

What about Young's 'literal' translation?

Young's "literal" (Hah!) translation

I recently had another conversation at one of the Christian Forums about whether or not there exists such a thing as a complete, inspired and 100% true Bible in any language, and I ran into another guy who was trying to push Young's 'literal' translation as being better than the King James Bible.

So, I addressed the points he raised and then finally decided to write something more about this bogus bible version so that everyone can see it for what it is - just another shabbily dressed impostor.

Here is our initial conversation, followed by some more examples of just how pathetic this so called 'literal' translation really is.

Will (that's me) said: "Young's has some very serious problems. Do you have eternal life or just "age during life"? Is God from everlasting to everlasting, or just "age during"?"

The man recommending Young's then responds: [quote]" I believe that many people make the mistake of equating eternal to everlasting and the phrase age-during.

Eternal is uncreated and not bound by time. Everlasting, Forever, or Age-During is a created state, but may go on without end. A Hebrew age is a reference to a thousand year lifespan such as Adam and Methuselah experienced. If you accept the holy-day prophecy of 6 thousand years of work and 1 thousand year reign of God, age-during makes sense in a dispensational way.

The understanding of the Hebrew 'owlam' is persistent endurance which can render as everlasting, forever, or the during part of -age-during. As to your reference to Psalms 90:2, 103:17, and 106:48 the phrase "everlasting to everlasting" just as easily renders "age to age" without changing the context in any way.[/quote]

Hi Allen. Sorry, but Young's completely messes up and changes the meaning. Here are some examples:

Psalm 119:89 "FOR EVER, O LORD, thy word is settled in heaven."

Youngs - "TO THE AGE (there is an end) O Jehovah, Thy word is set up in the heavens."

KJB "The eternal God is thy refuge, and underneath are the everlasting arms". Deut. 33:27
(there goes your theory about "everlasting" being a created state. Wrong.)

Youngs - "A habitation is the eternal God, And beneath are the arms AGE-DURING". (Again, there is an end to it)

KJB - Matthew 25:41 "Depart from me ye cursed, into EVERLASTING FIRE, prepared for the devil and his angels" 25:46 "And these shall go away into EVERLASTING PUNISHMENT; but the righteous into ETERNAL LIFE."

Youngs - "Go from me, the cursed, to the fire, THE AGE-DURING (there is an end), that hath been prepared for the Devil and his messengers." "And these shall go away to punishment AGE DURING, but the righteous to life AGE-DURING." (According to Young's goofy translation there is an end to both the punishment of the wicked and even the life of the righteous)

John 3:16 "...that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have life EVERLASTING."

Youngs' - "everyone who is believing in him may not perish, but may have life AGE DURING." Again, there is an end.

If you think Young got it right, then there is little hope of you ever seeing it correctly.

God has completely passed over Youngs' version. It never did make an impact. No church uses it and it has rightly been placed on the dusty shelf of oblivion.

Will K

Second Part of Response to Allen

Allen posts: "Will said (that's me again :-)) "However, what specific translation error do you think you have found in the King James Bible?"

Allen says:[quote] "I will cite the most obvious example: G4521 'sabbaton'

This term can only reference the Hebrew sabbath of rest which was commanded on the last day of the week. But in the KJV (and others) it has been rendered as day or week.

The incorrect renderings are in Matthew 28:1, Mark 16:2 & 9, Luke 6:1, 18:12, & 24:1, John

20:1 & 19, Acts 20:7, and 1 Corinthians 16:2

The reason for this mistranslation (allegedly) is to appease the catholic popes who thought to change God's sabbath of rest to sunday, the pagan worship day of the sun. See: Constantine”[/quote]

I then respond: “Allen, quite frankly this has got to be one of the dumbest things I have ever heard. You say: “This term can only reference the Hebrew sabbath of rest which was commanded on the last day of the week. But in the KJV (and others) it has been rendered as day or week.”

Allen, the last “day” of the week IS a day! Get it? And the word sabbaton DOES mean both “the sabbath day” AND “the week”. Every Greek lexicon tells us this, as well as virtually every translation in any language ever made - except for this crack pot Young and his sidekick Green.

Let’s look at the utter nonsense Young comes up with when he MIStranslates the word.

You mentioned Matthew 28:1. Well, let’s look at it more closely.

KJB - Matthew 28:1 - “In THE END OF THE SABBATH (a specific day) , as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.”

So read Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale 1535, Bishops’ Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible 1599, the RV 1881, Darby, ASV 1901, RSV 1954, NRSV 1989, ESV 2001, NASB 1995, NIV 1984, NKJV 1982, and the Holman Standard 2003.

But what does Young’s say? “And ON THE EVE OF THE SABBATHS, at the dawn, toward the first of the sabbaths, came Mary the Magdalene, and the other Mary, to see the sepulchre”

WHAT in the world does “on the eve of the sabbathS” even mean? Were the sabbaths to end after this moment in time? How many sabbaths had been before this one? And what is "the first of the sabbaths". Does he mean to tell us that there were no Sabbaths before this one? It is a ridiculous translation, and Green’s “literal” is just as bad.

Greens “literal” (Yuk, yuk) says: “But late IN THE SABBATHS, AT THE DAWNING INTO THE FIRST OF THE SABBATHS, Mary the Magdalene and the other Mary came to gaze upon the grave.”

This makes absolutely NO sense at all. Green also has a direct contradiction in just this one verse. We have "late in the Sabbaths" (how many days is that?), alongside "the first of the Sabbaths". How many Sabbaths can there possibly be BEFORE the FIRST of the Sabbaths?

As for your claim that "This term can only reference the Hebrew sabbath of rest which was commanded on the last day of the week. But in the KJV (and others) it has been rendered as day or week.", let's take a look at one of the verses you referenced for us - Acts 20:7

It looks like Young's did not agree with Green's this time, and Green's is the loopy one.

KJB - "And upon THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK (Sunday), when the disciples came together to break bread, Paul preached unto them, ready to depart on the morrow; and continued his speech until midnight."

So too read the Geneva Bible, the RV, ASV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Darby, Holman Standard and...(drum roll please) even your Young's 'literal'. -

"And ON THE FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK, the disciples having been gathered together to break bread, Paul was discoursing to them, about to depart on the morrow, he was also continuing the discourse till midnight," - YOUNGS literal translation.

The goofy one this time is Green's - "And ON THE FIRST OF THE SABBATHS, the disciples having been assembled to break bread, being about to depart on the morrow, Paul reasoned to them. And he continued his speech until midnight."

You would be hard pressed to come up with something more ridiculous. "the first of the Sabbaths"?!!? Does Green mean to say that there were no Sabbaths prior to this moment? Hellooooo....Is anybody home?

More Dubious Gems from Young's "literal" translation

Let's take a closer look at several of the blunders Mr. Young committed in his "literal" translation that prove it to be no more than a misbegotten and foolish attempt to improve upon God's majestic Book, the Authorized King James Holy Bible.

Habakkuk 2:4 KJB "Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his FAITH."

Romans 1:17 “For therein is the righteousness of God revealed from faith to faith: as it is written, The just shall live by FAITH.”

Young's 'literal'- Habakkuk 2:4 "Lo, a presumptuous one! Not upright is his soul within him, And the righteous by his STEADFASTNESS liveth." Yet when Young give the quote in Romans 1:17 he has: "according as it hath been written, 'And the righteous on by faith shall live."

Habakkuk 2:4 NIV 1984 - ““See, he is puffed up; his desires are not upright— but the righteous will live by his FAITH—”

Habakkuk 2:4 NIV 2011 - ““See, the enemy is puffed up; his desires are not upright— but the righteous person will live by his FAITHFULNESS—”

Yet when the NIV quotes the verse in Romans 1:17 it still says: “as it is written, the righteous will live by faith.”

The big theological question to ask is this - Does the just live by FAITH, meaning by what he believes about God or by his FAITHFULNESS, meaning how he lives?

All these Bible versions I looked at say in Habakkuk “the just shall live by his FAITH” including Wycliffe 1395, Tyndale 1525, Coverdale, Bishops’ Bible, the Geneva Bible, the Revised Version 1885, the ASV 1901, Darby, the RSV, NRSV, ESV, NIV 1984 edition, NKJV, JPS 1917, the 2004 Complete Tanach, the Syriac, the Douay-Rheims and the Syraic by Lamsa.

The ONLY bible versions that translate Habakkuk 2:4 (which is “quoted” in Romans 1:17) that says “the just (or righteous) will live by HIS FAITHFULNESS” instead of “by his faith” are the Catholic New Jerusalem bible 1985, the Jehovah Witness New World Translation “by HIS FAITHFULNESS he will keep living” and Daniel Wallace and company’s NET version.

Wallace’s NET version amply displays the typical “Every Man For Himself Bible Versionism” mentality so common today. Everybody thinks he’s an expert and they have no final written authority and no complete and infallible Bible. Their “final authority” is their own mind and peculiar and personal understanding.

Daniel Wallace and company’s NET version Romans 1:17 - “just as it is written, “The righteous by faith will live.” Footnote - A quotation from Hab 2:4.”

Yet in Habakkuk 2:4 Wallace's NET version reads: "but the person of integrity will live because of his faithfulness." Footnote - "Or "loyalty"; or "integrity." The Hebrew word ('emunah) has traditionally been translated "faith," but the term nowhere else refers to "belief" as such. When used of human character and conduct it carries the notion of "honesty, integrity, reliability, faithfulness...The present translation assumes that the preceding word "[the person of] integrity" is the antecedent. In this case the Lord is assuring Habakkuk that those who are truly innocent will be preserved through the coming oppression and judgment by their godly lifestyle, for God ultimately rewards this type of conduct."

Is Daniel Wallace a Catholic plant? Or is he just being seduced and deceived by the spirit of the whore of Babylon? According to the "new" NIV and the latest Catholic bible version like the New Jerusalem bible, and the works salvationists like the Jehovah Witnesses, the just shall live by how he lives (his faithfulness) rather than by what he believes (his faith). The whole Reformation is being overturned by these fake, new "Catholic" bible versions and the sad part is, few Christians even care.

In 1 Samuel 6:19 the true Bible tells us that God smote of the people "fifty thousand and threescore and ten men" (50,070). There is real confusion here among the bogus bible versions, with Young's being one of the more unique.

The Bible versions that correctly read that God struck down 50,070 men are the King James Bible, the NASB 1977, 1995, Revised Version 1881, American Standard Version 1901, Webster's 1833 translation, Wycliffe 1395, Coverdale 1535, Bishop's Bible 1568, the Geneva Bible of 1599, the Spanish Reina Valera of 1909 and 1960, the Italian Diodati, modern Italian, Modern Greek bible, the Portuguese, French and Rumanian bibles, the World English Bible, both the 1917 and 1936 Hebrew-English translations from the Masoretic text, the 1998 Complete Jewish Bible, the Hebrew Names Version as well as the Third Millennium Bible and the 21st Century KJB. These versions translate what the preserved Hebrew texts actually read - 50,070.

However the RSV, NRSV, NIV and ESV tell us that God slew 70 men while **Young's tells us it was "70 men - 50 chief men"**. Green's "literal" is different still, reading: "Yea, He struck SEVENTY among the people, FIFTY OUT OF A THOUSAND MEN." and the Holman Standard says it was "70 MEN OUT OF 50,000".

Here is an explanation of why the KJB is correct.

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/1sam619john1939.htm>

Youngs often does not follow the Hebrew texts, but not so badly as the more recent versions like the NASB, RSV, ESV, NIV and Holman Standard.

Here are some examples of where Youngs leaves the Hebrew and goes off into something else.

2 Chronicles 22:2 Here the Hebrew texts as well as the KJB, Geneva, NKJV, RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, JPS 1917 AND GREENs all tell us that Ahaziah was 42 years old. - “FORTY AND TWO years old was Ahaziah when he began to reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem.”

However Youngs joins several other modern versions in rejecting the clear Hebrew number of 42 and instead goes with the Syriac and a few LXX copies and has 22 instead. Youngs reads: “A son of TWENTY AND TWO years [is] Ahaziah in his reigning, and one year he hath reigned in Jerusalem”

For more of an explanation of this apparent contradiction and why the Hebrew texts and the KJB are correct, see:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/howoldwasahaziah.htm>

Hosea 6:5 KJB - “Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth: and **THY** judgments are as the light that goeth forth.”

Youngs - “Therefore I have hewed by prophets, I have slain them by sayings of My mouth, And **MY** judgments to the light goeth forth.”

Here the Hebrew Masoretic texts read **THY** judgments, and so do the Jewish translations JPS 1917, the Geneva bible, RV, ASV, NKJV, Greens, Darby and Douay.

The NASB goes off on its own with : “And the judgments on you are like the light that goes forth. “

But the NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, Holman and Youngs reject the Hebrew reading of **THY** (**YOUR**) and, as they tell us in their own footnotes, go with the Greek Septuagint and the Syriac reading: “**MY** judgments”.

The NRSV, NET and the Holman Standard all footnote that **MY** comes from the LXX and Syriac, but that the Hebrew reads “**YOUR**” (thy).

Likewise Young's does not always follow the same Greek texts that underlie the King James Bible.

For example: In Matthew 6:1 instead of reading "Do not your ALMS before men", Youngs has "your KINDNESS not to do before men". In Luke 2:22 instead of reading "HER purification" (Mary, according to the law), Youngs has "THEIR purification"; in 2 Thessalonians 3:6 instead of "after the tradition which HE received of us" Youngs has "the deliverance YE received of us", and in Revelation 16:16 instead of "HE (God) gathered them together into a place called in the Hebrew tongue Armageddon" Youngs reads: "and THEY did bring them together to the place that is called in Hebrew Armageddon."

Youngs has an unbelievably stupid theological blunder in Psalms 78:36 where translations like the Geneva Bible, RV, ASV, NIV, NKJV AND Greens all tell us that the children of Israel "FLATTERED" God with their mouths.

But Youngs, along with the NASB says "they DECEIVE Him with their mouth".

Does it really have to be pointed out that it is utterly impossible to DECEIVE GOD? See more about this huge blunder here:

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/eze149ps7836deceive.htm>

Youngs' "literal" has many examples of mind-boggling, ridiculous readings as well.

In Psalms 141:7 we read: "Our bones are scattered at the grave's mouth, as when ONE CUTTETH AND CLEAVETH WOOD upon the earth.

But in Youngs we see: Psalm 141:7 "As ONE TILLING AND RIPPING UP THE LAND, Have our bones been scattered AT THE COMMAND OF SAUL." (Say What?)

1 Samuel 25:22 "So and more also do God unto the enemies of David, if I leave of all that pertain to him by the morning light any that PISSETH AGAINST THE WALL." (Green - "urinates against the wall.")

But Young has: "thus doth God do to the enemies of David, and thus He doth add, if I leave of all that he hath till the light of the morning -- of THOSE SITTING ON THE WALL."

Proverbs 30:1 KJB - "The words of Agur the son of Jakeh, even the prophecy: the man spake

unto Ithiel, EVEN UNTO ITHIEL AND UCAL.”

So read the Geneva bible, Jewish Publication Society translation 1917, the RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, RSV, Holman Standard and NET versions.

Proverbs 30:1 NIV 1984 - “The sayings of Agur son of Jakeh—an ORACLE: This man DECLARED to Ithiel, TO ITHIEL AND TO UCAL.” (Equals KJB and others mentioned)

Proverbs 30:1 NIV 2011 - “The sayings of Agur son of Jakeh—an INSPIRED UTTERANCE. This man’S UTTERANCE to Ithiel: “I AM WEARY, GOD, BUT I CAN PREVAIL.”

So read the NRSV 1989, ESV 2001 and now the NIV 2011. The Message says: “The skeptic swore, “There is no God! No God!-I can do anything I want! **“Young’s ‘literal’ is virtually unrecognizable with: “Words of a Gatherer, son of an obedient one, the declaration, an affirmation of the man: -- I have wearied myself for God, I have wearied myself for God, and am consumed.”** The so called Greek Septuagint is not of any help here because the most common versions has absolutely NOTHING for all 33 verses of Proverbs 30:1-33 and is missing verses 1 through 9 of chapter 31.

One that made me laugh out loud when I first saw it was 1 Kings 18:21.

Here we read: “And Elijah came unto all the people, and said, How long HALT YE BETWEEN TWO OPINIONS? if the LORD be God, follow him: but if Baal, then follow him. And the people answered him not a word.”

But Youngs “literal” has: “and Elijah cometh nigh unto all the people, and saith, `TILL WHEN ARE YE LEAPING ON THE TWO BRANCHES? -- if Jehovah [is] God, go after Him; and if Baal, go after him;’ and the people have not answered him a word. “

Zechariah 9:9 KJB - “Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, AND HAVING SALVATION; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon a colt the foal of an ass.”

Youngs - “Rejoice exceedingly, O daughter of Zion, Shout, O daughter of Jerusalem, Lo, thy King doth come to thee, Righteous -- AND SAVED IS HE, Afflicted -- and riding on an ass, And on a colt -- a son of she-asses.”

Deuteronomy 33:2 KJB (and Green’s) - “And he said, The LORD came from Sinai, and rose up

from Seir unto them; he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went A FIERY LAW for them. “

Youngs - “...And hath come [with] myriads of holy ones; At His right hand ARE SPRINGS for them.”

Proverbs 30:1 KJB (and Green's) “The words of Agur the son of Jakeh, even the prophecy: the man spake unto Ithiel, even unto Ithiel and Ucal,”

Youngs actually reads: Proverbs 30:1 “Words of a Gatherer, son of an obedient one, the declaration, an affirmation of the man: -- I have wearied myself [for] God, I have wearied myself [for] God, and am consumed.”

Proverbs 22:20 KJB - “Have not I written to thee EXCELLENT THINGS in counsels and knowledge” (RV, ASV, NASB, NKJV, JPS 1917).

Youngs “literal” - “Have I not written to thee THREE TIMES With counsels and knowledge?”

Green's “literal” - “Have I not written to you YESTERDAY AND THE DAY BEFORE with counsels and knowledge”

NIV - “Have I not written THIRTY SAYINGS for you, sayings of counsel and knowledge”

Let's see “excellent things”, “yesterday and the day before”, “three times” and “thirty sayings”. Yep, looks like James White is right. By comparing several different versions we can get a better idea of what God *really* said, huh?

Job 1:5 “And it was so, when the days of their feasting were gone about, that Job sent and sanctified them, and rose up early in the morning, and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all: for Job said, It may be that my sons have sinned, AND CURSED GOD in their hearts. Thus did Job continually.”

So read Greens, the NASB, RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, Geneva, Holman, JPS 1917 etc.

However Young's “literal” has: “...for Job said, 'Perhaps my sons have sinned, YET BLESSED GOD in their heart.' Thus doth Job all the days.”

And in Job 1:11 Satan challenges God saying: “But put forth thine hand now, and touch all that he hath, and HE WILL CURSE THEE to thy face.”

So read the Geneva bible, the JPS 1917, RV, ASV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NASB, NIV, NKJV, Darby, Holman Standard and Green’s .

But Youngs “literal” says: “The work of his hands Thou hast blessed, and his substance hath spread in the land, and yet, put forth, I pray Thee, Thy hand, and strike against anything that he hath -- if not: to Thy face HE DOTHS BLESS THEE!”

Again, in Job 2:9 we see where Job’s wife says: “Then said his wife unto him, Dost thou still retain thine integrity? CURSE GOD, and die.”

So read Wycliffe, Coverdale, Bishops’ bible, the Geneva Bible, the NASB, NIV, RSV, NRSV, ESV, NKJV, Holman Standard, the JPS 1917, Darby and even The Message.

But both Young’s ‘literal’ and Green’s loopy version say the exact opposite - “And his wife saith to him, `Still thou art keeping hold on thine integrity: BLESS GOD and die.’

“Bless God” or “Curse God”? - Yep, pretty much the same meaning, right?

Anyone who tries to palm off Young’s “literal” translation as being the infallible words of God simply does not know what he is talking about. It is not even a good translation. It is little more than a passing footnote in the ever changing panorama of perverted bible versions that have come and gone over the years.

There is only one Bible that has stood the test of time and its critics. There is only one Bible that is believed and defended by thousands of Bible believers today as being the true “book of the LORD”- the Authorized King James Holy Bible - now about to celebrate 400 years of being THE Bible of the English speaking people.

Will Kinney

Return to Articles -

<http://brandplucked.webs.com/articles.htm>