

Linguistics (chapt. 1, 4, 5, 6)

Fundamental concepts of linguistics state: every language is complex, but also systematic, though the systematicity is not transparent to native speakers. It is very hard for native speakers to think or talk about their own language because they are not aware of the rules that specify that language. Speaking is also the primary mode of language, whereas writing is secondary. We can see that because children start speaking earlier than writing, which is not naturally acquired. To conclude, the main purpose of linguistics is to clarify differences and similarities among different languages. The study of linguistics does not require to learn how to speak different languages because it focuses on the scientific study of the phenomenon of human language in terms of structure and use. Knowing many languages, in fact, does not mean knowing ABOUT them. The word "phenomenon" is used to underline to reaffirm the notion of the larger issue of human language, which is a system composed by individual language being. Also important is "scientific" that leads to the scientific method, as it employ a scientific approach through languages. Linguists observe them and make hypothesis, then they will describe languages using laws. This system refers only to spoken languages, though written languages are part of a special definition.

It is not so easy to define a "language", in fact most people think that it is a way to communicate ideas, but that is not properly true when we consider statements that only conveys social functions such as greetings and sometimes the use of languages can go beyond the desire of communication. To sum up, we can otherwise describe a language stating that is the means to put thoughts into words. It is important to remark that the meanings can change according to the context and often people do not think exactly what they say. For instance, if X calls Y and ask if Z is there, the request is obviously to speak to Z, so the meaning goes beyond to the request of information.

The words in a language are SIGNS of our meaning and the meaning assigned to a certain word is arbitrary, that means that are not connection between the words WATER and AGUA, because if there was a link, every language would use the same words. When we talk about animal sound (onomatopoeia), they usually look alike because they are not completely arbitrary, in fact every animal sound the same regardless the language used. We cannot find a universal word that it the same in every language because that would mean that this word is a non-arbitrary sign and only the natural phenomenon can be non-arbitrary (fire provokes smoke). A system can work with arbitrariness thanks the fact that speakers follow many complicate rules unconsciously, especially referred to as grammar. This concept is the conformity at a morphological, syntactical and logical level and leads to the assumption that linguistics help people to speak properly, while it actually works describing how people speak, giving also a metalinguistic knowledge. Those rules can be in contrast with ideal rules, which are not used in an ideal world, even though they are very common in real conversation contexts. This distinction creates **PRESCRIPTIVISM** vs **DESCRIPTIVISM**. P. refers to the fact that someone believes in a list of rules that must be followed by speakers written before. Those who do not conform will use an incorrect structure. P. is not limited to the learning of foreign languages. Nevertheless, sometimes a particular rule can be confuted by examples that make that error sound correct. D. is surely used to learn the mother language, in fact nobody learnt it thanks to grammar. Descriptive grammar does not make distinction between correct and incorrect, but observe how people speak. This study involves also surveys where people must say if something sound good or bad. It is important to underline the fact that English people, for examples, are forced to follow some rules because by doing that they will be understood. There are also many rules that can change, in fact someone can perceive something wrong, another one right, due to that we do say that speakers do not share all the rules. In addition, the distinction between appropriate and inappropriate is considered more useful. There are also non-standard structures that cannot be used in formal context but are quite systematic. Finally, descriptive method will involve a type of scientific method, where you firstly need to observe the reality, hypothesise, test and then form your own idea.

When there was a movement that tried to normalise the usage of English during the 18th century, they published dictionaries and grammars to convey these ideas. The users saw these books as prescribers of use until the 19th century, when the attitudes towards languages changed and became descriptive.

A foreigner speaker's English can also be constructed by guessing or it might be influenced by the mother tongue, however, when the focus is on native speakers, we can realise how important is knowing how to speak the standard variety, which is accepted in formal context, even though the non-standard is not considered incorrect. If there are two versions of a statement, people usually think that the correct one is the one that is more familiar to them, so it could be very awkward to discover that the other one, which is not internalised, is the correct one. That explains the difficulties non-standards students have to deal with when they have to learn standard English.

If we concentrate on specific languages, we see that they share many principles (universals), even though they are different. These rules involve speech sounds (-ng at the beginning of a word is impossible in English), the formation of the words and sentences and so on. Obviously, the organisation can change but there is not a better system, it depends of the native language, in fact an English person will be considered English the most logical language, while someone that is unfamiliar could find it difficult. Another misconception is that linguistics can be considered useless for primary and secondary school teachers. Linguistics is required specially to understand in a conscious way what you previously do not know about a language. Language does not simply involve languages, but also any type of discipline, included Maths.

We can affirm that a certain culture can influence the context, which will surely influence the language. This last one is made up of many levels: phonetics and phonology (sounds in English), morphology (how words are constructed), syntax (how sentences, phrases and clauses are made), semantics (words, sentences, meaning) and pragmatics (the real use in the context). It is very important to underline the fact that the lower level will be contained in the following one, which is higher. Especially, we can build a rank scale and we will realise that a text consists of many sentences, a sentence of at least one clause, a clause of phrases, a phrase of words, words of morphemes and morphemes of phonemes. The scale specifically analyses the units, stretch of language that carries grammatical patterns, in this case they are arranged hierarchically.

Morphology is the study of word formation, the term comes from the Greek word *morphe* and it involves the division of words in categories based on form and function, the analysis English words by breaking them down according to their units of meaning and the study of the most common types of formation. Firstly, it is very important to define the word LEXEME: a single vocabulary item or dictionary entry which can show all of its variants (or morphosyntactically related forms). On the other hand, the morpheme is the smallest unit in morphological structure, representative of an abstract level, in fact, there is also the morph, which is its concrete representation as a grammatical unit. The word classes or parts of speech includes words that have the same behaviour, so classification is used to explain how these words included in a certain class work. In general, it is a descriptive observation that divides words into classes basing on their characteristics. The classification criteria used in this process can deeply change, however the two most important are FORM and FUNCTION. Talking about the function, it is easier to define it as its meaning. For instance, some words represent qualities, whereas other one physical objects. This definition is not so scientific, a more proper definition would focus on the grammatical function in a sentence, like if the word can describe or modify something. Focusing on the form, we will see that many words have many forms according to the role they play. The major classes have more members than the minor classes because they frequently accept new members when the language evolves. For this reason, they are also called OPEN CLASSES or NAVA.

Nouns are the most common, they are simply the words that can represent things, people or places. However, it can be problematic to define "thing", in fact we do not know if emotions, and the word emotion itself, can be considered thing. More scientific is the observation of the two possible forms in these category: 1)teacher→2)teachers, so a singular and a plural form. By doing this, we realise that every noun can be

marked for number using a suffix. Otherwise, we talk about inflection (a noun is modified to indicate a different meaning without creating a new word). This way is certainly more correct because it is based on empirical evidence, but sometimes that system cannot be applied, as we can see with “advice”. This words that do not fit the definition invoke a concept called SUBCATEGORISATION. It permits to subcategorised, in this case, this class, forming countable and uncountable nouns, which show different phenomena in terms of pluralisation. While the uncountable nouns do not pluralise, there are also many nouns that join the other class that do not use –s at all. Such words are irregular because they do not follow the same pattern, sometimes they can change the vowel in the singular form (goose → geese), others adding uncommon ending (child → children), while others simply do not change (deer → deer). We must consider other forms nouns can take, in fact, an uncountable noun like “oil” can be used with “-s”, which indicates possession. Referring to this last fact, it is important to include the concept of case: it refers to the relationship between words in a phrase, in fact it calls the grammatical function of a noun in a sentence. Consequently, we can add that words can be inflected by the case, especially possessive.

Verbs are also particularly familiar to people, they traditionally indicate action or state, but this definition is inadequate (“to hope” indicates neither of them/ “action” is a noun). We can indicate the forms that verbs can take: 1) walk as PRESENT TIME FRAME, 2) walked as PAST TIME FRAME, in particularly these time frames are generally referred to verb tenses, often they namely add –ed, but they can also be irregular and change the vowel (wrote), a consonant (made), make a unique change (bought) or do not change at all (put). Continuing with the other two columns, the first one adds –s to the present form due to a subject-verb agreement. The concept of person is less of obvious than number in nouns, in fact persons relate to the perspective of the speaker. If in Spanish we see that every person is different, in English there are only two forms: the one that adds –s (a third person singular suffix) for the third person singular subjects and the other one without –s for the other persons. The very last column (where it is added -ing) shows the aspect of the verb, in fact it does not illustrate a particular difference towards the subjects used or the tense. “Aspect” is defined as the internal time and, within each frame, we can refer to action in slightly different ways. Two phrases can refer to present, but using the last form we would talk about “progression”(expressed by the present participle form), the opposite is called “simple” and this one is less immediate but more regular. Another commonly used aspect is “perfect”: “walked” sound exactly the same as the version in the second column but, if it follows “have/s”, it cannot be the past tense inflection due to its usage in the present time frame. In this case, we must talk about past participle. To conclude, in English verbs can be inflected for tense, aspect, person and number.

Adjectives are also very common, but the most common definition (ad. can modify a noun) is grammatical instead of meaning-based. We must be able to distinguish adjectives and other words that can modify a noun anyway, like “a” in “a man”, which indicates a particular subject. Adjectives can also have different forms that convey a slightly different meaning. We can talk about COMPARATIVE when there is a comparison between two elements. In addition, there is a special suffix for this form that is –er. The form will be different when the comparison will be extended to a large group of people, in this case the form chosen will be the SUPERLATIVE with the suffix –est. If a word that can modify a certain noun can be modify thanks to these suffixes, it will surely be an adjective. Obviously, these statements are not always true: nastier is correct, while *unplesanter is not. In conclusion, adjectives can be inflected for comparison but there are adjectives that do not fit this definition.

Adverbs form the last of the major classes, however this category is hard to definite due to the heterogeneity of the members. For this reason, it is also called “garbage category” as a symbol of the fact that here we can find words that were not assigned to other classes. Adverbs perform a modifying function but they need to be subcategorised in order to understand in a better way their function. Sentence adverbs say something about the entire sentence, while adverbs like “very” are degree adverbs, in fact they indicate the degree of the word that follows. Adverb that describe a particular manner to do something are classified as manner

adverbs. Their overall functions are: modify sentences, other adverbs, verbs and adjectives. Describing the form is even more difficult: many of them end with -ly but that is not universally true, as the fact that not all the words that end like that are adverbs. Briefly, adverbs cannot be inflected for any grammatical meaning.

Minor classes contain fewer members, called function words, and they are generally not open, so they are also called closed classes. Due to the fact that only one of these can be described in terms of form, we will concentrate on pronouns. They are defined as words that substitute nouns, in particular that means that also pronouns can refer to people, places and things, as we said about nouns before. If some examples can support this idea. Also the case can be applied: the relationship is not between pronouns and nouns, but between the pronoun and the verb, in fact we use HE when it plays the role of subject, HIM if it's object, HIS in possessive case.

When we think about the structures of words, we must think about parts called morphemes that must be understood in order to understand the whole word. They are the minimal units of meaning in language, but they are obviously different from phonemes, which are units of sound that does not convey a sense if it is isolated. A morpheme contains a meaning itself, even though the meaning can dramatically change from a morpheme to another. The primary importance of the units of meaning allows changes in spelling (unworthiness derives from worthy). Returning to the point that the kinds of morphemes can have different meanings and different behaviours, specifically in terms of autonomy, position in the word and function (inflectional vs. derivational).

Due to these differences, we must firstly distinguish between free and bound morphemes: the first one can be used alone, while the second one must be attached at least to another morpheme. For example, choosing ACTIVATE, we can observe that ACT- can be used alone and it has a meaning itself, whereas IVE, ATE must follow something. Another difference is between lexical and grammatical morphemes. The first ones are defined as "real words" that means real objects, for this reason they are also called CONTENT MORPHEMES. As we said, "act" can be classified as a noun that has a meaning, the other two are grammatical for the same reason. Defining the meaning can be possible by looking for a synonym because that works only with lexical morphemes because the other type is better defined through the grammatical function (we can use "perform" instead of "act"/ "-ive" is for verbs). Sometimes the distinction does not appear so clear: most people can believe that "un-" is lexical because it can be substituted by "not" but is also true that its function is to alter the meaning of the word attached.

The next distinction is about root and affix morphemes: in the first case they behave like the roots of a tree, as they allow the construction of larger words from them. On the other hand, affix morphemes can be added to roots to create multiple combinations with different meanings, like they were the branches of the tree. Roots tend to be lexical and free, while affixes grammatical and bound. The first assumption can be considered wrong in case of "rejected" that is made up of three bound morphemes. Focusing on "ject", we must look for it in other words and only when we find it (for example in **project**) we can declare that is bound, even though it seemed the nearest to the concept of root, so we can call it bound root. This type is very different to recognise because they are not familiar in isolation, so it could be useful to investigate by looking to Latin or Greek. We learn that the etymology can be explain thanks to *jacere* (to throw).

