



### Chief Editor

**Dr. A. Singaraj**, M.A., M.Phil., Ph.D.

### Editor

**Mrs.M.Josephin Immaculate Ruba**

### Editorial Advisors

1. Dr.Yi-Lin Yu, Ph. D  
Associate Professor,  
Department of Advertising & Public Relations,  
Fu Jen Catholic University,  
Taipei, Taiwan.
2. Dr.G. Badri Narayanan, PhD,  
Research Economist,  
Center for Global Trade Analysis,  
Purdue University,  
West Lafayette,  
Indiana, USA.
3. Dr. Gajendra Naidu.J., M.Com, LL.M., M.B.A., PhD. MHRM  
Professor & Head,  
Faculty of Finance, Botho University,  
Gaborone Campus, Botho Education Park,  
Kgale, Gaborone, Botswana.
4. Dr. Ahmed Sebihi  
Associate Professor  
Islamic Culture and Social Sciences (ICSS),  
Department of General Education (DGE),  
Gulf Medical University (GMU), UAE.
5. Dr. Pradeep Kumar Choudhury,  
Assistant Professor,  
Institute for Studies in Industrial Development,  
An ICSSR Research Institute,  
New Delhi- 110070.India.
6. Dr. Sumita Bharat Goyal  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Commerce,  
Central University of Rajasthan,  
Bandar Sindri, Dist-Ajmer,  
Rajasthan, India
7. Dr. C. Muniyandi, M.Sc., M. Phil., Ph. D,  
Assistant Professor,  
Department of Econometrics,  
School of Economics,  
Madurai Kamaraj University,  
Madurai-625021, Tamil Nadu, India.
8. Dr. B. Ravi Kumar,  
Assistant Professor  
Department of GBEH,  
Sree Vidyanikethan Engineering College,  
A.Rangampet, Tirupati,  
Andhra Pradesh, India
9. Dr. Gyanendra Awasthi, M.Sc., Ph.D., NET  
Associate Professor & HOD  
Department of Biochemistry,  
Dolphin (PG) Institute of Biomedical & Natural Sciences,  
Dehradun, Uttarakhand, India.
10. Dr. D.K. Awasthi, M.SC., Ph.D.  
Associate Professor  
Department of Chemistry, Sri J.N.P.G. College,  
Charbagh, Lucknow,  
Uttar Pradesh. India

ISSN (Online) : 2455 - 3662  
SJIF Impact Factor :3.967

EPRA International Journal of  
**Multidisciplinary  
Research**

Monthly Peer Reviewed & Indexed  
International Online Journal

**Volume: 3 Issue: 2 February 2017**



**Published By :**  
**EPRA Journals**

**CC License**





## NIDA'S FIVE PRINCIPLES IN MORPHOLOGY

**M.Vinothini<sup>1</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Nadar Saraswathi College of Arts and science,  
Affiliated to Mother Teresa Women's University,  
Kodaikanal)Vadaputhupatti, Annanji (PO),  
Theni-625 531, Tamil Nadu, India

**Ramya.R<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>2</sup>Nadar Saraswathi College of Arts and science,  
Affiliated to Mother Teresa Women's University,  
Kodaikanal)Vadaputhupatti, Annanji (PO),  
Theni-625 531, Tamil Nadu, India

### ABSTRACT

*Language was considered as the most important and well known tool for communication. Linguistics plays a vital role for the development of a language. Linguistics was defined as scientific study of language which consists of four branches one among that was Morphology. Morphology deals with a very basic level of linguistics analysis and language description. This journal was mainly dealing with the "Nida's five principles in morphology".*

**KEYWORDS:** communication, Morphology, linguistics, doer

### INTRODUCTION

*"Language is not an abstract construction of the learned or of dictionary makers, but is something arising out of the works, needs, ties, joys, affections, taste of long generations of humanity and has its base broad and low close to the ground".*

*-Walt Whiteman*

Language was considered as one of the most important means of communication. And linguistics plays a vital role for the development of a language.

There are mainly four branches in linguistics and they are, **phonology, morphology, semantics, and syntax** and each of them have their own function for the development of a language.

### MORPHOLOGY

Morphology deals with a very basic level of linguistic analysis and language description. The branch deals with construction of grammatical word-forms, and word-formation, in a given language and languages in general, which occur in actual utterances. Thus morphology was the branch, which deals with internal structure of word-form those occur in actual utterance. The basic unit, which

constitutes a word-form, was “**morpheme**”. There are certain levels of linguistics analysis, *grammatical word-form, word-formation, utterance.*

### **NIDA’S PRINCIPLES**

There are five principles according to Nida, which one may apply in isolating and identifying morphemes. None of the principles was complete in itself; each was supplementary to the basic definition and was considered so.

#### **NIDA’S I PRINCIPLE**

*“Forms which have common semantic distinctiveness and an identical phonemic form in their entire occurrence constitute a single morpheme”.*

#### **MEANING**

It means that such a form as –er added to verb in such construction as worker, dancer, runner, walker etc., was a morpheme. It has always been the same phonetic-form, and always has essentially the same meaning, namely, that of the doer of the action (called ‘a genitive’). In English, there was another suffixal morpheme with the form –er, that is, the –er in comparative adjectives such as wider, broader, smaller, deeper etc.

But there was no longer common semantic distinctiveness (i.e. , identical in meaning) in the series of suffixal forms occurring in worker, dancer, runner, wider, broader and smaller. Despite, therefore, an identity of form, we may distinguish two morphemes on the basis of meaning. So, if a form (containing one phoneme or a number of phonemes) conveys the same meaning in its entire occurrence constitute a single morpheme.

#### **NIDA’S II PRINCIPLE**

*“Forms which have a common semantic distinctiveness but which differ in phonemic form (i.e. the phonemes or order of the phonemes) may constitute a morpheme provided the distribution of formal difference is phonologically definable”.*

#### **MEANING**

Nida’s II principle may first seem difficult to understand, but really it was quite simple. It means that one should discover forms with some common semantics distinctiveness but with different phonemes, one can still put these various forms together as a single morpheme if provided one can discover phonological condition which ‘govern’ the occurrence of such phonologically different forms. In English, for example, one negative prefix has more than a single form. Compare the words *intolerable* and *impossible*. The forms **in-** and **im-** bear a partial phonetic-semantic resemblance and the positions in which they occur are determined by the type of consonant following. Before alveolar sound such as t and d, the alveolar nasal n occurs e.g. intangible,

indecent. Before a bilabial sound such as p, the bilabial nasal occurs e.g. impracticable, impersonal. One may say that the form of the word to which the prefix was added “determines” the forms of the prefix. This was just another way of saying that the distribution i.e., positions of occurrence of in- and im- can be defined by the phonological characteristics of the form with which they occur.

#### **NIDA’S III PRINCIPLE**

*“Form which have semantic distinctiveness but which differ in phonemic form in such a way that their distribution cannot be phonologically defined constitute a single morpheme if the forms are in complementary distribution in accordance with the following restrictions:*

- *Occurrence in the same structural series has precedence over occurrence in different structural series in the determination of morphemic status.*
- *Complementary distribution in different structural series constitute a basis for combining possible allomorphs into one morpheme only if there different also occurs in these different structural series a morpheme which belongs to the same distribution class as the allomorphic series in question and which itself has only one allomorph or phonologically defined allomorphs.*
- *Immediate tactical environment have precedence over non-immediate tactical environments in determining morphemic status.*
- *Contrast in identical distribution environment may be treated as sub morphemic if the difference in meaning or the allomorphs reflected the distribution of the forms.*

#### **MEANING**

1. More than one form with different phonemic shapes conveying the same meaning and whose distribution cannot be phonologically explainable can be grouped under a single morpheme provided their distribution was morphologically definable.
2. ‘Common semantics distinctiveness’ means here ‘identical in meaning’.
3. But which differ in phonemic form in such a way that their distribution cannot be phonologically defined meant that the difference of form cannot be treated under principle II, whereby one reconcile such formal contrasts by determining the phonological distribution.
4. ‘Complementary distribution’ means that differences of form are paralleled by

difference of distribution. For example, let one assume that a morpheme has three allomorphs 1,2,3 and that these allomorphs occur with stems A through J in such a way that not more than one allomorph ever occurs with a single stem, e.g., A1, B1, C3, D2, E1, F3, G2, H1, I3, J2. In accordance with these type of distribution with types of distribution with steams A through J.

5. "Same structure series" in restriction 1, identifies a series of forms, which are structurally related, both by contrast with other series and by virtue of their having certain common features. One may say that in English, the forms **roses, boys, lips, oxen, and sheep** belongs to the same structural series. The formational elements of the plural are not identical, but this series contrast with all other series in English and exhibits the common features of which had singular nouns as steams and plural formatives consisting of a single allomorphic series.
6. In order to understand the meaning of restriction 2, one may consider a purely hypothetical problem involving the following sets of pronoun.

#### **NIAD'S IV PRINCIPLE**

*"An overt formal difference in a structural series constitute a morpheme if in any member of such a series; the overt formal difference and zero structural difference are not only significant features of distinguishing a minimal unit of phonetics-semantics distinctiveness".*

#### **MEANING**

'An overt formal difference' means a contrast, which was indicated by differences in phonemes or in the order of phonemes. A number of a structural series may occur with a zero structural difference and an overt formal difference.

#### **NIAD'S V PRINCIPLE**

Homophonous forms are identifiable as the same or different morphemes on the basis of the following conditions.

1. Homophonous forms with distinctly different meanings constitute different morphemes.
2. Homophonous forms with related meaning constitute a single morpheme if the meaning classes are paralleled by distribution differences, but they constitute multiple morphemes if the meaning classes are not paralleled by distributional differences.

#### **CONCLUSION**

This journal which was mainly dealing with semantic distinctiveness but which differ in phonemic form in such a way that, their distribution cannot be phonologically defined and whose complementary status can be morphologically predictable. And also this journal was having the aspects that one can learn to construct and account for a zero structural difference which will enable one to recognize under lying morpheme, learned how to extract morphemes if the homophonous nature of the phonemic shapes was misleading one to identify the morphemes.

#### **REFERENCE**

1. [www.language.com](http://www.language.com)