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0. Introduction. Although the bulk of this report will deal with Northern Paman, the group of languages located north of the Watson River in Cape York Peninsula, North Queensland, it seems advisable to introduce the discussion with a few comments regarding the position of Northern Paman among Australian languages as a whole.

It has long been recognized that linguistic diversity in northern Australia is greater than that in southern Australia. It has also been argued that all Australian languages are genetically related to one another.

The interrelated languages in southern Australia probably belong to a single phyllic family, while in the north, some 28 coordinate phyllic families are represented. Later, it will be shown that many languages situated geographically in the north, broadly defined, belong to the same phyllic family as the southern ones, rather than constituting separate phyllic families or aligning themselves with any northern group. This comment applies, in particular, to the Northern Paman languages, and detailed demonstration of this is the chief concern of the research being reported here.

In explaining the present distribution of related languages in cases like the Australian one, we choose the simplest possible model for population spread, i.e., the one which subsumes the fewest and least complex separate migrations and against which there is no convincing counter-evidence. A theory which holds that diversity has developed where it is found is simpler than one which assumes separate migrations of distantly related languages into some area to explain diversity presently found there. This is the argument used by Sapir in his Time Perspectives (Sapir, 1916) to explain the present distribution of Athabaskan languages and by Dyen in his explication of the dispersal of the Malayo-Polynesian languages (Dyen, 1962). In general, the argument is a good one unless, as in the case of the Celtic languages of Europe and the California languages of North America, there is evidence to contradict it.

More than one kind of evidence can be marshalled to show that the simpler model is valid for Australia and that the center of dispersal is in the north. Any competing theory which holds that the center of dispersal is in the south must also imply either a large number of separate migrations from south to north or some other equally complex manoeuvre for which there is no evidence whatsoever. The south as center of dispersal is implausible not only in view of this simplicity hypothesis but also in view of the virtual impossibility that Australia was populated by peoples entering the continent from the south.

The north of Australia is itself too broad to constitute in its entirety the center of dispersal of Australian languages. The concern of this study is, in part, to determine more exactly the location of this northern center. In larger part, the concern of this study is to document our conclusions with detailed comparative evidence. We ask whether the center of dispersal is located east or west of what is now the Gulf of Carpentaria and, by extension, we ask whether populations responsible for the interrelated languages now in Australia entered the northern part of the continent through Cape York Peninsula or at some point to the west of the Cape on the then exposed Sahul Shelf. In this connection, it is crucial to determine whether linguistic diversity in Cape York Peninsula is greater than, equal to, or less than that in the northern littoral west of the Gulf of Carpentaria.

Enough data are now available to us to establish sound correspondences which exist between the phonologically deviant Northern Paman languages and languages farther south which are unambiguously members of the rather homogeneous southern
Australian phylic family. It can be shown that all Cape York Peninsula languages, with the possible exception of the ill-attested Babaram of the Rain Forest and certain languages in the Princess Charlotte Bay area, are related to one another, indeed rather closely, and that the area as a whole articulates intimately with the mesh of close relationships extending over the southern bulk of Australia. Establishment of phonological correspondences and reconstruction of morphemes, now possible, reveal a number of sound changes peculiar to the Northern Paman languages, and to a number of languages farther south in the Peninsula, which effectively obscure their close external relationships and account for comments by earlier writers (Schmidt, 1919; Kroozer, 1923; Capell, 1956) to the effect that these peninsula languages are, in some way, un-Australian. When these obscuring factors are removed by reconstruction, the emerging phonological system is typically Australian—the "un-Australian" features are, then, relatively superficial, being the result of extensive, though probably recent, sound changes (see below).

In sharp contrast to the relative ease of reconstruction in Cape York Peninsula is the virtual impossibility of over-all reconstruction for the languages spoken across northern Australia west of the Gulf of Carpentaria. It is immediately evident that these languages do not belong to a single phylic family. Indeed, it is evident that many coordinate phylic families occur in the area. This is especially puzzling in view of the fact that, unlike the situation in Cape York Peninsula, most languages west of the Gulf share similar and often identical phoneme inventories and interphonemic specifications. The number of putative cognates shared by members of different phylic families, however, is exceedingly small and the possibility of tabulating regular sound correspondences is almost completely nil. Comparative work in this part of Australia falls into the category of what Carl Voegelin has called "phyllum" linguistics as opposed to the more feasible "family" or "sub-family" linguistics. The American analogue would be reconstruction in Macro-Penutian as opposed to reconstruction in Uto-Aztecan or even Aztec-Tanoan.

West of the Gulf of Carpentaria, typological similarities in phonology are superficial from the point of view of genetic relationship, whereas, east of the Gulf, typological dissimilarities are superficial and easily erased by reconstruction. If the diverse phylic families west of the Gulf are related to one another and to the geographically extensive southern phylic family to which the peninsular languages also belong, then, following the simplicity argument mentioned earlier, the center of dispersal for all these related languages is certainly west of the Gulf of Carpentaria.

The bulk of the research being reported here has been devoted to detailing, with accepted comparative methods, the evidence supporting the position taken above. In this regard, the actual accomplishments have been:

1. reconstruction of Proto Paman, the common parent of the majority of peninsular languages, and

2. description of the reflection of Proto Paman phonology by 13 modern Northern Paman languages and dialects.

Proto Paman is reconstructed on the basis of a comparison of some 30 linguistic corpora, obtained by Hale in 1960, from various areas in Cape York Peninsula. The term Paman is derived from the stem _pama_ person and is applied as a tentative label for the family to which most, if not all Peninsular languages belong. The precise subclassification of Paman languages is only partially understood at present. It is known, however, that Northern Paman forms an unambiguos subgroup identifiable not only on the basis of shared innovations in phonological change but also on the basis of shared innovations in lexicon.

Although only the Northern Paman languages have been fully treated to date, a corresponding treatment of the remaining Paman languages for which adequate samples have been obtained is now under way and will, hopefully, be completed in the near future.

The Northern Paman languages are collectively termed Wik Way (/wik/ language + /way/ bad) by the Wik speaking peoples south of them, and are distinct from the languages of the latter by virtue of the startlingly different phonological system. The Watson River is the topographic correlate of the collection of isoglosses separating Northern Paman from its Wik neighbors. The Northern Paman languages extend from the northwestern side of the Watson River to the tip of the Peninsula. They share more cognate vocabulary among themselves than to the south of the Watson and they share at least the most conspicuous of the phonological innovations (see 2, below) which so clearly distinguish them from the Wik languages south of the Watson.
Thirteen samples representing most if not all the major subgroups of Northern Paman were obtained in 1960 from informants now living at Weipa and Aurukun Missions. These are listed below according to the subgrouping which emerged on the basis of a consideration of shared developments in phonological change and, partly, on the basis of shared lexicon.

(A) Uraši.
(B) Mpaliť’yan, Lutįį.
(C) Yinwum.
(D) Limjiť’i, Alğiţ.
(E) Tyamgaţ’-Mamgaţ’-Ntfrawaŋayì (collectively termed Awŋjim), Ntfráŋjì.
(F) Njot.
(G) Artińjìtiyì.
(H) Mbiyowm.

In the following paragraphs, each of the languages is identified in terms of its geographical position and, as far as possible, in terms of published ethnographic literature.

Uraši

The informant’s designation, /uraši/, conforms to a common pattern of language naming in northern Cape York Peninsula, being formed from the demonstrative /ura/ and /shi/. The speech so labelled is similar to the one which Ray called Yaraika (Ray, 1907) and shares some 83% of basic vocabulary with it. It is also similar to Capell’s Bandji (Capell, 1956) and somewhat less so to Jardine’s Gudang (in Curr, 1886), also called Dyaraga (McConnel, 1939) and Kekoseno (Sharp, 1939). Other terms which appear in the ethnographic literature for the area are Ngamiti, Wottati, Yunnakundyi, Murtiaytim (McConnel, 1939, 1950); these, together with Uraši, are probably dialects of a single language spoken from the tip of Cape York Peninsula south to the Dalhunty R. on the west and Cape Grenville on the east. The informant whose speech is represented in the data stated that he learned Uraši from his father who was from McDonnell, on the Skardon River.

Mpaliť’yan and Lutįį

These two closely related dialects were spoken in the middle and upper Ducié River area. Judging from a comparison of our data with the kinship terms collected by McConnel (1950), our Mpaliť’yan appears to correspond to her Lutįį, located north of the Ducié, and her Tepit, south of the Ducié, corresponds to our Lutįį. At all events, the two forms of speech are closely similar. The term Lutįį is formed in the familiar way (cp. /lu/ this), while the term Mpaliť’yan, not located on any published tribal map, conforms to a different pattern of tribal and horde nomenclature not uncommon in the area, cp. Ilinadyana, Mba’tyana, Ulwauwušyana (McConnel, 1939).

Yinwum

This term (cp. /yin/ this) is easily identifiable in the ethnographic literature (see, e.g., McConnel, 1939). The language so designated was spoken south of Moreton on the Batavia River and west to Cox Creek.

Limjiť’i and Alğiţ

Limjiť’i (cp. /lin/ this) was spoken southwest of the Embley River and west of the Hey in the area called Winduwinda (Roth, 1910). This location, given by informants, does not agree with McConnel who locates her Leningiti much farther south, although still in the Winduwinda area (McConnel, 1939). Sharp’s Lemengiti is located by him in the Alğiţ area on the northeast side of the Embley River, at the present site of Weipa Mission—across the Embley from Limjiť’i, according to our location. It is probable that his informants gave him the term /laymjiť’/ (cp. /layn/ this), an alternate designation for Alğiţ, and that his informants were of the latter group rather than of the closely similar Limjiť’i (Sharp, 1939).

Awŋjim and Ntfráŋjì

The three virtually identical dialects subsumed under the term Awŋjim are clustered about the embouchure shared by the Embley and Mission Rivers. Mamgaţ’ is on Urquhart Point, while Tyamgaţ’ and Ntfrawaŋayì (cp. /ntfrawaj/ this) are on the lower Mission River. The term Tyamgaţ’ (from /tjan/ spearthrower) appears as te-ananadi in Roth (1910), and the other two terms are easily identified as McConnel’s Mamgaţ’ and Ndfráŋjì (McConnel, 1939). The dialects are close to Wimarama and Tainikwiti (McConnel, 1939) and to the Nggerikudi, alias Yupgaţ’, described by Hey who rightly regarded all of the dialects spoken along the "coastline extending from Cullen Pt. to the northern side of Duykeren Point..." as belonging to the same language (Hey, 1903). The term
Awtim (from /awŋ/ Ꟑ) is presumably McConnel's Angutimi.

Although it is separated from Awtim by Limijï and Aritimijï, Ntwaŋiŋ [cp. /ntwaŋ/ this] is more closely related to Awtim than to these intervening forms of speech. It was spoken around False Pera Head and the Norman River (cp. McConnel's Ndramangit, and Sharp's Anda?aneti).

Nkoŋ

The language known by this name (cp. /ŋkoŋ/ this) was spoken between the Embley and Hey Rivers south of their junction. The original site of Weipa Mission is said to have been in Nkoŋ country. Informants state that Nkoŋ and the presumably extinct Trotŋ are closely related dialects. Both terms are identifiable in McConnel's work as, respectively, Nggot and Tɔŋtj (McConnel, 1939).

Aritimijï

Aritimijï is the term applied by the Limijï to the language originally spoken around the head of the Hey River. The term is derived from a form of the Aritimijï verb /ari-/ to go. It is the Aritimiti of McConnel, the Adittingeti of Sharp (McConnel, 1939; Sharp, 1939), and the Aritiniti of Capell (1956). The informants for this language used either this Limijï term or the Ntwaŋayt designation /aritimayt/.

Mbiyworm

Mbiyworm (cp. /mbiyw/ camp) was spoken on the middle and upper Watson River and, more recently, on Myall Creek. York Downs and Merluna cattle stations are regarded by informants as being in Mbiyworm country. The term is easily identified in the published literature (Mbeiwum, McConnel, 1939; Kok Mbewan, Sharp, 1939).

2. General phonological developments in Northern Paman.

This part of the report consists of an abstract of the section, now complete, which details the reflection of Proto Paman phonology by each of the 13 modern Northern Paman languages and dialects.

The reconstruction of Proto Paman must still be regarded as tentative although it is believed that it will not be greatly altered by further research.

The inventory of Proto Paman consonants and vowels is as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>bilabial</th>
<th>apical</th>
<th>laminal</th>
<th>velar</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>stops</td>
<td>*p</td>
<td>*t</td>
<td>*k</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nasals</td>
<td>*m</td>
<td>*n</td>
<td>*n̂</td>
<td>*ŋ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lateral</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>*ɾ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>glides</td>
<td>*w</td>
<td>*ʁ</td>
<td>*y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Front central back

high   *i   *u   *
low    *a   *e   *o

Vowels may combine with the series generating component of length, thus, in addition to the short vowels above, there are the corresponding long vowels: *iː, *uː, *eː.

The comparative data indicate that all stems began in consonants and most stems ended in vowels. Most reconstructable stems are disyllabic, and long vowels occur in the initial syllable only. Clusters in reconstructions are medial only and consist of a resonant (nasal, lateral, flap, or glide) plus a stop (e.g., *mp, *nt, *lp, etc.). Of these, clusters of nasal plus stop are by far the most common. The seldom attested final consonants in reconstructions are resonants only, in particular *n, *l, *r, *ɾ, *y. In initial position, all consonants except *l and *ɾ are attested.

Reconstruction in Cape York Peninsula reveals a phonology which is extremely familiar in Australia, although the modern Northern Paman languages look decidedly un-Australian because of phonological developments peculiar to them.
Most conspicuous among the many developments which characterize Northern Paman reflection of Proto Paman is the reduction of initial syllables (*CV₁) by loss of initial consonants (*C₁) and loss or other reduction of immediately following vowels (*V₁). Associated with initial reduction, and at least partially responsible for it, is a shift of primary stress (a strictly phonetic feature) from the initial to the second syllable (*CV₂) in Paman stems.

In all Northern Paman languages, except Uraši and its sister dialects, *C₁ was lost invariable. Even in Uraši, the prevailing tendency has been toward initial loss, although *C₁ is sometimes positively reflected in that language. Short *V₁ was lost in some languages, retained in others, and metaphonetically in still others. Long *V₁ was shortened in all.

There was, then, a general merger of phonemic distinctions in initial position. However, these distinctions, although lost themselves, often left residual effects in segments which followed them and which survived in the modern languages, thereby giving rise to phonemic distinctions which were absent in the parent language. The ways in which phonemic split may occur in languages of the world are well known. One of them—the one which is particularly germane to Northern Paman phonology—relates to the well-known fact that any phonological segment, being characterized by a particular position and manner of articulation, has an influence on the phonetic actualization of other segments in its immediate environment. This is forcefully attested by spectrograms which show intricate phonetic intersection of structurally successive phonological elements—nasals have the effect of nasalizing adjacent vowels; laminal and palatalized consonants tend to advance or raise back vowels, and so on. In this way, conspicuous allophony develops. If a conditioning element is removed, the effect it had on adjacent segments may remain. Where different conditioning elements, each having its own particular effect, are lost from the same phonological environment, their separate effects may survive in the adjacent phones so that the latter, which were formerly allophones of a single phoneme, later stand in contrast.

Phonemic split of this kind is common in Northern Paman, and the conditions under which it occurs are often stable in terms of *C₁ or *V₁. In Yinwum, for example, medial stops (*S) were nasalized after *CV₁ in which *C₁ was a nasal. After loss of the initial, this prenasalization survived, and, in modern Yinwum, prenasalized stops contrast with plain stops which also reflect medial *S but do so only where the preceding syllable began in a non-nasal. Thus,

\[ \text{ŋ} \text{ŋ}_{\text{ipul}} > \text{ŋŋ}_{\text{yul you non-sg}}, \]
\[ \text{ŋ} \text{ŋ}_{\text{at}-} > \text{ŋ}_{\text{yi-} to see}, \]
\[ \text{ŋ} \text{ŋ}_{\text{t-}} > \text{ŋ}_{\text{ta-} to put on, apply}, \]
\[ \text{n} \text{ŋ}_{\text{uku}} > \text{n}_{\text{kur mother's older brother}}. \]

But,
\[ \text{ŋ} \text{ŋ}_{\text{apa-}} > \text{n}_{\text{y younger brother}}, \]
\[ \text{ŋ} \text{ŋ}_{\text{u-}} > \text{ŋ}_{\text{tma two}}, \]
\[ \text{ŋ}_{\text{pa-}} > \text{k}_{\text{ar down}}. \]

It is clear from this example, and this is only one of many that could have been given, that the technical exposition of Northern Paman historical phonology must allow for relative ordering of events. Thus, the rule for prenasalizing medial stops in Yinwum must precede the general rule whereby all *C₁ were lost; otherwise, the obvious regularity in this development could not be captured. Without ordering of rules it would, in fact, be necessary to posit phonological distinctions for the proto-language which were surely lacking. In pre-Yinwum, i.e., before loss of *C₁, prenasalization of medial stops was allophonic—predictable after initial nasals. There is, therefore, no need to posit a contrast between plain and prenasalized stops for Proto Paman as there would be if there were no initial consonants to which the split could be attributed. But more important, it is also abundantly clear that linguistic change in Northern Paman can be understood only in terms of a generalized theory of Paman phonology which attempts to account for developments in languages which retain initial consonants as well as those in which initials were lost. Without this more generalized theory, the very reconstruction of initial consonants and, therefore, the correct interpretation of modern Northern Paman phonology would be impossible.

The details of the Yinwum development outlined above are unique to that language, although the point they illustrate is universally valid in Northern Paman. In the paragraphs which follow, seven major phonological developments, each attested in more than one Northern Paman language, are listed and briefly exemplified.
1. Lenition of *C₂.

In many Northern Paman languages, long *V₁ had the effect of lenitng stops (*S) and clusters of nasal plus stop (*NS) which immediately followed them. The lenited reflexes of *S and *NS are normally voiced fricatives. Thus, in the leniting environment, */p, mp/ > */β/, */t, tV/ > */β/, and */k, ŋk/ > */β/, as in *Limijë:

*pi' pa > iβa- father’s younger brother.
*Ni- mpi > iβi- ashes.
*wa'- t'Ya > aβa- crow.
*mu' nVYi > oβi- to swim.
*Cuŋku > oyo- long, far;

and in *Uraći:

*pi' pa > iβa- father.
*wa'- t'Ya > waβa- crow.
*Ca- nVYa- > aša- to hurt, pain
*pi- ku > wiwu rib.
*pa-ŋkal > ayaw shoulder.

2. Reduction of *NS.

This development is at least as wide spread as lenition. Medial clusters of nasal plus stop lost the nasal segment after *CV₁ in which *C₁ was a nasal. That is, in sequences of the type *NVNSY, both nasals were lost in the process of initial reduction. *Limijë examples follow:

*ampui > puy we pl incl,
*qantu-na > t'Yo- a where,
*ŋuku > ko there;

but, where C₁ was non-nasal:

*kumpu > mpu urine,
*wuntu > nt'ō- to seek.
*puŋku > ḃko knee.

In *Yinwum and in *Mpalitaya, *NS lost the nasal segment itself, but the stop remained as prenasalized. Thus,

*ŋVŋqka- > *ŋkwe-, *ŋka- to smell.

3. Vowel umlaut.

Vowel umlaut is not widespread but does occur in more than one language. In *Yinwum, initial laminal consonants (*Y, *ŋ, *ŋ̓) had the effect of fronting central or back vowels which followed in the same step. Thus, in *CV₁, *a was fronted to /i/ if *CV₁ was short and began in a laminal:

*ŋYampa > mpi- to give.
*ŋYalan > lin mouth.
*ŋYana > ni- to go.
*ŋinta > nti- to spear.

The vowel in *CV₁ also exerted an umlauting effect on *V₂ in some languages. In *Yinwum, *i in *CV₂ was lowered to /e/ if *V₁ was *a and if the intervening *C₂ was non-laminal. Thus,

*kami > me- mother’s mother.
*kampiy > mpeR up.
*ŋali > le- we du incl.
*waRi- > te- to dig;

but, with laminal *C₂:

*ŋat'Yi- > *ŋyi- mother’s father.
*ŋanYi- > *ŋYi- me.
*ŋayi- > *ayi vegetable food.

4. Loss of *C₁.

As mentioned earlier, loss of *C₁ is general in Northern Paman. Exemplification here is from *Limijë in which short *V₁ was also normally lost in initial reduction:

*pama > ma person.
*pusku > *ŋko kneē.
*ŋYalan > laŋ tongue.
*ŋYâŋkaR- > *ŋka-? = daughter.
except where it was metathesized, was ordinarily lost. Loss of short *V₁ is not exemplified here, since the LingulЪ examples given earlier, to illustrate loss of *C₁, provide ample illustration of it.

7. Shortening of long *V₁.

Long vowels, reconstructed only in initial syllables of Paman stems, became short in all Northern Paman languages. In some languages, they developed discontinuous reflexes flanking *C₂—i.e., a portion remained preceding the medial consonant or cluster, and a portion metathesized to appear as a corresponding glide following the medial. Examples are from Yinwum, first without the partial metathesis:

*nyi’ ri > iyi nose.
*Cu-gku > uu-long, far.
*wa-ta > ata crow.

and, second, with partial metathesis:

*yi’ pa(r) > ipya-t south.
*pu-la > ulwa-father’s father.

In Awetim, contrasts among long vowels have been partially neutralized—all *V₁ > /a/. But where partial metathesis occurred, the quality of the original vowel can be determined from the portion which remains following the medial. Thus:

*C-i-puy > a-yuR smoke.
*ku-tyi’ > o-wi-two.
*na-ni > anay what.

but without partial metathesis, i.e., in cases where *V₁ and *V₂ were homorganic:

*nyi’ ri > a-Ri nose.
*Cu-gku > aYa-long, far.
*ka-ta > ada-mother.
3. Northern Paman vocabulary. In this section a "cognate density matrix" is presented. It is given to show, in a very tentative way only, the internal relationships of the Northern Paman languages as reflected by lexicon. The figures in the matrix are the numbers of basic meanings (body parts, motion and stance verbs, pronouns, etc.), out of a list of 100, which are represented by morphs shared as cognates by the members of each pair of Northern Paman languages in the sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Ura</th>
<th>Mpa</th>
<th>Lu</th>
<th>Yin</th>
<th>Ñya</th>
<th>Mam</th>
<th>NtØw</th>
<th>NtØa</th>
<th>Al</th>
<th>Lin</th>
<th>Nko</th>
<th>Ari</th>
<th>Mbi</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ura</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mpa</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lu</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yin</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ñya</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mam</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NtØw</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NtØa</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Al</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lin</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nko</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ari</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The average numbers of morphs shared as cognates by each language or dialect with the rest of Northern Paman are as follows:
Uraδi shares an average of 43 cognates, out of the 100 item list, with the rest of Northern Paman; Mpalitγan shares 52; Luttγ 52; Yinnu 45; Ñyan̄at 61; NtØwaŋγat 61; Mmanγat 59; NtØtŋat 61; Alŋat 59; Limgat 55; Nkoŋ 47; Aritimgat 42; Mbiyworm 38.
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