

University of Sarajevo

Faculty of Philosophy

Department of English Language and Literature

Translation Studies

Lexical and Stylistic Aspects of Montenegrin and Serbian Translations of "The Godfather"

Leksički i stilistički aspekti prevoda romana "Kum" na crnogorski i srpski jezik

Student: Hasan Bešliagić

Mentor: Prof. dr. Amira Sadiković

Index no.: 2616/2017

Sarajevo 2019

Contents

Abstract	3
Sažetak	4
Introduction	5
Biography of the author.....	5
Summary of "The Godfather".....	6
The required competence of the translator	7
Overview of the translation equivalents	9
Introduction	9
Chapter I.....	10
Chapter II.....	19
Chapter IV	21
Chapter V	23
Chapter VIII	25
Chapter XI.....	27
Chapter XIV	28
Chapter XVI	29
Chapter XVIII.....	31
Chapter XX	33
Chapter XXIII.....	34
Chapter XXVII.....	36
Chapter XXXII.....	38
Conclusion.....	40
An overview of the quality of the translations	40
Closing words.....	44
Literature	45

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to conduct an analysis of the Montenegrin and Serbian translations of "The Godfather", a famous 1969 novel by Mario Puzo. The comparison of the two versions with each other and with the English original will be at the center of the analysis. Also comments will be given regarding the quality of the translations. Suggestions will also be offered for the purpose of representing the various choices a translator has when translating particular phrases. Discussions of the linguistic competences of translator are also key elements of the paper together with discussions regarding the general knowledge a translator has to have in order to perform with high level of quality. In the conclusion, the competence and the quality of work the two particular translators have shown will also be analyzed within a general essay about the value of these two versions and how they present this novel to the readership.

Key words:

Godfather, Montenegrin, Serbian, translation,

.

Sažetak

Cilj ovog rada je provođenje analize crnogorskog i srpskog prevoda "Kuma", poznatog romana autora Maria Puza objavljenog 1969. godine. U srži ove analize će biti poređenje ove dvije verzije jedne sa drugom kao i sa originalom napisanim na engleskom jeziku. Također će biti ponuđeni komentari koji se tiču kvaliteta prevoda. Uz to, biti će ponuđeni prijedlozi u cilju predstavljanja raznolikog izbora koji prevodilac ima kada prevodi pojedine fraze.

Diskusije o lingvističkim sposobnostima prevodioca su također ključni elementi ovog rada zajedno sa diskusijama o općem znanju koje prevodilac mora imati da bih radio svoj posao kvalitetno. U zaključku rada sposobnost i kvalitet koji su ovi prevodioci pokazali će također biti analizirani u sklopu eseja o vrijednosti ova dva prevoda i načina na koji oni predstavljaju ovo djelo svojim čitateljima.

Ključne riječi:

Kum, crnogorski jezik, srpski jezik, prevod

Introducton

Biography of the author

Mario Puzo was an American novelist and screenwriter (born Oct. 15, 1920, New York, N.Y.—died July 2, 1999, Bay Shore, N.Y.). He was most famous for his chronicle of the Corleone family in "The Godfather"(1969) . It became one of the most successful novels of all time, selling around 21 million copies worldwide and spawning three Academy award winning, critically acclaimed films. From a young age, Puzo wished to be a writer but he was forced to drop out of school and get a job to earn money for his family after his father deserted them. First he worked as a railroad clerk and then after his military service in Germany during World War 2 he studied at the New School for Social Research and Columbia University. At first, he wrote pulp stories for men's magazines and his first two novels were "The Dark Arena"(1955) and "The Fortunate Pilgrim"(1964). They attracted good reviews but sold few copies. After that, he decided to write a novel which would earn him money to support his family and he began his research of organized crime because he had no previous knowledge of it. This spawned "The Godfather", his most successful novel. His other noted works include: "Fools Die"(1978), "The Sicilian"(1984), "The Last Don"(1996), "Omerta"(2000). He was also a noted screenwriter and most of his books were adapted to the movie screen, he also wrote screenplay for the first two "Superman" films (1978 and 1980) and "The Cotton Club"(1980).¹

¹ Source: www.britannica.com/biography/Mario-Puzo

Summary of "The Godfather"

The plot deals with a mob war fought between the Corleone family and the other four of the Five Families of New York. After Don Vito Corleone is shot by men working for drug dealer Virgil "The Turk" Sollozzo, his two sons, Santino and Michael must run the family business with the help of consigliere Tom Hagen and the two capos Peter Clemenza and Salvatore Tessio. When Sollozzo and an Irish police captain are murdered by Michael, the conflict escalates into a full scale war which results in Santino's death and Michael, despite his wishes, ascending to the head of the family. He slowly becomes more ruthless than his father, even killing his brother-in-law Carlo Rizzi, who played a part in Santino's murder. Also as the story progresses many of the minor characters, such as the Don's godson Johnny Fontane and his friend Nino Valenti, Sonny's former girlfriend Lucy Mancini, and Michael's bodyguard Al Neri, are expanded on and given their own subplots. Many of these subplots are not included in the movie. The novel culminates when Michael has his two main enemies, the novel's main antagonist, Emilio Barzini and a lesser but still severely important antagonist, Philip Tattaglia, assassinated. After the total elimination of the Tattaglia family and Barzini family, Michael sells all his business in New York with the intention of making the Corleone family a legitimate business in Las Vegas.

The required competence of the translator

By reading translated versions of literary works one has to keep in mind that their impression of the work, its themes, ideas and overall feeling depend almost entirely on the degree the translator has managed to represent the original intention of the author by his adaptation to the target language. Many would argue that keeping as many elements of the source language will only improve the conveying of the original message of the work. On the other side, the golden rule of translation is to assume that the person reading the translated version has absolutely no idea about the source language of the literary work or the culture it depicts and may not fully understand the true message. That is why translators need to find a balance between making the translation as understandable as possible in the target language but also trying to keep some of the original elements of the linguistic and cultural identity the book is attempting to represent. In other words, it is the translator's duty to find a middle ground between "foreignising" and "domesticating" the text. Susan Bassnett makes a very good contrast between the roles a translator can have:

According to one reading of the translator's role, the translator is a force for good, a creative artist who ensures the survival of writing across time and space, an intercultural mediator and interpreter, a figure whose importance to the continuity and diffusion of culture is immeasurable. In contrast, another interpretation sees translation as a highly suspect activity, one in which an inequality of power relations (inequalities of economics, politics, gender and geography) is reflected in the mechanics of textual production. (Bassnett 2002, 4)

The translator's knowledge of the subject matter that the translated work depicts also plays a huge role in the process. In general, the work of translation does not only boil down to linguistic competence but also to the general knowledge a person has to have in order to do this job. That is why this section will be dedicated to the importance of understanding the mafia subculture, its hierarchy, ideals and the Italian culture on which it is founded. This novel is noteworthy for introducing this subculture to the American audience. For the first time, the readers had a very detailed insight into the inner workings of the mob, the Italian-American community, its close-knit families, the principles, ideals and tradition brought over from "The Old Country" i.e. Sicily. From a linguistic standpoint, the value of "The Godfather" is most visible in the Italian phrases it introduced to an English speaking audience, such as *consiglieri*, *Cosa Nostra*, *caporegime*, *omerta* etc. The influence of the Italian language is also

visible in the dialogue filled with Italian slang and curse words. The very style of speech of particular characters is very much representative of their status in the organization, their level of intelligence and attitude.

It is imperative that the translator is well familiar with these facts before even attempting to produce a well suited, understandable translation. Mona Baker makes an accurate summary of this:

A good translator does not begin to translate until s/he has read the text at least once and got a 'gist' of the overall message. But this is only the first step. Once the source text is understood, the translator then has to tackle the task of producing a target version which can be accepted as a text in its own right. The phraseology and the collocational and grammatical patterning of the target version must conform to target-language norms, but even then the translation may still sound foreign or clumsy. Worse still, it may not even make sense to the target reader. (Baker 1992,111)

So the familiarity with the the subject matter as well as the phraseology is critical to achieving suitable equivalence in translation. Making the text and all of its underlying meanings understandable to the target language audience is the biggest obstacle to a translator. Sometimes the source language and its origin are so far removed from the target language that this is very hard to achieve. One can even use the term "linguistic psychology" when describing this task since the very way of thinking of the speakers of the source language has a great impact on its dictionary, grammar and semantics. Throughout this analysis, the degree to which the translators of these two versions have achieved this will become the major theme, it will be commented upon and suggestions of improved versions will be offered. A general opinion of the value of the translated versions will serve as the overall conclusion of the thesis, it will be fully based on the examples taken from the translated versions of the novel and presented in detail.

Overview of the translation equivalents

Introduction

The two translated versions which are the basis of this overview are both editions which have been published in the past ten years. The Montenegrin version was published by publishing house "Nova knjiga" in Podgorica. The translator of this version is Mirko Bižić.

The Serbian version of "The Godfather" was published in 2012 by publishing house "Laguna" in Belgrade and the translator was Nenad Dropulić.

Both translators did translate several bestselling books apart from "The Godfather". On the website *knjizara.com* translations by Mirko Bižić can be found, some of them are: "33 Strategies of War" by Robert Greene, "Behind Her Eyes" by Sarah Pinborough, "The Mystery of Edward Drood" by Charles Dickens, "The Devil's Spectacles" by Wilkie Collins and several others.

On the website *goodreads.com* Nenad Dropulić is credited with translating these works into Serbian: "Lord of the Flies" by William Golding, "Northern Lights" by Phillip Pullman, "Girl with a Pearl Earring" by Johannes Vermeer, "Murder on The Orient Express" by Agatha Christie and others.

The translators are obviously experienced having translated important works before this and have built up their own specific style of translation. The overview that will be carried out in the following sections will most certainly show the differences in their work.

Chapter I

English:

Amerigo Bonasera sat in New York Criminal Court Number 3 and waited for justice; vengeance on the men who had so cruelly hurt his daughter, who had tried to dishonor her. (Puzo 1969,2)

Montenegrin:

Amerigo Bonasera je sjedio u njujorškom Trećem krivičnom sudu i čekao pravdu – osvetu nad ljudima koji su tako surovo povrijedili njegovu kćer, koji su pokušali da je obeščaste. (Bižić 2014,11)

Serbian:

Amerigo Bonasera sedeo je u Njujorškom kriminalnom sudu broj 3 i čekao pravdu; osvetu nad ljudima koji su mu svirepo povredili kćer, koji su pokušali da je obeščaste. (Dropulić 2012,9)

In the very first sentence of the novel, immediately stark differences in the translations can be noticed. The official, full name of the institution mentioned is *New York Criminal Court* and the name of the city is an integral part of this name. In Montenegrin, names of institutions, political parties, religious institutions etc. are written with an upper case letter. For some reason the translator left the term *njujorški* in lower case and so, in this version the court is only geographically placed in New York. The Serbian version kept the upper case letter in the name but the translation of *Criminal Court* is "criminally" wrong. Instead of opting for *krivični*, like in the Montenegrin version or *kazneni* which would also work good in this case, for some reason the translator chose *kriminalni* thus making it a criminal rather than a judicial institution.

The word *cruelly* is also translated in very different ways. The Montenegrin version includes *surovo* while the Serbian version uses *svirepo*. While *surovo* will relay the necessary information, the word refers more to a particular environment rather than a person, while *svirepo* clearly refers to a character trait therefore the Serbian version is, to a better degree, closer to the original.

English:

Now on this great day, his daughter's wedding day, Don Vito Corleone stood in the doorway of his Long Beach home to greet his guests, all of them known, all of them trusted.(Puzo 1969,6)

Montenegrin:

Tog svečanog dana, dana udaje njegove kćeri, don Vito Korleone je stajao na vratima svog doma na Long Biču i dočekivao goste, sve odreda dobro mu poznate i pouzdane ljude.(Bižić 2014, 13)

Serbian:

Ovog velikog dana, na dan kćerkinog venčanja, Don Vito Korleone stajao je na vratima svog doma na Long Ajlendu i pozdravljao goste. Sve ih je poznavao i u svakog imao poverenja.(Dropulić 2012, 15)

The sentence starts by emphasizing that the wedding is happening *on this great day* and it is pretty clear that that particular day has great importance and yet in the Montenegrin version the pronoun is different and so we have *tog svečanog dana* which fails to point out that the previously mentioned fact.

An important element of the original which should have been kept in the translated versions is the poetic nature of the expression. The author wanted to emphasize the trustworthiness of the guests. They were not any guests but important members of the Corleone crime family, their close associates, politicians and the *soldatos*². This emphasis is achieved by repeating the phrase *all of them*. In the Montenegrin version the word *odreda* does not quite express this to the wanted degree but the Serbian translator most certainly went the right way by opting for splitting the sentence and using the pronouns *sve* i *svakog* to achieve the repetition effect.

² A soldier - The first official level of both the American Mafia and the Sicilian Mafia in the formal Mafia hierarchy or cadre. (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1)

English:

He had all the quiet force and intelligence of his great father, the born instinct to act in such a way that men had no recourse but to respect him. But when World War II broke out, Michael Corleone volunteered for the Marine Corps. He defied his father's express command when he did so. (Puzo 1969,8)

Montenegrin:

Imao je očevu blagu snagu i inteligenciju i svojim urođenim ponašanjem je kod ljudi izazvao poštovanje. No kad je izbio Drugi svjetski rat, Majkl Korleone se dobrovoljno prijavio u marince, usprotivivši se očevom izričitom naređenju. (Bižić 2014,17)

Serbian:

Srb: Imao je tihu snagu i inteligenciju svog velikog oca, urođeno nagonsko ponašanje koje je kod ljudi moralo da izazove poštovanje. Ali kad je izbio Drugi svetski rat, Majkl Korleone se dobrovoljno prijavio u Marinski korpus. Time se usprotivio očevom izričitom naređenju. (Dropulić 2012,16)

As mentioned previously, the strong character of Don Vito Corleone is the one of the central themes of this novel so the translator should not have missed out on transferring that theme into the translated versions. Therefore the adjective *great* in the first sentence should really have an equivalent in order to represent the ongoing theme. The Montenegrin version lacks this equivalent and therefore does not fully express it.

Also by the end of the first sentence it is mentioned that the followers of the Don had no choice but to respect Michael because he shared the same traits as the Don. The phrase *no recourse* carries the weight of this statement and so it also is integral in its representation. The Serbian version employs the use of the verb *moralo* which does not emphasize it to the same degree but it at least mentions it while the Montenegrin version does not. The bonds between the members of the Corleone family were represented as very strong. The *soldatos*, the *caporegimes*³ and others not only respected the Don but they also feared him, they were aware that if they were ever to betray him or show disloyalty towards him they would

³ Usually shortened to just a capo, is a rank used in the Mafia (both the Sicilian Mafia and Italian-American Mafia) for a made member of the crime family who heads a "crew" of soldiers and has major social status and influence in the organization. (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1)

experience a very harsh punishment. This is why once they were a part of the organization they really had no choice but to respect the Don.

English:

Hagen was the Don's lawyer and acting Consigliere, or counselor, and as such held the most vital subordinate position in the family business. He and the Don had solved many a knotty problem in this room, and so when he saw the Godfather leave the festivities and enter the house, he knew, wedding or no, there would be a little work this day. (Puzo 1969, 14)

Montnegrin:

Hejgen bješe Donovan advokat i konsiljere, savjetnik, što ga je činilo drugim čovjekom u poslovnoj hijerahiji Porodice. U toj prostoriji njih dvojica su riješili mnoge složene probleme, pa kad je vidio da Kum napušta slavlje i ulazi u kuću, znao je da će se i danas obaviti neki poslić, bilo vjenčanja ili ne. (Bižić 2014, 18)

Serbian:

Hejgen je bio Donovan advokat i vršilac dužnosti consiglierea, savetnika, i tako zauzimaio posle Dona najvažniji položaj u porodičnom poslu. On i Don rešili su mnoge zakučaste probleme u ovoj prostoriji i znao je, kad je Don napustio slavlje i ušao u kuću da će danas, bilo venčanja ili ne, biti nešto posla. (Dropulić 2012, 20)

In the first sentence the author describes Tom Hagen, advisor to the Don. The Montenegrin version uses the imperfect tense with the word *bješe* and it is a good choice since it represents a certain advantage of the language over English in these descriptions of people.

The difference which is visible between these two translations is how the Serbian version contains the precise Italian spelling of some of the terms while the Montenegrin version spells them by their pronunciation. In Serbian language the translator is given a choice, he could have also used a transcription-adapted spelling like in the Montenegrin version. In the Montenegrin language, foreign language words have to be written by the way they are

pronounced so *konsiljeri* is the only option which has to be used unlike the original *consiglieri*⁴ in the Serbian version.

In the mob hierarchy, the job of the consiglieri is well defined and as stated in the introduction it is something of which a translator has to have knowledge in order to achieve a precise and quality translation.

English:

Brasi's reputation for violence was awesome and his devotion to Don Corleone legendary. He was, in himself, one of the great blocks that supported the Don's power structure. His kind was a rarity. (Puzo 1969,15)

Montenegrin:

Brazi je bio nadaleko čuven kako po nasilništvu tako i po odanosti don Korleoneu. Sam po sebi, predstavljao je jedan od najjačih stubova Donove moćne organizacije. Takvih kao on nije bilo mnoštvo.(Bižić 2014, 20)

Serbian:

Brazijev ugled nasilnika bio je zastrašujući, a njegova odanost Donu legendarna. On je sam, sam po sebi bio jedan od velikih blokova koji su nosili Donovu građevinu moći. Pripadao je retkoj vrsti.(Dropulić 2012, 22)

It should be pointed out that although the translators went different ways in translating the first sentence both of the versions manage to accurately portray what is meant in the original.

The second sentence has issues which are representative of the quality of the translation which will be visible in the following parts of the analysis and especially will have to do with the Serbian version. In the original it says that Luca Brasi was *one of the great blocks that supported the Don's power structure*. When an English speaker imagines a block he/she might have in mind a building material that supports weight but in BCS languages the connotation is not the same. The Montenegrin version of it is *stub* which is fully

⁴ Advisor or counselor to the boss, with the additional responsibility of representing the boss in important meetings both within the boss's crime family and with other crime families. (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1)

understandable by a native speaker since in a literal and a metaphorical sense a pillar would bear weight. The Serbian version translates it literally and part of the meaning is lost. But the bigger problem in this version is the literal translation of *power structure*. *Građevina moći* in BCS languages makes very little sense and it misses the true intention of the metaphor. It is obvious that the author refers to the crime organization, its strength and solidity but by translating the phrase literally one does not also translate the metaphor so the meaning is lost. The Montenegrin translator decided to stick to the safest route and use the phrase *moćna organizacija* which does not fully relate the metaphor but at least it keeps the full meaning of the English version.

In the last sentence, again the author turns to the great respect Italians gave to men with strong characters and the fact that in modern times, these men of honor and reliability are a rare breed. For this purpose the word *kind* should have a very close equivalent in the translation just to convey this staunch belief. The Serbian version adapts it well but the Montenegrin version lacks a close equivalent.

English:

“By Christ in heaven, is it possible that you spent so much time in my presence and turned out no better than this? A Hollywood finocchio who weeps and begs for pity? Who cries out like a woman— ‘What shall I do? Oh, what shall I do?’”(Puzo 1969,26)

Montenegrin:

“Tako mi Hrista spasitelja, zar je moguće da si poslije tolikog vremena povedenog uz mene postao ovakav? Holivudski finokio koji kuka i moli za milost. Cmizdriš i preklinješ poput kakve ženturače – ‘Šta da radim? O, šta da radim?’”(Bižić 2014,34)

Serbian:

“ Hriste na nebesima, zar je moguće da posle tolikog vremena provedenog u mom prisustvu nisi bolji od ovoga? Holivudski finocchio koji kuka i moli za milost? Koji slini poput žene – ‘Šta da radim? Oh šta da radim!’”(Dropulić 2012,35)

Again, the Serbian version shows an example of literal translation. Although one could make claims that the phrase *by Christ in heaven* is used in English language as an expression of

outrage, contempt or disgust but the two phrases in the beginning of the translated versions are very rarely heard. The Montenegrin version *tako mi Hrista spasitelja* fulfills the requirement in the sense that it is a phrase people use when they want to express outrage but the Serbian version *hriste na nebesima* is practically never used in these cases. The core of the issue is that it is translated literally and to a native speaker of Serbian or any other BCS language it would seem out of place.

Another smaller issue appears in the continuation of the sentence with the phrase *is it possible that you spent so much time in my presence and turned out no better than this*. The Don questions Johnny Fontane and scolds him for being a weak man. The emphasis is on the fact that Johnny Fontane had spent a lot of his childhood under the Don's tutorship and protection where he should have built up a strong character. The Montenegrin version incorporates this meaning fully with the phrase *zar je moguće da si poslije tolikog vremena povedenog uz mene postao ovakav* but the Serbian version again contains a literal translation *u mom prisustvu* and the full meaning which was supposed to be transferred from English and Serbian is somewhat lost.

Again, the differences in the spelling of foreign language words is visible in the word *finocchio*⁵.

The Don also mocks Johnny's crying and compares him to a woman: *A Hollywood finocchio who weeps and begs for pity? Who cries out like a woman*. These sentences show the Don's strong hatred for men who cannot handle their problems, who show emotion and fear. It is also a clear representation of the patriarchal values he is trying to instill in his sons and family. In his world, women are weak and men should not allow themselves to be hurt by a woman. Both versions manage to relay this implication quite well but the Montenegrin version uses another advantage of the BCS languages by employing the word *ženturača* referring to Johnny's weakness and feminine display of emotion.

⁵ A gay man. (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1)

English:

Sonny lit a cigar and took a shot of whiskey. Michael, bewildered, said. "What the hell does that fish mean?" It was Hagen the Irishman, the Consigliere, who answered him. "The fish means that Luca Brasi is sleeping on the bottom of the ocean," he said. "It's an old Sicilian message." (Puzo 1969, 69)

Montenegrin:

Soni pripali cigaretu i sasu čašicu viskija u grlo, a potpuno zbunjeni Majkl upita: "Ama kog đavola znači ta riba?" Odgovor dobi od Irca Hejgena, konsiljerea: "Riba znači da Luka Brazi spava na dnu okeana. To je stara sicilijanska poruka." (Bižić 2014, 76)

Serbian:

Soni zapali cigaru i nasu sebi viski. Majkl, potpuno zbunjen, upita: "Šta ta riba znači dođavola?" Odgovorio mu je Hejgen, Irac consigliere. "Riba znači da Luka spava na dnu okeana", reče. "To je stara sicilijanska poruka." (Dropulić 2012, 84)

Immediately another positive aspect of incorporating the qualities of BCS languages is visible in the use of aorist tense in the phrase *Soni pripali cigaretu i sasu čašicu viskija u grlo*. Both translations make good use of this tense which is slightly different than the perfect tense the speakers of English know.

The mistake made in the Montenegrin translation is with the translation of *cigar* with *cigareta* which is not one and the same. A cigar is a rolled bundle of tobacco leaves while a cigarette is shredded tobacco rolled in paper. This mistake is commonly made in translating this term since a more common everyday term for cigarette in BCS languages is *cigara*.

In the Serbian version it says *Soni zapali cigaru i nasu sebi viski* while in the original the whiskey was already poured into the glass and then Sonny drank it. This is also a slight error which appears to be typical in this translation.

In Michael's statement *What the hell does that fish mean?* The feeling of bewilderment and his spontaneity is crucial to represent in the translation. The Montenegrin version shows another

good example of using the advantages of the language by incorporating the interjection *ama* which by itself carries the nervousness and wonder Michael felt.

Chapter II

English:

Virgil “the Turk” Sollozzo was a powerfully built, medium-sized man of dark complexion who could have been taken for a true Turk. He had a scimitar of a nose and cruel black eyes. He also had an impressive dignity.(Puzo 1969,58)

Montenegrin:

Virdžil Soloco Turčin bio je stamenito građen čovjek srednje visine i tamnog ten, koji je zaista mogao da se izdaje za pravog Turčina. Imao je nos kriv poput jatagana, surove crne oči i veoma dostojanstveno držanje.(Bižić 2014, 64)

Serbian:

Virdžil Soloco "Turčin", bio je snažno građen čovek srednje visine i tamnog tena, i zaista bi mogao da prođe kao pravi Turčin. Imao je kukast nos i surove crne oči. Osim toga, bio je izuzetno dostojanstven.(Dropulić 2012,71)

In the first sentence, in both translations, one can immediately notice how the nickname “The Turk” was moved after the last name. This is a practice of both languages when writing nicknames together with real names. But when looking at Serbian and Montenegrin names there is also a practice of writing the nickname between the name and surname (e.g. Velimir Bata Živojinović, Danilo Bata Stojković or like in the previous arrangement: Stojanka Novaković Stoja, Jasna Milenković Jami). A better option than the two offered could have been: Virdžil Soloco zvan Turčin. This option represents how nicknames would often be introduced in these languages and removes any need for quotation marks.

By using the word *stamenito* the Montenegrin description has truly encompassed several of the character’s qualities in a single expression and once again, it represents how using some words of our mother tongues is an advantage in translation.

By the end of the sentence, in the Serbian version, the phrase *zaista bi mogao da prođe kao pravi Turčin* has a more concise translation of *who could have been taken for a true Turk* and it is often heard in this language domain so it is a better option.

The description of the character's nose contains a comparison with a curved sword and the Montenegrin translation has achieved a better proximity of meaning to the original by using this comparison and it fits in well stylistically.

Chapter IV

English:

“If they had gotten the old man, what would you have done?” Michael asked.

Sonny said very simply, “Sollozzo is dead meat. I don’t care what it costs. I don’t care if we have to fight all the five families in New York. The Tattaglia Family is going to be wiped out. I don’t care if we all go down together.”

Michael said softly, “That’s not how Pop would have played it.” (Puzo 1969, 78)

Montenegrin:

"A da su ipak sredili starog, šta bi ti učinio?" upita Majkl.

Soni bez razmišljanja reče: "Soloco je mrtav čovjek. Šta košta da košta. Nije mi važno ni hoću li zaraditi sa svih pet porodica Njujorka. Tatalje ćemo zbrisati sa lica zemlje, makar i mi propali s njima."

"Tata to ne bi tako učinio", tiho će Majkl.(Bižić 2014,84)

Serbian:

"Da su sredili starog, šta bi ti učinio?", upita ga Majkl.

Soni reče sasvim jednostavno: "Soloco je mrtav čovjek. Baš me briga po koju cijenu. Ne marim i ako treba da se borim protiv svih Pet Porodica Njujorka. Porodica Tatalja biće zbrisana. Baš me briga ako svi propadnemo s njom."

Majkl tiho reče: "Tata ne bi tako igrao." (Dropulić 2012,93)

The beginning sentence of the second paragraph serves as an introduction to the Sonny’s statement, it shows how angry, rash and determined Sonny was as a clear contrast to his father. Although the Montenegrin version is not a literal translation like the Serbian one is, it presents this idea of how the following line which Sonny says is not that well thought through.

Another very concise translation is *Šta košta da košta*, in the Montenegrin version. The conciseness of the statement shows Sonny's determination but also his carelessness. This does not mean that the Serbian translation is not precise but choosing an expression which is both concise and commonly used in these situations is what the Montenegrin version was better at to a degree in this case.

Translating *the five families in New York* with capital letters is a good option because it shows us how the world looks at these crime organizations as institutions of the mafia, especially from today's perspective.

Again, the Serbian version has a more accurate depiction of the war that Sonny, out of anger, plans to start. By using the passive in *Porodica Tatalja biće zbrisana* the Serbian version presents as it was intended in the original, as a large, bloody conflict which will undoubtedly take place and the reader can get the feeling that it will be similar to an unstoppable natural catastrophe.

