

“ yet they were considered as sacrificed, not so much out
 “ of a regard to the public good, as to gratify the cruelty
 “ of one man.”

It is manifest, then, the Apostles were certain that laboring for Christ would not be productive of temporal benefit, and it would be simply too absurd to suppose that they told the most unpopular of lies, in the face of present ignominious punishment, for the improbable chance of posthumous fame. Nor is the argument of any value, “ that the Apostles might have been kept from changing their story, after it became unpopular, for the sake of appearing consistent,” for such a reason is not in keeping with the circumstances, because they were driven from place to place and could have ceased to mention the matter had they been so inclined. Instead of this, however, they pressed on the work, in each new field, proclaiming the Gospel of Redeeming Love whilst the devisings of persecuting hate continued to consume the charred remains of their ever scant earthly enjoyments. From these facts it is evident that they did not harbor a hope of an earthly reward, but, on the contrary, were being continually punished either actually or by anticipation.

1. It has been demonstrated that sane men do not lie for punishment.
2. The Apostles have been proved sane.
3. They were constantly punished for what they continued to tell.

Hence, what they told was not a lie.

Therefore, the story of the Cross is true.

By linking what has been proven with an objection often urged by infidels and sceptics, it will be manifest that the Apostles were unable to lie and preserve unchanged the circumstances which environed them throughout their Apostolic life. The objection is that the Apostles were only human and that “ to err is human,” and these objectors appear to forget that liability to err is but a negative condition and that there are other attendants, positive and