



A Critical Review of Evolution of Language Families in Nepal

*Dr. Nawa Raj Subba

Purbanchal University, Edenburgh International College, Biratnagar-16, Nepal

Submission Date: 1st March 2022 | Published Date: 16th March 2022

*Corresponding author: Dr. Nawa Raj Subba

Abstract

Nepal currently speaks languages from a variety of language families. Ethnic groups represent language families. The country's linguistic families include Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan, Austro-Asiatic, and Dravidian. Political, social, and literary perspectives are frequently employed to comprehend language and speakers. This article analyzes secondary data to illustrate the evolution of languages spoken in the nation from a comparative, historical, linguistic, and anthropological standpoint. The article reviews Nepal's native language and appearance from an etic view using the Triangulation approach. What was the historical linguistic background of language families? This article provides a brief overview of linguistics in logical order. As the analysis comes to a close, linguists believe the Negrito people were the first to visit the Indian subcontinent, including Nepal. Evidence suggests that Dravidian speakers took their place. As a result, there are still Dravidian talkers in the country. Nepal later encountered a swarm of Austro-Asian speakers. As a result, Austro-Asiatic-speaking people are also present in the country. Then, Tibeto-Burman speakers largely supplanted earlier languages speakers. Displaced languages speakers relocated to the southernmost part of India. Linguists believe that before Tibeto-Burman speakers dominated Nepal, the Kirat, a Mongol, spoke the Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic languages. Speakers of diverse languages cohabited in Nepal, giving origin to the Tibeto-Burman languages. Following Nepal's unification, Khas, an Indo-Aryan language, became the country's official language. The Khas Nepali language has become the nation's common language, allowing people of different languages to interact.

Keywords: Negrito, Dravidian, Austro-Asiatic, Tibeto-Burman, Indo-European, Nepali, Language, Nepal.

INTRODUCTION

Nepal is a multi-religious, multi-ethnic, and multilingual country. Its people are primarily Hindu, speak Nepali (Khas), and are of the Aryan ethnicity. However, aboriginal tribes with their own beliefs and languages had already established themselves throughout the nation. Theology grounds Shaiva (Kirat), Bon, Buddha, Muslim, Christian, and other religions.

Nepal is a historical country with a rich history of people and languages. The populace also speaks Tibeto-Burman, Australoid, and Dravidian language groups. The state has politically classified the community as Arya-Khas, Indigenous communities, Madeshi, Dalit, Muslim, and other marginalized groups aiming to incorporate them into the mainstream. According to the 2011 census, 81.3% of Nepalese people are Hindu, while 9% are Buddhist. In addition, 4.4% of the population is Muslim, 3% is Kirat/Yuma, 1.4% is Christian, and 0.9% adopted other religions (CBS, 2011).

The census of Nepal 2011 has recorded 26,494,504 population speaking 123 different languages. Most people talk to Nepali, Bhojपुरी, Maithili, Awadhi, Tharu, and Urdu, classified as Indo-Aryan under the Indo-European family (81.1%). In addition to this, Tamang, Newar, Magar, Limbu, Rai, Dhimal, and others have their mother tongue, Tibeto-Burman, under the Sino-Tibetan language family (17.3%). On the other hand, Santhali, Khadya, and Munda speak the languages of the Austro-Asiatic family (0.19%). And, Urao and Kisan chat in the Dravidian language family (0.13%) in the country (CBS, 2011; MoPE, 2017).

Interestingly, some ethnic groups claim to have originated on this soil, searching identity for politics. Rather than delving into their ancestors, they demonstrate that they are a glorious nation born in this land. As a result, tribals advocate for special rights because their ancestors were the first to settle in the country. Aryans and Hindus who speak Nepali (Khas) assert that their traditional culture is ancient. As a result, the communities of Nepal seem divided socially, politically, and intellectually.

This essay does not address the issues from a political or religious stance. Instead, this article critically analyzes the evolution of the Nepalese language from a historical-comparative linguistic standpoint or through a linguistic anthropological perspective, rather than the request and prejudice stated above. The study will address the issues raised above during the analysis.

Background

This article is a qualitative and theoretical review since it has argued based on several theories and approaches. Comparative linguistics is the scientific study of languages from a comparative perspective, according to Matasovic. Here languages are compared and classified. Language comparison is the discovery of shared features, whereas language classification is the disclosure of relevant defining concepts for diverse languages classes. Languages can be compared and classified according to three criteria: genetic, typological, or areal.

The language family is the fundamental unit of genetic categorization; it is the collection of languages demonstrated to have evolved from a single ancestor, known as the family's proto-language. Because all human languages may or may not have descended from a single proto-language, genetic relatedness is critical in this case (Matasovic, n.d.).

According to the University of Zagreb, Historical-Comparative Linguistics (HCL) is the empirical and theoretical study of linguistic-historical processes. The University states HCL is concerned with partitioning initially uniform languages into several successor languages and the linguistic intrinsic and extralinguistic processes influencing language change. Historical-Comparative Linguistics studies languages that share consistent patterns in inflexion, word formation, syntax, and lexicon. Comparing these languages yields previously unavailable knowledge on their history, prehistory, and the genesis and development of their respective features (Historical-Comparative Linguistics, 2022).

Linguistic anthropology also studies a language that focuses on the interaction between language, society, and culture (Wright, 2015). For example, in the eighteenth century, English scholar Sir William Jones observed that Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, and Latin arose from the same source and hence belonged to the same language family (Jones, 1807). The typical twentieth-century conception of language has significantly influenced developments across the entire spectrum of human sciences. It's especially noticeable in languages, philosophy, psychology, sociology, and anthropology (Roy, 1988).

As we discussed, linguistics has long been an essential part of anthropology. When learning a language, one looks for the race or ethnic group that speaks it. Anthropological research takes their history and distribution into account during the search. This review stands on the scientific basis for any race or language's origin and spread. This knowledge of Linguistic anthropology and other branches has made learning easier to advance. On the same scientific foundation, there is an opportunity to verify the validity of knowledge. As a result, we will be closer to achieving a consistent level of expertise.

It is usual to approach language and literature from the inside out. Speakers elevated language to a god-made status. Therefore, it is advised not to ask unneeded inquiries in the language's evolution because the gods created it. On the other hand, the literature has fostered confusion about the language's origins and growth by praising its glory. So, this article critically overviews evidence from an etic standpoint through Triangulation.

The evaluation will not look at each particular language spoken in Nepal but rather at language families as a whole. Nevertheless, there are specific guiding questions in the review. For example, which language families does Nepal speak? Which language family arrived first, and which came later? What is the present situation of language families in Nepal? The review will address such concerns throughout the article.

The review postulates a triangulation strategy to analyze the data. Bhandari (2022) has described Triangulation that responds to a research question by combining many datasets, approaches, ideas, and investigators. It can help us enhance the accuracy and dependability of our findings. In this scenario, we use a variety of data sources to address the research question.

The reviewer has adopted the Triangulation because it provides a more holistic perspective on a specific research topic. Triangulation can also boost credibility and validity (Bhandari, 2022). In addition, the combination of findings

from two or more rigorous methodologies offers a more comprehensive picture of the outcomes than either methodology could provide on its own (Tashakkori & Teddle, 2003).

THEMATIC REVIEW

Anthropological View

First and foremost, this author would like to state that theories such as the "Out of Africa model" and "Mitochondrial Eve" serve as the foundation for this review (University of Cambridge, 2007; Gibbons, 1992). According to the doctrine, the modern man migrated from Africa to West Asia, East Asia, and Australia. Human migration returned from East Asia and Australia to South Asia, including Southern China. On the other hand, human migration extended to Europe and America from West Asia and Central Asia. Humans went with their languages.

Languages evolved, and mutations occurred, resulting in the vocabulary. Linguists hypothesize that peoples of the Middle and Upper Paleolithic and Neolithic eras invented languages (Chazan, 1995). Unfortunately, many languages born in such a long period have vanished. Languages evolved into their current form through a long period in human civilization. However, linguists believe that many languages are still on the verge of extinction.

Loganathan (2005) asserted Shaivism and Sumerian Tamil. He described Sumerian temples with 'Om' emblems. It reveals that Sumer or Kirat were Shaivite and utilized Sumerian 'Om' mantras, which they carried to the Sindh Harappan region with Dravid. Shiv and Omkar, according to Swami Prapannacharya, are the foundation of the Shaiva philosophy belonging to Kirat and Dravid. So then, Swami claims that Kirat is a Hindu Arya (Prapannacharya, 2000).

The Kirat people are a varied group. Even though Kirat believes himself a child of Kirateshwar Mahadev Shiva, he cannot openly identify even as a Hindu today. It is for political, strategic, religious, and societal reasons. According to one theory, Vedic Sanatan was corrupted by the Vernashram caste structure, the Upanishads, and Bramhim literature, resulting in the superior Brahmin caste (Ghosh, 1951). As a result, Hindu has become a political and strategic phrase. However, linguistics has proof that Kashi and Sumer are mixed-blood groups. They handed down the results of the previous event to the next generation.

According to linguist Bal Krishna Pokhrel (1998), there is no doubt that no tribe in the world is immune to blood mixing. So, Sumer and Kashi are blood-mixed people. Guth, a cattle breeding group, influenced Kashi previously while blending in Mesopotamia. As a result of Guth's cattle-breeding culture, Kashi and Sumer adopted subsequently it (Pokhrel, 1998). Therefore, Kashi and Guth appear to have affected Kirat's ancestors. Kirats claim to be the Kashi dynasty. They had moved to Nepal via Eurasia, Afghanistan, Saptasindhu, and Ganga Maidan (Chemjong, 2003).

Linguistics and genetics support the findings stated above. They reinforced the same concept because Kirat, Dravid and Arya's ancestors lived in Persia before becoming sun-worshippers. Historian Naradmuni Thulung also asserts Kashi (Kashyap) of Aryans and Kashi, Sumer, Asura, Rudra, Dev, and Das of Kirat, Dravid coexisted for a long time were blended with blood (Thulung, 1985). As a result of their influence from the past and faith in their offspring, variances and groupings emerged.

Based on Vedic literature and Persian history research, historian Naradamuni Thulung claims that Swayambhuva Manu's Priyavrata gave birth to the Manurbharat branch, which developed Arya. Similarly, Swayambhuva Manu's Uttanpada branch produced Chakshusthanu, Ur, Anga, Dakshaputri, Yama, Vasu, Rudra, and Hun (Dravid, Ravana). Munaingba, Kiratingba, and Yaktumba evolved from the Hun-Mongol mix (Thulung, 1985).

What is notable here is that the researchers discovered the Dravidian language during the excavations of the Sindh Harappa civilization. The archaeological excavations have uncovered Shivalingas, Pashupatis, Shakti emblems, and other religious symbols. On the other, the vocabularies of the Kirat and Dravidian languages have similar words (Ramasamy, 2021). This scene strengthens Kirat, Mongol, and Dravid's connection. Therefore, Thulung's narrative of the origins of Hun (Kirat, Mongol) and Dravid from Rudra contains truth.

Shreds of evidence demonstrate that Kirat was with Dravid before meeting Arya. Kirat and Dravid spoke Dravidian, an Austro-Asian language, about 4,500 years ago in Sindh Harappan civilization (PTI, 2018). On the other hand, a Kirat association is also related to the Indo-European language. Kirat and Arya integrated culturally and linguistically after Arya entered Saptasindhu some 3500 years ago. Despite the admixture, Kirat was split into Arya and Non-Aryan because of preoccupied memory and spiritual impact. This foundation gave rise to language, literature, and civilization. These narratives are interpreted constructively in the Mundhum and Sanskrit literature.

