crime of bestiality with two of his mares. 'Willing I was,' Wharton wrote, 'to give what ease I could to a grieved conscience, but when I came to search the wound I found it so full of

filth that it startled and affrighted me. The poor soul was sensible of what danger he had trapped himself should his vileness be ever known. Yet was the horror of his conscience such, so pungent and tormenting, that he was not able to endure the sting and lash of it.' Wharton added that he had given the man as much comfort as possible without disguising the enormity of his actions, and he asked Lloyd's counsel in dealing with the matter.⁸⁵

Lloyd presented Sancroft with two important issues raised in this case. Although the crime had been revealed in a confessional, could it be kept from the civil authorities? If it were not considered expedient to disclose the incident, what penance could be imposed, since the offence exceeded the 'general rules of discipline.' He mentioned that he had consulted Sir Edward Coke's *Institutes of the Laws of England* and found that bestiality was a crime punishable by death. He pointed out, however, that to reveal an individual's voluntary confession was 'fatal and mischievous' except in relation to the most serious crimes like treason.⁸⁶ What answer Sancroft gave to these questions is unknown, but it is unlikely that so discreet a man would have permitted the revelation of such scandalous conduct by a member of his profession.

Less than a month later Lloyd was confronted with an equally discreditable case. He informed Sancroft that he had received 'informations' (signed accusations) charging Stephen Grigges, a young minister of Norwich with attempting an act of sodomy with an apothecary's servant in the city and with a student of Corpus Christi, Cambridge where Grigges had received his M.A. in 1687.⁸⁷ Lloyd believed the charges to be true, and he became almost comical in his outrage and horror. Stephen Grigges, he called 'the beast,' and he referred to Daniel, the penitent chaplain, as 'the beast of Shotesham.' Where Grigges was concerned, the matter was already known to several people. 'It's certain,' Lloyd said, 'the case is so notorious that it cannot be concealed and stifled without the greatest scandal to the Christian religion.' On the other hand, if he took judicial action against Grigges, he would bring him in danger of his life, for homosexual acts were also capital offences.⁸⁸

Lloyd decided to bring charges against the accused man in his consistory court, but Grigges escaped his jurisdiction by appealing to the Court of Arches, the court of appeal for the Archdiocese of Canterbury.⁸⁹ In June 1690 a commission of the Court of Arches heard evidence in Norwich concerning Grigges. Numerous witnesses testified to his good character. Some had heard reports of his unseemly behaviour towards young men and youths, but none had observed it themselves and several expressed the opinion that he was the victim of malicious gossip. One man who described Grigges as 'a person of sober and unblameable life and conversation,' reported that when his wife was in childbed, he had received a visit from the young minister. Grigges, he said, slept in the same bed with him and had been guilty of no questionable conduct.⁹⁰

The following year Grigges pressed his luck too far, and a second commission was sent to hear further charges against him. It appears that in October 1690 he officiated at the marriage of a man named Andrew Johnson who lived some distance from Norwich. During a party after the wedding he was alleged to have made amorous advances to Johnson. Later when the bridegroom went outside to visit the privy, Grigges followed him there, threw him on the floor, and tried to assault him sexually. Only the arrival of another man compelled Grigges to desist. Afterwards Johnson was heard to complain: 'What, am I come so many miles to be thus abused by the parson?' When he left Norwich with his bride the following day, someone shouted at him: 'There goes Mr. Grigges'

mistress!⁹¹ As a result of the trial, Grigges was dismissed from the two parishes of which he was minister, thereby fulfilling Lloyd's fervent hope that he would 'meet justice according to his merits.'⁹²

Is it possible to reach any conclusions concerning the character of the clergy based on the examples of misconduct cited above? Perhaps two points can be made. Clergymen at this time enjoyed a freehold in their livings, and deprivation from holy orders was less frequent than now. Therefore it was extremely difficult to remove even a grossly unsuitable clergyman, as Lloyd discovered in the case of Francis Buxton. Still more significant are the general standards of behaviour that prevailed in society down to the eighteenth century. As already noted, people were rougher and more uninhibited in words and action.⁹³

