Mehrdad Vasheghani Farahani. 2022. *Writer-reader Interaction by Meta Discourse Features: English-Persian Translation in Legal and Political Texts.* Berlin: Frank & Timme. 206 pages. ISBN: 9783732908851, € 39.80 (Paperback), ISBN: 9783732990979, € 50 (eBook)[1]

Writer-reader Interaction by Meta Discourse Features English-Persian Translation in Legal and Political Texts by Mehrdad Vasheghani Farahani is a book of research results that compares the translation of the metadiscourse features of legal and political texts in English and Persian. Legal and political texts that have been translated from English to Persian are compared using the linguistic corpus. (Farahani 2022: 13), focuses this book into three main discussions, namely:

1. The description of metadiscourse and interactional features used and shared throughout the English language corpus;
2. the description of the metadiscourse both interactional and interactive used and shared in the Persian translation; and
3. a description of the differences and changes in models of interaction between writers and readers of legal and political texts translation from English into Persian.

Farahani (: 20) emphasizes the urgency of this book that English is an international language that is in favor of the author. This assertion is supported by several sources cited by Farahani (: 21). For example, the opinion of (Hinds 1983, 1987, 1990) suggests that the writer's responsibility is to make the reader easier in understanding the information. In other words, writers are required to facilitate the flow of information and understanding of texts (Hinds 1990; Maddalena and Belmonte 2011). According to (Mur-Dueñas 2011) English is assessed as a writer-oriented language. The writer is responsible for making the text and its discourse as understandable as possible. Writer-oriented language usually uses linguistic characteristics to openly express its views and attitudes in the text by applying comments, evaluations, and questions. Thus, by means of Farahani (2022) that legal and political texts that use English and then translate into Persian have the potential to cause readers' misunderstanding because there are differences in meta-discourse features based on the linguistic corpus of English and Persian. Therefore, the writer also considers that to prevent misunderstandings in meaning, it is important to

---

state clearly, both quantitatively and qualitatively, a description of the meta-discourse features of legal and political texts translation in English and Persian.

The meta-discourse features concept is emphasized in this book as well as guiding to open up readers' understanding of the meta-discourse concept. In this case, Farahani (: 18), refers to several opinions to clarify the intended meta-discourse concept. According to (Boggel 2009), meta-discourse provides a valuable tool and strategy because it helps clarify the textual organization to highlight the authorial presence in the text and to interact with various readers or audiences. Hyland and Tse (2004) and Grosman (2011) argue that at the second level of meaning, the writer-reader or meta-discourse level, writers and speakers interact with the intended readers and audience. The facts show that the interaction between the reader and the writer is deliberately constructed. The writer builds interactions with readers who explicitly guide readers through the organization and structure of the text, comment on the process of the writing itself, or express their beliefs and opinions about the content (Herriman 2014: 1). In other words, at this level, the writer does not expand the content level of meaning; instead, he goes beyond the subject content and tries to define readers' expectations (Boggel 2009). The concept of meta-discourse characteristics constructs and links these two levels of meaning (Hyland 2005). Further, Williams' opinion (2010) shows that meta discourse refers to the way the writer cites the text, both writer and reader must understand the content of the propositions of the text to help the reader understand the text. The writer persuades the reader to accept their arguments. In other words, the primary purpose of meta-discourse features is to guide and assist potential readers or listeners in strategies for interpreting content propositions (Flowerdew 2015). To further elaborate on the notion of meta-discourse (Hyland 2017, 1998) argues that meta-discourse is a discourse about discourse and refers to the author's linguistics embodied in the text to classify or organize discourse and the expressive implications of what is said. In other words, meta-discourse features are rhetorical devices used by the writer to represent their presence in the text and guide the reader in communicating.

Structurally, this book is arranged systematically based on research structure. It begins with an abstract (: 13), then a description of the background and objectives (: 17-22), and a literature review—including previous related research literature—to strengthen related concepts and arguments (: 23-57), methodology (: 61-75), data analysis (: 77-129), discussion, and conclusions (: 131-179). Sequentially, the abstract describes the objectives, the methods, the results, and the conclusions of the research. The abstract is written like an executive summary. In the first part, this book affirms the urgency of research, problem statements (: 20-21), and research questions (: 22). Part two explains scientifically the concepts and definitions of meta-discourse features (: 23), the importance of discussing meta-

discourse (: 45), the rhetorical issues of meta-discourse (: 47), and the role of meta-discourse in the relationship between readers and writers (: 48), and is then supported by previous meta-discourse research (: 50). Part three of this book includes methodological descriptions of research design (: 61), research instruments (: 62), research procedures (including research corpus and data collecting) (: 63), and general conclusions about research methods (: 75).

The data analysis strategy is presented in section four. This section is methodical since it describes the components of the data that were analyzed by an analytical instrument used. This section begins with an overview of the data analysis strategy (: 77). Then, the classifications of meta-discourse features are explored in detail. The discussion then shifts to the Persian monolingual corpus, which is divided into interactive and interactional categories Persian corpus (: 78). Furthermore, it divides the English meta-discourse corpus into the same two categories as Persian: interactive and interactional (: 87-93). Then, it explains the meta-discourse properties of the translation corpus in English and Persian in detail (: 94). This section also includes samples of law and political texts from the original corpus of English as the source language, as well as the outcomes of their translation into Persian, to aid in a more comprehensive examination (: 107). A comparison of translations from the two language corpora; English and Persian is then shown in some of the original English and Persian features, as well as their respective translations containing law and political literature. This description makes it easier for readers and users of the book to assess the data analysis approach and findings. Furthermore, this book includes a data analysis summary (: 129).

This book covers the data analysis result in connection with the responses to the three research questions that form the basis of the discussion in section five. This section begins with a general description of the answers to the questions posed by the research (: 132-133). In the next section, it is explained in detail and systematically about the responses to the research questions. Farahani provides an answer to the first research question (: 133) by describing how interactional and interactive meta-discourse features are used and distributed in the English corpus. According to the research, the monolingual Persian corpus exhibits fewer word repetitions. The Persian translation corpus is larger than the English corpus. A higher ratio indicates that the translation into Persian contains fewer repetitions (fewer meta-discourse features in this study). This relates to the monolingual Persian corpus's token-type ratio. The responses to the second research question are then given, stating that the English corpus, Persian translation corpus, and the Persian monolingual corpus are all orientated toward the interactive category (: 141). The interactive aspect of the text may lend credence to the notion that native writers from both English and Persian paid more time and care in crafting texts to provide a more comprehensible message to the reader. In summary, the more frequently the

interactive meta-discourse feature is used, the writer recognizes that he is engaging in the message received by the reader and meeting the reader's demands persuasively.

The interactive meta-discourse feature focuses on how the author characterizes the text's structure based on an assessment of the reader's potential knowledge and understanding. According to (Hyland 1998), this assertion is correct. This means that the authors in the corpus, both the English corpus and the Persian monolingual corpus, pay close attention to editing and molding their texts to fulfill the needs of the readers. Persian has less interactive and interactional meta-discourse qualities, hence translators pay less attention to structuring information propositionally. A variety of interactive meta-discourse aspects suggest that the translator is less concerned with the quality of the translation or the persuasive message in Persian while translating from English to Persian on the subject of legal and political texts. The description that the third research question is answered by combining the information provided in the first and the second research questions (p. 142). Overall, the English corpus with meta-discourse traits appears to be more interactive than interactional. When compared to the monolingual Persian corpus, it is possible to establish that there is a relationship between the two. In other words, the interactive meta-discourse traits in the Persian monolingual reference corpus outnumber the interactional ones.

Based on the description, this book is intended for students or professional translators of legal and political texts in English and Persian. This book is scientific and academic, so it also fits the needs of researchers and university teachers in translating English and Persian legal and political texts. There are several advantages of this book. First, this book is arranged systematically and methodologically to meet the rules of a scientific book. Second, this book presents examples of translations of legal and political texts into two languages; English and Persian. Third, this book presents verified data because it presents both quantitative and qualitative data. Fourth, the research questions are also the study's focus, so the discussion only delves into some aspects of translation. The focus of this discussion is strengthened by measurable research instruments that can be analyzed systematically. Fifth, an explanation of the research results can be understood more quickly because it is supported by data in tabular form and meta-discourse comparisons of the two languages, quickly verifiable English and Persian. Sixth, based on concepts and ideas, this book can be accounted for because it is supported by relevant and up-to-date literature so that the concepts and definitions discussed are more easily understood and updated.

