

it by a desire to reconcile the doctrine of St. Paul with that of St. James, we have only to say that, in the first place, this was none of their business as translators; and, in the second place, while we are perfectly clear that there is no serious difficulty in adjusting, by other and legitimate methods, the apparent differences of the two Apostles, yet, if this cannot be done without doing violence to the text and perverting the language of one or the other Apostle, then, in God's name, — as Bishop Butler says in a similar emergency, — let it be left undone.

In fine, there can be no doubt that further consideration will satisfy all parties that the American revisers are right in proposing to substitute *but* for *save* in the revised text, and to omit the "margin"; or, rather, we shall simply return to the authorized version of the whole passage; for, as to "the faith of Jesus Christ," it is as intelligible as "faith in Jesus Christ," and probably was never misunderstood. Moreover, it is a more literal rendering than the other, and it is supported by the authority of the revisers themselves, who, at Rev. xiv. 12, have rendered τὴν πίστιν Ἰησοῦ "the faith of Jesus."

---

Τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα. *Jas. i. 17.*

BY PROF. D. R. GOODWIN, D.D., LL.D.

THE common, or, perhaps we should say, the vulgar, English reader is apt to understand "shadow" here as the extreme antithesis to substance or reality, as the least possible modicum, the infinitesimal particle; but there is no evidence that ἀποσκίασμα was ever used either by the learned or by the vulgar in any such sense. That sense should, therefore, be entirely set aside.

Some have presumed the author of the epistle to be using a strictly astronomical figure, as if he had said: "With whom is no parallax, neither tropical shade." But we cannot suppose St. James to have employed these words in the sense of the modern technical astronomy. Besides, the word παράλλαξις, and not the Apostle's παραλλαγή, belongs to that technical usage. Still, it must be admitted that the ancients had no little practical astronomical knowledge, — more perhaps of this than of almost any other of what we call the physical sciences. As early as Homer's time, τροπαί was used to indicate the solstitial points, and the times of the solstices and equinoxes were carefully observed and recorded on pillars or parapetmata, and were sometimes announced from sacred caves with religious and

oracular solemnity. Something of this kind seems to be alluded to in the fifteenth book of the *Odyssey* (403), ὄλι τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο. It seems also that *παραλλαγή* was familiarly used for this changing of the sun's position in his (apparent) diurnal as well as annual revolution. It is not unlikely, therefore, that the writer of the epistle makes a general allusion to the apparent (which he supposes to be real) changes of the sun as to position and illumination.

Or, again, we may suppose the allusion to be more directly to the phenomena of a sundial, and to the shadow cast by the gnomon, which changes its direction and extent as the sun changes his place in the heavens. This supposition does not differ substantially from the former, but simply suggests a particular instance or contrivance to illustrate the general fact.

What, then, is the precise interpretation of *τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα*? What is the relation between the two terms expressed by the genitive? It can scarcely be anything else but that of the genitive of characteristic, — a *shadow characterized by turning*. It is remarkable that this use appears often in this epistle, and especially in this immediate context. It is in fact a striking characteristic of the writer's style. Thus we have, at verse 25, "a forgetful hearer," or "a hearer that forgetteth," ἀκρυατῆς ἐπιλησμονῆς; and at ii. 4, "judges of evil thoughts," *i.e.*, "judges that think evil," or "judges with evil thoughts," κριταὶ διαλογισμῶν πονηρῶν. And perhaps we might add "word of truth" (i. 18), *i.e.*, "word that is true"; "face of his birth" (i. 23), *i.e.*, "the face that was born with him," "his natural face"; "the law of liberty" (i. 25), *i.e.*, "the law that is or that maketh free." So, then, *τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα* will mean simply "a shadow that turns, or that turns about," implying, — if the intervening body, which like the gnomon casts the shadow, is fixed, as the ancients supposed it to be, — that the luminary, the *sun*, is *changing* his relative position. This seems to be the plain meaning of the phrase, confirmed by the nature of the case and the whole style of the author, and especially in the immediate context.

What shall we say, then, to the wonderful invention of the learned revisers who translate the phrase, "Shadow that is cast by turning"? Who ever knew or heard of a shadow being cast by turning? A shadow is commonly cast by some opaque body interposed between the luminary and the surface that receives the shadow. The *direction* of the shadow may be changed by turning; but it must be a strange — or what the Germans would call *ein wunderliches* — shadow, or shadow of a shadow, that is actually *cast by turning*. Ought such an absurdity to be foisted upon the brother of our Lord?