ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2020-025 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2020-7-17
Primary Person submitting request: Devin O’Bannon
Affiliation: SIL-PNG
E-mail address: languagesurvey_png at sil dot org
Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
Crystal Davis, SIL-PNG, crystal_davis at sil dot org
Jed Carter, SIL-PNG, sl-teamleader_png at sil dot org

Postal address for primary contact person for this request (in general, email correspondence will be used):
SIL
PO Box 1
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 (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: kxr
Associated reference name: Koro

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:
   - Papitalai [pat]

---
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(b) Rationale for change

In the past, the Koro language was mistakenly split into two languages, called Koro and Papitalai. It was done all the way back in the early 20th century by several priests (Heinrich Schnee in 1901, Fr. Joseph Meier in 1912, and Fr. Bernard van Klaarwater in 1923). However, starting in 1980, Janice and Stephen Schooling of SIL-PNG, along with Gaus Jomogot of PNG BTA, surveyed Manus Province languages, and found that Koro and Papitalai were 83% cognate. For some reason, they still labeled both Naringel and Papitalai villages as speaking the "Papitalai" language, even though earlier in the report they wrote, "Koro is the language spoken at Papitalai." They elicited wordlists at both Powat 2 (which speaks Koro) and Papitalai, and the languages at both are labeled as "Koro." In 1997, Ton Otto, an anthropologist who worked among Manus peoples, said that Naringel, Riuriu, and Papitalai all speak Koro, and made no mention of a "Papitalai language." In 2014 and 2015, Jessica Cleary-Kemp of the University of California, Berkeley, published her work among the Los Negros Koro speakers, and was mainly based in Papitalai village. She also did some work among the mainland Koro speakers to the west. She mentioned that Koro was spoken on the mainland, and that the villages of Papitalai, Riuriu, and Naringel spoke a different dialect of Koro than the mainlanders. She said the differences between the dialects were minor and that they are "fully mutually intelligible." In 2018, the SIL-PNG survey team visited a mainland Koro village (Powat 2) as well as the Los Negros villages of Papitalai and Naringel. All three villages said that they spoke Koro. Papitalai villagers specifically mentioned there was not a "Papitalai" language that was different from Koro. Another village, Maraman, which spoke both Elu and Koro, mentioned that the mainland Koro villages (Powat 2, Lopahan, N'Drakot, Horan) and the Los Negros Koro villages (Papitalai, Naringel, Riuriu, as well as Mokerang which spoke both Idio [mft] and Koro) spoke the same language, but two different dialects.

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:

(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.

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:

(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:
   In 2018, the SIL-PNG survey team traveled to Manus Province to research language vitality and linguistic relatedness of Koro [kxr], Papitalai [pat], and Mokerang [mft]. They traveled to the villages of Maruman, Powat 2, Papitalai, Naringel, and Mokerang.

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:
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
An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

**Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers:**


Linguist List. Constructed Languages. [http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfConstructedLgs.html](http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfConstructedLgs.html)