

prophet said - and then you find a quotation of exactly in the Septuigent, the Septuigent contains the books the Roman Catholics think are reliable: therefore Matthew thought the apochryphal books which the Roman Catholics accepted were inspired. Our 6th point is that the N.T. sometimes quotes language which is found in the LXX--it is a rebuttal argument. It is only right that we understand this fairly and see whether ^{it} is a valid argument or not. Does the N.T. always quote from the N.T. No, it does not; when it quotes the O.T. sometimes has the phrase the same quoted as found in the O.T. LXX but sometimes in a very different way from the LXX and then sometimes it will be half like the LXX and half different therefrom. If you found that everytime an O.T. reference were quoted that it read just like the LXX that wouldn't necessarily prove that the LXX was an inspired book. The N.T. writers simply quoted from the generally accepted version of the O.T. If you quote from the King James' Version that doesn't mean that you think that Version is inspired. One would not be right in drawing that conclusion. However, if you never quoted from the Rev. Ver. and you never said that you thought such and such a passage read better in the Hebrew, someone might perhaps begin to draw that conclusion. Sometimes it will quote exactly from the LXX, sometimes give quite a different translation from the LXX and then again at other times give half like the LXX and half like the Hebrew. This very fact is quite conclusive proof that the ~~N.T.~~LXX did not have an authority in itself; that it was not a perfect and infallibly acquired translation of the O.T. It would be quite natural for you to quote that which is in the common versions. If you wished to bring out the truth and it was found in two or three verses, but one had a far superior translation than the other verses. You wouldn't necessarily alter the translations but quote from the commonly used translation provided that that verse brought out from the original that point which you wished to bring out. If that thought was in the translation you would then make your own translation. That is exactly how the N.T. writers treat the LXX. It is the original that is the authority and not just a few words which he quotes from the LXX though they give the right idea. In fact there are times which don't read like the LXX at all but it gives the idea which the original says. A translation perfect from one language to another is simply something that does not exist. It is absolutely impossible that any translation be absolutely accurate. The N.T. frequently quotes the LXX but not always. The LXX was translated around 200 B.C., at least the Pentateuch of it was. The

Hebrew MSS are of course from a much later time than this