As a result, most Kirat does not declare openly as Aryan Hindus. This contentious subject demands comprehensive and in-depth understanding to perceive and persuade. It requires proper perspective and explanation. However, the pen

has concluded that the Kirat ancestors are of the Omkar family, practising Shaivism (Danielou & Gabin, 2003; Thulung, 1985). Another point to note is that, while Kirat was the one to establish the Tibeto-Burman language family, his ancestors had previously spoken languages from the Dravidian, Austro-Asian, and Indo-European language families as well (Chemjong, 2003; Ethnologue, 2022; Hieu, 2020, 1853; UpadhyayRegmi, 1990).

Mythological View

There is an intriguing theory that explains how ethnicities developed in Nepal. This mythology tells the story of Kirat Kham Magar of Eighteen Magarat's beginnings. Long ago, their forefathers had four children. They have continued to hunt animals in the forest. One day, they split and were unable to assemble. Over time, the four brothers reared their children and established colonies in all four directions. The children of the eldest brother have become Brahmins (Arya). Thakuri (Kshatriya) is the child of the second brother. Khas is the third brother's offspring. Kami Magar, a younger Magar, has become another Magar (Genesis of Magar, 2022). This legend lends credence to the assertion that the linguist Pokhrel's ancestors were Kirat Magars. Pokhrel also claims in his book that Sen Oli, who is now known as Arya, had a Kirat Magar ancestor, referring to a notable Nepalese administrator (Pokhrel, 1998).

Historical View

Kirat culture and history talk about Kashigotre and Lhasagotre association (Chemjong, 2003). Kashigotre refers to people who entered Nepal through the Kashi Ganges plain, whereas Lhasagotre individual relates to Tibet and China route. The Kashigotre or Kashi dynasty is also known as *Khambongba*. In comparison, the Lhasagotre joined Himalaya Nepal through Chinese and Tibetan territories.

Kirat Samba Mundhum claims that these Kashigotre and Lhasagotre descended from the same Saba Yethangs (PhyangSamba, 2019). Linguist Pokhrel has also claimed that the Lepmu was the ancestor of Kirat Limbu belonging to Kashigotre and Lhasagotre (Pokhrel, 1998). Furthermore, language anthropology and history support Sumer, Kashi, or Kashyap descended from the same ancestors.

In Afghanistan, a branch of the Kirat family split off to form the Hazare tribe, according to Kirat history (Chemjong, 2003). Hazare is an Indo-European speaker (David, Simons, & Fenning, 2019). Linguistics reveals that several Kirats also belonged to the Indo-European language family. Another Kirat branch had already made its way to China (Kham) via Central Asia and Assam. They later belonged to the Sino-Tibetan or Tibeto-Burman language families and were associated with the Lhasagotre line.

Kirats' philosophy and language are diverse due to their widespread circulation and distribution. As a result, their beliefs, cultures, and faiths are not the same. For example, the Kirat people, who have been in India since the Sindh and Harappa civilizations, consider themselves Shiva and Linga worshipers (Danielou & Gabin, 2003; Thulung, 1985).

Kirat forefathers travelled in groups over China, Eurasia, Kashmir, and Assam to reach Tibet (Chemjong, 2003). Chinese and Tibetan migrants in Nepal practised Bon, Shaivitic-Bon, Buddhism, and Buddhist Bon (Yuma/Lhasahangma) over time. They brought their practices from antiquity through the ninth century (Balicki-Denjongpa, 2003).

Linguistical View

Linguistics represents not only a language but also culture. Culture and community or ethnicity are inextricably linked. On the other hand, language and culture are dynamic and multifaceted fields. As a result, linguistic knowledge helps construct a picture of lingual, ethnic distribution and convergence.

World Atlas of language families has displayed at least 135 families worldwide. They belong to a separate linguistic family. In addition, linguists have identified at least 135 live language families and 12 no longer extant (Pariona, 2018). The World Atlas also recorded that the Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan, Niger-Congo, and Austronesian language families are the most common. Language families such as Afro-Asian, Dravidian, Turkic, Japonic, Austro-Asiatic, and Kra-Dai are also in the top 10. Surprisingly, specific languages do not belong to any single language family, refers as linguistic isolation. Korean, Sumerian, and Elamite are linguistic isolates (Pariona, 2018). It's worth noting that Sumerian and Elamite people belonged to the Kirat family (Chemjong, 2003).

Linguists believe that Negrito was the first species to arrive in the Indian sub-continent, including Nepal (UpadhyayRegmi, 1990). They were making their way from Africa to the Arabian and Iranian coasts. They most likely settled in Nepal as well. Their body was short, black, and curly hair like sheep's wool. Linguists believe they were a Middle Paleolithic, Upper Paleolithic race (Chang, 1986). They made their way to South India and are now in the Andaman Islands. They still use their language there. The Dravid, Kirat, and later Aryans arrived in the Indian subcontinent and developed a high-quality civilization. As a result, the Negroes' cultural impact was minimal.

The Austroloids comprise Austro-Asiatics and Austronesians. Austro-Asiatics were the second human group to arrive in Nepal, according to Upadhyaya Regmi (1990). Its black complexion, long heads, and tiny noses distinguished them. Their bodies transformed later because of blood mingling with Kirats, Mongols, and Aryans. They were known as Nishad, Kohl, and Bhil by the Aryans.

The Indonesian, Micronesian, Melanesian, and Polynesian islands speak Austronesian languages. The languages of Mon-Khmer (Burma, Siam), Khasi (Assam), Munda (India), and Flung Nicobari (Burma) are known as Austro-Asiatic. Austroloid ancestors include the Dravidians of India, Kirats, and the Santhals of Nepal. Some researchers believe that Dravidians arrived in India before Austroloid. The Dravidian language was native to the Indian subcontinent. Thus, the Dravidian language and culture have significantly impacted the Sanskrit language and Hindu civilization (UpadhyayRegmi, 1990).

Dravidian Language family in Nepal

According to Stadler et al. (2016), human languages are a 'culturally evolving trait.' Consequently, language change is sporadic and robust, with new languages replacing the main established variants. Dravidians and Kirats most likely arrived in India from Africa via the Mediterranean via Iran. Archaeological excavations at Mohenjodaro and Harappa proved that the Dravidians and Kirats were the civilized and prosperous ancestors before the Aryans arrived. The unearthing in the Indus, Harappa has revealed evidence that supports Thulung's argument with Kirat. For example, Shiva, Pashupati, Maternal power, Shivalinga, bull idols, and so on were there. Arya first met Dravid and Kirat in the Sapta Sindhu region, where Arya referred to them as Dev, Das, Dasyu, and Shudra (Thulung, 1985).

Proto-Elamite and Proto-Dravidian languages arose from the Proto-Zagrosian language family (Southworth, 2012). Elamite, Sumer, and Kashi are synonyms for Kirat. Linking language families supports Thulung's (1985) theory that Kirat and Dravid were brothers. The Urau (Jhangad) ethnic group speaks a Dravidian mother tone in south-eastern Nepal. Their folklore connects them to the monkeys' army from the Ramayana era, who aided Ram (Bhandari & BhandariPoudel, 2004). These shreds of evidence suggest that the Dravidian language family is an ancient one that ousted the Negroid language in Nepal.

Dravid and Kirat were members of the Bhil family in the Sindh Harappa civilization. As a result, their language and culture seem comparable. Evidence suggests that Kirat spoke Dravidian and Austro-Asian languages during the Sindh Harappa civilization (Logan, 1853; UpadhyayRegmi, 1990). As a result, Dravidian vocabulary appears in Sino-Tibetan languages like Kirat Limbu. According to the evidence, Kirat and Dravid lived together in the Sindh Harappa culture. Therefore, it stated a Kirat-Dravid language link before the Tibeto-Burman language. There are signs of Linguistic links also found in Dravid and Sino-Tibetan vocabularies (Ramasamy, 2021). Thus, the Kirat spoke the Dravidian languages in the Sindh Harappan region (Logan, 1853).

Austro-Asiatic language in Nepal

Linguist Regmi believes Kirat spoke Austro-Asiatic language when residing in the Sapta Sindhu region. He claims that before adopting the Tibeto-Burman language, Kirat/Mongol used to speak the Austro-Asiatic language (UpadhyayRegmi, 1990).

Regmi's claim is possible since genetic research also indicates that Kirat's ancestors were closely related to Austro-Asiatic languages like Vietnamese, Mon, and Khmer. Kirat Limbu's DNA now contains Vietnamese DNA (Shall Explore, 2018). They are comparable in genetic and linguistic elements. The similarity of terms in Kirat Limbu and Austro-Asiatic languages speaker indicates the relationship (Sidwell & Blench, 2011). Thus, genetics and linguistics demonstrate a DNA link between Kirat Rai Limbu and Austro-Asian speakers (Ethnologue, 2022; Shall Explore, 2018).

For instance, we can consider the Austro-Asian language Mon-Khmer. In Mon-Khmer, the word 'Lang' denotes hamlet, walking, whereas, in Rai, Limbu language, 'Lang' means foot (Hieu, 2020). The meanings of Lang as village and foot are synonymous and analogous concepts that come together in social development.

Therefore, Austro-Asiatic was the linguistically third human group in Nepal. Nepal's Santhal and Munda ethnic groups belong to the Austro-Asiatic language family (Ethnologue, 2022). Before and after the arrival of Kirat, Mongol, and Arya, people in Nepal spoke Austro-Asiatic after Dravidian languages.

Let us also discuss the ancient Kirat wave. Unfortunately, there is no definite proof of the language spoken by the Kirat predecessors such as the Matsya dynasty, Dev dynasty, Asura dynasty, and Narkasur dynasty during the Mahabharata period and before. According to linguistics and historical reports, huge fights broke out in Devasur Sangram from Sumer, Elam, Babylonia, Sapta Sindhu, and Assam. Due to Kashi Aryan's conflict with Sumer and Kashi,

a wave of Kirat-Ashur fled to Kham, China (Chemjong, 2003). As a result, the Kirat Ashur family returned with the Tibeto-Burman dialect (Chang, 1986; Wang, 1996; VanDriem, 2005).

We can triangulate the evidence with mythology. Urau is an indigenous ethnic group of Nepal. Their legend pointed out their presence during the Ramayan era in Nepal and India (Bhandari & BhandariPoudel, 2004). They still speak the Dravidian language family. That illustrates that an ancient wave of people, including Kirat, spoke Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic languages (UpadhyayRegmi, 1990).

Tibeto-Burman language family

We are researching the history of Kirat, Sumer, and Elamite from various angles. Linguists classify Sumerian and Elamite languages as isolated languages (Pariona, 2018). Kirat's synonyms vary according to time, place, or context, including Kashi, Saumer, Elamite, Dev, Ashur, Mlechha, Naga, Bhil, Mongol, Khambongba, and others.

In China, the Mongols dwelt around the Yangtze and Huanghe-Ho rivers. These branches most likely dropped along the Brahmaputra and split into three (VanDriem, 2005). One component travelled to Burma, another to Assam, and another to the Himalayas (UpadhyayRegmi, 1990). Himalayan Nepal speak languages such as Newar, Tamang, Magarati, Sherpa, Jirel, Bansi, Hayu, Thami, Chepang, Rai-Limbu, and others belonging to the Tibeto-Burman language family.

