A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF SEMANTIC RICHNESS IN SOME EXTRACTS OF THE PALESTINIAN RESISTANCE OFFICIAL SPEECH AND THEIR ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

Qasim Abbas Dhayef[1] and Abdullah Abbas Alwan[2]

[1]Department of English Language/ Faculty of Education for Human Sciences/ University of Babylon;
[2]Department of English/ Faculty of Education for Girls/ University of Kufa; abdullaha.alkashami@uokufa.edu.iq

ABSTRACT

The present study seeks to provide explanations for the semantic richness as a cross-linguistic difference between Arabic and English. It investigates the points of contrast between English and Arabic in the light of four semantic concerns; hyponymy (which one tends to be hyponymic rather than hypernymic), semantic field (which semantic field is broader than the other), symbolism (to what extent the triggered symbols are different), conceptual metaphor (how the source and target domains are different in both languages). In particular, the study contrasts the depth of denotative meaning for two languages by analyzing the semantics of the chosen data from each. The methodology is based on a single-method approach. In order to put this data under scrutiny, a secondary data strategy is adopted, where it involved quoting the official spokesman of the Palestinian resistance; next, the quotes are analyzed using a content analysis approach. Some of the key results to mention are: (1) the hyponyms tend to manifest more than the hypernyms in the Arabic; (2) the hypernyms tend to appear more in English; (3) the semantic field of English terms is much broader than their Arabic counterparts; (4) symbolism and conceptual metaphor, although cross-linguistic tend to carry more specificity in the presented data. Some key conclusions to draw are: (1) Arabic involves more semantic precision as compared to English; (2) there is an English preference for generic phrases that are applicable in a variety of settings; (3) the features of semantic richness make Arabic a very complex language, ideal for expressing multi-layered, culturally relevant meanings.

Keywords: Semantic Richness, English, Arabic, Hyponymy, Semantic Field, Symbolism, Conceptual Metaphor.

1. INTRODUCTION

A semantic richness model of analysis and the manner in which meaning is depicted in both English and Arabic are being called for by the current study, which is normally undertaken in order to ask for such a model. To make a comparison between English and Arabic in terms of semantic richness, the research takes into consideration Gottlob Frege's concept of hyponymy, which was developed in the 19th century, as well as the semantic field theory of Trier (1931), the semantic symbolism of Fontanier (1968), and the conceptual metaphor theory of Lakoff (1992). All of these theories are incorporated into the study. This research focuses specifically on the core question of how the richness of meaning might point out a large cross-linguistic difference between English and Arabic. In particular, the research seeks to find linguistic semantic answers for this issue. The fact that such a cross-linguistic study not only contributes to the linguistic distinctions, but also includes key notes and outlines to follow in translation and educational issues, is something that should be brought to your attention here. The applicability of such research, which

are able to uncover successful answers for more than one language-related topic of study, is necessarily emphasized as a result of this. It is hypothesized that the four semantic aspects have a significant role in highlighting the richness of meaning in a contrastive manner between English and Arabic. The data that has been proposed comprises contextual factors that can implement these semantic features of richness in the most effective manner to settle the contrastive points. There is also the possibility that the dependability of the findings and conclusions of the study in both languages is improved by employing a cross-linguistic method of analysis, such as semantic field. In order to offer a sufficient background of how hyponymy, semantic field, symbolism, and conceptual metaphor function in this regard, detailed past studies are provided in terms of the semantic features of richness. This is done in advance of the analysis and discussion that will follow.

2. SEMANTIC RICHNESS

A concept's semantic richness can be described as "the amount of semantic information associated with a concept" (Kounios, Green, Payne, Fleck, Grondin & McRae, 2009, p. 95), while different authors have used different definitions of the term. Rich concepts are those that are considered to have strong, well-developed semantic networks, as measured by dimensions such as number of semantic features (Pexman, Hargreaves, Siakaluk, Bodner, & Pope, 2008); semantic neighbourhood density (Buchanan, Westbury, & Burgess, 2001); number of senses (Rodd, 2004; Woollams, 2005); number of first associates (Duñabeitia, Avilés & Carreiras, 2008); imageability (Cortese & Fugett, 2004); body-object interaction (Siakaluk, Pexman, Aguilera, Owen & Sears, 2008); sensory experience rating (Juhasz & Yap, 2013); emotional valence (Kousta, Vinson & Vigliocco, 2009; Yap & Seow, 2014); and contextual dispersion (Pexman et al., 2008). One way to think about the strength of the link to the semantic network is in terms of the number of characteristics, the density of the neighbourhood, the number of senses, and the number of associates. A concept's perceptual power is related to its imageability, physical contact, sensory experience, and emotional valence.

Some academics have looked at how semantic richness affects processing of metaphors, where a word's meaning is expanded to include an additional, figurative meaning, in addition to how it contributes to processing of individual words. According to research by Al-Azary and Buchanan (2017), the degree to which a metaphor is concrete (less concrete metaphors are easier to understand) and the density of semantic neighbourhoods (more sparse neighbourhoods are easier to understand) influence both online comprehensibility and appropriateness judgements.

2. 1. Lexical Aspect: hyponymy

The sense relation between a more general, more inclusive word and a more specific word is referred to as hyponymy (Dai Weidong & He Zhaoxiong, 2013: 69). Words with a more expansive or general meaning are called hypernyms or superordinates, whereas words with a more precise meaning are called hyponyms. This means that a superordinate word will encompass all of its hyponyms, and vice versa. Hyponyms that are members of the same superordinate are considered co-hyponyms. For instance, because of its broader connotation, "flower" is superior than all of its hyponyms, including "rose," "carnation," "tulip," "violet," "sunflower," "morning glory," and "lily," among many others.

The lexical link expressed in English by the phrase kind/type/sort of is known as hyponymy (Wenxu, 2012: 75). What this means is that hyponymy is a sense relation that encompasses both

A and B, or that A is a specific type of B. For example, "chair" might signify both "furniture" and "a kind of chair," or the two terms can be considered synonymous. Hyponymy, on the other hand, is based on social stratification. According to Hu Zhuanglin (2017: 95), the class name is superordinate and the members are hyponyms. Typically, a superordinate will have multiple hyponyms. For instance, aside from chairs, the umbrella word "furniture" encompasses a wide variety of items such as tables, desks, beds, sofas, dressers, and many more. Like chair, table, desk, bed, sofa, and dresser are co-hyponyms to each other, hyponyms that share the same superordinate or are members of the same class are also co-hyponyms.

In Arabic that is also the case. Words that are antonyms, synonyms, or hyponyms have a bidirectional meaning relation, whereas words that are hyponyms only have a unidirectional meaning relation. So, wardah means "rose" and zahrah means "flower." However, the word zahrah does not mean "rose" when used alone; it encompasses all types of flowers, including wardah. Here, we have a hypernymy between zahrah "flower" and wardah "rose" (and other flowers) because wardah "rose" is a hyponym to zahrah "flower," and vice versa.

2. 2. Referential Aspect: symbolism

For the most part, people who studied metonymy and those who were interested in studying metaphors have ignored the symbol's semantic structure, which served as a benchmark for comparison. Firstly, unlike metonymy and metaphor, symbols were not considered an autonomous figure in romantic or classical rhetoric textbooks (Fontanier, 1968: 78,79,84). Secondly, due to the diverse typology of symbols, an accurate description of the figure was impossible to achieve. Lastly, formalizing the logical and semantic relations between the terms of the symbol was and is considerably more difficult.

There are two main characteristics of the symbol: first, that "it is a name which is always extracted from the semantic field of concrete objects" (Manca., 2005: 358), and second, that the motivational character of the term substitution is revealed. Mihaela divides symbols into three types: those that have been transformed into poetical symbols, those that are proper poetical symbols, and those that are obscure (Manca., 2005: 364-390).

Moreover, the symbol changes the relation to the referent and the context in which it exists; this is what gives it its symbolic power. The symbol shifts the decoding viewpoint by evoking the symbolic reading of other words. The decoding process can be either progressive or regressive. In the former, the surrounding words are considered part of the symbolized's semantic field, and the symbol is located in the context of the symbol's recurrence clues. In the latter, the message is not given equal weight by all textual units, and the symbol is returned to the message.

2. 3. Semantic Field Aspect: lexical gap

There are few areas of linguistics more complex and fraught with ambiguity as the study of meaning. The analytical (referential) approach and the operational approach are the two main ways that semanticists propose to look at meaning. According to Ullman (1972, in Al-Yahya, 2010: 23), there are two main ways to study words: analytically, which involves breaking down words into their component parts, and operationally, which involves looking at words in context. Using an analytical stance, Trier (1931) presented the semantic field theory, which states that words are always related to one another through connections like "sense relations." As a result, according to Murphy (2003), Semantic Field Theory "depicts the lexicon as internally organised by paradigmatic semantic relationships, particularly synonymy, contrast, and hyponymy" (p.

"Flowers" frequently co-occur with "bloom," and "letters" with "writing." This is the basic idea behind the collocation notion. According to Syal (2007: 155), "semantic linkages inside a language are the building blocks upon which these networks and collocations are created.

Paradigmatic fields and syntagmatic fields are the two main subfields of Semantic Field Theory. According to Corson (1996: 31), "paradigmatic fields consist of words belonging to the same form class that possess shared semantic characteristics (e.g. kitten and puppy)." Examples of syntagmatic fields include "announce" and "microphone," two words that are closely related in usage but do not share a syntactic position. According to Corson (1996: 31), "words semantically related in any sense belong to the same semantic field."

Gliozzo and Strapparava (2009: 13) offer a counterargument, nevertheless. Semantic Field Theory argues that "the lexicon is organised into semantic fields: the semantic relationships among concepts within the same field are highly interconnected, whereas concepts from disparate fields are generally unassociated." The purpose of this research is to back up Channell's (1981: 117) claim that field analysis of language or lexical elements turns seemingly unrelated word lists into coherent wholes.

Also, according to Yang and Huaxin (2001: 51), the goal of Semantic Field Theory is to determine "the relationship between each individual word within a semantic set." Word meanings are connected in a myriad of ways. Three kinds of synonymy—antonymy, hyponymy, and synonymy—are used most frequently. The purpose of this research is to provide evidence that words that share specific meaning components are members of the same semantic field. On the other hand, they rarely reveal both sides at once. Reported by Channel (1981: 117–118). According to Jordan (1997), when it comes to thoroughly analysing the similarities and differences among words in the same semantic domain, componential analysis (CA) is the way to go.

Componential Analysis (CA) is a key idea in Semantic Field Theory. Componential analysis is a method for formalising and clarifying the semantic relationships between lexemes, according to Lyons (1995). Lyons (1995: 107) states that this requires breaking down the meaning of a lexeme into its component parts. The same semantic field may be used to group lexicemes that share comparable semantic properties. Words, however, are not always sufficient to express meaning. In particular, "walk and run are analogous as both are verbs denoting modes of locomotion for animate beings with legs; however, they diverge in that 'run' connotes a distinct, typically swifter, leg movement compared to 'walk'" (Channell, 118). Therefore, componential analysis offers a methodical way to differentiate between related terms in the same semantic field. It does this by breaking down the meaning of a word or words into its semantic components. According to Lehrer (1975) as cited in Yang and Huaxin (2001: 52), "the organisation of words in a field can serve as a basis for determining components" (Semantic Field Theory), which is also relevant to componential analysis.

Arab linguists on a temporary basis see the theory of semantic field as developing out of the widespread belief that words do not exist in isolation from one another but rather as parts of larger, cohesive systems. Different categories address different parts of the "semantic field." This is made clearer by Mukhtar's (2006:79) definition of semantic field theory, which is focused on bringing together and organising convergent meanings with shared semantic properties. To simplify, we might say that the semantic field is just a collection of related words, like "kinship" keywords like "father," "mother," "brother," "uncle," "aunt," "grandfather," "grandmother," etc.

2. 4. Cognitive Aspect: conceptual metaphor

A metaphor is a way of looking at one area of experience through the lens of another, completely distinct area of experience. In theory, a metaphor is just a way to map out the relationship between SD and TD. There is a lot of structure to this mapping. Take the "LOVE IS A JOURNEY" metaphor as an example. The "JOURNEY" domain is the source, and the "LOVE" domain is the target. A theory of ontological correspondences states that there is a systematic correspondence between entities in the domain of love (such as lovers, their shared objectives, challenges, and the love relationship) and entities in the domain of travel (such as passengers, vehicles, and their destinations). Many people mistakenly think that the act of mapping itself, which denotes a collection of correspondences, is the same as the term "mapping" (Lakoff, 1992: 5-6).

Words "do not exist alone; they come as surface manifestations of interconnected knowledge of words, context, and inferences" is the defining characteristic of domains and other technical terms in cognitive linguistics. The structure of background information known as a domain includes words, concepts, and conclusions that are related to one another. The SD is a concrete domain and the TD is an abstract domain.

There is an experiential reason for choosing a specific source domain to match a specific target domain. Put another way, the source domain is applicable to several target domains. Metaphorical expressions in language originate in the target domains (Kövecses, 3003:312). Here, "THEORIES" is conceptualized in terms of "BUILDINGS" owing to a series of correspondences between the two, as stated in the conceptual metaphor "THEORIES ARE BUILDINGS".

3. METHODOLOGY

This study uses a qualitative research approach because it allows for a comparative examination of Arabic and English to discover, comprehend, and interpret the essential distinctions in the semantic richness and complexity, yielding insights that are relevant, situationally appropriate, and meaningful. To answer questions that can only be answered by in-depth qualitative research and to capture the diversity of human viewpoints, this approach is crucial.

This study makes use of secondary data gathering methods since they facilitate efficient qualitative research, provide access to relevant historical and contextual information, and allow for the examination of comparative features between Arabic and English. The research can improve credibility and genuine citations to real-data sources by making use of current data and enhancing our comprehension of the complex semantic richness characteristics implied in the official speech of the Palestinian Resistance spokesman.

To accommodate the qualitative methodology and to give a means of methodically investigating, interpreting, and deriving meaning from various kinds of comparative semantic analysis of Arabic and English data, this study use the content analysis approach. Finding commonalities in texts and media is a great way to delve into the social and cultural context of the Palestinian Resistance's official statement. Content analysis is a useful tool for answering complicated qualitative questions because it provides a structured, adaptable, and interpretative approach that helps to uncover underlying meanings.

4. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

According to a qualitative content analysis method, eight extracts out of the official discourses for the Palestinian resistance spokesman Abu Obaidah (2023-2024) are analyzed to uncover their semantic richness as compared with their rendered English translations.

4. 1. Hyponymy/Hypernymy الله vs *God*

Hyponymy	Hypernymy
"إننا لا نطالبكم بالتحرك لتدافعوا عن أطفال العروبة والإسلام في غزة من خلال تحريك جهودكم ودباباتكم **لا سمح الله**"	"We do not ask you to defend the children of Arabism and Islam in Gaza by making your efforts and moving your tanks, **God forbid**"

The Arabic idiom "لا سمح الله" and the English phrase "God forbid" are similar enough to be considered interchangeable expressions. Nevertheless, they culturally denote distinct semantic meanings depending on the language they are utilized in. Where these two statements diverge from one other is in the comparison of the term 'الله' with 'God'. We may compare them from a semantic standpoint by looking at hyponymy and hypernymy; this will help us understand whether one has a more specific meaning and, by extension, is richer in meaning. When exploring the hyponymy-hypernymy relation between them, we are essentially asking whether one is a specific instance (hyponym) or a broader category (hypernym) of the other. In English, the word "god" can mean either the one ultimate entity or god in monotheistic faiths like Christianity, Islam, Judaism, etc., or, in plural form, other deities in polytheistic systems ("gods"). Here, "God" might be interpreted as a hypernym since it alludes to the idea of a supreme being in many belief systems and religions. Conversely, in Islamic contexts, the Arabic word for "God" is "الله" (Allah). For the monotheistic god, it is the name by which Muslims, Christians, and Jews who speak Arabic refer. For this reason, "الله" might be seen as a hyponym of "God" since it alludes to a particular Islamic understanding of God.

4. 2. Semantic Field: ضاري vs *Fierce*

Narrower Semantic Field	Broader Semantic Field
"فقد تمكن مجاهدونا بفضل الله خلال ساعات نهار الأحد من الوصول الى منطقة مفكعيم جنوب عسقلان المحتلة وخاضوا اشتباكات **ضارية** أدت الى الكثير من القتلى والإصابات في صفوف العدو"	"During the hours of Sunday, our jihadists were able to reach the occupied area of Mufqaim south of Ashkelon. They fought **fierce** clashes that resulted in many deaths and injuries among the enemy"

Despite sharing overlapping meanings in certain circumstances, the semantic field of the Arabic term "ضاري" and the English word "fierce" reveals disparities in cultural context, connotation, and language usage that are semantically reflected. In terms of semantic fields, the words "ضاري" and "fierce" have similar meanings that pertain to fierceness, aggression, and intensity, particularly when characterizing dangerous creatures or actions. Both of them make one think of wild, unbridled energy. The term "ضاري" is typically associated with physical danger, untamed nature, or predatory tendencies, particularly in animals. People are less likely to use it metaphorically or positively because of the negative connotations it brings with it, which are

related to aggressiveness. "Fierce" in modern English has a far broader semantic field, reaching into positive qualities like passion, determination, and strength, particularly in current usage. In contrast to "fierce," which can have both negative and good implications in English, the semantic area of "ضاري" is more limited, skewed towards natural untamedness and danger, especially in animals. The use of either term reveals deeper linguistic and cultural distinctions, despite the fact that they both mean intensity and aggressiveness.

4. 3. Hyponymy/Hypernymy: تمكَّنَ vs *Manage*

Hyponymy	Hypernymy
"**تمكن** مجموعة من المجاهدين من اقتياد مجموعة جديدة من أسرى العدو"	"A group of jihadists **managed** to lead a new group of enemy prisoners"

The English word "manage" is more general. Managing and overseeing activities or completing challenging tasks are all examples of what it might mean. It addresses both internal capacity and external supervision and control. Alternatively, "تمكنَ" (tamakkana) is more closely associated with the internal capacity or ability to accomplish anything, so it might be seen as a hyponym of "manage." "Manage" encompasses not only the empowerment or mastery part, but also larger applications such as leadership or handling responsibilities, in contrast to "tamakkana" which is more focused on these. Hence, regarding the hyponymy-hypernymy relation, "manage" is the hypernym because of its varied meanings, which include supervising, controlling, and accomplishing tasks, whereas "تمكنَ" (Tamakkana) is the hyponym because it specifically pertains to the capacity to accomplish or master something.

4. 4. Symbolism: خَنزير vs *pig*

Religious Symbolism	Natural Symbolism
"وقد سمعتم اليوم العجوز الخرف يؤاف غالانت يتحدث عن الحيوانات البشرية وكان يقص أسودنا الذين داسوا على رقاب جنوده **الخنازير**"	"Today, you heard the senile Gallant talking about human animals, he meant our lions who trampled on the neck of his **piggy** soldiers"

The Arabic word "خنزير" is strongly associated with negative religious, moral, and cultural meanings. The religious prohibition of pigs in Islam makes it a symbol of impurity, filth, and moral degradation in many nations with a Muslim majority. In contrast, the English word "pig" is largely apolitical and lacks the same moral or religious significance when used in casual conversation. Negative connotations of greed or filthiness are possible, but it does not possess the profound cultural aversion that is present in Arabic. While the pig is universally hated and taboo in Arabic-speaking cultures due to its association with moral impurity and taboo practices originating from religious prohibitions, in English-speaking cultures it is seen as just another ordinary farm animal, sometimes negatively associated with gluttony and uncleanliness. Thus, the Arabic word "خنزير" carries a significantly more negative and powerful symbolic meaning than the English word "pig" when considering the referential semantic part of symbolism. In Arabic, the term is strongly impacted by cultural taboos and religious beliefs; yet, in English, the word "pig" is typically used in a more neutral and negative context, frequently without the strong moral or religious overtones.

4. 4. Hyponymy/Hypernymy: عَجَزَ vs *unable to*

Hyponymy	Hypernymy
"لقد **عجز** العدو عن مواجهة مقاتلينا في الميدان على مدار أكثر من 60 ساعة حتى الآن"	"The enemy has been **unable to** confront our fighters on the battlefield until now for more than 60 hours"

The English word "unable" is more inclusive. In any situation where someone lacks the ability to do something, it can be used to describe their general state of incapacity. Mental, physical, or situational disability are all encompassed in this broad category. Regarding "عَجَزَ", it denotes a certain type of incapacity, so it can be viewed as a hyponym of "unable". The word "عَجَزَ" is frequently used to highlight a person's physical limitations or the overpowering situation that makes them helpless. Compared to the neutral "unable" in English, it conveys a stronger emotional or contextual meaning of failure or weakness. Therefore, the English word "unable" is a hypernym because it can mean different things when it comes to incapacity or inability, and the Arabic word "عَجَزَ" (ʿajaza) is a hyponym because it means a specific kind of incapacity that is characterized by weakness, failure, or defeat, which is a subset of the larger idea of "being unable."

4. 5. Hyponymy/Hypernymy: خَطير vs *serious*

Hyponymy	Hypernymy
"إن العدو يعلم أنه تعرض لفشل استراتيجي **خطير**"	"The enemy knows that it has suffered a **serious** strategic failure"

"Serious" is the more umbrella word in English. Anything noteworthy, serious, or important can be referred to with this word. In addition to dangerous scenarios, it also includes situations involving emotions, attitudes, and matters of high importance or that necessitate careful consideration. One way to look at "خطير" (khaṭīr) is as a hyponym of "serious" due to the fact that it explicitly refers to critical or dangerous conditions. Though it conveys gravity, it emphasises danger or danger in particular, which is only one aspect of the larger meaning of "serious." Hence, "serious" is a hypernym because it encompasses a wider range of meanings, such as danger, importance, and weightiness in different contexts, and "خطير" (khaṭīr) is a hyponym because it specifically refers to critical or dangerous situations, making it a more focused example of something being serious. Even though "خطير" means "serious," it specifically refers to danger or risk, making it a subset of severity that falls under the larger category that "serious" indicates.

4. 6. Conceptual Metaphor: غَيضٌ من فَيض vs *the tip of the iceberg*

Metaphor of *abundance*	Metaphor of *hidden danger*
"وقد نشرنا الكثير والكثير من الصور التي توثق استهداف مجاهدينا لجنود العدو وآلياته، وهذا **غيض من فيض** من مجمل عملياتنا على الأرض"	"We have published lots and lots of images documenting our jihadists' targeting of enemy soldiers and mechanisms, which is **the tip of the iceberg** of our land operations"

What is being seen is dwarfed by the wealth that lies under or beyond, according to the conceptual focus of the "غيض من فيض" metaphor. The emphasis is on the fact that what has been shared or disclosed is merely a portion of something substantially larger, typically suggesting latent wealth or untapped potential. When more could be shared or known, it is frequently used in situations involving generosity, wisdom, blessings, or information. However, "the tip of the

iceberg" emphasizes how limited our view is and how much more significant—and potentially harmful—what lies beneath the surface could be. The emphasis is on the invisible part, which could mean that the visible element is little or deceivingly small. When dealing with problems on a surface level could lead to missing the bigger picture, this method is employed when underlying concerns or complexities are not readily visible. In addition, the phrase "غيض من فيض" is frequently seen with a more positive or neutral tone since it implies that what is visible is only a small portion of a bigger and generally advantageous whole. In a positive sense, it is frequently used to suggest that there is more to provide, communicate, or comprehend. Since it implies that what is seen could be misleadingly small compared to the concealed, potentially deadly reality beneath, "the tip of the iceberg" is often used to compare things in a negative or warning light. It suggests that more thorough research and care are required. In summary, although both metaphors address the concept of a bigger, unseen force lurking beneath the surface, "غيضٌ من فيض" usually suggests possibility or optimism, whereas "the tip of the iceberg" suggests concealed danger or intricacy.

5. CONCLUSIONS

According to what has been mentioned in the analysis and discussion of the extracted speech above, there are some significant points of conclusion to come across.

First, in terms of the hyponymy-hypernymy relationship that each of English and Arabic include, Arabic shows a clear tendency towards using hyponymic expressions to depict the meaning included in the extracts in favor of the hypernyms. In other words, the Arabic terms in the hyponym-hypernym contrasts of (تمكَّنَ vs Manage), (الله vs God), (عَجَزَ vs unable to) and (خَطير vs serious) show a high degree of specificity as compared to their English counterparts. This can indicate that Arabic, at least with regard to the exhibited date, involves more semantic precision as compared to English due to its linguistic structure, cultural context, and lexicon. **Second**, semantic field analysis reveals that English semantic fields are typically more expansive than other languages. This is due to the English preference for generic phrases that are applicable in a variety of settings. In contrast, Arabic uses more specific vocabulary that is derived from its morphological system and cultural legacy, leading to more limited yet nuanced fields; for example, the semantic field of "ضاري" is more limited than that of "fierce.". **Third**, Because of its distinct linguistic, cultural, and historical connection to Islam and the Quran, which greatly influences the religious symbolism of Arabic, the language is more symbolic in its references to religion than English, especially when it comes to culture-specific terms like "pig" versus "خنزير". **Fourth**, examining conceptual metaphor in Arabic and its English translations reveals a notable denotative divergence due to cultural differences between the two languages, irrespective of the differences in the domains of metaphor utilized in each. Although the source domain of "the tip of the iceberg" and "غيضٌ من فيض" appears to be distinct, cultural norms also cause differences in the intended meaning of the two metaphors.

To sum up, when taken as a whole, these features of semantic richness make Arabic a very complex language, ideal for expressing multi-layered, culturally relevant meanings. Arabic is known for its complex web of connections and cultural distinctiveness, whereas English, although rich in its own right, tends to be more generalized and wider in its semantic areas.

REFERENCES

Al-Azary, H. & Buchanan, L. (2017). Novel metaphor comprehension: Semantic neighbourhood density interacts with concreteness. Memory & Cognition, 45, 296-307.

Buchanan et al. (2001). Characterizing semantic space: Neighborhood effects in word recognition. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 8(3), 531-544.

Channell. (1981), Applying semantic theory to vocabulary teaching, [Online], English Language Teaching Journal, v35 n2 p115-122

Corson. (1996), Using English Words, Netherlands, Springer.

Cortese, M. J. & Fugett, A. (2004). Imageability ratings for 3,000 monosyllabic words. Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36(3), 384 – 387.

Dai Weidong & He Zhaoxiong, (2013). A New Concise Course in Linguistics for Students of English. Shanghai: SHANGHAI FOREIGN LANGUAGE EDUCATION PRESS: p69.

Duñabeitia et al. (2008). NoA's ark: Influence of the number of associates in visual word recognition. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 15(6), pp. 1072 – 1077.

Fontanier, P. (1968). The Figures of Speech, Collection "Science of the Man", Flammarion, Paris

Gliozzo & Strapparava. (2009), Semantic Domains in Computational Linguistics, Trento, Springer.

Hu Zhuanglin. (2017). LINGUISTICS: A Course Book (Fifth Edition). Beijing: PEKING UNIVERSITY PRESS:p91, 96.

Jordan. (1997), English for academic purposes: a guide and resource book for teachers, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Juhasz, B. and Yap, M. (2013). Sensory experience ratings for over 5,000 mono-and disyllabic words. Behavior Research Methods, 45(1), 160-168.

Kounios et al. (2009). Semantic richness and the activation of concepts in semantic memory: Evidence from event-related potentials. Brain Research, 1282, 95-102.

Kousta, S. T., Vinson, D. P. & Vigliocco, G. (2009). Emotion words, regardless of polarity, have a processing advantage over neutral words. Cognition, 112(3), pp. 473 – 481.

Kövecses. (2010). Metaphor: A Practical Introduction (Second Edition). Oxford: Oxford

Lakoff .(1992). "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor". In Andrew Ortony (ed.), Metaphor and Thought (2nd edition), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lyons. (1995). Linguistics Semantics: An Introduction, Cambridge, Cambridge University press.

Mancaş, Mihaela, (2005), Modern Romanian Artistic Language. Sketch of Development, University of Bucharest Publishing House, Bucharest

Murphy. (2003), Semantic relations and the lexicon: antonymy, synonymy and other paradigms, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Pexman et al. (2008). There are many ways to be rich: Effects of three measures of semantic richness on visual word recognition. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 15,(1), 161–167.

Rodd, J. M. (2004). The effect of semantic ambiguity on reading aloud: A twist in the tale. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 11(3), 440-445.

Siakaluk et al. (2008). Evidence for the activation of sensorimotor information during visual word recognition: The body–object interaction effect. Cognition, 106(1), 433-443.

Syal. (2007). An introduction to linguistics: language, grammar and semantics, 2 ed, New Delhi, PHI Learning Pvt

Ullmann, S (1957). The Principles of Semantics. (2nd ed.) Glasgow: Jackson, Oxford: Blackwell.

University Press.

Wenxu .(2012). An Introducton to Linguistics. Beijing: BEIJING NORMAL UNIVERSITY PUBLISHING GROUP: p75.

Woollams, A. M. (2005). Imageability and ambiguity effects in speeded naming: Convergence and divergence. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition, 31(5), 878-890.

Yang and Huaxin. (2001). Errors of creativity: an analysis of lexical errors committed by Chinese ESL students, Lanham, University Press of America.

Yap, M. J. and Seow, C. S. (2014). The influence of emotion on lexical processing: Insights from RT distributional analysis. Psychonomic Bulletin & Review, 21(2), pp. 526-533.