

which there is no salvation, cannot exist, without the love also of our neighbour: and the love of our neighbour necessarily includes in it Charity to the poor. Therefore, without Charity to the poor, there is no brotherly love. Without brotherly love, there is no love of God. Without the love of God, there is no salvation. Whoever then is not charitable to the poor, cannot be saved. He loves not God, he remains in death. His end is destruction.

SELECTED.

Arguments in favour of the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation and the real presence; Selected from the sermons preached on that subject by the Reverend Richard Hayes. Continued.

BUT their simultaneous existence in various places is impossible, is it? The body of Christ passed through the rock of the sepulchre and the wood of the door, both uninjured, after his resurrection. What is the difference as to possibility, for two bodies to be in the one place, or for the one body to be in two places? None. Christ was seen by Paul after his ascension; not in a vision, but in reality. For Paul says: "He was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven. Then he was seen by more than 500 brethren at once. After that he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles: and last of all he was seen by me, as by one born out of due time." Paul then saw him as the others had done, namely in his body risen from the dead; for "See my hands and feet" said he to them, "that it is I myself, feel and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have." Yet Christ had ascended into heaven, several months before Paul saw him on his way to Damascus—heaven he will not leave until he come to Judge the world—therefore the body of our Lord was in two places at the same time. If in two, why not in three? Why not in more? And if, out of the sacrament, why not in it?

But, is it the divine body of Jesus alone, that can be in several places at once? No. Any body, any creature can be so, if Jesus please. He created all things: he therefore gave his creatures a place, when before they had none. The difference between no place, and place, is far greater than between one and ever so many places. He fed five thousand with five loaves, and four thousand with seven. Did he increase the number of loaves by the creation of new ones? Far from it. The text expressly says, that he distributed the loaves—the five—the seven—no more—to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. The same loaves then were in the hands & mouths of thousands at once—a sample of that miraculous power, by which the one sacramental body of the Son of God, without any pluralization of itself, is eaten by the faithful in all parts of the universe at one and the same time.

But the infidel who believes not the scripture, will tell me, that I am proving one impossibility by another. Scripture apart, then, for a moment—I will prove from naked reason, that God can make

a body present in many places at once. a body in motion can have its velocity increased *ad infinitum* to any degree; and the Almighty can at any moment, give it a velocity, not sensibly differing from infinite. Suppose then that such all but infinite velocity, is one of the attributes of the body of Christ. It evidently follows, that his body can pass from one end to the other of the universe, and through every single point of the universe, and in all directions throughout the universe, in a shorter time than the twinkle of an eye; and therefore can be present over and over again in every spot of the creation, at any one sensible moment of time. Thus not only is this simultaneous locality for the consecrated body possible to Omnipotence, but even our own weak minds can conceive a mode for its possibility. Nay, every body, while in motion must be at every single moment, in more than one place. For if for one moment it were in one only place, it would be so the next, and the next, and thus motionless for ever. It must therefore, every moment, be in more than one place; and the quicker it moves, the more places it it must be in, at every single moment of its motion. If then it be accelerated *ad infinitum*, it will be in every spot of all space at any one moment. Thus motion itself of any kind, which, because we see, we think we understand, is in reality not more possible, than the simultaneous existence of Christ's body in different places.

But is not this being in many places at once, the ubiquity of God? Nothing like it. A creature may be in many places; but yet the places, though multiplied forever, can never be infinite. God on the contrary, is every where, and more than every where; because he is infinite. And, yet he is a spirit, and occupies no space at all. Go proud and blind man! that would set bounds to the power of thy God, in the eucharistic mysteries—go, understand these two positions, if thou canst—every where—yet occupying no space! How apparently contradictory! And yet how true! Again: God is eternal; yet his duration is but one, standing, invisible, never passing moment. Go, comprehend that too, if thou canst. And wilt thou reject it, if thou comprehendest it not? Reject all revelation then; aye, and all reason too; for reason demonstrates these truths, though she cannot comprehend them. But, revelation apart, is there no incomprehensibility in nature? Do we understand all that our eyes see passing around us? The wonders of magnetism and electricity? The stupendous powers and phenomena of chemistry and steam? The daily prodigies of vegetation, so aptly compared by Paul to the general resurrection? The astounding multiplicity and operations of animals & insects? The motion of the earth and heavenly orbs? The complication and balance of the elements! The union of our souls with our bodies! Nay. The very nature of matter itself, which the more we scrutinize and subtilize its component parts, the less we understand! Do we not see all these prodigies? And yet do we comprehend any single one of them. Quite the reverse. The more we know of them, the more incomprehensible we find them. The naturalist, the chemist and the astronomer, willing or unwilling, must alike exclaim, "All na-

ture is a mystery." Shall not the God then, who made these mysteries in nature, be able likewise, to make a mystery in religion?

"But am I not to believe my eyes?" says the infidel. Most assuredly. What then do your eyes see in the eucharist? The sensible qualities of bread and wine," he replies. Well—they see aright; for the sensible qualities are there. And so necessarily are they there, that when they disappear, the body and blood of Christ disappear along with them. Your eyes convey to you only the appearance of things; & this appearance depends on the rays of light, which strike the optic nerve. You see a man in the street—you take him for another—he speaks—and you and your mistake. Did your eyes deceive you? No; they did their duty. They represented only what they ought, only what they could. The wrong conclusion was all your own. You see a straight stick half immersed in water; it appears crooked. Do your eyes deceive you here? No; they convey to you that appearance, which the refracted rays of light supply. You feel the stick—you find it straight—and you correct your false opinion. In the former case, then, the word of the man, and in the latter, your own touch rectified the wrong judgment you had formed, and thereby taught you that reason, experience, and the very senses themselves often prove, that things are not in substance what they seem. Joshua in one of his battles, saw an angel in armour. He took him for a man, and asked him whether he were friend or foe. "I am the leader of the heavenly host," replied the spirit; and Joshua fell prostrate. Magdalene saw Jesus at the monument, she took him for the gardener, until he told her who he was. The two disciples of Emmaus knew him not, before the breaking of bread. Was Joshua to belie the angel, or Magdalene and the two disciples their Saviour, because visual appearances seem to contradict their statements?

But, I shall be asked, "how is it possible for a human body, to be circumscribed in so small a space?" And I ask, in return; did not Jesus, as God, create his own body, as well as all other matter? Did he not make it visible or invisible, as he pleased, after his resurrection? Could he not even annihilate it? And if he could, can he not circumscribe it in the smallest particle of the sacrament? Annihilation, or even invisibility, is a greater act of power, than circumscription; and he that could do the greater, can do the lesser. Does not even nature, does not chemistry, every day, dilate and compress bodies to the most surprising degree. And shall we deny to the God of nature, the power which nature, and even art, hourly exercises?

"But," say the opponents, (and this they consider their principal argument,) "true; objects sometimes appear to our senses, what they are not as in the instances you have adduced; and then, we correct the mistake in the way you have said. But do we ever take a stick for a town, or a man for a mountain? When all our senses perceive a thing uniformly and always the same, we must believe them. How then can we think, that what uniformly appears to be bread, is the body of Christ? If u-