

Kohler-Baumgartner that is very useful to know about recent literature, recent discussions. But as to how far you can put trust in a translation, I don't think it's a fraction as helpful as BDB.

BDB was published in 1907. It is interesting that under the word shakath which they define as going into destruction or ruin or corruption, that under that ~~verb~~ shakath where they give the noun shakath they simply say see shuak. You look under shuak in BDB and you find that under shuak the second meaning given is "sink down." There it lists shakath, fem. noun meaning "pit". It has the occurrences in two divisions: (1) a pit for catching lions (2) the pit of Sheol. They say, This distinction of two parts of Sheol becomes important in Jewish and Christian theology." I don't know how they came to say that. I just don't know where in Jewish or Christian theology, you find the division of Sheol into two parts one of which is called the pit!

In fact I looked into the Interpreter's Dictionary which gives you a pretty good idea of general modernists attitudes on scholarly questions about the Bible, and there I found under PIT it said: "One of the many designations ~~is~~ employed in the OT for the abode of the dead. See dead, abode of the. Under Abode of the Dead the article was written by ~~the~~ T. H. Gaster and, under the terminology he gave as one word shakath "the ditch" RSV "the pit." He says the ancient versions prefer to derive this name from shakath "corrupt", cf. LXX diathora, or thora. Certainly it doesn't sound as if Gaster at least thought that the fact that the word means "pit" was absolutely certain.

As a matter of fact the LXX translates shakath by thanatos (death) in a few cases, in a far larger number of cases by some form of thora (ruin, destruction, desolation, corruption.) Once it translates it filth or dirt. Only 3 times out of all its occurrences where it renders it by bothros (cistern, pit). But BDB gives that as the only meaning for it! In the LXX it is used quite generally for destruction or corruption. But there are three cases where they take it as meaning pit, where the context clearly requires it.

Its interesting that in the KJV, they translate it pit quite a few more times than the LXX does. I don't know quite why that was but still in the KJV they translate it corruption, or destruction a very considerable number of times. Of course when you find that statement in the OT "you will not let your holy one see the pit" and NT says as proof of the resurrection " you won't let your holy one see corruption", it makes a pretty big problem. It's interesting that in this book by Shires he simply lists it forthright as one of the problems that the NT has quoted the LXX instead of quoting the Hebrew.

It's very interesting that there is a word very similar in form to shakath, and that is nachath. Nachath, just as shakath, you might think would be from shakath or from shuak, but they insist it must be from shuak, in the case of nakath it could come from naketh or it could come from muak. One of these means to rest; the other means to descend. BDB gives it under both roots. When you turn to the RSV, you find that in RSV in Isa. 30:15 they have "thus saith the Lord God the Holy One of Israel in returning and rest you shall be saved/" They don't say, "in returning and descent", they say