What need is there for another version? Why change from the Authorized? Are there any vital improvements in the new version? What is the proportion of improvements? How can we know that the new readings are better? What authority is there for them? How does the Editor of the CONCORDANT VERSION plan to keep out his own opinions? These are the principal questions which arise in the minds of those who hear of the CONCORDANT VERSION.

We have told of the principles and the plan which underlie it. We now propose to give a concrete example, showing how its method works in practice, and give the reason for every “change from the Authorized”, though, in the nature of the case, there can be no “changes”, as the work is based on a concordance, not on any previous version.

In order to make this study instructive and helpful, we have chosen a passage of scripture which contains the very foundation of the evangel—Romans, chapter three, verses 19 to 28.

In this short passage there are about seventy points in which the CONCORDANT VERSION differs from the Authorized. We shall take each up in turn and tell why it is preferable. Some may seem trivial at first sight, but only to such as underrate the preciousness of God’s revelation. In a costly gem an almost imperceptible flaw greatly depreciates its market value. In the most precious treasure in all the universe we should welcome the most minute improvement.

As there are about two hundred words in this passage and we propose seventy improvements, two-thirds of the Authorized Version stands, while the remainder, half as much, is replaced by better renderings. The American Revision, either in its text or margin, makes or suggests about half of these betterments.

It is presumed that the reader has a great respect and reverence for the Authorized Version. Nearly all of the corrections made by the CONCORDANT VERSION may be based on the authority of the Authorized. All that needs to be done in most cases is to apply the best one of their own renderings consistently. Thus, in the passage before us they have translated a certain word conclude. Yet in five other occurrences in the same epistle they render this word reckon. Is it criminal or commendable to “change” to the rendering they themselves have used elsewhere?

The law of reciprocation, which is the foundation of all language, is continually violated in most versions of the Scriptures. A word is merely the sound or sign of an idea. We gather this idea from the surroundings in which we find a word. Every time we read a passage of Scripture we unconsciously clothe each word with a meaning appropriate to its context. Every new context adds to our knowledge of its meaning. If we find it where it should not be, we unconsciously burden it with wrong ideas and color it with false notions.

In practice, we absorb the meaning of a word, not from the dictionary, but from the use to which it is put in the Scriptures themselves. If this is in concord with the Greek word it represents, we unconsciously imbibe the correct thought beyond the power of any dictionary definition to impart. Conversely, should we use it in discordant contexts, the mental image becomes distorted and confused.

It is impossible to overestimate the gain in clearness and accuracy which a concordant translation imparts. An English word, being found in the same contexts as the Greek word for which it stands, takes on the same force and color. If it should occur in false contexts, as in the Authorized Version, it then would assume false and misleading tendencies.

There seems to be no valid reason for changing from the clear reading of the Greek simply because we cannot grasp a distinction. It is not the translator’s duty to comprehend the minute differences in the original, but to pass them on to others, who may be able to discover those beauties which he has failed to observe.

19 Now we are aware that, as much Now we know, that what things as the law is saying, it is speaking to soever the law saith, it saith to those under the law, that every them who are under the law: that every mouth may be barred, and the entire mouth may be stopped, and all the world should be becoming subject to world may become the just verdict of God, guilty before God.

1. are aware for know] The A. V. uses six different terms, KNOW, PERCEIVE (per-
fect aware), recognize, be adept, fore-
know, be conscious of. One of these it 
translates know 196 times out of 224 oc-
currences. The C. V. renders it know 
always as there is no reason for any 
change. This passage, however, uses a 
different term, which they have rendered 
aware in Lu. 12:46, "at an hour when he is 
not aware". Thus they are authority that 
it has this meaning.

The sublinear has have-perceived, and 
this word is rendered perceived, except 
when its form is in the complete or per-
fected tense, denoting the condition which 
follows an act, rather than the act itself. 
Then it is more agreeable to the English 
idiom to render it be aware or be ac-
quainted. This, however, is done consis-
tently. It refers to knowledge gained ex-
perimentally, through the senses. Both 
terms occur in Rom. 7:7, which should 
read "I had not been aware of coveting". 
He knew of it, but not in his own experi-
ence. So here, Paul is aware from per-
sonal experience that the law speaks to 
those who are under it. We, who have 
ever been under it, know that this is so, 
but have never felt the force of it as they 
have.

2. as much as for what things soever] 
Although this word occurs over a hun-
derd times, the A. V. never translates it 
"what things soever" in any other pas-
sage. In Romans they render it as many 
as (212, twice; 514), so many as (63), as 
long as (71), in as much as (1113). They 
render it as much as in Jn. 6:11. Hence 
we have them for authority in our con-
sistent rendering.

3. is saying for saith] Saith has be-
come archaic.

4. is speaking for saith] As is shown 
in the sublinear, this is quite a different 
word from the saith immediately preced-
ing. Why, then, render it the same? The 
A. V. itself translates it speak, as we do, 
241 times. Only 15 times do they use say. 
There is often a decided difference be-
tween these words, as there is between 
our English say and talk, as when men 
talk much but say little. The contrast 
here is between the contents of the law 
and its application.

5. those for them] Them is archaic.

6. Omit who are] There is no neces-
sity for adding these words.

7. bar for stop] The usual meaning of 
stop is to bring from motion to rest. The 
word here used signifies to block up, hin-
der, dam. It seems especially fit to use 
banned here, because it is used of a moral 
and legal hindrance.

8. the entire for all the] When the 
word every is followed by a noun preced-
ed by the, in Greek, it changes the sense 
from every world to the entire world, 
taken as a single unit. The word all is 
used with the plural in English and fails 
to convey the idea of unity which is en-
forced here.

9. subject to the just verdict for guilty 
before] The A. V. rendering "guilty be-
fore God" has been challenged by almost 
every translator and commentator. It is 
certainly not correct, for the Greek word 
here used does not tell us whether the 
verdict is "guilty" or "not guilty". The 
Revisers have tried to indicate this by 
rendering "may be brought under the 
judgment of God". This, however, sug-
gests an adverse judgment, even if it 
does not express it. It is unfortunate also, 
in that the word judgment is always associ-
ated with an entirely different term, and 
should never be linked with the word 
here used.

The apostle's argument has developed 
the fact that the entire world, Jews as 
well as gentiles, are subject to the just 
verdict of God. They have been tried, but 
the verdict waits. It has not been pro-
nounced. Only in the case of those who 
believe is the Judge's decision given out, 
but in their case it is "not guilty", rather 
than "guilty". They are acquitted, or 
vindicated, or justified by His grace 
through the deliverance in Christ Jesus.

It is manifestly absurd to pronounce 
all "guilty" and then immediately, with-
out any further explanation, pronounce 
believers "not guilty". The A. V. render-
ing is without foundation in the Greek, it 
contrary to the apostle's argument, it 
is subversive of the grand doctrine of 
justification. One who is guilty cannot be 
justified. He may be pardoned or forgiv-
en, but to justify a guilty person is to be-
come a partner in his crimes. God is just, 
as well as a Justifier. He holds the entire 
world subject to His just verdict, and 
ever, under any circumstances, does 
aught but vindicate any one who believes 
Him.

The A. V. rendering has given us a 
false impression of God's attitude toward 
the world. It creates a condition where 
justification is impossible. It has effect-
ually robbed the saints of the truth of 
justification and substituted for it re-
mission or pardon, which alone is possible 
for those who are guilty.

The value of this version lies in large 
measure in the fact that its foundation 
principles make it possible to translate
beyond the translator's comprehension. His understanding or misunderstanding will not necessarily bar others from the truth. The common version, "guilty before God", is terse, vigorous English, which cannot be misunderstood. In fact, the translator himself was convinced that the sentence in this case was always "guilty" and he would assuredly have rendered it so if he had not been held in check by the law which does not allow him to import into a word what it does not contain in the Greek. A study of under-just made it evident that it was the legal term for those subject to the decision of a judge, but it does not, in itself, give the slightest hint whether the verdict is for or against. It was not until after this reading had been challenged that the truth dawned on the mind of the translator. He was wrong in supposing that, in this passage, it amounted to the same as "guilty".

Thus it is the aim of the C. V. to give a clear transcript of the scriptures, so that earnest students will not be hampered by the limitations of the translator, but may discover what he has overlooked, but which he has endeavored to leave open for those who may have a keener insight into the truth.

20 because, by works of law, no flesh shall be justified before Him, there shall no flesh be justified in His sight: for by the law is the knowledge of sin.

10. because for therefore] Nowhere else does the A. V. render this therefore. Ten times they translate it because. They themselves are ten to one for this rendering. It does not introduce a new conclusion, but gives the reason for the previous statement. The world is subject to the just verdict of God because law fails to provide any ground for justification. The Revisers changed to because.

11. Omit the before works] It is not in the Greek, and English usage corresponds to Greek in this case. See 13 below. The Revised margin omits it.

12. Works for deeds] The A. V. has this very phrase works of law in Ro.9:32 Ga.2:16. Why change it here? The Revisers have corrected this. Deeds is the equivalent of another term, associated with the verb do. "Deeds of the law" suggests that the law itself is the actor, rather than that which characterizes the action.

13. Omit the before law] This is important. Throughout this passage and elsewhere the law [of Moses] is distinguished from the principle of law in general by means of the word the. The statement here is a broad one. No one, either Jew or gentile under the dictates of conscience, can be justified by law, for through law (not the law of Moses only) is the recognition of sin. The A. V. has entirely obscured this vital point throughout this passage. The Revisers omit the in their margin.

14. Omit there] The Revisers also omit this useless addition.

15. through for by] The A. V. usually renders this word through. By is the efficient agent rather than the channel. The Revisers suggest through in their margin.


17. recognition for knowledge] The A. V. have recognized the special force of this word — on-knowledge — in Mt.14:35, "when the men of that place had knowledge of Him", that is, recognized Him. So also Mk.6:34, 54 Lu.24:11, 16, 31, etc. The law gives us a standard by which we can recognize sin.

21 Yet now, apart from law, a righteousness of God has been manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets.

18. Yet for but] The A. V. translates another disjunctive but 572 times. The word here used is much weaker than our but. In verse 19 the A. V. renders it Now. The C. V. renders it now and yet. It would be awkward to translate it now here, for it would read "Now now".

19. apart from for without] The Revisers agree in this change. Without means outside of. In Jn.20:7 the handkerchief was not without the tomb, but in a place apart.

20. Omit the] With the Greek text we omit the. It is not the law of Moses merely but the wider principle of law which is intended.

21. Omit the] "The righteousness of God" is too personal and narrow. The article is omitted in the Greek. It is a divine righteousness, for us as well as God. The Revisers made this correction.
They are “Authority” for Most Concordant Translations

22. has been for is manifested] The A. V. has rendered this very form of this word “hath appeared” (Heb. 9:3), showing that they recognized that it represents a state consequent on an action rather than a continuous action. Whenever the initial sound of a Greek verb is doubled, as in this case, the verb is in what may be called the perfect or complete tense, signifying the result of an action rather than the action itself. The Revisers have hath been.

23. testified to for witnessed] Witness is no longer used with an object in this sense. Testify to has replaced it in modern English.

24. Yet a righteousness of God, Even the righteousness of God through Jesus Christ’s faith, for all, which is by faith of Jesus Christ, unto and on all who are believing, for all and upon all that believe: for there is no distinction, there is no difference:

25. For all sinned and are wanting For all have sinned, and come of the glory of God, short of the glory of God;

24. yet for even] This is the same word which the A. V. translated but at the beginning of this paragraph, and we rendered yet. The word is a disjunctive, not a conjunctive, as even.

25. a for the] As 21.

26. Omit which is] It is without warrant and unnecessary. The Revisers also omit these words.

27. through for by] As 15 above. The Revisers make this change.

28. for for unto] The A. V. translates this word into 571 times, and idiomatically for, 87 times. Thus we are amply justified in our sublinear into, and the version for. The unto and upon suggests a distinction which does not exist, as though it came up to or as far as all, but only upon all who believe. In both cases it is the believer who is in question. It is into or for him and is on him.

29. on for upon] The A. V. renders this word both on and upon, without any apparent cause.

30. who for them that] Them that is not in good form. The A. V. uses who for this very phrase in Eph. 110.

31. are believing for believe] The A.V. renders this form believed (Ac. 2210), believe (Ro. 3:22, 1 Co. 121), do believe (1 Pt. 131). It is evident that they had no system. We distinguish between the indefinite form (usually called the aorist) and the present active, which is used here.