Therefore, this book contributes significantly to research ideas on meta-discourse in various languages, in English and Persian. Books that discuss meta-discourse like this one is rare. Likewise, the meta-discourse concept developed in this book can inspire other researchers to discuss how a

translated text does not experience a difference in meaning from the source language to the target language. The apparent difference in meaning can cause misunderstanding for the reader. Of course, this misunderstanding significantly impacts the practice of using translated texts, primarily legal and political texts, which are of public concern in various countries. Errors in the meaning of translations of legal and political texts have the potential to cause conflict. Discussion of connectivity between two languages, English and Persian, especially regarding metadiscourse in the translation of legal and political texts, also contributes, not only to language but to the potential for cooperation between the European region and the Western World as users of English, on the one hand, and several countries such as Iran, Tajikistan, Afghanistan, and Uzbekistan, which are Persian-speaking countries, on the other hand. Apart from that, this book also contributes to the cultural discourse of English- and Persian-speaking countries because meta-discourse in translation makes it easier for readers to understand the ideas put forward by the author from the source language, both English and Persian vice versa. The exchange of information through quality translation is believed to support mutual respect, tolerance, and diversity among people in English- and Persian-speaking countries.

Despite the many advantages and contributions that this book has, there are still some shortcomings that are important to note. So, that similar books can be more easily understood and support learning motivation for the international community. One of this book's weaknesses is that it would need to be more textual, because it is difficult for learners of English and Persian translations to accept it in a broader context. In addition, this book focuses too much on legal and political texts, making it difficult to understand English and Persian texts from other disciplines such as; literature, economics, culture, astronomy, chemistry, et cetera. Therefore, a book is needed that discusses, in a straightforward and relaxed manner, the translation of texts related to meta-discourse features from other fields. For example, this book should emphasize at the outset the reasons for the importance of translating legal and political texts into English and Persian and vice versa. The reason for studying English is strong enough because it has been emphasized that English is an international language. On the other hand, more information about the importance of learning the language and translating Persian texts must be provided. If only Farahani had given an earlier explanation of the urgency of translation from and into Persian from other sides, for example, the legal and political context from the aspect of bilateral relations and business opportunities between citizens, this book would be even more interesting because it would open the reader's horizons to understand more seriously the importance of translating legal and political texts from and into Persian.

References

Boggel, Sandra. 2009. "Meta discourse in middle English and Early modern English religious texts: A corpus-based study." *The Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 111/1: 120-122. https://doi.org/10.5406/jenglgermphil.111.1.0120

Flowerdew, John. 2015. "Revisiting metadiscourse: Conceptual and methodological issues concerning signaling nouns." *Ibérica* 29: 15-34.

Grosman, Meta. 2011. "Readers and reading as interaction with literary texts." *Primerjalna književnost* 34: 157-171

Herriman, Jennifer. 2014. "Meta discourse in English and Swedish non-fiction texts and their translations." *Nordic Journal of English Studies* 13/1: 1-32. https://doi.org/10.35360/njes.291

Hinds, John. 1983. "Contrastive rhetoric: Japanese and English." *Text–Interdisciplinary Journal for Study and Discourse* 3/2: 183-195. https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1983.3.2.183

Hinds, John. 1987. *Reader versus writer responsibility: A new typology.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Hinds, John. 1990. "Inductive, deductive, quasi-inductive: expository writing in Japanese, Korean, Chinese, and Thai". In: *The Coherence in writing: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives,* edited by Ulla Connor and Ann M. Johns A., 87–109. Alexandria, VA: TESOL.

Hyland. Ken. 1998. Persuasion and context: The pragmatics of academic metadiscourse. Journal of Pragmatics 30/4: 437-455. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(98)00009-5

Hyland, Ken, and Tse, Polly. 2004. "Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal." *Applied Linguistics* 25/2: 156–177. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/25.2.156

Hyland, Ken. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing.* London & New York: Continuum.

Hyland, Ken. 2017. "Meta discourse: What is it and where is it going?" *Journal of Pragmatics* 113: 16-29. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.03.007

Maddalena, Antonello and Alonso Belmonte I. 2011. "Unveiling the Writer–Reader Interaction in Peninsular Spanish and American English newspaper editorials: A cross-linguistic study." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43/3: 891-903. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2010.09.026

Mur-Dueñas, Pilar. 2011. "An intercultural analysis of meta-discourse features in research articles written in English and Spanish." *Journal of Pragmatics* 43/12: 3068-3079. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2011.05.002

Williams, Malcolm. 2010. "Translating Meta discourse: An explanatory analysis of problems in students' work." *Mutatis Mutandis* 3/1: 73–90.

Sukmawati Tono Palangngan

sukmawatitono@umpalopo.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Syauqiyah Awaliyah Alfiani Nur

syauqiyahalfiani@gmail.com

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia

Asia Masita Haidir

asiamasita@itbmpolman.ac.id

Universitas Negeri Makassar, Indonesia