

# ***Target and Translation Studies.*** **Half-baked observations towards a sociological account**

GIDEON TOURY

*Tel Aviv University, Israel*

Let me take you back in time to the year 1981, when Translation Studies was still in its infancy as an acknowledged academic discipline. I myself was turning forty then, with one book in Hebrew and a small collection of English articles to my name. With the passage of time I became convinced, and more and more so, that—if the study of translational phenomena was ever to develop into more than a mere side-kick of other fields of knowledge—it would have to have designated journals of its own. Rash as I was (I remember being referred to as the *enfant terrible* of Translation Studies, which I used to like), I drafted a seven-page “ideological” platform for such a journal, which I hastened to submit to a young (then married) couple of German publishers, Mr. and Mrs. Gunter Narr of Tübingen. The two already had a small number of titles on translation on their list, which was devoted to a variety of aspects of language and linguistics.

To my surprise, the two expressed immediate interest in the project. In fact, to my inexperienced eyes they looked almost enthusiastic to embrace it. Unfortunately, however, some time later the Narrs (German pun most definitely intended!) retracted their initial acceptance of the project, fearing that a journal solely devoted to translation—be it even broadly conceived as it certainly was—would not attract a large enough audience. I saw no other choice but take their word for it. For a long time I kept the agonizing failure to myself.

One day, a few years later, I happened to divulge the story to José Lambert, a friend and a colleague. José’s suggestion was that I come to Leuven (Belgium) and present the concept to the local academic publishing house Peeters, whose list included mainly books in “theology, philosophy, ethics, classical studies, archaeology, history of art, medieval studies, oriental studies, linguistics and literature” (quoted from the publisher’s official website). José promised to prepare the grounds for a meeting which did indeed take place; in 1987, if I am not mistaken. The two of us had the feeling that we were actually making headway, and then we broke off for lunch.

We were about to return to the meeting room, a few hours later, when José came running from his office and told me he had just had a phone call from Mrs. Claire Benjamins in Amsterdam, expressing interest in the unborn

baby and suggesting that we at least suspend our negotiations with Peeters and listen to what she and her husband had to offer. To be sure, to this very day I am not sure how Claire came to hear about the project or what induced her to make that suggestion. It was easier to understand why she later on decided to adopt the journal (which, at that point in time, was still tentatively called *Targum*, ‘translation’ in Hebrew-Aramaic). Be that as it may, preparations started right away, and in the middle of 1989 the first issue of *Target* (as it came to be called, now focusing on the target pole of the phenomenon but retaining most of the phonetics of the original non-English title) saw the light of day. Since that day, twenty volumes have been published, more or less regularly; altogether forty issues encompassing over 7200 pages of text: fully fledged articles as well as brief position papers (under the title “Forum”) and book reviews, long and short.

Twenty years in the life of a journal justify an interim stock-taking, be it ever so tentative, especially as it coincides with a major change of editorship. Also, the time seems ripe for some patting on the proverbial back, even if it is I who is doing the patting as well as offering my own back to be patted. In what follows, a series of half-baked observations will be presented towards a *sociocultural* account of our discipline and its evolution in time, which is an aspect we still miss. To be sure, I have always been of the opinion that academic periodicals, certainly those that wish to make a difference, should not be seen as simply accompanying a field of study and documenting what goes on in it (which they certainly do). They should also *direct the evolution* of the discipline in question; whether concretely, by putting forward areas and topics for research and discussion, or more abstractly, by instigating a general scholarly atmosphere for others to breathe.

What I have been saying so far has probably sounded like mere memoirs from a completely personal angle. However, I believe that there is a lot more to this story. In fact, I would claim that it is indicative of a number of factors which have had great influence on *Target* and that there is a tangled network of relations between the selection of a publisher—whether it is conceived of as making a selection or as being selected by one—and the makeup of the journal itself.

Thus, first publisher approached was medium-size, quite young but already somewhat established in continental Europe, in one of the very few countries where translation had been taken seriously and dealt with rather extensively. By contrast, the possibility of approaching a British, let alone an American publisher, old or new, was never so much as pondered. The reaction in the 1980s would probably have been: “translation what?”. (The fact that this has undergone huge changes in *Target*’s lifetime may be, at least in part, accorded to its achievements in putting the discipline on the map.)

We stayed on the continent, then, which certainly helped enhance the European slant Translation Studies had been demonstrating anyway. We then tried our luck with a relatively small Belgian firm, with some 130 years of experience in academic publishing along with a considerable amount of prestige in international circles, but it was still rather local, even marginal in nature. We finally established long-term working relations—and very good ones—with a publishing house of an “in between” status: not too old, not too young; with prestige and a solid background in academic publishing, and whose status continued to rise, among other things because of its parenthood to *Target* and the Benjamins Translation Library, the book series that was added a few years later. (To be sure, an accompanying book series had formed an integral part of the original document but we were not given the green light to start it right away.)

Finding the publisher we found gave rise to at least one important matter of policy that has been directing our editorial policy ever since: For reasons that had to do with the kind of distribution they thought—or rather wished—the periodical to have, the Benjamins people insisted that almost all the articles should be in English, with an odd paper in French and/or German. No other language was deemed acceptable. (It may well be the case that, until that time, most of the articles on translation were *not* in English!)

This dictate was, and still is, very significant, especially in view of the subject-matter of *Target* being translation. To be sure, most of the newer journals in the field, those which came into being in the 1990s, were even less open to non-English articles, which may be said to have turned a commercial agreement to a merit of sorts: *Target* seems to have always had broader horizons than the other periodicals that followed suit and are, to a great extent, its offspring, from *The Translator* (1995) to *Translation Studies* (2008).

A slightly freer hand was given to us in the Book Reviews Section, which has been an important component of *Target* from its inception. All in all, 370 new books have been reviewed in the years 1989-2008, in many different languages. The Section was taken care of by Lieven d’Hulst, another Belgian scholar who managed to recruit to the profession a growing number of contributors, both young and new, as well as experienced scholars, from many countries. Owing to their peculiarities, the reviews deserve to be taken stock of separately. Here I will mention one point only, which has important sociocultural roots as well as implications; namely, our failure to convince most of the reviewers to transcend descriptivism and adopt a *critical* stance. In my opinion, all the other journals share this disposition, which seems to go together with us constituting a relatively small and closely-knit community, where criticism is often likely to be interpreted as having “personal”, or at best “sectarian” motives.

The restriction on the use of languages has no doubt had a considerable impact on the growing marginalization in *Target* of research done in many

places in the world, in languages such as German, Italian, or Portuguese, not to mention Chinese and Japanese. As is well known, and despite some changes that have been occurring of late—scholars in many parts of the world still prefer to write and publish in other “international” languages, or even in their own parlance. One place where this state of affairs has been changing in the last few years is Spain, where English has become more and more a language of academic communication. In fact, as we will soon see, in the last few years Spain has been one of the main sources of submissions for *Target*. In fact, it now occupies the very first place alongside... China. A lot is bound to change in terms of accepted articles too, once the active English of those scholars has improved (or once competent translators have been employed).

In the seventh year of *Target*, the publishers made another administrative decision that greatly influenced the format and contents of the journal: they decided to increase the number of pages per issue by over 60%, from 125-130 to 200 pages. A few years later some changes were made in *Target*'s layout (different font, smaller margins, greater number of lines per page), which—minor as each one of them may have been—taken together they added 10-15% of text to each issue. Among other things, these seemingly “technical” changes enabled us to publish not only a greater number of articles and book reviews) per issue, but longer, and more elaborate studies as well: the average *Target* article is now quite a bit longer than it used to be and we no longer cut long articles into two parts. It also made it possible to bring a lot of (raw or processed) data in appendices, in a variety of languages and alphabets, which, scientifically speaking, have become one of the most important features of *Target* in the last few years: it allows one not only to follow closer the author's line of argumentation and check their conclusions, it also makes possible the reproduction of the whole study using different corpora. A fly in the ointment: all these changes for the better made the general editor work twice as hard, in spite of the assistance he has had from his two co-editors... In case you have been wondering, this is the main reason why my scholarly output dropped considerably after 1995.

As far as proper articles go, some 220 scholars representing almost forty different countries have contributed to *Target*. Of these, 80%, 175 in number, supplied a single article each, which testifies to great openness and variety: most names simply do not recur, or not very often. Some 32 scholars contributed two articles each, eight scholars have three articles each, two with five articles each, one with six articles and two with seven articles each. (In case you want to know, the three “champions” are Anthony Pym, Daniel Gile and José Lambert.)

The number of scholars submitting manuscripts that were *not* accepted for publication is about 4 or 5 times as much, which attests to rigid selection

procedures, not only in comparison to other periodicals in Translation Studies. My professional ethics hinders me from laying open the editor's wastepaper basket, in spite of the potentially interesting findings it may yield, so I'll put a full stop here.

Of course, the number of forty countries constitutes a very small percentage of the geopolitical entities that have attained independent standing. (The United Nations currently has 192 member States.) However, this number does encompass a non-negligible portion of the academic world map, especially in the humanities and social sciences. This can be taken as a fulfillment of the aspiration to create a truly *international* journal, which was one of my main motives in drafting the 1981 document. This aspiration found its explicit expression in the subtitle of the journal. Until that time, articles on translation were scattered in a myriad of journals pertaining to a variety of different disciplines, normally a single article at a time. (In those days, theme issues devoted to translation were very rare indeed.) Only very few periodicals were wholly devoted to translation, and the number of truly international ones among them was negligible—*Meta* and *Babel* readily come to mind, but that more or less sums it up.

The story about the man who drowned in a pond whose average depth was 20 centimeters is widely known. Using a similar observation, it could be claimed that *Target* published an average of 7.7 articles per contributing country. However, while mathematically flawless, this—or any other number—has precious little to say about the nature of our journal. Even less light can it shed on changes that it might have undergone over the years.

There are a very small number of countries on the list whose accumulated contribution can be designated as fairly dense. Thus, 221 (more than 75%!) of the articles were contributed by the first 11 countries and each one of the first two was responsible for over 10% of the overall production. At the other end of the scale, 14 countries (altogether 4.7%) are represented by just one article each, almost by accident, it would seem: there could easily have been other countries in their place.

One clarification is due: I am talking about the authors' affiliation at the time of publication, which may well have been a foreign country or a temporary place of residence for them. A single author may thus be listed under different countries at different points in their career, in accordance with their changes of place.

One intriguing feature in this connection, which deserves serious sociocultural research, is the existence of a rather weighty group of scholars who are affiliated with an institute outside of their country of citizenship: a German, a Dane, an Egyptian, a Greek, a Turk or a Dutchman in the United Kingdom; an Australian and a number of Brits in Spain; a Swiss, an American and a Dutch woman in Norway; and many more. Some of those were, are or will be central for the evolution of Translation Studies in their

adopted-adopting countries, maybe in the world as a whole. To what extent is this kind of migration unique to Translation Studies? The question certainly warrants pursuing far beyond its manifestations in *Target*. To be sure, implications may go well beyond the mere question of language use. After all, scholars who have been trained in different countries bring with them different scholarly traditions. It would be interesting to find out how those traditions change or interfere with other traditions.

The position of a country on the list of contributors, and the changes that may have occurred in it—what, if anything, can they tell us? Table 1 shows the numbers concerning the first nine countries (a totally arbitrary number), in decreasing order. Calculating the results, I was in for a number of surprises. It never occurred to me that this would be the distribution of contributing countries!

Country	Number of articles	Percent
1. Germany	33	12.0%
2. UK	32.5	11.8%
3. Belgium	27.5	10.0%
4. Finland	26	9.4%
5. Israel	23	8.3%
6. Spain	21	7.6%
7. US	13	4.7%
8. France	10	3.6%
9. Hong Kong	9	3.2%
	195	70%

Table 1. The first nine contributing countries

To be sure, even if one has formed a concept as to what would be desirable in the production of a periodical, an editor's work consists first and foremost in coming to grips with what is *available*; and not only due to time constraints either. Personal relations seem to be of utmost importance here. To be sure, we all have only a limited—and necessarily slanted—number of such relations, which supplies an explanation of sorts to the primacy of the first five countries on our list: Germany (where I spent two sabbaticals and where I made many acquaintances “in the business”), the UK (especially since Kirsten Malmkjær joined the editorial team), Belgium (José Lambert and Lieven d’Hulst), Israel and Finland (which deserves a focused study).

The marginality of a number of countries seems significant too, especially when those countries represent real “powers” on an international scale and, above all, prominence in academia. First and foremost among the countries that remained almost invisible are the former Soviet Union and today's Russia; for rather obvious reasons, I should say, which are connected

with the overall position of the former power in the academic world such that its almost absence from *Target* (altogether 3 articles) is nothing but a manifestation of its general weakness. There are first signs that this is on the verge of changing again, most notably an International Conference which is being organized on “Language, Culture and Society”, to be held in Moscow in September 2009.

Other countries I would mention briefly are Japan, Korea, Portugal, India and Turkey. In view of what we know about the role these countries have played in modern Translation Studies, we would have expected them to have a more massive presence in the international scene, including *Target*. One thing that might help improve the situation is having more contacts with scholars in those countries; on both the institutionalized and individual levels. Also, scholars in many countries need to become more daring and reach out beyond the borders of their own countries and languages. After all, this is what going international really means, and going international is a must for a discipline such as Translation Studies.

The place occupied by the United States of America is rather marginal, in spite of American scholars using English as the main language in their academic writing: It is only seventh on the list. This is hardly surprising, though, in view of at least two complementary factors: 1) the overall marginality of the US in the world of Translation Studies after, e.g., Nida, especially with respect to the discipline as conceived of in *Target*'s “ideological” platform, and 2) the aforementioned Eurocentricity of the journal and much of today's discipline, which for a long time acted as a barrier of sorts.

To be sure, there was no boycott involved in the marginalization of any country, like the one we witnessed from at least one other periodical in Translation Studies. In fact, when that boycott was first announced, back in 2003, I started nicknaming *Target* “the journal that boycotts no one”. I hope this slogan—which was intended in all earnest—managed to make some difference! It is not even as if we didn't try to establish contacts with colleagues in other countries, because we did. It is only that—to the extent that manuscripts were submitted, in the first place—many of them tended to be rather dated in their approach, theoretical framework and methodology and/or poorly written.

It should also be emphasized that *Target* never aspired to become a venue for “star”-writers, despite the saying that “big names sell magazines”. It most certainly did not earn its fame by “dropping names”. Let me tell you another secret: it is a fact that quite a number of “names” had their articles sent back to them, but I have already explained why I believe I should hold my tongue in this matter. On the other hand, we have adopted a deliberate policy of encouraging new writers to submit their fruits of their research, not only doctoral students but younger people too, working on their MA theses. Many beginner-authors have enjoyed close coaching from the editors, trying

to bring an article to the required standard, and not on the language level alone. We are therefore justified in claiming that *Target* has contributed directly to the education of researchers in the field, for its own benefit as well as that of other journals.

We seem to have advanced somewhat in our observations. At the same time, we have been treating a twenty year period as one amorphous lump, which has probably resulted in obscuring our wish to trace processes of joining the list of contributing countries, moving up and down along the list, or totally dropping out of it. Table 2 brings some of the highlights in this last respect. For this purpose, the twenty volumes of *Target* were divided into five four-volume blocks, which is just another arbitrary number.

	Vols. 1-4 (1989-1992)	Vols. 5-8 (1993-1996)	Vols. 9-12 (1997-2000)	Vols. 13-16 (2001-2004)	Vols. 17-20 (2005-2008)
1.	Germany 15 art., 30.6%	Germany 8 art., 13.3%	Germany 7 art., 11.5%	UK 8 art., 13.3%	UK 8½ art., 13.9%
2.	Belgium 8 art., 16.3%	Finland 6 art., 10%	UK 7 art., 11.5%	Spain 7 art., 11.7%	Belgium 7½ art., 12.3%
3.	Canada 7 art., 14.3%	UK 6 art., 10%	Finland 6 art., 9.8%	Finland 7 art., 11.7%	Spain 6 art., 9.8%
4.	Israel 5 art., 10.2%	Israel 5 art., 8.3%	Spain 5 art., 8.2%	Israel 4 art., 6.7%	Canada 5 art., 8.2%
5.	UK 3 art., 6.1%	Belgium 4 art., 6.7%	Israel 5 art., 8.2%	Belgium 4 art., 6.7%	Finland 5 art., 8.2%
6.	Holland 2 art., 4%	Spain 3 art., 5%	Canada 4 art., 6.4%	Hong Kong 4 art., 6.7%	Israel 4 art., 6.6%
7.	Finland 2 art., 4%	USA 3 art., 5%	Belgium 3 art., 4.9%	France 3 art., 5%	Denmark 3 art., 4.9%
8.	USA 2 art., 4%	Austria 3 art., 5%	France 3 art., 4.9%	Germany 3 art., 5%	USA 3 art., 4.9%
	44 art., 89.8%	38 art., 63.3%	40 art., 65.6%	40 art., 66.7%	42 art., 68.8%

Table 2. Changing positions of countries in the list of contributors

All in all, there are only 13 different countries which have appeared at least once in the upper part of the list (first eight places): Germany, the UK, Belgium, Finland, Spain, Canada, Israel, Holland, Hong Kong, the US, France, Denmark and Austria. If we try to devise a “prominence index” for



the first 11 of these countries (giving, e.g., 8 points for first place, 7 for second, and so on, to one point for eighth place), this is what we get:

1.	UK	33
2.	Germany	25
3.	Finland	25
4.	Belgium	24
5.	Israel	22
6.	Spain	21
7.	Canada	14
8.	US	4
9.	Holland	3
10.	Hong Kong	3
11.	France	3

Germany starts at the very top of the list: it occupies the first place with almost a third(!) of the articles published in the first four volumes—an all-time record which would never be equaled by any country in any other period. In other words, *Target* did not start off as a highly variegated journal but it certainly became one with the passage of time. Germany retains its first place in the second and third periods, but goes down considerably, to 13.3% and 11.5% of the overall production, respectively. It then drops down to the eighth place, below Hong Kong and France, with as little as 5% of the articles, and ends up in the lower part of the list. This trajectory seems very significant, and its implications certainly transcend *Target*. Apparently, Germany's position in the world of Translation Studies at large has gone down considerably (and consistently). Then again, the willingness of German scholars of the newer generation to publish in English seems not to have increased much. These findings are reinforced by the list of German scholars who did contribute to *Target*, most of them actually belonging to the old(er) generation; e.g. Wolfram Wilss and Hans J. Vermeer.

Spain shows an almost reverse tendency: it is not represented at all in the first period. In the second period it occupies the sixth place (with 5%), and then goes gradually up to the fourth place (with 8.2%), and finally to the second and third places (with 11.7% and 9.8% of the articles, respectively). As I have already said, this tendency shows clear signs of being continued.

Finland shows a zigzag trajectory. It starts rather low, in seventh place (with 4% of the overall production). It then climbs up to second place (with 10%), goes down to third (in two consecutive periods, with 9.8% and 11.7%, respectively), and finishes fifth (with 8.2%).

The UK starts fifth, with 6.1% of the published articles coming from there. It then climbs up to the third and second places (with 10% and 11.5%,

respectively), and ends up at the very top, with as much as 13.9% of the articles.

Canada, no doubt one of the leading countries in Translation Studies and which has a number of internationally oriented journals of its own, constitutes an interesting case in point. It hardly appears on the list, and when it does, especially in the last period, we have four Canadian articles constituting some 50% of a special issue on “Heterolingualism in/and Translation”, a topic most pertinent to Canada as well as Belgium, which indeed occupies most of the rest of the issue in question (37.5%) (18:1 [2006]), and from where the guest editor comes.

As to the United States, it rarely ever appears in the top part of the list. Moreover, when it does appear, it occupies the seventh or the eighth places only (with as little as 4%, 5% and 4.9% of the production).

Another interesting comparison would concern the authors’ affiliation vs. the way the paper version of the periodical gets distributed (unfortunately, in terms of subscribers and buyers only, and not actual readers, whose numbers can only be estimated). Table 3 lists the first ten countries in terms of distribution with respect to one particular volume of *Target*. As the actual figures constitute a commercial secret, only percentages are given.

	<b>Country</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1.	Holland	18.3%
2.	US	11.9%
3.	Belgium	9.2%
4.	UK	7.5%
5.	Germany	6.1%
6.	Spain	5.3%
7.	Italy	4.4%
8.	France	3.7%
9.	Israel	3.7%
10.	Finland	3.4%
		73.6%

Table 3: The leading countries in terms of distribution

All in all, 46 countries appear on the list of subscribers, which means that the number of different “passive” countries is slightly higher than the number of “active” ones. This is only to be expected. Moreover, in a sense, this is in keeping with the publisher’s calculations concerning the journal’s distribution we mentioned above. At the same time, countries that have English as a major language—Australia, Canada, Hong Kong, India, Ireland, New Zealand, South Africa, the UK, the US—account for only 26.3% of the distributed copies, which must be somewhat disappointing for the publishers.

<b>Contributions</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Distribution</b>	<b>Percent</b>
1. Germany	12.0%	1. Holland	18.3%
2. UK	11.8%	2. US	11.9%
3. Belgium	10.0%	3. Belgium	9.2%
4. Finland	9.4%	4. UK	7.5%
5. Israel	8.4%	5. Germany	6.1%
6. Spain	7.6%	6. Spain	5.3%
7. US	4.7%	7. Italy	4.4%
8. France	3.6%	8. France	3.7%
9. Hong Kong	3.2%	9. Israel	3.7%
	70.9%		70.2%

*Table 4: Contributing countries vs. distribution (top of lists)*

Also, it is easy to see (Table 4, based on the juxtaposition of Tables 1 and 3) that the first nine countries on the two lists are not all that different, even though their order and percentages are not the same. The differences warrant an analysis which, at the moment, I cannot venture. Among other things, they may have something to do with the subscription rates being rather high for scholars in many countries. It would be interesting to compare those findings with the extent to which the online version of the journal is being accessed, where it is possible to pay only for what one actually uses.

Let us move to yet another observation of a sociocultural nature: It has often been claimed that translation has become a feminine occupation. This claim seems to be true for most cultures, especially in the last few decades. Does it have any repercussions for the status of Translation *Studies*? Is the discipline “feminine” too, or is it at least becoming one? And what can *Target* tell us, in that respect? Table 5 brings some information that is relevant for this question.

1:1	6 m. (66.6%)	3 f. (33.3%)	9		
1:2	4 m. (66.6%)	2 f. (33.3%)	6	10 m. (66.6%)	5 f. (33.3%)
2:1	5 m. (83.3%)	1 f. (16.7%)	6		
2:2	3 m. (60%)	2 f. (40%)	5	8 m. (72.7%)	3 f. (27.3%)
#3:1	3 m. (50%)	3 f. (50%)	6		
3:2	3 m. (60%)	2 f. (40%)	5	6 m. (54.5%)	5 f. (45.5%)
4:1	6 m. (75%)	2. f. (25%)	8		
*4:2	2 m. (33.3%)	4 f. (66.6%)	6	8 m. (57.1%)	6 f. (42.9%)
5:1	4 m. (66.6%)	2 f. (33.3%)	6		
5:2	4 m. (66.6%)	2 f. (33.3%)	6	8 m. (66.6%)	4 f. (13.3%)

6:1	5 m. (100%)	0 f. (0%)	5		
6:2	3 m. (60%)	2 f. (40%)	5	8 m. (80%)	2 f. (20%)
*7:1	5 m. (41.6%)	7 f. (58.4%)	12		
*7:2	3 m. (37.5%)	5 f. (62.5%)	8	*8 m. (40%)	12 f. (80%)
8:1	6 m. (66.6%)	3 f. (33.3%)	9		
#8:2	4 m. (50%)	4 f. (50%)	8	10 m. (58.8%)	7 f. (41.2%)
*9:1	2 m. (25%)	6 f. (75%)	8		
*9:2	2 m. (28.6%)	5 f. (71.4%)	7	*4 m. (26.6%)	11 f. (73.4%)
10:1	5 m. (83.3%)	1 f. (16.7%)	6		
10:2	7 m. (77.7%)	2 f. (22.3%)	9	12 m. (80%)	3 f. (20%)
#11:1	3 m. (50%)	3 f. (50%)	6		
*11:2	2 m. (28.6%)	5 f. (71.4%)	7	*5 m. (38.5%)	8 f. (61.5%)
12:1	5 m. (62.5%)	3 f. (37.5%)	8		
*12:2	5 m. (41.6%)	7 f. (58.4%)	12	#10 m. (50%)	10 f. (50%)
13:1	9 m. (75%)	3 f. (25%)	12		
*13:2	4 m. (44.4%)	5 f. (55.6%)	9	13 m. (62%)	8 f. (38%)
14:1	4 m. (57.1%)	3 f. (42.9%)	7		
#14:2	3 m. (50%)	3 f. (50%)	6	7 m. (53.8%)	6 f. (46.2%)
*15:1	1 m. (20%)	4 f. (80%)	5		
*15:2	3 m. (42.9%)	4 f. (57.1%)	7	*4 m. (33.3%)	8 f. (66.6%)
16:1	4 m. (57.1%)	3 f. (42.9%)	7		
*16:2	2 m. (33.3%)	4 f. (66.6%)	6	*6 m. (46.1%)	7 f. (53.9%)
*17:1	1 m. (14.3%)	6 f. (85.7%)	7		
17:2	6 m. (85.7%)	1 f. (14.3%)	7	#7 m. (50%)	7 f. (50%)
#18:1	4 m. (50%)	4 f. (50%)	8		
*18:2	2 m. (33.3%)	4 f. (66.6%)	6	*6 m. (42.9%)	8 f. (57.1%)
19:1	5 m. (62.5%)	3 f. (37.5%)	8		
19:2	7 m. (53.8%)	6 f. (46.2%)	13	12 m. (57.1%)	9 f. (42.9%)
20:1	6 m. (75%)	2 f. (25%)	8		
*20:2	1 m. (10%)	9 f. (75%)	10	*7 m. (38.9%)	11 f. (61.1%)

\* indicates female-author domination; # indicates equal share of female- and male-domination

*Table 5: Articles by men and women authors, according to issues and volumes*

You will have to believe me when I say that gender has never been a consideration in the procedures preceding acceptance (or rejection) of articles for publication. This notwithstanding, the findings are not uninteresting. Above all, they certainly show a significant change along the time axis, which must bear on the question we have just asked.

Thus, eleven of the first twelve issues (volumes 1-6, 1989-1993) were man-dominated. There was one single exception, volume 4:2 (1992; 2 m., 4 f.), but I can see no way of assigning any historical significance to this deviation from the dominant pattern. It certainly marks no change of orientation.

From volume seven on, the role of women-authors has been growing incessantly, and the numbers of male- and female-dominated issues become approximately the same. The last issue so far (20:2 [2008]) features nine women-contributors and only one man, and I cannot but wonder whether this marks yet another enhancement of the relative weight of women.

Again, it would be interesting to check whether the same pattern occurs in the numbers of men- and women-authors in the articles that were rejected. Also, eventually, the significance of the findings for *Target* will have to be confronted with the numbers revealed by other periodicals, collections of articles and conference programs and proceedings. Thus, for instance, the Festschrift in my honor, which was published a few months ago (2008), has a ratio of 16 women to 13 men and the Festschrift for Miriam Shlesinger (2008)—a ratio of 8 men to 9 women. By contrast, the proceedings of the 4<sup>th</sup> EST Congress (*Doubts and Directions in Translation Studies* [2007]) contains 21 articles by women and only 5 by men.

There are, no doubt, other parameters of potential interest for a sociological analysis of *Target*, or any other journal, as well as the discipline as a whole. However, I would like to leave some room for others to excel.