

The Translation of Gender Terminology in the NIV 2011

Denny Burk

Associate Professor of Biblical Studies

Boyce College

The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary

Louisville, Kentucky

With researchers **Ben Montoya, Mitch Chase,
Daniel Diffey, Adam Howell, Nick Moore,
Jason Motte, and Josh Philpot**

Introduction

My dad led me to Christ when I was nine years old. Almost immediately after my profession of faith and baptism, a desire welled-up within me that I had never experienced before. I wanted to read and understand the Bible for myself. I had been taught that it was God’s Word to me, and I knew that growth in Christ depended on my knowledge of it. So I picked up my blue hardback King James Version—the standard-issue text used by children for “Bible Drill” in Southern Baptist churches—and I began reading. Not knowing any better, I just started at the beginning, Gen 1:1. It did not take very long for my little nine-year old brain to bog-down in the archaic English of the 1611 King James Version. As a result, I eventually gave up on being able to read the Bible for myself with any real comprehension. I would continue to use my King James at church, but it was not something I felt comfortable reading on my own.

It would be another 8 years or so before my parents gave me one of the best Christmas gifts of all time—a new Bible. But this was not just any Bible. It was a Life Application Bible, and the translation was the New International Version (NIV). This was just the text that an unlettered adolescent like me needed. This gift changed my life. Yes, the

notes, maps, and other study helps were valuable. But the best thing about this Bible was the translation itself. For the first time in my life, I owned a Bible that I could actually read and comprehend, and I devoured it. I began reading the Bible again as for the first time.

By the time I reached my sophomore year in college, I became convinced that I needed to read this book from cover to cover every year. The first time I read the Bible all the way through from Genesis to Revelation, I read from the NIV. I look back on those days of reading the NIV as the most formative period of my spiritual life. I had a hunger for God’s Word, and the NIV was where I found my nourishment.

Even now as I thumb through the pages of that old NIV Bible and read the highlights and notes I added to it so many years ago, I am filled with gratitude for the NIV’s place in my own story. That is in part why I was thrilled several years ago to contribute to a primary study-aid for readers of the NIV, *Mounce’s Complete Expository Dictionary of Old & New Testament Words*.¹ As I write this critical review, therefore, I write as one whose testimony has been inexorably shaped by the NIV translation.²

But this is not just my story. According to

the Christian Bookseller Association, the NIV is by far the best-selling Bible in English—ahead of the King James Version, the English Standard Version, and a host of others.³ It is hard to overstate the influence of the NIV among English speaking evangelicals (especially in North America). Its influence has been pervasive for a generation of believers. In many ways, the 1984 revision of the NIV has become the authorized version of evangelicalism.

That is why the last two attempts at revising the NIV have proved so controversial.⁴ The NIV has a wide influence, and both revisions (the NIVI and the TNIV) adopted the much-criticized gender-neutral philosophy of Bible translation. There is a great difference of opinion among scholars, pastors, and other leaders over the proper way to render the Bible's gender language into English. The gender-neutral approach of the TNIV became such a lightning-rod that the version never caught on with American evangelicals and is now discontinued.

Nevertheless, the TNIV provoked a lively discussion among evangelical scholars and Bible readers about translation philosophy in general and about gender-neutral approaches in particular. The debate actually preceded the appearance of the TNIV. It began in the late 1990's and extended through the mid-2000's. Many of the contested issues in that discussion remain unresolved.⁵ And many evangelicals who once benefitted from the NIV (like myself) have not been happy with the gender-neutral revisions. It is no surprise, therefore, that many evangelicals have been anticipating the release of the 2011 NIV. Readers want to see how this latest revision has resolved (or not resolved) points of contention about gender language that are left over from these previous discussions.

The first point to remember is this: The NIV 2011 is not a fresh translation or a revision of the previous NIV but is a revision of the now defunct TNIV. So the question that everyone wants answered is this: Have the weaknesses of the TNIV been sufficiently overcome in the NIV 2011? In the end, the answer has to be no.

If the answer is no, what does that say about

the viability of the translation? Will the NIV 2011 enjoy the same prominence among evangelicals that the NIV 1984 has had for so many years? Or will the NIV 2011 fall into disuse and go the way of the TNIV?

To be sure, the NIV translators have made numerous improvements that are worthy of note.⁶ For instance, in most cases the key Pauline term *sarx* has been changed from “sinful nature” to the more literal and precise term “flesh” in the 2011 NIV (for example, Rom 8:4). In Rom 1:17 and related texts, “righteousness from God” becomes “righteousness of God.” In other verses, “observing the law” becomes “works of law” (see Rom 3:20, 28). All three of these changes now leave open important interpretive options and represent a significant improvement over renderings in the 1984 NIV that closed those options.

There have also been a number of important improvements related to the use of gender language. For example, in 164 passages, “man” and “mankind” have replaced a gender-neutral equivalent such as “humanity” (as in Gen 1:27, which now says, “God created mankind in his own image,” retaining the male-nuanced meaning of Hebrew *'adam*).⁷

Similar welcome changes have been made in hundreds of verses where “brother,” “father,” “son,” and “he/him/his” have been restored, replacing the gender-neutral alternatives that were used in the TNIV. In total, we have counted 933 places where gender-neutral translations in the TNIV have been changed in the 2011 NIV, and in most cases they have been replaced with more accurate, gender-specific translations.⁸

We are thankful for this significant improvement in nearly a thousand places in the 2011 NIV, and we recognize that the NIV's Committee on Bible Translation expended a large amount of effort and scholarly discussion to make these changes. In fact, many of these improvements were made in verses that were highlighted in previous criticisms of the TNIV by CBMW and others. And there are numerous other improvements as well that we cannot mention here.⁹

Even though these are all welcome advances over the TNIV, there are still a great many unre-

solved issues related to gender language. And so the question we wish to explore in this article is whether or not NIV 2011 sufficiently corrects the problematic renderings of the TNIV with respect to gender language in particular and to gender-related texts in general.

For the reasons enumerated below, we believe that improvements to the TNIV have not been extensive enough in NIV 2011, and that some new changes represent a step in the wrong direction.

The Vast Majority of Problematic Gender Renderings from the TNIV Are Retained in the NIV 2011

Wayne Grudem and Vern Poythress were instrumental in cataloguing problematic renderings in the TNIV Old and New Testaments. Over

the course of two different books, they catalogued some 3,686 “inaccurate translations in the TNIV” Old and New Testaments that relate to gender language.¹⁰ The current study has surveyed all of these 3,686 problems in the TNIV to see how they were rendered in the NIV 2011.¹¹ We found that although the NIV 2011 walks back many of its most controversial renderings of gender language from the TNIV, the majority of the problems identified by Poythress and Grudem still remain. In many cases, the NIV 2011 unnecessarily removes male-oriented terminology—especially the use of generic masculine forms of expression. Below is a numerical summary of our findings. The following charts (Tables 1-3) represent revisions from TNIV to NIV 2011.¹²

Table 1 – Summary of Revisions of Gender Language from TNIV to NIV 2011

Testaments	Same as TNIV	Revised from TNIV	%Same	%Revised
OT	2194	597	79%	21%
NT	572	336	63%	37%
Totals	2766	933	75%	25%

Table 2 – Summary of New Testament Revisions¹³

Category	Same as TNIV	Revised from TNIV	%Same	%Revised
A. Changes from Singular to Plural to Avoid the Use of “He/Him/His”	385	223	63%	37%
B. Changes to Avoid the Word “Father” and Related Words	35	4	90%	10%
C. Changes to Avoid the Word “Brother” (Or to Add the Word “Sister”)	53	33	62%	38%
D. Changes to Avoid the Word “Man”	22	52	30%	70%
E. Changes to Avoid the Word “Son”	19	6	76%	24%
F. Changes to Avoid the Phrase “The Jews”	24	0	100%	0%
G. Changes that Lose the Nuance of Holiness in “Saints”	27	14	66%	34%
H. Other Changes	7	4	64%	36%
Totals	572	336	63%	37%

Table 3 – Summary of Old Testament Revisions

Category	Same as TNIV	Revised from TNIV	%Same	%Revised
A. Changes Made from Singular to Plural (and a Few Related Changes) to Avoid the Use of “He/Him/His”	1617	429	79%	21%
B. Changes Made to Avoid the Word “Father”	293	23	93%	7%
C. Changes to Avoid the Word “Brother”	10	17	37%	63%
D. Changes to Avoid the Word “Man”	256	117	69%	31%
E. Changes to Avoid the Word “Son”	14	11	56%	44%
F. Changes Made to Avoid the Word “Women”	4	0	100%	0%
Totals	2194	597	79%	21%

Of the 3,686 “inaccuracies” that Poythress and Grudem identified, we found that three-fourths of them (75%) stayed exactly as they were in the TNIV. That means that whatever improvements have appeared, the vast majority of the “inaccurate” renderings of gender language persist in NIV 2011.

A close inspection of the 25% that was revised shows that the NIV 2011 eliminates some of the most heavily criticized gender-neutral renderings of the TNIV, and for that we are thankful. Nevertheless, the modifications were incomplete, since the vast majority of the problems previously identified during the TNIV debate still remain.

These problems fall in several main categories, including these: changing singular pronouns (“he/him/his”) to plurals (“they/ them/ their”); changing “man” to “human” or “person”; changing “brother” to “friend” or something else; changing “son” to “child” or “children”; and changing “father” to “parent” or “parents.” Detailed lists of these changes can be found at <http://www.dennyburk.com/JBMW/NIV2011-OT-Spreadsheet.xlsx> and <http://www.dennyburk.com/JBMW/NIV2011-NT-Spreadsheet.xlsx>.

The Most Contested Verse in the Gender Debate, 1 Timothy 2:12

One cannot underestimate the importance of 1 Tim 2:12 in the intra-evangelical debate over gender roles and women in ministry: “I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man” (1984 NIV).

There is a reason why countless articles and

even an entire book¹⁴ have been written on the interpretation of this single verse. In many ways, this verse is the most disputed text in the debate. It is clear that Paul is prohibiting something, but just what he prohibits has been fiercely contested.

Complementarians argue that Paul prohibits women from doing two things—teaching Christian doctrine to and exercising authority over the gathered church.

Egalitarians argue that Paul prohibits women from doing one thing—a certain kind of teaching. They argue that there is no gender-based authority structure indicated in this text but that Paul means to prohibit women from “teaching with authority,” from “teaching in a domineering way,” or from “teaching false doctrine.” In their view, Paul doesn’t prohibit all teaching by women over men, but only a certain kind of teaching. Recently, some egalitarians have argued that Paul means to prohibit women from a wrongful kind of “teaching and assuming authority” over a man. Philip Payne makes this argument in a 2008 article for *New Testament Studies* and in his 2009 book *Man and Woman, One in Christ*.¹⁵

Sadly, the NIV 2011 reflects the latter approach in its rendering, “assume authority.” Here is how the verse appears in the four NIV versions since 1984 (Table 4).

As the table indicates, the crucial change occurred in the TNIV 2005, which is the basis for the NIV 2011, where “have authority” was changed to “assume authority.” What difference does this change make? “Assume authority” seems to imply

Table 4 – Revisions of 1 Timothy 2:12

Text of 1 Timothy 2:12	Notes
NIV 1984 I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent.	
TNIV NT 2002 I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over ^b a man; ^c she must be quiet	^b Or <i>to exercise authority over</i> ; or <i>to dominate</i> ^c Or <i>her husband</i>
TNIV 2005 I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man; ^{1,2} she must be quiet.	¹ Or <i>teach a man in a domineering way</i> ; or <i>teach or to exercise (or have) authority over a man</i> ² Or <i>over her husband</i>
NIV 2011 I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man; ^b she must be quiet.	^b Or <i>over her husband</i>

the idea of acting independently in order to take up an undelegated authority.¹⁶ In other words, “assume authority” has the ring of a sinful power-grab. On this view, Paul is not prohibiting women from exercising authority *per se*, but only from *assuming* a stance of independent (and thus illegitimate) leadership in the church. So *women may in fact teach men and exercise authority over them* so long as such authority is properly delegated to them by the church.¹⁷

It appears, therefore, that the NIV 2011 comes down on the side of egalitarianism in its rendering of 1 Tim 2:12.

The NIV translators, however, do not see it this way. They argue that “assume authority” tilts neither in the direction of complementarianism nor of egalitarianism. In their “Translators’ Notes,” they write,

“Assume authority” is a particularly nice English rendering because it leaves the question open, as it must be unless we discover new, more conclusive evidence. The exercise of authority that Paul was forbidding was one that women inappropriately assumed, but whether that referred to all forms of authority over men in church or only certain forms in certain contexts is up to the individual interpreter to decide.¹⁸

But is it really true that this translation “leaves the question open”? I don’t think so. From the trans-

lators’ own words, we see that “assume authority” denotes an “inappropriate” taking up of authority. This gives a negative connotation to the word, and Andreas Köstenberger has shown that a negative connotation is not possible in this particular grammatical construction—a conclusion that has been widely received among feminist and complementarian scholars alike.¹⁹ So “assume authority” does not leave the question open but moves the discussion decidedly into the direction of egalitarianism.

For the record, I am not the only one who views “assume authority” as an egalitarian rendering. Interpreters from both sides of the debate view it the very same way that I have it here. This translation is in fact the preferred translation of Payne, a New Testament scholar who has devoted the better part of his scholarly career to defending an egalitarian reading of Scripture. Payne writes,

Since lexical and contextual evidence favors the meaning BDAG gives for *authentein*, “to assume a stance of independent authority”, this article translates *αὐθεντεῖν* “to assume authority”

Teaching combined with assuming authority is by definition not authorized

What 1 Tim 2.12 prohibits, it must regard as negative: a woman teaching combined with assuming authority over a man. . . .

This οὐδέ construction makes best sense as a single prohibition of women teaching with self-assumed authority over a man.²⁰

Complementarian Wayne Grudem likewise agrees that this is an egalitarian interpretation. In his 2006 book *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism?* he writes,

In 1 Timothy 2:12 the TNIV adopts a highly suspect and novel translation that gives the egalitarian side everything they have wanted for years in a Bible translation. It reads, “I do not permit a woman to teach or to assume authority over a man”.... If churches adopt this translation, the debate over women’s roles in the church will be over, because women pastors and elders can just say, “I’m not assuming authority on my own initiative; it was given to me by the other pastors and elders.” Therefore any woman could be a pastor or elder so long as she does not take it upon herself to “assume authority”.... So it is no surprise that egalitarian churches are eager to adopt the TNIV.²¹

Even though the TNIV 2005 employed the translation “assume authority,” it at least preserved alternatives in the note, “*teach a man in a domineering way; or teach or to exercise (or have) authority over a man.*” This note has disappeared in NIV 2011, so a complementarian interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 will no longer be available to readers of the NIV. All the reader has is an egalitarian rendering in the text. If the translators intended to “leave the question open,” why is this note removed in NIV 2011?

What is the upshot of this translation for the average reader of the NIV? Those readers will see a significant change in their translation the next time they purchase an NIV. In their new Bible, “have authority” will give way to “assume authority” with absolutely no explanation in the notes. Those readers may very well conclude that women may exercise authority over men (i.e., serve as pastors) so long as they do not “assume” that

authority independently.

One cannot judge a translation based on a single verse. Nevertheless, the NIV’s rendering of 1 Tim 2:12 is particularly important because it is a watershed in the evangelical gender debate. Unfortunately, the NIV 2011 obscures Paul’s prohibition of women having governing authority over the entire church. Furthermore, many readers, perhaps most, will read the verse as permitting women to serve as pastors and to teach men. Hence, I would not recommend that individual Christians or churches adopt the NIV 2011, for it misleads in a crucial verse in the gender debate and it lacks clarity and accuracy, as I noted above, in many other verses as well. Individual Christians and churches who are concerned about evangelical accommodations to feminism need to exercise caution before adopting the new NIV Bible.

A Survey of Key Texts and Translation Tendencies²²

The main question facing current NIV readers is not how much the new NIV is like the TNIV (see above), but rather, *How much has changed from the 1984 NIV that I am currently using?* Therefore the following section examines changes from the 1984 NIV to the new 2011 NIV.

The new NIV adopts feminist translations of key verses

This is not to presume upon the motives of the translators or their individual convictions about the gender debate. Indeed, we know that there are complementarians on the Committee for Bible Translation, and the chairman himself has written one of the definitive arguments in favor of a complementarian reading of 1 Tim 2:12. Nevertheless, feminists who claim that women can be pastors and elders will find much to their liking in the 2011 NIV because it tilts the scales in favor of their view at several key verses. In the previous section we already discussed the most important text, 1 Tim 2:12. Other verses have been reoriented in a similar way.

^{1984 NIV} **Rom 16:7** Greet Andronicus and Junias, my relatives who have been in prison with me. They are outstanding among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was.

^{2011 NIV} **Rom 16:7** Greet Andronicus and Junia, my fellow Jews who have been in prison with me. They are outstanding among the apostles, and they were in Christ before I was. (same as TNIV, except for footnote)

This verse changes “Junias” (a man’s name) to “Junia” (a woman’s name; the Greek spelling could refer to either a man or a woman), and now says that “Andronicus and Junia” are “outstanding among the apostles,” thus making the woman “Junia” an apostle. This is a highly disputed verse, but the NIV now clearly gives more weight to the feminist argument that says there was at least one woman apostle, and if a woman could be an apostle (like Paul or Peter!), surely women can be pastors and elders as well.

Some other recent evangelical translations also translate this name as “Junia” (a woman), but at least three translations do not then make Junia an apostle. Based on what some believe to be a better understanding of the Greek phrase *episēmoi en tois apostolois*,²³ both the ESV and the NET Bible say that Andronicus and Junia are “well known to the apostles,” and the HCSB says they are “noteworthy in the eyes of the apostles.” Thus, the apostles *recognized* Andronicus and Junia, but they were not themselves apostles. (The new NIV also gives a similar reading to this as an alternative in a footnote.) We recognize that there are other explanations (including the claim that “apostle” here has a weaker sense),²⁴ but it still should be noted that, in contrast to three other recent evangelical translations,²⁵ the new NIV adopts the translation strongly favored by feminists, apparently making Junia an apostle.

^{1984 NIV} **1 Cor 14:33-34** For God is not a God of disorder but of peace. As in all the congregations of the saints, women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak,

but must be in submission, as the Law says.

^{2011 NIV} **1 Cor 14:33-34** For God is not a God of disorder but of peace—as in all the congregations of the Lord’s people. Women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the law says. (same as TNIV)

The question here is where to divide the paragraph and where to put the phrase, “as in all the congregations of the saints.” The old NIV put the phrase with what follows, so Paul said, “As in all the congregations of the saints, women should remain silent in the churches.” There is a good reason for this: the Greek word *ekklēsia* (“church, congregation”) is repeated in both phrases, tying them together, and a statement that something is done “in all the congregations” is an appropriate way for Paul to give weight to what he says about women speaking in church.

What does Paul mean by “women should remain silent”? Many interpreters take this to mean that women should be “silent” when spoken prophecies were being judged (a governing function for the whole church). But whatever kind of silence Paul meant, the phrase “As in all the congregations of the saints” showed that Paul was not just solving some *local* problem at Corinth but was reminding them about the established practice of *all the churches*. “All the churches” had some kind of restrictions on some kinds of speech by women in the assembled congregation.

But the 2011 NIV now *disconnects* the phrase “as in all the congregations of the Lord’s people” from the statement, “women should remain silent in the churches” (1 Cor 14:33-34). They put that phrase with the previous sentence: “For God is not a God of disorder but of peace—as in all the congregations of the Lord’s people” (1 Cor 14:33). Now Paul’s statement, “Women should remain silent in the churches,” (1 Cor 14:34) starts a new paragraph, and the feminist argument that Paul was *only addressing a local problem at Corinth* (not a problem that applies to churches today) has gained

new force. Once again the new NIV has been modified in a way that favors a common feminist interpretation.

Now it must be said that at several of these verses the new NIV does give an alternative, more conservative reading in a footnote, and we appreciate that. But what people read in a translation are the words in the Bible text itself, far more than the footnotes. And the 2011 NIV has shifted some key verses in a gender-neutral way that supports women apostles and women elders.

There is one last text in this category that is worthy of note. Making Phoebe a deacon in Rom 16:1 will be of concern to churches where male deacons have a governing role over the church.

^{1984 NIV} **Rom 16:1** I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a servant of the church in Cenchrea.

^{2011 NIV} **Rom 16:1** I commend to you our sister Phoebe, a deacon [footnote: or *servant*] of the church in Cenchreae. (same as TNIV)

This verse changes Phoebe from a “servant” to a “deacon” of the church at Cenchrea, and thereby it endorses women as deacons. Both translations are possible meanings for the Greek word *diakonos*, and the decision must be made from the larger New Testament context. (In the entire New Testament, the NIV translates *diakonos* as “deacon” only four times out of twenty-nine occurrences: here in Rom 16:1 and in three verses where no individual is named but a church office is clearly in view: Phil 1:1; 1 Tim 3:8, 12.)

CBMW has not taken a position on whether women can be deacons.²⁶ My comment here is more of an observation than an objection. For churches and denominations that do *not* have women deacons, the new NIV will prove difficult. These churches hold that “deacon” is a governing office in the church and that 1 Tim 3:12 requires deacons to be “the husband of one wife.” But if such churches use the 2011 NIV, the debate about women as deacons will shift: Phoebe is now named as a deacon in Rom 16:1; therefore, it seems, women should be

deacons today. This will be of concern to a number of churches.²⁷

The new NIV changes “father” to “parent”

^{1984 NIV} **Prov 15:5** A fool spurns his father's discipline, but whoever heeds correction shows prudence.

^{2011 NIV} **Prov 15:5** A fool spurns a parent's discipline, but whoever heeds correction shows prudence. (same as TNIV)

But the Hebrew text has *'ab*, which means “father,” not “parent.” Fifteen other verses in the 2011 NIV make a similar change. Why seek to eliminate “father” when that is the precise meaning of the Hebrew text?

There are no cases in the Old Testament where the singular Hebrew word *'ab* means “parent” rather than “father.” Hebrew lexicons define this word in singular as “father,” not as “parent.”²⁸ Moreover, the Proverbs are consistently and specifically cast as the exhortation of a father to a son.²⁹ The use, therefore, of an individual “father” to teach a general truth about all parents is natural and expected. Nevertheless, the new NIV translators in verses like this were unwilling to translate the word with the clear, simple English equivalent “father.”

Similar changes in other verses diminish the role of the father in Israelite society. For example,

^{1984 NIV} **1 Sam 18:2** From that day Saul kept David with him and did not let him return to his father's house.

^{2011 NIV} **1 Sam 18:2** From that day Saul kept David with him and did not let him return home to his family. (same as TNIV)

Although the Hebrew text in such verses speaks several times of a “father’s house” or “father’s family” and uses the ordinary Hebrew word for “father” (*'ab*), the new NIV eliminates the word “father” and substitutes “family” or some other expression. The new expressions remove any suggestion of a father’s leadership role in the family. These new NIV verses are not translated as accu-

rately as possible, but they are consistent with the new NIV's practice of removing male-oriented details of meaning from the text of the Bible.

The new NIV changes "forefather" to "ancestor"

^{1984 NIV} **Josh 19:47** (But the Danites had difficulty taking possession of their territory, so they went up and attacked Leshem, took it, put it to the sword and occupied it. They settled in Leshem and named it Dan after their forefather.)

^{2011 NIV} **Josh 19:47** (When the territory of the Danites was lost to them, they went up and attacked Leshem, took it, put it to the sword and occupied it. They settled in Leshem and named it Dan after their ancestor.)

The Hebrew text has *'ab*, the ordinary word for "father," and here the translation "forefather" is appropriate for such a reference to a male ancestor from earlier generations. But the new NIV's word "ancestor" *eliminates* the male component of meaning that would have been evident to every Hebrew reader because this was the common word meaning "father." This change occurs 313 times in the 2011 NIV. Why does the new NIV seek to eliminate male meaning that is present in the Hebrew or Greek text?

The new NIV changes "son" to "child"

^{1984 NIV} **Prov 13:24** He who spares the rod hates his son, but he who loves him is careful to discipline him.

^{2011 NIV} **Prov 13:24** Whoever spares the rod hates their children, but the one who loves their children is careful to discipline them.

The Hebrew word here is *ben* (singular), and it means "son," not "child" and certainly not "children." The pronoun connected to "son" is masculine singular and means "his" not "their."

The Bible often teaches by giving a specific, concrete example (such as a single father who is disciplining a specific son) and then expecting the

readers to apply this vivid example more generally as appropriate. But the new NIV finds such a specific masculine example objectionable and changes it to a broader truth about "whoever" and "their children" generally, all in the interest of removing the masculine specificity that is there in the Hebrew text of Scripture. Several other verses in the OT make this same change.

This tendency to avoid the word "son" also affects the phrase "son of man" in some verses:

^{1984 NIV} **Ps 8:4** what is man that you are mindful of him, the son of man that you care for him?

^{2011 NIV} **Ps 8:4** what is mankind that you are mindful of them, human beings that you care for them?

The phrase in Hebrew is *ben-'adam*, and *ben* (which is singular) means "son" and *'adam* means "man." The translation "son of man" is correct, and this verse is understood that way in Heb 2:6. There is a clear possibility that Jesus thought of himself as fulfilling this passage (as well as Dan 7:13) when he referred to himself frequently as "the Son of Man." But the connection to the New Testament and to Christ is obscured with the new NIV, as it removes male components of meaning from verse after verse.³⁰

The new NIV changes "brother" to "brother or sister" or to other non-family words

^{1984 NIV} **Luke 17:3** So watch yourselves. "If your brother sins, rebuke him, and if he repents, forgive him.

^{2011 NIV} **Luke 17:3** So watch yourselves. "If your brother or sister sins against you, rebuke them; and if they repent, forgive them.

Why did the NIV make this change? Jesus gave a specific example of a brother who sins. He could have said "brother or sister" if he had wanted to, because elsewhere a New Testament author says "brother or sister" in Greek (Jas 2:15, "Suppose a brother or sister [Greek *adelphos ē adelphē*] is with-

out clothes and daily food”). But Jesus did not say that. He gave a specific example of a brother. English translation, therefore, should retain the specific example of a brother.

Yet the new NIV does this many other times, changing “brother” to “brother or sister,” or to some other gender-neutral expression. This happens in the Old Testament as well:

^{1984 NIV} **Deut 22:1** If you see your brother's ox or sheep straying, do not ignore it but be sure to take it back to him.

^{2011 NIV} **Deut 22:1** If you see your fellow Israelite's ox or sheep straying, do not ignore it but be sure to take it back to its owner.

The Hebrew word *'ab* normally means “brother,” but can by metaphorical extension refer to “fellow tribesman” or “fellow countryman.”³¹ Yet in this context, the word most likely has a masculine component of meaning. Why not translate this word in a way that recognizes that property rights in patriarchal cultures (like ancient Israel) belong to men? Why not translate this common word according to its ordinary meaning, which includes the rich family imagery of “brother,” unless you are trying to eliminate much of the male-oriented language from the Bible?

The new NIV changes “he” and “him” to “they” and “them”

This is the largest category of changes in the new NIV, and it makes a significant difference in meaning. This is because changing singulars to plurals removes the emphasis in a verse on individual, personal relationship with God and specific individual responsibility for one's choices and actions.

^{1984 NIV} **John 14:23** Jesus replied, “If anyone loves me, he will obey my teaching. My Father will love him, and we will come to him and make our home with him.”

^{2011 NIV} **John 14:23** Jesus replied, “Anyone who loves me will obey my teaching. My

Father will love them, and we will come to them and make our home with them. (same as TNIV)

The “If” that Jesus said (Greek *ean*) is omitted, and three masculine singular pronouns (Greek *autos*) are translated with “them,” removing the amazing emphasis on the Father and Son dwelling with an individual person. In the 2011 NIV, maybe “them” refers to the whole group of those who obey. How can we know? Though some of these changes have been corrected from the TNIV, such changes from singular to plural (or from “he” to “you” or “we” or no word at all) still occur 2,002 times in the new NIV.

Such changes from singular to plural still occur many hundreds of times in the new NIV. And at times the desire to avoid the words “he” and “him” leads to English sentences that brim with the awkwardness of politically correct speech:

^{1984 NIV} **Rev 3:20** Here I am! I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with him, and he with me.

^{2011 NIV} **Rev 3:20** Here I am! I stand at the door and knock. If anyone hears my voice and opens the door, I will come in and eat with that person, and they with me.

The expression “that person” has a cold, impersonal feel in comparison to both “them” and “him.” That is not how we speak when we want to maximize the warmth and intimacy of our relationship with someone in English. “That person” is how we speak about someone we don't know. In order to avoid the word “him,” the new NIV struggles with sentence awkwardness and with such impersonal connotations regularly.

The Use of the Collins Dictionaries Report

One of the major criticisms of the TNIV was its regular use of generic plural forms in place of generic masculine singular forms.³² John 14:23 offers us an example of how this point has been debated in previous conversations.

Table 5 – John 14:23

NA27	ἀπεκρίθη Ἰησοῦς καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἐάν τις ἀγαπᾷ με τὸν λόγον μου τηρήσει, καὶ ὁ πατήρ μου ἀγαπήσει αὐτὸν καὶ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἔλευσόμεθα καὶ μονὴν παρ’ αὐτῷ ποιησόμεθα.
NIV1984	Jesus replied, “If anyone loves me, he will obey my teaching. My Father will love him , and we will come to him and make our home with him .”
TNIV	Jesus replied, “ Anyone who loves me will obey my teaching. My Father will love them , and we will come to them and make our home with them .”
NIV2011	Jesus replied, “ Anyone who loves me will obey my teaching. My Father will love them , and we will come to them and make our home with them .”

The underlying issue in this text is the rendering of the Greek word *autos*, which occurs three times in this verse as masculine and singular. The 1984 NIV translates it accordingly, but the TNIV and 2011 NIV translate *autos* with the generic plural “them.” It is true that the Greek pronoun probably has a gender-inclusive meaning in this verse. The translator, therefore, has a challenge before him in trying to figure out the most accurate way to render this verse. Since English has no gender-inclusive singular pronoun, the translator can either translate as “him” and risk losing the gender-inclusive sense of *autos*. Or he can translate as “them” and risk losing the singular sense of *autos*. At least this is how the problem is commonly put forth.

The problem as formulated above, however, presumes that generic singular pronouns (like “him”) are no longer intelligible in English. And yet this is precisely the point in the debate that remains unresolved. On one side, Poythress and Grudem have argued that generic masculine singular forms are still intelligible in English.³³ On the other side, D. A. Carson, Mark Strauss, and others have argued that such forms are no longer acceptable among large sectors of English speakers.³⁴ In fact, Carson suggests that such forms might unwittingly exclude “half of humanity” from texts that should include them.³⁵ Such forms, therefore, should not be favored in translating the Bible.

The NIV 2011 translators have shown great awareness of this ongoing dispute and have tried to address the problem by commissioning an empirical study of English gender language. On this point, it will be worth quoting the translators at length:

All previous Bible translation efforts have been hampered by the lack of accurate, statistically significant data on the state of spoken and written English at a given time in its history. Beyond appealing to traditional style guides, all that translators and stylists have been able to do is rely on their own experiences and others’ anecdotal evidence, resulting in arguments such as, “I never see anybody writing such-and-such,” or “I always hear such-and-such,” or “Sometimes I read one thing but other times something else.”

As part of the review of gender language promised at the September 2009 update announcement, the committee sought to remove some of this subjectivity by enlisting the help of experts. The committee initiated a relationship with Collins Dictionaries to use the Collins Bank of English, one of the world’s foremost English language research tools, to conduct a major new study of changes in gender language. The Bank of English is a database of more than 4.4 billion words drawn from text publications and spoken word recordings from all over the world. Working with some of the world’s leading experts in computational linguistics and using cutting-edge techniques developed specifically for this project, the committee gained an authoritative, and hitherto unavailable, perspective on the contemporary use of gender language—including terms for the human race and subgroups of the human race, pronoun selections following various words and phrases, the use of “man” as a

singular generic and the use of “father(s)” and “forefather(s)” as compared to ancestor(s). The project tracked usage and acceptability for each word and phrase over a twenty-year period and also analyzed similarities and differences across different forms of English: for example, UK English, US English, written English, spoken English, and even the English used in a wide variety of evangelical books, sermons and internet sites.³⁶

This extended excerpt explains why the translators commissioned this study and how the findings shaped the rendering of gender language in the NIV 2011. The full report from Collins Dictionaries is available online.³⁷ According to the study, generic masculine forms are on the decline, but they are still in use among English speakers. The summary on the translators’ website says it this way: “Between 1990 and 2009, instances of masculine generic pronouns and determiners, expressed as a percentage of total generic pronoun usage in general written English, fell from 22% to 8%.”³⁸ This finding from the study directly impacted the translators’ approach to rendering gender language in the NIV 2011. In particular, the translators adopted the following approach: “Singular ‘they,’ ‘them’ and ‘their’ forms were widely used to communicate the generic significance of pronouns and their equivalents when a singular form had already been used for the antecedent.”³⁹

While the data collected in the Collins Dictionaries report is impressive, the translators’ use of it is not. The translators say that the report “tracked usage and acceptability” of the relevant gender language over a twenty-year period. Certainly the report gives significant insight into English *usage*, but the report itself sheds very little light on the *acceptability* of any given idiom. Moreover, it is not at all clear what is meant by *acceptability*. Does it mean *understandable*? Or perhaps does it mean *inoffensive*? D. A. Carson has defended the translation philosophy adopted by the NIV 2011, and in his defense of it he has used the term *acceptable* to refer to that which may or may not offend people of certain ideological tendencies:

I cannot help noting that generic “he” is more acceptable in culturally conservative sectors of the country than in culturally liberal sectors. But I have been doing university missions for thirty years, and in such quarters inclusive language dominates. Not to use it is offensive.⁴⁰

So for Carson, *acceptability* has something to do with whether or not a given use of language offends the liberal sensibilities of potential readers. But this is not really a linguistic concern so much as it is an ideological one. The Collins report provides no insight on *acceptability* in this sense. In any case, *acceptability* in this sense is certainly not a concern that should determine the translation of a given text—a point with which Carson would likely agree. Perhaps this is not what the translators mean by *acceptability*, and a clarification on this point would be helpful.

It may be that *acceptability* in the Collins report refers to the *understandability* of an expression among potential readers. This would be a linguistic concern, but the Collins data gives very little insight here either. The Collins data says that 8% of all generic forms are masculine generics. If anything, the fact that the idiom is still in use presumes its understandability among English speakers. The infrequency of an expression does not imply its unintelligibility. As Poythress and Grudem have argued,

There is no reason we have to avoid infrequently used expressions in Bible translation. Some words like “heron,” “amethyst,” “blasphemy,” “elder,” and “apostle” may not occur with high frequency in secular writings today, but they are intelligible. Translators can use such words when they need them. The same is true of generic “he” when it is needed to express the meaning accurately.⁴¹

The claim that generic masculines are not understood by wide swaths of English readers is simply not supported by the Collins data. A decline in frequency of a given form by no means implies a decline in understandability.

Herein is the flaw of NIV translators' use of the Collins data. *Usage* and *understandability* are not synonyms, and yet the NIV translators treat them as if they are. For this reason, the translators of the NIV address a relatively small number of the problems previously identified in the TNIV. That is a methodological shortcoming on the part of the translators that led them to retain at least 75% of the problematic renderings from the TNIV in the text of the NIV 2011 (see tables above).

Also note that the NIV translators themselves returned to the occasional use of generic masculine expressions in some key verses (!)—thereby admitting that these uses are still understandable and acceptable. So if they are still acceptable, why not admit that they were wrong in excluding them earlier, and why not use them everywhere the Greek or Hebrew texts use a generic masculine singular, since this is the most accurate translation in English?

So how does this affect the way in which texts like John 14:23 are translated? The English pronoun "him" still works best to render Greek generic masculine singulars. One need not pick between gender-inclusiveness and singularity here. "Him" does well at communicating both, just as it did in the 1984 NIV. If this argument is correct, then Grudem's critique of the TNIV's rendering still applies to the 2011 NIV.

"The 'If' that Jesus said (Greek *ean*) is omitted, and three masculine singular pronouns (Greek *autos*) are incorrectly translated with 'them,' removing the amazing emphasis on the Father and Son dwelling with an individual person. In the TNIV [and NIV 2011], maybe 'them' refers [to] the whole group of those who obey. How can we know?"⁴²

2 Timothy 2:2 and Masculine Specific Meaning

I think the NIV's aversion to generic masculines sometimes causes it to miss instances in which masculine meaning is intended by the author. Take 2 Tim 2:2, for example. This text has not weighed heavily in intra-evangelical debates about gender roles, but it did appear as a topic for discussion in an online scholarly forum last year that discussed

particular renderings in the NIV 2011.⁴³ The text reads, "The things which you have heard from me in the presence of many witnesses, entrust these things to faithful men [*anthrōpōis*] who will be able to teach others also" (author's translation).

The question here concerns the proper rendering of the Greek term *anthrōpōis*. In preparing to write this article, I made my way through fourteen different commentaries on this verse. Out of the six of them that favored the translation "people," not a single one of them put forth a sustained argument in favor of that translation. The most they have to offer is the observation that the plural of *anthrōpos* is regularly used generically. Craig Blomberg, one of the translators for the NIV 2011, offered an argument in favor of "people" in the aforementioned online scholarly forum. Because major commentators have very little to say on this point, I found Craig Blomberg's contribution to be the most substantive argument in favor of the translation "people" that I have read.⁴⁴

That being said, I do want to contest Dr. Blomberg's conclusion that says "people" is "the only legitimate translation" of *anthrōpōis*. It is true that the plural of *anthrōpos* is often used generically (e.g., 1 Tim 2:1, 4; 4:10; 6:5; 2 Tim 3:2; Tit 2:11; 3:2), but that fact is no argument for a generic referent in a given context. If we want to understand the word's appearance in 2 Tim 2:2, we must look to context. So let me make some observations about the context that in my view tip the scales decisively in favor of the translation "men."

First, there is precedent in the pastorals for Paul's use of plural *anthrōpos* in a gender-specific way. In 2 Tim 3:8, for instance, Paul writes, "Just as Jannes and Jambres opposed Moses, so also these men oppose the truth—*men* [*anthrōpōi*] of depraved minds, who, as far as the faith is concerned, are rejected." The *anthrōpōi* here must be men since they are "worming their way into women's homes."⁴⁵ If this is correct, then the *anthrōpōi* of both 3:2 and 3:13 should be understood as males as well. Consider also the *anthrōpōi* of 1 Tim 5:24: "The sins of some men are quite evident, going before them to judgment; for others, their sins follow after." In context, Paul is telling Timothy to be careful about

whom he appoints as elders (v. 5:22: “Do not lay hands on a man too quickly”). Since Paul held to an all male eldership (1 Tim 2:12; 3:2), the *anthrōpoi* of 5:24 must also be males. Given Paul’s use of *anthrōpoi* in a gender-specific way both in the pastorals and elsewhere (e.g., 1 Cor 7:7), we have to allow for the possibility that context can determine *anthrōpoi* with a masculine referent.

Second, in the context of 2 Timothy 2, Paul is telling Timothy to entrust the gospel to faithful *anthrōpoi* who will be able to teach others (2:2). Notice the one qualification that Paul has for the *anthrōpoi*. They must be *qualified* to teach “others.” This is significant because “others” is a masculine plural pronoun [*heterous*]. That means that “others” would consist of both men and women or of men only. Since Paul has already prohibited women from teaching Christian doctrine to men (1 Tim 2:12), women would not be qualified to teach “others.” Thus, when Paul employs *anthrōpoi* here, he certainly has in mind males only. Contextually speaking, *anthrōpoi* must be gender-specific in this text. It seems that Paul wishes to emphasize the special responsibility that qualified men have to pass the faith on to the next generation.

With this interpretation in mind, we are in a position to answer the Blomberg’s arguments in favor of “people.”

(1) Blomberg argues that “people” is a grammatical “slam dunk” because the plural of *anthrōpos* is “regularly” used in a gender-inclusive way. Nevertheless, the regular use of *anthrōpos* in a gender-inclusive way is not argument for its meaning in a given context. Gender-specific uses of *anthrōpos* are

also within the term’s range of possible meanings, so the argument for “people” has to be developed within the context of 2 Timothy (and the other pastorals). I do not think Blomberg has provided such an argument yet.

(2) Blomberg argues that translating *anthrōpois* as “people” would not “infringe on those restrictions” Paul set up to prohibit women from teaching men. The problem with this argument is twofold. First, the term “others” is masculine plural, so the teaching of both men and women is in view. Thus, Blomberg cannot placate complementarian concerns with the suggestion that only the teaching of women and children is in view. Second, most English readers will read “people” in a gender-inclusive way. If Paul did not intend to be gender-inclusive in this text, why obscure the point for English readers?

(3) Blomberg says that the translation “faithful men” will be heard by most readers as gender-specific, not as gender-inclusive. In this context, he is certainly right about this. But those who favor the translation “faithful men” do not do so because they believe “men” to be gender-inclusive. On the contrary, they favor “men” because they believe males are in view.

(4) Blomberg also mentions his experience in parachurch organizations for whom this text is a staple. In those organizations, this text is a touchstone for understanding the organic disciple-making process that is incumbent upon all Christians, both men and women. I would argue that such organizations can still access this text in support of such disciple-making ministries. But when they

Table 6 – Revisions of 2 Timothy 2:2

Text of 2 Timothy 2:2	Marginal Notes
NIV ¹⁹⁸⁴ And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable <i>men</i> who will also be qualified to teach others.	
TNIV ²⁰⁰² And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable <i>people</i> ^a who will also be qualified to teach others.	^a 2 Or <i>men</i>
TNIV ²⁰⁰⁵ And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable <i>people</i> who will also be qualified to teach others.	
NIV ²⁰¹¹ And the things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable <i>people</i> who will also be qualified to teach others.	

do so, they should find that support in a legitimate *implication* of the text, not as Paul's original *meaning*. In context, Paul is addressing the special responsibilities of church leadership who are supposed to be examples to the rest of the flock (1 Tim 4:12; Titus 2:7).

Finally, let me offer a word about how this text has been rendered in the NIV and its revisions since 1984.

Only one word has been changed in this verse from the 1984 NIV to the 2011 revision. "Men" has changed to "people." The initial change occurred in TNIV 2002, and a marginal note was added to give the alternate interpretation from the NIV 1984. In the TNIV 2005 and in the NIV 2011, there is no indication in the notes at all about another possible interpretation of this text. If my interpretation is correct, then *anthrōpōis* should be rendered as "men" in the text of NIV 2011. At the very least, the marginal note that appeared in TNIV 2002 should be restored to show that there is another possible translation of the text.

Why is this verse worth discussing in this review? It is true, after all, that other translations have rendered *anthrōpōis* as people with relatively no push-back from critics (e.g., NET, NLT, NJB). The translators of the NIV clearly see the term with no masculine referent, but that point is disputed in the literature. Why then would the translators favor the word "people" (which can only be understood generically) when "men" leaves open the possibility of both a generic referent or a specifically masculine one? Why leave readers with a translation that has decidedly egalitarian implications (that women may teach men)? I do not think that the translators are pursuing a stealth egalitarian agenda, but I do think that an aversion to generic masculines has caused them to miss the author's specific meaning in this text.

Conclusion

There are many more texts that are worthy of note, but there is not space to comment on all of them in a short review. What we have hoped to show is that the 2011 NIV has only moved

away from *some* of its more controversial gender-neutral renderings. Although many of these revisions offer an improvement over the TNIV, many of the renderings are not without problems themselves. Whatever improvements have been made in the translation of gender language, about 75% of the "inaccuracies" identified by Poythress and Grudem still remain.

How do I evaluate the NIV 2011 and would I recommend it to others? I would argue that the most *accurate* approach to translation is one that seeks an "essentially literal" translation as far as is compatible with good English. There are nuances and implications of language that are retained in such an approach but that can be lost in dynamic equivalence renderings.

Even though the NIV aims to combine both formal equivalence and dynamic equivalence approaches, it too often loses balance in my view. Its pervasive use of gender-neutral language is a case in point. The NIV 2011's aversion to generic masculine forms of expression is unnecessary and can have the deleterious effect of obscuring aspects of the biblical authors' meaning. In my view, this feature alone weighs heavily against the NIV 2011.

Different situations call for different kinds of translations, but an essentially literal translation is still the best for the regular preaching, studying, and reading of the scriptures. Thus, I recommend the NASB as the most accurate version,⁴⁶ and the ESV as the best combination of both accuracy and readability.

As I mentioned in the introduction, the 2011 NIV includes many very helpful improvements over the 1984 NIV. And as a former user of the 1984 NIV, I regard these as an advance over the previous version. Nevertheless, I wish that these improvements could have been introduced without retaining 75% of the TNIV's problematic renderings of gender language. Perhaps Zondervan would consider a future revision that addresses these issues more fully.

ENDNOTES

- ¹William D. Mounce, ed., *Mounce's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old & New Testament Words* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2006).
- ²Full Disclosure: Under the influence of pastors from my home church and college church, I eventually developed a preference for formal equivalence translation. Since 1995, therefore, I have been using the New American Standard Bible as my primary text for preaching and personal Bible study.
- ³The CBA's rankings are available online at http://www.cbaonline.org/nm/documents/BSLs/Bible_Translations.pdf.
- ⁴The first attempt was the New International Version Inclusive Language Edition (NIVI) in 1996 (released only in the UK), and the second was Today's New International Version (TNIV) in 2005.
- ⁵Mark L. Strauss, *Distorting Scripture?: The Challenge of Bible Translation & Gender Accuracy* (Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1998); Glen G. Scorgie, Mark L. Strauss, and Steven M. Voth, eds., *The Challenge of Bible Translation* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003); Vern S. Poythress and W. A. Grudem, *The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy: Muting the Masculinity of God's Words* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2000); D. A. Carson, *The Inclusive-Language Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998); Vern S. Poythress and W. A. Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 2004); Wayne Grudem and Jerry Thacker, *Why Is My Choice of a Bible Translation So Important?* (Louisville, KY: The Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood, 2005).
- ⁶The Committee on Bible Translation summarizes many improvements in a report released online in late 2010: "Updating the New International Version of the Bible: Notes from the Committee on Bible Translation" (The Committee on Bible Translation, August 2010) [cited 2 May 2011]. Online: <http://www.niv-cbt.org/niv-2011-overview/translators-notes>.
- ⁷For a full list of these and other changes listed by category and verse, see www.cbmw.org.
- ⁸See previous note for a full list of such revisions, including an annotation where each verse has been corrected from the TNIV. However, it should be noted that this total of 933 is probably a bit high, since it includes all the instances where the objectionable gender language of the TNIV has been revised, but in some of those passages one gender-neutral term has just been replaced with another, and some inaccuracy remains.
- ⁹Some welcome improvements listed in the CBT's "Notes" include the following: "Using plurals instead of singulars to deal with generic forms was avoided.... Using second person forms instead of third person forms to deal with generics was avoided" (Ibid., 5).
- ¹⁰Grudem and Thacker, *Why Is My Choice of a Bible Translation So Important?*, 33. The TNIV New Testament appeared in 2002. In response, Vern Poythress and Wayne Grudem published in 2004 *The TNIV and The Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy* in which they cataloged 900 examples of gender-related "translation inaccuracies" (Poythress and Grudem, *Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy*, 73). The TNIV Old Testament appeared in 2005 along with another revision of the TNIV New Testament. In response, Wayne Grudem and Jerry Thacker produced a volume cataloguing some 3,686 "inaccurate translations in the TNIV" Old and New Testaments (Grudem and Thacker, *Why Is My Choice of a Bible Translation So Important?*, 33). Grudem and Thacker identified ten additional problems in the TNIV New Testament and that brought the total number of "inaccuracies" for the NT up to 910 (Ibid., 81-96).
- ¹¹Grudem's number from *Why Is My Choice of a Bible Translation So Important?* is 3,686. The researchers that surveyed these texts for the current study identified new problems but were also unable to confirm some of the others listed in Grudem's book. The net change from Grudem to the current study is +15. These verses comprise about a half of one percent of the total, so the difference is statistically insignificant.
- ¹²We were greatly assisted in this research by an online tool that tracks how the NIV 2011 compares to the NIV 1984 and the TNIV. The creator of this resource is Robert Slowley, a senior software engineer at the European Bioinformatics Institute in Cambridge, U.K. The data from this comparison is available in a table at the following website: http://www.slowley.com/niv2011_comparison.
- ¹³Data concerning "saints" and "Jews" are also contained in this chart even though they are not gender-related terminology. They appear here for the sake of completeness because they were included in Grudem and Thacker's study.
- ¹⁴Thomas R. Schreiner and Andreas J. Köstenberger, *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (2d ed.; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005).
- ¹⁵Philip B. Payne, "1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of *oude* to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea," *New Testament Studies* 54, no. 2 (2008): 235-53; Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul's Letters* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009), 385-97.
- ¹⁶Henry Scott Baldwin's important study of *authentēō* identifies "assume authority" as a sub-meaning of "to act independently." See Henry Scott Baldwin, "An Important Word: *Authentēō* in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church*, 45, 47. Baldwin incorrectly says that "assume authority" is a "positive term" (Ibid., 47), as pointed out by Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ*, 385, n. 122.
- ¹⁷Ibid., 393: "What Paul says is this: 'I am not permitting a woman to teach and assume authority over a man,' namely, to take for herself authority to teach a man without authorization from the church. Practically, this excluded women in Ephesus from assuming to themselves authority to teach men in the church. It would not, however, prohibit women with recognized authority from teaching men (e.g., Priscilla)."
- ¹⁸"Notes from the Committee," 7.
- ¹⁹Andreas J. Köstenberger, "'Teaching and Usurping Authority: 1 Timothy 2:11-15' (Ch 12) by Linda L. Belleville," *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 10, no. 1 (2005): 43-54.
- ²⁰Payne, "1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of *oude* to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea," 235-36, 247, 252, 253.
- ²¹Wayne Grudem, *Evangelical Feminism: A New Path to Liberalism* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway, 2006).
- ²²Much of the material in this section is adapted from Grudem and Thacker, *Why Is My Choice of a Bible Translation So Important?* and from personal correspondence with Wayne Grudem.
- ²³MH Burer and Daniel B. Wallace, "Was Junia Really and Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7," *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 76-91. Contra Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2005), 72-78. Linda Belleville also refuted Burer and Wallace's article in Linda Belleville, "*Iouianian . . . episemoi en tois apostolois: A Re-examination of Romans 16.7 in Light of Primary Source Materials*," *New Testament Studies* 51, no. 2 (2005): 231-49. Burer has responded to both saying, "I have not read anything in any of them that has dissuaded me from the viewpoint Wallace and I advanced in the original article" (Michael Burer, "Reassessing Junia: A Review of Eldon Epp's *Junia: The First*

Woman Apostle,” *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood* 13, no. 1 [2008]: 56–59.)

²⁴This is in fact how Thomas Schreiner takes it in his commentary on Romans. See Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans*, Baker Exegetical Commentary on the New Testament (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 796–97. Schreiner defines “apostle” in this text as *itinerant evangelist* or *missionary*. It does not designate Junia as having the same authority as the twelve, Paul, Barnabas, or James.

²⁵The NASB has “Junias” as a man in Rom 16:7.

²⁶For example, both views are represented in John Piper and Wayne Grudem, *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (Crossway, 1991).

²⁷The 2011 NIV does have the following note on Rom 16:1: “The word *deacon* refers here to a Christian designated to serve with the overseers/elders of the church in a variety of ways; similarly in Phil. 1:1 and 1 Tim. 3:8,12.” But the note itself is obscure and does not definitively say that the office of “deacon” is not one of governing authority. In any case, the text itself will be what most readers pay attention to, not the footnote.

²⁸See Francis Brown, S. R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament* (2d ed.; Oxford: Oxford University, 1952), 3 [hereafter, BDB]; also Ludwig Koehler and Walter Baumgartner, *Hebrew and Aramaic Lexicon of the Old Testament* (trans. M. E. J. Richardson; Leiden: Brill, 1994), 1–2.

²⁹Prov 1:8, 10, 15; 2:1; 3:1, 11, 21; 4:3, 10, 20; 5:1, 20; 6:1, 3, 20; 7:1; 19:27; 23:15, 19, 26; 24:13, 21; 27:11; 31:2.

³⁰For recent discussion of the quotation of Ps 8:4 in Heb 2:6, see Craig Blomberg, “‘But We See Jesus’: The Relationship Between the Son of Man in Hebrews 2:6 and 2:9 and the Implications for English Translation,” in *A Cloud of Witnesses: The Theology of Hebrews in its Ancient Context* (ed. Richard Bauckham et al.; London: T & T Clark, 2008), 88–99; Barry Joslin, “‘Son of Man’ or ‘Human Beings’?: Translating Hebrews 2:5–9 and a Response to Craig Blomberg,” *JBMW* 14, no. 2 (2009): 41–50.

³¹HALOT, s.v. *’ab*, 5, 6.

³²Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy*, 73–100.

³³E.g., *Ibid.*, 9.

³⁴Poythress and Grudem argue for the continuing usability of generic ‘he.’ Certainly it’s easy enough to find sectors of society where inclusive language has made relatively little impression. For various reasons I move in quite different sectors, and, although I’m relying on what I personally observe rather than on large-scale empirical studies, I cannot help noting that generic ‘he’ is more acceptable in culturally conservative sectors of the country than in culturally liberal sectors. But I have been doing university missions for thirty years, and in such quarters inclusive language dominates. Not to use it is offensive” (D. A. Carson, “The Limits of Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation,” in *The Challenge of Bible Translation: Communicating God’s Word to the World, Essays in Honor of Ronald F. Youngblood* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003], 81–82).

³⁵*Ibid.*, 87.

³⁶“Updating the New International Version of the Bible: Notes from the Committee on Bible Translation.”

³⁷“The Development and Use of Gender Language in Contemporary English—A Corpus Linguistic Analysis” (Collins Dictionaries, September 2010) [cited 2 May 2011]. Online: <http://www.niv-cbt.org/information/collins-language-study-full-report>.

³⁸“Summary of Collins Corpus Report” (The Committee on Bible Translation) [cited 1 April 2011]. Online: <http://www.niv-cbt.org/information/collins-corpus-report>.

³⁹“Updating the New International Version of the Bible: Notes from the Committee on Bible Translation.”

⁴⁰Carson, “The Limits of Functional Equivalence in Bible Translation.”

⁴¹Poythress and Grudem, *The TNIV and the Gender-Neutral Bible Controversy*, 324.

⁴²Grudem and Thacker, *Why Is My Choice of a Bible Translation So Important?*, 28.

⁴³The forum is titled “Perspectives in Translation: A Discussion of English Bible Versions,” (<http://www.biblegateway.com/perspectives-in-translation>) and was a joint effort of The Gospel Coalition and BibleGateway.com (which is owned by Zondervan).

⁴⁴Craig Blomberg, “How Should We Identify the Teachers in 2 Tim. 2:2? Craig Blomberg,” December 8, 2010 [cited 2 May 2011]. Online: <http://www.biblegateway.com/perspectives-in-translation/2010/12/how-do-we-identify-the-teachers-in-2-tim-22-craig-blomberg>.

⁴⁵William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Word Biblical Commentary; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000), 550.

⁴⁶This is the English version that I have been using since 1995.