Transmission of Postcolonialism through Translation, Discourse Analysis of "Heart of Darkness" and Two of its Persian Translations at Micro and Macro Levels

Dr. Mansour Fahim[1], Mandana Eftekhar Paziraie [2]

[1.] Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Department of English Language, Tehran, Iran
[2]Islamic Azad University, Central Tehran Branch, Faculty of Foreign Languages, Department of English Language, Tehran, Iran scientificgroup@hotmail.com

Abstract: This article mainly focused on transmission of post colonialism throughout translation, with particular emphasis on literary translation. For this purpose, the researcher employed the discourse analysis (DA) model in both micro and macro levels proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976), and Hatch (1992), respectively to delve into probable differences of endophoric references, conjunctions, and reiterations on one hand, and characters on the other, in the two Persian translations of "Heart of Darkness." Moreover, the researcher examined footnotes and translator's judgments to see how the two translators faced with the issue of post colonialism in their translations. To carry out this qualitative, quantitative, descriptive corpus-based research, two translations of the English novel done by two different Persian translators were examined. The results clearly showed that the frequency use of characters at macro level, and endophoric references, conjunctions, and reiterations as grammatical and lexical cohesive devices at micro level have visibly affected the translation products and manifest signs of different manipulations within the micro level could be observed. Besides, the results showed that the frequency use of footnotes and prefaces affected the issue of postcolonialism.
[Dr. Mansour Fahim, Mandana Eftekhar Paziraie . Transmission of Postcolonialism through Translation, Discourse Analysis of "Heart of Darkness" and Two of its Persian Translations at Micro and Macro Levels. Journal of American Science 2012; 8(1):139-146]. (ISSN: 1545-1003). http://www.americanscience.org.

1. Introduction

Literary texts have special characteristics; one of them is Intertextuality, a term that was coined by Julia Kristeva (2). Intertextuality states that the meaning of texts (especially, literary ones) is shaped by other texts and in each text, one can see the footprints of the other texts. Thus, it implies that a literary text has never been an isolated one; instead, it is polluted in history, culture, power and other texts. Similar to texts, it can be claimed that translation of these texts has never been an isolated actively, as well. There is always a text in which translation takes place, a history from which a text emerges and another one into which a text is transposed. Thus, the common episode between literary texts and their translations is the idea that none of them is isolated. Therefore, in order to be able to do a qualified translation, translators need to be equipped with some tool, which enables them to analyze the literary texts translated before, in order to get enough experience for further translations.

Discourse analysis is one of the tools, which denotes a very useful framework to analyze the text in micro and macro levels. The goal of discourse analysis as Brown and Yule (1984: 1) put, "is to investigate of what the language is used for." The type of discourse that is used in this article is the one, which is proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) for analyzing the texts at micro level, and that of Hatch (1992) that analyzes the literary texts at macro level. At the micro level, a text is generally analyzed at:
a.   grammatical level
b.   lexical level

Yet at grammatical level, the researcher looks for endophoric references, conjunctions, and reiterations. More specifically, the researcher analyzes only additive and adversative conjunctions among different kinds of conjunction proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976). Moreover, among the different kinds of reiteration, the researcher only analyzes synonym/near-synonym and superordinate.
At the macro level, a researcher generally looks for:
a.   Characters in the story
b.   Author's aim of authoring the story
c.   Setting of the story
d.   Statement of the problem

However, in this study, the researcher only searches for the number of characters in the two Persian translations and the probable similarities or differences between them.
Seen from one side of the coin, the researcher is going to illustrate how translators (Persian translators, in this case) can apply these two special models of discourse analysis to analyze and rate their own translations by practicing this study. In addition, through teaching how to use discourse analysis

practically, teachers can save their times and spend more time on teaching new methods and models of translation, instead of spending long hours on correcting students' translations.

Seen from the other side of the coin, discourse analysis has its own methodology, which should be learnt. Since discourses of novels are going to be investigated in this study, the researcher is going to investigate how this discourse has been created by departing it at micro and level. Moreover, the researcher is intended to know how postcolonial discourse has been transmitted to Persian translations of "Heart of Darkness" novella.

1.1 Heart of Darkness" as a Postcolonial Novel

The history of postcolonial literature can be traced back to the beginning of 20th century. In that time and by India's success for getting its independence, a new movement started in the history of colonized cultures in Africa, South America, Australia, and Asia , to name a few. By the mid 20th century, some colonial and non-colonial authors created their works on colonialism and established the postcolonial literature (4). In 1899, a Polish author named Joseph Conrad created one masterpiece named "Heart of Darkness" as a three-part series in 1899 in the Blackwood's magazine. Conrad's "Heart of Darkness" is ranked as #67 out of 100 top novels (18).

The field of translation has been different researchers' area of interest. For instance, Joshua (20) analyzes the history of translation and explains that the process of translation gained form and order through the rendering of Bible. The Arabs promoted translation greatly during the eight, ninth, and tenth centuries. In the sixteenth century is marked by the first theory for sense-to-sense translation. The seventeenth century is a great era for French classicism in which the translation of the French classics increased greatly in France between 1625 and 1660, and French writings were translated into English. The eighteenth century, was the time to clarify the sense of the text to the readers. Yet, the field of translation flourished with strange theories during the nineteenth centuries. The development of communication theory, the expansion of the field of structural linguistics and the application of linguistics effected significant changes in the principal and theory of translation during the twentieth century. Good literature written in any part of the world in any language is now made available to the rest of the world through translation.

Many scholars and theoreticians (14; 5; 23), to name a few, have considered this field of study in a variety of social science discipline, such as semiotics, linguistics, anthropology, cognitive psychology, and translation studies. (21)

Gee (2010: 116) states "a discourse analysis is based on the details of speech (and gaze and gesture and action) or writing that are arguably deemed *relevant* in the context *and* that are relevant to the arguments the analysis is attempting to make."

Van Dijk (1983) believes that discourse is analyzed at different levels, and each level has its own sub-levels. For instance, phonology is regarded as one level of discourse and intonation, and the structure of sounds are considered as some sub-level of phonology. Through this example, Van Dijk (1983) states that when morphology is regarded as one analyzing level of discourse, it belongs to one larger group that he called "surface structure". Yet, more interesting issue is that similar to levels, units can be recognized for discourse analysis as well: individual words, various structures of the clause, whole sentences, sequences of sentences (paragraphs), or the whole discourse. In order to illuminate what he says, he uses an example and states "for example, the whole theme, or topic of the discourse can be studied only through semantics not lexical items or sentences." (1983: 22)

Alba-Juez (2009) believes that text-internal elements constitute the text while text-external elements constitute the context.

Halliday and Hasan (6) recognize three types of reference as one of the grammatical cohesive devices elements: personal, demonstrative, and comparative. Personal reference is achieved through personal pronouns, possessive pronouns, and determiners. However, they believe that endophoric personal references are only cohesive. Moreover, they believe that only endophoric demonstratives are inherently cohesive.

One of the researchers who studied narrative genre was (21) who believed that any narrative is composed of two narrative clauses. A narrative clause is one that cannot move without changing the order in which events must be taken to have occurred. Therefore, it implies that for Labov, narrative is not any talk in which a sequence of clauses is matched to a sequence of events, which actually occurred.

Moreover, Benwell and Stokoe (2006) analyze the narrative genre and state for the narrative analysts "identity is constructed in the stories we tell about ourselves; in fact we are 'storied selves'". Therefore narrative analysts examine the structure of narratives (for example, the beginnings, middles, ends), as well as the cultural narrative genres that connect 'on the ground' stories (such as Jane's stories about herself) to wider 'master narratives' (for example, 'narratives of self help'). These 'master narratives' are sometimes

called 'discourses' or 'interpretive repertoires' in other traditions.

One of the researches that have been conducted on discourse analysis is Van Dijk's research (1983) that was done on news. In that study, he specified some characteristics such as functionality and meaningfulness, and then he used them to explain news discourse. Finally, he concluded that the grammatical or the lexical choices and items might be functional. As an instance, understanding short sentences, with a standard noun-phrase, and standard verb-phrase structures may be easier than long, complex sentences.

Nirmala (2009) is another researcher, who used discourse analysis to study "*the Man-Eater of Malgudi.*" She applied a linguistic view on discourse, and explained the linguistic relations and its sub-categories such as anaphoric, cataphoric references, cohesion, redundancy, exclamation, and repetition in the novel. Then she investigated the dialogue discourse and finally she concluded that the language the author has used in the novel was simple and enjoyable.

Similar to discourse analysis, there are researchers (19; 17; 4), to name a few, who have studied postcolonialism and postcolonial literature. According to Loomba (2005), colonialism can be defined as the control and conquest of other people's lands and goods.

At the beginning of 18th century, the concept of colonialism was still extended from the Mediterranean to the Indian Ocean, and Chinese Empire was larger than anything Europe had seen. Therefore, the modern European colonialism cannot be scaled off from the earlier histories of the colonized region. (16)

Hawley (2001: 142) states that "postcolonial discourse that focuses on text written in English veer toward "academic neocolonialism." The focus on the subaltern frequently has excluded work by the subaltern; vernacular, and popular cultural texts that embody a literature of self-awareness continue to remain ghettoized."

Watt (1979: 136-137) analyzes Conrad's "Heart of Darkness" and states that the author's procedure is much the same to the characters:

In *Heart of Darkness,* most of the characters are given type names-the director, the brickmaker, and so on. […]. Many of Conrad's changes in other matters were fairly obviously dictated by the need for narrative economy and thematic focus.

Edward Said (15) discusses one of the problems of *"Heart of Darkness"* and states

…neither Conrad nor Marlow gives us a full view of what is *outside* the world, conquering attitudes embodied by Kurtz, Marlow, the circle of

listeners on the deck of *Nellie*, and Conrad… For it we truly understand someone else's experiences and if we must therefore depend upon the assertive authority of the sort of power that Kurtz wields as a white man in jungle or that Marlow, another white man, wields as narrator, there is no use looking for other, non-imperialist alternatives; the system has simply eliminated and made them unthinkable.

2. Material and Methods

Through the application of DA, the researcher intended to shed light on various cohesive devices and details of the texts at micro and macro levels, exerted by different translators of the novella *"Heart of Darkness."* This article addresses the following questions:

1.   Regarding discourse analysis in Hatch's model (1992) viewpoint in macro level, what are the similarities and differences between the two Persian translations of Conrad's "Heart of Darkness"?
2.   Regarding discourse analysis at micro level from Halliday and Hasan's (1976) viewpoints, what are the similarities and differences between *endophoric references, conjunctions, reiterations* in the Persian translations of Conrad's "Heart of Darkness"?
3.   What are the similarities and differences between the postcolonial themes in the Persian translations of Conrad's *"Heart of Darkness"*?

1.2Corpus

The corpus of the study consisted of 63 pages selected randomly from different parts of *"Heart of Darkness,"* written by Joseph Conrad (1988) along with its Persian translations "دل تاریکی" *[Dele Tariki],* and "در اعماق ظلمت" *[Dar Amaghe Zolmat]* produced by two different translators.

The first translation of *"Heart of Darkness,"* *[Dele Tariki]* was rendered by Saleh Hosseini in 1389 Iranian calendar (2010), the second one *[Dar Amaghe Zolmat]* by Fereidoun Hajati in 1365 Iranian calendar (1986).

2.2Data collection

The study mainly focused on contrasting the source text with its translated texts to find the cohesive elements and constituent elements named in the research questions as well as the postcolonial theme of production of the source and translated texts. In this regard, any manipulation in the translations of certain features in this novel, comparing to those existing in the original text, were precisely analyzed within the DA framework developed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) at micro level, and Hatch (1992) at macro level.

For this purpose, the researcher studied and investigated any endophoric references (personal references, demonstratives, and comparatives), conjunctions (additives, adversatives, and causals), reiterations (synonym/near-synonyms and superordinates), which had occurred during the process of translation. She also probed into characters of the story and analyzed them separately to find any probable differences between the source text and its translations. Finally, the researcher analyzed the collected data within DA framework

3. Results

1.3 Analysis at Micro level

The following table displays some of the significant examples of endophoric references, conjunctions, and reiterations, which occurred in the two translations of *"Heart of Darkness."* In this table, the bold parts shown in translations indicate the endophoric references, the italic parts shown in the two translations indicate the conjunctions, and the underlined parts indicate reiterations.

Table 2 shows the frequency and percentage of endophoric references, conjunctions, and reiterations by the separation of sub-categories occurred within *"Heart of Darkness"* and its translations.

According to the above table, out of the total number of 2,723 cases of cohesive devices in Hosseini's translation (2010), 864 cases (equal to 32%) belong to personal, 295 cases (equal to 11%) to demonstrative, 148 cases (equal to 5%) belong to comparative. Moreover, 1093 cases (equal to 40%) belong to additive, 187 cases (equal to 7%) belong to adversative, and 70 cases (equal to 3%) belong to causal. Finally, 45 cases (equal to 2%) belong to synonym/near-synonym, and 21 cases (equal to 1%) belong to super ordinate.

Moreover, out of the total number of 2,538 cases of cohesive devices in Hajati's translation (1986), 902 cases (equal to 36%) belong to personal, 286 cases (equal to 11%) belong to demonstrative, and 66 cases (equal to 3%) belong to comparative. In addition, 1025 cases (equal to 40%) belong to additive, 168 cases (equal to 7%) belong to adversative, and 31 cases (equal to 1%) belong to causal. Finally, 40 cases (equal to 2%) belong to synonym/near-synonym, and 20 cases (equal to 1%) belong to super ordinate.

Finally, out of the total number of 2,739 cases of cohesive devices in Conrad's text (1988) 1,631 cases (equal to 60%) belong to personal, 181 cases (equal to 7%) belong to demonstrative, and 121 cases (equal to 4%) belong to comparative. Moreover, 600 cases (equal to 22%) belong to additive, 129 cases (equal to 5%) belong to adversative, and 24 cases (equal to 1%) belong to causal. In addition, 35 cases (equal to

1%) belong to synonym/near-synonym, and 18 cases (equal to 1%) belong to super ordinate.

Table 1. Endophoric references, conjunctions, and reiteration in the two translations of *"Heart of Darkness"*

Original text	Translations	
Hosseini's translation in 2010 of *"Heart of Darkness"*	...«عده ای از زایران در عقب تخت روان **اسلحه های او** را-شامل دو تفنگ ساچمه ای، یک تفنگ سنگین و یک اسلحه کمری سبک-صاعقه های آن ژوپیتر رقت انگیز-**با خود** می آورند. ...» [..edeie az zayeran dar aghab e takht e ravan **aslahehaye oo** ra shamel e <u>do tofang sachmeie</u>, yek <u>tofange sangin</u> *va* <u>yek aslaheie kamari</u> e sabok-saeghehaye aan zhopiter e reghat angiz- **ba khod** miavarand.]	…'some of the pilgrims behind the stretcher carried **his** <u>arms</u>-two <u>shot-guns</u>, a heavy <u>rifle</u>, *and* a light <u>revolver</u>-carbine-the thunderbolts of **that painful Jupiter**…
Hajati's translation in 1986 of *"Heart of Darkness"*	...«چند تن از مهاجرین در پشت سر برانکارد **سلاحهای او** را حمل می کردند-دو تفنگ شکاری، یک تفنگ گلوله زن و یک ششلول سبک. **اینها** رعد و برقی بود که ژوپیتر، با **آن** به میان **آنها** رفته بود."...» [..chandtan az mohajerin dar posht e sar e brankard **selahhaye oo** ra haml mikardand- <u>do tofang e shekari</u>, yek <u>tofang e golole zan</u>, va yek <u>sheshlool e sabok</u>. **Inha** rad o bargh I book ke zhopiter ba **aan** be mian e **aanha** rafte bood...]	

2.3 Analysis at Macro Level

At this level, the researcher studied the numbers of characters in the light different of versions of production and comprehension of the text. Comparison of characters reappeared in both translations of *"Heart of Darkness."* The following

table shows the frequency of characters given in the form of "named by the occupations," and "named by their own names." The letter (F) represents frequency and (P) represents percentage.

Table 2. The results of cohesive devices separated by subcategories in the source and two translated texts

Conrad (1988)		Hajati (1986)		Hosseini (2010)		Translators	
P1	F1	P1	F1	P1	F1		
60%	1631	36%	902	32%	864	Endophoric Personal	Frequency/ Percentage of subcategories
7%	181	11%	286	11%	295	Endophoric Demonstrative	
4%	121	3%	66	5%	148	Comparative	
22%	600	40%	1025	40%	1093	Additive	
5%	129	7%	168	7%	187	Adversative	
1%	24	1%	31	3%	70	Causal	
1%	35	2%	40	2%	45	Synonym/near-synonym	
1%	18	1%	20	1%	21	Super ordinate	
2739		2538		2723		Total number	

According to the above table, out of the total number of 20 cases of characters, which were found in Hosseini's translation (2010), 2 cases (equal to 10%) belong to "by name," 13 cases (equal to 65%) belong to "by job", 4 cases (equal to 20%) belong to "by family relation," and 1 case (equal to 5%) belongs to "unnamed." Moreover, the same results were achieved for Hajati's translation (1986), and Conrad's text (1988).

Table 3. Frequency and percentage of the characters in the two translations of *"Heart of Darkness"* and the source text

Conrad (1988)		Hajati (1986)		Hosseini (2010)		Translators	
P1	F1	P1	F1	P1	F1		
10%	2	10%	2	10%	2	By name	Frequency/Percentage of subcategories
65%	13	65%	13	65%	13	By job	
20%	4	20%	4	20%	4	By family relation	
5%	1	5%	1	5%	1	Unnamed	
100%	20	100%	20	100%	20	Total number	

3.3 Transmission of post colonialism throughout the two translations

As stated earlier in this article, "Heart of Darkness" is regarded as a postcolonial novel in which the writer tried to depict the dominance of colonizers on colonized people. In order to make the Persian readers more familiar with the aim of the author, the two translators talked over the issue of colonialism in the beginning, or at the end of the

books. Moreover, the two translators used footnotes; wherever they faced with words or phrases, they felt readers might need more explanations. However, the two translators were different in terms of content and amount of prefaces or posteriors and footnotes, respectively. In addition, the researcher used translators' judgments to refer the translators' prefaces and posteriors, and analyzed them as well as footnotes in the following lines, to find out which of the two translators transmitted the issue of postcolonialism better in his rendition.

4.3 Comparison of the translator's judgments of *"Heart of Darkness"*

The two translators are different in their approaches towards the source text.

Hosseini (2010) allocated twenty-seven pages entitled *"instead of preface" [be Jaye Moghadameh]*, to the book, in which he gave detailed information about the novella. He analyzed *"Heart of Darkness"* in the form of romance, in which he found some similarities between this novella and *"King Arthur and the Knights of the Round Table."* He then analyzed the novella in the form of epic, in which he found some similarities between this novella and *"Divine Comedy."* He analyzed it in the form of tragedy, in which he explained the structure of tragedies and compared them with those in this novella. Then he analyzed the novella as a poetic work, in which he stated that Conrad used figurative language to present and fit all the content and meanings in a novella.

Moreover, Hosseini (2010) allocated two more sections at the end of the book. In the first section, Hosseini (2010) wrote ten pages under the title of *"The Discovery of Truth at the bottom of Darkness," [Kashfe Haghighat dar Omghe Tariki]*, in which compared *"Heart of Darkness"* with "*The Divine Comedy."*

In the second section, Hosseini (2010) allocated sixteen pages entitled *"Buddist Thought in the Heart of Darkness," [Andishehaye Boodayee dar Dele Tariki]* to the book, in which he reprinted one of the Talebzade's articles (as cited in Hosseini, 2010) and discussed the characters and the historical background of *"Heart of Darkness"* in detail.

Hajati (1986) allocated two different sections to give information about the source text: in the first part, he wrote only nine pages entitled *"foreword," [dibacheh]*, as a preface to the book, in which he gave some information about the situation of Europe in the nineteenth century as well as Conrad's purpose for authoring the novella. In the second part, Hajati (1986) wrote five pages entitled *"Joseph Conrad's Life,"* or *[Zendegi e Joseph Conrad]*, in which he gave some brief information about Conrad's

birthplace, education, marriage, and her father's job as well as the date of his death. He further referred to his other works and popularity of them.

5.4Comparison of the Translations' Footnotes in *"Heart of Darkness"*

The following table shows the frequency of footnotes given in the form of "only named in English," "only Persian explanation," and "English names with Persian explanation." letter (F) represents frequency and (P) represents percentage.

