ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2007-183 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2007-9-1

Primary Person submitting request: Karl Anderbeck

Affiliation: SIL Indonesia Branch

E-mail address: karl_anderbeck@sil.org

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

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

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) 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: mly

Associated reference name: Malay

1. Modify an existing language code element

   (a) What are you proposing to change:

      □ Language reference name
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_NewCodeRequestForm.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:

(b) Rationale for change

5. Split a language code element into two or more code elements

(a) List the languages into which this code element should be split:
   Standard Malay
Haji
Papuan Malay
Local Malay

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:
Malay as described in the Ethnologue 15th ed. currently has several dialects listed under Sumatra, many of which are in other areas of Indonesia besides Sumatra, and of which eighteen are already listed as separate languages or dialects of other separate languages, or should be listed on their own as separate languages. Other country listings for Malay have similar issues. After clarifying those, however, there remains a need to specify Standard Malay (along with various local/vernacular Malay dialects and sociolects, e.g., Terengganu and Trade Malay)

Aji, or more properly, Haji, is proposed as a new language; see proposal for Haji (Aji) for more detail.

Papuan Malay should be recognized as a separate language; see proposal for more detail.

These steps will remove double listing of a speech variety as both a stand alone language in one listing, a dialect of a language in another listing, and a dialect of Malay in another listing, and also recognize the languages that warrant separate treatment. Goal-one listing for each speech variety.

The following elaborates on the clarifications regarding the Malaysian and Indonesian "Dialects" sections of the current Ethnologue entry for Malay [Malay]:

First, there should be a listing of "Dialects" not only for Sumatra but also Kalimantan.

Jakarta, another name for existing separate code element Betawi [bew]
The following are currently listed under Sumatra for Malay [mly] but are actually spoken in Kalimantan and should be considered not a part of either Standard Malay or Local Malay:

- Borneo (Sintang), and Kota-Waringin, both dialects of Malayic Dayak [xdy]
- Labu (Lebu, Labu Basap), exists in the Ethnologue as Basap [bdb]
- Balikpapan is represented in the Ethnologue as Banjar [bjn]
- Bakumpai is a separate code element [bkr].

(moving onto dialects outside Kalimantan):

- Makassarese or Makasar Malay exists as a separate code element [mfp].
- Manadonese (Menadonese) exists as a separate code element [xmm].
- Mulak, another name for existing separate code element Kaur [vkk]
- Bangka is the proposed expanded value for existing code element [mfb] (currently Lom)
- Larantuka (Ende Malay) has been proposed as a separate code element. (cf. 2007-197)
- Peranakan exists as a separate code element [pea]
- Basa Kupang (Kupang) exists as a separate code element [mkn]
- Belide, actually a dialect of Musi (cf 2007-182)
- Daya, actually a dialect of Lampung Api (cf 2007-142); Lengkayap, another name for Daya

- Aji is another name for Haji [hji] (proposed new code element)
- Papuan Malay (Irianese) has been proposed to be a new code element [pmy].

There are also a few problems with the Malaysia "Dialects": Kedah, already an existing separate code element, Kedah Malay [meo]. Pasir Malay may refer to an area in East Kalimantan currently mapped as Banjar [bjn] rather than any dialect in Malaysia.

Thailand Malay probably refers to the separate code element Pattani Malay [mfa].

With this analysis, there remains a number of "local" or "vernacular" Malay language varieties that are not well differentiated from each other, as well as a number of language varieties for which further research is required to clarify their level of differentiation from more mainstream dialects. The following Sumatran dialects should be considered in this group: Tamiang, Deli, Riau mainland, Lubu, Akit, Sakai, Riau islands, coastal Jambi, and Belitung. Though not well defined, this should be considered a separate code element from Standard Malay.

(Local) Malay currently listed under Sumatra but actually spoken in Kalimantan are:

Sambas, Kota-Waringin, Sukadana, Ritok (Siantan, Pontianak), Sampit, West Borneo Coast Malay. This list of dialects would be better expressed as Sambas, Pontianak and Ketapang.

(Local) Malay dialects in Peninsular Malaysia (mostly following Collins 1989) include but may not be limited to: coastal Terengganu, inland Terengganu, Kelantan (evidently mutually intelligible with Patani Malay), Pahang, Southeast Island, Orang Hulu, Orang Kuala, Jugra-Muar-Melaka-Johor. This list deliberately does not repeat the misleading dialect labels based on state boundaries. It also does not include the Malay varieties currently listed as separate Ethnologue entries, although some of these may be better understood also as Local Malay dialects: Kedah, Negeri Sembilan, Jakun, Orang Kanaq, Orang Seletar and Temuan.

(Local) Malay dialects in Eastern Malaysia and Brunei include Sarawak, and one or more
local Malay dialects are spoken in Brunei alongside the national Standard Malay variety.

What remains is Standard Malay more narrowly specified (not including the above language varieties), also to be a new code element. Standard Malay (Bahasa Malaysia), the national language of Malaysia, differs substantially, particularly on the morphosyntactic level, from any described local Malay dialect.

[RA comment: The clarification of "Malay (individual language)" must of necessity reference the Ethnologue entry for this language (Standard Malay). The current Ethnologue entry involves a large number of language varieties that already are or should be (on linguistic grounds) recognized as separate languages, along with numerous varieties that are more correctly recognized as being with the scope of other existing language code elements. Two new language code elements are being proposed as part of this refining of Standard Malay and separation of Local Malay from it. Because of this past confusion regarding what "Malay (Individual language)" should denote, and a clear narrowing of the desired denotation to be Standard Malay, the existing Malay [mly] code element must be retired.]

(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.

The ISO 639-2 code element [msa]/[may] Malay, considered a macrolanguage in 639-3, currently includes a somewhat random selection of Malay dialects as well as Malay trade languages and creoles. I will not propose a complete revamping of which ISO 639-3 individual language codes should be considered as relating to the Malay macrolanguage (in many places the "Malay" or "Indonesian" identity is one of degree). Standard Malay (to which [mly] primarily referred) should be included, as should Local Malay, and Indonesian [ind]. Refer also to Mead and Anderbeck (unpublished communication with Ethnologue, "Austronesian languages - higher level classification").

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:

(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.
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:

A sociolinguistic survey in 2007 of Bengkulu accompanied with analysis of over 40 wordlists from the Pusat Bahasa publication Pemetaan Bahasa Daerah Sumatra Barat dan Bengkulu showed the interchangeable use of Mulak for Kaur. A series of surveys in 2006 and 2007 by the Western Indonesian Survey Team found Belide to be a Malayic variety that is best listed as a dialect of Musi, on the basis of comprehension. Surveys of the Lampungic and Komering language areas in 2004, 2005, and 2006 by WIST found Daya to be a Lampungic variety. These same surveys found Haji (Aji) to be a distinct language on the basis of comprehension and significant variance with the surrounding Central Malay Malayic varieties.

In many cases disambiguation of the above dialects required only an atlas to compare with the existing Ethnologue maps. In other cases the situation has entered common knowledge to the extent that it is superfluous to cite specific sources, e.g. Jakarta Malay vs. Betawi.

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:

(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

An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers: