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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:

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)
       □ 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:

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:

(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
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: Interslavic

(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:

Interslavic has a high degree of mutual intercomprehensibility with all Slavic languages, but cannot be linked to any such language in particular. It is essentially a modernized continuation of Old Church Slavonic, but not more similar to it as for example Interlingua is to Classical Latin.

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:

The history of the Interslavic language starts in the 17th century with the works of Juraj Križanić, a Croatian priest who worked in Russia and wrote the first Interslavic grammar. Later efforts at describing the same language were made during the 19th and 20th centuries, mostly by Czech, Slovenian and Croatian authors, including Ján Herkeľ, Matija Majar-Ziljski, Božidar Raič, Ignac Hošek and Ladislav Podmele. Most of these language projects were elaborate and used in various publications. Although they were isolated efforts by individual people, their differences are too minimal to consider them separate languages.

In the 21st century, the idea was revived, which resulted in two new collaborative projects: Slovianski (2006) and Neoslavonic (2009). Initially, they worked together under the name Interslavic, and in 2011 a common standard was established under the same name, incorporating the material of both projects, as well as several historical projects. The last remaining differences were eliminated in 2017. The language is currently being managed by a commission of five people.

Interslavic has a user community consisting of a Facebook group with ca. 5000 members (the largest user community of any constructed language but Esperanto) and a few other other groups and forums amounting for another 1000 members. Although precise numbers about the actual number of speakers are hard to give, we know for sure that Interslavic has several hundreds of proficient users, including several dozens of people who can speak it fluently. We have no data about native speakers, but since Interslavic is primarily a constructed language, its primary purpose is to serve as an additional auxiliary language,
to be learned anew by each new generation. Although we cannot exclude that there are parents who speak Interslavic with their children, this would be a side effect rather than the purpose of the language.

This purpose can be defined as one-way communication with Slavs of different nationalities, who can understand it without prior knowledge. Thus, Interslavic is not only the main language of written communication within the aforementioned Internet groups, it is used in a variety of other fields as well. For example, it is used in hotels and other touristic locations with many Slavic visitors, and there are plans to use Interslavic for the development of e-democracy applications in Central and Eastern Europe. Interslavic is used on various websites, including a news site and a wiki, as well as several private and commercial websites. Interslavic has an extensive and continuously growing text corpus, including a few books. It is the main language of the scientific journal "Slovjani.info" (published every six months since 2016), included in the CEEOL database and regularly archived by the National Library of the Czech Republic. Another scientific journal, "Ethnoentomology", provides its articles with abstracts in Interslavic.

Interslavic is used in oral communication as well. Conferences on the Interslavic Language (CISLa) have taken place in the Czech Republic in 2017, 2018 and 2019, each of them with 60-70 participants from various countries (presentations where either held in Interslavic or translated consecutively by an interpreter). Furthermore, Interslavic has been for school exchanges as part of the "Slavic Cultural Diplomacy" programme. In 2019, Interslavic was featured as the main language of Václav Marhoul's film "The Painted Bird", the Czech candidate for the 2020 Oscar nominations for the Best International Movie.

Textbooks have been published in English, Russian, Czech and Chinese, and there are bidirectional dictionaries with English, Polish, Russian and Serbian. Interslavic has been subject of various research, including dissertations and theses. The language has been presented at international conferences in Poland, Russia, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Montenegro, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Great Britain and the Netherlands. Courses and workshops have been given at various universities (including Prague, Bratislava, Łódź).

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:

c) Knowledge from published sources (please give complete bibliographical references):
Internet resources:
- <http://steen.free.fr/interslavic> - Main page, featuring grammar, online dictionaries, history, spell checker, transliterator, bibliography, etc.
- <http://www.interslavic-language.org> - Interslavic language portal
- <http://www.neoslavonic.org/> - Interslavic language tutorial
- <http://slovjani.info/> - Scientific journal "Slovjani.info"
- <http://izvesti.info/> - News site
- <http://conference.interslavic-language.org/> - The CISLa conferences
- <https://www.ceeol.com/search/journal-detail?id=1890> - CEEOL database
- <http://www.facebook.com/groups/interslavic/> - Interslavic Facebook group
Printed resources (books and theses, after 2006):
- Maria Vagner (Klementyeva), Medžuslovjanski jezyk (Меджусловянски jезык). Interslavic language (bachelor's thesis) (Praha 2017).

Printed resources (articles in the scientific press, after 2006):
- М.И. Исаев, Словарь этнолингвистических понятий и терминов (Москва, 2001), pp. 85-86.
- Лина Йорданова et al., "Как ние българите разбираме Новославянския език без обучение и на латиница?". In: Slovanská Unie, no. 2:1 (May 2017), ISSN 2464-756X, ISSN 2464-7578, pp. 54-59.
- Roberto Lombino, Mezislovanský jazyk a jeho srozumitelnost pro členy jednotlivých slovanských národů (závěrečná ročníková práce Gymnázium Na Zatlance, Praha, 2016).
- Vojtěch Merunka, "Korišćenje medžuslovjanskog jezika v filmu Kolorovana ptica" (Use of Interslavic in film Painted Bird). In: Slovjani.info 3/1, May 2018, ISSN 2570-7108 (print), ISSN 2570-7116 (on-line), pp. 69-75.
- Vojtěch Merunka, "Prva medžunarodna lingvistična konferencija o medžuslovjenskom jeziku CISLa 2017". In: Slovanská Unie, no. 2:1 (May 2017), ISSN 2464-756X, ISSN 2464-7578, pp. 22-23.
- Vojtěch Merunka, "Slovenska kulturna diplomacija. SWOT analiza, strategija i taktika do budućnosti". In: Slovanská Unie, no. 1:1 (May 2016), ISSN 2464-756X, ISSN 2464-7578, pp. 36-46.
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:
Appendix to the request for an ISO 639-3 code for Interslavic

Interslavic is a so-called zonal constructed language, intended to be intelligible to any speaker of a Slavic language without prior learning. It has a history of over 400 years and one of the largest user communities of all constructed languages. It has been broadly discussed in scientific and non-scientific literature, is used in a variety of different fields and is sufficiently unique for it not to be a variety of any other language. In spite of that, two earlier requests for a code [isv] have been rejected.

The first request was submitted in 2012 and was rejected “because evidence has not been presented showing Interslavic to be a single language. The supporting documentation for the request includes both historical varieties and material on two or three recently created interlanguages [...]. There is no single language variety represented by the references.”

At different moments in history, different authors have attempted to establish a standard for one and the same language, usually using a descriptive name (Slavic, Pan-Slavic, Inter-Slavic, Neoslavonic, etc.). These projects are based on the same material and intended to serve the same purpose. As a result, they are nearly identical and mutually fully understandable. Minor differences in grammar, for example regarding the use of a dual number, a vocative or athematic nouns, are a matter of taste rather than inalienable components of a project and have no impact on the intelligibility of a written text whatsoever. The biggest differences are not even between the varieties themselves, but between their written representations. Of course, Juraj Križanič’s Interslavic from the 17th century looks different from today’s Interslavic, but not more than, say, Polish in the age of Jan Kochanowski differs from modern Polish. Therefore, these projects are indisputably varieties of a single language according to SIL’s definition of individual languages. The only thinkable argument for treating them as separate languages would be the interlinguistic maxim that constructed languages can only have one standard that automatically invalidates all others, so that a similar project by a different author automatically becomes a separate language. This approach, however, is not based on linguistic criteria and conflicts with the registrar’s choice to assess Interslavic as a natural language.

In a second application, submitted in 2014, Interslavic was limited to the modern version. This request, however, was turned down as well, because the language “does not have a well-developed or long history. [...] Although it is being taught in a few places, there is not yet a substantial literature or user community or intergenerational transmission of the language. [...] Should it continue to develop standardization and literature and users, with evidence of being passed to another generation, it can be resubmitted for a code.”

Given the above, it cannot be said that Interslavic “does not have a well-developed or long history”: the first Interslavic text goes back to 1583, when the Croatian priest Šime Budinić translated works of Petrus Canisius into what he called Slovinsky, and the first Interslavic grammar was completed in 1666 by Juraj Križanič. Thus, Interslavic is probably the oldest international auxiliary language in existence. Of course, its history is not one of unbroken, continuous development. Most historical proposals were created independently from each other, and there is no direct link between them. Nevertheless, today’s Interslavic did not start in a void: it draws unambiguously from previous projects and its authors explicitly call it a continuation of the latter. That continuous development is not a hard condition for an ISO 639-3 code is demonstrated not only by Revived Cornish, but also by the fact that SIL International assigned a code to Interglossa, a sketch from 1943, but not to Glosa, which developed it into a full language in the years 1972–1992.

It should be noted that in both change requests, Interslavic was explicitly presented as a “constructed language”, but in both cases the registrar treated it as a Slavic language of Eastern Europe instead and judged it as such. Paradoxically, had it done otherwise, Interslavic would probably have passed easily.

---

2. Exceptions are schematic languages that have Slavic words but use a grammar that is not based on Slavic at all, such as Neposlava, Slovanština and Slovio.
Interslavic belongs to a grey area between constructed and natural languages. Among the former we find Klingon and Quenya, which are entirely the fruit of their authors’ imagination, but also Interlingua, a kind of modernised and simplified Latin without artificial elements. Natural languages, on the other hand, contain various expressions of linguistic creativity as well. Especially standardized literary languages and revived languages involve a lot of top-down engineering, and some of them (f. ex. Nynorsk, Modern Hebrew, Katharevousa Greek, Rumantsch Grischun) can even be attributed to a single author. An interesting case is also Revived Cornish, a mix of modernised elements from Middle Cornish, reconstructions based on related languages and newly invented material.

Before the 20th century, authors of Pan-Slavic language projects never considered their work artificial or even new: all Slavic languages, they believed, were dialects of a heterogeneous Pan-Slavic language, and to provide it with a common literary standard, they simply had to adapt Old Church Slavonic to contemporary needs. This was not a creative process, but a matter of analysis and comparison, similar to the process of reviving Cornish or establishing a common standard for a group of dialects rather than to the process of creating a new language like Esperanto.

Because improvised forms of Interslavic have existed among Slavs of different nationalities for centuries, it has been qualified as a pidgin language as well.4 Although this assertion is clearly wrong (pidgins are naive languages that appear spontaneously against the background of heterogeneous languages), it does not preclude the possibility of treating Interslavic as a koine language, the latter being based on two or more mutually intelligible languages or dialects. In this context, Ladislav Podmele spoke of “unscientific jargon” vis-à-vis “the scientific synthesis of all common elements and structures” of the Slavic languages, both of which he considered expressions of the same language.5

The aforementioned approaches put Interslavic on the natural side of the scale, but Interslavic meets the defining criteria of a constructed language as well. All forms of written Interslavic, both past and present, are the work of individuals or small groups. Interslavic was created with the purpose of being intelligible to Slavs of any nationality, but it was never intended to replace anyone’s native language. Its written form has always taken precedence over its spoken form, a feature typical for constructed languages. And at last, because all Slavic languages have well-established standards nowadays, it can no longer be said that it unites a group of dialects.

Although the dichotomy between natural and constructed languages is not the most fortunate one, the introduction of a third category of semi-constructed languages would only lead to two grey areas instead of one. For the lack of a better solution, we will have to accept that according to modern criteria, Interslavic has all the characteristics of a constructed language, which is also how the authors of modern Interslavic have presented it from the very beginning. If an artificially modernized Latin like Interlingua is a constructed language, wouldn’t it be logical for an artificially modernised Old Church Slavonic to belong to the same category?

For this reason, it is unreasonable to demand “intergenerational transmission”, a requirement that no constructed language but Esperanto can meet. In fact, the very absence of such transmission is one of the main factors that distinguish a constructed language from a natural language: the former serves by definition as an additional language that is learned anew by each generation.

The Registration Authority also mentions a lack of standardisation, which is remarkable, since there is no policy to support this argument. ISO 639-3 contains countless languages that never met standardisation. The only valid argument for not including a non-standardised language would be that it is a variety of another language. Interslavic, however, is not a variety of any language in particular. The only potential candidate, Old Church Slavonic, has not undergone any changes after the 9th century. For comparison, Old English (450–1100), Middle English (1100–1500) and Modern English (after 1500) have three separate codes.

---

Besides, it is not true that Interslavic lacks standardisation. At the time of both change requests, there were no less than two standards: Interslavic (Medžuslovjanski) and Neoslavonic (Novoslověnsky). Even before their merger in 2017, differences between them were too minimal to even call them dialects, and most users mixed elements from both of them. Even so, having multiple standards is not a disqualifying factor, as is demonstrated by examples like English, Rusyn and Silesian.

Another argument used by the Registration Authority is that “there is not yet a substantial literature or user community”. The Interslavic text corpus is less extensive as Esperanto’s, but definitely larger than that of most other constructed languages currently included in the ISO 639-3 standard. Already in the 17th century Juraj Križanič wrote books and other texts in Interslavic, including his magnum opus (later known as Politika). Matija Major-Ziljski used his Uzajemny pravopis slavjanski for a grammar of the language itself, for a book about St. Cyril and St. Method and for a magazine he published in the years 1873–1875, Slavjan. Other authors, like Božidar Rač and Ladislav Podmele, wrote in Interslavic as well. Among more recent publications are a translation of Antoine de St. Exupéry’s Little Prince and a 100 page Interslavic reader, containing 31 texts by 15 different authors.6 A collection of texts can also be found on the website Vikisbornik. Furthermore, Interslavic has had a news portal from 2007 onwards, called Slovianska Gazeta (2007–2011) and Izvesti.info (since 2011), and since 2016 a scientific journal appears that is predominantly written in Interslavic, Slovjani.info. Another scientific journal, Ethnoentomology, provides its articles with abstracts in Interslavic, which makes Interslavic the second international auxiliary language after Interlingua that is used for abstracts in a scientific paper.7

As for Interslavic’s userbase, Ivan G. Iliev wrote in 2012 that Slovianski (the name of the project before 2011) was spoken by several hundreds of people.8 The registrar’s choice to ignore this fact is surprising, since in the same period codes were granted to Kotava and Talossan, two constructed languages with only a handful of users. Currently, the main meeting point of the Interslavic community is a Facebook group with almost 5000 members—the largest user community of a constructed language after Esperanto. Other groups and forums amount for another 1000 members. Of course, there is some overlap between these groups, and not every member is automatically an active user of the language, but on the other hand, there are users and even fluent speakers who do not belong to any group at all. What we know for sure is that Interslavic has at least a few hundred proficient users.

Summarizing, even if Interslavic did not fulfil the requirements for inclusion in 2012 and 2014, it most certainly does now. Let’s take a look at the criteria for inclusion:

“Languages are not static objects; there is variation temporally, spatially, and socially; every language corresponds to some range of variation in linguistic expression.” Two related varieties are usually considered varieties of the same language, if its speakers “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. [...] Thus, each language identifier represents the complete range of all the spoken or written varieties of that language, including any standardized form.”9

As pointed out above, Interslavic cannot be considered a version of any particular other language. The best candidate would be Old Church Slavonic, but because that language is “frozen” in the 9th century, it cannot be considered the same language. For the same reason, historical Interslavic projects can and should be considered part of the same Interslavic language.

---


Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code, page 12
"In order to qualify for inclusion the language must have a literature and it must be designed for the purpose of human communication."\(^{10}\)

Interslavic is both designed and used for human communication. Modern Interslavic has a printed scientific journal, several books and hundreds of longer and shorter texts that can be found on the Internet. Historical projects also include books, magazines and articles.

“It must be a complete language”\(^{11}\)

Interslavic has a complete grammar, ca. 18,000 unique words and ca. 37,000 dictionary entries (not including “virtual vocabulary”), dictionaries in English, Polish, Russian and Serbian. For a constructed language, it is highly elaborate.

“and be in use for human communication by some community long enough to be passed to a second generation of users.”\(^{12}\)

With ca. 6000 speakers, sympathizers and interested bystanders, the Interslavic user community is probably the largest after Esperanto’s, outnumeering even Interlingua and Ido (the traditional #2 and #3).

As far as we know, Interslavic does not have native speakers, nor was it ever intended to have them. Typically, constructed languages are not transmitted but learned voluntarily, and therefore they cannot be required to have native speakers. Esperanto is the only one that does, which is a side effect of its success rather than the achievement of its goal.

If the phrase “passed to a second generation of users” simply means that older, first-generation users are teaching the language to younger newcomers, then the answer is affirmative. Many students of Interslavic are in their early twenties, some of them even in their teens.

A language should be “full”, which means that it is:

- used in a variety of domains,
- used to support communication across all genders and all ages,
- stable enough to be widely understood across the whole area of the language.”\(^{13}\)

Yes, Interslavic is used in a rather wide variety of domains, including personal communication, Internet communication, scientific and non-scientific publications, radio broadcasts, websites, tourism, conferences and even a prizewinning film.

The community has grown so big that it is no longer possible for us to keep track of demographics. In the earliest years, almost all active users of the language were men, but at the moment, I think it’s about fifty-fifty. The same goes for age. Some of us are older, others are younger. I have no idea how old our oldest user is, but I’m sure we have several people who are retired. Interslavic has also been used by teenagers in school exchange programs. Probably some people use it when talking to children, too.

As for stability, the first years (2006-2011) were mostly a matter of experimenting with different approaches (varying from ultra-simplified to highly archaic grammar). After Interslavic was baselined in 2011, there haven’t been any substantial changes. The last few remaining differences between both Interslavic projects were eliminated in 2017 after the First Conference on the Interslavic Language. I should add that all changes were part of a process of natural development and intended to make the language easier to understand for Slavs. They were always consulted with the community and mostly the result of practical usage.

In spite of their long history, Pan-Slavic languages projects have always been a somewhat marginal phenomenon, being mostly ignored both by Slavists and interlinguists. In the digital age, this changed

\(^{10}\) https://iso639-3.sil.org/about/types#Constructed [access: 24 Dec. 2018]  
slowly but radically. Interslavic came into being because many people felt the need to use it, not because someone wanted to create it, and in the meantime, it has gained broad acceptance in scientific and non-scientific circles. Because most Slavs can understand Interslavic better than English, many people see its potential advantages in the fields of tourism, business, international events, education, entertainment, etc. Given its almost exponential growth during the last few years, it is a language that can no longer be ignored. It has become a thing.

We ask for an ISO 639-3 code not merely as a gesture of recognition, but because it becomes increasingly difficult to function without one. Libraries use them in their classification schemes. Computer support, such as keyboard definitions and spelling control, is much harder to realize without a code. Much of the Wikimedia software has already been translated into Interslavic, but its implementation is impossible without a code. And Interslavic would definitely qualify for its own Wikipedia project, but this requires a code as well.

We leave it to the registrar's wisdom to decide whether Interslavic should be qualified as a constructed language, an individual Slavic language or a Slavic macrolanguage. It has elements of all three of them. In previous change requests, the registrar opted for the second possibility, a Slavic language, a solution we can certainly live with. However, should the absence of native speakers subsequently lead to a rejection, then we kindly request you to treat it as a constructed language instead.

Best regards,
Jan van Steenbergen