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: 2017-8-11

Name of Primary Requester: Bernadette Mitterhofer

E-mail address: survey underscore utb at sil dot org

Names, affiliations and email addresses of additional supporters of this request:
Tim Roth, linguist, SIL-UTB, tim underscore roth at sil dot org

Associated Change request number : 2017-024 (completed by Registration Authority)
Tentative assignment of new identifier : rwl (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:
      Ruwila

   b) Autonym (self-name) for this language:
      Kiruwila

   c) Common alternate names and spellings of language, and any established abbreviations:
      different spellings: Luwila, Luwira, Lwila, Lwira, Ruwila, Ruwira, Rwila, Rwira

   d) Reason for preferred name:
      During the survey (2012), the main village was spelled 'Uruwira', however in the cencus 2012 (a little later) it is spelled 'Urwila'. There hasn't been done any linguistics, so it's a combination of some asking around & looking at how it was spelled most often in the villages.

   e) Name and approximate population of ethnic group or community who use this language (complete individual language currently in use):
      Waruwila, 5,600 (based on percentages given during the survey (2012) and cencus data (2012). Tim Roth's 3,500 in his unpublished paper is based on data before the cencus.)

   f) Preferred three letter identifier, if available: rwl

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:
   Tanzania

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

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

3. MODALITY AND LINGUISTIC AFFILIATION

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

   b) Language family, if classified; origin, if artificially constructed:
      It is probably in Bantu F (Niger-Congo, Atlantic-Congo, Volta-Congo, Benue-Congo, Bantoid, Southern, Narrow Bantu, Central, F). However, further analysis is needed.

   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:
      Konongo (80%, currently named as dialect of Nyamwezi)

4. LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT AND USE

   a) What written literature, inscriptions or recordings exist in this language? Are there newspapers, radio or television broadcasts, etc.?:
      none

   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?:
      none

   c) Comment on factors of ethnolinguistic identity and informal domains of use:
      Ruwila speakers are surrounded by the Galla people to the north, the Pimbwe people to
the south, the Bende people to the west and the Konongo people to the east. Ruwila is used in everyday life in the village where there are only Ruwila speakers present. According to teachers of the area (not Ruwila speakers) Ruwila children do not know any other local languages, but some Ruwila adults know Konongo and Nyamwezi. At least half of the children do not know Swahili (national language) when they start school.
**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:
   The SIL Tanzania Language Assessment Team carried out a sociolinguistic survey of the Ruwila and Konongo peoples in Mlele District, Katavi Region, Tanzania in February and March 2012. The linguistic findings are presented so far in an unpublished paper and the sociolinguistic data in a short report about the survey.

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:**
