ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2016-024 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2016-7-2
Primary Person submitting request: Dr. Christophe Landry
Affiliation: University of Sussex
E-mail address: christophe.landry at yahoo dot com

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
Dr. John M. Lipski, Pennsylvania State University, jllipski at psu dot edu
Dr. Pete Gregory, Northwestern State University, soc_sci at nsula dot edu
Thenesoya Vidina Martín De la Nuez, Harvard University, tvmartin at fas dot harvard dot edu
Wade Falcón, Canary Islander Heritage Society at Baton Rouge, falcanary at yahoo dot com
Dr. Leslie Bary, University of Louisiana at Lafayette, lxb1801 at louisiana dot edu
Dr. Darryl Barthé, University of Amsterdam, D.G.Barthe at uva dot nl
Dr. Andrew Jolivette, San Francisco State University, ajoli at sfsu dot edu
Dr. Rain Prud'homme-Cranford, ohoyocreole at gmail dot com
Dr. Carolyn Dunn, Central Michigan University, cmdunn at ucsc dot edu
Dr. Mark Lentz, Utah Valley University, mlentz at uvu dot edu
Oliver F. Mayeux, University of Cambridge, ofm23 at cam dot ac dot uk

Postal address for primary contact person for this request (in general, email correspondence will be used):
48 London Road, Brighton BN1 4JD, United Kingdom

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 (include here a request for a new code element for a divergent dialect of a major language)
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)
      - [X] Language additional names
      - [ ] Language type (living, extinct, historical, etc.)
      - [ ] Language scope (individual language or macrolanguage)

   (b) What new value(s) do you propose: LSP - Louisiana Spanish

   (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_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, or the major language and the divergent variety (or varieties) for which a new code element is being requested:

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, or for requesting a separate identifier for the divergent variety: Louisiana Spanish-speakers today cannot read or write in Spanish and therefore does not share any literary culture in Spanish with any Hispanophone community in the world. There is some mutual intelligibility between Louisiana Spanish-speakers and other Hispanophones, yet syntax and lexicon in Louisiana Spanish often depart from normative standardized syntax and lexicon in all other Spanish varieties spoken in the world. Where intelligibility poses a problem, it is because Louisiana Spanish-speaking communities have remained isolated from the Hispanophone world since the 18th century and therefore retains elements no longer present in other Spanish varieties.

(c) Does the existing language code element 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.? Please comment. Yes, SPA represents a major language in which a significant body of literature and research already exists. No written form in Louisiana Spanish; no literature in Louisiana Spanish. The only remnants of written Louisiana Spanish are ecclesiastical and legal/civil documents in Louisiana dating to the 18th and 19th centuries.

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, provided that sufficient information on the rationale is given in (b) above.

In the case of a minority language that has been considered in some contexts to be a dialect of a major language, yet is divergent enough to be unintelligible to speakers of the standard variety of the major language, it may be more beneficial for the users of the ISO 639-3 and 639-2 code sets to create a new code element for the divergent language variety without splitting the existing code element of the major language. The ISO 639-3 Registration Authority may make this determination when considering a request involving a major language and a highly distinct “dialect.” If such a course is followed, the rationale for the decision will be published in a comment by the Registration Authority on approval of the requested addition for the divergent variety.

6. Create a new language code element

(a) Name of missing language: Louisiana Spanish

(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:

Louisiana Spanish, in both the Adaeseño and Isleño varieties in Louisiana, have been spoken in isolation from other Hispanophones since the 18th century and as a result emerged before standardization occurred anywhere in the Hispanophone world. As a result, LSP remains distinct from all other varieties of Spanish spoken in the world. Its grammar, syntax, and lexicon often depart from normative Spanish also

Louisiana Spanish-speakers today cannot read or write in Spanish and therefore does not share any literary culture in Spanish with any Hispanophone community in the world.
(c) There is some mutual intelligibility between Louisiana Spanish-speakers and other Hispanophones, yet syntax and lexicon in Louisiana Spanish often depart from normative standardized syntax and lexicon in all other Spanish varieties spoken in the world. Where intelligibility poses a problem, it is because Louisiana Spanish-speaking communities have remained isolated from the Hispanophone world since the 18th century and therefore retains elements no longer present in other Spanish varieties.

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:
Louisiana native

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
Communication on Facebook with community members through common interest group.

(c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):

Academic literature:

Armistead, Samuel G., The Spanish tradition in Louisiana (Juan de la Cuesta, 1992).


Fertel, Randy, The BP Oil Spill and the Bounty of Plaquemines Parish, Gastronomica 11, no. 1 (Spring 2011): 24-32.

González, Manuel Hernández, La Emigración Canaria a América (Centro de la Cultura Popular Canaria, 2005).


Lestrade, Patricia Manning, The Last of the Louisiana Décimas, Hispania 87, no. 3 (Sep., 2004): 447-452.


Michael, Ronald L., Historical Archaeology: Journal of the Society for Historical Archaeology - Presidios of the North American Spanish Borderlands (The Society for Historical Archaeology, 2004).

Pérez, Juan Manuel Santa, Emigración por reclutamientos: canarios en Luisiana
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: