verb suach, to dig; or from the verb shakath, to be corrupted. It

could conceivably be derived from either of those. But there are

a number of cases where it occurs where it is clearly derived from

shuach. There are anumber of such cases. In those cases it means

pit. Does that mean it has to mean pit is this case too? Can it

mean corruption? In the LXX, in about 1/3 of the cases where that

Heb. word occurs, it is trans. pit, and in 2/3 of the cases

"corruption." How can the same word mean both pit or corruption?

We have plenty of cases in English where one word can have two

very different meanings. In each of these cases the word sehx

shakath is a perfectly proper form of noun derived from one of

these verbs. Does it always have to be derived from the one?

Couldn't it sometimes be from one and somethings from the other?

        I did not know whether they would tell us, No; if the

word shakath is derived from shuach it cannot ever meanx be

derived from shakath. But I do know that there is a xdx very

similar word nakath identical in form, with a ʜ   num instead

of a shin--nakath. Nakath might be derived from nuach, or it

might be derived from nasar, to go down. In Is. 30 to 31, the

word nuach occurs twice. In one case they take it from nuach.

In the other case from nakath. So if that can be true of nuach,

why can't it be true of shuach? Why can't Peter and Paul have

known what they were talking about?

        There was a reference there to the Second Psalm. You

look at that Psalm, and the quotation was from v.7, "I will tell

the decree of the Lord. He said to me, You are my son today, I have

begotten you." Incidentally one of the great criticisms that caem
                                                            came
out about the RSV, when it first appeared, was that in the NT, Jesus

was addressed as "you" instead of "thou." People said that denied