ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2018-085 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2018-8-29

Primary Person submitting request: Linda Jordan

Affiliation: SIL International, Wycliffe South Africa and Instituto de Línguas Nacionais (Angola)

E-mail address: linda underscore jordan at sil dot org

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:

Sebastian Floor

Wycliffe South Africa and The Seed Company

sebastian_floor at sil dot org or sebastian_floor at tsco dot org

Postal address for primary contact person for this request (in general, email correspondence will be used):

7500 W. Camp Wisdom Rd.

Dallas, TX  75236

USA

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 and will be posted on the ISO 639-3 website.

Types of change requests

This form is to be used in requesting changes (whether creation, modification, or deletion) to elements of the ISO 639 Codes for the representation of names of languages — Part 3: Alpha-3 code for comprehensive coverage of languages. The types of changes that are possible are to 1) modify the reference information for an existing code element, 2) propose a new macrolanguage or modify a macrolanguage group; 3) retire a code element from use, including merging its scope of denotation into that of another code element, 4) split an existing code element into two or more new language code elements, or 5) create a new code element for a previously unidentified language variety. Fill out section 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5 below as appropriate, and the final section documenting the sources of your information. The process by which a change is received, reviewed and adopted is summarized on the final page of this form.

Type of change proposed (check one):

1. [ ] Modify reference information for an existing language code element
2. [ ] Propose a new macrolanguage or modify a macrolanguage group
3. [ ] Retire a language code element from use (duplicate or non-existent)
4. [ ] Expand the denotation of a code element through the merging one or more language code elements into it (retiring the latter group of code elements)
5. [ ] Split a language code element into two or more new code elements
6. [✓] Create a code element for a previously unidentified language

For proposing a change to an existing code element, please identify:
Affected ISO 639-3 identifier:
Associated reference name:

1. **Modify an existing language code element**
   (a) What are you proposing to change:
       - [ ] Language reference name; generally this is changed only if it is erroneous;
         if usage is shifting to a new preferred form, the new form may be added (next box)
       - [ ] Language additional names
       - [ ] Language type (living, extinct, historical, etc.)
       - [ ] Language scope (individual language or macrolanguage)
   (b) What new value(s) do you propose:
   (c) Rationale for change:

2. **Propose a new macrolanguage or modify a macrolanguage group**
   (a) For an existing Macrolanguage, what change to its individual language membership do you propose:
   (b) Rationale for change:
   For a new Macrolanguage proposal, please also complete the form “Request for New Language Code
   Element in ISO 639-3” (file name “ISO639-3_NewCodeRequest.doc” or “ISO639-3_NewCode
   RequestForm.rtf”), which must also be submitted to fully document the intended meaning for the new
   macrolanguage.

3. **Retire a language code element from use**
   (a) Reason for change:
       - [ ] There is no evidence that the language exists.
       - [ ] This is equivalent to another ISO 639-3 language.
   (b) If equivalent with another code element, with which ISO 639-3 code element (identifier and name)
       is it equivalent:
   (c) Rationale for change:

4. **Expand the denotation of a code element through merging of one or more code elements**
   (a) List the languages (identifier and name) to be merged into this code element and retired from use:
5. Split a language code element into two or more code elements

(a) List the languages into which this code element should be split:

By the language identification criteria set forth in ISO 639-3, the simple fact of distinct identities is not enough to assign separate identifiers. The criteria are defined in the standard as follows:

For this part of ISO 639, judgments regarding when two varieties are considered to be the same or different languages are based on a number of factors, including linguistic similarity, intelligibility, a common literature (traditional or written), a common writing system, the views of users concerning the relationship between language and identity, and other factors. The following basic criteria are followed:

- Two related varieties are normally considered varieties of the same language if users of each variety have inherent understanding of the other variety (that is, can understand based on knowledge of their own variety without needing to learn the other variety) at a functional level.
- Where intelligibility between varieties is marginal, the existence of a common literature or of a common ethnolinguistic identity with a central variety that both understand can be strong indicators that they should nevertheless be considered varieties of the same language.
- Where there is enough intelligibility between varieties to enable communication, the existence of well-established distinct ethnolinguistic identities can be a strong indicator that they should nevertheless be considered to be different languages.

(b) Referring to the criteria given above, give the rationale for splitting the existing code element into two or more languages:

(c) Does the language code element to be split represent a major language in which there already exists a significant body of literature and research? Are there contexts in which all the proposed separate languages may still be considered the same language—as in having a common linguistic identity, a shared (or undistinguished) body of literature, a written form in common, etc.? If so, please comment.

In order to complete the change request, the form “Request for New Language Code Element in ISO 639-3” (file name “ISO639-3_NewCodeRequestForm.doc” or “ISO639-3_NewCodeRequestForm.rtf”) must also be submitted for each new identifier that is to be created. That step can be deferred until this form has been processed by the ISO 639-3 registrar.

6. Create a new language code element

(a) Name of missing language: Mpinda
(b) State the case that this language is not the same as or has not been included within any language that already has an identifier in ISO 639-3:

Mpinda is a Bantu Zone H language (Guthrie 1970), and its closest relative with an ISO 639-3 identifier is Kimbundu [kmb]. The origin of the Mpinda people, a coastal group found in Porto Amboim municipality of Angola’s Kwanza Sul province, is heterogeneous. Their ancestors include Sama [smd] speakers and people from the Waku Kungo area (Cela municipality of Kwanza Sul) as well as speakers of Kisolongo (a dialect of Kikongo [kng]) from Cabinda who were brought to work in the coastal areas of Kwanza Sul because the local people were resistant to Portuguese incursion. These people all settled in the Porto Amboim area and became the ancestors of the modern-day Mpinda speakers (Gabriel Vinte e Cinco, pers. comm.).

Mpinda’s highest lexical similarity with any speech variety in the area stands at only 64% with Ndongo, according to a more liberal count that takes regular sound correspondences into consideration. (Ndongo is a variant of Kimbundu spoken by the descendants of people who migrated from the core Kimbundu area in what is now Malanje Province.) All other speech varieties in the area have 54% or lower lexical similarity with Mpinda.

The results of comprehension testing indicate that Mpinda speakers have low partial comprehension of Kibala [blv], the most widespread language in Kwanza Sul Province, spoken just to the east of the coastal strip occupied by the Mpinda. Kibala has only 47% lexical similarity with Mpinda. The Mpinda test subjects understood less of the Kibala text than the Ndongo test subjects did (though the Ndongo results also indicated low partial comprehension of Kibala).

The results of the participatory dialect mapping exercise conducted with a group of Mpinda speakers indicates that they consider Ndongo to be a distantly related language, even more different from Mpinda than Nsume (which has only 54% lexical similarity with Mpinda). They perceive Ndongo as having only moderate inherent intelligibility with Mpinda. According to the Ndongo interview group, Mpinda is a very different language from their own, and Ndongo speakers who have not learned it have low partial comprehension of it. The Ndongo speakers consider Kibala to be more closely related to their language. In spite of this, both groups reported that everyone speaks his own language for interethnic communication, with no need to switch to another language to make oneself understood. This is apparently due to close contact between speakers of the two languages, resulting in passive bilingualism.

As Mpinda’s closest neighbor and the speech variety that shares the highest lexical similarity, Ndongo is the only plausible candidate for being included within the same language. However, because this lexical similarity only stands at 64% and interviewees from both groups displayed a strong separate linguistic identity, Mpinda should be considered a distinct language.

In order to complete the change request, the form “Request for New Language Code Element in ISO 639-3” (file name “ISO639-3_NewCodeRequest.doc” or “ISO639-3_NewCodeRequestForm.rtf”) must also be submitted to more fully document the new language.
Sources of information

Please use whichever of the points below are relevant in order to document the sources on which you have based the above proposal.

(a) First-hand knowledge. Describe:
In April 2017, Isata Manuel of the Institute of National Languages and I (Linda Jordan) conducted a sociolinguistic survey of the Mpinda and Ndongo speech varieties in the community of Porto Amboim, in the coastal lowlands of Angola's Kwanza Sul Province. The fieldwork was carried out with the permission and cooperation of the provincial culture office. This survey followed up on an earlier one conducted in May-June 2012, focusing more on other speech varieties in the province.

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
Rev. Gabriel Vinte e Cinco, a local historian, has done extensive research into the origins of ethnolinguistic groups in Kwanza Sul Province. He participated in the 2012 fieldwork and provided a wealth of background information for the survey.

(c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):


The change proposal process

A request to change the code set goes through a six-step process:

1. A user of ISO 639-3 proposes a change and submits it to the ISO 639-3 Registration Authority (ISO 639-3/RA) using this form.

2. The ISO 639-3 registrar processes the change request to verify that the request is compatible with the criteria set forth in the standard and to ensure that the submitter has supplied all necessary information. This may involve rounds of interaction with the submitter.

3. When the change request proposal is complete in its documentation (including all associated New Code Requests), the change request is promoted to “Proposed Change” status and the ISO 639-3 registrar posts the request on the official web site of the ISO 639-3/RA. Also at this time, an announcement is sent to anyone requesting notification of new proposals matching their specified criteria (region and/or language family of interest). Periodically, a message maybe sent to the general LINGUIST discussion list on Linguist List (http://linguistlist.org/issues/index.html), and
other appropriate discussion lists, inviting individuals to review and comment on pending proposals. Anyone may request from the ISO 639-3 registrar to receive notification regarding proposals involving languages in a specific region of the world or specific language family.

4. Individuals may send comments to the ISO 639-3 registrar for compilation. The consensus of early reviews may result in promotion to “Candidate Status” (with or without amendment), or withdrawal of the change request, if the conclusion is that the request is not in keeping with the stated criteria of the ISO 639-3 standard.

5. Three months prior to the end of the annual cycle of review and update, a new notice is posted on the official web site of the ISO 639-3/RA, and an announcement listing the Candidate Status Change Requests is posted to the LINGUIST discussion list and other discussion lists, as requested by their owners. All change requests are then open to further review and comment by any interested party for a period of three months. A Change Request received after the start of Candidacy phase must wait until the next annual cycle for consideration. The purpose of this phase is to ensure that a minimum of three months is allotted for the review of every proposal.

6. At the end of the formal review period, a given Change Request may be: 1) adopted as a whole; 2) adopted in part (specific changes implicit in the whole Change Request may be adopted separately); 3) rejected as a whole; or 4) amended and resubmitted for the next review cycle. All change requests remain permanently archived at the official web site of the ISO 639-3/RA.

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
E-mail: [iso639-3@sil.org](mailto:iso639-3@sil.org)

An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers:
Linguist List. Constructed Languages. [http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfConstructedLgs.html](http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfConstructedLgs.html)