

If there is any quotation in the N.T. it is always taken from those books which the Jews considered to be authoritative Scripture. No writer quotes from the LXX as a book since there is no such thing. The copies are comparatively few. Swete says that whether uncials or cursives, rarely do they contain all of the O.T. There are a few exceptions (8). Thus the LXX was not circulated around as the LXX/ In the day of Christ there were only rolls and there might have been two or three translations of some books even in His day. Maybe it is quoting from these other books or rather translations common in their day of which we don't have a copy. When Christians started getting books, they even then rarely put all the O.T. in one roll or book. Only a few books are found put together. Just because there is a quotation from Isaiah and today Isaiah is found along with the apocryphal books--that does not mean that they were considered inspired along with the books of Scripture. It would seem like a pretty strong argument if you could prove that all these books were bound together in Christ's day but they were in separate rolls.

#45 ----which at first sight appears like a strong argument that he quotes from LXX and the LXX contains his words. But he does not quote from the LXX in the sense of a specific book. He does not by any means always quote from the LXX, the quotations vary greatly. There was no such a thing as a book called a LXX at the day and when rolls were put together, they rarely put them all together into one book and when they did they differed. So that the argument that the N.T. sometimes quotes the LXX does not in any wise mean that those books which are contained in some manuscripts of the LXX and which are not contained in our Hebrew Bible were considered as inspired by Christ and the Apostles. And this is particularly true when we realize that neither Christ nor any of the other N.T. writers ever quotes from any one of these books. No one of them is ever quoted or referred to in the N.T. In addition to that if you were to say that a N.T. quotation from the LXX, then any book contained in the LXX as we have it today was authoritative and inspired. It would not prove that the Roman Catholic idea of what is in the canon was correct because there are books in the Septuagint which they also deny to be inspired and authoritative so it is an argument which they are the only ones who would use, it is one of the strongest arguments they have in support of the Apocryphal books and it is not a satisfactory argument for that purpose for if it were valid it would prove too much. It would prove that other books which they also claimed to be inspired books.