

1 TRANSLATION PRINCIPLES OF UBS¹

1.1 Definititon of functional equivalence translations

Functional equivalence translations (called sometimes *functional correspondence* or *meaning-based* translations) look for the meaning of the Hebrew and Greek structures, and they express this meaning in modern, commonly used, receptor language vocabulary and structures.

Formal correspondence (literal, traditional) translations are not the kind normally preferred by UBS, although BSs print and distribute old versions which fit that description, as long as there is demand for such versions. As a matter of policy, therefore, UBS is engaged in the translation of the Bible following principles of functional equivalence translation.

BS translations, first and new, for the most part follow functional equivalence principles; traditionally, most have been common language translations.

The translation goal is to render the meaning of the **source text**:

- **accurately and faithfully**
- in a way that is **clearly and easily understood**
- which **expresses the emotive and evocative dimensions** of the source.
- **With the main goals of intelligibility and naturalness** in the receptor language
- **With the intended audience in mind**

It is accuracy as regards the original, clarity as regards the meaning, and naturalness as regards the receptor language, which define appropriateness and comprehensibility of the translational result and thus qualify it as acceptable.

1.2 The textual base

1.2.1 Base texts:

UBS Greek NT 4th Edition and Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia (BHS)

English: RSV and GNB – formal and functional equivalence translations

Further reading:

More on the principles and practice of “Base-Model” translation can be found in Fehderau, H., “The role of bases and models in Bible translation,” *The Bible Translator*, Vol.30, No.4, 1979, and Sterk, J., “Key Structure Analysis, Or, the Base and Model Approach Revisited,” *The Bible Translator*, Vol.35, No.1 1984, and “ ‘Which text do I translate?’ The base/model method of translation,” an unpublished paper, available upon request.

¹ This document is a re-arrangement of information found in Chapter 3 the Translation Officer’s manual. Additional personal comments are found in the comments windows. The section on the content of reader’s helps is not included. (perhaps to be put elsewhere?)

1.2.2 Question of variant readings:

Where several meanings are possible the onus is on the translator to choose the rendering that is most probable (if there is one) and not resort to an ambiguous literal translation. After the translator has made a choice, the literal rendering of the source text may be given in a footnote along with other possible renderings. An example would be 1 Cor 7.36 “But if anyone thinks he is not behaving properly toward his virgin...” (Gk), where the Greek word translated “virgin” could mean a fiancée, an unmarried daughter or a partner in celibacy. Another example is Gen 1.2 where *ruach elohim* can be rendered as “mighty wind”, “wind from God” or “spirit of God”. For both cases, we refer to GNT, text and footnote, for a recommended approach.

1.2.3 Detailed guidelines

- 1) The translation of the books of the Hebrew OT is to be made from the **Masoretic Text** (MT) according to the Codex Leningradensis (M^L) as published by Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft under the titles *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* (BHS) and *Biblia Hebraica Quinta* (BHQ, forthcoming) respectively.
- 2) In cases where the text offered by M^L is corrupt, the recommendations of the *Preliminary and Interim Report on the Hebrew OT Text Project (HOTTP)*, edited under the auspices of UBS by Dominique Barthélemy and others, New York 1973-1980, are to be considered. Occasionally the previous edition of *Biblia Hebraica* edited by Rudolf Kittel (BHK) may be of help. **Qere** as well as **Ketiv** readings are to be taken into account. The preferred reading should in general be compatible with the **Masoretic Consonant Text** (MCT). Deviation from MCT ought to be made only if no meaningful interpretation can be arrived at otherwise.
- 3) In cases where the local church has received a **canonical** text different from MT, this may be followed, though it should be taken care of that semantically significant differences from MT will either be footnoted or be notified in a separate appendix. In interconfessional or ecumenical translation projects, however, differences due to particular church traditions should preferably be presented in notes rather than in the running text, unless the local churches have agreed otherwise.
- 4) Preferred **variant readings**, whether from other Masoretic manuscripts or from ancient versions such as **Septuagint** (LXX), differing from BHS or HOTTP need to meet with the approval of the TC, who will seek the consent of the committee of scholarly advisors, the translation team, and the editorial committee. Requests by local churches will be duly considered.
- 5) The basis for the translation of the NT is the critical text of the **Greek NT** as published by the UBS (Greek NT, 4th edition [GreekNT⁴], or Nestle-Aland, 27th edition (NA²⁷)). Other critical editions such as of Tischendorf, Westcott/Hort, Weiss, v. Soden, Vogels, Merk, Bover, Nestle²⁵ and further manuscript evidence may be taken into account. However, the preferred reading ought to be attested by

external, internal, or indirect evidence as having been known in the 2nd century A.D. already. Since the identical critical texts of GreekNT⁴ and NA²⁷ have been edited jointly by Protestant, Catholic, and Orthodox scholars, these editions are to be preferred in interconfessional or ecumenical translation projects, unless the local churches have agreed otherwise.