The final distinction regards inflectional and derivational affixes, the first type does not create a new word when used because they simply change the form to convey a grammatical meaning, i.e -ed for past tenses. They are very limited in English and refer to noun: plural-s or -es, possessive -'s or -s', adjective: comparative -er and superlative -est, verb: 3rd p. singular, past tense -ed and irregular form, past participle aspect -ed, -en and present participle aspect -ing. On the other hand, derivational ones do create new words and sometimes the meaning can be completely different (**unhappy**), while other one can change the category the word made up of (**quickly**), thanks to these examples we can also see that there can be prefixes and suffixes depending on where this affix is attached. This second group contains more members than the other one

and they could also be very different, indeed we can substitute un- with “not”, but when they show in particularly a function, like “ly”, the definition could be hard to find. It is also important to underline that we identify the FUNCTION of a morpheme instead of its proper MEANING. Anyway, an important function is clearly COMPOSITIONALITY, which is particularly to suppose the meaning of a multi-morphemic or derived word from the morphemes it is made up of. There could also be exception like: “looker” (someone who is attractive), “recorder” (someone who records something) and “actor” (someone who plays a role)

The distinction between form and meaning can be very difficult to find, we realised that the word “cement” contains the same segment as “argument” but they does not necessarily share the same function. In “argument” we can distinguish the root “argue”, which is absent in “cement”, that means that in this case this word in an entire morpheme in its minimal state. The same thing can happen when two forms have different meanings, as we can say in gladly (adverb with adjective root) and friendly (adjective with noun root). Analysing the internal structures on words, being able to distinguish a root, we’ll obviously understand that we must think about a hierarchical structure of morphemes. In “friendly” we can see that the word is built around “friend”, that one will be the initial morpheme at the bottom of the structure, then we have to determinate which one of the other two will be the following. If we think about un-, we would have to realise that the stem (intermediate between root and complete structure) “unfriend” does not make sense because it is not a word, so this affix must be attached after -ly, creating an antonym of “friendly”, in fact “unfriendly” means the exact opposite. Using this view, it is understandable how far it could be from a linear structure. “Unhappiness” could be more difficult to define due to the fact that the two stems, happiness and unhappy, are both words. At this point, we must study how they behave: while un- works attaches either verbs or adjective roots and stems, -ness attaches only to adjectives roots and stems. If un- cannot attach to the nouns, and happiness is actually a noun, we must suppose that un- attaches to the adjective “happy” and then “-ness” can attach to the adjective root “unhappy”.

Learning new words does not always require learning new structures. Affixing and derivation are useful tools for creating new words, in fact someone can create an infinity number of words using a number X of affixes and Y of roots, by doing this the speaker can add words to his or her vocabulary. This is actually true for productive affixes that can be used in many words, like un-. Obviously, you learn the root that completely change meaning if it followed that prefix, so we can say that by doing so the language immediately double that part of the vocabulary. The developing of technology led many people to look for new words, this process involves web-users too: -ity that create “dubiosity”, -itude “hackitude”, -ful “screenful”, -fication “hackification” and so on. Even if often a suffix must be added in order to change category, it is unnecessary in case of “impact” (noun and verb without variations). However, if we can say correctly “impacted” we must remember that it was originally only a noun. When this phenomenon happens, we talk about functional shift or category extension, which was not so accepted by prescriptivists but now it is so popular that in many cases nobody remembers how a certain word was created. This is also called CONVERSION or “zero-derivation”, since the word is the same even though a new function was added. This process can be responsible for the change of stress in in the words involved, like “record” (the verb is stressed as *re*còrd, the word as rècord).

The semantic shift is very similar to functional shift, but here the variation or extension regards the meaning: i.e “doves and hawks” that are not just birds anymore but they can also refer to the military jargon, where the most violent are “hawks” while the diplomatic are “doves”(we notice an importance difference between the literal and figurative meaning). The literal meaning obviously leads to the figurative, in fact, in nature, hawks are more violent than doves.

In English we also find compounds, poly-morphemic words that have two free roots that are combined to form a single word, this process, which forms “bookstore” “bedroom”, is fairly extensively. Nonetheless, “motel” or “smog” are different, as only a part of these morphemes has been used: “motel” is a blend of “motor” and “hotel” and indicates a hotel near the motorway. The same thing happens to “smog” when it is

used the first part of “smoke” and the second part of “fog”. When they become very familiar, native speakers start perceive them as unique morphemes. There can be one-word compounds like “bittersweet”, hyphenated like “good tasting” or two words like “small talk”. There could be many combinations: NN as in bedroom, AN as in high school, PN as in overdose, VN in swearword, NA in headstrong, AA in red-hot, PA in underripe, NV in pan-fry, AV dry-clean, PV underfeed or VV in stirfry. In most cases, we use the RIGHT-HAND HEAD RULE to identify which is more important, as it behaves like the head; however, there also could be exceptions “bedroom”, i.e a word that does not reflect the rule, but also all the phrasal verbs. To conclude, there ENDOCENTRIC and EXOCENTRIC compounds, in the first case there is a head and the meaning is related to the words it is made up of, the second one is headless and not compositional (i.e “cold shoulder”).

Clipping or shortening can be found in standard and colloquial English and also in slangs: two clipped words can be combine like in “sci-fi”, there can be e- compounds (like “e-mail”) and they can also have suffixes, especially –y or –ie (it derives from Australian English and it has a diminutive function, so it can be used for proper names but also for other words like “selfie”). Another suffix quite used is –o (“journ-o”, “weird-o” and also “friend-o”, used when you want to scare someone). Others variants are made by reduplication like “bye-bye” (full) and zigzag (partial).

Borrowing from other language has been so prolific that 85% of words used a thousand years ago have disappeared, replaced by borrowed words. That phenomenon is continuing developing, as “macho” and “karate” were recently accepted. Even though they come from different cultures, today they can be considered English words as well. They obviously convey the same meaning they have in the original language and they were adopted not to create new words in English that would have been a synonym.

Acronyming is created by taking the initial of multi-word phrases, pronouncing them as a single word. A common example of an acronym is “scuba” (self-contained underwater breathing apparatus), FBI it is different from this example as the letter as spelled individually, like all the abbreviation. English people accept this type of formation to the point that they do not aware of the fact that “laser” is an acronym too. In “light amplified by stimulated emission of radiation”, not all the initial letters are included.

While the previous types of words creation require existing words, roots creation is different and it is also very common with brand names. “Kleenex” was initially used as a proper noun (names with unique referent) but now it is used as a common noun (non-names that have many referents), this happens when a proper name is so used by people to become intensively part of the vocabulary, so nobody remembers its origin.

