ISO 639-3 Registration Authority
Change Request Form for ISO 639-3

Change Request Number: 2017-021 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: May 25, 2017
Primary Person submitting request: Ryan David Klint
Affiliation: SIL-MXB
E-mail address: ryan underscore klint at sil dot org

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
Daniel Agee, dan_agee at sil dot org, SIL Mexico
Isabel Klint, isabel_klint at gmail dot com, SIL Mexico
Mario Chavez Peón, mariochavezpeon at gmail dot com, CIESAS

Postal address for primary contact person for this request (in general, email correspondence will be used):
Calle Niños Héroes 22, 74030 Mitla OAX, México

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. 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: maa
Associated reference name: Mazatec, San Jerónimo Tecóatl

Request for New Language Code Element in ISO 639-3, page 1
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_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:
Puebla Mazatec: San Lorenzo Cuauenequitlía, Coyomeapan, San Sebastián Tlacotepec, Tezopana Veracruz (Ixtacapa el Grande), San Francisco Huehuetlán, Santa Ana Ateixtlahuaca.

(b) Mazateco de San Jerónimo Técoatl: San Antonio Elochochitlán, San Jerónimo Tecóatl, San Lucas Zoquiapan, San Pedro Ocopetatillo, and Santa Cruz Acatepec municipalities.

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.

(c) 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:
The speakers of Puebla Mazatec do not recognize their language as the same as that of San Jerónimo, though some teachers use the term “lengua” to refer to the entire Mazatec language family. There is no literature that I am aware of written in Puebla Mazatec, and since the language has undergone a vowel shift, the literature written in San Jerónimo Mazatec does not seem to correspond to their spoken language well.

(c) Does the existing language 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.
The Instituto Nacional de la Lengua Indígena (INALI) of México is in the process of writing pedagogical materials in each of the Mazatec languages, and they intend to write a unique set of materials for Puebla Mazatec.
Hugo Carrera, from the community of San Lorenzo Cuauñecuitla, located in the State of Oaxaca, but that speaks the Puebla Mazatec variety, has written a phonology of his variety as his masters thesis for CIESAS. 

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: Puebla Mazatec, ‘án Xo’boó

(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:

This Mazatecan variety has undergone a vowel shift, (a>o, e>a, i>e, o>u) which, in addition with other lexical changes, makes it very difficult to understand.

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:
I have participated in the INALI based language orthography project, and when teachers would offer their language as examples for orthographic needs, the room of Mazatec speakers from other languages were always perplexed and amused by the Puebla examples because they were so different from other varieties.

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
Speakers of Puebla Mazatec are quite aware of how distinct their language is from the other Mazatec varieties and even have the word, ‘án Xo’boó, to describe it.

(c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):
A recent article from Jean Léo Léonard discusses the variation inside the “Mazatec
diasystem” in which they describe Pubela as “again, stand far apart, as a strongly innovative dialect as far as phonology is concerned – with strong consequences on morphology too.” (2017: 17). The below graph shows what the authors refer to as linguistic space, which is a “two-dimensional projection from multi-dimensional scaling analysis. In this comparison of 12 Mazatecan dialects, they place San Lorenzo as quite distinct from the groupings of the other Mazatecan languages. The 9 Mazatecan dialects currently labeled as languages in the Ethnologue are represented by AY (vmy), CQ (maq), HU, MG, and JI (mau), IX (mzi), JA and DO (maj), MZ (vmz), TE and LO (maa) and SO (vmp). As you can see, LO is described as more separate from TE, than TE is from the HU cluster

![Diagram of linguistic space showing the position of Mazatecan dialects](image)

(HU, Jl, and MG), which is considered a different language in the Ethnologue.


Currently a research group at Centro de Investigación de Estudios Superiores, de Antropología Social (CIESAS) under the direction of Dr. Mario Chávez Peón, a supporter of this request for change, and through the financing of the Instituto Nacional de Lenguas Indígenas (INALI) has been researching the language variation within Mazatec and has
proposed a division of 10 languages, the 9 existing languages in the Ethnologue, as well as Puebla Mazatec. Of the Pubela variety, they write “this region is among the most recognizable due to the fact that its lexemes have undergone a clockwise vowel replacement; this is to say *e has become /a/, *a has become /o/, and *u has become fronted and/or lost it’s rounding to become [u], [ɛ], or [ɨ] depending on the variant. In particular, the variant of Cuauñecuitlia has completed the circle moving *u to /i/ (in palatalizing contexts) and some words with *i have become /e/. Despite the fact that this area is quite closely related of the northern part of zone 2 [maa area] syntactically, morphologically, and lexically, the vowel change has been sufficiently dramatic to confuse mutual ineligibility. It has certain conservative features (such as the lack of affrication in the post-alveolar aspirate), the presence of retroflex consonants patterning with the variants in the Zona Alta. In the state of Oaxaca, ...[Puebla Mazatec] includes Huehuetlán, Ateixtlahuaca y Cuauñecuitlia, while in municipalities of Coyomeapan and Tlacotepec are found in the state of Puebla.” (unpublished, translation mine)

The change proposal process  5-12 de June

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: