ISO 639-3 Registration Authority
Request for New Language Code Element in ISO 639-3

This form is to be used in conjunction with a “Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code” form
Date: 2012-1-19

Name of Primary Requester: Diana Cohen
E-mail address: diana underscore cohen at sil dot org

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
Carey McLaughlin, SIL International East Asia Group; carey underscore mclaughlin at sil dot org
Robert McLaughlin, SIL International East Asia Group; robert underscore mclaughlin at sil dot org

Associated Change request number : 2011-160 (completed by Registration Authority)
Tentative assignment of new identifier : hng (completed by Registration Authority)

PLEASE NOTE: This completed form will become part of the public record of this change request and the history of the ISO 639-3 code set. Use Shift-Enter to insert a new line in a form field (where allowed).

1. NAMES and IDENTIFICATION
   a) Preferred name of language for code element denotation:
      Green Hmong
   b) Autonym (self-name) for this language:
      Mong, Mong Leng, Mong Ntsua
   c) Common alternate names and spellings of language, and any established abbreviations:
      Moob Ntsuab, Moob Leeg, Mong Njua, Hwa Miao, Mong Hoa, Flowery Miao, Ching Miao, Qing Miao, Lv Miao, Lu Miao, Southern Hua Miao, Green Miao, Green Meo, Blue Miao, Blue Meo, Blue Hmong, Meo Dam, Meo Lai, Tak Miao.
   d) Reason for preferred name:
      Green Hmong is the most common English name used to refer to this group in SE Asia and the West, and is of the form "modifier+Hmong" which we would like to use consistently to refer to all the Farwestern Hmongic groups. Because there are multiple ethnonyms for this group, a term which applies to all the people is preferred over choosing one of the ethnonyms.
   e) Name and approximate population of ethnic group or community who use this language:
      Hmong; population speaking these varieties estimated around 270,000 worldwide
   f) Preferred three letter identifier, if available: mng

Your suggestion will be taken into account, but the Registration Authority will determine the identifier to be proposed. The identifiers is not intended to be an abbreviation for a name of the language, but to serve as a device to identify a given language uniquely. With thousands of languages, many sets of which have similar names, it is not possible to provide identifiers that resemble a language name in every case.
2. TEMPORAL DESCRIPTION and LOCATION

a) Is this a

☐ Living language
☐ Nearly extinct/secondary use only (includes languages in revival)
☐ Recently extinct language
☐ Historical language
☐ Ancient language
☐ Artificially constructed language
☐ Macrolanguage

(Select one. See explanations of these types at http://www.sil.org/iso639-3/types.asp)

b) Countries where used:
Laos, Myanmar, Thailand, Vietnam; Australia, Canada, France, USA.

c) Region within each country: towns, districts, states or provinces where used. Include GPS coordinates of the approximate center of the language, if possible:
northern Laos,
northern Vietnam,
northern Thailand: Chiangrai, Chiangmai, Maehongson, Tak, Phayao, Phrae, Nan, Loei,
Sukhothai, Kamphaengphet, Uthai, Petchabun provinces
northeastern Myanmar adjacent to Thailand

d) For an ancient or historical language, give approximate time frame; for a recently extinct language, give the approximate date of the last known user’s death

3. MODALITY AND LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

a) This language is:
☐ Signed
☒ Spoken
☐ Attested only in writings

b) Language family, if classified; origin, if artificially constructed:
Hmong-Mien, Hmongic, Chuanqiandian

c) Closest language linguistically. For signed language, note influence from other signed or spoken languages:
1. White Hmong
2. Southern Hmong
4. LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND USE

a) What written literature, inscriptions or recordings exist in this language? Are there newspapers, radio or television broadcasts, etc.?:


b) Is this language officially recognized by any level of government? Is it used in any levels of formal education as a language of instruction (for other subjects)? Is it taught in schools?:

occasionally taught in adult literacy classes and used orally in children's bilingual primary school classes as an aid in transition to the national language; taught in a few US public secondary schools and colleges as a language and culture elective

c) Comment on factors of ethnolinguistic identity and informal domains of use:

Estimate of ethnolinguistic vitality: "5 "Written" for Green Hmong, because some parts of the community are using the written form of the language effectively.

Ethnolinguistic identity: Green Hmong identify themselves as part of the worldwide "Hmong" language group. Some parts of the Green Hmong community seek recognition as a distinct ethnolinguistic group from the White Hmong, and prefer the name "Mong" (without any modifier) to contrast with "Hmong" (which they feel should be reserved for referring to the White Hmong). White Hmong and Green Hmong are the most populous Hmong groups in southeast Asia and western countries, and as a result, some members of the southeast Asian and overseas Hmong community commonly think of "Hmong" as having only this binary distinction. But there is a growing awareness among southeast Asian and overseas Hmong of the many diverse Hmong languages spoken in China, and a growing interest in travel to China to meet fellow-Hmong who may speak varieties other than White and Green.
5. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

You do not need to repeat sources previously identified in the form, “Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code”

a) First-hand knowledge. Describe:

SIL researchers have conducted field language research (survey work) in China including intelligibility testing between this and related language varieties.

Speakers' Own Distinctions
Regarding Southern Hmong and Northern Hmong speakers' own recognition of their varying comprehension levels of Hmong spoken outside China, see Andy Castro and Royce Flaming's 16 October 2009 "Honghe RTT Respondents' Individual Responses" and 4 September 2009 "Wenshan RTT Respondents' Individual Responses." For example, Hmong Nzhuab respondent #3 at Y10 in Wenshan said that she cannot understand Hmong Nzhuab from France. Northern Hmong respondents in Honghe at Y25 (Hmong Soud) and Y26 (Hmong Bes) stated that they cannot understand the speech of the Hmong actors from America and Thailand in the DVD movies and music that they purchase.

Inherent Intelligibility
Testing of Southern Hmong RTT stories from China on Green Hmong respondents in southeast Asia and western countries has not yet been done. Scores of Southern Hmong respondents listening to Green Hmong stories from Thailand may be used to predict comparable scores in the reverse direction of intelligibility.
Inherent intelligibility between Green Hmong and Southern Hmong on fairly simple stories varies from intermediate to extremely high. See Andy Castro and Royce Flaming, 4 September 2009, "Wenshan RTT Results" and 16 October 2009, "Honghe RTT Results" for the following data:

Thailand Hmong Nzhuab texts tested on Hmong Shib in 2 Wenshan locations: average scores of 77%, 88% and 95%; tested on Hmong Nzhuab in 2 Wenshan locations: average scores of 93%, 99%, 100% and 100%; tested on Hmong Lens in 1 Honghe location: average score of 100%
The two Green Hmong stories used for RTT testing in Guizhou and Yunnan were fairly basic in content; for English translations of these stories, see Robert McLaughlin, 29 October 2008 Dananshan and Thailand Hmong Nzhuab RTT Data and Test Scores, "NZH Childhood Story Text" and "NZH Bear Story Text." My own [Diana Cohen's] informal testing of more abstract and complex Green Hmong content matter (such as folktales, children's stories, proverbs and translated narratives) on 10-12 Southern Hmong listeners (Hmong Shib and Hmong Nzhuab of Wenshan) has elicited remarks like the following: "It sounds as if the speaker is using Hmong words, but I don't know the meanings of those words. I can't get any meaning from what the speaker is saying, because we don't talk that way here."

Lexical Similarity
Lexical similarity of Green Hmong was not calculated in comparison to Southern Hmong. Compare wordlists in "2008-2009 Yunnan and Guizhou Hmong Survey Wordlist Samples" abridged from 20 January 2010 Andy Castro and Royce Flaming, Wordlists with GT analysis, "Master list." As will be seen from comparing wordlists, basic vocabulary is highly cognate across the border; however, comprehension is affected strongly by differences in abstract terms, loanwords, grammatical functor words and discourse particles between
Green Hmong (of southeast Asia and western countries) and the Southern Hmong varieties of China.

b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:

c) Knowledge from published sources. Include known dictionaries, grammars, etc. (please give complete bibliographical references):

Please return this form to:
ISO 639-3 Registrar
SIL International, Office of Language Information Systems
7500 West Camp Wisdom Road
Dallas, Texas 75236 USA
Email: iso639-3@sil.org
An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Further information:
If your request for a new language code element is supported by the Registration Authority as a formal proposal, you may be contacted separately by researchers working with the Ethnologue or with LinguistList asking you to provide additional information.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers: