International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology
ISSN: 2162-1357(Print), 2162-1381 (Online)

BRPI

Original Article | Open Access | Peer Reviewed

Check for Updates

The Role of Componential Analysis in Modern Semantic Theory: Strengths and Limitations

Mopelola Deborah Ayoni OLATAYO[1]

[1] The Nigéria French Language Village, Ajara-Badagry, Lagos State, Department of Translation and Interpretation; mopelolaayoni@gmail.com.

ORCID iD:

https://www.orcid.org/0009-0002-4773-4549

Address for Correspondence:

Mopelola Deborah Ayoni OLATAYO, The Nigéria French Language Village, Ajara-Badagry, Lagos State, Department of Translation and Interpretation. (mopelolaayoni@gmail.com)

Article History:

Received: 30 September 2024; Accepted: 16 October 2024; Published: 21 October 2024

Abstract The concept of language is more than just words; it is a multidimensional system of meanings and connections. Linguists have attempted to unravel this intricacy via componential analysis, which separates word meanings into smaller, unique aspects. This technique has had a considerable impact on modern semantic theory, allowing scholars to have a better grasp of how meaning is constructed across languages and cultures. This paper investigates the contributions of componential analysis, emphasising its merits, such as its systematic nature, utility in discerning minor distinctions in meaning, and use in fields such as machine translation and linguistic comparison. However, despite its utility, componential analysis has limitations. Critics claim that it oversimplifies meaning, struggles to account for abstract notions, and fails to represent cultural and contextual changes in language. The purpose of this study is to present a fair view of the role of componential analysis in modern semantics by addressing both its strengths and drawbacks. While it remains a useful tool, its limits highlight the need for integration with other semantic theories in order to get a more comprehensive understanding of meaning in human language.

Keywords Componential analysis; Semantic theory; Linguistic meaning; Semantic features; Language structure

Volume 14, 2024

Publisher: The Brooklyn Research and Publishing Institute, 442 Lorimer St, Brooklyn, NY 11206, United States.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbht.v14p5

Reviewers: Opted for Confidentiality

Citation: Olatayo, M. D. A. (2024). The Role of Componential Analysis in Modern Semantic Theory: Strengths and Limitations. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, *14*, 42-50. https://doi.org/10.30845/ijbht.v14p5

Introduction

Language is a strong tool for communicating, expressing emotions, and conveying ideas. At its core, meaning is critical to how language functions, and knowing how words connect is an essential component of linguistic research (Violi, 2001). Componential analysis, a systematic technique to break down word meanings into their most fundamental components has made a substantial contribution to our knowledge (Belfarhi, 2013). The componential analysis offers an organised approach to analysing language and meaning by identifying the various elements that distinguish one word from one and another. It is a linguistic technique that breaks down words into smaller semantic elements or characteristics to analyse their meanings (Widyastuti, 2010). Usually, these characteristics are expressed in binary form, where the existence or absence of a certain trait is indicated by positive (+) or negative (-) values. For instance, the word "brother" can be distinguished from other related terms like "sister" or "father" by breaking it down into the components [+human], "+ male," and "- parent" (Leech, 1981). This approach is a useful tool in the study of language structure because it enables linguists to determine the similarities and differences between words within a specific semantic area (Palmer, 1976).

The shortcomings of conventional semantic theories, which found it difficult to provide a systematic explanation of meaning gave rise to componential analysis in the middle of the twentieth century. The method was initially created in the study of kinship concepts in the discipline of anthropological linguistics. This approach was first used by academics such as Ward Goodenough (1956) and Floyd Lounsbury (1956) in examining how various cultures classify family connections and relationships. It was discovered that kinship phrases could be deconstructed into distinct semantic elements, exposing underlying trends in the ways that various societies organise their conceptions of family structure (Nida, 1975).

The componential analysis became a popular approach in general linguistics and eventually spread outside family studies. Its values in differentiating words that have distinct subtleties of meaning but belong to the same semantic field was emphasised by Geoffrey Leech (1981). Words such as bachelor and husband, for example, have the same characteristic [+male], yet they differ in [+ unmarried] and [- unmarried], respectively. Because of this exact division, componential analysis has proven especially helpful in fields where comprehending subtle differences in meaning is crucial, like lexical semantics, language instruction, and machine translation (Finegan, 2004). Componential analysis has significantly advanced our understanding of language meaning, but it has flaws. Its methodical and structured methodology, which enables distinct semantic differences and cross-linguistic comparisons, is one of its main advantages. It offers a strict framework for meaning analysis and has been especially helpful in computer linguistics, where accurate word meaning definitions are essential for natural language processing (Crystal, 1987).

Critics counter that by reducing words to fixed binary qualities, componential analysis tends to oversimplify meaning and may not always fully represent the fluidity and richness of language. Some words, for example, have context-dependent meanings that are difficult to distill into a collection of fixed elements. Furthermore, it is challenging to apply the same set of semantic traits worldwide due to cultural differences in meaning (Lyons, 1977). In order to improve their methods and incorporate componential analysis with alternative semantic theories, such as prototype theory and cognitive semantics, which offer a more dynamic and adaptable explanation of meaning, linguists must be aware of these limits (Lakoff, 1987). This paper aims to present a fair assessment of componential analysis's place in contemporary semantic theory by looking at both its advantages and disadvantages. Even if it is still a useful tool in linguistic analysis, it is crucial to be aware of its limitations and look for ways to supplement it with other methods in order to obtain a more thorough grasp of the structure of meaning in human language.

Theoretical Background of Componential Analysis

The basic idea behind componential analysis is that a word's meaning may be deconstructed into smaller semantic elements, each of which represents a unique facet of the word's definition. Usually, binary values are used to convey these qualities, with a positive sign (+) denoting the presence of a characteristic and a negative sign (-) denoting its absence. In the realm of kinship terminology, for example, the words "father" and "mother" can be represented by the qualities [+ human], "+ male," and "+ parent," respectively. The word "mother" also has these properties, but it varies in that it has the feature [+ female] rather than [+ male] (Leech, 1981). By determining the characteristics that differentiate concepts within the same semantic field, linguists can use this method to systematically discern between them. The use of binary features contributes to the development of a structured framework for analysing meaning, making componential analysis an important tool in linguistic study (Finegan 2004).

The study of kinship words was one of the first and most important uses of componential analysis. Linguists and anthropologists have noted that while all cultures classify familial ties differently, there are underlying patterns that are shared by all languages (Ruhlen, 1987; Nichols, 1992; Dixon, 1997). By dissecting kinship phrases in Native American languages into their constituent elements, Floyd Lounsbury (1956) showed how they may be examined. By doing this, he was able to discover the fundamental structure of kinship classification systems and discover systematic links between various kinship categories. In a similar vein, Eugene Nida (1975) used componential analysis to examine biblical translations, contending that accurate cross-linguistic meaning transmission required knowledge of the semantic components of words. His research highlighted the significance of identifying both language-specific and universal characteristics in semantic analysis, which has had a long-lasting impact on lexicography and translation studies (Crystal, 1987).

Componential analysis has been used in a number of linguistic study fields outside of kinship terminology, such as lexical semantics and vocabulary classification. For instance, we can say that it aids in the explanation of the minute distinctions in meaning between words that could otherwise seem identical in the study of synonyms (Widyastuti, 2010). Take the terms "dog," "puppy," and "wolf," which all denote canine species but have different semantic characteristics. There are several ways to depict dogs: [+canine], [+domesticated], and [±young]. A puppy has the extra trait [+young], whereas a wolf is [-domesticated]. These differences demonstrate how componential analysis can offer a methodical and accurate means of contrasting and comparing words within a specific semantic field (Lyons, 1977).

For instance, in the study of antonymy, where words are defined in opposition to one another based on their semantic components, is another significant application of componential analysis. The terms "man" and "woman," for instance, have the same characteristic [+ human], yet they differ in terms of gender relation [+ male] and [-male], respectively. In a similar vein, although both the terms "hot" and "cold" refer to temperature, their distinguishing semantic characteristics differ in that they have opposing values. The componential analysis aids in exposing the structural patterns that control word meanings and their interactions within a language by charting these linkages (Nida, 1975). It has real-world uses in domains like artificial intelligence and natural language processing in addition to its function in linguistic research. Computational linguists have utilised this approach to create machine translation systems that generate and interpret language via semantic feature analysis.

These systems can more precisely translate words and phrases between languages by dissecting word meanings into their constituent elements, which lowers ambiguity and increases linguistic precision (Finegan, 2004). Lexicography has also used this method, where dictionaries gain from a systematic examination of word meanings to offer more precise definitions and usage distinctions.

Nida (1975:32) categorised the types of components into two main types, which are the Common component and the Diagnostic or distinctive component. The common component is the central component which is shared by all the lexemes in the semantic domain or lexical field while the diagnostic/distinctive components serve to distinguish the meaning from others from the same domain. Here are some examples:

Table 1: Common and Diagnostic components of the words: Husband, Wife, Spinster and Bachelor.

	Adult	Male	Female	Married	Unmarried
Bachelor	+	+	-	-	+
Spinster	+	-	+	-	+
Husband	+	+	-	+	-
Wife	+	-	+	+	-

The word bachelor, spinster, husband and wife all belong to the semantic field of the human race and the relations between them were represented by the matrix in the table above. In the semantic domain, HUMAN is the common component and it is distinguished by ADULT, MALE, FEMALE, MARRIED, UNMARRIED as the diagnostic components. The meanings of the individual items are expressed by the combinations of the features adding +/- to the presence or absence of a feature.

Table 2: Common and diagnostic components of the words: Tricycle, Bicycle, Car, Lorry and Motorcycle.

	Wheels	Bonnet	Pedals	Brake	Roof	Airbag
Tricycle	+	-	+	+	+	-
Bicycle	+	-	+	+	-	-
Car	+	+	-	+	+	+
Lorry	+	+	-	+	+	+
Motorcycle	+	-	-	+	-	-

1. The words tricycle, bicycle, car, lorry and motorcycle all belong to the semantic field vehicle and the relations between them were represented by the matrix in the table above. In the semantic domain, VEHICLE is the common component and it is distinguished by TRICYCLE, BICYCLE, CAR, LORRY, and MOTORCYCLE as the diagnostic components. The meanings of the individual items are expressed by the combinations of the features adding +/- to the presence or absence of a feature.

Table 3: **Common and diagnostic components of the words: Tasse, Verre, Flûte, Gobelet, Chope and Coupe (ITEMS ARE IN FRENCH).**

	Avec Anse	Profound	Avec Pied	Transparent	Haut	Porcelain
Tasse	+	-	-	-	-	+
Verre	-	+/-	-	+	+/-	-
Flûte	-	+	+	+	+	-
Gobelet	-	+	-	+/-	+	-
Chope	+	+	-	+	+	-
Coupe	+	+/-	+	+	+/-	-

The word Tasse, Verre, Flûte, Gobelet, Chope and Coupe all belong to the semantic field of recipient and the relations between them were represented by the matrix in the table above. In the semantic domain, RECIPIENT is the common component and it is distinguished by TASSE, VERRE, FLÛTE, GOBELET, CHOPE, and COUPE as the diagnostic components. The meanings of the individual items are expressed by the combinations of the features adding +/- to the presence or absence of a feature.

Table 4: **Common and diagnostic components of the words: Fauteuil, Tabouret, Chaise, Canapé, Strapontin, Banc and Pouf (ITEMS ARE IN FRENCH)**

	Siege	Avec dossier	Avec bras	Long	Lit de repos	Replicable
Fauteuil	+	+	+	-	-	-
Tabouret	+	-	-	-	-	-
Chaise	+	+	-	-	-	-
Canapé	+	+	+	+	+	-
Strapontin	+	+	-	-	-	+
Banc	+	-/+	-	+	-	-
Pouf	+	-	-	-	-	-

The word fauteuil, tabouret, chaise, canapé, strapontin, banc, and pouf all belong to the semantic field of recipient and the relations between them were represented by the matrix in the table above. In the semantic domain, SIÈGE is the common component and it is distinguished by FAUTEUIL, TABOURET, CHAISE, CANAPE, STRAPONTIN, BANC, and POUF as the diagnostic components.

Componential analysis can only be done within the same semantic domain. In determining the semantic components of any word's meaning, it is essential to compare the related meanings of other words and analyse them. The idea of a component does not introduce a new kind of relation but it offers a theoretical framework for handling kinds of relationships. However, the linguistic procedures employed in componential analysis consist of four types:

- **Naming:** is a specific act of designating a referent.
- **Paraphrasing**: is used to spell out the distinctive features of any semantic unit.
- **Defining**: consists of combining all the various specific paraphrases into a single statement based on the diagnostic components of the particular meaning in question.
- **Classifying**: involves a triple procedure:
    - Lumping together units that have certain features in common.
    - Separating those that are distinct from others.
    - Determining the basis of such groupings.

The most important advantage of componential analysis to semantics is the particular combination of lexical items as well as the acceptability/unacceptability of syntagmatic combinations of words or phrases. Although componential analysis is a useful tool for comprehending meaning, it is critical to be aware of its limitations. Some opponents contend that some words, especially those with abstract or context-dependent meanings, are difficult to distill into a collection of distinct characteristics. Words like "love" and "happiness," for instance, are difficult to categorise into two categories because of their ambiguous meanings, which are altered by social, cultural, and personal circumstances. Additionally, some academics have noted that componential analysis tends to ignore connotative and pragmatic features of language in favour of referential meaning (Lyons, 1977). These concerns highlight the necessity to supplement componential analysis with other approaches, such as prototype theory and cognitive semantics, in order to gain a more complete explanation of meaning in human language (Lakoff, 1987).

Despite these problems, componential analysis remains an important tool in semantic theory. Its ability to deconstruct meaning into organised components has made it an invaluable tool for linguists, anthropologists, translators, and computational linguists. By methodically analysing word meanings, it sheds light on how languages categorise concepts and how meaning is constructed across linguistic and cultural settings. As linguistic research progresses, including componential analysis with other semantic models will be critical to gaining a more comprehensive understanding of meaning and communication.

Strengths of Componential Analysis

Because of its methodical and controlled approach to meaning interpretation, componential analysis has remained an essential instrument in linguistic research. This approach, in contrast to more abstract semantic theories, offers a rigorous framework for dissecting words into their most basic constituents, enabling accurate comparison and analysis. Its efficacy stems from its capacity to break words down into discrete characteristics, exposing patterns that might not be immediately apparent. Linguists can establish unambiguous links between words through componential analysis, which allows for a more objective examination of semantics by methodically organising meanings (Leech, 1981).

The fact that componential analysis applies to a variety of languages is one of its biggest benefits. This approach is especially helpful for cross-linguistic comparisons because it is predicated on recognising universal semantic components. This method allows linguists to study how concepts are categorised in various languages and how some semantic elements are similar or different across linguistic boundaries. Kinship terms, for instance, differ greatly among cultures; yet, by dissecting them into characteristics like [+ parent], [+ sibling], [+ male], or [-female], componential analysis enables researchers to uncover the underlying commonalities and differences (Nida, 1975). It is a useful tool in comparative linguistics and translation studies because of its capacity to analyse meaning consistently across languages (Palmer, 1976).

Componential analysis's ability to clarify semantic linkages is another important advantage. Although they have small differences, many words in the same semantic realm have overlapping meanings. By identifying the unique characteristics that distinguish these concepts, componential analysis enables their systematic distinction. One might see, for example, that while the terms bachelor, husband, and widower all have the characteristic [+ male], bachelor is [+ unmarried], husband is [- unmarried], and widower is [+ previously married]. Because of its accuracy, componential analysis is especially helpful in lexicography and language instruction, where a grasp of subtle

semantic differences is essential. By outlining the characteristics that make words different, it aids researchers and students in gaining a greater comprehension of the meaning inside a language.

Componential analysis has been used in computer linguistics, namely in machine translation and natural language processing (NLP), in addition to classical linguistic analysis. The componential analysis offers an organised method of decomposing words into significant characteristics, which enables computers to comprehend and analyse language more precisely in artificial intelligence (AI) systems that depend on semantic analysis. For instance, accurate word distinctions are necessary for machine translation programmes like Google Translate and AI-powered chatbots to guarantee correct usage and interpretation. These systems may distinguish between different meanings and choose the best translations or answers depending on the situation by encoding words with particular semantic properties (Finegan, 2004). Additionally, by making sure that every word is examined in terms of its defining characteristics, componential analysis helps to refine word meaning in NLP tasks like speech recognition, text classification, and sentiment analysis. This methodical technique improves computational models' accuracy and efficiency, enabling them to perform more complicated linguistic tasks (Crystal, 1987).

As a whole, the advantages of component analysis include its systematic approach, cross-linguistic adaptability, capacity to elucidate semantic relationships, and pertinence to contemporary technology developments. It is a useful tool in language theory and real-world applications because of its methodical approach, which enables accurate analysis. Its contributions to the study of meaning continue to influence linguistic research and technological advancements in language processing, despite certain drawbacks. Linguists and computer scientists can create even more potent instruments for examining and comprehending human language by combining componential analysis with other semantic models.

Limitations of Componential Analysis

The study of semantics has benefited greatly from componential analysis, although it is not without drawbacks. Its intricacy and time commitment are two of its main disadvantages. Componential analysis can be a laborious and complex technique because it necessitates dissecting words into their most basic semantic properties, particularly when working with huge vocabularies or complex language systems. It takes a lot of research to pinpoint the exact characteristics that set words apart, and it can be difficult to apply this technique consistently across languages or semantic domains. The technique is extremely comprehensive and time-consuming since linguists have to carefully examine each word's meaning in connection to other terms in the same semantic area (Leech, 1981). This intricacy makes it impractical for use in routine language research and adds to its very limited use outside of academic research (Finegan, 2004).

The fact that not all words lend themselves equally to componential analysis is another important drawback. It works well for classifying terms that are concrete and well-defined, but it has trouble with meanings that are abstract or context-dependent. Emotional, philosophical, or culturally expressive words frequently defy easy binary classification. For instance, because its meaning varies depending on one's perspective, cultural background, and situational context, the word "happiness" is difficult to break down into distinct semantic components (Lyons, 1977).

Abstract notions may contain subjective interpretations that are difficult to convey by binary values, in contrast to familial phrases or objects that have well-defined qualities. Componential analysis's universality as a semantic tool is diminished by its inapplicability to a broad variety of words. This also restricts its usefulness in domains where meaning is frequently contextually driven and fluid, such literary studies or sociolinguistics (Palmer, 1976).

Componential analysis is also criticised for its propensity to oversimplify meaning. Although the approach is helpful for emphasising word differences, it frequently simplifies meaning to a collection of inflexible traits, omitting the depth and complexity that words can convey. Words can have several meanings that change based on usage, tone, or speaker intention, hence language is not always strictly classified. The characteristics [+ male] and [+ unmarried], for example, may be used to define the term "bachelor," but this definition does not adequately account for the word's societal connotations, historical meaning shifts, or the fact that the term "bachelor" may mean different things depending on the context (e.g., a "bachelor of arts" in academia versus a single man in social discussions) (Nida, 1975). Figurative language, idiomatic phrases, and polysemy all of which are essential to the way words operate in everyday communication are not taken into consideration by this strict approach to meaning (Crystal, 1987).

Furthermore, contextual and cultural diversity are problems for componential analysis. Meaning is dynamic and heavily impacted by social interactions, cultural conventions, and contextual elements. A term may imply one thing in

one culture and something else in another. Kinship terminology like uncle or cousin, for instance, may be classified differently in different languages. In English, an uncle is a person's parent's brother; but, depending on cultural conventions, the name may also refer to other members of the extended family in other countries (Goodenough, 1956). Such differences are not usually taken into account by componential analysis, which depends on universal semantic properties. Furthermore, meaning is greatly influenced by context, and words frequently change depending on the speaker, the situation, or the intended meaning. In one context, the term "cold" could refer to a low temperature, yet in another, it might be used to metaphorically characterise someone as hostile. Componential analysis's capacity to present a comprehensive picture of meaning is weakened by its incapacity to completely include context and cultural variety into its framework (Lakoff, 1987).

Criticism and Alternative Approaches

Despite being a popular approach in semantic studies, complementarity analysis has drawn a lot of criticism for its shortcomings in providing a complete explanation of meaning. John Lyons (1977), one of the most outspoken opponents of componential analysis, contends that although the approach helps differentiate words according to their semantic constituents, it ultimately falls short of capturing the complete complexity of word meanings. Lyons contends that the strict binary classification scheme used in componential analysis is insufficient to capture the complexity and fluidity of language. Words don't always fit into clearly defined feature sets, and speaker purpose, cultural connotations, and context all have an impact on meaning. Lyons also points out that componential analysis tends to focus on referential meaning while ignoring the connotative and pragmatic features of language, which are critical for understanding how words operate in real communication.

Another major criticism of componential analysis is that it presupposes that meanings can be reduced to a fixed set of universal semantic traits, which may not necessarily be true across languages and cultures. This assumption ignores the fact that linguistic categorisation is frequently influenced by cultural experiences and social norms. Scholars like Geoffrey Leech (1981) and Stephen Ullmann (1972) stress the issue that meaning is not always static and that componential analysis struggles to account for words that change meaning over time or across different contexts. Furthermore, the technique does not effectively analyse figurative language, idioms, or polysemy, all of which are important in natural language use (Crystal, 1987). These limitations have prompted many linguists to investigate alternate approaches to semantic analysis that provide a more flexible and context-sensitive interpretation of meaning.

Prototype Theory, first proposed by Eleanor Rosch in the 1970s and subsequently refined by linguists like George Lakoff (1987), is one such option. By arguing that meanings are arranged around archetypal examples rather than rigid sets of binary attributes, prototype theory contests the rigorous classification of componential analysis. This theory holds that words belong to categories that are organised around central or most typical examples rather than having definite definitions made up of necessary and sufficient requirements. For example, although all four are in the same category, individuals are more likely to imagine a robin or sparrow than a penguin or ostrich when they think of the category bird. This implies that word meanings are graded rather than rigidly defined, giving interpreters greater latitude. Compared to componential analysis, prototype theory is a more flexible method of examining meaning since it more effectively takes into consideration language variance and cultural variables (Rosch, 1978).

As a subfield of cognitive linguistics, cognitive semantics is another significant substitute for componential analysis. According to scholars like George Lakoff and Mark Johnson (1980), meaning is not a fixed collection of semantic elements but is instead essentially shaped by human cognition and experience. Cognitive Semantics focuses on how our understanding of words and concepts is shaped by conceptual metaphors, mental images, and embodied experience. Cognitive Semantics considers meaning to be dynamic and context-dependent, in contrast to componential analysis, which is based on static categories. For instance, the idea of anger is sometimes defined in terms of the metaphor that anger is heat (e.g., "He exploded in anger," "She was boiling with rage"). Although it is difficult to describe using componential analysis, this type of metaphorical mapping is essential to the construction of meaning in human cognition (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980).

Another approach to componential analysis is Frame Semantics, which was created by Charles Fillmore in 1982 and focuses on the larger conceptual structures that words activate. This theory holds that words are understood in connection to mental frames or schemas that offer context rather than having independent meanings. For example, the word "restaurant" conjures up a whole frame that contains words like "menu," "waiter," "bill," and "food." The

reductive character of componential analysis, which treats words as distinct entities rather than as components of a wider conceptual network, stands in contrast to the interrelated nature of meaning.

Sociolinguistics researchers also criticise componential analysis, arguing that social interaction shapes meaning and that solely structural approaches are unable to properly capture it. In contrast to fixed semantic elements, pragmatic theories like those put out by Paul Grice in 1975 emphasise that meaning frequently depends on speaker intent and conversational context. As an illustration of how meaning is frequently implied rather than being stated directly, the phrase "Can you pass the salt?" is regarded as a request rather than a direct query concerning ability. Componential analysis falls short in addressing these pragmatic factors, which underscore the need for more context-aware approaches to semantic analysis.

Componential analysis is nonetheless a useful tool in semantics despite these objections, especially because of its methodical and organised approach to meaning. Its drawbacks, however, indicate that it should not be applied alone. Rather, combining it with other methods like Prototype Theory, Cognitive Semantics, and Frame Semantics can offer a more thorough comprehension of how language constructs meaning. These other models provide a more complex and accurate depiction of how words work in human communication by viewing meaning as a dynamic and context-sensitive phenomenon as opposed to a fixed collection of characteristics.

Conclusion

In semantics, componential analysis has been shown to be a useful technique since it provides a methodical approach to decomposing word meanings into their most basic constituents. Its methodical technique has proven invaluable in identifying minute variations among terms, examining kinship terminology, and supporting linguistic comparability. Its drawbacks, however, such as its strict binary classification, incapacity to adequately convey abstract and context-dependent meanings, and insensitivity to cultural differences, underscore the necessity for a more adaptable strategy. Lyons (1977) and other critics contend that because language is dynamic and context-driven, meaning is too complicated to be boiled down to fixed semantic elements. A more thorough comprehension of meaning is made possible by combining componential analysis with other models like Prototype Theory, Cognitive Semantics, and Frame Semantics in order to overcome these drawbacks. These methods recognise that meaning is dynamic and influenced by associations in the real world, cultural context, and cognitive processes. Componential analysis is still helpful for certain linguistic analyses, but it works much better when paired with more dynamic and context-sensitive semantic theories, guaranteeing a more comprehensive approach to language comprehension.

Conflict of Interest: None declared.

Ethical Approval: Not applicable.

Funding: None.

References

Belfarhi, K. (2013). The componential analysis of literary meaning. *Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal,15*(2): 288-301. https://doi.10.14483/udistrital.jour.calj.2013.2.a010

Crystal, D. (1987). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dixon, R. M. W. (1997). *The life and death of languages*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In Linguistics in the Morning Calm (pp. 111-137). Seoul: Hanshin Publishing Co.

Finegan, E. (2004). *Language: Its structure and use* (4th ed.). USA: Thomson Wadsworth.

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

Grice, P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics, Volume 3* (pp. 41-58). New York: Academic Press.

Lakoff, G. (1987). *Women, fire, and dangerous things: What categories reveal about the mind*. University of Chicago Press.

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

Leech, G. (1981). *Semantics: The study of meaning* (2nd ed.). London: Longman.

Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nichols, J. (1992). *Linguistic diversity in space and time*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Nida, E. (1975). *Componential analysis of meaning*. Belgium: Mouton.

Palmer, F. R. (1976). *Semantics: A new outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosch, E. (1978). Principles of categorisation. In E. Rosch & B. B. Lloyd (Eds.), *Cognition and categorisation* (pp. 27-48). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ruhlen, M. (1987). *A guide to the world's languages*. London: Edward Arnold.

Ullmann, S. (1972). *Semantics: An introduction to the science of meaning*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Violi, P. (2001). *Meaning and experience*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Widyastuti, S. (2010). Componential analysis of meaning: Theory and applications. *Journal of English and Education (JEE)*, 4(1): 116-128.