Michael's statement in the end is an obvious comment on Sonny's character and it shows just how calm and tactical Michael is. The Serbian translator chose well when he used the term *igrao* comparing the war between the families with a game of chess but a needed adjustment is putting the expression into past perfect tense as it was intended thus *Tata to ne bi tako odigrao* would sound slightly better when spoken.

Chapter V

English:

Hagen said quickly, "OK, leave Freddie out. Leave him out of everything, absolutely everything. Now, Sonny, until this is all over I think you should stay in the house. I mean never leave it. You're safe here. Don't underrate Sollozzo, he's got to be a pezzonovante, a real.90 caliber. Is the hospital covered?" (Puzo 1969,80)

Montenegrin:

Dobro nećemo uplitati Fredija u ovo", hitro će Hejgen. "Držaćemo ga van svega, ama baš svega. Soni, mislim da ti ne bi smio izlaziti iz kuće dok se ovo ne okonča. Ovdje si bezbjedan. I nemoj da potcijeniš Soloca, on je pravi *pezonovante* krupnog kalibra. Je li bolnica pod nadzorom?" (Bižić 2014, 87)

Serbian:

Hejgen brzo reče: "U redu, ostavićemo Fredija na miru. Isključi ga iz svega, potpuno. Vidi, Soni, dok se ovo ne završi mislim da ne teba da izlaziš iz kuće. Mislim uopšte. Ovde si bezbedan. Ne potcenjuj Soloca, on je *pezonovante*, pravi kalibar 90. Je li bolnica pokrivena?" (Dropulić 2012, 98)

By reading the first sentence, the reader would get the impression that Sonny and Tom are leaving Sonny's brother out of this war because of their care and love for him. While that might be partially true, the following Tom's statement obviously shows they care much more for the family business and revenge. The Serbian version, with the expression *ostavićemo Fredija na miru* implies that they are leaving Freddy out for his own good but the impression that we get from the original is different. The sentence is cold and calculated, it shows just how Tom refers to this affairs, *just business*. He cares for the strength of the organizations and always looks at it from the business perspective.

In the second to last sentence, the Italian expression *pezzonovante*⁶ is another example of the two languages use different spelling of foreign words.

Pravi kalibar 90 is a very literal translation of the original and in Serbian it isn't used commonly so the reader might be confused regarding the metaphor. The Montenegrin version on the other hand keeps the "weapon" metaphor and uses an expression more widely used.

⁶ In Sicilian, literally means \$1.90. This term usually is applied to persons of importance, "big shots". (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1)

Chapter VIII

English:

One of the button men brought a bowl of spaghetti in from the kitchen and then some plates, forks and wine. They ate as they talked. Michael watched in amazement. He didn't eat and neither did Tom, but Sonny, Clemenza and Tessio dug in, mopping up sauce with crusts of bread. It was almost comical. They continued their discussion. (Puzo 1969,97)

Montenegrin:

Uto jedan od vojnika iz kuhinje donese veliku zdjelu špageta, a zatim i tanjire, viljuške i vino. Razgovor nastaviše za stolom. Majkl ih je zabezeknuto posmatrao. On nije jeo, nije ni Tom, ali Soni, Klemenca i Tesio halapljivo su navalili na hranu i nisu se zaustavili sve dok koricama hljeba nisu počistili posljednje tragove sosa. Bio je to gotovo smiješan prizor. Rasprava s nastavila. (Bižić 2014, 110)

Serbian:

Jedan od izvršilaca unese iz kuhinje činiju špageta, a zatim i tanjire, viljuške i vino. Uz jelo su razgovarali. Majkl ih je zapanjeno posmatrao. Nije jeo, kao ni Tom, ali Soni, Klemenca i Tesio navališe na hranu, umačući korice hleba u sos. Bilo je gotovo komično. Nastavili su raspravu. (Dropulić 2012, 115)

A *button man* is a hired killer. In the Mafia hierarchy they are soldiers, or the lowest rank. They are the ones that do the "dirty work" of a mafia family. (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1) The Montenegrin translation is factually correct, these men are cold soldiers but when translating this expression it is necessary to insert a footnote about an explanation because a reader who is not familiar with the hierarchy can become confused. One can argue that the Serbian translation is more understandable but also, in this case an explanation would clear any possible confusion.

The expression *halapljivo* in the Montenegrin version is well used, it paints a better picture of serious men who deal with serious issues and even at a time of turmoil they give food the necessary attention, just like the entire Italian culture puts food on a special pedestal.

The mistake which the Serbian translation makes is that the man would dip their bread in sauce, instead of that they actually used crusts of bread to wipe their plates as they had eaten all the food and the sauce was the only bit left.

The necessary translation of this scene needs to have comical elements as it is a slight time-out from the gloom and preparation for the war to come.

Chapter XI

English:

Sollozzo was no dummy and McCluskey was a very tough egg. He felt the ache in his wired jaw and welcomed the pain, it would keep him alert. (Puzo 1969, 124)

Montenegrin:

Soloco nije budala, a Meklaski je tvrd orah. U žicom povezanoj vilici osjeti bol i obradova mu se; on mu neće dati da se opusti. (Bižić 2014, 131)

Serbian:

Soloco nije budala, a Meklaski je vrlo tvrd orah. Osetio je bol u žicom povezanoj vilici i obradovao mu se; držaće mu pažnju budnom. (Dropulić 2012, 137)

The first sentence contains a good example of a translation of an idiomatic expression, in this case it is a character trait referring to a person that is hard to understand and in both translations it is very much it is very much close to the original meaning in both translations.

Another example of a literal translation is in the last part of the paragraph, in the Serbian version. The original directly refers to a level of awareness Michael needs to have but the translation is literal and loses all meaning in Serbian language since, in this sense personification of *attention* is never used.

Chapter XIV

English:

For the first time Vito Corleone spoke. His voice was reasonable, showed no anger. It was courteous, as befitted a young man speaking to an older man of Fanucci's eminence. He said softly, "My two friends have my share of the money, I'll have to speak to them." (Puzo 1969, 168)

Montenegrin:

Vito Korleone progovori po prvi put. Glas mu je bio razuman, u njemu se nije osećao gnjev. Bio je to uglađen glas, kakav priliči mladiću koji se obraća starijem čoveku Fanučijevog položaja. Blago reče: "Moj dio novca je kod moje dvojice prijatelja, moraću da razgovaram s njima." (Bižić 2014, 179)

Serbian:

Vito Korleone progovori po prvi put. Glas mu je bio razuman, nije pokazivao ni trunku gneva. Govorio je učtivo, kako i dolikuje mladiću koji se obraća starijem čoveku Fanučijevog ugleda. Rekao je tiho: "Moj deo novca je kod moje dvojice prijatelja. Moram da razgovaram s njima." (Dropulić 2012, 181)

In both translations of this paragraph, one can notice how the translator took different paths in their translation, and even though they chose different expressions they all meet at a singular meaning, intended with the original. The Montenegrin version uses the phrase *Glas mu je bio razuman, u njemu se nije osećao gnjev* while the Serbian version uses *Glas mu je bio razuman, nije pokazivao ni trunku gneva*. The phrases used are different but the reader will get the same idea. *Bio je to uglađen glas* and *Govorio je učtivo* are also good examples of this notion that even when the style of the translation differs, the end result can be the same.

Chapter XVI

English:

She was getting dressed up in the real New York City guinzo style that he hated. A silk flowered-pattern dress with belt, showy bracelet and earrings, flouncy sleeves. She looked twenty years older. "Where the hell are you going?" he asked. (Puzo 1969,201)

Montenegrin:

Počela je da se oblači kao prava njujorška Žabarka, što je mrzio. Svilena haljina sa cvjetnim dezenom sa pojasom, napadne minđuše i narukvica, naborani široki rukavi. Izgledala je dvadeset godina starije. "Kuda, dođavola ideš?" upita je. (Bižić 2014, 215)

Serbian:

Oblačila se po onoj žabarskoj njujorškoj gradskoj modi koju je toliko mrzeo. Svilena haljina na cvetove s pojasom, upadljiva narukvica, lepršavi rukavi. Izgledala je dvadeset godina starija. "Kud si pošla, do đavola?" upitao ju je. (Dropulić 2012, 238)

One of the tasks of a translator is to find appropriate equivalents when translating vulgar or slang words. Sometimes, the target language does not have a term that is fully compatible and a successful understanding of the word by the reader wholly depends on the translator's capability to find the closest possible equivalent. In the case of the first sentence of this paragraph there is the word *guinzo*. The term *guinzo or guinea* is a pejorative expression referring to Italians, it is found throughout this novel. Both of the translators chose the closest possible term *žabar*, (the true origin of the term is a mystery, most sources state that this refers to the Italian cuisine although the French are more famous than the Italians for their dishes containing frog meat). The Montenegrin translation spells it with a capital letter and it is a pejorative noun while in the case of the Serbian translation it is an adjective describing the style itself. Both versions display the character's hatred for that particular style but it is obvious that his dislike is also directed towards the particular culture and habits therefore one can argue that the Montenegrin translation achieves this to a slightly higher degree.

In the translation of the second sentence, the Serbian translator used a term which, when analyzed semantically does not make much sense: *Svilena haljina na cvetove*. Any speaker of

Serbian would know that this is referring to the pattern of the dress even if important sentence elements are missing. It is a good example of using everyday language in translation which would most probably be used in a similar context if the speaker was from this region.

Chapter XVIII

English:

On the embalming table was the bullet-smashed face of Sonny Corleone. The left eye drowned in blood had a star fracture in its lens. The bridge of his nose and left cheekbone were hammered into Pulp.

For one fraction of a second the Don put out his hand to support himself against Bonasera's body. "See how they have massacred my son," he said. (Puzo 1968, 219)

Montenegrin:

Na stolu za balzamovanje ugledao je metkom uništeno lice Sonija Korleonea. Lijevo oko je bilo rasprsnuto i natopljeno krvlju. Korijen nosa i lijevi obraz bili su potpuno smrskani.

Na dijelić sekunde Don se pridrža za Bonaseru. "Vidi kako su iskasapili mog sina", reče.(Bižić 2014, 234)

Serbian:

Na stolu za balsamovanje video je mecima smrskano lice Sonija Korleonea. Sočivo levog oka okruženog krvlju prslo je u vidu zvezde. Koren nosa i levi obraz bili su zgnječeni u kašu.

Na delić sekunde don Korleone se rukom oslonio na Bonaseru. "Vidi kako su iskasapili mog sina", rekao je.(Dropulić 2012, 256)

A single word within a translation can make a large difference in the reader's understanding of the literature work. Even if it does not make a large change the translator styles and their own understanding of the work can be differentiated from these small varieties in the translation. In the first sentence of these two versions we can differentiate between two single words: *uništeno* and *smrskano*. *Uništeno* does relay the necessary information about the state of the character's appearance but it is much more general than *smrskano*. After reading the Serbian term the reader will get a much clearer image that the writer imagined.

This contrast between the general and the particular in these translations continues in the next sentence. The Montenegrin version states what kind of wounds the character had but does not go into detail as the original did. On the other hand, the Serbian version includes a very literal

depiction, almost totally similar to the original. One can argue that both versions went a bit too far in different directions. A middle ground should have been found where the translation would not be too generalized and not too literal when translating the details. The same can be said for the last sentence in this paragraph.

Chapter XX

English:

“We made the peace this afternoon,” he said. “I gave my word and my honor and that should be enough for all of you. But our friends are not so trustworthy so let’s all be on our guard still. We don’t want any more nasty little surprises.”(Puzo 1969, 248)

Montenegrin:

"Ovog popodneva smo sklopili mir", rekao je. "Dao sam svoju riječ i uložio svoju čast i to bi trebalo da bude dovoljno za svakog od vas. Ali naši prijatelji nisu toliko pouzdani, pa zato svi i dalje treba da budemo na oprezu. Ne želimo više nikakva sitna gadna iznenađenja."(Bižić 2015, 268)

Serbian:

"Danas smo sklopili mir", rekao je. "Dao sam svoju reč i zakleo se svojom čašću da je to dovoljno za sve vas. Ali naši prijatelji nisu toliko časni, pa ćemo i dalje biti oprezni. Ne želimo nikakva neprijatna iznenađenja." (Dropulić 2012, 293)

In this excerpt Don Vito’s way of speaking is shown. In these sentences the reader will notice the solemn nature of his speech, his calmness in times of trouble and turmoil. These are the qualities that make men follow him and respect him. Certain phrases present here such as peace, honor, word, fiends are representative of his tactfulness and very good political strategy.

In the first sentence the reader can imagine him as a general that had signed a peace treaty to end a bloody conflict, remaining calm dignified. The *sklopili* is used in official peace treaties so it is a good decision to incorporate it. Also specifying the very time as did the Montenegrin translator (*Ovog popodneva*) shows that the peace did not come on its own but rather there was a time and a place where the Godfather achieved peace.

In the end the people who had killed his son and also brought him harm he still calls *friends*, obviously he understands their nature but does not show his fear or insecurity openly, he does not show any fear when talking about them and any further harm they would do to him or his family he degrades by calling them *surprises*. These elements are important to preserve in the text so the translators have made good choices by translating them literally.

Chapter XXIII

English:

Michael was installed as a guest in the home of a bachelor uncle of the capo-mafioso. The uncle, in his seventies, was also the doctor for the district. The capo-mafioso was a man in his late fifties named Don Tommasino and he operated as the gabbellotto for a huge estate belonging to one of Sicily's most noble families.(Puzo 1969, 271)

Montenegrin:

Majkl je smješten u kuću *kapo-mafiozovog* strica, kao gost. Ujak, neoženjena starina od sedamdeset godina, bio je mjesni ljekar. Sam *kapo-mafiozo*, don Tomazino, imao je pedesetak godina i radio kao *gabeloto* na velikom imanju u posjedu jedne od najjačih plemićkih porodica na Siciliji.(Bižić 2014, 297)

Serbian:

Majkl je smešten kao gost u kuću neoženjenog ujaka mesnog *capo-mafiosa*. Taj ujak, starac sedamdesetih godina, bio je takođe i oblasni lekar. *Capo-mafioso* bio je čovek od pedesetak godina, zvao se don Tomasino i radio je kao *gabelotto* na velikom imanju, vlasništvu jedne od najotmenijih sicilijanskih porodica.(Dropulić 2012, 323)

In the mafia hierarchy there are different names for the same positions. In the United States mafia, the term *caporegime*, or *capodecina* (which refer to the same position) is usually shortened to *capo*, in Sicily the same practice exists but another term which is used is *capo-mafiozo*. Again, this term like some previous ones should have been explained in the glossary of both books or at least a footnote with an explanation should have been written. The different expressions used can be confusing for the reader. One of the very important linguistic traits of this novel are Italian expressions, and as stated previously, a thorough understanding of them is necessary to implement them in the translation. This fact partially makes the translator's job easier because in order to retain this sentiment a translator should not even translate those terms. It is obvious that one of the devices the author uses to present

this element of the book are the various Italian expressions found in a novel written in English. It somewhat mimics the speech of Italian-Americans. One example in this case is *gabelotto*⁷.

⁷ The overseer of a large land estate. (Lost in Translation: "Godfather" Vocabulary, 1)

Chapter XXVII

English:

Greene laughed harshly. “You goddamn Dagos, I do you a favor and take Freddie in when you’re having a bad time and now you push me out. That’s what you think. I don’t get pushed out by nobody and I got friends that will back me up.”(Puzo 1969, 328)

Montenegrin:

Grin se osorno nasmija. "Smrdljivi Žabari, učinio sam vam uslugu i primio Freda kad ste bili u nevolji, a sad biste da me se otarasite. To ste mislili? Niko mene neće otjerati odavde. Moji prijatelji će me podržati."(Bižić 2014, 353)

Serbian:

Grin se oštro nasmeja. "Vi prokleti žabari, učinio sam vam uslugu i primio Fredija kad vam je išlo loše, a sada me izbacujete. To mislite. Neće mene niko izbaciti. Imam ja prijatelje koji će me podržati."(Dropulić 2012, 385)

Introducing the line spoken by the character by the first sentence of the excerpt is crucial. Mo Greene was angry when he spoke these lines to Don Michael but apart from that he shows his arrogance. He believed that his arrogance towards Michael is backed up by the strength of the crime families supporting him and he vastly underestimated Michael and his own crime organization. Therefore the Montenegrin version presents this picture by using the expression *osorno*. As previously discussed, big differences in the translation can be made by using only different single words and this a good example of how a single word gives a precise image of what the author meant in the original.

Another instance of how rich the vocabulary of the mafia is when it comes to insults or vulgarity is the word *dago*, it is another ethnic slur referring to Italians⁸. Again, *žabari* is really the closest option but this term was used in translation when translating *guinea* and *guinzo*. Unless an explanation exists specifying the term, more confusion may be created among the readers. Greene’s hatred towards Italians is also very well portrayed by the insult

⁸ Believed to be derived from employers hiring immigrants fresh off the ships and paying them as 'the day goes'; and sometimes Spaniards and the Portuguese derived from the common Spanish name Diego. (Lost in Translation: “Godfather” Vocabulary, 1)

before the derogative term *dagos*. *Goddamn* can be translated by any number of vulgar words in both versions. The Montenegrin version gives a more colorful insult and represents both the disgust and hatred Greene had towards them.

Chapter XXXII

English:

She had led across a meadow to a tree-shaded brook. Hagen sank down on the grass and sighed. He looked around, sighed again and said, "In this world you could do it. Kay said, "He's not the man I married."

Hagen laughed shortly. "If he were, he'd be dead now. You'd be a widow now. You'd have no problem." (Puzo 1969, 375)

Montenegrin:

Poveo ju je preko livade do potočića zaklonjenog drvećem. Hejgen sjede na travu i uzdahnu. Osvrnu se oko sebe, ponovo uzdahnu, pa reče: "U ovakvom svijetu bi to bilo moguće."

"Majkl više nije čovjek za kog sam se udala", reče Kej.

Hejgen se kratko nasmija. "Da je ostao takav, sada bi bio mrtav. A ti bi bila udovica. Ne bi imala ovaj problem." (Bižić 2014, 405)

Serbian:

Krenula je livadom do trostrukog slapa potoka. Hejgen sede na travu i uzdahnu. Osvrnuo se oko sebe, ponovno uzdahnu irekao: "U ovom svetu to bi bilo moguće."

Kej reče: "On više nije onaj za kog sam se udala."

Hejgen se kratko nasmeja. "Da jeste, do sada bi bio mrtav. Ti bi bila udovica. Ne bi imala nevolja." (Dropulić 2012, 441)

This excerpt was chosen because it contains a mistake in translation of low quality, a translation with minimal revision or none at all. In the first sentence there is the expression a *tree-shaded brook*, a brook shaded by a tree. In the Serbian version however, the brook has three waterfalls and there is no mention of a tree casting a shade on the brook. This mistake is either made in the case that the original was dictated to the translator as he was translating or it is a spelling error in the version the translator had. Whatever the case, these mistakes should be spotted and corrected in the revision of the translation.

In the last paragraph I believe the conciseness of Tom's dialogue should be preserved as it represent how he is able to show great intelligence in very little words. Therefore the Serbian version does a better job of that by keeping the sentences in Tom's dialogue as they were meant to be, as short as possible. A great example is: "*Da jeste, do sada bi bio mrtav. Ti bi bila udovica. Ne bi imala nevolja.*" Compared to the Serbian version, the conciseness of the expression carries more weight.

Conclusion

An overview of the quality of the translations

Attempting to navigate through the entirety of the translations of this novel and choose the most interesting paragraphs as a basis for analysis is a task that required a substantial amount of time spent reading and underlining. The knowledge about translation that a person starts out with when starting to do such an analysis is always built upon during this analysis. In the end, new knowledge is revealed and new skills adopted. It is clear that the overall quality of a translation depends on several factors and not only on finding equivalent phrases in a dictionary. The role of the translator is much greater than most readers can notice. A reader rarely has in mind that the novel he is reading is not actually the original but it is a translation, it was interpreted and rewritten by the translator. It went through the unique process every translator has when doing his/her job. This process involves taking the text from the author, putting it through the filter i.e. the translator and giving it to the recipient i.e. the reader. The process can either keep the original intention of the author fully or it can make changes to adapt it better to the culture and understanding of the recipient. Whatever the case, the original intention of the author has to be kept to some degree. Portraying this intention does not only depend on equivalence on a linguistic level. The translation has to rise above the linguistic level, it should be its foundation but, but as stated previously, the translator's knowledge has to include other domains in order to produce a quality translation. Nigel Armstrong touches upon this:

While a fully bilingual translator having a very good knowledge of the two cultures may arrive at translation solutions without formal instruction, less privileged individuals seem to require a theoretical training that depends on making explicit two crucial (and related) aspects of the two languages. These are the purely linguistic structures of the languages of interest, and the cultural aspects: by these latter is meant the twofold fact that languages both express a set of cultural practices that can differ quite considerably, and at the same time are conditioned by those practices, often in subtle ways that go beyond lexical items whose culture specificity is fairly easily apparent. (Armstrong 2005, 3)

When deciding on the quality of these particular translations, of course several factors have to be taken into consideration. The first one is of course the vocabulary and the linguistic

equivalence, the second one is the style of the translator and the third one is knowledge of the wider subject matter encompassed by the themes of this novel.

Any person reading this analysis will notice that emphasis is put on the translator's capability to employ words and phrases specific to the target language that can represent the original intention of the author but also implement some traits of the target language. Some examples being *bješe* and *ama*. Even though this is not a deciding factor for the quality of the translations it is a very appreciable detail that will show that the translator went beyond the scope of finding mere equivalents. In this respect the Montenegrin version showed better examples of such elements thus making the translation much more domestic while keeping the vibe of the original text intact.

The particular styles of these two translators vary to large degree. There is no doubt that both translators had a large task given to them. The scope of the vocabulary necessary to understand and translate this novel is not small in scope. Of course one needs to have in mind the style of the very author, the particular language used at the time of writing and the social environment in which the novel was written. Satisfying the previously mentioned first and the second factor requires particular translation skills which used in situations when a direct word equivalent cannot be found but a myriad of near equivalents exist. In that case a translator makes choices and needs to account for keeping both equivalence and satisfactory style, similar to the author's style. Susan Bassnett explains this very precisely:

Translation involves far more than replacement of lexical and grammatical items between languages and, as can be seen in the translation of idioms and metaphors, the process may involve discarding the basic linguistic elements of the SL text so as to achieve Popović's goal of 'expressive identity' between the SL and TL texts. But once the translator moves away from close linguistic equivalence, the problems of determining the exact nature of the level of equivalence aimed for begin to emerge. (Bassnett 2002, 34)

Both translations had a satisfactory level of equivalence, in some cases one prevailed over the other. But the question of maintaining style is the one which makes the Montenegrin version stand out again. Several times throughout the analysis it has been pointed out that the issue of literal translation plagues the Serbian version. Many examples could be named (*Pravi kalibar 90, jedan od velikih blokova koji su nosili Donovu građevinu moći...*) but it is perhaps the biggest failure of the Serbian version of the novel. In many cases confusing phrases are used

which make no sense in the Serbian language. In the beginning it was discussed how there are two main paths when translating a text: domestication and foreignisation. A translator needs to be very careful not to go too far by a single path, a middle ground has to be found where the text would be understandable to the target language readership but also keeping important elements of the source language. In the case of the Serbian version of this novel, incompetence of the translator and disregard for the quality of the translation was shown in parts of the text which also distort and tarnish the main idea of the work. This is very much representative of the status of quality translation in modern times. A large portion of the audience believes that machines and software can accomplish the tasks of humans. This will never be true for translation because the sheer thought capacity and knowledge needed to produce a quality translation will never be matched by a computer. Translation of art literature has a special place and carries a larger degree of difficulty because it requires a special level of creativity and such translations can even be considered separate works of literature by themselves.

To accomplish translation using the same number of expressions as the original and with such conciseness to achieve satisfactory equivalence is something that translators should strive for. A rich vocabulary makes possible to achieve quality translations with no need for descriptively translating certain phrases. Levy stresses this element:

As in all semiotic processes, translation has its Pragmatic dimension as well. Translation theory tends to be normative, to instruct translators on the OPTIMAL solution; actual translation work, however, is pragmatic; the translator resolves for that one of the possible solutions which promises a maximum of effect with a minimum of effort. That is to say, he intuitively resolves for the so-called MINIMAX STRATEGY. (Levy in Bassnett 2002, 44)

The last factor which needs to be discussed is the overall knowledge of the subject matter these translators have shown. Many literary texts are representative of a certain culture or subculture. In this case the mafia or Italian-Americans can be considered a subculture and therefore require a certain amount of knowledge. A discussion can be held on whether the Serbian and Montenegrin society of 1969 (when the novel was written) was familiar with the notion of the Italian-American mafia, their behavior, style of speech and other mannerisms. Some would argue their familiarity was minimal and only through movies and books of the following decades did those societies familiarize themselves with this subculture.

Nevertheless, a certain amount of research is needed when trying to represent them in translation. After completing the analysis, the conclusion is that both versions could have done more in bringing certain themes closer to the audience. A good decision was to leave the original spelling for certain Italian words used but neither one of the translations included footnotes or any explanation regarding these expressions. Some of them have more meanings and these meanings need to be explained to a readership that might have very little previous knowledge about this subculture which was most certainly the case at the time the book was published. Armstrong explains this:

If we had to define the purpose of text, we might suggest, as previously, that it is to provide entertainment of a sophisticated order. More precisely, the author is (among other things) playing a game using some of the sociolinguistic resources of English. If we pursue further the analogy of a game, we can state that sophisticated games presuppose a set of rules unfamiliar to some if not most potential readers.(Armstrong 2005,32)

In line with the Armstrong's analogy, in certain parts of these texts the translators are playing a game with the reader and the reader is not familiar with the rules because the translators failed to explain them. Having that in mind, in both texts, the original idea of the novel can be understood even if certain parts of it are confusing.

The very style of speech used by Italian-Americans is present both in the dialogue of the characters and mimicked by the narration. Using some Italian expressions in English dialogue is a trait the author implemented to paint a better picture of the subculture and leaving these Italian expressions or purposefully misspelling certain words to mimic the speech of the characters are tools used to present them as colorfully as possible. Both versions have managed to incorporate that element to a satisfying degree and the translators have shown sufficient knowledge of the subject matter.

Closing words

In conclusion, these two translations have definitely managed to correspond to an already existing audience. One can argue that a wide readership was almost guaranteed since this novel is very well known and has a cult following. Translating such an immense work of literature is an honor to any translator and special attention should be given to its quality since any mistake will be spotted very quickly and any dissatisfaction with the text will be shown by a large number of readers. These particular versions that have been the subject of this analysis have shown positive and negative sides. Literal translation or word-by-word translation can be very dangerous in this kind of literature and has tarnished the overall quality of the Serbian version, as stated previously. It is unfortunate that such errors are made by experienced and very well paid translators and it only represents the regard in which translation is generally held. Nevertheless, both versions just by being published by large publishers have their place on shelves of bookstores and libraries. Their quality will be judged by generations of readers of "The Godfather" and it is their judgment that should matter in the end. This paper has attempted to systematically analyze and overview these translations and assess their quality. It is the hope of the author of this paper that this was accomplished and that the analysis has been thorough.

Literature

- Puzo, Mario. The Godfather. G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1969
- Puzo, Mario. Kum. Nova knjiga. 2014
- Puzo, Mario. Kum. Laguna. 2012
- Bassnett, Susan. Translation Studies. Routledge. 2002
- Armstrong, Nigel. Translation, Linguistics, Culture: A French–English Handbook. Multilingual Matters Ltd.
- Baker, Mona. In Other Words. Routledge. 1992
- Lost in Translation: “Godfather” Vocabulary.
<https://www.portnet.org/cms/lib/NY01001023/Centricity/Domain/175/Godfather%20vocab.pdf>. Date visited: 25.5.2019.
- The Editors of Encyclopaedia Britannica. Mario Puzo: American author.
<https://www.britannica.com/biography/Mario-Puzo>. Date accessed: 23.5.2019.