ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for New Language Code Element in ISO 639-3

This form is to be used in conjunction with a “Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code” form

Date: 2019-8-22

Name of Primary Requester: Kirk Miller

E-mail address: kirkmiller at gmail dot com

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:

Associated Change request number : 2019-047 (completed by Registration Authority)
Tentative assignment of new identifier : xpf (completed by Registration Authority)

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. Use Shift-Enter to insert a new line in a form field (where allowed).

1. NAMES and IDENTIFICATION

a) Preferred name of language for code element denotation:
Southeast Tasmanian, alt Nuenonne

b) Autonym (self-name) for this language:
Horton name ‘Nuenonne’

c) Common alternate names and spellings of language, and any established abbreviations:
Corresponds to the AIATSIS codes T5 South-eastern Tasmanian

d) Reason for preferred name:
Bowern

e) Name and approximate population of ethnic group or community who use this language (complete individual language currently in use):

f) Preferred three letter identifier: xpf, for no better reason than that the alphabetically adjacent remaining codes [xpb], [xpd], [xpf] would all be along the eastern coast.
[xbs] with ‘s’ for ‘Southeast’ would also work (but also would for Port Sorell)

Note on ISO codes: There are only three [xt-] codes left in ISO to continue the [xtz] pattern of the Tasmanian ‘macrolanguage’. Reconstructed endonyms for the Tasmanian people include ‘Palawa’ (< “Parlevar”) and ‘Pakana’, and ‘Palawa’ has seen some minor usage in the lit. Therefore codes based on [xp-] seem appropriate. There are currently nine of them, enough to accommodate the current split. Together with the three remaining [xt-] codes, they may be enough to cover Bowern’s classification. There are also a dozen remaining [xb-] codes. Given that [b] and [p] were presumably allophonic in the Tasmanian languages, [xb-] codes might also be appropriate if future splits are required.

Your suggestion will be taken into account, but the Registration Authority will determine the identifier to be proposed. The identifiers is not intended to be an abbreviation for a name of the language, but to serve as a device to identify a given language uniquely. With thousands of languages, many sets of which have similar names, it is not possible to provide identifiers that resemble a language name in every case.
2. TEMPORAL DESCRIPTION and LOCATION

a) Is this a □ Living language
□ Nearly extinct/secondary use only (includes languages in revival)
□ Recently extinct language
☒ Historical language
□ Ancient language
□ Artificially constructed language
□ Macrolanguage

(Select one. See explanations of these types at http://www.sil.org/iso639-3/types.asp)

For individual languages, also complete:

b) Countries where used:
   Tasmania, Australia

c) Region within each country: towns, districts, states or provinces where used. Include GPS coordinates of the approximate center of the language, if possible:
   The eastern side of the southern corner of the island

d) For an ancient or historical language, give approximate time frame; for a recently extinct language, give the approximate date of the last known user’s death
   The Tasmanian languages were driven to extinction in the 18th and 19th centuries,

3. MODALITY AND LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

a) This language is: □ Signed ☒ Spoken □ Attested only in writings

b) Language family, if classified; origin, if artificially constructed:
   Eastern Tasmanian

c) Closest language linguistically. For a Macrolanguage, list the individual languages (adopted and/or proposed) to be included in its group. For signed language, note influence from other signed or spoken languages:
   Bowern separates Bruny Island Tasmanian as a distinct (though closely related) language, but this is not even reflected in AIATSIS. She concludes third variety (attested in the Milligan vocabulary) was marginally distinct enough to be considered a separate language.

   Glottolog does not accept the Eastern Tasmanian family linking SE Tasmanian with Oyster Bay.

4. LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND USE

a) What written literature, inscriptions or recordings exist in this language? Are there newspapers, radio or television broadcasts, etc.?:

b) Is this language officially recognized by any level of government? Is it used in any levels of formal education as a language of instruction (for other subjects)? Is it taught in schools?:

c) Comment on factors of ethnolinguistic identity and informal domains of use:

4. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

You do not need to repeat sources previously identified in the form, “Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code”

a) First-hand knowledge. Describe:

b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:

c) Knowledge from published sources. Include known dictionaries, grammars, etc. (please give complete bibliographical references):

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
Email: iso639-3@sil.org
An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Further information:
If your request for a new language code element is supported by the Registration Authority as a formal proposal, you may be contacted separately by researchers working with the Ethnologue or with LinguistList asking you to provide additional information.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers: