

That the accidents doe not remaine wythout the subiect after consecration of the Sacrament.

After the sense contrary to that Decretall Cum Marthe, we graunt that it is heresie.

That Christ is not in the sacrament, the selfe same truly and really in hys owne copozall presence.

Although this conclusion as the words stand found to be probable and intelligible; yet in the sense contrary to the decretall in Cle. Si dudum. we graunt that it is heresie. And briefly concerning this whole matter of the Sacrament of the aulter as touching also all other thyngs, we professe that we will both in worde and sense, holde to the holy Scripture, with the determination of the holy church and sayings of the holy Doctours.

Obstinately to affirme that it hath no foundation in the Gospell that Christ ordained the Masse, we graunt that it is heresie.

That God ought to obey the demill.

In this sense that God in hys owne person or essence, ought to obey the demill with the obedience of necessity.

We graunt that it is heresie.

If a man be duely contrite, that all externall confession is to him superfluous and unprofitable.

We graunt that it is heresie.

If the Pope be a reprobate & an evil man, and consequently a member of the demill: He hath no power ouer the faithful of Christ, giue to him of any, vnkess it be of Celar. We graunt that it is heresie.

That after Pope Urbane the 6. none is to be receyued for Pope, but that we ought to liue after the manner of the Breccians vnder our owne lawes.

We graunt that it is heresie.

To say that it is against the holy Scripture for ecclesiasticall persons to haue temporall possessions.

If obstinacie be ioynd withall: we graunt that it is heresie.

That no Prelate ought to excommunicate any man, vnkess he know him before to be excommunicate of God.

We graunt that it is an error. Understanding this knowledge to meane an experiential knowledge: so that heere with may stand the Decree of the Church. 11. q. 3. Nemo Episcopo.

That he which doth so excommunicate, is thereby an hereticke or excommunicate.

After the sense agreeing w the other before, we graunt to be an error.

That a Prelate excommunicating a clerke, whych appealeth to the king or counsell of the realme, in so doing is a traitor to God, the king, and the realme.

We graunt it is an error.

That they whych leane off to preache, or to heare the word of God & the gospel preached, for the excommunication of men, are excommunicate: and in the day of iudgement shall be counted for traytors to God.

Understanding this conclusion vniuersally so, as scripture and lawes do vnderstand such indefinite propositions: we graunt it is an error.

To affirme that it is lawfull for any Deacon or Priest to preache the word of God without the authority of the sea Apostolique or catholique Bishop, or of any other whose authority he knoweth sufficient.

We graunt it is an error.

To affirme that there is no sinne Lord, no Bishop nor Prelate whilist he is in mortall sinne, we graunt it is an error.

That temporall Lordes may at their pleasure take away the temporall goddes from Churches offending habitually: we graunt it is an error, after this sense that they may so take away temporall goddes of the churches without the cases limited in the lawes of the Church and kingdoms.

That the vulgar people may correct the Lordes offending at their pleasure: vnderstanding by this word may, that they may do it by the law: we graunt it is an error, because that subiectes haue no power ower they Lordes.

That tithes be pure almes, and that parishioners may for the offences of their Curates detain the same and bestow them to others at they pleasure: vnderstanding by this word may, as before, to may, by the law: we graunt it is an error.

That special prayers applied to any one person by prelates or religious men, do no more profit then the general prayers, if there be no let by the way to make them vniuersal: vnderstanding this conclusion vniuersally negatiuely, & vnderstanding by special prayers, the prayers made vpon special deuotion and general prayers of general deuotion: then after this sense, no such special prayers applied to any

one person, by special orators do profite more specially the said person, then general prayers doe, which are made of the same and for the same persons, we graunt it is an error.

That the generall almes to the friers, or to any other that preacht, is excommunicate both by that generall, & by that taker: vnderstanding this proposition vniuersally or conditionally as is aforesayd: we graunt to be an error.

That who so curthly into any priuate religio what so euer, is thereby made more vnapt and vnmete to obey the commaundments of God: we graunt it is an error.

That such holy men as did institute any priuate religious whatsoeuer, as well of secular hauing possessions, as of friers hauing none, in so instituting did sinne: vnderstanding this vniuersally or conditionally: we graunt it is an error. After this sense, that what Saint soeuer dyd institute priuate religions, instituting the sayd religion vpon that consideration as they did, did sinne.

That religious men living in priuate religions, be not of the religion of Christ: vnderstanding the proposition vniuersally as is aforesayd: we graunt it is an error.

That friers are bound to get their liuings by the labor of their handes and not by begging: vnderstanding this proposition vniuersally as before: we graunt it is an error.

These things haue we spoken reuerend father & Lord, in all humilitee, vnder your gracious supportation and benigne correction, according to our abilities & slender capacities for this present (the honor of god, the berry of our belief, and safe conscience in all points reserved) more humbly yet beseeching you: that if any other thing there be that seneth meete vnto your excellency & discretion to be more or other wise said & spoken: that your gracious fatherhood would vouchsafe to informe vs as children by the sacred scriptures by the determination of the church, or authorities of the holy Doctours. And doubtes with redy wils, and obedient mindes we will consent and agree vnto your wholesome doctrine. May it therefore please your fatherhood right reuerend in God, according to the accustomed manner of your benignity, favourably to accept these our wordes and sayings, soasmuch as the aforesayd conclusions were neuer by vs either in scholes affirmed, or els in Sermons publicly preached.

¶ Further examinations and proceedings against the foresayd Nich. Herford, Phillip Repingdon, and Io. Aishton.

When all these answers were made vnto the said lord Archb. of Canter. the sayd Nicholas and Phillip, for that they answered not vnto the meaning and words of the first conclusion expelly: but contrary to the sense of the decretall Firmiter credimus, were there iudicially examined what their sense and meaning was, but they wold not expresse the same. Then was it demaunded of them according to the sense of the same conclusion declared on the behalfe of the sayd Lord of Cant. whether the same material bread in numero, whych before the consecration is laid vpon the aulter, remaine in the proper substance and nature, after the consecration in the Sacrament of the aulter, and whether of the wine: To this the said Nicholas & Phillip answered, that for the time they could say no more therein, then that they had already answered, as is aforesayd in writing. And for that vnto the sense and wordes of the second conclusion they answered not fully and expelly, but in a sense contrary to the Decretall Cum Marthe, beyng asked what was the meaning, would not expresse the same. Therefore it was demaunded of them according to the sense of the same conclusion, declared in the behalfe of the sayd Lord of Lamberbury, whether those copozall accidentes which formally were in the bread and wine before the consecration of them: after the consecration were in the same bread and wine, or els were subiected in any other substance? To this they answered, that better to answer, then before in they writings they already had, for that time they could not. To the meaning also and wordes of the third conclusion, for that they answered not playnly and expelly, but in sense contrary to the decretall in the Clementines Si dudum, being asked what was that sense and meaning, would not declare the same: wherefore it was then demaunded of them according to the sense of the same conclusion, declared on the behalfe of the sayd Lord of Lamberbury. Whether the same body of Christ which was assumed of the virgine, be in the sacrament of the aulter, secundum se ipsum, euen as he is really in carnall substance, proper essence, and nature. To this they answered, that for that time they could say no more then that they had sayd, as before is specified in writing.

Further examinations against the sayd Nic. Phil. and Io. Nich. Herford. Phil. Repingdon. Io. Aishton, examined, 20. Iunij. an. 1382.

Further-