

Yet despite those good things we have said about it, I think the title The Holy Bible is an utter misnomer, because while they had a different group that was translating the OT - there were very few belonging to both groups - yet the whole group voted on the content of both sections and when you put the two sections together it becomes impossible to reach any other conclusion than that the NT writers and speakers utterly misunderstood the OT and quoted it to prove things that it never proved at all.

I can understand how they would get that idea because these people were mostly men that thought these writers in the early days of Christianity were rather foolish men with some crazy ideas but the craziest idea which they could not get through their heads as being at all possible was the idea that people hundreds of years ~~xxx~~ before could have written ~~things~~ things that were intended to convey a meaning that they probably did not understand, certainly none of their contemporaries understood. Yet they express it in I Pet. that that is what the NT writer really thought about the OT because they speak in I Pet. - "The prophets who prophesied of the grace that was to be yours searched and inquired about this salvation; they inquired what person or time was indicated by the Spirit of Christ within them when predicting the sufferings of Christ and the subsequent glory." So they present Peter as believing that these OT writers wrote about things hundreds of years after their time which they did not understand, they did not know when they would come, and did not understand many of the details of it. Yet when they came to translate the OT they just could not bring themselves to believe that that was what the OT meant.