|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quotations**  Original version (pg 70) | **Quotations**  *Italian translation* | Comparative analysis |
| “We had flown first class... I was served champagne.” | “Avevamo volato in prima classe... A farmi servire champagne.” | The reader can find out again that in the Italian form there is no subject, but from the  conjugation of the verb it is easy to understand that the subject is the first plural person. Interesting is to notice that both the verbs in the original version and the Italian one are in past perfect. Another relevant thing is that in Italian it is used the preposition "in" before the word "prima classe". The second propositions are different between the two forms: in the original language the speaker got champagne served, it implies that he did not ask for it but the hostess just give it to him, while in the Italian phrases is underline the fact that he asked for champagne, he wanted to be served. Another interesting thing the reader should look at is the different time of the English and the Italian verbs, while in the original sentence it is used the past perfect, the Italian form used the simple present. |
| Reason for choice: The quotation provides an example of the two realities where Changez lives, the luxury of the America compared to his modest origins. | |
| **Analysis**:  This phrases is used from Changez to describe his job-trip to Philippines, he was very proud about his economical situation, about his appearance like a rich young businessman. He tells his interlocutor that his coworkers and him flown first class, smoothing that he had never experienced before, and that he got champagne served, as any rich, elegant and sophisticate man. The intelligent reader can understand the the prefer to behave like an American, he refuse his Pakistan identity. | |
| **Possible conclusion:**  The original quotations uses words in an extremely elegant way, while in the Italian version the speaking is more direct. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quotations**  Original version (pg 71) | **Quotations**  *Italian translation* | Comparative analysis |
| “Unlike anything I had seen in Pakistan” | “Diversi da qualunque cosa avessi mai visto in Pakistan” | The intelligent reader should understand that in the two forms there are different words with different meaning: in the original one there is the word "unlike" that is an adjective that implies that something is not similar or equal to something else. In the Italian form the is the word "diversi" that is an adjective to identify something different and diverse. Interesting is also to notice that while America uses just one word "anything" in the Italian version, to say the same thing there we three words "da qualunque cosa". The original version uses the verb in the past perfect "had seen" while the Italian version uses the verb in the conditional "avessi visto", in addiction the Italian form uses the expression "Mai" to empathize the meaning of the sentence. |
| Reason for choice: The quotation implies the poorness of Pakistan compared to others countries as America and Philippines | |
| **Analysis**:  It is interesting to notice that Changez describes the county of Philippines as something he has never seen in Pakistan, he compares the two cities of Manila and Lahore and finds out that even Manila is richer and thecnological than Lahore. He felt ashamed for Lahore's condition. | |
| **Possible conclusion:**  The two forms have the same meaning, also is they used a differet way to convey it. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quotations**  Original version (pg 72) | **Quotations**  *Italian translation* | Comparative analysis |
| “and I learned to answer, when asked where I was from, that I was from New York” | “e imparai a rispondere, quando qualcuno mi chiedeva di dov’ero, che ero di New York” | Again in the Italian form there is no subject because it is tacit, both the original form and the Italian one used the verb "to answer" as a direct complement with the infinitive form. In both the sentence there is the use of  the temporal adjective "when". Interesting is to notice that in the original form there is the use of the verb "asked" while in the Italian version there is the use of the expression "mi chiedeva". Relevant is in the Italian form the use of the pronoun "qualcuno". Different is also the composition of the following phrases "where I was from" that is translated not in a literal way  as "di dov'ero". |
| Reason for choice: The quotation presents Changez behavior, his shame for his identity. | |
| **Analysis**:  The sentence is told by Changez when he told the interlocutor about his trip to Manila, he felt ashamed about his native country, so he began to answer that he was from New York, trying to hide his real identity. He did not want others to recognize him as someone coming from a poor and unimproved country. | |
| **Possible conclusion:**  In the original version the reader can feel more the feeling that Changez has for New York; the Italian form is more objective and detached. | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quotations**  Original version (pg 77) | **Quotations**  *Italian translation* | Comparative analysis |
| “I did not grow up in poverty. But I did grow up with a poor boy’s sense of *longin*g, in my case not for what my family had never had but for what we had had and lost.” | “Non sono cresciuto in povertà. Però sono cresciuto con lo stesso *senso di struggimento* di un bambino povero, nel mio caso non per ciò che la mia famiglia non aveva avuto, ma per ciò che aveva perso.” | It is interesting to notise that while the first sentence did not change the syntax, the second one starts with the conjunction “but” (“però”), introducing a problem and producing curiosity into the reader’s mind. Moreover, in the Italian version the subject is omitted while in the original quotation the subject is explicated. Another thing that comes to the reader’s mind is the word “longing”, wrote in cursive: the writer would highlight this word to make in evidence its importance; the same thing is made in the Italian quotation, where is highlighted the sentence “senso di struggimento”. Just from this example is clear to notice that the original version is more direct than the Italian one, for the reason why with just one word it clearly explains the meaning. Another interesting thing, is that in English, the complement of specification can be used before the object’s complement thanks to the genitive. This gives you more direct informations. In addition, the intelligent reader in the last can notice that while in the original version the subject is “we” (intended as Changez and his family), in the Italian version is “my family” ( as Changez family without him). |
| Reason for choice: The quotation provides an example of two different points of view (the differences between when you had never had something and when you had had and lost it). | |
| **Analysis**:  Changez is talking. The sense of longing could be felt by two different causes: by what you had never had or by what you had lost. Changez is comparing two different points of view and makes the reader turn his/her point of view. Indeed, he felt the sense of longing not for what his family had never had but for what he had had and lost. I think is much stronger the sorrow of something that you had lost than something you had never had; because to lose something it’s harder than have never had it. You can accept the lack of something but you cannot accept the loss of something; moreover if that something was important for you. | |
| **Possible conclusion:**  The original quotations gives more direct informations to the reader, and it presents a more clear meaning (it goes straight to the point). | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Quotations**  Original version (pg 80) | **Quotations**  *Italian translation* | Comparative analysis |
| “I was not at war with America. Far from it: I was the product of an American university; I was erning a lucrative American salary; I was infatuated with an American woman.” | “Io non ero in guerra con gli Stati Uniti. Anzi, ero il prodotto di un’università americana; stavo guadagnando un lucroso salario americano; ero infatuato di una donna americana.” | Just from the first sentence, it is possible to notice that in the original language it is used the word “America” not “USA” like in the Italian version. America is something bigger than USA; it is a continent. But it is interesting to notice how in the Italian culture United States are the most representatives of the continent, that can resume all the culture of the continent (by the reason that United States are a multicultural country). They are not proper the same things, so this difference highlights the detachment of the two cultures. So, I think that if the reader wants better understand the real meaning, he should read the American-English version, because it explains the wright meaning by the vision of the American/Pakistani culture. Moreover, the second sentence starts with “far from it”, that underlines a separation from the first point of view. On the other hand, the Italian version starts with a simple conjuction “anzi”, that it does not adds nothing new. Then Changez makes a list of what America offered to him. By the list the intelligent reader notice that the syntax is quite the same in both the quotations. A difference is the omitted subjects in the Italian one. |
| Reason for choice: The quotation provides the main theme of the chapter: Changez’s vision of America that it does not concern with American’s vision of him. | |
| **Analysis**:  In the quotation, Changez wants to highlight his gratitude to America: he makes a list of what America offered to him. He denies to be in war with America (thought of Americans, by the reason of his provenience, after the twin tower’s attack). He loves America, he feels American. From the quotation it is possible to understand the importance Changez gives to America, by the breathless repeating of the word “America”, following all the things and possibilities America offered to him. | |
| **Possible conclusion:**  The two quotations produce a different effect. I think that if the reader is interested to understand better the real meaning of the story, he should read the book in the original language. Small particulars make the difference. | |