**Abstract of PhD thesis:** 'Metadiscourse in German History Writing and English Translation: A Study of Writer-Reader Interaction'
**Author:** Peter Skrandies, University of Manchester, School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures, 2007

The present thesis studies writer-reader interaction in German history writing and its translation into English. The starting point is the development of the concept of historiographic metadiscourse and its identification in historiographic text. Historiographic metadiscourse consists of self-reflective and reader-oriented language through which writers refer to historiographic discourses and the present act of communication between themselves and their readers. It is distinguished conceptually and formally from the descriptive and narrative contents of academic history writing. The empirical bases for a detailed quantitive and qualitative analysis of historiographic metadiscourse are textual data which have been extracted from a parallel corpus of German history writing and their published English translations. The analysis shows that the German writers represented in the corpus prefer impersonal realizations of metadiscourse in the form of *man*-clauses, short passives and passive paraphrases and frequently employ modal verbs and conditional sentences in argumentative passages to engage readers, pre-empt possible objections and conduct an often implicit dialogue with other historians. The use of the first person plural is infrequent, while employment of the first person singular is very rare. The data demonstrate a correlation between the theoretical outlook of historians, their dominant mode of writing and the amount of metadiscourse used. The main rhetorical function of metadiscursive interventions is described as an attempt by writers to persuade readers to accept the claims to historical knowledge brought forward in the form of narrative by highlighting cognitive and communicative processes involved in the creation of historical knowledge. If narrative can be considered as one solution to the problem of "how to translate knowing into telling" (Hayden White), historiographic metadiscourse problematizes and reflects this process and through it historians explicitly or implicitly concede that different narratives as well as non-narrative ways of writing history are possible.

The analysis of the translation side of the parallel corpus describes typical translation patterns, identifies shifts in translation and evaluates these shifts with regard to their effect on writer-reader interaction. It shows that although translators generally respect the rhetorical functions of historiographic metadiscourse, they use a variety of linguistic means in their transfer of metadiscursive patterns and structures. It can be demonstrated that translators frequently change the presentation of metadiscursive acts from the point of view of the ST writer to the perspective of the TT reader and that they opt for syntactic reorganization to ensure a coherent flow of information. Functional shifts from source text metadiscourse to target text narrative are relatively rare. This shift from metadiscourse to narrative is the most significant in terms of writer-reader interaction and is characterized as a functional or epistemological simplification with regard to how historical knowledge is gained and presented. While metadiscourse is discourse-reflective and shows that historiographic propositions are reconstructions of the past which were produced by a historian with a particular audience in mind, narrative does not acknowledge the presence of discourse participants and by implication equates the historiographic proposition with what 'really' happened or existed in the past.