International Journal of Language and Literary Studies
Volume 6, Issue 3, 2024
Homepage : http://ijlls.org/index.php/ijlls

Five Models Used in Contrastive Semantics: A Comprehensive Synthesis and Analysis

Ly Ngoc Toan
Department of Legal Foreign Languages -- HCM University of Law
lntoan@hcmulaw.edu.vn

DOI: http://doi.org/ 10.36892/ijlls.v6i3.1883
APA Citation: Toan,L.N. (2024). Five Models Used in Contrastive Semantics: A Comprehensive Synthesis and Analysis. *International Journal of Language and Literary Studies.* 6(3).491-503. http://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v6i3.1883

Received: *27/08/2024*

Accepted: *02/10/2024*

Keywords: *Contrastive Semantics, Semantic Theories, Conceptual Structures, Language Universals.*

Abstract

The present study aims to assess and contrast five different approaches in the field of contrastive semantics: natural semantic metalanguage (NSM), conceptual metaphor theory (CMT), frame semantics (FC), semantic field theory (SFT), and cognitive grammar (CG). The research is set to review the available literature on the described techniques in order to focus on their distinguishing characteristics, practical applications, and illustrative samples. The findings reveal that these five models do play an insightful role when it comes to analyzing and comparing synonymous and semantically related profiles across distinct languages. Relations of semantic elements are the core concern of NSM while CMT investigates the internal schemata of the mind. As opposed to cognitive frame analysis, where knowledge structures are the central object of study, in SFT are language units grouped according to their meaning, while CG sees no separation of grammatical and meaning structures. This paper expounds on how these frameworks fill the gaps left by each of them and offers a broader understanding of the ways words encode meaning and how speakers of different cultures think about the world. Moreover, this study augments the knowledge regarding the variations of languages and gives an understanding of how languages relate to cognition, culture, and how people think about the world through words.

1. Introduction

1.1.Background on Contrastive Semantics

With the rise of contrastive semantics in the second half of the 20th century, one notes an interest in how meaning is represented and realized in different languages. This area of study has changed in the course of its history considerably, which corresponds to general changes in linguistics.

Lado (1957) reveals that the essential elements in the systematic cross-linguistic comparison were highlighted; particularly, attention was paid to semiotics and ethnoculture in addition to grammar. The 1960s and 1970s witnessed Nida's (1975) componential analysis, which was crucial for disassembling a given complex meaning, embracing anthropological linguistic discourses, like Goodenough (1956).

However, the 1980s were described as a cognitive turn due to Lakoff and Johnson's conceptual metaphor theory, which proposed that abstract concepts are regarded in terms of concrete domains. At the same time, Wierzbicka presented the natural semantic metalanguage theory, which posited the existence of universal semantic primes.

More developments were made in the field, such as Fillmore's (1982) frame semantics and Langacker's (1987) cognitive grammar, which changed the view over meaning and structuralism once again. These competing theories generated a controversy mostly concerning semantic universals and the relationship between language and thought.

As of now, the area contains elements of corpus linguistics and its psycholinguistic as well as computational branches that further address translation, teaching foreign languages, intercultural communication and processing natural languages.

1.2. Importance of contrastive semantics

One of the most effective methods that can assist in developing the field of human comprehension, language invariants, as well as cultural diversity, is to compare semantic structures in different languages. In the same work, Wierzbicka (1996) says that studying the semantics of various languages brings to light both basic concepts that every culture has, as well as meanings that are only associated with a given culture within the context of a language.

From a practical perspective, understanding semantic differences is essential for effective translation and intercultural communication. Baker (2011) emphasizes that awareness of semantic nuances helps translators navigate the challenges of conveying meaning across linguistic and cultural boundaries, ensuring more accurate and culturally sensitive translations.

Thus, there is also an important need for further development of comparative semantic studies in the sphere of foreign language teaching or learning. The evidence that Levinson (2003) provides indicates that knowing the structure of a language that defines spatial relations differently could be beneficial for second language acquisition strategies or even pedagogy.

Within the scope of cross-linguistic semantic analysis, it is also impossible to overlook the problems of natural language processing and artificial intelligence. It helps in creating more advanced machine translation techniques as well as helps in improving the body of knowledge used in developing language-independent AI systems more competent in comprehending and processing human languages.

Moreover, even semantic structure comparison produces valuable insights into a speaker's worldview and thinking patterns, thus increasing cross-cultural understanding and collaboration. The highlights also promote conservation and record keeping of language diversity, especially those that are endangered, by drawing attention to aspects of meaning that may not otherwise be of value.

1.3. Thesis statement: The five models to be analyzed

This study critically examines and compares five influential models in contrastive semantics. Each model offers a unique perspective on how meaning is structured and expressed across languages. By analyzing their key features, applications, and limitations, we aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of current approaches to cross-linguistic semantic analysis. This comparison will illuminate the complementary nature of these models and their collective contribution to our understanding of semantic structures across diverse languages and cultures. The study will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, offering insights into their practical applications in linguistic research and language education.

2. Literature review

2.1. Natural semantic metalanguage (NSM)

Natural semantic metalanguage, invented by Wierzbicka (1996), opens a new horizon for comparative semantics. The basic idea of NSM is honed down to about 65 semantic primes: *I*, *you*, *want*, *do*, *good* and *bad* and other universal concepts that exist in all languages (Goddard, 2000). Such a paradigm alters the understanding of complete language relativity, reframing the situation quite the contrary: there is a semantic core, although it is diluted, into many different languages.

In the case of this particular type of linguistics, the NSM is operationalized in three steps: (i) lexical - retrieving the common semantic primes of the studied languages; (ii) semantic - breaking down the polyedes into the basic elements; and (iii) cultural - performing a semantic analysis of the different languages. This viewpoint creates a stereotypical perception of how the language package of thought differs from other languages. For example, abstract terms such as freedom may differ from

one culture to another in ways that are not immediately apparent, yet come to a consensus in the overall meaning (Wierzbicka, 1996).

That is to say, NSM cuts across geographical boundaries while introducing a language for proper thinking about major things in every language. This allows for better accuracy in certain comparisons made in comparative semantics as well as studies of cross-cultural communication. What is more, the use of NSM provides leeway from the culturally heavy language, resulting in a neutral evaluation of cultural and language aspects.

In addition to that, NSM is useful as it also proposes a scheme on how the meanings of several languages can be weighed. Such researchers can chart how the languages hold particular cultural constructs and how some of these constructs have been desemanticized (Goddard, 2002). The method is useful for cross-cultural concepts and cross-cultural emotions in their exploration.

Through the fundamental principles of NSM, the notion of semantics is looked at with fresh eyes. This has enhanced considerable progress in research on language typology, language acquisition, and intercultural communication. All in all, NSM to a great extent is a useful tool for a contrastive linguist who focuses on exploring the relationships of language, brain, and culture.

2.2.Conceptual metaphor theory (CMT)

The conceptual metaphor theory, as introduced by Lakoff and Johnson (1980, attempts to explain the cognitive understanding of abstract notions in a much easier and more widespread manner. Within the theory of critical contrastive linguistics, CMT presents itself as a very eloquent tool for emphasizing the reasons for the existence of metaphors within different languages and cultures. This method has proven to be effective in revealing general cognitive schemas and culture-specific conceptual schemas.

Apart from CMT, existing literature in contrastive linguistics rests on the classification of three principle aspects of metaphor, namely: (i) metaphor analysis involving two or more or within a single language; (ii) use of metaphor-cherished and unique in/for a particular culture; and (iii) bodily experience and how it changes the meta conceptual understanding of various linguistic backgrounds. Answering these questions enables researchers to investigate the complex relationships between language, thought, and culture.

Focusing on contrastive linguistics and applying CMT, researchers have discovered how different societies tend to form some abstract notions. For example, the concept of time, which is often characterized by the common understanding of the metaphor TIME IS MONEY, can be different among nations. While a particular society may consider time as a commodity that can be consumed or used up, another may think of time in terms of a trip and refer to going time. This illustrates the influence of culture and environment in shaping speakers' cognitive and linguistic functions.

As for the methodological issues, CMT employed in contrastive linguistics is also organized around a coherent sequence of activities involving four basic steps: (i) discovering metaphorical usages in more than one language; (ii) ordering these usages under general metaphors; (iii) evaluating the structural and functional mechanisms of the ordering of particular metaphorical usages in different languages; and (iv) explaining the findings culturally and cognitively. This methodology encompasses a corpus-based approach, ethnography, and cross-linguistic studies, thus covering both the breadth and depth of metaphors used in language.

With this systematic approach, CMT can present contrastive linguistics as an effective way to expose universal principles and their particular linguistic encasements. Expanding on this understanding deepens the insights of the interrelationship of language, thought, and culture as well as the cognitive aspects of language diversity. Supporting the understanding of how people think and how people understand culture through language, CMT helps bring some towards much-needed brain

in linguistic research and is practically useful in understanding variation in culture and language at the end of modern linguistics.

2.3. Frame semantics (FS)

Frame semantics, which was developed by Fillmore (1982), is a vigorous theory and concrete scientific method in the domain of contrastive linguistics. It seeks to understand the relationship between words and the conceptual structures internally known as frames, which can be defined as arrangements of interrelated mental representation elements that provide the conceptual structure for a certain meaning or message. Within the contrastive linguistics framework, FS is very helpful as it reveals the structural organization of meaning within the languages and primarily brings out their interdependence and interconnectedness as regards language, thought, and culture.

The FS theoretical model in the contrastive perspective analysis consists of the following stages: (i) noting that concepts associated with words are framed in conceptual structures; (ii) locating mainframes in languages that denote concepts they denote in other languages (conceptual consensus); (iii) focusing on the distribution of these frames in different languages and the explanation of such distributions in terms of culture and cognition; (iv) identifying lexical units that do not have equivalent concepts in any particular language; and (v) studying how culture and spatial setting affect the organization of frames. This theoretical approach will make it possible to see the interaction of different semantic features without distorting the nature of the content of languages.

With the aid of FS, contrastive linguistics is able to identify previously neglected semantic meanings and interpret culture-dependent notions. This method is especially suitable for exposing the cultural and ecological factors and cognitive patterns that affect the usage and understanding of language in diverse cultures. Not only does FS take into consideration looking at a word in isolation and looking for a similar word in another language, but it also looks for entire frames. This in turn assists in explaining how different ways of encoding information are associated with different languages and explains language from the perspective of cognition and culture development.

In its application for contrastive reconciliation, FS in linguistics takes several stages in its succession: (i) searches for equivalent frames or mapping frames in the other language or languages, which goes beyond mere language understanding, but the comprehension of the culture underlying the languages being compared; (ii) analyzing in detail frame elements of a given language; examining what words, phrases, and grammatic structures are used to express the concepts within the frame in question; (iii) dissimilarity of these frame elements is undertaken and patterns of similarities and differences are chronicled; (iv) attempts to explain non-existent words and the cultural or environmental reasons for that; (v) looking for ordinary meaning of a word upon apparent word equivalence in a translation.

It is through this comparativist framework in FS that one gets a complete picture of how meaning is conceptualized in various languages, how certain cultural values are revealed and how the speakers' experiences are encoded. This allows them to transcend surface-level comparisons and delve deep into the conceptual archetypes that determine how meaning is formed and communicated in languages. As FS classifies and defines the frames, it also brings many important aspects of how languages arrange and encode information that help comprehend better studies of linguistic and cultural diversity.

2.4.Semantic field theory (SFT)

The semantic field theory, which was developed by Trier (1931), as presented, is the newest method in lexical relations analysis in different languages. SFT offers the idea that individual words can gather in groups of semantic fields – that is, groups of overlapping meaning parcels that are acted on

by one another in some way. Such fields embody every single possible element of human experience, which starts from the physical domain of colour and ends with a surrounding of relatives.

The transformations in defence of SFT as a theory dysnologize and in SFL evolve from (i) remapping semantic fields of languages; (ii) seeking the intrinsic composition of the fields so-as delineated; (iii) discerning the patterns of field constructions among languages; (iv) exploring polysemia of words; and (v) excavating the ethnographic and psychological patterns undermining or propelling lexical networks. This tactic brings the variation of the semantic space distribution in different languages to the fore.

SFT accounts for the relationship between language, culture and cognition. It demonstrates how the lexicon of a language traumatizes a consistent, sophisticated perception of its users. A common case in point is found in colour nomenclature - some languages treat blue and green as the same concepts and nurture the concept of blue and blue-green.

In terms of systemic functional theory, contrastive analysis implies the following activities: (i) harmonization of the semantic fields in the languages being studied; (ii) identification of the main lexical units in each field; (iii) realization of the field's architecture; (iv) identifying a lack or surplus of needed lexical items; and (v) field as a member of culture. A similar procedure usually brings to light more extreme cases of lexical categorization, such as differences in kinship terms systems among varying societies.

Transfer of technology in SFT was applied by Lehrer (1974) to the study of languages. Grandy (1987), however, offered the most valuable contributions. They all state that cross-linguistic analysis via SFT is highly relevant when attempting to approach the problem of cultural differences in the subdivision of the same meanings in different languages.

By means of such analysis, it is possible to position SFT in this paradigm as a strategy for the cartography of linguistic vocabulary. It sheds light on the perception and culture that have an impact on the way words are ordered in society, and through this knowledge, one appreciates language and language features from a psychological angle. Holding such potential helps SFT make a step toward illuminating how meaning is reconstructed within language, thus the language-thought-culture nexus. Such a position allows SFT to illuminate ethnoviolence in particular and contrastive linguistics as a whole.

2.5. Cognitive Grammar (CG)

First proposed in 1987 by Langacker, cognitive grammar has changed the way one looks at structure within language. The idea is that ideas and grammatical constructions are intertwined and interact with each other, which makes it hard to find any clear distinction between grammar and meaning. In this approach, grammar is no longer about just a proper set of constraints; it becomes a mental apparatus within which meaning and form are closely bound.

Construal is at the centre of CG – it is a linguistic quick change act performed by the speakers, who create a certain reality by words. Look at *John broke the vase* and *The vase broke*. It is still the same event but portrayed through different cognitive lenses. And it is precisely this amenability to shape that makes vivid the language mechanics of its speakers.

Continuity as an interface is modernly encapsulated in CG for contrastive linguistics. It helps to effectively explain the grammatical oddities found in many languages. How can we even consider the possibility of cross-linguistic event structures in terms of agents, events, and the location of events? And on its part, CG does not shy away from such an unfair pretension revealing the mental processes behind these linguistic structures.

The CG strategy of data analysis in metalinguistic research seems to be really magic. It consists of (i) identifying grammatical constructions in different languages; (ii) identifying the underlying concepts; (iii) comparing the construal; (iv) how the same idea can be expressed in many languages with varying grammatical means; and (v) investigating the relationship between grammatical structure and mental processes.

Langacker's (1987, 2008) works remain the foundation of compensation contrastive studies. They provide by way of blueprints what grammar ought to be, demonstrating the mutual co-occurrence of language and cognition. In this way, such a prism of analysis afforded by CG reveals the possibilities of ways in which languages reflect and shape the thinking within a person, thus facilitating the understanding of language and its cognitive aspects.

3. Methodology

3.1. Approach to literature review and analysis

In order to analyze and compare five language models operating within the contrastive semantics, a thorough literature review was done within the scope of this study. This perspective of the conceptual content of the models was focused on the recent trends and classical concepts for each model, which takes into consideration its theoretical background, assumptions, and where they are applied in the analysis of semantics across the languages.

Such a description presented the analysis as systematic and comparative and determined the advantages and disadvantages, as well as the place of new ideas in each of the existing models of contrastive semantics. In particular, there was an interest in how each of the models represented meaning from different languages and cultures. The analysis of the models included their applicability in the respective point of language, which is linguistic research, and practical language, i.e., education. Given such an approach, this one sought to reconcile the contradictions noticed through the emergence of new trends in the study of contrastive semantics, which are interoperable.

3.2. Criteria for comparing the five models

The comparison of the five contrastive semantic models will be based on nine key criteria. These criteria are designed to provide a comprehensive evaluation of each model's theoretical foundations, methodological approaches, and practical applications. The following table summarizes these criteria for a systematic comparison. The following table presents a summary of these nine criteria, offering a framework for our comparative analysis.