As a result of the interaction phonology and morphology, it was created an area that includes both aspects called MORPHOPHONOLOGY. We know that phonemes are not generally pronounced in isolation, neither morphemes, which can be influenced by the neighbouring. This study combines word structures and sound systems, indeed, when morphemes are combined in multi-morphemic words, their sound can be modified. So, the phonetic representation of a single morpheme can vary from a word to another. The process where two mono-morphemic words are spoken consequently is very similar, because their sound change too. The existence of allomorphs in morphophonology reflects phonology and its allophone (*allo-* means other), so we can affirm that ALLOMORPHS are single units that can have more than a single pronunciation.

The analysis in this field involves the isolation of a morpheme, investigating and determining how many forms he has and then you can write a rule. When this phenomenon regards roots (so we talk about root allomorphy), we must focus on them eliminating bound morphemes, comparing the sound that the word has alone and when it is part of a multi-morphemic word: i.e “hymn” [him] becomes [himn] when attached to form “hymnody” [hymn/ədi]. Due to the fact the there are two phonetic realisations, this morpheme will have two allomorphes. Sometimes it can be not so obvious to determine which one is the basic form, so an analysis must be carried on: if [him] is the basic form that means that [himn] is produced when the basic form is followed by a sound, specifically a vowel, whereas In the second case [himn] is the basic form. In order to agree with the first option, we must suppose the existence of a rule that leads speakers to insert a morpheme

[n]. However, it does not make sense due to the **rule of insertion** (used to separate phonetical sounds that are quite similar). Here we can see that /m/ and the vowel the immediately follows are not similar at all, thus there is no need to separate them. The second option makes more sense thanks to the **rule of deletion**, which explain that speakers delete [n] to pronounce that word easily. That depends on some rules that vary from a language to another: languages do not allow all the combinations of sounds in a syllable. The couple [mn] in a coda contrasts the phonotactics, so speakers unconsciously delete it. That phenomenon is not necessary when [m] [n] are separated by a syllable boundary. Anyway, even though we alter its pronunciation when it is alone, we spell “hymn” the same way. Due to this point, we can explain odd spellings, like silent consonant at the end of the word.

Allomorphic variation with affixes is not so different: as we did before, we just have to look for the different form that a prefix or a suffix can show in different words separating multi-morphemic words. The prefix “In-/im-” is composed of the sound [ɪŋ] in “incomplete”, [ɪm] in “improbable”, [ɪn] in “independent”. To sum up, that prefix has three allomorphs. Now we must decide the name of the morpheme, choosing the one that fit in more situation: if [ɪŋ] is before a velar sound, [ɪm] before a bilabial, [ɪn] can be find before alveolar sound, labiodental and with the vowel sound [ə], so it must be the most representative. This variation is truly systematic; in fact, a general trend leads native speaker to use them correctly: the consonant of the prefix **assimilates** to the following sound due to a **rule of assimilation**, which leads the consonant in the prefix to share the same place of articulation of the sound that precedes.

To perform a correct analysis, we must be able to distinguish how many allomorphs a certain morpheme can take, and then to describe the conditions and the rules responsible of these variations. Specifically, you need to divide the morphemes focusing on the one you have to concentrate on. Secondly, write down all the forms it can take, determining also in which environments they appear; the one that will appear in more environments will be the basic form. Finally, determine phonological process, rule and condition that allows that transformation and formulate an explanation for the modifications of the basic morpheme. The most common types of rules are:

- 1) ASSIMILATION (a sound becomes more like a neighbouring sound)
- 2) INSERTION (sound inserted between two sounds in order to simplify the pronunciation, making all the sounds audible, or rather the ease of perception)
- 3) DELETION (a sound deletes to make the pronounce easier, or rather the ease of articulation)

When the allomorph and the basis have the same number of sounds, we must think about the assimilation, otherwise, there must be one of the other two phenomena.

This field is also very important when we concentrate on the **general rule types**, specifically analysing two rules: past tense and plural suffixes. To begin with past tense, believing that verbs are made past simple by adding –ed at the end can be misunderstood. We draw a boundary between the root verb and the past tense suffix comparing the uninflected form (present) with the inflected. In some verbs, like robbed, we simply add –d [rəb/d], in others –t, like raced [res/t], but actually some verbs add the syllable [əd]. In a verb like “boost” we must add a vowel, however, the syllable is unstressed and for this reason it will be represented by the schwa (boosted → [bʊst/əd]). In this situation, both a vowel and a consonant create the past tense. Here we can find systematic rules too: [d] → b, m, z, a, aw, e / [t] → k, s, ʃ / [əd] → d, t. The sound before than [əd] share the feature alveolar and stop, [t] follows allomorphs that share only voicelessness. To sum up, we hypothesise that [əd] and [t] involve a unique environment, namely one used with alveolar stops and the other voiceless consonant. Since the sounds before [d] do not share any feature, we must think that these allomorphs can go with voiced consonants and vowel, it involves two environments and it is for this reason the basic form. We also see that, while the present tense of a verb ends in an alveolar stop, we must add the schwa to distinguish the sounds, therefore they are both audible. On the other hand, verbs ending in voiceless consonant assimilate the following morpheme, which will be voiceless too. In the end, we can say that the rule that we simply add –ed is not completely wrong, that

works when we spelled verbs in past tense but it is too general for pronunciation. We also have to remember that this rule is followed only by regular verbs, i.e. “feed” will change the vowel instead of adding -ed.

We must evaluate also the rule that affirms that we must add -(e)s. Isolating the morphemes at the beginning, we can see that this principle is actually working, but we cannot study other possibility: if “notes” [not/s] ends in [s], “bees” [bi/z] ends in [z] and “blazes” [blez/əz] in [əz]. The next step is to determine which one is used in different situations: [s] → k, t, f / [z] → g, d, n, a, i, aw / [əz] → č, s, z. Before [s] there are voiceless consonants (except a particular type), so there will be the assimilation to the preceding sound. The sounds before [əd] do not seem to share features, but, in truth, here it is not important the articulation: we must focus on how we perceive them. The acoustic feature shared is a sort of “hissing” sound, so they will be called **sibilants** (the sibilant in the root will be divided by the sibilant in the root by the one in the plural morpheme using the schwa). The [z] follows both voiced consonants and vowels, so it is the most successful. The rule previously describe works as a spelling rule, in fact we do add -s or -es to regular nouns (the same thing as the regular verbs), otherwise they could show other types of change (“goose” → “geese”). In conclusion, we studied three level: the first one requires to deal with linguistic issue, the second one requires the study of the common processes of changes in the form, realising that they are almost the same in every language, then, the final level in which we learn two rules of inflectional morphophonology: the past tense and the plural.

Spelling is not so linked to pronunciation, in fact, we say that English is not so phonetic because we cannot predict how is word is spelled based on how it sounds. By the way, English is **very phonemic**, indeed this language does not make any distinction between the allophones of a phoneme. For this reason, we will use /t/ in “stop” and “top”, even though the sound varies. The same thing happens for these cases mentioned above, so there is no reason to change the spelling (the only exception are words that end in -e, so there is no need to add another -e when we have to form the past tense). This rule is less accurate for pluralisation: even though the allomorphs [z], [s] do not change the spelling, when [əz] must be added, there could be many problems. In fact, we do change the way we spell the word because we add an additional vowel letter.

Syntax involves larger units and it is specifically the study of the structure of a sentence. We will study in particular the form (the inflection the word classes could take) and the function (the meaning each word represent). For this reason, we have to add CO-OCCURRENCE features, they refer to the other kinds of worlds a given type of word can occur together with. Nonetheless, our functional definitions will be more grammatical than meaning-based. We'll namely revise word categories because, regardless of pronouns, minor classes cannot be inflected to indicate any meaning. The first type of members belonging to minor classes are **DETERMINERS**. They can indicate a specific referent with “my” or a general one with “a”. In particular, we can find subcategories, and the first one to be shown includes “the” and “a”: they are namely **ARTICLES**, which can be definitive, as in the first example, or indefinite, like “a”. **QUANTIFIERS** include “three”, “several”, “many” and so on, in order to suggest the quantity of the referent they modify, **DEMONSTRATIVES** show proximity and they are “this”, “that”. **PRONOMINAL DETERMINERS** include “my” and indicate possession of something. They are derived from pronouns, although their function is very different, we must also think that they are strongly relate to nouns, which appear immediately or shortly thereafter. **PREPOSITIONS** are also very important, but hard to define. They are not simply words that indicate location or direction, but they can also relate many elements in the same phrase, in fact “in” referring to something contained in something else, does not indicate a place. Thanks to many examples, we understand that also prepositions are linked to nouns. **AUXILIARIES** are better known as “helping verbs”, that imply a function of support. They help other verbs to express their meaning, however that can be false because many of them add very different shades: “might” express possibility, against “will” that express that something will be surely did in the future. These verbs are called **MODALS**,

which add tense and aspect. The assumption that auxiliaries must necessarily precede the main verb is not generally true, indeed, when we use “have” and “been”, only one directly precedes that. **CONJUNCTIONS** can hook up phrases, clauses and words, in fact it can conjoin two nouns, two adjectives, and two groups of words containing a verb and a subject each (clauses), which is different from a phrase, where words work together to convey a single message. That is very important, thus we consider a sentence ungrammatical when they are used to conjoin different word classes. We can find two different types of conjunction: coordinating (“and”, “or”) and subordinating (“but”).

Referring to the major classes, we notice that determiners work with nouns, which can play the role of object or subject in a phrase. Particularly, we see that the determiner is the first one, then it is followed by the adjective and together specify the noun. This analysis is very important because we can tell which one between the group of words is the noun, in fact it will be the word modified by the others. To conclude, there is also an important distinction to make: the single word that indicates the subject of the verb is known as SIMPLE SUBJECT, but we should define it as the head, in fact all the phrase (det+adj+noun or NP) is also the subject of the verb, specifically the COMPLETE SUBJECT. The next segment expresses what the speakers want to tell about the subject, that is the PREDICATE, due to the fact that the head of this phrase is a verb, that will be a VP. Verbs are for this reason a part of the predicate, even though they could form the only word of the segment. It is easy to distinguish the head, in fact we must treat it as the root of a word, it is namely the part of the phrase that contains most part of the information. At this point, we will talk about co-occurrence *requirements* and *possibilities*: a verb can follow an auxiliary, but it does not necessarily have to, the same thing for nouns that are not obliged to follow determiners or adjectives, so this is the co-occurrence POSSIBILITY. On the other hand, a determiner must be followed by a noun to be usable, otherwise it would be ungrammatical, this is REQUIREMENT. Adjectives are not always part of NP: when their function is PREDICATIVE, they are part of VP; otherwise, when they specify an aspect of the noun, they are called ATTRIBUTIVE. With regard to co-occurrence of adverbs, we can say that sentence and manner adverbs have quite flexible positions, degree adverbs are more fixed, they stay namely with the adjective they modify, especially in the immediately preceding position, so they move every time their word is replaced.

Returning to minor classes, if we correctly suppose that pronouns substitute nouns; that point will lead us to think that they behave the same way. That is obviously wrong, indeed pronouns cannot follow determiners and adjectives. In addition, they are inflected by case, while nouns stay the same regardless of their function in the sentence. To sum up, the co-occurrence feature of pronouns is that they cannot be used with the same words that nouns are. The last point that has to be underlined is the difference between modifiers that precede the element they are linked to (PRE-MODIFIERS) and modifiers that follow it (POST-MODIFIERS).

The first type of sentence to analyse are SIMPLE SENTENCES. They contain the essential components that a sentence needs (subject, predicate) and, according to the definition, “a sentence which contains the bare minimum and it is at its simplest form, is also an INDEPENDENT CLAUSE”, so a sentence that can stand alone. Not all sentences are simple; sometimes we can find sentences with two subjects and two verbs, which are equal due to the fact that both sentences could stand alone without the other one. They are COORDINATE SENTENCES, linked by a coordinating conjunction that does not create hierarchical structures. On the other hand, subordinating conjunctions combine sentences in a different way: we have a super-ordinate subject that will be the subject of the whole sentence, even though there is another one, supported by another verb. This subject will be buried or embedded, while the entire sentence, which is part of, will be subordinate. Due to subordinating conjunction, the sentence they precede will be dependent from the other one, so it will not stand alone and for this reason will not be considered as grammatical. Sentences with at least one dependent clause are called COMPLEX SENTENCES. In COMPLEX-COORDINATE SENTENCES, we can find both kinds of sentences. It is important to underline the main of

conjunction: the same sentence can stand alone if it is linked to “and”, while it loses its independency if it is linked to “because”. Sometimes that analysis can be not so spontaneous, so it could be useful a **movement test**: we know that subordinating conjunctions become part of the sentence, so if a dependent clause is replaced, for instance, at the beginning of the complex sentence, it will still make sense and we will see that they act like a single unit. Otherwise, if we try to replace a coordinate sentence with the conjunction it is linked to, we will realise that it not grammatical, so we must suppose that the conjunction is not part of the sentence.

In subordination, we can also distinguish different function these clauses have: they are ADVERBIAL if they modify the head verb of the phrase they are dependent to, answering a *how, when, where, why*. When a clause is introduced by “that” we have another type of information, in particular, it performs a nominal, as it were a noun, in fact it tells us *what*, thus it is a NOMINAL clause. That is obviously fixed as it substitutes an object NP. That could be confused because many people could find a sentence with a different order than the canonical a little bit awkward, but not incorrect. Moving this type of sentence could be useful to learn how to distinguish them from adverbial sentences, nominal ones can be actually moved, but you need to add something to render the sentence grammatical. Sentences introduced by “that” can be also ADJECTIVAL, their aim is very different, in fact they do not act as an object. They do modify a specific word like they were adjectives and for this reason they are strongly relate to the noun that they specify. Applying the movement test, we will aware of the fact that they are a single unit that cannot be apart. This last kind is very different from the others: firstly, it is not introduced by a conjunction and, secondly, the two sentences seem to have different structures, in fact the second one lacks a subject. Actually, that sentence has a subject: it is “that”, moreover, it substitutes the preceding subject (the one in the independent clause) performing as a pronoun. In conclusion, “that” has a nominal function and it is the relative pronoun that names this type after (adjectival clauses are also called relative). There can also be different pronouns, it depends on the subject it has to represent: while “that” is general and it fits in both cases, “which” refers to non-persons and “who” to persons. The last distinction depends on the verb, in particular, if it is finite (FINITE clauses where the verb will be finite) and if it the verb contained is non-finite, so if it is a participle, a gerund or an infinitive (NON-FINITE WORDS).

If you want to know the correct structure of English syntax, it is very important not to focus on single sentences, because the same error can be made in other situations. The most important aim is to formulate general rules that are universally true. First of all, we must say that sentences are made up CONSTITUENTS, units that can be define by their form and function. The basic constituents of a sentence are obviously NP and VP, which have heads, respectively a noun and a verb. The collaboration of NP and VP produces a higher level, the sentence, so the hierarchical structure is very important also in syntax. The hierarchy of the phrase is fundamental in case of AMBIGUOUS MEANING, i.e when a sentence could have more than a single interpretation. This hierarchy can be expressed using TREE DIAGRAMS: we find NP and VP at the same level, as they work together, in addition they are located below S, so we say that S directly dominates these levels. We can also find PREPOSITIONAL PHRASE and the other types analysed before, which perform different function in the sentence. In particular, we must concentrate on the different functions and the grammatical relation between NPs. We have alluded to case, but in this case we can distinguish a subject, which is the one does the action expressed by the verb. Linearly, the word that performs this role will be placed to the left of verbs and directly dominated by the sentence node. Another role is the direct object, which traditionally receives the action. That type is an NP dominated by VP and it is to the right of the verb linearly, rather than on the left. An NP can also not be related to the verb: when it is to the right of on preposition and it is directly dominated by a PP, it is called object of preposition. We can represent also complex sentences, dependent clauses are located under the DC node, which is dependent by VP. Substantially, it works together with the predicate and NP, for this reason they are at the same level. When there are coordinate clauses, it can be impossible to establish their level due to the fact that they are equally important. The result will be the construction with the sentences at the same

level, moreover, the conjunction will not follow the sentence it precedes. Sometimes, diagramming can be difficult due to their ambiguous structure. There can be more options and, by doing this, the diagram will change too: in fact, the way nodes dominate the levels below can be deeply modified according to these different interpretation...obviously they can be both true.

Now we must determine the function performing a meaning-based test: we have seen that elements that modify nouns are adjectival, on the other hand, it is adverbial if determine a verb. However, the most effective test is, as we saw with complete clauses, is the movement test, in particular we simply move the direct object to the subject in order to create a passive form. In this case the NP to the left of the verb is grammatical and also the logical direct object, that means that it receives the action. In active sentences we find the opposed situation: the grammatical subject is also the logical subject –the one that does the action. Grammatically, the direct object replaces the grammatical subject, then a form of the auxiliary “to be” is inserted and past participle inflected form of the main verb is used and finally the subject is moved to the end, embedded in a “by” PP. Passive sentences have not always the same structure, sometimes a PP can follows the direct object in order to render the sentence grammatical. If we use a fronting test that consists in moving the PP from the normal position to the front. If the sentence is ungrammatical, that means that PP is part of NP, so it behaves like an adjective. Otherwise, if it does not modify the noun, it can be easily moved, without altering the grammaticality.

Following the principles of phrase structure is very important to formulate grammatical sentences. Obviously, we must first describe rules:

<p>S= NP+VP or S= S+CC+S</p> <p>NP= (det)+(adj)+(PP)/(S) or Pro</p> <p>VP=(aux)+V+(NP)+(PP)+(DC)</p> <p>Adj</p> <p>PP=P+NP</p> <p>DC= SC+S</p>
--

Each language is different, so there must be different data to follow. Anyway, the most important thing to focus on while we have to face ungrammatical sentences is seeing which rules are not followed. We can try to correct them or concentrating on the verb: even though they belong to the same category, some verbs require additional material that other verbs do not need, that is possible by individuating **subcategories**. Observing that, for instance, “to put” works only if we add PP, while “to love” does not, we are led to formulate a theory called **subcategorization restriction**. The theory state that we can distinguish verbs from each other based on their complements.

The first subcategory analysed is the one of TRANSITIVE VERBS, which must be used with a direct object in order to work grammatically. The prefix trans- means “across” and that makes sense because the verb involves actions across the verb from the subject to the object. We can see that PP is optional, while NP is not, in fact it is mandatory. In addition, a predicate adjective cannot work with a transitive verb. The opposite is represented by INTRANSITIVE VERBS: there is no action across the verb from the subject to a direct object; actually, there cannot be a direct object at all. Here it is possible for a PP to be in the predicate, but there cannot be a predicative adjective. COMPLEX TRANSITIVE VERBS are transitive verbs with a complicating twist, which is the fact that they need also a PP. in these verbs, PPs are not optional, in fact, if they or the NP are missing, the sentence will be ungrammatical. In the end, the data tell us that

predicative data cannot be used. LINKING VERBS, finally, link two grammatical elements and work ONLY IF there is a predicative adjective and a subject. That makes sense, because if one of these is absent, the verb cannot work grammatically. We can also find a PP working together with the adjective, it can also be the only element in the PV, it can namely perform the same function. There are also a particular kind of verbs called LINKING VERBS REVISITED, which can have an NP in their predicate. Contrary to what we have seen, these verbs allow the possibility to rename a subject, linking it with other elements in the predicate, called **complements**. We can establish a new relation between subjects and this element called subject complement. The final point is that, as we saw in morphology, there are not a single point of view: "run" can be intransitive ("I run to school every day") but also transitive when it means "to manage" ("he runs that industry"), so it can be a good decision to observe carefully the behaviour of all the words.