Table 4. Frequency and percentage of footnotes in *the two translations of "Heart of Darkness"*

Hajati (1986)		Hosseini (2010)		Translators	
P1	F1	P1	F1		
94%	17	46%	11	Only named in English	
0	0	21%	5	Only Persian explanation	Frequency/Percentage of subcategories
6%	1	33%	8	English names with Persian explanation	
100%	18	100%	24	Total number	

The above table indicates that out of the total number of 24 cases of footnotes, which were found in Hosseini's translation (2010), 11 cases (equal to 46%) belong to "only named in English", 5 cases (equal to 21%) belong to "only Persian explanation", and 8 cases (equal to 33%) belong to "English names with Persian explanation."

Furthermore, out of the total number of 18 cases of footnotes, which were found in Hajati's translation (1986), 17 cases (equal to 94%) belong to only name in English, no case belongs to only Persian explanation, and only one case (equal to 6%) belong to English names with Persian explanation.

4. Discussions
1.4Micro level: endophoric reference, conjunction, and reiteration

As it was presented in table 2, the most significant amount of references (endophoric personal, demonstrative, and comparative) relates to Hajati's rendition (1986) showing the most coherence. Yet, the most significant amount of conjunctions (additive, adversative, and causal) relates to Hosseini's rendition, which shows the most cohesion in his text. However, the most significant amount of reiteration (synonym/near-synonym, superordinate) relates to Hosseini's rendition, which shows the most cohesion in the text.

It seems that due to the special use of conjunctions and reiterations, Hosseini (2010) has presented a more cohesive translation than Hajati (1986).

Finally, the results of table 2, shows that the number of cohesive devices in Hosseini's rendition (2010) is closer to the number of cohesive devices in Conrad's text (1988); therefore, regarding the original text, Hosseini's rendition (2010) is more cohesive than Hajati's rendition (1986).

2.4Macro level: Characters

As it was presented in the table 3, the most significant amount of characters is related to the category of "by their jobs," which is the same for the both translators. Moreover, the least amount of characters is related to the category of "unnamed," which is the same for the both translators.

In addition, the two translators used as similar numbers of characters as the original text. This shows that both translators had similar opinions toward the use of characters. Therefore, it can be concluded that the two translations are similarly cohesive and none of these two texts is coherently superior to the other.

3.4Postcolonial level: Judgment

The prefaces and introductions written to these two translations clearly show the two translators' understanding of the source text writer, and their effort to introduce the writer's work to the readers.

In this regard, Hosseini's rendition (2010) produced more detailed information about the source text than Hajati (1986).

4.4Footnote

Out of 30 examples of proper nouns in the source text, Hosseini has given 23 footnotes mainly in the forms of "only name in English" (equal to 39%), "English names with Persian explanation" (equal to 89%), and "only Persian explanation" (equal to 100%), which shows his strong interest in giving appropriate information in this regard.

In addition, Hajati (1986) gave 18 footnotes in the forms of "only named in English,' (equal to 61%), and "English names with Persian explanation" (equal to 11%).

Since the amount of footnotes reflects the amount of the translator's knowledge of the source text, it can be concluded that the translator who gave more footnotes, had more knowledge of the source text; therefore, provided the readers with more information of the source text. Since Hosseini (2010) included stronger information and presented more footnotes in his translation, his rendition transmitted the issue of postcolonialism more than Hajati's rendition (1986)

5. Conclusion

Comparison of the micro and macro levels of the corpus gave rise to interesting results, proving significant differences at micro level (i.e. endophoric personal, demonstrative, and comparative references, additive and adversative conjunctions, and synonym/near-synonyms and superordinates) and macro level (i.e. characters). Moreover the results included differences between translators' judgments and footnotes) in these translations.

Hosseini's translation exhibits the highest degree of grammatical and lexical cohesion. In his rendition, which was carried out in (1389/2010), he has used more conjunctions and reiterations than Hajati (1986).

At macro level, the analysis of constituent elements of the novella clearly showed that the translators had the same idea toward using the characters.

The analysis of the prefaces and introductions written to these two translations clearly show the difference between levels of interest in giving the information to the readers and levels of comprehending the postcolonial spirit in the source text.

In his short preface to the book, Hajati (1986) was mostly active in explaining only a brief history of colonialism and a short biography of the source text writer's life, while Hosseini's preface and posterior (2010) included the translator's full understanding of the source text and the postcolonial theme in it.

Regarding the footnotes given by the translators, it is worth saying that the highest amount belongs to Hosseini (2010), who attempted to provide readers with useful information.

In this article, the researcher applied DA to analyze one American novella "Heart of Darkness" and two of its Persian translations at micro and macro levels. Moreover, the researcher analyzed footnotes and prefaces the translators provided to investigate the transmission of postcolonialism through translations.

By applying this model of DA, the Translation teachers and students can analyze the translated texts accurately and understand how much their translations are coherent. Moreover, the teachers and students can analyze the books translated before by different translators, to find out which one is more cohesive. Finally, syllabus designers can include different models of DA in different Translation courses by which they assist students to present translations that are more accurate.

The researcher has provided some suggestions for those who are interested in conducting their researches in DA field;

1. Regarding Halliday and Hasan's model (1976) at micro level, are there any differences or similarities between types of *ellipsis* in the two translations of "Heart of Darkness"?
2. Regarding Halliday and Hasan's model (1976) at micro level, are there any differences or similarities between types of substitution in the two translations of "Heart of Darkness"?
3. What are the similarities and differences between collocations of the two translations of "Heart of Darkness" according to Halliday and Hasan's model (1976)?

Corresponding Author:
Dr. Mansour Fahim
Islamic Azad University, Tehran Central Branch,
Foreign Language Faculty
E-mail:scientificgroup@hotmail.com

References
1. Alba-Juez, L. (2009). *Perspectives on Discourse Analysis: Theory and Practice.* UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
2. Baron, S. (2010). *Strandentwining Cable:Joyce, Flaubert, and Intertextuality.* New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Benwell, B., & Stokoe. E. (2006). *Discourse and Identity.* Edinburgh University Press Ltd.
4. Bressler, Ch. E. (2007). *Literary Criticism: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (4th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson.
5. Brown, G., & Yule, G. (1984). *Discourse Analysis.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. Butler, Ch. (2003). *Structure and Function: A Guide to Three Major Structural-Functional Theories: Part 2.* USA: John Benjamins Publication Co.
7. Conrad, J. (1988). *Heart of Darkness.* Edited by Robert Kimbrough. A Norton Critical Edition. (3rd ed). New York: W.W. Norton
8. Gee. P. J. (2010). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (3rd ed.). UK: Taylor & Francis e-library.
9. Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.
10. Hajati, F. (1986). *Dar Amaghe Zolmat. [Heart of Darkness].* Tehran: Ekbatan.
11. Hawley, J. Ch. (2001). *Encyclopedia of Postcolonial Studies.* USA: Library of Congress Cataloging-in Publication Data.

12. Hosseini, S. (2010). *Dele Tariki. [Heart of Darkness]*. Tehran: Niloufar.
13. Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Jorgenson, M., & Philips, L. (2002). *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method.* London and Thousand Oaks and New Delhi: Sage.
15. Lane, J.R. (2006). *The Postcolonial Novel*. UK & USA: Polity Press.
16. Loomba, A. (2005). *Colonial/Postcolonialism.* USA & Canada: Routledge.
17. *Modern Library's 100 best novels.* (2011). Retrieved December 10, 2011, from http://www.modernlibrary.com/top-100/100-best-novels/
18. Nirmala, S. (2009). Language Use and Society in R. K. Narayan's *The Man-Eater of Malgudi. Language in India.* Vol. 9. pp. 35-45
19. Young, R. (2003). *Postolonialism: A Very Short Introduction.* New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
20. Ray, M. K. (2008). *Studies in Translation; Translation: Its Brief History and Theory* (2nd rev. Enlarged ed.). India: Nice Printing Press, Delhi.
21. Schiffrin, D., Tannen, D., & Hamilton, H. E. (2001). *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis.* UK: Blackwell Publishers.
22. Van Dijk, T. A. (1983). Discourse Analysis: Its Development and Application to the Structure of News, *Journal of Communication.* Vol. 33. No. 2. pp. 20-43
23. Watt, J.P. (1979). *Conrad's in the Nineteenth Century, Vol 1.* USA: University of California Press.

12/22/2011