29. distinction for difference] The A. V. uses distinction in 1 Co. 14. There are many differences between men, even as to their sins. The Revisers make this change.

33. sinned for have sinned] The margin of the Revision suggests this change. Have sinned suggests a present state, the equivalent of being sinners. We who are justified sinned in the past, but, being acquitted, are no longer in the condition of those who have sinned. This distinction is important, especially when we realize the full import of justification.

34. are wanting for come short] The A. V. has only once again “come short” (Heb. 4:1). In that characteristic occurrence (Lu. 15:14) the prodigal began to be in want. See also 2 Co. 116. Paul was in want. So here it is not that our efforts fail to reach the divine standard, but our condition is one of want.

24 Being justified gratuitously by Being justified freely by His grace through the deliverance His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus that is in Christ Jesus:

35. gratuitously for freely] The A. V. freely no longer has the sense of a gift, but now means liberally, abundantly. Gratuitously is the only English word which adequately conveys the causelessness of this gracious gift.

36. deliverance for redemption] The A. V. consistently translates the usual word for redemption (Lu. 16:8; 23:3; Heo. 9:12) and the C. V. does the same. The word here used, however, is a strengthened form which they on one occasion, render happily by deliverance (Heb. 11:35). This is used uniformly in the C. V. Its aptness can only be appreciated by seeing it in all its contexts.

25 (Whom God purposed for a Pro- Whom God hath set forth to be a pitiable, through faith in His blood, propitiation through faith in His blood, for a display of His righteousness be- cause of the passing over of the penal remission of sins alty of sins which occurred before in that are past, through the forbearance of God) the forbearance of God;
37. *purposed for set forth*] This word may mean "set forth", but the connection indicates a past act with a present point, which is better satisfied by the usual rendering *purposed*. Thus it is always elsewhere in the A. V.

38. *Propitiatory for propitiation*] The A. V. correctly and consistently renders *propitiation* in its two occurrences (1 Jn. 2:2410). But this is a different form which they have translated *mercy seat* in its only other occurrence (Heb.9:5). It should, consequently, be *mercy seat* here, or better, *Propitiatory*, to preserve its connection with *propitiation*. This is not the act, but the place of propitiation, the meeting place of God with man. The propitiation was sprinkled with blood, hence God could meet man between the cherubim. The passage is concerned with justification and a common ground where both God and man can be just. This is the blood stained Mercy Seat—the Propitiatory.

39. *for for to*] Very rarely indeed does the A. V. translate this word *to*, though it occurs hundreds of times.

40. *a display for declare*] This is a noun, not a verb. Elsewhere they translate it *evident token* (Phil.1:28) and *proof* (2 Co.8:24). The Revisers have changed it to *show*. The word *display* fits all of its occurrences better than the variety of the A. V. The evident thought is that God wishes to show openly that He is just.

41. *of is added*] The word righteousness is in the case which the A. V. usually indicates by prefixing *of* as in Ro. 11:1517.

42. *because of for for*] The A. V. often has this *because of*. The Revisers have changed it to this.

43. *passing over for remission*] This is quite a different term from *remission* elsewhere in the A. V. It does not involve nearly so much. Sin's penalty was not *remitted* before the sacrifice of Christ. It was merely covered or *passed over*. The use of *remission* here is a serious defect which was remedied by the Revisers.

44. *the is added*] The Revisers insert *the* here to define the particular sins or penalty referred to. It is in the Greek.

45. *penalty of sins for sins*] The word here rendered *sin* by the A. V. has a special ending which changes it from *sin* to the *effect of sin*. This is clearly seen in 1 Co. 6:8 where the penalty of sinning, not sin itself, is demanded by the context. It was the divine penalty of sins which was passed over when the sacrifices were offered in connection with the law.

46. *which occurred before for that are past*] The Greek, as shown by the sublinear, is *BEFORE-HAVING-BECOME*. The A. V. is a loose paraphrase, which has led us to think that the apostle is speaking of our past sins as individuals. The Revisers have changed it to *done aforetime*, rather old-fashioned phraseology for a modern version, and almost as loose as the A. V.

47. *in for through*] The Revisers change this to *in*, as it should be.

26 Toward the display of His righteousness in the current era, for righteousness: that He might be Him to be just and a Justifier of the one who is of the faith of Jesus, which believeth in Jesus.

48. *toward for to*] The A. V. *to declare* suggests that this is a repetition of the same phrase in the previous verse. It is not. The connection here is quite different. The A. V. translates it *toward* in other places.

49. *display for declare*] See 40. The italicized "I say" is also omitted.

50. *of added*] See 41.

51. *in for at*] The A. V. translates this connective in, 1553 times, at, 106 times.

52. *current for this*] This is the usual word for *now*, which we translate *current* when the English idiom will not bear the usual rendering. The word *this* is too indefinite.

53. *era for time*] This is not the word usually translated *time* in the A. V. They often render it *season*. The Revisers have changed it to this. But it is better to speak of the present *era* than the present *season*, for the latter is used only of a short period of time, and the era here referred to has run nearly two millenniums already.

54, 55, 56. *for Him to be for that He might be*] There is no warrant for the word *might* and the idea of contingency. It is the simplest, form of the verb *to be*, as the A. V. itself is witness (Ro.1:22). If this were turned back into Greek an entirely different phrases would be the result. *That* is the same word which they made *unto* in verse 22 and *to* in verse 25, which we have consistently given as *for*. *He* is in the objective case, *Him*. 
57. *for the*] It is His character as a Justifier which is pressed here. The insertion of *the*, which is not in the Greek, interferes rather than helps.

58. *for him which*] The Greek is simply *τιμία* in the singular, and though usually listed as masculine, is applied to both genders in common. Hence it is not well to limit this to the masculine *him*. No one would defend the *which*, though the Revisers retained it.

59. *of faith for believeth*] A reference to the sublinear will show that this is not a verb, *believe*, but a noun, *belief*. The A. V. has deliberately altered the sense of this passage, making our believing *in* Jesus the basis of justification instead of Jesus Christ’s faith, as in verse 22. The point is that it is not His keeping the law which made Him a fit Propitiatory where we could meet God and be justified, but His faith which led Him far beyond the law’s demands, in faith obedience, even to the death of the cross. From this faith springs justification. It is out of this faith for our faith (Ro. 11:17). Whatever we may believe on this point, we are not warranted in deliberately altering the text to suit, as the A. V. has done.

60. *for in*] See 59. The *in* is absent in the Greek.

64. *for therefore*] The A. V. follows a different reading here, which is given in the superlinear as *then*. The better reading, which we follow, they have translated for 992 times.

65. *we are reckoning for we conclude*] Only here has the A. V. used *conclude*. Elsewhere they render *number, account, count, reason, think, suppose, esteem, etc.*, and *reckon* (Ro. 4:4; 10:6; 11:18). The tense is present active, not indefinite.

66. *mankind for a man*] This is not the word for *a man* as distinct from a woman, but a human being of either sex. This cannot always be expressed in English, as it has no noun corresponding to *human* except *mankind* and *humanity*.

67. *to be for that . . . is*] Why change the Greek when the same construction yields good sense in English? Besides there may be a subtle distinction which dull minds fail to grasp.

68. *apart from for without*] See 19.

69. 70. *Omit the twice*] The works of the law confines the statement to the Jew and the law of Moses. The Greek omits both the *s* in order to include the principle of law wherever found.

The point we wish to press in this comparison with the Authorized Version is that, to a large degree, our work can claim the “authority” of these translators for the very variations which distinguish it from theirs. Their work was loose, with little system or order. We use much the same material but dispose it in accord with the fundamental law of language that the same word should always be used to express a given idea.

We wish also to show that, however much we may revere the version to which we are bound by ties of sentiment, there is real need for another. Everyone must acknowledge that some of these seventy corrections are vital, and that most of them are desirable. Very few of them can be questioned, because the translators of the Authorized have themselves set their seal to most of the corrections by their renderings in other passages.

There are at least seven improvements of vital value in this short passage. They affect our enjoyment of justification, our attitude toward law, our apprehension of the place of Christ Jesus as the Propitiatory, and His part in procuring justification. If the rest of the seventy seem unimportant, these alone ought to convince us of the vital value of a version based on a concordance rather than on human scholarship.