

But can they look at statements that OT writers which NT writers say are predictions of events in the NT? Can they really believe, or can they really translate something they don't believe at all that those OT men could actually see Christ coming, see what he was going to do, see great facts about Him and express it in their idea? How can they possibly do that? So I had considerable trepidation as I looked forward to the coming of their OT.

When their OT appeared 8 years later, I found that my fears were more than justified. The NT over and over quotes the OT. This is done to full fill what the prophets said. Proof of this is found in what the prophets said. Then you look at the OT and you find he never said it at all. I found case after case where that was true. To make it worse yet a person could read in the KJV that something happened in OT times which predicted something now, and they read it and say, well that's nice the OT predicted that. Then they could go and get a concordance and/or ask somebody and try to find out where it is ~~and~~ in the OT, and most people won't bother. But with the RSV they always put a footnote telling you where it is in the OT, so that makes it doubly easy for you to see whether the NT writers knew what they were talking about or not. And when you find that in practically every page, where the NT builds a doctrine upon an OT statement and the NT gives you a reference to the place in the OT and all you have to do is to turn back in your one volume and find that phrase and find he never said it at all, what kind of an effect is it going to have on your attitude toward the Bible?

So I wrote an article in which I said, There is a lie on the cover.