ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2008-044 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 7 March 2008

Primary Person submitting request: Ian Tupper

Affiliation: SIL-PNG

E-mail address: i.tupper@sil.org.pg

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):
PO Box 341, Ukarumpa, EHP 444, PAPUA NEW GUINEA

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. [x] 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:

(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:
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: Abu' Arapesh

(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:

1. Abu' is a member of the Arapesh dialect chain, together with its neighbours Bukiyip (Mountain Arapesh) and Mufian (Southern Arapesh). Nevertheless, speakers of the language have a distinct ethnolinguistic identity from neighbouring members of the Arapesh family. This ethnolinguistic self-perception is supported by several studies examining lexical similarity. In addition, "the Abu' language area is identified by a specific set of lexical, phonological (and possibly grammatical) isoglosses that exhibit considerable difference between it and other genetically related languages" (Nekitel 1985:30).
2. The issue of ethnolinguistic self-perception is documented by Nekitel, who conducted fieldwork in Womsis village, in the centre of the Abu' language area. He comments (ibid.): "When asked about the relationship of Abu' vis a vis other Arapesh languages, the majority of the people interviewed asserted that the Abu' linguistic boundary ends at Balup to the north and Womsak no. 1 to the south. A minority, however, expanded the Abu’ linguistic area testified by the majority and included [various villages], thereby maintaining that that is where a boundary line must be drawn to mark off the Abu' from Mufian [=Mufian] and Buki [=Bukiyip]." While the exact position of the boundaries of Abu' Arapesh is somewhat uncertain (especially the village of Matapau), it is clear from this quotation that there is a self-perception that Abu' is a distinct member of the Arapesh family compared with its neighbours Bukiyip and Mufian. These comments gain added force from Dr Nekitel’s experience of growing up at Womsis village, which gave him insider access to Abu’ self-perception. Thus the core of the Abu' language area has a self-perception distinct from the other Arapesh languages.

Comments from the edge of the Abu' language area reinforce this self-perception. The survey by Gray et al (2008) found that the villages of Malin, Balup and Matapau (at the northern edge of the language area identified by Nekitel) all considered that they spoke the same language as each other, although Matapau spoke a different dialect. Malin and Balup considered that they spoke the same language as the more central Abu' villages (Womsis, Walum, Asapas and Walawiga). The villagers considered villages of the neighbouring Bukiyip and Mufian languages harder to understand; notably "people in Matapau said that adults (but not children) could understand everything said in Bukiyip villages but little of what was said in Mufian."

3. While Abu' is a member of the same language chain as Bukiyip and Mufian, there is no agreement by outsiders as to which of the other languages it more resembles. Conrad (1978) treats the Abu' villages as a northern dialect of Mufian, placing the southern boundary south of Womsak (approximately where Nekitel places it). Laycock (1973) divides the Abu' villages between Bukiyip and Mufian.

4. Different studies have produced different scores of lexical similarity between Abu' and its neighbours; however they agree that lexical similarity is too low for Abu' to be considered the same language as its neighbours. Thus Nekitel (1985: 37), measuring in the centre of the Abu' language area, found 38% "cognates" between Abu' and Bukiyip, and 28% between Abu' and Mufian, based on a 49-word list. This compares with 30% between Mufian and Bukiyip, based on the same list. Gray et al (2008), measuring at the northern edge, found 62-63% lexical similarity between Malin / Balup and the nearby Bukiyip village Lowan, and 66% lexical similarity between Matapau and Lowan. (The lexical similarity between Matapau and Malin / Balup was 72%.) SIL considers 70% lexical similarity to be the minimum score for two speech varieties to be considered the same language. Hence Gray et al concluded: "The similarity between Matapau, Malin and Balup is a minimum of 72%, just above the threshold, which indicates that they may belong to the same language. Balup and Malin have a high level of lexical similarity with each other, ninety-seven percent, an indication that they share the same dialect. Matapau is its own dialect [since] percentages are too low to consider it the same dialect as the other two. The lexical similarity between Matapau and Lowan is too low to consider Matapau being part of Bukiyip."

in Mufian, medial /u/ in Abu' corresponds to medial /o/ in Bukiyip and Mufian.

5. CONCLUSION: The low lexical similarity between the Abu' villages and the Bukiyip villages constitute sufficient grounds to place a language boundary between them. This statistical decision is supported by the ethnolinguistic self-identification of Abu' speakers, both in the centre of the language group (Nekitel 1985) and at the northern periphery (Gray et al 2008). As Gray et al state: "Lexical similarity between Matapau, Malin and Balup and reported language boundaries during the survey and by Nekitel (1985) suggest that Abu' is a separate language from Mufian and Bukiyip." This conclusion is supported by other sources, e.g. Conrad (1991:1).

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:

(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: