

Metadiscourse in English and Swedish Non-fiction Texts and their Translations

Jennifer Herriman, University of Gothenburg

Abstract

This study compares the metadiscourse (i.e. the meanings which relate to the writers and readers of a text) in two samples of English and Swedish non-fiction texts and their translations in the English Swedish Parallel Corpus. Using an integrative approach to metadiscourse (Ädel & Mauranen 2012:2), it finds that there is a considerably higher frequency of metadiscourse in the Swedish original texts and a somewhat larger proportion of interpersonal metadiscourse, which represents the writer's attitude towards the propositional content and the readers themselves. In particular, there is a more frequent usage of boosters. In both of the translation samples, there is an increase in transition markers, which raises the level of explicitness in the text. In the translations into English, a tendency was also found for translators to reduce emphasis by omitting boosters and, in some cases, inserting hedges. This, coupled with the higher frequency of boosters in the Swedish original texts suggests that there may be differences in writing conventions in English and Swedish non-fiction texts, for instance, when it comes to increasing the emphatic force of propositions.

Key words: metadiscourse, translation, metadiscourse, translation, English, Swedish, boosters, hedges

1. Introduction

Texts may be seen as consisting of different levels of meaning, a propositional content level, which refers to actions, events, states of affairs or objects in the world portrayed by the text, and a writer-reader level, where the writers interact with their readers, explicitly guiding them through its structure and organisation, commenting on the writing process itself or expressing their opinions and beliefs concerning its content. The meanings expressed on the writer-reader level of the text have been referred to by the umbrella term metadiscourse, i.e. “the self-reflective linguistic expressions referring to the evolving text, to the writer, and to the imagined readers of that text” (Hyland 2004:133). Typical linguistic expressions of metadiscourse include, for instance, conjunctions and conjuncts, first and second pronouns referring to the writer and reader, interrogatives and imperatives addressing the reader, and references to the text itself,

Herriman, Jennifer. 2014. “Metadiscourse in English and Swedish Non-fiction Texts and their Translations.” *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 13(1):1-32.

2 Jennifer Herriman

etc. As metadiscourse is “a manifestation of the writer’s linguistic and rhetorical presence in a text.” (Hyland 1998a:3), expressing the writer’s “personality, audience-sensitivity and relationship to the message” (Hyland 1998c:438), it is one of the means by which writers attend to the rational, credible and affective appeals of persuasive rhetoric (logos, ethos and pathos) (Hyland 2005:63-85).

Metadiscourse varies depending not only on the writers’ purpose and their relationship to their readers, but also the social and cultural context in which writing takes place (Hyland 2005:113-137). Anglo-American writers of research papers have been found, for instance, to use a greater amount of metadiscourse in order to explicitly guide their readers through their texts than Finnish writers, who use a generally more implicit rhetorical strategy with less reflexivity and emphasis (Mauranen 1993: 252-259). According to Mauranen, this reflects a tendency for Anglo-American writing to be more rhetorically explicit than Finnish writing. Similarly, in a comparison of metadiscourse in English, Norwegian and French economics and linguistics texts, Dahl (2004:1821) found that the English and Norwegian writers used more metadiscourse than the French writers. Other contrastive studies have also found differences in the usage of metadiscourse in English and other languages, e.g. English and Slovene research papers (Pisanski Peterlin 2005), English and Spanish editorials (Milne 2003), and English and Spanish economic texts (Valero-Garces 1996). According to Hinds (1987:143), English represents a “writer responsible” culture, i.e. writers are expected to take responsibility for the clarity of their texts by providing signposts for the reader to ease processing, as opposed to a “reader responsible culture” which tends to be more implicit, laying more responsibility on the reader for the success of the communication. This is related to what Chesterton (1997:114), refers to as the “significance threshold” in communication, i.e. the point above which something is felt to be worth saying, and below which it is not felt necessary to say anything at all. This may vary from culture to culture and appears to be somewhat lower in English than in Finnish, for instance. When translating from Finnish into English, translators may therefore feel a need to strengthen the text by adding features of metadiscourse, whereas in translations into Finnish they may feel a need for the text “to be ‘toned down’ somewhat in order for it to meet the target culture’s different tolerance of rhetorical display”

(Chesterton 1997:115). Translating a text involves therefore taking into account the fact that the usage of metadiscourse in the target language may be influenced by different cultural preferences and norms of politeness. Williams (2010) found, in a study of students' translations from French to English, for instance, that when some of the students failed to translate some of the features of metadiscourse appropriately, this resulted in the loss of some of the nuances, which, according to Hyland (2005:39), contribute towards making the content of a text "coherent, intelligible and persuasive to a particular audience". Similarly, Pisanski Peterlin (2008) found that translators of Slovene research articles into English made a considerable number of changes in the metadiscourse, both omissions and insertions.

Swedish advanced learners of English have been found to use more metadiscourse in their argumentative writing than native speakers (Petch-Tyson 1998, Ädel 2008). In particular, there are more overt references to the discourse participants and more taking into account the imagined reader. There is also a greater density of metadiscourse elements (Ädel 2008:54). According to Ädel (2008:59), one of the chief influencing factors, as well as general learner strategies and a lack of genre awareness, may be different Anglo-Saxon and Swedish writing conventions, in particular a strong tendency towards informality in Swedish writing. It is possible, then, that in certain circumstances Swedish and English may have a different significance threshold as far as the usage of metadiscourse is concerned. This study aims, therefore, to investigate whether this may be the case. For this purpose, it will first compare the usage of metadiscourse in a sample of English and Swedish original texts (five texts in each language consisting of altogether approximately 60,000 and 64000 words, respectively) and then examine how the metadiscourse has been dealt with in their translations into English and Swedish (approximately 73,000 and 57,000 words, respectively). The original texts and their translations have been selected from the non-fiction category of the English Swedish Parallel Corpus (Aijmer *et al.* 1996). Each language sample consists of extracts from five texts. As the non-fiction category contains a wide variety of text types, ranging from parliamentary speeches and company reports to biographies and historical accounts, similar text types have been selected from each language as far as possible. Each language sample therefore comprises

4 *Jennifer Herriman*

two extracts from biographies, two extracts from travel books and one extract from a historical account. A full list of the texts and the codes used in the examples quoted here are given below.

Section 3 compares the metadiscourse in the original texts. Section 4 compares the metadiscourse in the translations and examines what changes have been made. Section 5, finally, discusses what conclusions can be drawn from these findings. First, in the next section, the model used in the classification of metadiscourse will be presented.

2. *Classification of metadiscourse*

There are two main approaches to analysing metadiscourse, an integrative approach which sees textual interaction between the writer and reader as its main defining feature and a non-integrative approach which follows a narrower definition of metadiscourse as reflexivity only, i.e. language commenting on language itself (Ädel & Mauranen 2010:2). It is the former, broader approach which will be adopted here, following Hyland's classification (1998a, b & c, 2000, 2004, 2005), which is a development of the taxonomy originally proposed by Vande Kopple (1985) and later revised by Crismore *et al.* (1993). This model makes a distinction between interactive metadiscourse, which is used to organize the propositional content of the text, and interactional metadiscourse, which alerts readers to the author's perspective towards the propositional information and the readers themselves (Hyland 2005:50-54). In this study, I will, however, refer to these as textual and interpersonal metadiscourse, respectively. Each of these types of metadiscourse are illustrated here by examples taken from the samples of English and Swedish translations.

Textual metadiscourse consists of the sub-categories: transition markers, frame markers, endophoric markers, code glosses and evidentials. Transition markers express semantic relations between stretches of discourse, i.e. they explicitly establish "preferred interpretations of propositional meanings by relating individual propositions to each other and to readers" (Hyland 1998b:228). They signal, for instance, additive, contrastive and resultative relations, and they are realized by a wide variety of linguistic markers ranging from

conjunctions and conjuncts to prepositional phrases, etc.¹ In (1), for instance, the conjuncts *therefore* and *därför* (“therefore”) signal a resultative relation.

- (1) Dog-driving was difficult, because the dog as a draught animal hardly existed in Norway; it was only later imported from Greenland and Alaska. Amundsen *therefore* began with what lay closest; the art of mountain skiing. Att lära sig hundkörning var svårt *därför* att hunden som dragdjur knappast förekom i Norge. Den importerades först senare från Grönland och Alaska. Amundsen *därför* började *därför* med det som låg närmast: skidåkning i fjällen. (RH)

Frame markers signal boundaries in the discourse and different stages in the argument, e.g. *Denna mycket korta kavalkad skall avslutas med ...* and *This very brief cavalcade will end with ...* in (2), which signals a shift to the final topic of the text, and *This guide's aim* and *Den här bokens syfte* in (3), which announces the goal of the discourse.

- (2) *Denna mycket korta kavalkad skall avslutas med* den mycket begåvade poeten Niklas Törnlund (f 1950), som i en diktsamling 1981 tryckte “Sorlande revir”, som han daterat till nyåret 1979 och som inspirerats av arkeologernas grävningar i stadskärnan. *This very brief cavalcade will end with* a very gifted poet Niklas Törnlund (b.1950) who published “Sorlande revir” (Humming territory) (1979) in a volume of 1981 and the poem was inspired by the archaeological excavations going on in the centre of the town. (LI)
- (3) *This guide's aim* is to provide the sort of information a Londoner would give to a *Den här bokens syfte* är att förse besökaren med det slags information en londonbo skulle ge

¹ These have only been counted as transition markers if they are rhetorically optional i.e. “they constrained the interpretation of the message rather than just contributing to the coordinations of sentence elements” (Hyland 1998b: 229). I have therefore only included items which connect propositions i.e. which connect main finite clauses which could have been independent.

6 Jennifer Herriman

friend visiting the capital. en vän på besök i huvudstaden.
(SUG)

Endophoric markers refer to the text itself. They are sometimes used to remind the readers of material earlier in the text, e.g. *som tidigare nämnts* and *As mentioned earlier* in (4), or to anticipate material yet to come, e.g. *i ett annat kapitel av denna bok* and *in another chapter of this book*, in (5).

- (4) Detta kontrakt skrev — *som tidigare nämnts* — Axel Johnson år 1901 och transporter som påbörjades 1904 omfattade tio år t o m 1913. *As mentioned earlier*, Axel Johnson concluded this contract in 1901 and the shipments ran for a decade from 1904 to 1913. (TR)
- (5) Offentliga konsten i Lund behandlas i ett annat kapitel av denna bok. Public art in Lund *is dealt with in another chapter of this book*. (LI)

Code glosses assist the readers' interpretation of the text by adding information that elaborates on what has been said, for example, by rephrasing or explaining its wording, as in (6) where the code glosses *our April* and *vår april* explain *the month of Nisan*. Some code glosses are metalinguistic comments which put the choice of wording in focus, e.g. *to use the phrase that ...* and *För att använda den fras som ...* in (7).

- (6) Celebrated in the holy city of Babylon during the month of Nisan — *our April* — the Festival solemnly enthroned the king and established his reign for another year. Den firades i den heliga staden Babylon i månaden nisan — *vår april* — genom att man under högtidliga former insatte kungen på tronen och stadfäste hans styre för ytterligare ett år. (KAR)
- (7) It was, *to use the phrase that comes out in Provence whenever the sun goes in*, pas normale. *För att använda den fras som dyker upp varje gång solen går i moln i Provence*: det var inte normalt. (PM)

Evidentials signal that the content of the text is from another source. This may be named or hearsay, e.g. *säges* (“says”) and *so it is said* in (8).

- (8) Någon mera framstående vetenskapsman *säges* han inte ha varit, men ryktbarhet fick han genom upptäckten av Ramlösa brunn, som Döbelius i sin egenskap av provinsialläkare öppnade för allmänt bruk 1707. Någon mera framstående vetenskapsman *säges* han inte ha varit, men ryktbarhet fick han genom upptäckten av Ramlösa brunn, som Döbelius i sin egenskap av provinsialläkare öppnade för allmänt bruk 1707.

Textual metadiscourse consists of the subcategories: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, engagement markers and self mentions. Hedges withhold commitment to a proposition, e.g. *troligen* (“probably”) and *probably* in (9). In doing this, they indicate the writer’s decision to acknowledge the possible existence of other voices and viewpoints and thereby be open to heteroglossic negotiation with the reader (Bakhtin 1986, Martin & White 2005:105).

- (9) Den katedral som helgades åt S:t Laurentius — i dagligt tal Domkyrkan — började *troligen* byggas 1085, då kung Knut (så småningom “den helige”) skapade ekonomiska förutsättningar för bygget. The cathedral dedicated to St Lawrence was *probably* begun in 1085, when King Canute (later to be called Canute the Holy) created economic conditions for the construction. (LI)

Boosters, e.g. *without doubt* and *utan tvivel* (“without doubt”) in (10), increase the writer’s commitment to a proposition and demonstrate a confident, decisive image (cf Hyland 2000:236). Like hedges, they open up the content to heteroglossic negotiation but at the same time they contribute to closing down the argument (Bakhtin 1986, Martin & White 2005:133). Some boosters emphasise the remarkability of the proposition, e.g. *rentav* and *even* in (11).

8 Jennifer Herriman

(10) Lying just south of the Thames in west London, Richmond Park is the most “natural” and largest of the London Royal Parks and *without doubt* the one which holds the most wildlife interest. Strax söder om Themsen i sydvästra London, är Richmond Park den mest ‘naturliga’ och största av Londons kungliga parker och *utan tvivel* den som är intressantast ur viltsynpunkt. (SUG)

(11) Lundaandan sägs innehålla en rejäl dos skepticism. Hos vissa når denna skepticism sådana höjder att de *rentav* förnekar existensen av en Lundaanda. The Lund spirit is supposed to contain a generous dose of scepticism. In some people this scepticism reaches such heights that they *even* deny the existence of a Lund spirit. (LI)

Attitude markers show the writer’s opinion of the content, expressing, for instance, affective attitudes of surprise, e.g. *paradoxalt* (“paradoxically”) and *Strange to say* in (12), or regret, e.g. *Sadly* and *Sorgligt nog* (“sadly enough”) in (13).

(12) Lunds karaktär av universitetsstad kom *paradoxalt* att öka under efterkrigstidens expansionsår. *Strange to say*, Lund became even more of a university town during these years of postwar expansion. (LI)

(13) *Sadly*, it no longer harbours the deer which once provided sport for kings, the disturbance caused by increased public pressure having driven them away. *Sorgligt nog* har hjortarna, en gång kungligt villebråd, försvunnit härifrån på grund av de störningar samhällsutvecklingen orsakat.

Engagement markers explicitly address readers and draw them into the discourse. They are typically second person pronouns referring to the reader, e.g. *you* and *du* in (14), and first person plural reader-inclusive pronouns *we* and *vi*, as in (15), and interrogatives and imperatives addressing the reader, as in (16) and (17).

- (14) In it *you* will find everything from the newest museums to a personal selection of shops, hotels and restaurants. What *you* will not find is information on where to have an Elizabethan banquet; neither are there pages and pages of historical facts. På dessa sidor kommer *du* att hitta allt från de nyaste museerna till ett personligt urval butiker, hotell och restauranger. Något *du* inte kommer att hitta i den här guiden är var man kan bevista en elisabetansk bankett; det finns inte heller sida upp och sida ner med historiska fakta. (SUG)
- (15) *We* will discuss the two other sources of the Pentateuch the Deuteronomist and Priestly accounts of the ancient history of Israel — in Chapter Two. I kapitel två skall *vi* behandla Pentateukens båda andra källor— deuteronomistens och prästcodex' skildringar av Israels äldre historia. (KAR)
- (16) *Vad* sitter våra riksdagsmän och stirrar på under sina debatter i det nygamla riksdagshuset? En målning av arbetande människor, fabriker och skorstenar, bilar och hus? Nej. En enorm väv, föreställande ett skärgårdslandskap. Icke ett hus, inte en människa. *At what* do our riksdagsmän stare during their debates in their renovated riksdag? A painting of people at work, factories and smoke stacks, cars and houses? No, an enormous tapestry representing the land-and-seascape of the skerries, without a single house or human being in sight. (IU)
- (17) *Nå* låt oss lämna vår fiskande vän och återvända till Ett Svenskt Hem. *Well now let's leave* our friend the director with his net and return to The Swedish Home. (IU)

Self mentions are typically first-person pronouns *I* and *jag*, which make the writer's presence known in the text, as in (18).

10 Jennifer Herriman

- (18) Detta barndomshem var rött och hade vita knutar, behöver jag säga det? And do I need to say that his childhood home was painted red and had white-painted corners? (IU)

All the instances of metadiscourse in the English and Swedish samples were collected manually and then classified according to the model of metadiscourse above. Only explicit linguistic realisations have been included, although metadiscoursal meanings may also be inferred in the text. When several types of metadiscourse combine with each other, as in (17) above, where engagement markers (the imperatives, *Låt oss lämna* and *Let's leave*) function at the same time as frame markers indicating a shift of topic, and in (18), where the self mentions *I* and *jag* combine with engagement markers (the interrogative clauses, *behöver jag säga det ...* and *And do I need to say ...*), each function has been counted as a separate feature. The next section compares the metadiscourse in the English and Swedish original texts.

3. Metadiscourse in the Original Texts

Table 1. compares the metadiscourse in the English and Swedish original texts.

Table 1. Metadiscourse in the English and Swedish original texts

	English			Swedish		
	No	Per 1000 words	%	No	Per 1000 words	%
TEXTUAL						
Transition marker	939	15.6	64.6	1155	18.0	55.3
Frame marker	12	0.2	0.8	55	0.8	2.6
Endophoric marker	11	0.2	0.8	35	0.5	1.7
Code gloss	44	0.7	3.0	101	1.6	4.8
Evidential	79	1.3	5.4	155	2.4	7.4
Total	1085	18.1	74.6	1501	23.4	71.8

INTERPERSONAL						
Hedge	110	1.8	7.6	158	2.5	7.6
Booster	102	1.7	7.0	236	3.7	11.3
Attitude markers	36	0.6	2.5	73	1.1	3.5
Engagement marker	119	1.9	8.2	96	1.5	4.6
Self mention	1	0.01	0.06	26	0.4	1.2
Total	368	6.1	25.4	589	9.2	28.2
TOTAL	1453	24.2		2090	32.6	

In the sample of English original texts, there are 1453 metadiscourse items altogether, and their frequency is 24.2 times per 1000 words. In the sample of Swedish original texts, in contrast, the total number of metadiscourse items (2090) is much higher (statistical significance $p < .001^2$), and their frequency is 32.6 times per 1000 words.³ A similar higher frequency of metadiscourse in Swedish non-fiction texts was found in a study carried out by Ädel (1999).

All the different types of metadiscourse occur more frequently in the Swedish sample than in the English sample, with the exception of engagement markers, which are, conversely, slightly more frequent in the English sample (1.9 vs. 1.5 times per 1000 words). This is probably due to the fact that the second person pronoun *you* in English can both be an engagement marker addressing the reader and at the same time have generic reference, whereas Swedish makes a distinction between the second person pronoun engagement markers, *du* (“you”, singular) and *ni* (“you”, plural), and the impersonal pronoun *man* (“one”), which is used for generic reference. (This is exemplified by example (36) below). The greatest difference between the samples is found in the interpersonal metadiscourse, which is

² Statistical significance has been calculated using the Sigil Corpus Frequency Test Wizard (sigil.collocations.de/wizard.html)

³ There is a great deal of variation between the individual texts. In the Swedish original texts, the frequency of metadiscourse ranges from 21.7 to 55.36 times per 1000 words. In the English original texts, it ranges from 15.7 to 39.0 times per 1000 words.

12 *Jennifer Herriman*

altogether 1.5 times more frequent in the Swedish sample than in the English sample (9.2 vs. 6.1 times per 1000 words) compared to the textual metadiscourse, which is 1.3 times more frequent (23.4 vs. 18.1 times per 1000 words). There is thus a somewhat larger proportion of interpersonal metadiscourse in the Swedish sample than in the English sample (28.2% vs. 25.4%). The features which differ most in frequency are boosters and self mentions. Boosters occur more than twice as frequently in the Swedish sample as in the English sample (3.7 vs. 1.7 times per 1000 words) and self mentions occur 26 times in the Swedish sample and only once in the English sample.

In sum, there is more metadiscourse in the sample of Swedish original texts, in particular, interpersonal metadiscourse. The total amount of metadiscourse found in both of the samples is much lower than that which has been found, for instance, in studies of English academic writing, such as research articles and university course books, where metadiscourse features occur three times more frequently (66.2 and 68.5 times per 1000 words, respectively) (Hyland 2005: 102). The most striking difference is the less frequent usage of hedges, which occur only 1.8 and 2.5 times per 1000 words in the English and Swedish original non-fiction texts, respectively, in contrast to 16.7 and 6.4 times per 1000 words in research articles and university course books, respectively (Hyland 2005:102). It appears, thus, that in the type of non-fiction writing examined here, writers tend to intrude less into their unfolding text to influence their reader's reception of it. This is most probably due to the fact that they do not cast their claims as individual and contingent to the same degree as writers of research articles, and therefore there is not the same need to "ground propositions in an explicitly acknowledged degree of subjectivity" (Hyland 2005:93).

I will now go on to examine what happens to the metadiscourse when it is translated.

4. Metadiscourse in the translations

Table 2 compares the total amount of metadiscourse in the English-Swedish and Swedish-English original texts and their translations. It includes the numbers of matches, i.e. metadiscourse features which correspond to similar features in the original texts, and the numbers of

changes, i.e. metadiscourse features which have been omitted or inserted in the translations.

Table 2. Metadiscourse in the translations

English-Swedish					Swedish-English				
Orig.	Translations				Orig.	Translations			
	Match	Omit	Insert	Total		Match	Omit	Insert	Total
1453	1319	134	133	1452	2090	1851	239	270	2121

In the English-Swedish translations, the total number of metadiscourse items (1452) is similar to that in their original English texts (1453). Altogether 1319 of these are matches (approximately 90% of the metadiscourse in the translations). 134 items in the English original texts (approximately 9% of the total number) have been omitted in the Swedish translations and 133 items (approximately 9% of the total number) have been inserted. In the Swedish-English translations, the total number of metadiscourse items has increased slightly from 2090 in the Swedish original texts to 2121 in the English translations (statistical significance $p < .001$). Altogether 1851 of these are matches (approximately 87% of the metadiscourse in the translations). The correspondence between the metadiscourse in the Swedish-English translations is thus slightly lower than in the English-Swedish translations. 239 items in the Swedish original texts (approximately 11% of the total number) have been omitted in the English translations, and 270 items (approximately 13% of the total number) have been inserted. There is thus a slight increase in the total amount of metadiscourse in the translations from Swedish into English, which may be a translation bias due to the influence of a high frequency in the source texts (cf. Gellerstam, 1994:61). In both of the translation samples, the translators have made a number of changes, both insertions and omissions of metadiscourse features. I will now examine these in more detail.

According to Chesterton (1997:88-115), changes made in translation are syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic strategies used by the translator in order to achieve “what they regard as the optimal translation”. Syntactic strategies manipulate the clause and sentence structure of the text. Semantic strategies change its meaning, by, for instance, changing emphasis (Chesterton 1997:104). Pragmatic

strategies, which typically incorporate syntactic and semantic strategies, manipulate the message itself, depending on the translator's knowledge of the prospective readership of the translations. These include explicitness changes, which affect the level of explicitness of the text (Chesterman 1997:108), information changes, which add or omit information that cannot be inferred from the surrounding text (Chesterman 1997:109), interpersonal changes, which alter the relationship between the author and the reader (Chesterman 1997:110), illocutionary changes, which are changes in speech acts (Chesterman 1997:110), and visibility changes which are changes in the authorial presence in the text (Chesterman 1997:112).⁴ Underlying these strategies is the tendency for translators to make compensatory changes, i.e. to compensate for items that have been omitted, added or changed in the translation at some other point of the text.

In the following, I will examine how the translators have used these strategies in the translation of metadiscourse, looking first at the textual metadiscourse.

4.1 Textual metadiscourse

Table 3 compares the textual metadiscourse in the original texts and their translations, including the numbers of matches, i.e. the textual metadiscourse features in the translations which correspond to similar features in the original texts, and the numbers of changes, i.e. the textual metadiscourse features which have been omitted or inserted in the translations. Textual features have increased in number in both of the samples (from 1085 to 1115 in the English-Swedish translations and from 1501 to 1531 in Swedish-English translations). Altogether 1010 and 1348 of these are matches (approximately 90% and 88% of the textual metadiscourse in the translations). 75 items in the English original texts have been omitted in the Swedish translations and 105 items have been inserted. 153 items in the Swedish original texts have been omitted in the English translations, and 183 items have been inserted.

⁴ Chesterman also includes other pragmatic strategies such as cultural filtering when culture-specific items are translated into cultural equivalents in the target language, coherence changes in the logical arrangement of information in the text, and partial translation, e.g. the translation of sounds only.

Table 3. Textual metadiscourse in translations

	English-Swedish					Swedish-English				
	Orig	Translations				Orig.	Translations			
		Match	Omit	Insert	Total		Match	Omit	Insert	Total
Transition marker	939	875	64	96	971	1155	1020	135	165	1185
Frame marker	12	11	1	0	11	55	53	2	0	53
Endophoric marker	11	8	3	1	9	35	30	5	2	32
Code gloss	44	39	5	6	45	101	90	11	16	106
Evidential	79	77	2	2	79	155	155	0	0	155
Total	1085	1010	75	105	1115	1501	1348	153	183	1531

In the following discussion of the changes in features of textual metadiscourse, I have treated the insertion and omission of transition markers, endophoric markers, frame markers and evidentials as explicitness changes and the insertion and omission of code glosses as information changes. I will exemplify each of these changes as follows.

Explicitness changes

The insertion of transition markers, endophoric markers, frame markers and evidentials raises the level of explicitness by making explicit relations which are implicit in the source text, as in (19), where the translator has made the implicit causal relationship in the original text explicit by inserting the transition marker *accordingly*, and (20), where the translator has inserted the endophoric marker, *i den här guiden* (“in this guide book”), thereby making explicit reference to the text itself. Similarly, in (21), the translator has inserted the evidential *men skrev till honom* (“but wrote to him”), making the source of the following quoted extract explicit.

16 Jennifer Herriman

- (19) Detta är bakgrunden till att Rederiaktiebolaget Nordstjernen tillkom år 1890. (“This is the background to that ...”)
- It was *accordingly* against this background that Rederiaktiebolaget Nordstjernen was founded in 1890. (TR)
- (20) What you will not find is information on where to have an Elizabethan banquet; neither are there pages and pages of historical facts.⁵
- Något du inte kommer att hitta *i den här guiden* är var man kan bevista en elisabetansk bankett; det finns inte heller sida upp och sida ner med historiska fakta. (SUG) (“Something you not come to find in this guide is ...”)
- (21) Jens Engebret, so fated to be away from home on days of importance, was in France when Gustav got his cap in 1886. You have no idea how glad I was to learn that ...
- Jens Engebret, som olyckligtvis råkade vara borta på viktiga dagar, befann sig i Frankrike när Gustav erövrade mössan 1886 *men skrev till honom*

Conversely, omission lowers the level of explicitness, as in (22), where the transition marker *so* has not been translated, leaving the causal relationship implicit, and (23), where the translator has omitted the endophoric marker *som nämnts* (“as mentioned”), which refers to an earlier passage in the text. Similarly in (24), the translator has omitted the frame markers, *för det första* (“for the first”) and *för det andra* (“for the second”), which indicate the organization of the discourse in separate stages of argumentation.

- (22) Erskines nya hem låg isolerat — drygt två kilometer från närmaste affär och bra mycket längre från The Erskines’ new home was isolated — a little more than two kilometres to the nearest shop and much farther to the station. Ralph

⁵ Interestingly, *information on* has not been translated into Swedish, making the translation less explicit than the original.

järnvägsstationen, så han hade had every chance to get to know the
rika tillfällen att bekanta sig area well. (RE)
med trakten.

(... from the railway station,
so he had ...”)

- (23) Ett av Carl Adolph Agardhs One of Carl Adolph Agardh’s
värdefulla initiativ var som valuable initiatives was to set up an
nämnts skapandet av en “academic union” for students,
“akademisk förening” för housed in a building for the students
studenterna, inhyst i ett themselves. (LI)
studenternas eget hus.

(“One of Carl Adolph
Agardh’s valuable initiatives
was as mentioned the creation
of a ...”)

- (24) I Luleå var en sådan In Luleå this knowledge was
kunskap ovärderlig eftersom priceless because the project was
projektet var riskfyllt från risky from the start. Existing
början. För det första måste foundations had to be removed, and
redan anlagda grunder cash was constantly short, which led
avlägsnas, för det andra rådde to constant improvisations. (RE)

det en konstant brist på
pengar, vilket ledde till
ständiga improvisationer.

(“For the first must already
constructed foundations be
removed, for the second was
there ...”)

Some explicitness changes are due to syntactic differences between the two languages. Non-finite *-ing* clauses in English, for instance, have no directly corresponding non-finite form in Swedish and therefore often correspond to finite clauses linked by a transition marker. In (25), for instance, the *-ing* clause, *Going to sea young*, has been translated into a finite clause, *Jens Engebretth gick till sjöss tidigt*

(“Jens Engebretth went to sea early”) which is coordinated by the transition marker *och* (“and”).

- (25) *Going to sea young*, Jens Engebretth had had only elementary schooling. This had not prevented his learning how to navigate or rising to the top. *Jens Engebretth gick till sjöss tidigt och fick bara elementär skolutbildning. Detta hindrade honom inte från att lära sig navigera eller nå en hög position. (RH)*
 (“... went to sea early and had only ...”)

As shown in Table 3, the textual feature that has been changed most is the transition marker. In both translation samples more transition markers have been inserted (96 and 165 in the English-Swedish translations and Swedish-English translations, respectively) than omitted (64 and 135 in the English-Swedish and Swedish-English translations, respectively), which results in an increase in the total numbers of transition markers (from 939 to 971 in the English-Swedish translations, and from 1155 to 1185 in the Swedish-English translations). (These differences are statistically significant at $p < .01$ in both translations.) This increase in transition markers reflects the tendency for translators to raise the level of explicitness in the text (Blum Kulka 1986:292). The other textual features which alter explicitness, i.e. endophoric markers, frame markers, and evidentials have been changed a small number of times, but these changes do not result in significant differences in their numbers in the translations.

Information changes

The insertion of code glosses provides new information which the translator believes the target language readers may need in order to interpret the text. This is based on the translators’ assumptions concerning the target language readers’ knowledge of the cultural environment of the source language. In (26), for instance, the translator has inserted the code gloss *typically a small wooden house* in the English translation to explain *stuga* (“cottage”), a Swedish expression which the target readers are not expected to be familiar with and therefore may need explaining.

- (26) Efter att ha bott i en modern lägenhet under vintern flyttade Erskine med fru till en liten stuga i Djupdalen, tre mil söder om Stockholm, medan han övervakade bygget av von Platens hus. They had lived through the winter in a modern flat, but now they could move to a small *stuga*, (typically a small wooden house), in Djupdalen, 30 km south of Stockholm, whence he could supervise the building of von Platen's house. (RE)

In (27), the translator has inserted the code gloss *so to say*. This is a metalinguistic comment highlighting the double-layered meaning of the verb *spread* in combination with *colour* in *the colour spread*. Insertions of code glosses such as these reflect the translator's increased awareness of the language itself during the translation process.

- (27) På 1500-talet målades slottstak och kyrkor röda. Under stormaktstiden, d v s under 1600-talet, spred sig färgen till finare timmerhus, man ville imitera den röda tegelfärgen. During the sixteenth century the roofs of palaces, big houses and churches were painted red. During Sweden's Great-Power period (1560–1718) the colour spread, *so to say*, to larger timber-built houses; their owners wanted to imitate brick. (IU)
- (“...spread itself the colour to finer timber houses ...”)

Conversely, the omission of a code gloss removes information that translators believe are irrelevant for the target language readers' interpretation of the text. In (28), for instance, the translator has omitted the code gloss *eller “läkekvinnor”, hur man nu vill kalla dem* (“or ‘women healers’, how one now wants to call them”), which is a paraphrase of the expression *kloka gummor* (“wise old women”).

- (28) En av dem var Hedda Albertina Andersson, som blev medicine licentiat 1892. I rakt nedstigande led stam-made hon från sex generationer “kloka gummor” eller One of them was Hedda Albertina Andersson, who took a degree in medicine in 1892. She was directly descended from six generations of “nature-healers”. (LI)

20 Jennifer Herriman

“läkekvinnor”, *hur man nu vill kalla dem.*
 (“... or ‘women healers’, how one now wants to call them”)

Similarly, in (29) the translator has omitted the code gloss *so-called* which in the English original text indicates that *students cap* is an expression that the writer believes English readers may not be familiar with. The Swedish target language readers, on the other hand, have a similar tradition of *students caps* and may therefore be expected to be familiar with this expression.

- (29) This was the *so-called* “students cap”, a grey peaked quasi-military affair with a tassel dangling from the top. (RH)
- Det var studentmössan, grå, en smula militärisk i stilen och med en tofs som hängde ned från kullen.

As shown in Table 3, code glosses have been inserted slightly more often in both translations (6 and 16 times in the English-Swedish and Swedish-English translations, respectively) than omitted (5 and 11 times in the English-Swedish translations and Swedish-English translations, respectively), which may reflect a tendency for the translators to add information which assists interpretation.

In sum, the main change which the translators make in textual metadiscourse is to raise the level of explicitness by increasing the number of transition markers. This occurs in both translation directions and is inherent in the translation process.

4.2 Interpersonal metadiscourse

Table 4 compares the interpersonal metadiscourse in the original texts and their translations, including the numbers of matches, i.e. the interpersonal metadiscourse features in the translations which correspond to similar features in the original texts, and the numbers of changes, i.e. the interpersonal metadiscourse features which have been omitted or inserted in the translations. Interpersonal features have decreased in number in the English-Swedish translations (from 368 to 337), but remain almost the same in the Swedish-English translations

(589 in originals and 590 in translations). Altogether 309 and 503 of these are matches (approximately 91% and 85% of the interpersonal metadiscourse in the translations). 59 items in the English original texts have been omitted in the Swedish translations and 28 items have been inserted. 86 items in the Swedish original texts have been omitted in the English translations, and 87 items have been inserted.

Table 4. Interpersonal metadiscourse in translations

	English-Swedish					Swedish-English				
	Orig.	Translations				Orig.	Translations			
		Match	Omit	Insert	Total		Match	Omit	Insert	Total
Hedge	110	99	11	10	109	158	148	10	18	166
Booster	102	89	13	16	105	236	185	51	25	210
Attitude markers	36	34	2	1	35	73	69	4	9	78
Engagement markers	119	87	32	1	88	96	76	20	29	105
Self mention	1	0	1	0	0	26	25	1	6	31
Total	368	309	59	28	337	589	503	86	87	590

In the following discussion I have treated the insertion and omission of boosters and hedges as emphasis changes, the insertion and omission of engagement markers, which include the reader in the discourse, as interpersonal changes, and changes from or into interrogative and imperative clauses as illocutionary changes. The insertion and omission of self mentions and attitude markers have, finally, been treated as visibility changes. I will exemplify each of these changes as follows.

Emphasis changes

The insertion of a booster increases the force of a proposition, as in (30), for instance, where the translator has inserted the booster, e.g. *faktiskt* (“in fact”). The force of a proposition is also increased by the omission of a hedge, as in (31), where the translator has omitted the hedge *what may be interpreted as*.

22 Jennifer Herriman

- (30) He was so open about his
fabulating that to mention it
seems almost pedantic, but
Emma Goldman did not
lecture in San Diego that year.
- Han var så öppen i sitt fabulerande
att det nästan känns pedantiskt att
nämna att Emma Goldman *faktiskt*
inte höll några föreläsningar i San
Diego det året. (RF) (“... almost
pedantic to mention that Emma
Goldman in fact not held ..”)
- (31) Three days earlier, some
1,500 miles to the east,
Captain Thaddeus Bellings-
hausen, a Russian naval
officer sent out by the Tsar
Alexander I in a burst of
expansionistic fervour, re-
corded *what may be*
interpreted as a sighting of
the Antarctic ice cap where it
meets the sea.
- Tre dagar tidigare hade kapten
Thaddeus Bellingshausen, en rysk
sjöofficer som sänts ut av tsar
Alexander i ett anfall av
expansionsiver, ungefär 2 800 km
längre österut antecknat att han
siktat den antarktiska iskalotten där
den möter havet. (RH)
 (“... recorded that he sighted the
Antarctic ice cap ...”)

Conversely, the omission of a booster “tones down” the force of the proposition, as in (32), where the translator has omitted the booster, *säkerligen* (“certainly”). The force of a proposition is also “toned down” by the insertion of a hedge, which signals the writer’s lack of commitment to its content, as in (33), for instance, where the translator has inserted the hedge, *kanske* (“perhaps”).

- (32) Detta fantastiska intresse
har nu inte enbart med lusten
att bevara forna metoder att
göra. Det hänger *säkerligen*
även ihop med nutiden.
 (“It hangs certainly even
together with the presence.”)
- This fantastic interest doesn't
concern just a compulsion to
preserve the past, but⁶ has
something to do with our present
too. (IU)

⁶ The connective *but* has been added making the translation more explicit.

- (33) Miller was a man Miller var en människa som var desperately anxious to prove enormt angelägen om att få visa himself, and the failure to get vad han dög till och misslyckandet the scholarship to Cornell may med att få ett stipendium till partly account for the Cornell kan *kanske* delvis förklara de ferocious and desperate nature de våldsamma och desperata of the ambition he later ambitioner han senare kom att displayed. lägga i dagen. (RF)
 (“... can perhaps partly explain the ...”)

As shown in Table 4, the changes in boosters and hedges work in different directions. In the English-Swedish translations, the numbers of insertions and omissions of boosters (16 and 13) and hedges (10 and 11) do not result in any great change in their numbers in the translations. In the Swedish-English translations, on the other hand, there are twice as many omissions of boosters as insertions (51 vs. 25), which results in a decrease in the total number of boosters (from 236 to 210, statistical significance $p < .01$). There are also slightly more insertions of hedges than omissions (18 vs. 10). It appears, thus, that the translators into English but not Swedish have felt the need to “tone down” propositions by omitting a number of boosters and inserting a few hedges.

Interpersonal and Illocutionary changes

The insertion of engagement markers increases the reader’s involvement in the text, as in (34), where the translator has changed the third person expressions in the Swedish original, *varje människa* (“all people”), *de* (“they”), *dess handhavare* (“their users”), by using inclusive *we* in the English translation, thereby presenting the content from a shared writer and reader perspective, and (35), where self mention by the author in the original text has been extended into inclusive *vi* (“we”) in the translation, thereby including the reader.

- (34) Därtill kommer expert- On top of that, *we* live in a society
 samhället samt att nästan of experts, and everyday most of *us*
varje människa dagligen use equipment that *we* know only

24 Jennifer Herriman

använder sig av apparater som *de* inte vet ett skvatt om annat än det *man* behöver veta för att kunna använda dem. Om de går sönder kan *dess handhavare* inte ens få ihop en plausibel teori om vad det är för fel eller vad man ska göra åt det.
 (“... that nearly all people daily use ...which they not know anything about other than what one needs for to be able to use it. If it breaks can these users not even ...”)

- (35) I propose to look briefly at two of these new developments before proceeding in the next chapter to examine the reformed religion of Yahweh. *Vi* skall här helt kort granska två av dessa nya företeelser för att därefter i följande kapitel undersöka den reformerade Jahvereligionen. (KAR)
 (“We shall here quite briefly examine ...”)

Similarly, the reader’s involvement in the text has been increased in (36) by using *you* when the Swedish original has the impersonal generic pronoun *man* (“one”), and in (37) by changing a declarative clause into an interrogative which functions as a rhetorical question directed towards the reader.

- (36) När *man* ber svenskar räkna upp nåt typiskt svenskt så svarar de fatost
 (“When one asks Swedes to ...)
 If *you* ask Swedes to name some typically Swedish things, they will reply fatost (a sort of cheese from Ångermanland)... (IU)
- (37) Därest en tolvårig pojke tagit sig in på byggplats och
 And if any twelve-year-old gets into a building site and mangles

<p>biter sönder lyftkranen så sker det i hundra procent mot föräldrarnas vilja och vetskap. (“In case a twelve-year-old boy taken himself in to a building site and bites broken the crane so happens it in hundred per cent against the parents’ will and knowledge”)</p>	<p>one of the cranes with his teeth, doesn't he do it, to one hundred percent, without the knowledge and consent of his parents? (IU)</p>
---	---

Conversely, the omission of engagement markers reduces the reader’s involvement in the text, as in (38), where inclusive *vi här* (“we here”) in the Swedish original text has been translated into *in Sweden they*, thereby adapting the text to the readers of the English translation, and (39) where the engagement marker *you*, has been omitted.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <p>(38) Trots att renässansen samtidigt florerade i Italien, fortsatte <i>vi här</i> att bygga i beprövad tegelgotik.
 (“...continued we here to build ...”)</p> | <p>Despite the fact that the Renaissance was flourishing in Italy at that time, <i>in Sweden they</i> continued to build in the tried and tested brick Gothic style. (LI)</p> |
| <p>(39) This book does set out to show <i>you</i> a side of the British capital usually reserved for residents!</p> | <p>Avsikten är att visa den sida av den brittiska huvudstaden som vanligtvis är förbehållen dess invånare. (SUG)
 (“the intention is to show this side of the British capital ...”)</p> |

As shown in Table 4, the changes in engagement markers (32 omissions and only one insertion in the English-Swedish translations, and 29 insertions and 20 omissions in the Swedish-English translations), occur mainly in one translation (SUG) in the English-Swedish translation sample and in two translations, (IU) and (LI), in the Swedish-English translation sample. In (SUG), most of the

omissions are where the translator has used the impersonal generic pronoun *man* when the English original has *you*, as exemplified by (37) above. These changes are, therefore, chiefly due to language differences (i.e. the fact that the second person pronoun *you* in English also has generic reference, corresponding to the impersonal pronoun *man* (“one”) in Swedish). In the two translations in the Swedish-English sample, one translator (IU) has frequently inserted the engagement marker *we* when the Swedish original has a third person perspective, as exemplified by (34), above, and the other (LI) has, conversely, changed the shared author-reader perspective denoted by inclusive *vi* (“we”) in the original text to a third person perspective in the translation, as exemplified by (38) above. The changes in engagement markers in the two samples appear, therefore, to be partly due to language differences and partly due to individual choices by translators, rather than to overall differences in the usage of engagement features in Swedish and English non-fiction texts.

Visibility changes

The insertion of self mentions and attitude markers increases the visibility of the author, as in (40), where the translator has inserted *to me* and also uses an active verb and first person reference (*I have here quoted*) to correspond to the objective agent-free passive *citeras* (“is quoted”) in the Swedish original and (41), where the translator has inserted an attitude marker (*although, looking at its motorway, one is hard put to believe this*) expressing an opinion concerning the content.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>(40) Ur detta hittills opublicerade manuskript citeras här kapitlen som berör kontakterna med Gunnar Asplund. De har förmedlats av Stig Ödeens son, Kai Ödeen, professor i byggnadsmateriallära vid KTH.</p> <p>(“...From this until now unpublished manuscript <i>are</i> quoted here the chapters</p> | <p>From that unpublished manuscript <i>I</i> have here quoted the chapters touching on his contacts with Gunnar Asplund. These were supplied to <i>me</i> by his son, Kai Ödeen, Professor of the Science of Building Materials at KTH. (CE)</p> |
|---|--|

These have been supplied by Stig Ödeens son ...”)

- | | |
|---|---|
| (41) Tidigare kunde dessa sommarnöjen ha ett blygsamt avstånd från det ordinarie hemmet, Essingen till exempel. | Summer pleasures for uncomfortably-off Stockholmers were to be enjoyed rather nearer the city—in Essingen, for example, <i>although, looking at its motorway, one is hard put to believe this.</i> (IU) |
|---|---|

Conversely, the omission of self mentions and attitudinal markers reduces author visibility, as in (42) where *jag citerar* (“I quote”) in the original is translated into a nonfinite verb *to quote*, and (43) where the attitude marker *med all rätt* (“with every right”) has been omitted.

- | | |
|--|---|
| (42) och — <i>jag citerar</i> Carl Fehrman — han hade “obestriddigen en glädje vid att inta paradoxala ståndpunkter; att på alla punkter säga något annat än sina föregångare”. (“and — I quote Carl Fehrman ...”) | and - <i>to quote</i> Carl Fehrman - he “undeniably took pleasure in adopting paradoxical stances, in saying something different from his predecessors”. (LI) |
| (43) Det har <i>med all rätt</i> skrivits flera böcker om denna akademiska förening och dess hus. (“It has with all right been written more books about ...”) | Several books have been written about the Academic Union and its premises. (LI) |

As shown in Table 4, self mentions and attitude markers have only been changed a small number of times in both samples, and these changes do not result in a significant difference in their numbers in the

translations. In the Swedish-English translations, there are, however, slightly more insertions of both of these features (9 attitude markers and 6 self mentions) than omissions (4 attitude markers and 1 self mention), which is perhaps due to the influence of a higher frequency of these features in the Swedish source texts.

In sum, the main changes which the translators make in interpersonal metadiscourse are to reduce emphasis and, in some texts, to alter the interpersonal relationship between the author and the target language reader. The former change takes place in the translations into English only, which suggests that translators may be adapting their texts to a lower level of emphasis which they perceive to be required in the target language. The latter change appears to depend on choices made by individual translators to, for instance, adapt the author-reader relationship of the original text to the target language readers.

5. Conclusion

This comparison of metadiscourse in a small sample of English and Swedish original non-fiction texts and their translations has found a considerably higher frequency of metadiscourse features in the sample of Swedish original texts than in the English sample. It has also found some qualitative differences, i.e. that there is somewhat more interpersonal metadiscourse in the Swedish texts, in particular a more frequent usage of boosters. In the translations, a number of changes were made in the metadiscourse, and all of the different kinds of metadiscourse features were both inserted and omitted in varying numbers. For some features, these changes led to an increase or decrease in their proportions in the translations. The main change was in transition markers, which were inserted more often than omitted, thereby increasing their total number and raising the level of explicitness in the translated texts. This occurred in both translation directions and appears therefore to be an inherent part of the translation process. The other main changes were in engagement markers and boosters. The changes in engagement markers were chiefly restricted to two translations in one sample and one translation in the other, and appear therefore to be mainly due to choices by individual translators rather than to the translation process itself. Boosters, on the other hand, were omitted more often than inserted in

the translations from Swedish into English only. There was, thus, a tendency for the translators to reduce emphasis in English by omitting boosters and, in some cases, inserting hedges. This, coupled with the higher frequency of boosters in the Swedish original texts suggests that there may be differences in preferences in English and in Swedish when it comes to increasing the emphatic force of propositions.

The samples investigated here are small and therefore conclusions drawn from them must be tentative. In general, however, the findings suggest that, in its usage of metadiscourse, Swedish is similar to English in being a writer-responsible writing culture. In fact, the larger amount of metadiscourse found in the Swedish original text suggests that this may be true to an even larger extent of Swedish. The results of the comparison also suggest that this is particularly true of certain kinds of interpersonal metadiscourse, such as emphasis and also, to some extent, self mention. As both of these features are characteristics of informal writing, the findings here provide further support for Ädel's observation (2008: 54) that there may be a strong tendency towards informality in Swedish writing, and this influences the usage of the metadiscourse in Swedish advanced learners' writing in English. To conclude, then, it appears that, in non-fiction texts such as those investigated here, there may be differences in Anglo-Saxon and Swedish writing conventions so that the "significance threshold" in Swedish may be somewhat lower than in English when it comes to expressing certain kinds of interpersonal metadiscourse. Further investigation of larger samples and other text types is, of course, needed.

References

Primary Sources

English-Swedish translations

- Armstrong, K. A. 1993. *History of God*. Heinemann: London (11790 words). Translated by I. Johansson as *Historien om Gud*. Forum: Stockholm (10799 words). (KAR)
- Ferguson, R. 1991. *Henry Miller: A Life*. Hutchinson: London (13881 words). Translated by N. Lindgren as *Henry Miller: Ett Liv*. Wahlström & Widstrand: Stockholm (13783 words). (RF)

30 *Jennifer Herriman*

- Grossman, S. 1994. *Essential London*. Basingstoke: The Automobile Association. (9407 words) Translated by R. Strömberg as *London. Allt du vill veta*. Norstedts: Stockholm 1994 (8706 words). (SUG)
- Huntford, R. 1980. *Scott and Amundsen*. A.P. Watt: London (11729 words). Translated by M. Eklöf as *Scott & Amundsen*. Albert Bonniers Förlag: Stockholm (10836 words). (RH)
- Mayle, P. 1989 *A Year in Provence*. Hamish Hamilton: Oxford (14038 words). Translated by C. Wiberg as *Ett år i Provence* Richter: Malmö (13194 words). (PM)

Swedish-English translations

- Egelius, M. 1990. *Ralph Erskine, arkitekt*. Byggförlaget: Stockholm. (14256 words) Translated by J. Franks as *Ralph Erskine, Architect*. Byggförlaget: Stockholm (15671 words). (RE)
- Engfors, C. 1990. *E.G. Asplund. Arkitekt, vän och kollega*. Arkitektur Förlag: Stockholm (12727 words) Translated by R. Tanner as *E.G. Asplund. Architect, Friend and Colleague*. Arkitektur Förlag: Stockholm (14247 words). (CE)
- Ingvar, L. 1990. *Lundandan. Lund tusenårsstaden*, Lund: Lunds kommun (11890 words). Translated by M. Spalding Larsson as *Lund One Thousand Years*. Lund: Municipal Council of Lund (14513 words) (LI)
- Rinman, T. 1990. *Rederiet Johnson Line under 100 år*. Rinman & Lindén: Göteborg. (11674 words) Translated by R. E. Gooderham as *The Johnson Line 1890-1990*. Rinman & Lindén: Göteborg (13698 words). (TR)
- Unge, I. 1987. *Helsvenskt. Svenska folket och deras bilder*. Svenska Turistföreningen: Stockholm. (13512 words). Translated by J. Franks as *The Wholly Swedish Empire*. Swedish Touring Club; Stockholm (14955 words). (IU)

Secondary Sources

- Ädel, A. 1999. "Metadiscourse in English and Swedish informative non-fiction texts" presented at *Contrastive Linguistics and Translation Studies 1999*: Poster presentation co-authored by K. Aijmer, A-L. Fredriksson & M. Boström Aronsson at Université Catholique de Louvain, Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium.

- Ädel, A. 2008. "Metadiscourse across Three Varieties of English, British and Advanced-learner English." In Connor, U., E. Nagelhout & W. Rozycki (eds). *Contrastive Rhetoric: Reaching to Intercultural Rhetoric*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 45-62.
- Ädel, A. & A. Mauranen. 2010. "Metadiscourse: Diverse and Divided Perspectives." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 9:2. 1-11.
- Aijmer, K., B. Altenberg and M. Johansson. 1996 (eds). *Languages in Contrast*. Papers from a symposium on text-based cross-linguistic studies in Lund 4-5 March 1994. Lund: LUP. 73-85.
- Bakhtin, M. 1986. "The Problem of Speech Genres" in *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*, McGee, V.W. (trans.), Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Blum-Kulka S. 1986. "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation." In House, J. & S. Blum-Kulka (eds) *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication. Discourse and Cognition in Translation*. Tübingen: Narr. 17-36.
- Chesterman, A. 1997. *Memes of Translation*. Amsterdam/ Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Crismore, A., R. Markkanen & M. Steffensen. 1993. "Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Texts Written by American and Finnish Students." *Written Communication* 10. 39-70.
- Dahl, T. 2004. "Textual Metadiscourse in Research Articles: A Marker of National Culture or of Academic Discipline?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 36, 1807-1825.
- Gellerstam, M. 1996. "Translations as a Source for Cross-linguistic Studies." In Aijmer, K., B. Altenberg and M. Johansson. 1996 (eds). *Languages in contrast. Papers from a symposium on text-based cross-linguistic studies in Lund 4-5 March 1994*. Lund: LUP. 53-62.
- Hinds, J. 1987. "Reader Versus Writer Responsibility: A New Typology." In Connor, U., Kaplan, R. (eds.) *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 texts*. Addison-Wesley. Reading, MA, 141-152.
- Hyland, K. 1998a. "Talking to Students: Metadiscourse in Introductory Coursebooks." *English for Specific Purposes* 18:1, 3-26.

- Hyland, K. 1998b. "Exploring Corporate Rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's Letter." *Journal of Business Communication*. 35: 2, 224-45.
- Hyland, K. 1998c. "Persuasion and Context: The Pragmatics of Academic Metadiscourse." *Journal of Pragmatics* 30: 437-455.
- Hyland, K. 2000. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.
- Hyland, K. 2004. "Disciplinary Interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 Postgraduate Writing." *Journal of Second Language Writing* 13: 133-151.
- Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Mauranen, A. 1993. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Martin, J.R. & P.R.R. White 2005. *The Language of Evaluation. Appraisal in English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Milne, E. D. 2003. "Metadiscourse Revisited: A Contrastive Study of Persuasive Writing in Professional Discourse." *Estudios Ingleses De La Universidad Complutense*. 11, 29-52.
- Petch-Tyson, S. 1998. "Writer/reader Visibility in EFL Written Discourse." In Granger, S. (Ed.) *Learner English on Computer*. London: Longman. 107-118.
- Pisanski Peterlin, A. 2005. "Text-organising Metatext in Research Articles: An English-Slovene Contrastive Analysis." *English for Specific Purposes* 24: 3. 307-319.
- Pisanski Peterlin, A. 2008. "Translating Metadiscourse in Research Articles." *Across Languages and Cultures* 9:2. 205-218.
- Valero-Garces, C. 1996. "Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Spanish-English Economics Texts." *English for Specific Purposes* 15:4, 279-94.
- Vande Kopple, W. 1985. "Some Exploratory Discourse on Metadiscourse." *College Composition and Communication*, 36, 82-93.
- Williams, M. 2010. "Translating Metadiscourse: An Explanatory Analysis of Problems of Students' Work." *Mutatis Mutandis*. 3: 1, 73-90.