Table 1. Criteria for comparing the five models

No	Criteria	Description
1	Theoretical foundations	Core principles and assumptions
2	Conceptualization of meaning	View and representation of semantic structures
3	Methodological approach	Techniques for cross-linguistic analysis
4	Scope and applicability	Range of phenomena and languages covered
5	Treatment of cultural factors	Addressing cultural influences on semantics
6	Empirical evidence	Supporting research and case studies
7	Practical applications	Relevance to related fields
8	Strengths and limitations	Unique contributions and shortcomings
9	Compatibility	Potential for integration with other models

4. Analysis and discussion

4.1.Comparative analysis of the five models

In this section, we will compare and contrast five of the leading models in contrastive semantics. More particularly, we shall examine the special features and methodologies of each model pertaining to its theoretical framework as well as the merits and demerits in cross-linguistic semantics. Thus, we intend to advance a comprehensive analysis of these models and, in return, advance our understanding of the interactions taking place at the level of semantics across languages. Such a comparison will help not only demonstrate the variety of methods existing within contrastive semantics but also point to how such methods are interrelated and can enhance the description of linguistic meaning and its translation across languages and cultures.

4.1.1. Key features and principles

Five pivotal models have notably shaped the evolution of contrastive semantics: the natural semantic metalanguage, conceptual metaphor theory, frame semantics, semantic field theory and cognitive grammar. Each of these models has unique approaches to exploring and contrasting the bauhaus through the lenses of language, leading to broadening the comprehension of the intricate concepts of language, thought and culture that are usually interwoven. These models complement each other in explaining the processes of meaning creation, meaning construction and meaning transfer in various languages.

The focus and methods of these models are pretty much the same, while the features differ by a mile. NSM posits the universality of some concepts and decomposes the complex meanings into core concepts that are valid across all languages. Conversely, CMT looks at ways in which abstract ideas may be conceived and expressed through less abstract and more experiential domains. FS focuses on the background knowledge structures employed in the process of meaning construction, and SFT structures words based on the associations among their meanings. CG's concerns are somewhat ahead of the issues discussed thus far since they address grammar and meaning simultaneously.

These models have some differences in the area of use as well as the scope. NSM allows for a comparative analysis of core meanings in different languages while CMT sheds light on peculiarities of cultural metaphor. FS helps to explore meaning, especially when dependent on context. SFT performs well in doing vocabulary foliage. As a matter of fact, CG strength is in integrating grammar and semantic structures of language, which allows one to comprehend language structure in a broader sense. Regardless of their differences as illustrated above, every such model makes the pattern evident in the language, mind and sociocultural experience relationship.

These models discussed here allow one to look at languages from different angles and therefore utilize the language more effectively in research, teaching and translation. They allow going beyond the simple comparison of languages and the comparison of societies comprising those languages. These models help the learner, in the case of a language classroom, tackle difficult areas, manage vocabulary and build cultural skills. They offer advanced methods for resolving cross-linguistic problems, including ones with cultures, metaphors, etc., in the process of translation. Combining all the models, linguists, practitioners, and traders manage to construct very useful systems for the study of the semantics of various languages and their cultures.

Table 2. Key features of five models in contrastive semantics

MODES	NSM	CMT	FS	SFT	CG
Focus	Universal semantic primitives	Metaphorical understanding of abstract concepts	Knowledge structures underlying meaning	Organization of lexical items into semantic domains	Integration of grammar and semantics

Characteristics	- Identifies a set of basic, universal concepts - Assumes complex meanings can be decomposed	- Explores how abstract ideas are understood through concrete domains - Emphasizes the role of embodied experience in cognition	- Examines how words evoke broader knowledge structures - Focuses on context-dependent meanings	- Categories vocabulary into interrelated semantic fields - Examines relationships between words within fields	- Views language as a system of symbolic structures - Emphasizes the meaningful nature of grammar
Analytical Approach	- Breaks down complex meanings into simpler, universal terms - Compares core meanings across languages	- Identifies and analyzes conceptual metaphors< - Compares metaphorical mappings across cultures	- Analyzes words within their cognitive and cultural contexts - Maps out frame elements and their relationships	- Maps out semantic fields in different languages - Compares lexical organization across languages	- Analyzes grammatical structures as meaningful units - Examines how different languages construe situations
Benefits in Research	- Facilitates cross-linguistic comparison of fundamental concepts - Reveals semantic universals	- Reveals cultural variations in conceptual thinking - Illuminates cognitive processes underlying language use	- Provides insights into cultural and cognitive aspects of meaning - Enhances understanding of lexical semantics	- Reveals linguistic categorization patterns - Identifies lexical gaps and overlaps between languages	- Provides a holistic view of language structure - Bridges the gap between grammar and semantics

4.1.2. Strengths and limitations

The five models examined in this study: natural semantic metalanguage, conceptual metaphor theory, frame semantics, semantic field theory, and cognitive grammar, each offer unique strengths and face certain limitations in their application to contrastive semantics.

These models provide diverse approaches to analyzing and comparing semantic structures across languages, contributing valuable insights into the relationship between language, thought, and culture. Their strengths lie in their ability to uncover both universal and language-specific aspects of meaning, which offer tools for detailed cross-linguistic comparison. However, each model also has limitations, such as potential oversimplification of complex semantic relationships or challenges in application to certain language types.

Making sense of these strengths and limitations is crucial for researchers and linguists to engage in contrastive semantic studies. It allows for a more informed selection of appropriate methodologies and helps in interpreting results more accurately. Moreover, the recognition of the

limitations of each model can guide future research directions, which potentially leads to refinements in existing theories or the development of new, more comprehensive approaches to contrastive semantics.

The following table provides a concise overview of the key strengths and limitations associated with each of the five contrastive semantic models discussed:

Table 3: Strengths and limitations of five contrastive semantic models

Model	Strengths	Limitations
NSM	- Uses universal semantic primes - Avoids ethnocentric bias - Allows precise definition of complex concepts	- Limited set of primes may oversimplify - Challenges in translating all concepts into primes - May not capture all nuances of meaning
CMT	- Reveals cognitive bases of language - Explains abstract concepts through concrete domains - Uncovers cultural variations in thought	- May overemphasize metaphorical thinking - Difficulty in identifying all relevant metaphors - Potential for subjective interpretation
FS	- Provides context for meaning - Reveals cultural knowledge structures - Allows detailed analysis of lexical fields	- Frames can be complex and overlapping - Challenges in defining universal frames - May not account for all aspects of meaning
SFT	- Organizes vocabulary systematically - Reveals lexical gaps and overlaps - Useful for comparative lexicology	- Field boundaries can be arbitrary - May oversimplify semantic relationships - Challenges in dealing with polysemy
CG	- Integrates grammar and semantics - Focuses on linguistic construal - Explains cross-linguistic grammatical differences	- Complex theoretical framework - Difficulties in quantitative analysis - May overemphasize cognitive aspects

4.2.Complementary aspects and potential integration

The NSM, CMT, FS, SFT and CG integrations are a sleeping giant in the furthering of contrastive semantics. It is possible to perform an analysis of the basic elements of CMT with the help of universal semantic primes of NSM. This combination allows us to go further and understand how these elementary meanings at the level of semantics form the basis for the metaphoric constructs in different languages. For example, researchers might examine how the verbal primes *feel*, *think*, and *want* when employed in emotional metaphors, are rooted in universal contributions as cognitive processes, but are also notable for their particularities from the perspectives of various cultures.

SFT provides a deep insight into lexical skills when combined with FS. The place of knowledge frame emphasizes FS in organizing SFT vocabulary as outsourced according to semantic fields. Such a combination allows looking at the functioning of the words in the large frames while studying the interrelations of the specific topical vocabulary. For example, the *commerce* frame could

be comprehended using both FS and SFT to understand how various cultures 'think' about economic transactions, particularly, the underlying concepts and the differences in society attached to it.

The importance attributed to grammar in terms of CG is proposed to be a site of integration between the meaning and the structure in contrastive studies. In this way, it is also possible to combine CG with the other models and consider how grammatical constructions carry meaning elements such as NSM, CM, FS or SFT. This could provide an understanding of the reasons behind some languages marking similar concepts morphologically to varying degrees. For instance, the study of the grammaticalization of spatial relations can help to bridge CG, NSM, CMT and FS or SFT.

The following table summarizes the key aspects of potential integration among the five contrastive semantic models, highlighting the involved models and their expected outcomes:

Table 4: Potential integration of contrastive semantic models

Integration Aspect	Involved Models	Potential Outcome
Semantic primitives and metaphors	NSM, CMT	Understanding of universal elements in metaphorical constructions
Lexical Relations	FS, SFT	A comprehensive view of word relationships in conceptual and lexical contexts
Grammar-semantics interface	CG, NSM, CMT, FS, SFT	Insight into the grammatical encoding of semantic structures
Conceptual mapping	CMT, FS	Enhanced understanding of domain relationships in metaphor and framing

4.3.Implications for language teaching and translation

Five models, in particular, have contributed greatly to the development of contrastive semantics, including natural semantic metalanguage, conceptual metaphor theory, frame semantics, semantic field theory and cognitive grammar. These models present various ways of examining and contrasting semantic structures in different languages and are of great importance in understanding the interplay of language, cognition and culture. Apart from theoretical considerations, these models can be used in practice: in the sphere of teaching languages and translating, they provide effective means and innovative approaches to further develop these domains.

In foreign language teaching methods, the use of differences between languages and cultures so-called contrastive analysis, can significantly enhance the methods of vocabulary teaching, grammatical interpretation, and culture acquiring. In particular, as the NSM model deals only with the concept of semantic primes, which are not language-related, it enables teachers to deconstruct complicated ideas into simpler ones, bridging language and culture gaps. Within CMT, having mastered the language, people are said to have the ability to understand how to employ metaphor in most of our thoughts, descriptions, or explanations which are highly conceptual in nature. FS fosters lexical knowledge organization towards the specific cognitive themes or contexts enhancing situational use of the language. The following table summarizes the key benefits of applying contrastive semantic models in language teaching:

Table 5. Benefits of contrastive semantic models in language teaching

Model	Key benefits in language teaching
NSM	- Simplifies complex concepts using universal semantic primes
	- Facilitates cross-linguistic comparisons of core meanings
	- Enhances learners' understanding of semantic universals

CMT	- Illustrates abstract concepts through concrete experiential domains
	- Highlights cultural differences in metaphorical thinking
	- Aids in teaching and remembering idiomatic expressions
FS	- Organizes vocabulary learning around coherent knowledge structures
	- Enhances contextual understanding and pragmatic competence
	- Facilitates the teaching of domain-specific language
SFT	- Structures vocabulary teaching within meaningful semantic networks
	- Illustrates lexical gaps and overlaps between languages
	- Supports the development of rich vocabulary knowledge
CG	- Demonstrates the meaningful nature of grammatical structures
	- Explains cross-linguistic variations in grammatical constructions
	- Enhances learners' awareness of the form-meaning interface

The contrastive semantic models can be useful for translators offering them modern translation and translation propositions. In such cases, the NSM approach seems to be handy, especially with the translation of culture-bound words since one can disassemble the meaning into its universal parts and put it back together within another language. Conceptual metaphor theory assists in the technique of conceptualizing and translating metaphorical expressions and their cognitive maps. The FS approach in translation helps in emphasizing the context and the knowledge of the individuals that assist in the generation of meaning in the ST thus aiding in accurate translations. Application of SFT in translation involves working out the intricate connections that exist between words in a semantic field and helps translators choose better synonyms in the target language. The fact that CG reveals the semantic dimension of grammar to assist in making translation decisions on structure makes it possible to retain the conceptualization intended by the source language in the target language. The following table outlines the specific benefits of contrastive semantic models in translation practice.

Table 6. Applications of contrastive semantic models in translation

Model	**Key applications in translation**
NSM	- Decomposes culture-specific concepts into universal semantic components
	- Facilitates the explanation of untranslatable terms
	- Ensures preservation of core meanings across languages
CMT	- Guides the translation of metaphorical expressions
	- Helps in identifying and adapting conceptual metaphors for target cultures
	- Enhances the rendering of figurative language
FS	- Provides context for understanding source text meanings
	- Aids in maintaining coherence in domain-specific translations
	- Supports the transfer of situational and cultural knowledge
SFT	- Assists in selecting precise lexical equivalents

	- Highlights semantic nuances and lexical gaps between languages
	- Facilitates the mapping of semantic relationships in specialized terminology
CG	- Informs decisions about syntactic choices in translation
	- Guides the preservation of cognitive construal across languages
	- Enhances the natural rendering of grammatical structures

In short, the use of these contrastive semantic models in the processes of language instruction and translation elaborates meaning effectively across the languages. This is in the sense that appreciating the advantages of each model will enable teachers and translators to enhance their approaches towards the problems posed by cross-linguistic communication. It also implicates that such complex supervising methods wireless enhancement the processes of language teaching and teaching translation but also provide ways to comprehend the effects of language on cognition and culture. This suggests that with the dynamic development of language teaching or methodological approach and cross-linguistic research classical and conceptual theory applications will become viable again. The increasing knowledge concerning the semantics of the language under different models has without doubt practical implications that will surface with further research.

5. Conclusion

This research has analyzed five prominent approaches to the study of contrastive semantics: natural semantic metalanguage, conceptual metaphor theory, frame semantics, semantic field theory, and cognitive grammar. Each of these models provides tools necessary to this field of study, that is cross-linguistic semantic study: NSM offers the components of meaning, which can be used in the elucidation of complicated ideas; CMT shows how explication of abstract ideas is achieved via concrete examples; FS asserts the importance of schemas; SFT classifies the vocabulary into fields of meaning; CG unites grammatical and semantic studies departing from the principle of language as a way of conceptualization. The investigation has shown that the aforementioned frameworks enhance and are enhanced by each other since they operate with cross-semantics and address other substructures, which formulation presents. This systemic assessment has great value in the following comparisons, pointing at each model – its strong sides and weaknesses, examining the possibility of their synthesis, systematizing the cross-linguistic semantic scope, and cross-linguistic interrelations of language, thought and culture.

For contrastive semantics, this study is important because of its multi-perspectival approach, combining several models in order to understand the geometrical properties of meaning across languages. By comparing these five models together, we have demonstrated that it is rather the combination of universal cognition and culture-specific concepts that forms the essence of linguistic meaning. This broad perspective on the problem stresses the need to look at cross-linguistic semantics through the lens of several theories. Moreover, the research exhibits great promise for extending these models toward practice in such areas as language instruction, translation, and intercultural use of language, thus integrating theoretical linguistic science and practice of language usage.

Future studies in contrastive semantics may explore several fruitful venues. Formulating ‘integrated’ approaches that synthesize the best of several models may diminish differences in comparative studies of semantics across languages. This would allow the investigation of such models in languages that are less studied compared to others, thereby broadening linguistic inclusivity. Understanding how these models may be relevant in other

language-related fields could provide interesting and helpful information to professionals in such areas. Harnessing these models on a huge cross-linguistic dataset to test the efficacy of computational techniques may generate new patterns and their correlations. Finally, performing a time-series analysis of semantic change employing these models would allow researchers to address change more dynamically. Because of pursuing these directions, researchers can deepen our comprehension of semantic structures within and across languages and cultures, addressing a number of important challenges within theoretical and applied linguistics.

Reference

Baker, M. (2011). *In other words: A coursebook on translation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In Linguistics Society of Korea (Ed.), *Linguistics in the morning calm* (pp. 111-137). Hanshin Publishing Company.

Goddard, C. (2000). Polysemy: A problem of definition. In Y. Ravin & C. Leacock (Eds.),

Polysemy: *Theoretical and computational approaches* (pp. 129-151). Oxford University Press.

Goddard, C. (2002). The search for the shared semantic core of all languages. In C. Goddard & A.

Wierzbicka (Eds.), *Meaning and universal grammar: Theory and empirical findings* (Vol. 1, pp. 5-40). John Benjamins.

Goddard, C., & Wierzbicka, A. (2014). *Words and meanings: Lexical semantics across domains, languages, and cultures*. Oxford University Press.

Grandy, R. E. (1987). In defense of semantic fields. In B. Rupp & W. Bublitz (Eds.), *New directions in semantic theory* (pp. 259-280). De Gruyter Mouton.

Goodenough, W. H. (1956). Componential analysis and the study of meaning. Language, 32(1), 195-216.

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. University of Chicago Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites* (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press

Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Langacker, R. W. (1987). *Foundations of cognitive grammar: Theoretical prerequisites* (Vol. 1). Stanford University Press.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.

Lehrer, A. (1974). *Semantic fields and lexical structure*. North-Holland.

Levinson, S. C. (2003). *Space in language and cognition: Explorations in cognitive diversity*. Cambridge University Press.

Nida, E. A. (1975). *Componential analysis of meaning: An introduction to semantic structures*. Mouton.

Trier, J. (1931). *The German vocabulary in the semantic field of the intellect: The history of a linguistic field*. Winter.

Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and universals*. Oxford University Press.