

Now let us look at the facts. We find that ~~there is~~ the word here is the Heb. word shachath. This Heb. word occurs ^{ten} ~~sight~~ times in the Old Testament. Of these ten, the Septuagint made about 200 years before the time of Christ, translates it corrupt exactly as Peter ^{quoted} ~~renders~~ it 8 cases and pit in two places. Etymologically the word, the noun shachath could ~~it~~ come either from ~~the~~ a verb shachay or the verb shuhach (spelling?). The verb shachath means to be corrupt, the verb shuhach means to dig. Now from dig a noun pit could very reasonably come. There is a quotation ⁱⁿ ~~from~~ Job which makes it clear that in that case the word means pit. Now some commentators say it is quite unthinkable that there could be two words shachath, one from shachay and one from shuhach; one meaning pit and one meaning corruption. Since this word clearly means pit in one case in the light of context ~~and~~ it must always mean pit so the R.S.V. translates it pit in every single case and rules out corruption altogether, ruling out Peter's interpretation~~s~~ and making the origin of Christianity to be an utter fraud!

However, ~~if~~ this reasoning seems a bit doctrinaire. It is pretty hard to decide that a whole religion is ~~a~~ a fraud on the basis of such a reasoning unless we examine it very carefully and be sure that the reasoning is altogether valid. Is it impossible that there could be two words shachath, one from shachay and one from shuhach? Were the Septuagint translators utterly in error when ~~7~~ 8 times they translated this as if it came from shachay and only twice as if it came from shuhach?

As a matter of fact, there is a very similar case which surely should throw some light on it. There is a Heb. word which means "to come down" and a word nuach.... which means "to rest". From either of these a noun..... could be taken. And we do as a matter of fact, fine. Both nouns used in the Bible