

In this issue of the *Technical Papers*, we have been able to bring together four articles that explore in various ways Eugene Nida's contributions to the field of translation studies. The first three articles, by Wendy Porter, Stanley Porter, and Jonathan Watt, are revisions of papers prepared for the SBL Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics Section that met in Toronto, Canada, November 2002. Nigel Statham's article was not a part of that forum, but its interests and focus link it naturally to the SBL discussion. While each study will of course repay a careful reading, Wendy Porter's may seem unlike standard *BT* fare. In my own reading of Anthony Pym's work in the area of Histories of Translation, and through conversations with him, I have, however, become convinced that an element often missing in our academic study of translation is "the people." Wendy Porter seeks to provide a reconstruction of the very real human context that gave rise to one particular translation scholar's contributions.

While the preceding articles provide a historical perspective on Bible translation, Tim Wilt's article reflects the increasing, contemporary appreciation for diverse approaches to translating Scripture. In 2002, the volume entitled *Bible Translation: Frames of Reference* (Manchester: St. Jerome) was produced by six UBS consultants with the basic goal of "providing a general perspective on Bible translation at the turn of the twenty-first century, in part by indicating important developments since the appearance of [Eugene Nida and Charles Taber's] *The Theory and Practice of Translation*" (Leiden: Brill, 1969). *Frames* pointed out dramatic changes in the communication situations of Bible translation since *TAPOT* and recognized the validity of a wide spectrum of approaches to Bible translation, especially in view of diverse audiences and translation goals. *Frames* gave special attention to "A literary approach to biblical text analysis and translation," the title of Ernst Wendland's chapter. In his introduction to the chapter, Wendland observed that "over the past few decades, a wide array of studies" have enhanced appreciation of the literary nature of the Bible but that "far less attention has been given to translating the Bible as literature." Wilt's article accords with this call to give more attention to representing the literary nature of the Scriptures.

The Editor