In the very center of Africa lies a group of Niger-Congo languages separated from related languages in the west by a wedge of Benue-Congo languages that reaches northward from the Congo republics into the Central African Republic, the Cameroun Republic, and Nigeria. The group, taken to be a linguistic unit, a subphyllum of Niger-Congo by Greenberg (1963), has an east-west distribution that reaches from the Cameroun to the Sudan and includes both the southeastern portion of the Chad and the northern portion of the Congo Republic (Kinshasa), with the Central African Republic representing most of its territorial expanse. This group of languages actually consists of at least two subgroups: Adamawa, located principally in the Cameroun (in the general area of the Adamawa mountains), but spilling over into the adjoining parts of Nigeria, the Chad, and the C.A.R.; and Eastern, so-called because these languages once were considered to represent the eastern extension of Sudanic languages. Hence, Adamawa-Eastern. Murdock (1959) uses the term Eastern Nigritic instead, but his classification is not taken very seriously by linguists.

The geographical distribution of these languages is for the most part uniform in the center but disperses at both the eastern and western ends. Thus affected are the Adamawa languages scattered in generally small pockets in Nigeria, the Cameroun, and the Chad. The Eastern languages, on the other hand, spread solidly from the eastern part of the Cameroun all the way through the C.A.R. This distribution is broken up in the Sudan, where Eastern languages are minority languages among Central Sudanic ones, and in the Congo, where the presence of Benue-Congo lan-

---

1 This study would have been impossible without the help of many who responded to a request for information about languages about which I knew nothing. Those whose information is used here are the following: Pierre Alexandre, Lee Bohnhoff, Luc Bouquiaux, Jan de Waard, Donald Flaten, Dean Gilliland, Peter Ipema, Hermann Jungraithmayr, P.F. Lacroix, R. Nelson, Donald Raun, Leslie Stennes, Jacqueline Thomas, and Kay Williamson. A special acknowledgement is due Bohnhoff who provided me with a great deal of data, particularly on Duru, most of which I could not use in this study, and Stennes who, as will be seen in the text, knows a great deal about the linguistic situation of northern Cameroun. He also read the manuscript of this study. To those whom I have not named I am, of course, also deeply grateful.

2 The French rendition of this designation is a literal Adamawa-Oriental and it should lead to some misunderstanding if used carelessly; there is no ‘Adamawa occidental’, for example.
languages makes for a jigsaw puzzle of the area, albeit a simple one. It is in these southern and eastern parts of the territory also that the subgroups of Eastern languages are intermixed; the central part is uniformly Gbaya-Manza-Ngbaka, Banda, and Zande, going from west to east.

ADAMAWA

Adamawa is the more poorly known of the two subphyla of Adamawa-Eastern. The listing of languages and dialects is less reliable, and the linguistic studies are fewer. It therefore presents the greatest challenges and opportunities for field research in the next decade or two. Already, in fact, there are several investigators whose reports will greatly clarify the internal relationships of the Adamawa languages and of these languages to Eastern or other languages of the area.

There are fourteen different groups of languages in this subphylum, according to Greenberg, and the Voegelins (1964) use the same number and order of listing them. This list is given below with one slight modification. As a mnemonic aid, the first language of each group is either the best known one of that group or is in an alphabetical relationship to the first mentioned languages of the other groups.

The order within each group here is, as it is in the Voegelins' work, for the most part that of Greenberg. It should be understood, however, that the order is not necessarily significant. In some cases more closely related dialects may be listed adjacent to each other, but in other cases Greenberg himself seemed to be following other lists. For example, both Greenberg and Richardson (1957) may be following Meek, whose concern was not primarily a linguistic one, in listing Donga, Lekon, Wom, and Mumbake (group 2) in that order.

Adamawa Languages and Dialects
(following Greenberg)

1. Cham, Mona, Tula, Dadiya, Waja, Kamu, Awak.
2. Chamba, Donga, Lekon, Wom, Mumbake, Ndagam.
3. Daka, Taram.
6. Mbum, Dama, Mono, Mbere, Mundang, Yasing, Mangbei, Kpere, Lakka, Dek.
7. Mboi, Yungur, Libo, Roba.
8. Kam.
10. Longuda.
11. Fali.
14. Masa.

The Voegelins go beyond Greenberg in giving information about the location of the languages and dialects and about their size in numbers of speakers. The information is drawn from many sources of unequal authority. For example, whereas only 2,000 speakers are attributed to Duru (group 4), the figure should be closer to 32,000 according to a recent investigation (Bohnhoff, pers. comm.). Likewise, although group 6 is said to be found only in the Cameroun and the Chad, it is also represented in the Central African Republic by Pana, Pondo, Gônge, Tale, and Kârë. In fact, the town of Pawa supposedly in the Chad is probably the same as Paoua [Pâwâ] in the C.A.R. (To the east are found Gbaya-speaking peoples and to the immediate north are found the Kaba who speak a Central Sudanic language.)

As work continues in the northwestern part of the Adamawa-Eastern area new languages are being discovered, some of which may belong to this phylum. For example, K. Williamson wonders if Patapori, spoken in the town of Serti (Gashaka District, Sardauna Province, Nigeria), and Yingulu, spoken on the Nigeria-Cameroun border, might not be Adamawa. The first has words like nô{to) 'eye', nir ‘name’, and kûm ‘fat, oil’, and the second words like nîr ‘name’, and nûm ‘oil’. Likewise Lacroix suggests that the following languages, all found at the upper reaches of the Benue River, might possibly be Adamawa: Gewe (of Gebake), Dule (of Gbake), Nyam-Nyam (of Be and Tcheboa), Ngong (of Tcheboa), Mbanu (of Gunna), and Nagumi (of Bibemi). Jungraithmayr (pers. comm.) adds the name of Burak from the Tangale/Waja Division of Bauchi Province, Nigeria. Although it is found in the same area as some group 1 languages, it is quite different in vocabulary and in having no signs of the noun class system. It does have some Niger-Congo cognates, but these may be evidence only of its membership in this macrophylum: e.g. nuy 'eye', cf. Dadiya nu and Awak nügi; pronominal suffixes -mi 1S, -mo 2S, -ma 3S.

In the following paragraphs Adamawa groups are taken up one by one and comments are made about internal and external relationships.

Group 1. In addition to the languages included in this group by Greenberg, Jungraftmayr (pers. comm.) would add Awak, Mona (a very close dialect of Cham), and Longuda. Since Longuda was put in a group of its own by Greenberg (viz. 10), this addition of Longuda is a significant modification of group 1. Jungraftmayr does admit that it is the most distantly related of the group, but it seems to preserve the original class system best. He characterizes all of these as suffix class languages. For example:

‘lion’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Tula, Cham</th>
<th>Longuda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>turuy-wa</td>
<td>turuy-ha</td>
<td>turum</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘earth’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Tula, Cham</th>
<th>Longuda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>too (i.e. too-ma)</td>
<td></td>
<td>katam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This classification is based on fieldwork done in the Tangale/Waja Division of Bauchi Province of Nigeria. In the course of this investigation no information was obtained to confirm the existence of Greenberg's Kamu, a language about which others are also ignorant.

Group 2. According to Lacroix (pers. comm.) some of the languages of this group are more closely related to others in group 4. He suggests, for example, that Kolbila (group 4) is similar to Lekon and Donga and should be here in group 2. (Is this some kind of confirmation of an earlier classification that, according to de Waard, made groups 2, 3, and 4 all 'part of Chamba'? On the other hand, Gilliland (pers. comm.) says that groups 8 and 2 are related if one accepts the similarity of Kam and Donga, for, he says, 'the linguistic continuity is well known'. Although the Chamba are the best known people of this group, there are more dialects than have hitherto been reported. Flaten (pers. comm.), for example, gives the following three: Nakeyare, the most widespread of the three, centered around Jada, Nigeria; Dako, a rather large group, near the Cameroun border, south of Jada; and Leko, spoken by about 10,000 people, straddling the Nigeria-Cameroun border, around Mt. Balkossa. These seem to be quite different dialects, and people say that they cannot understand each other. In the Bamenda area also there are supposed to be about 9,000 Chamba speakers, principally around Nyona (Nepgayeba) and Bali Kumba (Nepkolbe). Ipema (pers. comm.) reports that there are small pockets of Chamba among the Jukun in the Takum hill district of Nigeria. Here, as in much of this Adamawa area, as is attested by the difficulty one has had in determining linguistic relationships, there is considerable borrowing. Ipema, for example, says that the Chamba of the town of Donga, on the Donga river, are 'strongly influenced by their contacts and ties' with the Wapa, who are also known as Jukun.

Group 4. Of this group Duru will be, if it is not already, the best known for the next several years. Bohnhoff, for example, has undertaken an extensive study of the language. But Namshi (with all of its variant spellings) is the best known term. It should, however, be retired if Nelson (pers. comm.) is correct in saying that it is both pejorative and ambiguous. For example, the Pape, Dupa (that is, Nduupa), and Dowayo have all been called Namshi, perhaps following the practice of the Fulani; the Pape themselves use this term of the Dupa. The government has discontinued using it of the Dowayo.

Some of the communities represented in this group are quite small. According to Nelson, there are less than 5,000 (Bohnhoff says 'only a few hundred') Dupa, about 2,000 Koma, and about 1,000 Pape near the town of Poli in the vicinity of Mt. Yinga.

The internal relationships of this group are beginning to take shape. Lacroix says that Kpotopo and Kutin are close enough to be considered dialects of the same language, and Nelson (not a linguist) thinks that Vere, Pape, and Kutin are closely related.
although not necessarily dialects of the same language. Nduupa (Greenberg’s Dupa) is definitely a separate language and is somewhat closely related to Duru. Bohnhoff has compared these two languages with Doyāyo (spelled Doñaño by him, the language of the Dowayo ‘tribe’) and concludes that Duru and Nduupa are more closely related than either is to Doyāyo. (These languages are spoken in the general area enclosed by Poli, Tcholliré, and Ngaoundéré.) Grammatical and phonological comparisons confirm the lexical ones. On the basis of 157 word-sets the probable cognates are as follows:

- Nduupa-Doyāyo 40%
- Duru-Doyāyo 36%
- Duru-Nduupa 61%

Duru, incidentally, has five or six more-or-less mutually intelligible dialects including Ngbang, Goom, Paani, and two that have not yet been identified by name.

As for external relationships, we have Lacroix’ comparison of Duru with Galke, a language of group 6. This comparison (1962) is based on data obtained in 1960 at Mbé and Tcholliré. There are 95 glosses for the terms in the French protocol of which 7 are identical and 22 probable. This represents only 6.6%. But it is to be noted that most of these are cultural terms or ones so widely found (like ‘father’) that they are hardly diagnostic. The result is that not a single word is a member of the so-called Swadesh list.

Group 5. Gilliland, without the aid of precise lexical studies, suggests that Yendang and Waka are more closely related to each other than either is to Mumuye. In fact, these seem to be as far apart as Donga and Chamba (group 2) are from Kam (group 8). It should also be noted that Zinna is only a dialect of Mumuye which has about five dialects.

Group 6. On the basis of his own linguistic observations, de Waard (pers. comm.) supports the integrity of this group with the exception of Mangbei. Since Stennes (pers, comm.) considers Mangbei to be closer to Fali (group 9) than it is to Mundang of this group, it would seem that Mangbei may indeed have to be excluded. It is spoken by about 2,000 speakers, according to Stennes, on the Cameroun-Chad border. It is characteristic of this area that Fali, Mangbei, and Mundang, although not at all closely related, are all found in the same geographical area.

The presence of Yasing is also problematic. Mouchet (1938) includes it here (and is responsible for its present membership?), but Stennes would relate it to Tupuri (group 9). Since Stennes rejects Greenberg’s classifying Tupuri as a Chadic language, this raises an interesting problem about the relationship of these languages.

Greenberg lists both Mbere and Lakka for this group, but these appear to be ambiguous names. Mbere, for example, is also used of the Gbaya around Bouar, hence Gbaya-Mbere, and the Voegelins refer to a Laka Mbere that belongs to this group; they actually drop the name Lakka. The ubiquity of the name Lakka, as with Namshi and Mbere, may be explained as a general ethnic designation. Stennes
suggests that it was used by Muslims to mean ‘pagan’. In any case, it is used pejoratively.

As has already been mentioned, the representatives of this group in the Central African Republic are Pânâ, Pondo, Gonge, Tale, and Kârë dialects, attested to me personally by many informants, and that form a wedge in the Gbayâ area of northwestern C.A.R., with the apex being at Bozoum. Although there is a language of the Cameroun known as Kârî, it would be presumptuous to identify it with Kârê, the proper pronunciation for what is known in the C.A.R. as Karre; they certainly do not occur in the same localities. In the relationships between these dialects, on the basis of reports from Tali informants near Bozoum, intelligibility decreases in this order: Tali, Pondo, Kârë, Pana, Gonge [göge], Mbum.

In the list of Adamawa languages Mbana, Bana, and Imbana are given as being related to Mundang. These are undoubtedly various forms of the same word distorted by Europeans: in Bana the nasal onset is lost and in Imbana it is kept but is preceded by a vowel. Stennes does not know these names, as well as Kiziere, given by Murdock. Zazing and Kaele are place names. Zing (or sóy), however, means ‘up’, and Zazing may have referred to up-country Mundang. The language spoken at Kaele is mutually intelligible with Mundang according to Stennes.

Only the following can be said at this time about the internal and external relations of group 6. In comparing my own Kârë material with a word list of Mundang provided by D. Raun, I find 24.5% of probable cognates in 175 pairs of words; the questionable cognates represented 8%. The list of 43 probable cognates between Kârë and Mundang is given below.

**Kârë-Mundang Cognates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kârë</th>
<th>Mundang</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>animal</td>
<td>nây</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bite</td>
<td>nuy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood</td>
<td>sem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chicken</td>
<td>kaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>come</td>
<td>gi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>këë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dew</td>
<td>mem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>die</td>
<td>hu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink</td>
<td>nzo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ear</td>
<td>suka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Provided with my Kârë questionnaire, C. Pairault, with the collaboration of Maurice Houis, attempted a comparison of Kârë and Kulaal (group 13). The result is stated as follows: ‘Pour autant qu’il m’était possible d’isoler, dans vos données, les constituants syntaxiques, je ne trouve aucune ressemblance entre le vocabulaire kùlääf et les éléments kârë’.
The same collection of Kârê material was compared by Bohnhoff with Duru (group 4), leading to the identification of 13.8% of probable cognates in 138 pairs of words. But since Duru has been demonstrated to be quite distant from another group 4 language, namely, Doyâyo (see above), it is necessary to compare Doyâyo, not Duru, with Kârê and Mundang, for example, to get an idea of the relationship between groups 4 and 6. On the basis of Bohnhoff’s wordlists, I have established the following probable cognates.
Doyāyo-Kārē-Gbeya Cognates

bird  nɔɔs-e  ndoe  nɔy
bite  lɔŋ  nuŋ  yɔŋ
black  wil-ɔ  yiri
die  wɔri  hu
dig  zɔe  nzo  zã
drink  yɔ  nɔ  nɔ
egg  baar-e  pãrã
eye  yõl-e  nõna
father  baap-ɔ  baba
fog  kuu zee-õ  kutû
four  nãso  nãã
he  gi  ke
head  zul-e  tul
hit  le  rik
I  mĩ  mĩ
man  wɔl io-øo  wɔrĩ  wëey
moon  see-ɔo  ze
mother  nãã-ɔo  nãã
mountain  gããt-ɔo  kara
star  see waa-ɔo  sõrã
stick, V  sãdi  zũ
three  taars  tar-
tooth  mũŋ-go  nĩn
tree  tẽ-ɔo  di  te
you (sg.)  mĩ  mĩ

Group 9. Since this group is represented by only two language names, and since there is a Chadic, that is, Afroasiatic, language by the name of Jen (more accurately, Njeng), according to Stennes (pers. comm.), one is entitled to question the inclusion of Jen in this group and even perhaps the authenticity of the group itself. It should be pointed out that Lembezat (1961:191) includes a Njegn (Njeign, Njai-Jegn) with Bata.

Group 11. The name Fali may have been given by the Fulani to a group of people, who otherwise have no general term for themselves, because they fled to the hills where they were difficult to dislodge. The word means something like ‘stuck up on top’. The Fali in Nigeria may have got their name in a similar way, but they are by no means related.

4 These 14 Doyāyo-Kārē cognates occur in 127 pairs of words. If these are accepted, the percentage is therefore 11%. The Gbeya cognates are given only by way of comparison. Tone marks are omitted except in the Gbeya examples. The Doyāyo material was provided by L. Bohnhoff.
The Fali group is located in the Guider and Garoua arrondissements of the Garoua Préfecture and are estimated to number about 50,000 people. Fali may be called one language, but the differences in dialect are so great that many inter-Fali contacts are made by use of the Fulani language. There are probably five dialect clusters: Southern Fali (e.g. Tingueling), Western Fali (the Basheo area), Northern Fali (e.g. Bonyoum, Bossoum), Bori-Peske, and Kangu. (All of this is from L. Stennes.)

Group 13. The recent work of Pairault seems to establish the integrity of this group whose existence goes back to Nachtigal, followed by Gaudefroy-Denombynes and others. But Pairault adds more languages while excluding some whose names led to their inclusion here. The group is retained here as part of Adamawa, because of Greenberg's listing, but Pairault feels that this 'Boa group' might turn out to be Eastern in affiliation. P. Alexandre (pers. comm.), who has seen Pairault's material, says of one of these languages, Kulaal, that it 'is a class language which ... looks like something out of Chari-Nile by Adamawa-Eastern or the other way round'.

The languages of this group are spoken primarily if not exclusively in the Chad. The Voegelins add the Central African Republic, but no specific languages are mentioned, and I know of no languages from the following list in the C.A.R. Since they are probably repeating Tucker and Bryan (1956), Pairault's investigation is important. It is the 'Gula' that were supposed to be found in the north-central and northeastern part of the C.A.R., but the 'Gula' other than the 'Gula Iro Melfi', whom he identifies as Kulaal, Moriil, and Tāātaal, are mostly Sara-speaking peoples. Like so many ethnic terms in Africa (see 'Namshi' above), 'Gula' seems to refer to different kinds of groups.

The languages of this group may now be established as the following: Boa, Nielim, Koke, Mana, Tunya, Fanyan, Bolgo, and Gula. The last includes Moriil and Tāātaal, which may be known as Gula Gera (and includes Zan, Iber, Chinguil, and Bon), and Kulaal, which may be known as Gula Iro because it is spoken in the Lake Iro area. Kulaal is divided into four dialects by Pairault, grouped, on the one hand, into Pōnaal, Tiāala, and Tīītaal, and, on the other hand, Patool, on the ease of comprehension reported by informants. However, Tāātaal seems to show more similarity to Patool than it does to Pōnaal. Kulaal is another small group, represented by about 2,500 speakers.

Bibliography

In general

Most of the works on Adamawa languages at this time are of a general nature, many of them providing hardly more than language names or lists of words.

Gaillard and Poutrin (1914) and Lembezat (1961) are alike in providing ethnographic information about the Chad and northern Cameroun respectively. Lembezat's is an exceptionally good overview; the Adamawa groups it deals with are Mundang, Fali, Doayo, Mbhum, and Duru.

More strictly linguistic in nature are the following. Baudelaire (1944) provides the numbers 1 to 10 for many Cameroun languages, including Dama, Doayo, Duli, Dupa,
Duru (three dialects), Fali (four dialects), Galké, Kali, Mambay, Mbum (five dialects),
Monon, Mundang, Nyam-Nyam, Panon, and Sari. Meek (1931) is an ethnographic
survey, but it does provide many wordlists. These are listed in the same, but not
alphabetical order, in three columns: English – Orthographical – Phonetic. The Ada-
mawa languages covered are: Fali, Chamba, Wom, Mumbake, Chamba Daka, Verre,
Mumuye, Waka, Teme, Kumba, Longuda, Yungur, Mboi, Libo, Mbum, Jen, and Kam.

There are three works of a general ethnographic nature that contribute information
of linguistic significance. Baumann and Westermann (1948) classifies African lan-
guages. Murdock (1959), although published after Greenberg's first reclassification of
African languages, sets forth his own hypotheses in terms of culture history. Wieschoff
(1948) is a little-known work with a very good bibliography as far as it goes.

In the ethnographic surveys of the Cameroun and the former French territory of
French Equatorial Africa other attempts at classifying ethnic groups and languages
can be found. On the Cameroun are works such as Anonymous (1934) and Anony-
mous (1944) and Dugast (1949). The first two classify tribes by geographical areas and
linguistic relationship, with some information about population being given. The
classification of 1944 is quite bad. For example, there is a 'Groupe des Sara occiden-
taux' that includes not only Sara, but also Mbum, Tupuri, Bamun, Bamiléké, Nyokon,
and Baboute! Dugast's work, on the other hand, is quite good. Poutrin (1914) is
similar to the others, but is restricted to French Equatorial Africa.

Attempts to classify African languages in general include Greenberg's (1955, 1963)
and the Voegelins' (1964). The latter work uses published material, including Green-
berg's and Murdock's, but it is also based on personal communications from people
with field experience.

Linguistic works that cover both Eastern and Adamawa include the well-known
publications of the International African Institute such as Guthrie, Tucker, et al.
(1956), Richardson (1957), and Westermann and Bryan (1952). These provide very
little linguistic information, however, contenting themselves with giving demographic
data and statements about linguistic relationships. The first two works resulted from
the survey to establish the northern boundary of the Bantu language group. Similar
to these and published at about the same time is Hauser (1954).

Struck's work (1912), although limited to a rather restricted geographical area, is
quite well done. Its two maps in color are exceptionally good.

Mouchet (1938) is one of the better surveys of the earlier period. It covers the
Cameroun area North of Rey Buba and is based on data collected on three occasions
between 1925 and 1937. There are about 300 terms and a few pages of grammatical
notes. Mouchet makes an attempt to classify the languages and arrives at two for this
area: Kabi-Bénwé (that includes Tupuri, Mundang, Mono, and Kali) and Logone-
Mandara. The latter is not treated in this survey. Strümpell (1910), with the coopera-
tion of Bernhard Struck, compared 29 languages, using words, phrases, and sentences.
The Adamawa languages in the list are: Jassing, Mangbei, Were, Chamba-Daka,
Kotopo, Mbum, Durr, Kolbilla, Dama, Ssari (i.e. Sari), Pape, Namshi, Falli, Niam-
Niam, and Mono. Although much older than Mouchet's study, it is almost as good. Another good survey is that of Tessmann (1932) which ought to be consulted for its bibliographical references. The Adamawa languages are found in his Musikton- sprachen – Nigratische Sprachen – Nichtklassensprachen (i.e. the second subgroup of musical-toned languages): namely, Mbum, Duru, Niam-Niam, and Falli. In this group are also found the Eastern languages Mbaka and Baja. In this survey might be mentioned Czekanowski (1917) and Lukas (1937), but they were not available to me.

By groups

Group 4. Griaule (1941) deals with the area southwest of Garoua in the Cameroun where the following languages are spoken: Namči (the most numerous single group), Fulani, Papé, Chamba, Koma, Batta, Voko, Kolbila, Bornu, Kutin, Mbum, Vere, Hausa — in an order of decreasing size. The total population was about 31,000. The data were collected during one week at Poli in 1932 from five informants interviewed in Fulani by means of a Fulani-speaking sergeant. The linguistic material presented in this article consists of about 460 entries. Each one of the above-mentioned groups, according to Griaule, speaks several dialects, by which he probably means languages as well as dialects.

Group 5. Vielhauer's Grundzüge einer Grammatik der Balisprache is mentioned by Westermann and Bryan (1952). It is not certain, however, that it really is related to Chamba.

Group 6. The best-known language of this group is Mbum. One of the earliest publications is that of von Duisburg (1925). It provides some grammatical information on phonology, morphology, parts of speech, and syntax. Its wordlists go in two directions, German to Mbum and Mbum to German. The dialect used for the lexical material is Pere; it is very similar to Mbum he says. Pere (also Peri) is further identified with Wuna, Buna, Bure, and Kepperre. This work seems to be the authority used by later classifiers of Cameroun languages. Tessmann (1930) gives information on a couple of Mbum dialects, including wordlists and grammatical notes. (For the introduction to this study one must see Zeitschrift für Ethnologie, 1930, 60.305–52.) In his work of 1932 Tessmann classifies the languages of the ‘Mbumgruppe’. There is also published a linguistic map in color. Flottum’s Mbum-English dictionary (70 pp.) is the best there is on the language, but it was only duplicated for limited use. He also published a tale with translation and notes (1950). Hagège has a brief description of Mbum phonology (1968). Galke ("dafi") is treated by Lacroix (1962) in a brief grammatical sketch. The language is spoken around Tcholliré, Cameroun, and is related to Mbum by about 40.3% (or 56.25% using the ‘Swadesh’ list). The article also has Galke, Mbum, and Duru wordlists.

Group 11. Lebeuf (1941) deals with the Fali area as well as with Fali itself. In comparing his own material with that of Strümpell (1922–23), Lebeuf finds some similarities, but his dialects ‘ne présentent pas de ressemblance appréciable’ with Meek’s (1931). All but one of the wordlists were collected in 1936–37 in the area north
of Garoua. The informants were usually the 'chefs de village', all interviewed in Fulani. It is to be inferred from what he says that he had about 300 more words from two other Fali dialects. These have not yet been published. In Gauthier (1967) we have a description of the different Fali literary genres and the publication of a romantic dialogue, a tale, and a few poems.

Group 13. De Rendinger (1949) is a survey of a geographical area, so Bolgo and Gula, languages he considers Charien (in contrast to Chari-Ouadaien), get only incidental treatment. This area is between the Chari and the Ouadaï rivers and extends 700 km east to west and 300 km north to south, with Melfi at about the center. The study is exceptionally important because it is based on data collected between 1909 and 1912 at a time when people were just beginning to come down from the hills where they had fled from the slave raiders. When he says that these languages have borrowed considerably from one another, we are reminded how difficult it is going to be to establish relationships between the groups within both Adamawa and Eastern languages for quite some time to come (see above for Duru and Galke). The wordlists are arranged grammatically. Boujol and Clupot (1941) give demographic information on the Bolgo, Fanyan, and Koke. Mouchet on Gula (1958) is a nicely done grammatical sketch, but it has no wordlists. Gaudefroy-Demombynes (1906) has information about Boa, Niellim, Mana, and Tounia.

Group 14. Masa is the only language listed by Greenberg for this group, and if it is the same as the one documented by Mayssal et al. (1967) it is not Adamawa but Chadic according to Stennes. It will also be necessary to exclude languages related by Murdock to Masa, namely, Bana, Banana, Kim, Marba, and Musoi. Stennes knows nothing of Budugum, Gisei, Kosob, also identified with Masa by Murdock.

EASTERN

The integrity of the Eastern subphyllum of Adamawa-Eastern seems rather obvious although its internal structure and its relationship to Adamawa are not at all clear yet. There is, for example, no indication as to what languages of the two branches of AE are the most closely related (but see below). If one takes Gbayà, the most western of the Eastern languages, with what Adamawa language would it be compared? (Gbayà, of course, consists of many dialects some of which are nearly mutually unintelligible with each other.)

Two coterritorial Adamawa and Eastern languages that might be compared are Kârë and the Gbayà of Bozoum, both spoken in the Sous-Préfecture of Bozoum. The cognates turn out to be few indeed. Using the same protocol that was used in comparing Kârë with Mundang and Duru, the Gbayà dialect of Bossangoa (my Gbeya), which is mutually intelligible with that of Bozoum, only 135 km away from Bossangoa, we find that out of 230 pairs of terms there are 33, or 10.43%, probable cognates. But it may be necessary to delete twelve of these pairs for two reasons. Four of the pairs
were not detected by simple examination, the usual method followed in much of our work in Africa at the present time; rather they appeared only after examination of Greenberg’s (1963) Niger-Congo wordlist. Eight more of these words are so similar in shape that one suspects borrowing: e.g., bûrûngû ‘heart’, rendeng ‘smooth’, ām ‘to suck’, and săp/sâm ‘saliva’. The cognates are therefore reduced to only 9.13%. There are 17 more, but questionable, cognates. If these were calculated with all the rest, the cognates would be 17.39%, being quite generous.

It is quite possible, of course, that the Kârë are recent inhabitants of the Eastern area and that some other languages of group 6 are more closely related. But Mundang, for one, does not show any appreciably closer relationship. On the basis of the comparison between Duru and Kârë, where cognates were established for only 13.8%, it does not appear that group 4 would be any closer than group 6. Perhaps we must look to group 13 about which information is slowly accumulating.

In his first attempt at classifying the eastern Niger-Congo languages Greenberg was diffident about the assignment of Gbaya because it displayed evidence of affiliation with the Adamawa branch (1955:12 fn.). The information given above confirms the ambiguous relationship of Gbaya, and only more detailed lexical comparisons supplemented by grammatical ones will settle the question.

Bouquiaux and Thomas propose a revision of Greenberg’s classification (pers. comm.) that would reduce the number of groups from eight to five.

1. Gbaya-Ngbandi-Monzombo-Ndago
   a. Gbaya, Manza, Ngbaka
   b. Ngbandi, Sango, Yakoma
   c. (1) Ngbaka-Ma’bo, Monzombo, Gbanziri, Mundu, Mayogo, Bangba; (2) Ndago, Bai, Bviri, Golo, Sere, Tagbo, Feroge, Indri, Mangaya, Togoyo.

2. Banda

3. Zande, Nzakara, Baramba, Pambia

4. Amadi (Madyo, Ma)

5. Mondunga, Mba (Bamanga)

Although Greenberg’s Group 6 is put with 1c, they admit that they do not have information to propose another classification. They also keep 7 and 8, their 4 and 5, intact for the same reason. From a geographical point of view the inclusion of Ndago et al. with Monzombo et al. is unlikely. Were it not for this subgroup, Group 1 might be called the western branch of Eastern. The infelicity of this name is caused by the retention of Eastern as a designation. It really should be changed.

I propose the replacement of Greenberg’s term Eastern for this subphylum by Ubangian which would only restore its use. It has many merits. The subgroups of Ubangian would then be the following, if Bouquiaux and Thomas are correct. But even if they are not, the following geographical terms could be used.

1. Western
2. Central
In general

The identification of the ethnic groups in the area of Eastern languages is to be found in Éboué (1933) and Lafarge (1964) for the Central African Republic and Burssens (1958) for the Congo. More linguistically-oriented surveys are the following. In Guthrie and Tucker (1956) Jacquot and Richardson report on the Gbaya, Banda, and Ngbaka-Ma’bo groups and van Bulck and Hackett report on the Gbaya group and the eastern languages of Eastern, what they call the ‘Southern Sudanic languages’ like Zande and Banda. Richardson (1957) reports on the same Eastern languages covered above in only a slightly more ample way. Demographic information is given by Tucker and Bryan about the Banda, Gbaya, Ngbandi, Zande, and Mba languages. Earlier (1940) Tucker considered languages like Zande and Banda ‘Eastern Sudanic’, but by this term he meant something different from what is here, following Greenberg, meant by Eastern; for example, Tucker considered Moru-Madi ‘Eastern’. This volume has some linguistic information about our Eastern languages.

The Eastern languages of the Congo are treated by de Rop (1960), Meeussen (1948), in an article dealing with the transcription of Congolese languages in field work, Hulstaert (1950), who provides a classification, map, and bibliography, and finally by van Bulck. The latter’s work of 1938 is an early version, it seems, of 1954a. In 1938 he grouped the languages we know as Eastern into eastern and western groups; the numerals 1–10 are cited as supporting data. In 1954a the classification is abandoned and no supporting data are given. Van Bulck (1953) is a report on the linguistic work that had been done in the Congo between 1949 and 1951, and van Bulck (1954b) discusses the spelling of names.

As sources of information for several different languages might be cited Gaudefroy-Demombynes (1906), Bruel (1932) — the latter for Sango, Banda, and Manza — Giraud (1908), Éboué (1918), and Tisserant (1950). The last is useful because it has an index where plant names are given in the indigenous languages as well as in their scientific form.

By groups

Group 1. The Gbaya-Ngbaka-Manza group represents what some people have called a ‘dialect cluster’ and what C.F. Hockett describes as an ‘L-complex’: there seems to be mutual intelligibility as one proceeds from one locality to a contiguous one. There are, however, some areas where the breaks are sharper between dialects than in other areas, but an isoglossal characterization of the area does not put the dialects into clear relief. (My own extensive collection of dialect data have not yet been published except for Samarin 1957 and 1958.) The lexical uniformity in the area is illustrated by
the following words taken from languages that are called Gbaya (Gbaya-Bossangoa, that the people call Gbeya, and Gbaya-Berberati), Manza (Bodonge) and Ngbaka-Manza (Damara). These secondary names are of localities, and the area represented is spherical.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>'animal'</th>
<th>Bossangoa</th>
<th>Berberati</th>
<th>Bodonge</th>
<th>Damara</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'bark (of tree)'</td>
<td>iyo</td>
<td>sâdâ</td>
<td>âfe</td>
<td>iyo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'belly'</td>
<td>zâñ</td>
<td>zañ</td>
<td>zââ</td>
<td>zââ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bird'</td>
<td>nôy</td>
<td>nôè</td>
<td>nôwê</td>
<td>nôè, nôy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'blood'</td>
<td>tôk</td>
<td>tô</td>
<td>tôco</td>
<td>tô</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bone'</td>
<td>gbârâ</td>
<td>gbala</td>
<td>gbârâ</td>
<td>gbâyâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'breast'</td>
<td>bere</td>
<td>bele</td>
<td>beñe</td>
<td>boñe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngbaka, in all of its spellings, should be clearly identified. There is a Ngbaka in the C.A.R. and in the Congo that is part of this group (the Congo form may be closer to Ari and Gbanu than to Manza). Then there is another one, Greenberg’s Bwaka, that occurs in group 5. At least some forms of the names are identical, but this latter one is also known as Ngbaka-Ma’bo: ma bo clearly means ‘I say’.

Several of the languages of this group are represented in the linguistic literature. Starting with the western ones, there is Hartmann (1930), based on the dialect of Baturi that he calls Buri, 250 km southwest of Bouar. This work contains a vocabulary and grammatical notes. Naumann (1915) is on the Bouar dialect. Hilberth’s work (1945, 1952) is on the Gbaya of the Berberati area. (His ethnographic work of 1962 contains some information of linguistic relevance.) Landréau (1900) also seems to be based on the Berberati speech. The work of Tessmann (1931), although based on a Gbaya found in the Cameroun at that time, must be closely related to the Berberati or Bouar forms, probably the latter; the Germans were also in control over what is now Bozoum in the C.A.R. to the east of Bouar, and Tessmann seems to have been familiar with Gbaya-Mbay (1937). Further to the east is Bossangoa, whose speech, Gbeya or niù-booro ‘the language of Boro’ (the original village at what is now Bossangoa), has been described by myself (1966). In the Southeast are found the Ari and Ngbaka-Manza. It is their speech, not Gbeya, that is apparently the object of Calloc’h (1911).

For the Ngbaka of the Congo, what some people call Ngbaka-Gbaya, there is almost as much as on Gbaya. Maes (1945) provides an overview of the ethnic group: comments on the relationship to other groups, its history, the subgroups, cultural notes, etc. Grammatical sketches are supplied by Maes (1951) and Englund (1963). Both indicate three levels of phonemic pitch, a fact that is significant when Ngbaka is compared with Gbeya that has only two. Englund’s phonological description seems to be inferior to that of Maes; she has some rather strange sounds. Texts are in abundance. Coeman (1945) provides tales only in Dutch translation, but the others provide texts in Ngbaka with translation: namely, Maes (1965, 1967), Saenen (1935,
Maes has also published a rather good dictionary (1959), and a bibliography of other works is to be found in van Bulck (1948).

Group 2. There are many Banda dialects and languages listed in the literature, but it is not at all clear what their relationship is to each other. From my own experience in the Central African Republic, I would say that most of them, except for the riverine ones with which I have had no experience, were more or less mutually intelligible. We know most about the ones in the C.A.R. from works by Coté (1907), Santandrea, and Tisserant. The last is the most complete; unfortunately, we have in the dictionary only French to Banda entries. Santandrea’s is more useful for comparative purposes because Banda is contrasted with other Eastern languages. Mortier (1940) is one of the few publications on a Banda language of the Congo.

Group 3. The languages of this group may represent an ‘L-simplex’ because of the reported mutual intelligibility between Ngbandi, Yakoma, and Sango. The latter two dialects, if that is what they are, are virtually unknown. (But three evangelistic phonograph records at 78 rpm are available in the Sango, labelled ‘Sango: Ubangi’, language from Gospel Recordings in Los Angeles, California. They were made at Libenge in the Congo.) It is to be understood that this vernacular Sango is different from, although the source of, the lingua franca that has been studied by myself. Some have listed the lingua franca as a dialect of the vernacular. Although classificatory problems of this type are moot points, I would not advise this classification; the lingua franca is a separate language.

Tanghe (1940) and Hulstaert (1945) are general studies. The latter classifies Ngbandi with respect to the other languages of the area. He shows 59 lexical similarities with Lomongo or Lingombe or both, but these are Bantu and coterриториal languages; therefore the similarities are to be accounted for in more than one way. Lekens (1923) is the only grammar and is quite good considering the time at which it was produced. The dictionaries of Lekens, both in French (1952) and also in Dutch (1955, 1958), are quite good. The latter are, in fact, monumental; they contain a great deal of ethno- graphic material and could be used in reconstructing the grammar of the language. Texts are to be found in A. and H. De Clercq (1911–12) and Tanghe (1924, 1929). The work by the brothers De Clercq is supposed to be the first collection of Ngbandi texts and is based on the speech found at the Bosso Mbaya mission on the Melo river. There are four pages of grammatical remarks and 14 texts with interlinear free translation. They make the mistake, one that Lekens did not completely free himself from, of writing some expressions as solid words: e.g. agawe for aga awe ‘he parted’.

Group 4. This group again is reported to be rather uniform with very little differentiation particularly within Zande and between Zande and Nzakara. These two languages have been rather well studied.

Grammatical information is available from Gore (1926), Lagae and vanden Plas

---

6 But one of my Banda informants listed two groups: one including Yakpa, Linda, Togbo, and a group that he called Banda (probably meaning the real Banda), and the other including Langba, Dakpa, Ngbugu, and Langbasi.
(1921), and Tucker and Hackett (1959). The last is by far the most important. It describes the phonology and grammar principally of Zande and Nzakara, but there are grammatical notes on Barambu and Pambia. It also contains a comparative vocabulary of all these languages. Barambu and Pambia are considered to be Zande although they are quite different in many ways. Tucker and Hackett frequently refer to earlier works, but theirs was based on original field investigations. The three volumes by the Dominican missionaries Lagae and vanden Plas (by 1925 Lagae was Monseigneur) are especially rich. Volume 1 has a grammatical section of 72 pages, 34 pages devoted to French-to-Zande sentences, and 63 pages to translated texts with grammatical notes. In this same series are two volumes of dictionaries, French to Zande and Zande to French, the former being the larger. They say of their examples that they are ‘ou bien empruntés à la littérature orale ..., ou bien ils renferment un renseignement ethnographique’. The number of entries per page is about the same for these two volumes. There are also dictionaries by Coens and Joderie (1912), and the works by Gore on the Zande of the Sudan. The latest one is that of Rev. Canon and Mrs. Gore (1952), revised by Bullen and based on the 1931 edition. Most of the diacritics of the earlier edition are omitted except for marking some ‘stress’ (tone), centralization of vowels, and nasalization. In the examples verbs are very often given in the second person singular command forms. This is a two-way dictionary, but the English-Zande section is more or less just a reverse index of the Zande-English. As for Nzakara, there is the dictionary of Block (1912), to be followed by one by de Dampierre which is now in preparation.

Texts on Zande are to be found in Lagae and vanden Plas (1921), in Dijkmans (1965), and in Gore (1931b). Dijkmans’ texts are translated into Dutch, but the orthography is not very faithful to the language and tones are not indicated. Texts on Nzakara are published by de Dampierre (1963, with Volume 2 in preparation).

Group 5. On this group rather little has been done by comparison with the others. On Ngbaka (i.e. Ngbaka-Ma’bo) there is the grammar by Thomas (1963) that contains no texts or wordlists preceded by a phonological description of 1958. Earlier there was a little discussion by Tessmann (1930) that contains wordlists and grammatical notes. On the other languages of the group we have only Calloc’h (1911), in which French entries are followed by Ngbaka, Gbanziri, and Monjombo glosses.

Group 6. This group has virtually been the private domain of Father Santandrea. See (1950), (1957, originally written about 1935 and revised in his 1965 publication), (1961), (1966a and 1966b a recovered distribution of offprints of 1966a). All these works are in English, but reveal little acquaintance with modern linguistics.

Group 7. The languages of this and the following group are very little known. Tucker (1940) discusses the relationship of Madi to his other Eastern Sudanic languages, but one must see Czekanowski (1917) for linguistic data.

Group 8. According to Greenberg (1955) the only documentation for the existence of Mondunga that constitutes this group is a brief notice in de Boek (1936).
There are four special languages in the AE area — To, Labi (or Laği), Ngaragé, and Gobanda — that deserve more attention than they have hitherto attracted because of the light that they may shed on linguistic and cultural relations. (Sango, the lingua franca of much of the area, is not a 'special language' in the sense used here, and it has been rather thoroughly described. See elsewhere in this volume.)

All of these languages are associated with societies or cults (as some use the word) and are more or less restricted in use to the membership of these organizations. They might be called secret languages were it not for the fact that they are comprehensible to at least some outsiders.

To and Labi are described by Tessmann (1931) as being the languages of the ‘resurrection cults’ (Auferstehungskulte) of the same names (treated more fully in the ethnographic work of 1937). Although they are considered to be Gbaya languages, in the sense that they are most characteristic of the Gbaya people, they are also known, according to Tessmann, among the Southern Laka (Chari-Nile) and some Mbum-speaking people. He also suggests the possibility that To is used in Seu (Sewu?) in the Mbum female cult.

Tessmann does not consider To and Labi to be artificial languages created to conceal the activities of the cult members. He suggests rather that they might be vestiges of extinct languages that had had some influence on the evolution of Gbaya, Mbum, and Laka. It is more probable, in my opinion, that these are argots that are based on natural languages. A superficial comparison of the lexical material presented by Tessmann leads me to suggest that Labi has a Central Saharan base and To an Adamawa base. Comparisons are given here, the data coming from my own notes on the Laka and Kârë languages in the Central African Republic; all of the diacritics in Tessmann’s data and tone marking in my own are eliminated.\(^6\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labi</th>
<th>Laka</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'fire'</td>
<td>pur</td>
<td>par</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'head'</td>
<td>dom</td>
<td>doe 'his head'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'eye'</td>
<td>kom</td>
<td>kame 'his eye'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'dog'</td>
<td>gbisi</td>
<td>bisi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'person'</td>
<td>ṝuki</td>
<td>nzuku</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'head'</td>
<td>tur</td>
<td>tul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'thing'</td>
<td>fe</td>
<td>fë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'penis'</td>
<td>sor</td>
<td>sò</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'fire'</td>
<td>hora</td>
<td>here</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'two'</td>
<td>ser</td>
<td>sere</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) Unfortunately Tessmann's work (1931) was available to me for only a short time, but I was assisted in its use by Mr. Leslie Stennes.
Of the languages, To, Labi and Gbaya, To is considered by Tessmann to be the simplest, but Labi also has features characteristic of a special language (about which more is said below). If he held a view that African languages were more primitive than European languages, he would not likely see the linguistic differences between argots and natural languages.

Whereas To and Labi are found in that part of the Cameroun that adjoins the Central African Republic (although in the late 1950's the existence of Labi societies was reported in the Gbaya area west of Bozoum in the C.A.R.), Ngaragé and Gobanda are found where Banda, Manza, and Gbaya have had cultural contact. My own information is very limited. The Gobanda data were obtained from a Manza at Bouca, and the Ngaragé material from Gbaya in the Bossangoa area. In any case, I never heard of the Ngaragé speech or society to the south of Bossangoa. Among the Gbaya the Ngaragé society is a rather loosely organized grass-burning and hunting society (Samarin 1959) that bears only superficial resemblances to the form the society took deeper in the Banda territory. (My information is based on one interview with someone at Ft. Sibut.)

Gobanda rather closely resembles Vale, a Chari-Nile language that is mutually intelligible with Sara-Mbay, found just to the northwest of Batangafo in the C.A.R. The differences between Gobanda and Vale are like those that exist between dialects, that is, in variations in pronunciation and in lexical innovations, illustrated by the examples below. There seems to be enough similarity between Vale and Gobanda that the former could understand the latter. We may hypothesize that Gobanda is therefore a Vale idiom used by the Manza and the Gbaya, with perhaps some attempt at modifying it to make it more of an argot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gobanda</th>
<th>Vale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'knife'</td>
<td>kamba</td>
<td>kuya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'animal'</td>
<td>tadu</td>
<td>zâ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'grass'</td>
<td>ngeli</td>
<td>muu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'one'</td>
<td>doy</td>
<td>keda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bird'</td>
<td>kagba</td>
<td>koba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'bird'</td>
<td>yeli</td>
<td>aali</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ngaragé has practically no lexical resemblance to Gobanda. (Only one word occurs in both languages, and it occurs in Vale also: viz. gâgâ ‘tree’). What is even more significant is that it cannot be identified with any other language of the area although it looks like Gbaya, Banda, and even Ngbandi in some respects. Like Gbaya it has preglottalized nasals which in Gbaya occur only contiguous to nasalized vowels as an allophone of the phoneme /b/: e.g. béré bébé ‘stone’ (the word resembles a Gbaya ideophone); there are lexical items that are clearly Gbaya-Manza, like iny in iny pây ‘know already’. Ngbandi, or one of its related dialects, is seen in such words as: asingi ‘be full’, aringi ‘be able’, zongo ‘to burn’, fangi ‘to cut’. Banda is seen in the
number of words that begin with *a*: e.g. *ania* ‘who?’ *adólógo* ‘blood’, *afúngi* ‘nose'. Perhaps some of these similarities are due to a deliberate attempt to disguise the origin and meanings of words, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, to make artificial resemblances to a known language. If this is true, then *zôngo* might be a borrowing from Sango, the lingua franca, and the prefixing of *a*- makes Ngaragé sound more Banda-like. There is, however, no way to account for the bulk of the morphemes at this time.

There is enough evidence to suggest that these four special languages are in some sense pidgins (see Samarin Ms. 1 where pidginization is defined). Gobanda stands at one end of the spectrum, being most language-like, and Ngaragé stands at the other end. The pidginized nature of To is seen in the fact that it is simpler than Labi and Gbaya, by Tessmann’s judgment, and by the presence of such constructions as *fefer tur*, literally ‘grass head’ for ‘hair’ where one expects different words for ‘grass’ and ‘hair’. A less certain case is To *maray kaso* ‘water sun’ for ‘rain’, since other Eastern languages have expressions like *ri-kôro* ‘water sky-spirit’ (Gbaya). But since Kârê has *mbam* for ‘rain’, as opposed to *mbi* ‘water’, the To expression may be a pidginization on the model of the Gbaya. When it is remembered that the form of To studied by Tessmann is that of the Gbaya, it is not at all unreasonable to expect the Gbaya to have pidginized an Adamawa language.

The pidginized nature of Ngaragé is seen in the very restricted number of morphemes in its inventory and the way they are used in periphrastic constructions. Thus *gada* is used for ‘sun’ but also for ‘moon’ in *gada sisi biri*, literally ‘sun of night’, and for ‘seed’ in *gada gáká* ‘sun of tree’.

**BIBLE TRANSLATIONS IN ADAMAWA-EASTERN LANGUAGES**

Because of the great use to which Bible translations can be put in linguistic investigations, the following information is provided. Only published material available by purchase or likely to be in libraries (e.g. those of the British and Foreign Bible Society, London, or the American Bible Society, New York) are mentioned. Most of the information comes from Coldham (1966), but some comes from Beckmann (1966). The abbreviation B.F.B.S. stands for the British and Foreign Bible Society. For francophone Africa the name Société Biblique Britannique et Étrangère is used, but in all cases I use B.F.B.S.

Bachama, Nigeria. Gospel of Mark. B.F.B.S.

* For text material one can get recordings from the aforementioned Gospel Recordings. Of the 114 separate entries for the languages and dialects of the Cameroun and the Chad, the following Adamawa and Eastern languages are represented, some in several dialects: Fali (Basseo, Bori-Peske, Mayo Oulo, Yek Mango), Baya (i.e. Gbaya), Mambay (Tibolgui), Mbum, and Tpur (i.e. Tupuri).
Baya (= Gbayu, Gbea, Gbeya), C.A.R. Matthew, Mark, John, Acts. B.F.B.S.
Karre (= Kârê), C.A.R. New Testament. B.F.B.S. and A.B.S.
Masana, Cameroun and Chad (around Bongor, in the Logone River valley). Psalms, Société Biblique au Cameroun; New Testament, B.F.B.S.
Ndogo, Sudan. Selections from the Gospels, duplicated. Missioni Africane, Verona, Italy.
Ngbandi, C.A.R. and Congo (Kinshasa). Mark and John, Congo Balolo Mission; Mark, B.F.B.S.
Pana, C.A.R. John. B.F.B.S.
Zande, C.A.R., Sudan, Congo. Psalms and New Testament (bound together), B.F.B.S.; Selections from the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, Jonah (complete), and Malachi, Society for the Propagation of Christian Knowledge. The Missioni Africane, Verona, also have the Old and New Testaments in various stages.

APPENDIX

Adamawa languages and dialects alphabetically arranged

In the following list a colon is to be read as ‘related to’ and the equals sign as ‘the same as’, meaning a different spelling of the given name. Numbers refer to group membership (see text above). The sources of the names are given in only some cases, all abbreviated within parentheses: w/b is Westermann and Bryan (1952), v is C.F. and F.M. Voegelin (1964), m is Murdock (1959). There are three unpublished sources: l is P.F. Lacroix, b is L. Bohnhoff, and g is D. Gilliland.

Babal: Mbum (w/b)
Bajama, 5: Mumuye (v)
Bali, 5: Chamba (v)
Bambuka, 9 (g)
Bana = Mbanu
Bana¹ = Banana

¹ Bana is equated with Banana because of the possibility that -na is the same suffix as Masa -na which means something like ‘the’. Bana itself in Masa means ‘friend’. This Bana¹ should not be con-
Boa = Bua
Boko = Wokô
Bolgo = Bolgô, 13
Boñum: Fali
Bori-Peske = Peski
Bua, 13 = Boa
Bugudum = Budugum? (l)
Buso, 13?
Byrre: Kepere (m)
Cham, 1
Chamba, Djamba, Jamba, Sama, Tsamba, 2: Bali, 2 (w/b); 5 (v), Daka, 3 (gr); 2 (w/b), Dima, Diña (w/b), Diŋi (w/b), Diŋyim (w/b), Kolbila, 4, Lamja (w/b), Lekon, Mumbake, Ndagam (w/b), Samabu, Tsugu (w/b), Vere, 4
Dadiya, 1
Daka, 3: Chamba
Dama, 6
Dari, 2 AE (m)
Day, 13? (v)
Dek, 6
Dima: Chamba
Ding-ding: Mumuye
Diŋa: Chamba (w/b)
Diŋi: Chamba (w/b)
Diŋyim: Chamba (w/b)
Dirrim, 3 (m)
Djamba = Chamba
Djasing = Yasing
Doado: Namshi (m)
Do Ayo = Doyâyo
Donga, 2 = Dongo
Dongo = Donga
Donyayo = Doyâyo
Doyâyo = Donyayo
Dui, Duli?: Duru
Duli, AE?

Fused with Bana3, a Chadic language spoken in Northern Cameroun, near Nigeria, south of where the Kapsiki people are found. (All of this is from Stennes, personal communication.)

One should consider the possibility that Dari and Day, as well as Duli and Dui, are variant pronunciations of the same word. See Samarin 1958 for a discussion of the loss of intervocalic l and r in Gbaya languages. Stennes said that he knows only of a Dari that is a Chadic language related to Lame.
Duli = Dui?
Dupa = Nduupa
Durr = Duru
Duru, Durr, 4: Dui, Koma, Kotopo, Kutin, Ngbang, Panon, Pape, Voko (w/b)
Dza: Jen (v)
Fali, 11: Boñum, Bori-Peske, Gobri, Kang, Kangu (m), Mongo, Peski (m), Tingelin (m)
Fana = Fanya (v)
Fanian = Fanya
Fanya, Fana, Fanian, 13: Kobe (v), Mana
Galke, 6 (: Gikao?)
Gandole, 3 (m)
Gelama, 6 (v)
Gengle, 5
Gewe, AE?
Gikao: Galke? (b)
Gobri: Fali
Gola, 5: Mumuye
Goom, 4
Gula, 13: Moriil, Täätaal
Gunje, 6: Mbum
Gwomo, 9: Jen (g)
Imbana = Mbana
Imbara, 6: Yasing (m)
Jamba = Chamba
Jasing = Yasing
Jen, 9: Dza (v), Gwomo (g)
Jiri, 4: Vere
Kaele, 6: Tupuri (v)
Kali = Kari
Kam, 8
Kanawa, 9 (g)
Kang, Kangu? 11: Fali
Kangu, 11: Fali (m)
Kare, Karré, Kärë, 6: Mbum
Kärë = Kare
Kari, Kali, 6: Mbum
Karré = Kare
Kepere, 6: Byrre (m), Mbum
Kera

According to Stennes the Tupuri claim that they are descendants of the Kera. If this is so, and the Tupuri are related to the Kaele, who speak a Mundang language, then Kera is a group 6 language.
Khoke = Koke
Kiziere, 6: Mundang (m)
Kobe, 13: Fanya (v)
Koke = Khoke, 13
Kolbila, Kolbilari, Kolbilla, 4: Chamba (w/b)
Kolbilari = Kolbila
Kolbilla = Kolbila
Koma: Duru (w/b)
Kotofo = Kotopo
Kotopo, Kotofo, Kotpojo, Kottofo, Kpotopo, 4: Duru
Kotpojo = Kotopo
Kottofo = Kotopo
Kotule, 1: Tula (v)
Kper, 6: Mbum (w/b)
Kpere, 6
Kpotopo = Kotopo
Kugama, 5 (v)
Kulaal, 13: Patool, Poṣaal, Tiaala, Tiitaal
Kumba, 5: Kuseki (v), Sate, Yọfo (v)
Kuseki, 5: Kumba (v)
Kutin, Kutine, Kutinn, 4: Duru
Kutine = Kutin
Kutinn = Kutin
Lakka, 6
Lala, 7: Yungur (v)
Lame, AE (m)
Lamja, 2: Chamba (w/b)
Lankaviri, 5: Mumuye
Lekon, 2: Chamba
Libo, 7
Longuda = Nunguda, 10
Mambai = Mangbai
Mana, 13: Fanya
Mangbai, Mangbei, 6: Mambai (w/b)
Mangbei = Mangbai, 6
Masa, 14
Mata: Tupuri (w/b)
Mbama, AE?
Mbana, Bana, Imbana, 6: Mundang (w/b)
Mbere, 6: Mbum (w/b)
Mboi, 7

4 Kutin, being a place name, may not refer to a linguistic unit at all.
Mbhum, 6: Babal (w/b), Gunje, Kare, Kari, Kepere, Kper (w/b), Mbere (w/b), Nger (w/b), Njal (w/b), Pana, Pani, Pere (w/b), Tali, Tiba (w/b)
Mon-Non = Mono
Mongo, 11: Fali
Mono = Mon-Non, 6
Moriil, 13: Gula
Moundan = Mundang
Mubako, 2: Mumbake
Mumbake, 2: Chamba, Mubako, Nyongnepa (w/b)
Mumuye, 5: Bajama (v), Ding-ding, Gola, Lankaviri, Pugu (v), Yakoko, Yoro
Mundang, Moundan, Muŋdaŋ, 6: Bana (w/b), Imbana (w/b), Kaele, Kiziere (m), Mbana (w/b), Yasing
Munga, 9
Muŋdaŋ = Mundang
Nagumi, AE?
Namci = Namshi
Namdji = Namshi
Namji = Namshi
Namshi, Namci, Namdji, Namji, Namtchi, 4: Doado (m)
Namtchi = Namshi
Ndagam, 2: Chamba (w/b)
Ndore: Tupuri (w/b)
Nduupa = Dupa, 4
Ngbang, 4: Duru
Nger, 6: Mbhum (w/b)
Ngong, AE?
Nielim, 13
Nimbari, 12
Njal, 6: Mbhum (w/b)
Nunguda = Longuda, 9
Nyam-Nyam, AE?
Nyongnepa, 2: Mumbake (w/b)
Pana, 6: Mbhum
Pani, 6: Mbhum
Panon, 4: Duru
Pape, 4: Duru
Passam, 5 (v)
Patapori, Adamawa?
Patool, 13: Kulaal
Pere, Ripere, 6: Mbhum (w/b)
Pereba, 2: Wom (v)
Peski, Bori-Peske, 11: Fali (m)
Pojaal, 13: Kulaal
Pugu, 5: Mumuye (v)
Ripere = Pere
Roba, 7
Sama = Chamba
Samabu, 2: Chamba
Sari, 4
Sate, 5: Kumba
Sewe, 4
Tââtaal, 13: Gula
Talé = Tali
Tali, Talé, 6: Mbum
Taram, 3
Teme, 5
Tiaala, 13: Kulaal
Tiba, 6: Mbum (w/b)
Tiitaal, 13: Kulaal
Tinguelin, 11: Fali (m)
Tsamba = Chamba
Tsugu, 2: Chamba (w/b)
Tuburi = Tupuri
Tula, 1: Kotule (v)
Tunya, 13
Tupuri, Tuburi: Kaele (v), Mata (w/b), Ndore (w/b), Yagoua (v)
Vere, Verre, Were, Yere, 4: Chamba, Jiri
Verre = Vere
Voko, Woko, 4: Duru (w/b)
Waja, 1
Waka, 5
Were = Vere
Woko = Boko, Voko
Wom, 2: Pereba (v), Zagai
Yagoua, 6: Tupuri (v)
Yakoko, 5: Mumuye
Yasing, Djasing, Jasing, Yassing, Zazing (m): Imbara: Mundang
Yassing = Yasing
Yendang, 5
Yere = Vere
Yingulum?
Yofo, 5: Kumba (v)

* Yagoua may not be a language at all because it is the name of an administrative center.
Yoro, 5: Mumuye
Yungur, 7: Lala (v)
Zagai, 2: Wom
Zazing = Yasing (m)
Zinna, 5
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