An incident of a very different kind occurred in the spring of 1688, one which is of particular interest since it raised the possibility of witchcraft in Lloyd's mind. According to his report, a daughter-in-law of Sir Percy Gleane, a prominent citizen of Norwich, was brewing beer at her country house when a poor woman appeared and asked for some of the wort [unfermented beer] to drink. When a servant refused her request, the woman went away grumbling. Soon thereafter, instead of fermenting properly, the wort came out as if it had been mixed with tallow and gave off a vile smell. A little later while Mrs. Gleane was churning butter another beggar asked her for some milk. Mrs. Gleane offered her food but refused to give her any milk, and the woman went away discontented. The maid continued churning but no butter could be made, and such a foul odour came from the churn 'that they were obliged to give over and throw away the milk and churn and all.'⁹⁴

Lloyd had received this information from John Jeffery, rector of St. Peter Mancroft, Norwich where Mrs. Gleane was a parishioner. While at church on Good Friday, she became so ill that she was hardly able to walk home and then suffered convulsions which caused her limbs to be contorted in strange positions, and several of her joints to be dislocated. So rigid did her limbs become that not even wooden splints or iron bars could hold them straight. Jeffery reported other curious incidents: Mrs. Gleane was pulled half out of her bed by an invisible force; at night she was 'nipped and pulled' on various parts of her body so that they were covered with 'grievous black spots'. He also mentioned that the sick woman had been tormented by the presence of a mouse with a large slender body whom no one could drive away and of whom her cats were terrified. When she tried to read the bible, she was temporarily struck blind, and when her affliction was mentioned in prayer she would fall senseless.⁹⁵

At the time Lloyd reported this case, the woman had been ill for nearly four months and we do not know whether she recovered. It may seem strange that an educated man like the Bishop of Norwich should recount this story without questioning its credibility, but people convicted of witchcraft could still suffer the death penalty.⁹⁶ Even a distinguished scholar and physician like Sir Thomas Browne or a scientist such as Robert Boyle had not abandoned a belief in witches.⁹⁷ The whole episode, apparently resulting from a refusal of requests by two beggars illustrates Alan Macfarlane's suggestion that suspicion of witchcraft often arose in sixteenth and seventeenth century England when people felt that they had violated the traditional duty of charity: '... an accusation of witchcraft,' he wrote, 'was a clever way of reversing the guilt, of transferring it from a person who had failed in his social obligation . . . to the person who had made him fail.'⁹⁸

After his ejection from the bishopric of Norwich, Lloyd's existence was one of

frequent danger and difficulty. In the spring of 1688 he and the other Nonjuror bishops had been public heroes for their resistance to James II. Now they found themselves subject to popular hostility and official scrutiny. Even before his refusal to take the oath of Allegiance and Supremacy Lloyd had to face the possibility of mob violence in Norwich. In March 1689 he informed Sancroft that malicious people in the city had spread a false rumour that James II had lodged in his house before fleeing to France. Their purpose, he said, was 'to stir up the rabble to make me a visit under that notion, but I bless God even those unruly people had no such thought of me, so the contrivance was defeated.'⁹⁹

The following summer after he had moved to London, the English fleet was defeated at the battle of Beachy Head. The resulting panic precipitated outbursts of violence against suspected Jacobites. About 9 A.M. on 4 August 1690 two men came to his house with news that a mob 150 strong was tearing down dwellings nearby. Lloyd immediately took his wife and child in a hackney cab to the Temple where they remained until late afternoon. They then returned to find their house undamaged and the crowd dispersed by the arrival of a company of the trained bands.¹⁰⁰ The following spring Lloyd described himself as almost a prisoner in his own house under threat of prosecution. 'The true blue Protestant justices', he told Sancroft, 'are very punctual in pursuing their cruel and revengeful promise . . . to present me this term to the Grand Jury of Middlesex as an enemy to the government, not doubting the zealous men of the Grand Jury and the more zealous Dutchman and his officials will do my business for me.'¹⁰¹ Concerning this threat he defiantly wrote ' . . . for all their huffs I will fix my trust in God and despise their fierce wrath.'¹⁰² No action appears to have been taken against him, however.

In February 1692, less than two years before his death, Sancroft delegated his archiepiscopal authority to Lloyd who remained head of the Nonjuror Church for nearly eighteen years.¹⁰³ The choice was an excellent one, for Lloyd was a stronger personality than Sancroft and had already demonstrated exceptional physical and moral courage. In order to keep at the centre of affairs where he could more effectively serve his church, he lived first in London and later in the nearby village of Hammersmith, thereby exposing himself to greater danger than many of his fellow Nonjurors were prepared to face. 'My dear Lloyd,' Sancroft wrote, 'while others of us scamper away where they can find their convenience, remaining some beyond Jordan, others in the ships on the seashore, you still jeopard yourself to the utmost in the highest places of the field fixing yourself at the very point of danger, as the centre of unity filling the circumference with your care . . .'¹⁰⁴

Though ready to endure every risk to serve his cause, Lloyd was careful not to attack the Established Church or to give offence to the government. As a loyal Jacobite, he maintained contact with the exiled court at St. Germain, but he refused to involve himself in conspiracy. In January 1696 when a plot was being formed for the overthrow of King William, and James II was waiting to sail from Calais upon its successful execution, Lloyd had a secret meeting in London with his Jacobite friend Lord Ailesbury. Without speaking openly he indicated his knowledge of the conspiracy and showed Ailesbury a letter from James asking Lloyd to take action on his behalf. Ailesbury replied that he hoped James would recall the fate of the Duke of Buckingham who launched a rebellion against Richard III before Henry, Earl of Richmond had even embarked from France. 'My lord,' Lloyd said, 'one would think that you and I had consulted together, for I have the very same thoughts as you.'¹⁰⁵

Though discreet and cautious in many matters, Lloyd was uncompromising in his determination to preserve the schism, and he sharply repudiated any attempt by more moderate Nonjurors to achieve reconciliation with the Church of England. Nevertheless by the time of his death in 1710 he had won admiration not only from his fellow nonjurors but from many leading men who remained within the Church of England. John Sharp formerly Lloyd's Dean and later Archbishop of York adamantly refused to take his place as Bishop of Norwich.¹⁰⁶ Lloyd's faults were those commonly found in zealous men who carry heavy administrative responsibility: impatience and inflexibility in the pursuit of sometimes unrealistic aims, occasional indulgence in displays of pomposity and ill-temper (though one has to bear in mind the many exasperating personalities with whom he had to deal.) He could also be harsh in disciplinary matters, but these failings were offset by his many acts of kindness and constant concern for the good conduct and well being of people placed under his charge. To these qualities can be added an endearing naivité and credulity which appear in some of his dealings.

William Lloyd revealed no brilliance of intellect, but he was a knowledgeable person, especially in matters of law, and a capable administrator. Above all, he was a man of character whose courage and honesty commanded the respect of others. The best comment on him came from Humphrey Prideaux's biographer who wrote: '... in him the diocese [Norwich] was deprived of a very able and worthy pastor, a man of great integrity and piety who thoroughly understood all the parts and duties of his functions and had a mind fully bent to put them into execution for the honour of God and the good of the Church on all occasions.'¹⁰⁷

June 1983

1. *Fasti Ecclesiae Anglicanae* (John Le Neve Comp.), 2, 472.
2. There are two short studies of Lloyd's career: J. H. Overton, *The Non jurors, Their Lives, Principles and Writings* (1902), 38-46; G. M. Yould, 'William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich,' *Norfolk Archeology*, 35, (1970), 364-374.
3. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, part 1 (1924), 96.
4. See *Bodleian Library*, Oxford, MS Tanner, 459, f. 98.
5. G. M. Yould, 'William Lloyd, Bishop of Norwich,' *Norfolk Archeology*, 35, (1970), 364.
6. *Diary of John Evelyn*, E. S. De Beer ed. (1955), 4, 3-4, 369.
7. Charles J. Abbey, *The English Church and Its Bishops* (1887), 1, 169.
8. MS Tanner 92, f. 98.
9. MS Tanner 31, f. 19.
10. MS Tanner 31, f. 211.
11. MS Tanner 31, f. 217.
12. MS Tanner 138, f. 37.
13. *Marriage and Society: Studies in the Social History of Marriage*, (R. B. Outhwaite ed.), (1981), 11-12.
14. MS Tanner 138, f. 36.
15. MS Tanner 138, f. 37. MS Tanner 134, f. 38.
16. MS Tanner 30, ff. 168, 178.
17. Humphrey Prideaux, *The Case of Clandestine Marriages Stated* (1691), 364-5. In a lecture at the 1982 meeting of the Anglo-American Historical Conference entitled 'Conventional Marriage and the common people: from resistance to compliance, 1700-1980,' Professor J. R. Gillis of Rutgers University estimated that prior to 1750 only about half of the marriages in England were legally performed in the full sense of a church wedding preceded by the publication of banns. If evasion of marriage requirements was this widespread, it is easy to understand the problem faced by a conscientious bishop like Lloyd in trying to enforce them.
18. MS Tanner 134, f. 27.
19. MS Tanner 134, f. 87.
20. MS Tanner 134, ff. 80-81.

21. MS Tanner 134, f. 58. Lloyd contemptuously referred to Scott as 'an odd man' in a letter to Spencer, and his abrupt refusal to allow him to preach at Norwich Cathedral is a further indication of his attitude. MS Tanner 134, f. 88.
22. MS Tanner 134, f. 87.
23. MS Tanner, 134, f. 25.
24. MS Tanner 134, F. 89. Spencer's book, *De Legibus Hebraeorum, Ritualibus at Rationibus libritres* was published in 1685, the year Lloyd became Bishop of Norwich.
25. MS Tanner 134, f. 80. 'The Narrative of John Spencer, Archdeacon of Sudbury prosecuted in the Court of Norwich for some pretended misdemeanours . . .' MS 134, ff. 87-96.
26. MS Tanner 134, ff. 84, 24, 85.
27. MS Tanner 138, f. 65.
28. One of the reasons which Spencer gave to excuse his unwillingness to perform his duties personally in Norwich was that the revenues of his archdeaconry would not bear the cost of the journey. MS Tanner 134, f. 90. However, his protest against this alleged hardship has to be set against the fact that he was a man of large private means who bought an estate worth £3,600 for Corpus Christi College and on his death left bequests of nearly £1000 to members of the College and other deserving people. Canon Charles Smyth 'The Very Reverent John Spencer (1630-93)' *Letter of the Corpus Association* (Michaelmas 1975), no. 54, 17, 19.
29. MS Tanner 31, f. 278.
30. MS Tanner 31, f. 273.
31. MS Tanner 138, f. 53.
32. MS Tanner 138 ff. 46, 48.
33. MS Tanner 29, f. 5.
34. MS Tanner 138, f. 66.
35. MS Tanner 29, f. 8.
36. MS Tanner 29, f. 11.
37. MS Tanner 138, f. 67.
38. MS Tanner 138, f. 37. MS Tanner 28, f. 165.
39. MS Tanner 134, f. 59.
40. *Camden Society Publications*, (1875), 146.
41. MS Tanner 31, f. 295.
42. MS Tanner 138, f. 65.
43. MS Tanner 138, f. 46b. MS Tanner 30, f. 107. MS Tanner 92, f. 119. MS Tanner 138, f. 45.
44. MS Tanner 31, f. 273.
45. MS Tanner 31, ff. 276, 293. MS Tanner 30, f. 37.
46. Norfolk Record Office, Dean and Cathedral Chapter Book 3, f. 221.
47. Overton, 57.
48. MS Tanner 138, f. 6. MS Tanner 30, f. 159.
49. MS Tanner 29, f. 35.
50. MS Tanner 31, f. 217.
51. MS Tanner 134, ff. 58, 26, 92.
52. MS Tanner 138, f. 41. MS Tanner 31, ff. 249, 250.
53. MS Tanner 134, ff. 26, 92.
54. See the evidence in the case brought in the Norwich Consistory Court in 1688 for Webster's removal from the vicarage of All Saints and from holy orders in the Church of England. N. R. O. Consistory Court, Libels and Allegations 1688, Con 35. Dep/52 File 56. 1687-1689.
55. MS Tanner 134, f. 58.
56. MS Tanner 138, f. 65.
57. Ms Tanner 138, f. 52.
58. J. P. Kenyon, *Stuart England*, (1979), 231.
59. MS Tanner 29, f. 8.
60. MS Tanner 29, f. 11.
61. MS Tanner 29, ff. 12, 21.
62. MS Tanner 29, f. 11 Blomefield, 3, 423. John Evans, *Seventeenth Century Norwich*, (1979), 311.
63. Anon, *Life of Humphrey Prideaux, Dean of Norwich*, (1748), 24. MS Tanner 29, f. 66.
64. MS Tanner 29, ff. 66-68, 73.
65. MS Tanner 29, f. 133. Humphrey Prideaux's biographer describes the conflict between Acton and the Catholic faction in Norwich, on the one hand, and Prideaux on the other. This writer, of course,

- concentrates on the activities of Prideaux, who spoke and wrote extensively against Catholicism and in defence of the Church of England in 1687-8. He also states that Lloyd 'exerted himself to the utmost for the Protestant cause.' *Life of Prideaux*, 26-39.
66. *Life of Prideaux*, 39-40. George D'Oyly, *William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury*, 1, 269.
 67. MS Tanner 28, ff. 48, 82.
 68. D'Oyly, *Life of Sancroft*, 308.
 69. *Life of Prideaux*, 40. H. Foxcroft, *Life and Letters of Sir George Saville, Marquis of Halifax*, (1898), 2, 534-535.
 70. MS Tanner 28, f. 114.
 71. MS Tanner 28, f. 183.
 72. MS Tanner 28 ff. 232, 224.
 73. MS Tanner 29, f. 141.
 74. P. R. O., S.P. 3/4, f. 135.
 75. *Life of Prideaux*, 47.
 76. L. Anderdon, *Life of Thomas Ken*, (1854), 499.
 77. *Correspondence of Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon and of his brother, Laurence Hyde, Earl of Rochester* (Samuel W. Singer ed.). (1724), 2, 236-7.
 78. *Correspondence of Henry Hyde*, 2, 256.
 79. *Diary and Autobiography of Edmund Bohun*, (William Rixed ed.), (1853), 88.
 80. MS Tanner 28, f. 377.
 81. Yould, 'William Lloyd,' *Norfolk Archeology*, 35, 366.
 82. MS Tanner 28, f. 377.
 83. MS Tanner 28 ff. 25c, 248, 258, 274.
 84. Blomefield, 1, 162.
 85. MS Tanner 28, f. 374v.
 86. MS Tanner 28, f. 374.
 87. *Alumni Cantabrigienses*, Part 1, 2, 268.
 88. MS Tanner 27, f. 11. In a recent article on the subject of homosexuality in early Stuart England Dr. B. R. Burg says that although punishable by death, homosexual acts between adults seldom resulted in the infliction of this penalty, and that there was little public hostility towards such activity. Bestiality and homosexual child molestation, however, were regarded as much more serious crimes. B. R. Burg, 'Ho Hum, Another Work of the Devil; Buggery and Sodomy in Early Stuart England,' *Journal of Homosexuality*, 6(1/2), Fall/Winter 1980/81, 69-78. Whether there was any change in public attitude in the late seventeenth century is unclear. The fact that clergyman were involved may partly explain Lloyd's outrage in the cases cited in this paper, but the favorable testimony initially given on behalf of Stephen Griggles shows an absence of strong feeling on this subject.
 89. MS Tanner 27, ff. 24, 78.
 90. Lambeth Palace Library, Court of Arches, Commissions in partibus. Bbb 721/1 (1690).
 91. LPL Court of Arches Bbb 733/3.
 92. Blomefield, 4, 81, 131. MS Tanner 27, f. 24.
 93. One gets a vivid picture of people's capacity for verbal violence at this time by reading the consistory court records. Women seem to have been especially imaginative in their use of invective. In 1687 Martha Curson was accused of calling Deborah Berd 'a smoke nose old whore and drunken bitch'. Mary Bunell was said to have referred to Elizabeth Dye as 'a runnagate pockey whore', and as 'a big mackerel backed whore' adding, 'if you was not your husband would not have sold you, for a flagon of beer to a soldier'. N.R.O. Consistory Court, Libels and Allegations Con 35.
 94. MS Tanner 28, f. 162.
 95. MS Tanner 28, f. 161.
 96. The last person known to be executed for witchcraft in England was hanged in 1682; the last recorded case of a person being condemned to death for this offence occurred in 1712. Wallace Notestein, *A History of Witchcraft in England from 1558 to 1718*, (1911), 383, 419.
 97. Notestein, 266-7, 305-6.
 98. Alan Macfarlane, *Witchcraft in Tudor and Stuart England*, (1970), 196.
 99. MS Tanner 27, f. 176.
 100. MS Tanner 26, f. 56.
 101. MS Tanner 26, f. 56.
 102. MS Tanner 28, f. 377.
 103. Overton, *Non-Jurors*, 41-2.

104. L. Anderdon, *Life of Thomas Ken*, (1854), 770.
105. *Memoirs of Thomas, Earl of Artesbury*, (1890), 1, 361-2.
106. *Life of John Sharp by his Son* (1742), 108-9.
107. *Life of Prideaux*, 70.