

ISO 639-3 Registration Authority

Request for Change to ISO 639-3 Language Code

Change Request Number: 2009-042 (completed by Registration authority)

Date: 2009-7-9

Primary Person submitting request: Prof. Anvita Abbi

Affiliation: Professor of Linguistics

E-mail address: anvitaabbi at gmail dot com

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

Dr. Bidisha Som, Assistant Professor, IIT Guwahati, India /bidishasom at gmail dot com

George Weber, andaman at bluewin dot ch

Postal address for primary contact person for this request (in general, email correspondence will be used):

Chairperson

Centre for Linguistics

School of Language, Literature and Culture Studies

Jawaharlal Nehru University

New Delhi 110067, India

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:

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, 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: Present Great Andamanese
- (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:
 1. "The linguistic system of Present Great Andamanese [PGA for short] appears to be close to Koineization. As the language is highly endangered with seven terminal speakers, it is very difficult to say how far the language is mixed and what elements are mixed." (you will find this quote in several of my published works). Unfortunately, we lost the only fluent speaker a few months ago.
 2. Out of these six people, not all come from Jeru tribe and thus speak a mixture of Jeru and their respective language variety, such as Khora, Sare and Bo. It would be a misconception to say that the language of the present speakers is Jeru.
 3. It is true that Jeru had been the significant influence on shaping up the present variety but it would not be proper to call this variety as Aka-Jeru [by the way tribes, use the name of the language without the prefix Aka-].
 4. Possibly, various social workers, anthropologists and non serious linguists have called this variety 'Aka-Jeru' because thats what the tribes have been told to say to others when asked for the name of the language. The case is very similar to the status of Hindi. Every North Indian in the so called 'Hindi belt' identifies himself as a 'Hindi' speaker despite the fact that he may be speaking one of the 49+ varieties. Hence a Bhojpuri speaker from Bihar and Garhwali speaker from Himachal or Marwari speaker from Rajasthan, all call themselves 'Hindi speakers'.
 5. Since my fieldwork (2001 onwards) as well as Manoharan's work (late seventies) involved analysing the language which was not pure Jeru but a koine, I named it Great Andamanese. It incorporates structures drawn from Sare, Khora, Bo (a large amount) as well as Jeru. This language is spoken in the Strait Island, 53 nautical miles to the northeast of Port Blair. As the various members of the tribes keep frequenting their relatives in Port Blair the language is also spoken in the city of Port Blair.
 6. the web page http://www.ethnologue.com/show_language.asp?code=apq has some mix up. There was no Pucikwar speaker left in 2000. The Govt. of India collected all the stray members of the North Andamanese tribes such as Jeru, Sare, Khora and Bo and put them together in the Strait Island in early seventies so as to "protect" them from the so called 'modern civilization'. This is one of the reasons why the present language is a Koine.
 7. The only problem I see is that the present form of the language is named 'Present Great Andamanese' and the name of the language family is also identified as 'Great Andamanese' so as to preclude other languages of the Andaman Island such as 'Onge' and 'Jarawa' which belong to a separate and distinct family [refer to my 2008 paper in 'Language Sciences'].

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:

(b) Knowledge through personal communication. Describe:

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

Abbi, Anvita. 2006 'The Endangered languages of the Andaman Islands. Munich. Lincom Europa

Abbi, A., 2006. Vanishing voices: a typological sketch of Great Andamanese. In: Saxena, Anju, Borin, Lars (Eds.), Lesser-known Languages of South Asia. Status and Policies, Case studies and Applications of Information Technology. Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, New York, pp. 107–123.

Abbi, Anvita 2008 "Is Great Andamanese genealogically and typologically distinct from Onge and Jarawa?" doi:10.1016/j.langsci.2008.02.002

Annamalai, E., Gnanasundaram, V., 2001. Andamanese biological challenge for language reversal. In: Fishman, Joshua (Ed.), Can Threatened Languages be Saved? Reversing Language Shift, Revisited. A 21st Century Perspective. Multilingual Matters, Clevedon, pp. 309–322.

Basu, D.N., 1952. A linguistic introduction to the Andamanese. Bulletin of the Department of Anthropology 1–2, 55–70.

Burenhalt, Niclas, 1996. Deep linguistic prehistory with particular reference to Andamanese'. Working Papers, Lund University, Department of Linguistics, Lund, Sweden, vol. 45, pp. 5–24.

Manoharan, S., 1986. Linguistic peculiarities of Andamanese family of languages. Indian Linguistics 47 (1–4), 25–32.

Manoharan, S., 1989. A Descriptive and Comparative Study of the Andamanese Language. Anthropological Survey of India, Calcutta.

Vanishing Voices of the Great Andamanese, <http://www.andamanese.net/> (accessed 2009-07-09)

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 may be 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
ISO 639-3/RA web site: <http://www.sil.org/iso639-3/>
E-mail: iso639-3@sil.org

An email attachment of this completed form is preferred.

Sources of documentation for ISO 639-3 identifiers:

Gordon, Raymond G., Jr. (ed.), 2005. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World*, Fifteenth edition. Dallas, Tex.: SIL International. Online version: <http://www.ethnologue.com/>.

Linguist List. Ancient and Extinct Languages. <http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfAncientLgs.html>

Linguist List. Constructed Languages. <http://linguistlist.org/forms/langs/GetListOfConstructedLgs.html>