- 6) Some passages taken by sound scholarship as lacking in the autographs (in GreekNT⁴ and NA²⁷ enclosed by double square brackets, e.g. Mark 16.9-20; Luke 22.43-44; 23.34a; John 7.53—8:11) need to be included in the translation, since they are received as canonical by all Christian churches. They will be accompanied by a footnote.
- 7) If the local church requires some additional passages of the NT found in the **Byzantine tradition** (as largely represented by the *Textus Receptus*), these need to be included. The same applies as regards the Nova Vulgata. In interconfessional or ecumenical translation projects, however, it would be advisable to present the translation of these additional passages in footnotes.
- 8) The translation of the **deuterocanonical books** of the OT is to be made from the Ancient Greek translation called **Septuagint** (LXX). As base text may serve the study editions by Alfred Rahlfs or by Αποστολικής Διακονίας, respectively, albeit the critical editions of *Septuaginta Cantabrigiensis* and *Septuaginta Gottingensis*, so far as published and available, are to be consulted. The book *Die Apokryphenfrage im ökumenischen Horizont*, edited under the auspices of the German BS by Siegfried Meurer, may serve as guidelines in case of doubt.
- 9) In cases regarding the OT Deuterocanon where the local church follows **Vulgate**, **Lukian** recension, **Old Church Slavonic** or other canonical traditions, these may be respected. Semantically significant differences from LXX/Theodotion will be noted.
- 10) Any choice of **variant readings** concerning the deuterocanonical books is to be made in consultation with the TC. In cases of doubt the final decision is to be taken on the basis of majority vote by the committee of scholarly advisors in conjunction with the translation team, the editorial committee, and the TC. Requests by local churches will be duly considered.
- 11) It is the aim of the UBS to provide the Holy Scriptures in a **canon** with a **range** and in an **order** of books that is desired by the churches. In a complete Bible edition the translated books will be presented in compliance with the tradition of the local church. In interconfessional and ecumenical translation projects, however, the deuterocanonical books ought to be placed in a separate section after the Hebrew OT books, but preceding the NT.
- 12) The deuterocanonical books (sometimes referred to as Apocrypha) are: Tobit, Judith, Additions to Esther, Wisdom, Ben Sira, Baruch, Letter of Jeremiah, Additions to Daniel, 1st and 2nd Maccabees. Besides these the following books

may be regarded as canonical by various Eastern Churches: 3rd and 4th Maccabees, 1st Esdras (3rd Esra), Prayer of Manasse, Psalm 151, 4th Esra, Jubilees, Henoch.

- 13) The translation of the entire Greek text of the book of Esther will be presented in the deuterocanonical section whereas the translation of the Hebrew text will appear among the books of the Hebrew canon. The deuterocanonical parts of the book of Daniel (Prayer and Song in the Furnace, Susannah, and Bel and the Dragon) will be presented as three items in the deuterocanonical section. For these supplements the ancient version of **Theodotion** may be preferable. For the book of Ben Sirach, it would be advisable to print the shorter text, as found in the main Greek manuscripts, while taking into account the Hebrew and Syriac texts. The longer texts, from other Greek and Latin manuscripts and eventually other Hebrew variant readings, could be printed, if necessary, in annotations. The Epistle of Jeremiah may appear as the 6th chapter of the book of Baruch or as a separate item.
- 14) The **verse numbers** as in BHS and GreekNT⁴ are definitive in interconfessional or ecumenical translation projects. As regards the deuterocanonical books Rahlfs' counting of verses ought to be applied. In cases where the local church tradition requires a different versification or counting this may be respected and notified accordingly either in an introduction or in a footnote. The alternative may be given in brackets next to the figure of the preferred counting.
- 15) **Deviations** from the principles stated before need to be met with the approval of the TC, who is obliged to seek and consider relevant advice from church leaders and specialist scholars. If the local churches have unanimously arrived at an **agreement** on this matter, the afore stated principles may be replaced by such agreement.

1.3 Exegetical Procedure

- 1) Appropriate interpretation of the Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek base texts calls for academic and scholarly **exegesis**. This exegesis must focus on translational issues and should only follow sound scholarly advice and recommendations from a substantial number of respected experts; it should refrain from denominational preconception and flimsy or whimsical hypotheses and theories. Only those commentaries, manuals, handbooks, guides, monographs, articles, and contemporary translations are to be considered, which meet with the above requirements. In case of doubt the TC is to be consulted.
- 2) It is advisable to read and study various translations, in particular **functional equivalence Bible translations** into different contemporary vernacular languages. They can serve as models for new translations and often offer lucid and sound suggestions or even solutions to exegetical, philological, linguistic, and translational difficulties. The translator, however, should never use a modern

translation as a base text, unless otherwise agreed on with the TC and the Editorial Committee.

- 3) Serious study of Translator's **Handbooks** and **Helps** covering all NT books and many OT books, published by UBS, is a mandatory commitment.
- 4) The translator is also obliged to read and study textbooks of and introductions to **translational linguistics** with emphasis on those works which describe functional-equivalence Bible translation (e.g. the works by Nida, Tabor, de Waard, Wilt, and others, see Part 12, 2.).
- 5) Learned **dictionaries** and **grammars** granting access to the original languages and biblical commentaries and concentrating on semantic issues are essential items on the translator's desk. Various dictionaries and grammars of the receptor language are likewise indispensable. (Hebrew and Greek dictionaries as well as a basic grammatical analysis of the source texts are now part of Paratext.)
- 6) Before beginning translation proper the translator should read and study **the entire book** to be translated. A thorough preliminary exegesis should be done, with the principal aim of identifying in advance delicate translational problems, and prepare their resolution.
- 7) The textual critical material is to be studied conscientiously. **Alternative readings**, i.e. those texts which represent a significant possibility of being original, or which reflect a long translational tradition, need to be taken into account. In some cases it may be necessary to reflect alternative readings in footnotes.
- 8) **Alternative renderings**, i.e. different interpretations due either to ambiguities in the original languages or alternative ways of translating them, always deserve careful consideration. It may sometimes be advisable to draw the reader's attention to alternative renderings in a footnote.

1.4 Translation guidelines

1.4.1 Audience considerations

- 1) Prior to the selection of an appropriate type of translation, the **target audience**, **purpose**, and **aim** of the intended translation need to be identified. This is to be done on the basis of thorough research and in close cooperation with local churches. There are many **different types** of translation, e.g. Accommodating, Bilingual, Children's Bible, Common Language, Distancing, Functional equivalence, Interlinear, Literal, Liturgical, Meaning-based, Polyglot, Scopus Oriented, Study Bible, Word Concordant, and Youth Bible. The guidelines laid down here focus on adult readers with an average level of education and literacy and envisage a **balanced type of a common language, meaning-based, moderately functional equivalence translation**. The translation in view eventually ought to be of service in catechism, evangelization, and pastoral care

activities and should attempt to reach out both to people with church affiliation and to those without particular religious commitment. The aim is to make the Bible, its world, riches, and message **accessible to the target audience**. It should therefore also meet with basic requirements of audio, video, radio, television, internet, and other electronic aural or visual transmission techniques and environments. The translation should be **intelligible** and **relevant to non-Christians as well** as to Christians, and must be respectful to other religious constituencies. Phraseology which might be (mis-)understood as offensive or disrespectful, must not occur.

- 2) The **linguistic level/register** of the translation should correspond as far as possible to the **standard literary form of the target vernacular as used in creative literature, but also sufficiently reflect the common idiom**. Solecisms and **colloquialisms** are to be avoided. Translators must refrain from expressions and idioms typical of the journalistic register. **Elevated** and refined language as well as mannerism is likewise not to be used. A particular **theological idiomatic register** is to be avoided. In cases where church tradition desires and requires a special language register, this may be taken care of by footnotes.

1.4.2 Pragmatics, Discourse and grammar considerations

- 3) The **different styles/literary genres/discourse types** of the biblical language need to be reflected in the translation. Literal imitation, however, is to be avoided, since identical stylistic features often serve different functions in the original and in the receptor languages.
- 4) **Poetry** may be rendered as prose, if the poetical features of the source text are not available or if prose is more appropriate in the receptor language. An introduction or a footnote, respectively, may inform the reader. Additional features such as line proofs or changing type face are also helpful. They may serve readers, private or public, in grasping the meaning that is conveyed by form. The meaning of poetical source texts is more important than their form, albeit the form, in so far it carries meaning, needs to be translated creatively.
- 5) Strict adherence to the Stephanus-**versification** and the ancient **chapter segmentation** is to be maintained only if this does not interfere with the natural discourse structure and logic arrangement of sentences in the receptor language. In cases where the sentence order of the source text requires the reversal and restructuring of several verses on grounds of idiomatic or logic consistency in the receptor language, all the verse numbers concerned are to be presented at the beginning of the restructured passage. **Paragraphing**, text segmentation and punctuation, therefore, require careful analysis of the source's as well as the receptor language's discourse structure.
- 6) Long and complex **sentence clusters** of the original that are alien to the receptor language have to be broken down and rearranged in accordance with the natural

syntax structure of the receptor language. Sequences of short sentences and small units, respectively, may be built, if this is preferred by the receiving vernacular.

- 7) Order, arrangement, and choice of **sentence constituents** (in particular marked versus unmarked constituent order) must always follow the natural and typological pattern of the receptor language. The insights of modern linguistics as regards VSO (e.g. biblical Hebrew), SVO (e.g. biblical Greek), SOV (e.g. Mongolian, Turkish, German) language typologies are to be taken into account and duly applied to the translation. For this reason a **thorough contrastive analysis of receptor and source languages is essential**.
- 8) It is advisable to render **rhetorical questions** as propositional statements, if misunderstandings are likely to occur. Dynamic utterances with a pragmatic shift of meaning (e.g. irony, understatement, hyperbole, litotes, euphemism, mockery) may be rendered as rhetorical questions, if this is an appropriate strategy of the receptor language. It even may be necessary, to make the implied illocution explicit
- 9) The choice of **word classes** also depends on language typology. In noun based biblical Hebrew for instance nouns very often express events, adjectives only occur in predicative position and function, attributes are expressed by *status constructus* (in European translations following the LXX model traditionally rendered by genitive constructions). Conjunctional clauses frequently are formed by a nominalized infinitive with a preposition. The translation must always find a way to render meaning not only in a way that is faithful to the source text but also is respectful of typology, idiomatic expressions, form, and style of the target vernacular.
- 10) **Elliptical constructions** ought to be replenished, if necessary, while **redundant expressions** may be reduced, where required by natural style and structure of the receptor vernacular.
- 11) Wherever pronominal **reference to participants** becomes obscure or ambiguous in the process of translation, proper discourse strategies for tracing and tracking participants in the receptor language should be adopted. **Third person references** to first person or **first person plural references** to first person singular will be rendered in a way natural to the target audience so as to avoid ambiguity or misunderstanding.
- 12) **Politeness strategies** or **honorifics** are to be selected in compliance with cultural and behavioral customs of the receptor language. Euphemisms are to be selected accordingly, where needed. are to be selected according to the politeness strategies and the idiomatic peculiarities of the receptor language.

1.4.3 Semantics and lexical considerations

- 1) **Technical terms** relating to a single distinctive referent (e.g. angel, priest, altar, temple, frankincense, vineyard, prophet, apostle, elder, synagogue, church,

baptism, prepuce, circumcision, etc), often referred to as *realia*, should be translated consistently by one single equivalent term in the receptor language. If such a single term is not available, frequently a descriptive term, syntagm, or compound phrase (e.g. baptism → religious-rite-with-water; angel → heavenly-messenger; prophet → God's-voice) consistently used throughout the entire Bible may help. Where the receptor language does not allow for descriptive compounds of this kind or perceives them as awkward, any particular word, if explained and defined in the glossary, may be sufficient. All technical terms or compound phrases need to be explained in the glossary.

- 2) **Key-terms**, i.e. those terms and phrases mainly expressing abstract theological core notions (e.g. kingdom of God, righteousness, faith, sin, covenant, glory, grace, God's presence, mercy, purity), should be translated according to the principle of context consistency. Where possible a single term for all occurrences of each source text key-term is to be preferred. However, **contextual consistency always overrules lexical consistency**. In many languages lexical consistency may not be possible due to different world views and linguistic categories to categorize it. Depending on the context (e.g. righteousness of man versus righteousness of God; covenant of circumcision versus covenant in Christ) different terms may be required. In those cases entries in the glossary may indicate the notional unity found in the source language. All key-terms need to be explained in the glossary.
- 3) In accordance with firm and unchanged common Christian practice already evident in the LXX, the name of God expressed by the Hebrew **tetragrammaton** and rendered in Greek by the word κυριος in agreement with early Jewish custom and Massoretic tradition, where the *ketiv* **YHWH** is consistently replaced by the *qere perpetuum* «Adonaj» (Lord), is to be rendered by a word equivalent in meaning and function. The tetragrammaton or its transliteration must not be used in the translation.
- 4) Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek, and Latin **transliterated terms** such as Alleluja, Amen, Hosannah, Maranatha, Phylakterion, Centurio are normally not to be used, for they are meaningful to church affiliated people only and will be not understood or, even worse, be misunderstood by many others. Different from this are cases where a Hebrew or Aramaic word or phrase is explained by the biblical text itself (e.g. "Immanuel" in Mt 1:23).
- 5) In order for a translation to be more easily proclaimed, it is necessary that any expression be avoided which is confusing or ambiguous when heard (such as the English **homophones** «lyre» and «liar»), so that the hearer would fail to grasp its meaning.
- 6) **Archaisms** are as little desirable as **anachronisms**.

- 7) Where **synonyms** are available in the receptor language (e.g. prepuce = foreskin) the one more commonly used is to be employed. **Synonyms** of the source language may be translated by one and the same word of the receptor language.
- 8) **Figures of speech** are very much part of the rich language of the Hebrew and Greek texts. But, if translated literally, their meaning and impact is often lost in translation because the literal rendering may not represent a figurative equivalent in the receptor language and will hence be taken at its literal value. **Utterances in a transferred sense**, phraseologies, idioms, coined or parabolic expressions, dead metaphors, euphemisms, and other kinds of **figurative or analogical speech** need to be changed into equivalent common expressions of the receptor idiom. Where these do not exist the meaning of the original must be translated in a direct way. Receptor language idioms may be used in place of direct language, if these idioms precisely cover the original meaning, in order to keep the overall stylistic appearance equivalent to the original. In other instances the opposite may apply: a shift to a figure of speech in the receptor language may serve to express non-figurative language in the source.
- 9) **Metaphors** are to be translated as similes if required by the receptor language. The translation of creative metaphors (i.e. metaphors which are created ad hoc by the biblical author) may usually follow the form of the source text; idiomatic metaphors, however, ought to be translated, if possible, by idiomatic metaphors of the receptor language.
- 10) **Family relationships** and **genealogies** are to be rendered according to linguistic practices of the receptor idiom. Words which express consanguinity or other important types of relationship, such as *brother*, *sister*, etc., which are clearly masculine or feminine in the context where they occur, are to be maintained as such in the translation.
- 11) **Inclusive Language** : Where in the Hebrew and Greek texts it is clear that a reference to participants is to both men and women, the translation should faithfully represent this meaning without a linguistic bias towards one gender to the exclusion of the other. In ancient culture, often male nouns and pronouns were used refer to all humans. Examples are *adam* in Hebrew and *anthrôpos* in Greek when in context they refer to the human race, and the Greek *adelphoi* when it addresses or refers to a group which includes both male and female participants. (See GNT 1 Cor 1.10 for an example.)
- 12) «**False Friends**», i.e. words or phrases, which correspond formally to the source language yet render a different meaning in the receptor language, are to be avoided!
- 13) **Proper names carrying meaning** (so-called **popular etymologies**, e.g. Isaac, Israel, Jesus) demand explanation when their intended comprehension in context depends on it.

Commented [MSOffice1]: Page: 9

I would add that where synonyms are available in both the source and receptor language, and where semantic correspondence is available, that translation of synonyms be maintained, especially in poetic parallelism, where the use of synonyms have a literary function.

- 14) **Proper names** and toponymica are to be transliterated from Hebrew and Greek, respectively, according to phonetics, phonology, vowel consonant clustering, syllabic patterns, and acceptable word length of the receptor language. If required by local church traditions, spelling of proper names may follow Vulgate, Septuagint, Old Church Slavonic, or other normative models. Interconfessional agreements of mutually acceptable common transliteration and orthography ought to be aspired to. In case where agreement cannot be reached, denominational differences in spelling and transliterating proper names need to be listed in an appendix. Names of identical individuals or places must be the same consistently throughout the New and OTs and thus should generally follow their OT form. Spelling of widely known proper names may concur with the form in use, except where important socio-religious reasons might recommend otherwise.
- 15) Objects of radically different form and/or function (e.g. weights, **measures**, volumes, distances, coins, currency units) ought to be replaced with terms familiar to contemporary readers. In lack of striking evidence one may assume the denarius as a day's wage in NT times (cf. Matth 20:2) and transform monetary units in the NT by reference to this base.

1.4.4 Some general considerations

- 1) While utter caution is advisable lest the historical context of the biblical passages be obscured, the translator should also bear in mind that the Bible is not simply an historical document. For the biblical text treats not only of historical persons and events, but also of **spiritual mysteries**, and thus refers to the people of the present age and to their lives. While always maintaining due regard for the norm of fidelity to the original text, one should strive, whenever a choice is to be made between different ways of translating a term, to make those choices that will enable the hearer to recognize himself and the dimensions of his own life as vividly as possible in the persons and events found in the **text**.
- 2) Unintentional **ambiguities** must be made unambiguously clear. Intended **ambiguities**, which cannot be rendered in a semantically and idiomatically correct way into the receptor language, need to be translated clearly and plainly in one way or, if at all possible, in a twofold translation. A footnote will draw the reader's attention to the metasyntactic play with ambiguity that is in the text.
- 3) **Implicit Information:** In the UBS approach to translation we recognize a number of areas where it is necessary to make explicit certain types of implicit information as a legitimate part of translation. This is done where the implicit information is seen as an **indispensable minimum component for the reader to make sense of the text**. Excesses will not meet BS publishing criteria. Here are some good examples:
 - i. Making participants explicit - *field*: grammar, eg. Passive > active – explicit subject

Commented [MSOffice2]: Page: 10

This is interesting and new idea. I wonder about the the practical application of this approach..

- ii. Making explicit the identity of persons or places – *field*: general background knowledge
- iv. Making explicit historical information – *field*: history
 “We should have been like Sodom and become like Gomorrah” (Is 1.9)
 translated as “Jerusalem would have been totally destroyed, just as Sodom and Gomorrah were.”
- v. Historical information and practice – *field*: social/military practice
 “If anyone forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles” (Mt 5.41)
 translated as, “If one of the occupation troops forces you to carry his pack one mile, carry it two miles.”
- vi. Making explicit cultural information – *field*: culture
 “You gave me no kiss” (Lk 7.45) translated as “You did not welcome me with a kiss” or “you refused me the customary kiss of greeting”; “rent my garments” (Ezra 9.3) translated as “tore my clothes in despair”.

Where essential implicit information cannot be made explicit by translational means, it should be supplied by a footnote.

- 4) Translation oriented exegesis needs to distinguish between implicit information and **background information**. Some background information should not be entered into the running text of the translation, but must be reserved for footnotes, glossaries, or other kinds of additional material.
- 5) Translational exegesis aims at a **linguistically appropriate interpretation** and refrains from inserting information in the translation that is in the nature of a **comment** on the text.
- 6) Not infrequently an exegetically correct and semantically complete **translational paraphrase** might be the best possible rendering of the meaning of the source text. **Metaphrases** (i.e. literal, formal correspondence renderings) are to be avoided. The aim of meaning-based functional equivalence translation is the closest natural semantic equivalent. Form corresponding metaphrases tend to sacrifice meaning to lexico-grammatical similarity.
- 7) **Explicit information** in the resource text already implied in the receptor language by virtue of context or phraseology, does not need to be translated explicitly.
- 8) **Plays on words**, if their reconstruction in the receptor language is required lest the text be meaningless, must either be rendered by a functional equivalent or, if this is not possible, explained in a footnote.
- 9) Decisions on **capitalization** of nouns and pronouns in the text should be made with reference to local customs and traditions. Considering the wide use of Scriptures in aural contexts (e.g. liturgy, devotions) and the increasing influence of audio/ video media for Scripture conveyance, capitalization should not have any semantically distinctive significance, since it is a feature solely related to print media.

- 10) **Reflect cultural background of the Bible:** The UBS does not support intervention by the translator to revise social and cultural norms and ideological constructs in the Bible which are found incompatible with modern social and cultural norms and ideological constructs. In particular, inclusive language should not be used where, within the patriarchal and androcentric culture of the source texts, there are clearly exclusive references to male participants.