ISO 639-3 Registration Authority
Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2008-026 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2008-1-2

Primary Person submitting request: David Mead

Affiliation: SIL International

E-mail address: david_mead@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):
P.O. Box 248
Waxhaw, NC 28173

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.  [x] Retire a language code element from use
4.  [ ] Split a language code element into two or more new code elements
5.  [ ] 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: tlz

Associated reference name: Toala'

1. Modify an existing language code element

(a) What are you proposing to change:
   [ ] Language reference name
   [ ] Language additional names
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.
☒ 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: rob - Tae'

(c) Rationale for change:

Grimes and Grimes (1987) Languages of South Sulawesi, proposed two languages to the east of the Toraja area: Toala’ and Rongkong. Even though the Grimeses’ own computations showed Toala’ and Rongkong to be 83% cognate, one consideration for not combining the languages was that Rongkong speakers themselves viewed their language as separate. However, a follow-up survey of the Toraja language area (Valkama 1987, WILC vol. 5) revealed dialect chaining which was more complex than the Grimeses’ initial survey had indicated, with no particular reason to demark the two languages. In their update to Languages of South Sulawesi, Tim Friberg and Tom Laskowske (1989, NUSA vol. 31) proposed that these two languages be combined and be renamed the Rongkong-Luwu’ language.

In 1988, Ian and Tanya Vail began living in the area, in order to investigate the situation in greater detail. After an extensive survey, which involved living in six different locations in Kabupaten Luwu, Vail concurred (Vail 1991) that the languages be combined, but suggested that the language be named Tae’ after the negative term which is used throughout the area (this term was also acceptable to speakers themselves as a language name). However, this term is neither definitive nor unambiguous, since tae’ is also the
negative term in Sa'dan Toraja (compare for example Van der Veen's 1940 Tae' Woordenboek, which is a dictionary of Sa'dan Toraja, not Rongkong-Luwu').

Unfortunately, these later suggestions were only halfway incorporated into the Ethnologue, which up through the 14th and 15th editions, had changed the name of Rongkong to Tae' but maintained Toala' as a separate language. The data listed under Tae' (location, dialects, etc.) in the Ethnologue, 14th and 15th eds., partly assume that the languages were merged, and yet partly assume that the languages are separate.

One curiosity is where Chuck and Barbara Grimes even got the name Toala'. They write on page 49, "There has been great diversity in the previous classification of Toala'..." and so one might assume from the following discussion that Esser, Van der Veen, Salzner, Mills and the authors of the Peta Bahasa had all mentioned a Toala' language, but this is not true. The term Toala' is used only by Salzner, who listed it under his Makasar-Bugi group (see page 15), but never gave it a location on his Southern Sulawesi map (map no. 23). Since Salzner did not do any original research in Sulawesi, he must have picked up this term from someone else, but we could not track down this earlier source. Noorduyn calls Toala' "an exceedingly inapt exonym ... meaning 'people of the forest'" (1991:203). The preferred self-designation is Luwu', and "there is little chance of confusion with the Luwu dialect of Bugis" (Friberg and Laskowske 1989:9).

Following Vail (1991), there are four dialects of Tae'. Major subdialects of Tae' appear to be:

Northeast Luwu' (= Bone-bone = Masamba)
  Rongkong
    Seko Lemo
    Rongkong Atas
    Rongkong Bawah (= Sabbang)
  Bua
South Luwu'
  Bajo (=Palili')
  Bastem (=Toala')

However, integrating the dialect descriptions of Valkama (1987:125, 127), Friberg and Laskowske (1989:9) and Vail (1991:79) is not without its difficulties. In particular, Valkama writes as if Rongkong Bawah and Sabbang are separate subdialects, and places the latter within his North Luwu dialect. Valkama also uses the inelegant terms Northern South Luwu' and Southern South Luwu'. These terms are especially to be avoided since once Bua is removed from his Northern South Luwu' (following Vail 1991), the split is more east-west rather than north-south. The Bastem and Bajo subdialects are named after kecamatans (subdistricts), but both are spoken more broadly than the respective kecamatan borders. Bastem is a mountain kecamatan which borders on the Toraja area. Finally, it is unclear from Ian Vail's report whether Bone-bone and Masamba are to be regarded as synonyms for Northeast Luwu', or whether they should be regarded as separate, marginally different subdialects under Northeast Luwu'. Kari Valkama took only one word list in this area, so it is impossible to resolve the issue by investigating Kari's primary data.
4. 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.

5. 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:

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
Tom Laskowske provided some very helpful background information, which has been summarized in the above discussion.

(c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):
The major primary sources on the classification of Tae’ are the following three articles.


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) 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: