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

Change Request Number: 2009-082 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2009-8-25

Primary Person submitting request: Jason Lobel

Affiliation: University of Hawai'i at Manoa

E-mail address: jasonlobel1 at yahoo dot com

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
William Hall, SIL Philippines, william_hall at sil dot org

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 underline 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: hil

Associated reference name: Hiligaynon/Ilonggo

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:
Bantayanon (while otherwise leaving the listing for Ilonggo/Hiligaynon as-is)

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:

Bantayanon is a separate language from Ilonggo/Hiligaynon. Bantayanon is not mutually intelligible with Ilonggo/Hiligaynon, and is not considered to be Ilonggo/Hiligaynon whether by its own native speakers or by native speakers of Ilonggo/Hiligaynon or other neighboring languages like Cebuano. It should therefore have been listed as a separate language from the start, and not as a dialect of Ilonggo/Hiligaynon. There is no "common ethnolinguistic identity with a central variety that both understand". Speakers of Bantayanon have intelligibility of Cebuano because they are politically part of Cebu province, are exposed to Cebuano media of all types on a daily basis, and must use Cebuano in conducting business on the provincial and regional level. However, Cebuanos who are not from this area do not have inherent intelligibility of Bantayanon. Likewise, speakers of Bantayanon often have exposure to Ilonggo/Hiligaynon media from neighboring Negros and Masbate Islands, but Ilonggos do not have inherent intelligibility of Bantayanon.

(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 language code for Ilonggo/Hiligaynon DOES in fact "represent a major language in which there already exists a significant body of literature and research". However, Bantayanon is a separate language from Ilonggo/Hiligaynon, has never been included in or represented in the Ilonggo/Hiligaynon literature as part of the Ilonggo/Hiligaynon language, and there have never been any dedicated publications (whether books or articles) on the Bantayanon language. Bantayanon is not mutually intelligible with Ilonggo/Hiligaynon, and is not considered to be Ilonggo/Hiligaynon whether by its own native speakers or by native speakers of Ilonggo/Hiligaynon or other neighboring languages like Cebuano. It should therefore have been listed as a separate language from the start, and not as a dialect of Ilonggo/Hiligaynon. This is a case where one language somehow got included as a dialect

of another language, but no harm has been done as no articles or other publications have been written about Bantayanon, nor have any articles or other publications been written about Ilonggo/Hiligaynon in which it was stated that Bantayanon was a dialect of Ilonggo/Hiligaynon. As such, it is being argued here that no changes will be necessary to the Ilonggo/Hiligaynon entry except for simply deleting the name "Bantayan" from the list of dialects in that entry. At the same time, a new entry and code should be created for Bantayanon. There is no common linguistic identity, no shared (or undistinguished) body of literature, and no written form in common between the two languages.

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:
Jason Lobel, language researcher and Ph.D. candidate at the University of Hawaii, who has done extensive fieldwork on 180 languages in the Philippines, Sabah (Malaysia), Sulawesi (Indonesia), and Brunei.

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
(1) Discussion with R. David Zorc, author of the most comprehensive study to date of Bisayan languages (see reference in part C below); (2) Discussion with native speakers of Bantayanon and of neighboring languages on Bantayan Island, Cebu Province, Philippines; (3) This change was discussed and approved by a panel of both SIL linguists and outside linguists at SIL-Philippines in July 2009.

(c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):
(1) Zorc, David Paul R. 1975. The Bisayan dialects of the Philippines: subgrouping and reconstruction. Ph.D Dissertation: Cornell University. (Published in 1977 by Pacific Linguistics. Canberra: The Australian National University.); (2) Lobel, Jason W. in preparation. Issues in Philippine and Philippine-type languages. Ph.D. dissertation, University of Hawaii (anticipated 2010 completion).

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
ISO 639-3/RA web site: http://www.sil.org/iso639-3/
E-mail: iso639-3@sil.org

An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers:

Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.), 2005. Ethnologue: Languages of the World, Fifteenth edition. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Online version: http://www.ethnologue.com/ .

Linguist List. Ancient and Extinct Languages. http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfAncientLgs.html

Linguist List. Constructed Languages. http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfConstructedLgs.html