ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2006-085 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2006-4-19

Primary Person submitting request: David Beck

Affiliation: University of Alberta

E-mail address: dbeck@ualberta.ca

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
Yvonne Lam, University of Alberta, yvonne.lam@ualberta.ca

Postal address for primary contact person for this request (in general, email correspondence will be used):
Department of Linguistics
4-45 Assiniboia Hall
University of Alberta
Edmonton, AB T6E 2G7
Canada

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.

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) retire a code element from use, including merging its scope of denotation into that of another code element, 3) split an existing code element into two or more new language code elements, or 4) create a new code element for a previously unidentified language variety. Fill out section 1, 2, 3, or 4 below as appropriate, plus section 5 to document 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. □ Retire a language code element from use through a merge
3. ☒ Split a language code element into two or more new code elements
4. □ Create a code element for a previously unidentified language

For changes of type 1, 2 or 3 (proposing a change to an existing code), please identify:

Affected ISO 639-3 identifier: tot

Associated reference name: Totonac, Patla-Chicontla
1. **Modify an existing language code element**

(a) What are you proposing to change:
- Language reference name
- 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. **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.
- This is a variety that is fully intelligible with another ISO 639-3 language and should be merged with it.

(b) If one of the latter two reasons, with which ISO 639-3 code element (identifier and name) should it be merged:

(c) Rationale for change:

3. **Split a language code element into two or more code elements**

(a) List the languages into which this code element should be split:
- Upper Necaxa Totonac (spoken in Patla, Chicontla, San Pedro Tlalontongo, and Cacahuatlan) and Tecpatlán Totonac, spoken in Tecpatlán and possibly in one or two neighbouring villages to the north and west

The term Patla-Chicontla Totonac has been used inaccurately to date (based on the Ethnologue data for the language [tot]), referring to more than one language.

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 693, 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:

Upper Necaxa Totonac and Tecpatlán Totonac do not seem to be naively mutually intelligible, although many speakers of one have enough experience with the other that in practice they can communicate. However, Upper Necaxa as spoken in Patla, Chicontla, San Pedro Tlalontongo, and Cacahuatlán is distinguished by (and recognized as a dialect in the region according to) a number of sound changes including the neutralization of a contrast between the voiceless lateral affricate and the voiceless lateral fricative. Tecpatlán Totonac has also undergone a shift of /w/ to /b/ (a sound not found at all in Upper Necaxa). There are a great many lexical distinctions that set Tecpatlán apart from the others.

Tecpatlán Totonac does, however, share one important sound change with the Upper Necaxa variety, the lenition of *q to a glottal stop and the concomittant collapse of historical fricative-q clusters to ejective fricatives. The shift is not quote complete in Tecpatlán, however, which retains /q/ in at least some lexical items. Tecpatlán and Upper Necaxa also share a shift in the grammatical paradigms so that many n-final verbs are treated as consonant-final stems for the purposes of perfective aspectual inflection (departing from the more common Totonacan pattern). These changes set Tecpatlán apart from Zihuateutla Totonac.

(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.

According to local folk histories, the people of Patla and Chicontla are late-comers to the area, having migrated (according to people from Chicontla) from the southwest. Cacahuatlán was apparently founded later by settlers from Patla. These communities identify themselves as a linguistic group as distinct from speakers in Tecpatlán, although all Totonacs feel that they speak the same language (this extends as far as Papantla and other varieties already given distinct ISO designations).

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.

4. Create a new language code element

(a) Name of missing language:
(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:

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.

5. 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:
I have worked with speakers in Patla and Chicontla for more than 8 years and have visited Tecpatlán on a number of occasions. I have heard the Tecpatlán variety of Totonac spoken and can attest to the phonological differences. I attended a regional conference of bilingual teachers where the Upper Necaxan changes to the verbal paradigms were discussed and shown to be unfamiliar to teachers from the adjacent areas. In the summer of 2006 I visited all four communities and did a preliminary dialect survey focusing on features I considered to be definitive of the Upper Necaxa speech variety. I spoke personally with native speakers in all four locations and recorded a short text in Tecpatlán (supplementing the material I have already collected in communities in the Necaxa valley).

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
One of my primary consultants in Patla was involved in the production of the SIL Biblical translation for TOT and reported to me that the translation encountered tremendous difficulties because of the failure of the SIL linguist working on the project to recognize the phonological and lexical differences between the varieties. In my own discussions (most post hoc) with this person (who had been based in Tecpatlán but also worked with people from Patla and, to a lesser extent, Chicontla), I was unable to get her to accept the existence of the Upper Necaxan sound changes, and she flatly rejected efforts by her consultants to get her to recognize them during the translation process. The translation that resulted was largely unintelligible in either community but especially so in Patla and Chicontla. As of the summer of 2005, most of the copies of the Bible have remained undistributed because people are unable to read them (or at least unwilling to learn how).

Other consultants not involved in the translation project routinely tell me that the speech of Tecpatlán is unlike the speech of Patla and Chicontla and the differences between this variety as opposed to the differences between Patla and Chicontla are generally recognized as being of a different order of magnitude. I have also done some lexical work as part of my dictionary project and attempts to elicit forms found in the Xicotepec de Juárez Totonac dictionary frequently got responses such as "that's what they say in Tecpatlán" or "in Zihuateutla".

(c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):
The change proposal process

A request to change the code set goes through a five 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 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 the proposal. Any list owner may request from the ISO 639-3 registrar to receive an announcement 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 these first 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 (ordinarily October 1st), 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) amended and resubmitted for the next review cycle, or 4) withdrawn from consideration. 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

An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers: