it is altogether possible that the it is possible the LXX saw gr bagad, instaed of $2\frac{1}{2}$ it could be...... $2\frac{1}{2}$

Oh, yes, the treacherous dealing ones. Act treacherously, and despise. We would have to get the exact shade of meaning. Those two could approach very closely, and they could be quite distinct.....3...., but that's what the LXX says, you desépisers? Yes. Well, that would look like a change in the Hebrew, rather than in the kXX Greek. But it doesn't affect the thought of the passage. It fits perfectly, and is a good summary of what is in the previous three verses.

AAM: Paul bases not argument on it. If it is a mistake, it still presents the idea in the previous two verses, so that it is not a mistake which introduces error. It could be that. But it doesn't introduce any erroneous idea, and consequently there is not need of correcting it here. It is simply brining out... $3\frac{1}{2}$

AAM: No, that's not my recollect. Now, let's see that. That's Acts 13. That's not my recollection. Oh, Beware, therefore, lest that come upon you, which is spoken of in the prophet. You see?

SH: Oh, well that's only part of the verse.

AAM: Lest that come upon you which is spoken of in the prophets. That
The prophets said to the people of Judah, you are wicked despising was people,
and God is going to bring the Chaldeans upon you. He says, beware lest
that come upon you which came upon them.

SH: Well, does that indicate that Paul knew the LXX better than he knew the Hebrew? If so it would have been quite easy for4 3/4...

AAM: No, I don't think so, I think he was speaking to the people that were familiar with the LXX. And he didn't bother to change. I shat think he knew the Hebrew well enogen. I think that he gt figured...5.......Of/ course, it is not impossible that Luke might have been giving in Greek a talk that was given in Aramaic, might instead of translating the Aramaic word for word