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This paper has three purposes. First, it presents a descriptive approach for the analysis of the identity chain in different types of Arabic texts. Second, it shows the ways and methods by which the chain is constructed and how it functions. Third, it attempts to find out whether chain interaction is essential for judging textual coherence. The text-types subjected for this analysis are dialogue and/or narrative texts.

Before I start the analysis, it would be illuminating to define the concept of chain; how does it function? All these will be presented in the following sections.

2. Definition of a Chain

A chain is defined as a connected or a series of links that has the power of binding, connecting, and relating items to each other. It is a thread of continuity running through the whole text. Hasan (Halliday & Hasan 1985) points out that a chain is formed by a set of items each of which is related to the others by semantic relations, i.e. co-referentiality, co-classification and co-extension. Such semantic relations describe the operation of many cohesive chains, each of which withstands and purifies the field of meaning for the others. Taking this type of relation into account, one can sub-categorize chains into two types: identity chain and similarity chain. These two types of chains will be briefly defined in the following sections.

2.1 Identity chain

The identity chain is a chain that has to do with co-referentiality. That is, every member of a chain refers to the same thing, event, attribute or relation. For example, Adam and he form an identity chain since the relationship between these two items is that of co-reference, where he refers to the same noun Adam. According to Hasan
(Halliday & Hasan 1985), identity chains can be realized by devices of reference such as the pronouns he, she, it, etc. and demonstratives such as this, that, these, etc. The relation of co-referentiality can also be realized by other devices such as comparatives. However, what is typically known about co-referentiality is that it can be realized by devices of reference.

From a different perspective, the notion of co-referentiality can be developed further. For example, items such as I, my, and me, make an identity chain if, and only if, each item in the chain refers to the same person. If we take the criterion of referring to the same person, then all of these variants of the first person singular pronoun will form but one identity chain (Hasan 1979).

2.2 Similarity chain

The similarity chain is a chain that has to do with either co-classification or co-extension. In this chain, members are related to each other by the above two categories (e.g. co-classification and co-extension). In co-classification relations, things and processes to which two members refer belong to an identical class, whereas in co-extension, the two items refer to something within the same general field of meaning.

Before I embark on the analysis of the text and its main attributes, structure and texture, it would be extremely significant to give an idea about the meaning of a text. This is very significant as chains can only be constructed in texts.

3. Definition of a Text

A text can be defined as any passage, spoken or written, that has a unified whole; it is a language that is functional (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 10). What Halliday means by functional is that language is doing something in some context. Text is related to context in the sense that neither one can operate without the other. A text is a semantic unit and a social exchange of meaning (Halliday 1977; Hasan 1978).

Taking this general perspective into account, it should be pointed out that unity is displayed throughout texts; it is what distinguishes a text from a non-text. Hasan (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 52) points out that the basis for the judgement of whether a text is complete or incomplete lies in the notion of unity. A text also displays continuity and connectedness and these are very important elements for the unity of any text. The idea of connectedness, as Hasan suggests, can be mediated through lexical cohesion relations;
these relations are undeniably significant for the continuity of a text. Lexical cohesion relations can be expressed in terms of co-reference, co-classification, and co-extension and such relations, when they are strung across the text, constitute what is called the identity chain.

Identity chains are very powerful as integrative devices; they are only created in well-formed texts. The way these devices function will be manifested later in the analysis.

Furthermore, chains can be constructed in which the relation between the members is not that of identity or situational meaning; chains can also be constructed in which the relation between the members is that of similarity of situational meaning. Hasan points out that the relation of similarity of situational meaning exists between the following items:

1. synonymy: e.g. have and take.
2. antonymy: e.g. take and give.
3. hyponymy (including co-hyponymy): e.g. fruit, banana, and orange.
4. meronymy (including co-meronymy): e.g. dollar and cent.

Hasan points out that any item that stands in any of these relations to the others will constitute a similarity chain (SC).

Considering what has been previously stated, one can realize that chains are found in all texts, but whether a chain is dominating or not is a different issue. The important element here is that well-written texts manifest texture and structure. These will be illustrated in the sections that follow.

3.1 Texture

My justification for focusing on structure and texture lies in the fact that structure and texture are necessary attributes of text. That is, the unity of a text, as manifested by its texture, is a function of the unity of the contextual configuration within which the text is embedded. Therefore, if there is not texture, there is no text. Texture is very appropriate in expressing the property of being a text. According to Kress (1976), a text has texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text; it derives this texture from the fact that it functions as a unit with respect to its environment.

Hasan points out that texture is a matter of meaning relations between its parts (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 71). It is these relations (i.e. ties or meaning relations) that are constitutive of texture. Texture can be manifested by certain kinds of semantic relations between its individual
messages. These relations are realized through lexico-grammatical patterns. The property of texture is related to the listener's conception of coherence.

It would be entirely untrue, therefore, to claim that a tie is not an important concept in the formation of texture, as a tie cannot appear alone; it requires the presence of two members. These also appear in a tie unless there is a relation between them. This observation of a tie is shown in Diagram I.

![Diagram I: Representation of a Tie](image)

It can be realized that x is separated from y, but the thing that correlates between them is the relation of meaning. This nature of interconnection is called a semantic relation; it ties together the two separate members, which, in one way or another, forms the basis for cohesion among the individual messages of a text.

There are certain kinds of meaning relations between the two members; such relations are co-referential relations (pronominals and demonstratives), co-extension, and co-classification which are constitutives of textual unity and continuity of a text.

3.2 Structure

Structure is also an important source for the creation of unity; it is an expression of the unity of the social process as an event. Structure is an ordered arrangement of elements in chain relations. It is a generalized statement of the meaningful relations between elements. It is a unifying relation. The parts of a sentence or a message obviously cohere with each other. Hence, these parts that cohere with each other display texture; the elements of any
structure have an internal unity which ensures that they are all woven together to form a unified text (Hodge & Kress 1988).

Within this perspective, it should be pointed out that texture is the property of connectedness that arises from the establishment of certain cohesive devices between the constituent elements of distinct individual messages in a text (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Halliday and Hasan point out that cohesive ties are non-structural in the traditional sense, that the relation is not that of constituency.

4. Analysis of Texts

On the following pages, I will present an extract from a novel entitled awlād ḫaritnā, written by Najīb Mahfouz, who is known for his social awareness in his writing; he is the one who speaks of torture and suffering; he is the one who supports the poor and condemns the tyrants. In this extract, an attempt will be made to concentrate on discovering the identity chains throughout the text; it will show how these chains function. Matters that are enclosed in [ ] relate to non-verbal processes in the interaction. Numbers that appear in ( ) provide the address of the clause that immediately precedes the brackets.

The text is produced in the course of a dialogue between a husband Rifā'ah and his wife Yasminah reminiscing old times.

Text: (1)

(Y) stands for the wife Yasminah.
(R) stands for the husband Rifā'ah.
(*) See Notes for transliteration.

The dialogue goes as follows:

Y: limāgā anqadtni? (1) why save-me?

R: lā uṭīqu an yatafadāba aḥad (2) not tolerate to suffer someone

[fa galabahān al-gayd wa qālat fi] [then overcome-she the-anger and said in

ḥiddah:] intensity;]
Y: min ajli hādī tazawajtanī (3) min ajli hādī for sake this married-me for sake this

wa'bdūh! (4)
alone!

[fa qāla bi rajā']
[then said in hope]

R: lā taqūdī ilā ayyāmi al-gaḍab! (5) not bring back to days the-anger!

[fa ẓaddat shifatihā fīmā yuṣbihu
[then bit she lip-her in what look like

al-nadam wa qālāt bi sawtīn munṣafīd;] the-remonse and said-she in voice low;

Y: qanantuka abbatanī (6) I-thought-you loved-me

[fa qāla bi ẓidqin wa basātah;
[then said-he in truthfulness and simplicity:

R: innī uḥibuki yā Yasmi̇nah (7) I love-you voc. Yasminah

[fa lāha at-taṣajubu fi sīnayhi wa [thus appeared surprise in eyes-his and

tamtam;
murmured;

Y: ḥaqan? (8) really?

R: naṣām (9) mā min maḵluqin fi ḥāratīnā
yes not from creature in neighborhood-our

illā wa uḥibbuh (10) if not and love-him

[fa tanahhadat fi kāybatin wa ramaqathu
[then sighed-she in disappointment and glanced-him

bi rībatin qālātāni] with doubt saying-she:]
Y: fahintuk (11) sa tabqā ilā jānibī ashhuran
understood-you will remain to side-my months
tumma tuṭalliqanī (13)
then divorce-me
[fat tasa=at aynahu wa tamtam;]
[then got-wide eyes-his and murmured-he;]

R: lā ta=ūdī ilā al-afkār al-maqīyāh! (14)
not go-back-you to the-ideas the-past!

Y: ḥayyartani! (15) maḏa =induka lī? (16)
confused-me! what have-you for-me?

R: assa=ādatul al-ḥaqīqīyāh (17)
the-happiness the-real
[fa qālat bi inti=ād;]
[then said-she with resentment;]

Y: ṣaraftuhā aḥyānan min qabli an arāk! (18)
I-know-it sometimes from before to I-see-you!

R: lā sa=ādata bilā karāmāh! (19)
no happiness without dignity!
[fa qālat wahya taqāhaku =alā
taqāhaku against
[then said-she while-she laugh-she against
unwillingness-her;]

Y: wa lākinnā la nas=adu bi al-karāmāti
and but-we not made-hope-we by the-dignity
waḥdahā (20)
able alone
[fa qāla bi sawtīn ḥazīn;]
[then said-he in voice sad;]

R: lam ya=rifā aḥadun min ḥayyīnā
has not known someone from neighborhood-our
assa=ādat al-ḥaqīqīyāh (21)*
the-happiness the-real

(Mahfooz 1978: 259)
Translation of Text (1)

Y: Why did you save me? (1)
R: I cannot stand seeing people suffer. (2)
   [She was overcome with anger and said furiously:]
Y: Is that the reason why you married me? (3) Is that the only reason? (4)
   [Imploring, he replied:]
R: Don’t go back to the days of anger! (5)
   [She bit her lip as if with remorse and said with a whisper:]
Y: I thought you loved me. (6)
   [Simply and honestly, he replied:]
R: I do love you, Yasminah. (7)
   [She murmured with a trace of surprise:]
Y: Do you really?! (8)
R: Yes. (9) I love EVERYONE in our quarter! (10)
   [She sighed with disappointment and glanced at him doubtfully saying:]
Y: I understand, (11) you’ll stay with me a few months (12)
   and then you’ll divorce me. (13)
   [His eyes opened wide and he murmured:]
R: Don’t go back to your old ideas! (14)
Y: You’re confusing me! (15) What have you got for me? (16)
R: True happiness. (17)
   [She said with resentment:]
Y: I already experienced that occasionally before I met you! (18)
R: There can be no happiness without dignity! (19)
   [Laughing unwillingly, she said:]
Y: But dignity alone will not make us happy. (20)
   [Sadly, he replied:]
R: Nobody in our neighborhood has ever known true happiness. (21)

An overall look at this text will show that the text is a unified whole; it has integrative devices that simultaneously operate in it. These devices can be studied under Structure and Texture (Hasan 1979). Consider (1) and (2) in Text 1. The two individual messages are apparently connected, but not structurally; they cohere because they are members of an adjacency pair in which (1) is the question and (2) is the answer. They also cohere because of the connection between their constituent elements through ellipsis in (2). The process of ellipsis is determined by reference to (1). Also, the process of ellipsis in (2) allows us to interpret the answer as angaduki li annani ɿ uţiqlu an yataqadaba aḥad. However, this paper is not concerned with details as to how the process of ellipsis is realized, but it is worth noting
that although in this case cohesion by ellipsis connects two distinct messages, which are members of an adjacency pair, ellipsis does not always require the presence of an adjacency pair relation (i.e. question - answer) or vice versa. For example: "a'ya'na adu? yu'fiátí adama muhâdarâz=an is an example of an adjacency pair where ellipsis is not involved. On the other hand, the sentences Adam plays chess. Amy doesn't are a good example of cohesion by ellipsis that occurs outside the environment of an adjacency pair (Hasan 1979).

An examination of (2, 3 and 4) will again show that these messages are connected, and connectedness is brought about by reference to (2). This kind of relation is known as co-referentiality, where huqâq refers back to (2). This relation of co-referentiality ties (2, 3 and 4) together. This is not the only way that co-referentiality can be established by the occurrence of different pronouns. Consider the pronouns in (2, 7, 9) and (3, 6, 8, 12, 14, 15 and 17); the pronoun refers to the same situational being or referent. That is, the pronoun I in (2, 7 and 9), and the pronoun you in (3, 6, 8, 12, 14, 15 and 17), refer to the same situational referent, and that is R. It is evident that the pronouns occurring in (2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15 and 17) are threaded together across the text like sporadic beads on a chain. The relation that links or joins them together is that of identity of situational meaning. This set of items that refers to the identity of situational meaning is known as the identity chain (Hasan 1979).

There are different kinds of identity chains: big chains that can permeate throughout the whole text and small chains that are less pervasive. However, the significance of identifying big chains and small chains is not one of the purposes of this paper; the interest here is discovering chains and how they are constructed. This is in addition to whether or not chain interaction is very essential for judging textual coherence.

Furthermore, if we examine (7, 8 and 9), we can say that these messages are connected. The connection between these three messages is non-structural. One can realize that (7 and 8) are linked together and cohere not only because they are members of an adjacency pair, but also through a componental device such as ellipsis resolution involving (8) huqâqan?... and na'am... It is obvious that (8) is the question to which (9) is the answer. Na'am in (8) is elliptical and the retrievable information is na'am, uhibuki yâ Yasminah.

The identity chain is very powerful as an integrative device. This is not the only kind of chain created in well-formed texts; the larger the text, the truer this observation is. In most texts, chains are created in which the relation between the members is not of identity of situational meaning, but rather that of similarity of situational meaning. The similarity of situational meaning, as pointed earlier, can be realized through the following items:
1. Synonymy (similar meanings).
2. Antonymy (opposite meanings).
3. Hyponymy (including co-hyponymy) (meaning of one word is included in the meaning of another).

An item that stands in any of these relations to the other creates what is called a similarity chain (SC). The relation that connects any two members of a partial similarity chain will not be identical with those holding between its other pairs (Hasan 1979). Considering this general statement, one can realize that (11 and 15), (5 and 21) and (12 and 13) form similarity chains. The relation between fahimtuk and hayartani; alqa'ab and asa'adah; and satabqah and tu'alliqani, as members of the chain, is that of antonymy, whereas the relation between (10) haratinah and (21) hayyina, as members of the chain, is that of synonymy. These chains are represented in Diagram II.

![Diagram II: Representation of Similarity Chain](image)

The notion of semantic relation (sense and meaning relations) between the members of a similarity chain can be described as that of co-extension (COE) and co-classification (COD) (Hasan 1979). Co-extension can be defined as members that are located in the same space, but each member extends in a slightly divergent direction. Hasan (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 74) points out that co-extension is the kind of relation that refers to something within the same general field of meaning. This kind of relation can be recognised only through lexical cohesion. For example, consider the pair akaga and a-ip3. Both cover the same semantic space but
each extends in an opposite direction. That is, as-tā shows possession for the doer of the process of as-tā, whereas akada shows possession for someone else. This can be inferred from Text 2.

Text (2)

(*) See Notes for transliteration.

akada ādama kullā mā yahṭājuhu wa aṣṭā took-he Adam all what needed-he and gave-he
kullā mā yamliku min al-māl.* all what owns-he from the-money.

Translation of Text (2)

Adam got all what he needed and gave all the money he had.

Items in co-classification, on the other hand, refer to the non-identical members of an identical class: they cover the same semantic space, referring to the same class of things or events, but differ only by virtue of the difference between the specific situational referent of each. Hasan (Halliday & Hasan 1985: 74) points out that, in this type of meaning relation, things, processes, or circumstances to which x and y refer, belong to an identical class, but each end of the cohesive tie refers to a distinct member of this class. Hasan argues that there is a significant difference between co-referentiality and co-classification. This is demonstrated in the following text:

Text (3)

(*) See Notes for transliteration.

inna ṭawratā qurābī ṭawratun qāma biḥa emph. revolution urabiyy revolution started in-it
al-jayās (1) wa inđama ilayḥa aṣṣāqā (2) wa the-army and joined-it to-it the-people and
ṭawratu ṭalaṭa wa ʿiṣrūn yūlū qāma revolution third and twenty July started
biḥa al-jayās (3) wa ayyadahā aṣṣāqā (4) in-it the-army and supported-it the-people
Translation of Text (3)

The revolution of Urabi was started by the army (1) and with the acquiescence of the people (2); the revolution of July 23rd was started by the army (3) with the support of the people (4); and the revolution of the 19th was started by the people alone (5)...

Considering Text 3, one can realize that each token of revolution refers to a distinct member of the same class. Co-classification is different from co-extension in that, co-classification can only be realized through cohesive devices such as ellipsis and substitution, whereas co-extension can be realized through lexical cohesion. Examples of both types of relations can be found in Text 1: maqlūqin (10), ahadan (21), ḥaratinā (10) and hayyinā (21) exhibit co-extension relations whereas ʿarifūhā in (18) can be interpreted as ʿaraftu assaʿādata al-ḥaqiqiyah by reference to (17). In this case, the situational elements to which (17) and (18) refer are different members of the same class.

5. Chain Interaction and Formation

It should be pointed out that the importance of chain formation is quite evident in the texts under discussion. Well-formed texts will actually contain a number of identity and similarity chains. However, one cannot deny the fact that some very small proportions of lexical items will remain outside chains of one kind or another. Text 1 displays the fact that less than ten lexical items fall outside the chains.

With this general perspective, one can argue that chain formation is a powerful and significant device, because each chain is like a thread of continuity running through a sizeable part of the text (Hasan 1979). If we examine the overall structure of Text 1, one can realize that chains are characteristically formed by referential and lexical cohesive ties. It is a measure of the centrality of chain formation to the unity of a text, that texts, in which texture is not mediated by these two types of cohesive ties, are not easy to find. Some forms of referential and lexical cohesion can be
found in all texts of all genres.

In most texts, identity chains and similarity chains occur side by side. They are motivated by different principles of continuity. The unity that is created by the similarity chain can be seen as a reflection of the unity of register. The difference between them is that similarity chains cannot be text-defining while identity chains can. Identity chains cannot cross the boundary of a text; they can be described as text-defining. That is, whatever pieces of language form one particular identity chain, they must all belong to the same text. This supports the fact that the identity chain is the expression of the unity of a text. It follows, therefore, that the construction of at least one identity chain would be obligatory to all well-formed texts (Hasan 1979). In normal texts, Hasan argues that one identity chain is obligatory. This, however, does not imply that texture can be created solely by the presence of identity chains; both types of chain must occur side by side, and the longer the text, the larger the number of each chain.

The pattern of chain interaction for texture is, in fact, more important than the creation of the chain. The relation or amount of coherence in a text depends very much on the unbroken interaction amongst its chains (Hasan 1979). This interaction happens when two members of a chain stand in an identical and functional relation to two or more members of another chain (Actor-Goal). Actor here means the logical subject or performer whereas goal is used here to imply the receiver in a communication situation (for more information, see Halliday 1970: 159). Also, in well-formed texts, no two chains form a separate interacting unit. This means that if chain A interacts with chain B, then chain B may, in its turn, interact with chain C and D, which will, in their turn, interact with others and so on. As Hasan suggests, whenever one may start, step by step, one will cover the entire set of interactions within the text. This observation can be seen in Diagram III.

![Diagram III: Actor-Goal Interaction.](image-url)
This diagram shows that, in Text I, there is a continuity of relationship between R and Y through the whole dialogue. It also shows that, through a constant correlation of interconnection between R and Y, the individual and distinct messages in the text are brought together. These relations between the two members (i.e. R and Y) are expressed in terms of Actor-Goal relations.

Another interaction takes a form of a process. A process, as Halliday (in Kress 1976) points out, is a representation of meaning; it is meaning in the sense of content. It refers to anything that is expressed in/by a verb, event (whether it is a physical event or not), a state or relation. A process consists of three components: the process itself, the participant in the process and the circumstances associated with the process.

According to Halliday, there are three basic types of processes. First, there is material process, (i.e. a process of doing such as the verbs shoot, throw, etc.). Second, there is a mental process, (i.e. a process of sensing such as the verbs like, see, please, etc.). Third, there is a relational process, (i.e. a process of being such as the verbs is, was, etc.).

Accordingly, a process can be mental (see, please, believe, say); action (throw, shoot); and it can be relational (is, was) (for more information on types of processes, see Kress 1976).

To this effect, consider (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14), where (14) ties itself back with (5). They indicate that there is a continuing and tying relation between the individual messages in the text. This is also obvious in Diagram IV.

Diagram (IV): Continuity of Semantic Relations.
Each part of this diagram represents a chain, and within these parts, members interact with other members. The interaction is realized through the relation expressed in terms of Actor-Material Process - Locative Circumstance. Furthermore, an examination of (17, 18, 19, 20 and 21) will show that chain interaction goes on to cover the entire text. Chain interaction displays the continuities of the text, in which members of distinct messages interact with each other forming a coherent and unified text. The relations between these members can be expressed in terms of Actor-Goal relations and part of the chain interacts with other elements through a causal relation. These relations are shown in Diagram V.

![Diagram V: Manifestation of Actor-Goal Relation.]

It is obvious from the diagram that there is always a constant network among all members of the text, but whether the relation between these members is Actor-Goal, Actor-Material-Process within locative Circumstance or Causal relation, the most significant factor for the creation of textual coherence, continuity of a text, and constant interaction between distinct messages in the text remains to be seen.

This continuum of interaction is an indication of tight coherence within the text. This type of interaction is obvious in Text 1 where one chain interacts with another and the other chain interacts with another chain and so on. Therefore, chain interaction is the most powerful of all the measures for determining the coherence of a text.

Furthermore, Hasan argues that if one of the important means of establishing texture is the interaction of chains, it is difficult to see how one can talk intelligently about textual meaning without referring to these units.
6. Conclusion

To sum up this paper, it is noticeable that chains are unifying devices, and one cannot deny the fact that they are extremely significant to the unity of all the texts under discussion. An overall examination of Text 1 shows that chains are found in almost every individual message. They are found in (1 and 2) and at a later stage, they connect (1, 2, 3 and 4) together to form a complete and unified text. In fact, chains go on to form or interact with other chains. This is obvious particularly when one examines the fact that from (1) up to (11), cohesive relations appear across the text as a series of connected or related things. In Text 1, chains are characteristically realized by referential and lexical cohesive devices. Any text in which texture is not realized by these two types of cohesive ties will not constitute a text. In fact, referential and lexical cohesive ties are capable of forming chains continuously whenever they occur. This general observation can be justified by a careful examination of Text 1 where there are continuous unifying chains from (1) up to (11) and from (11) up to (21). At a later stage, an individual message ties itself back with what has preceded till all individual messages are completely unified in a consolidated text. This observation is supported by Hasan's remark that chain interaction cannot create separate forms, i.e. cannot form a separate unit. That is, whenever one chain starts, step by step, it will cover the entire set of interaction within the text.
NOTES

In order to facilitate the pronunciation of Arabic words appearing in the original texts, the following transliteration system has been used (El-Shiyab 1990).

**Arabic Consonants**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arabic</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>١</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٢</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٣</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٤</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٥</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٦</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٧</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٨</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>٩</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٠</td>
<td>sh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١١</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٢</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٣</td>
<td>j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٤</td>
<td>g</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٥</td>
<td>h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٦</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>١٧</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Arabic Vowels**

- **Long Vowels**
  - ā | a | ay - e.g. bayt 'house'
  - ū | u | aw - e.g. nawn 'sleep'

- **Short Vowels**
  - ī | i |
  - ū | u |

The glottal stop /ʼ/ is omitted from initial position.
The repetition of the same consonant as in [akkada] 'affirmed' indicates a geminated letter.
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