Up to this moment, we will deal not only with DECLARATIVE SENTENCES (meaning statements), but also with INTERROGATIVE SENTENCES, which have different structure. If we have to face sentences that begin with an auxiliary, and that contrasts the phrase structure rule, we will call them **non-canonical**. They are grammatical, though they do not fit the regular structure. When a sentence begins with the word "what", we must discover which type of class it belongs to, maybe trying to substitute that with other words, each of which is an NP. If we remember that words that substitute NP are pronouns, we must think that it is an INTERROGATIVE PRONOUN; by the way, we have not explained the reason why is it (and also the auxiliary before the subject) in that position yet. Another ambiguous thing is the fact that PP is without required object. As the previous one, does not conform to English structure, is it, therefore, non-canonical. If a sentence begins with "why" we can hypothesise that it do not substitutes a single word: we can think about a dependent clause that answer to the question. Substantially, we call all the constituents that substitute entire sentences PRO FORMS, in particular that would be a pro-DC. According to the canonical structure, a dependent sentence embedded within the predicate, so it cannot be placed in the initial position, and that is why it violates the regular order.

Now we must explain how it could be possible to solve these contradictions: linguists have created a **theory of transformations**, which specifically states that these sentences simply have been transformed from canonical to non-canonical. This type seems not to follow the rules, but we know that we modify an unspoken canonical structure that only exists at a deep level. The result will be a grammatical sentence at a surface level, so we will explain the fact stating that they are different versions of a same sentence, by doing that, we will admit that the non-canonical sentences really do follow the rules. The opposed process, which leads members of the sentence to return to their original position, causes a flip-flopping of subject and auxiliary known as **subject-auxiliary inversion**. That last process confirms that theory of transformation does surely work, but now we must determine if the change is systematic and can be applied in all the sentences that show the same characteristics. First of all, we must understand which type of interrogative question we have to deal with; in particular, we must notice if you can answer "yes" or "no", then we will obtain a **yes/no question**. In this case, the auxiliary and the subject NP simply change place at a surface level; essentially, it is the subject that changes place with the auxiliary. While in some sentences there must be several words as subjects, in others there could be a single word. **Information question** cannot be resolved only thanks to these rules, the process involving them is called **wh-movement**, which requires the substitution of the interrogative pronoun with the subject of the auxiliary, while the pronoun will be the last word of the sentence. Not all non-canonical sentences are interrogative, we have also seen the different structure of relative clauses. If "that" performs as the verb of the clause, the structure is considered canonical, but there could be situations where that word is not the subject, but the direct object or the object of a preposition. The most important thing when you have to undo the transformation is to identify which one is the correct answer, and then we can replace every constituent. We can finally state that, if "that" is the subject, there will not be movements inside the clause, otherwise, it will be necessarily replaced –indeed, there will be the PP dominated by VP node.

Now we will analyse English vocabulary, in particular their involvement in semantics and meaning: VOCABULARY indicates the group made up of all the words a particular person knows or uses, but the term can also use all the words that exist in a language. On the other hand, the DICTIONARY is a concrete book that contains a list of words in alphabet order, it explains their meaning or gives a word for them in other languages. The second contradiction is between LEXIS (all the words in a language) and LEXICON (a list of words that can be used in a particular language or subject). The vocabulary of English according to the OED 1933 can be literary (which can be scientific or foreign), common (technical or dialectical) and colloquial understand that is not possible to find a point at which English language stops. In syntax, we refer to LEXICAL DENSITY when there is an higher proportion of content words vs. functional words

We define sign as a relation between a form and a meaning and that is true, but there are also different situations: when two different forms correspond to a single meaning, we have SYNONYMY, when a single form correspond to different meanings, we will have HOMONYMY and POLYSEMY. Polysemy refers to two words that have common origin and relatedness, so we have a word with multiple referents (like mole, crane). Homonymy refers to two words that share the same form (sound and spelling) but there is no relation between them (race, bank, seal). For instance, "mole" indicates a growth in human skin but also a small insectivorous mammals which lives underground, a machine used for tunnelling through rocks and a spy that works against his or her own government or organization. An example of homonymy is race, which indicates a genealogical line or a group of people classified together, a breed of strain BUT ALSO a completion of speed. Another example is "seal", which can be a verb (to certify, to close hermetically) or part of phrasal verbs (*seal off*, close tightly), a designer or emblem itself, which exclusively belongs to his owner, a device that joins two systems but also an aquatic carnivorous mammal. To conclude, "bank" can be a business establishment BUT ALSO a piled-up mass or, if used as verb, to amass or to cover. The idea is very simple to understand: in polysemy we have two words with a related meaning (in fact a "summit" is the top of the mountain but also a conference of leaders), homonymy is more ambiguous, as the meaning are not relatable. HOMOGRAPHY is another phenomenon, which links two different words spelled in the same way. Returning to synonym, we can make a distinction between loose and strict synonym, loose synonyms are two words, which meaning is slightly different, varying in formality, degree of specification, word combination and so on. We also have ANTONYMY, which refers to the opposed meaning of a particular word ("kind" as antonym of "selfish").

There could be situations in which translation and meaning relations can be missed up: in particular, false friends and equivalence in translation from a language to another ("sensible/sensible" "actually" which can be used differently). We must also be able to use English across different register, so by using different register (FORMAL when there is distance in terms of age, social status or degree of familiarity, INFORMAL when there is low or no distance between the speakers). Words, rhythm and syntactic structures used reflects a particular field in which the conversation takes place, as in a courtroom ("objection" and "sustained" as opposed to "agree, disagree"), in legal language (where the passive form is very strong) and even when you have to speak to a doctor. By doing this, we can distinguish between FORMAL ("repair"), NEUTRAL ("mend") and INFORMAL ("fix"), the usage of phrasal verbs also leads to a less formal statement and the same thing happens for abbreviations: "it's not a prob" / "I'll be back ASAP". On the other hand, slangs are informal items that have not reached wide acceptance to be labelled colloquial, in fact, it is defined as language at its most informal, many people consider it ungrammatical and sometimes rude. It is often used within a small social group thanks to its cryptic nature and its sense of belonging. It is very fluent and changes fast and adds concreteness, enriches the language, reduces cliché and seriousness and promotes difference.

In UK: **bent as a nine-bob note** (dishonesty referring to nine-shilling note)/**blinding** (excellence)/**angry-bargy** (argument or confutation)

In US: **knock** (speak negatively)/ **hyped** (exciting)/ **Monday morning quarterback** (to criticize someone after-fact-with the advantage of hindsight)

In Ireland: **craic** (a good time)/ **she's peeled** (broken object)/**foddered** (eaten)

In Australia: **ace!** (good!)/ **arvo** (afternoon)/ **amber fluid** (beer)/ **she'll be apples** (it'll be alright)

To conclude, formal words regard, as we said, formal context where there is a certain distance between speakers, they can also involve specialized fields and their derivation can be classical: they can have a Latin or Greek origin, like "Occident", "Orient", "carnivore", "herbivore" and "decease".

COLLOCATION is defined as the phenomenon in which two words frequently occurring together (we say "strong tea", not "powerful tea"). They are blurred boundaries between compounds and collocations and collocation and idioms, in fact they have PREDICTABILITY in common. They can be made by ADJ+ADJ (completely satisfied), ADJ+N (excruciating pain), N+N (surge of anger), N+V (commit suicide), V+ Expression w/t P (burst into tears), V+ ADV (wave frantically). It is important to underline the fact that, even though we can find a particular collocation in a language, we do not have necessarily the same group for that referent in other one. A literal collocation can be wrong in this case, therefore, every language has its own rules ("fumatore accanito" is not the literal translation of "heavy smoker", "make a decision", "make a difference" are "prendere una decisione" and "fare la differenza", so the verb is not the same).

Binomials are a type of collocation where two elements are connected through a linker, there are usually words with opposed meaning ("black and white") or similar meaning ("fit and well"). We can distinguish between: perfect match (life and death), partial match (fit and well), term inversion (black and white). When you translate the term, there can be a single term preserved ("sick and tired" becomes "stanco"). **Idioms** are pre-constructed, whose meaning differs from the combined meaning of their single components. They vary in transparency, that means that their meaning can be partly derived from the literal meaning of the individual words in them ("make up mind" means "make a decision" and it is very transparent, "kick the bucket" is less transparent and means "to die"). Idioms differ from collocation due to their higher fixedness and lower transparency, however, their level of IDEOMATICITY can be different from an expression to another.

Some examples: he's just crying wolf, play our cards, under the weather [no equivalent idiom in Italian: **don't pull all your eggs in a basket**, difference in form: **kick the bucket** 'tirare le cuoia', same form and meaning: **devil's advocate**].

The term "World Englishes" was coined in 1978, research was pioneered in the 1980's by Kachru, a Kashmiri linguist. In *Standards, Codification and Sociolinguistic Realism: The English Language in the outer circle* (1985), he presented the theory of three circles, which represent how English has spread around the world, the patterns of acquisition for non-native speakers and the patterns of English use. The **Inner circle** represent countries where English is the native language, so it includes UK, US, Ireland, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The **outer circle** includes post-colonial countries in which English played an important role in education system, even though it is not the primary language. The group includes India, Pakistan, Singapore, Nigeria and more than 50 other countries and territories. The **expanding circle** includes countries in which English plays an important role in society, here it is taught as a foreign language, often for business communication. We can find Russia, China, Japan and many others. The language in countries involved in the inner circle can vary: we have words that reflect cultural differences: "Ivy league" and "Groundhog Day" for US, "value added tax" for UK, other difference are: "apartment", "cookie", "elevator" in British English, "flat", "biscuit" and "lift" in American English. The spelling of some words also changes, we see that -ou- in UK becomes -o- in US ("colour", "color"), -tre becomes -ter ("theatre", "theater"), -nce becomes -nse ("defence", "defense"), -elled, elling become -eled, ("travelled", "traveled"). Referring to the relation between BrE/AmE and World English, the AmE word is in WE: *can, eraser, French fries and zero*, BrE word in WE: *curtain, autumn, queue, tap*, both: *administration-government, antenna-aerial, baggage-luggage, sweater- jumper*. We also have words that have different meaning in their variety like "public school" wa (expensive school in England, school supported by American government thanks to taxes), or "flyover" (a bridge that carries a road, while "flyover countries" are lands which many people only see when they fly over them). Others words were added in English vocabulary when Brits landed in America, discovering new animals and plant unnamed. They borrowed terms from Native Americans, like "loon", "squash" and

“moose”, however, we can say that generally many words have different origins due to historical reasons, the most important origins are: ANGLO-SAXON, FRENCH-LATIN, SCANDINAVIAN and words FROM COLONIES. German tribes, as Anglo-Saxon and Jutes, which settled in, replaced the Romans. The Anglo-Saxon vocab created terms like “house”, “werewolf”, “woman” and the day of the week, named in honour of their gods, except of Sunday, Saturday and Monday. Along came Vikings, which gave English around 2000 words, as well the phrase “watch out for that man with the enormous axe”. In 1066, William the Conqueror invades Britain, bringing there the French language and Doomsday book. French, in particular, was *de rigueur* for official business (“jury”, “justice”), while Latin was used in Church. In addition, “cow” and “sheep” comes from English farmers, “beef” and “mutton” derive from French, instead. The bonhomie all ended with the beginning of the HUNDRED YEARS WAR AGAINST FRANCE, which lasted 116 years and was very important for the consolidation of English.

From the Caribbean come from “barbecue” and “cannibal”, from India “yoga”, from Africa “voodoo”, from Australia “nugget” and “boomerang”. English vocabulary was characterised by a deep change with the developing of internet, so many neologisms were coined though a process called COINAGE. However, there was also the necessity to make the message more short and immediate, so “in my humble opinion” became IMHO, “by the way” BTW, LOL can be both “laugh out loud” and “lots of love”. We can also find EPONYMS (words named after a person or a place), WORDS BORN BY MISTAKE, which were created by a process of reinterpretation of word form and spelling, like “sparrow-grass” that derives from “asparagus” and LINGUISTIC RECYCLING, which provokes the developing of new meanings of old words. Neologism are “nylon”, which is a material, or “google(-ing)”, we talk about eponyms with “kleenex” named after the mostcommon brand, “hoover”, which is a particular vacuum, while linguistic recycling involves words like “window”, “mouse”, “bug”, “virus”, which lead to technological field. The last important aspect happened when English was deeply influenced by Italian, the two languages were blended and the result was a group of words containing “orrait” (allright), “carta” (official document).

The last topic regards the main translation strategy: LITERAL (word by word), SUBSTITUTION (replacing elements), REDUCTION (eliminating elements), EXPLICATION (adding elements), other distinctions regard DOMESTICATION and FOREIGNIZATION. In the first type, the translator tries to bring a text closer to the receiving or target language and culture, perhaps by changing some elements, otherwise, by applying “foreignization”, a text is left closer to the starting language.