

way from any other books. No other books are inspired of God, in the historic theological sense of the word. From these sixty-six books, and only from these sixty-six books, can we secure the data on which religious ideas can safely be based.

The third section of the chapter deals with those books which only the Roman Catholic church takes as authoritative. It is a brief statement but an important one. It says: "The books commonly called Apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of the Scripture; and therefore are of no authority in the church of God, nor to be any otherwise approved, or made use of, than other human writings."

Now does that say that the books commonly called the Apocrypha ~~were~~ <sup>are</sup> bad books? It does not say that, does it? I think this is important to keep in mind, because it is so easy when you are opposing error to say; "That is what they believe, therefore the opposite must be true"--it is very easy to say that. Some people even think they can find truth that way. I have heard it said that if you want to know about God, there are two ways to find out about Him. One is <sup>to</sup> name all the good qualities you can think of, and multiply each one thousands of times and this will give an idea of the good qualities of God. The other is to name all the bad qualities you can think of, and then think of these as entirely absent from God. Well, you can't decide what God is like by working anything out of your head like that. If you want to find out what God is like, study the Bible. You can't work out a theory or a presupposition or an idea that will tell you what God is like--the Word of God gives the data, and it is our only source for knowledge in this field.

It is easy to think that we can learn what is right by simply taking the opposite of that which is wrong, but it does not work out that way. There is not a cult or a movement that does not contain some truth. Its principal teachings may be wicked and wrong, but if every-