

himself of spirits who crowded about him and to whom in true self-protection—in the interest of his evangelical perception and of his standing as a reformer—he could not extend the hand. But the thing had its own logic. While contending in the name of faith for the *one* point, the real presence, which did not express the nature and peculiarity of his own faith, all the mediæval interests in him were aroused which seemed to have been overcome. Here awakened Biblicism (“*est*”, “*est*”), here scholastic doctrinarianism in the place of the *fides sola*, here a perverse interest in sophistical speculations, here an unheard-of regard for the sacrament alongside of and above the word, here a leaning toward the *opus operatum*, and above all a narrow-hearted and loveless temper! As regards the statement of the doctrine itself, it could not fail to be more paradoxical than the Catholic. Transubstantiation was not recognized, but the hypothetical declaration of Occam and other nominalists, that in one and the same space (with, by, and beneath) the visible elements and the true body of Christ are enclosed. The same man who earlier had derided the scholastics now explained: “The sophists speak correctly here”, supplied his Church with a Christology which in scholastic inconsistency far exceeds the Thomistic (ubiquity of the body of Christ), eliminated faith from the sacrament so completely that he raised the doctrine of the *manducatio infidelium* to the *articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiae* (“the body

Revives
Biblicism.

Revives
Occam's
View.