The linguistic genetics research shows the Chinese-Tibeto-Burmese language evolved between 5550 and 2700 BC, according to linguist Van-Drian (VanDriem, 2005). The language family arrived in the Taklamakan between 2500-1700 BC. Wang, another linguist, claims that the Tibeto-Burman language family split off from the Chinese language 6,000 years ago (Wang, 1996). At that time, the construction of ancient China began. Evidence from archaeological excavations backs up this notion (Chang, 1986).

According to archaeology, genetics, and linguistics, the migrants of Tibeto-Burman language speakers invaded Nepal first between 2900 BC and 1700 BC, traversing the Mekong and Brahmaputra rivers from China's Sichuan to northeast India and the eastern part of Nepal. Then, another human group from Sichuan entered Nepal with the Tibeto-Burman language via the Saptasindhu region, along the Ganges River from the west of Nepal and the South Ganges plains (VanDriem, 2005).

Gordan Luce has classified the Tibeto-Burman language family scientifically. Luce supports the theory of the origin, classification, and distribution of the Chinese-Tibeto and Tibeto-Burman language families. For example, Kirat Rai Limbu belongs to the Tibeto-Burman language family. Still, the Tibeto-Burman language family is highly diverse. China, Tibet, Burma, Northeast India, Northern India, Nepal, and Southeast Asia, speak this language family. Therefore, Luce has classified the Kirat Rai Limbu language speaking in Nepal, India, and Bhutan under the Mahakirat language family (Luce, 1912-1978).

Indo-European language family

Here is another piece of evidence from a later historical period. Evidence indicates that the following Kirat group from Persia spoke the Indo-European language (Ethnologue, 2022). Kirat's track record appears to support this argument. According to historian Iman Singh Chemjong, Kirat's family, the Hazare, had been abandoned in Afghanistan. A member of the Kirat family named the Hazare tribe speaks in Indo-European languages (David, Simons, & Fenning, 2019). Another Kirat member is Kachin, who was divided in Burma. Hazare and Kachin were all of Kirat's lineage (Chemjong, 2003) and now speak Indo-European languages (Ethnologue, 2022). Because Hazare, Kachin tribes speak Indo-European languages, an influx of Kirat people likely talked in Indo-European before the Tibeto-Burman language.

Based on the data, it is likely that a stream of Kirat spoke an Indo-European language family when they migrated from Afghanistan to the Ganges plain. Kirat history tells us Kirat (Saumer/Kashi) became Kirat, Khas, and Gorkhali today. Kirat group conquered Kathmandu and ruled Nepal, forming the Kirat dynasty. The descendant was later known as Kirat Rai Limbu of the Kashi Dynasty *Khambongba* (Chemjong, 2003).

Arya spent a long time in Babylonia. They are from the Arab lands surrounding Persia. Thulung (1985) claims Indra, not Arya, was Saumer. On coming to India, a sect of Indo-Iranian started to call themselves Arya after the arrival of Indra. Linguists believe that Aryan has derived from Iran (Yarshater, 1989). That is why the Aryan who came to India got named after Iran.

Since the last generation of Arya arrived in India, Saptasindhu, from Persia (Iran), they became Aryans attributing to near Iran. Thus, Aryan and Iranian were synonymous in Persian history (Yarshater, 1989). They went to Kirat and Dravid's Saptasindhu Harappa region to meet the Naga ethnic of Kirat. A mighty Naga tribe rescued Vishnu from the

deluge mentioned in Matsya Purana. Naga was a formidable Kirat race. Afterwards, India established the Vishnu (Thulung, 1985).

Some Kirats openly show themselves as Aryans. For example, swami Prapannacharya advocated the same principle (Prapannacharya, 1988). The main reason for this is that Kashi Arya and Kashi Kirat come from different cultures and pedigree despite blood mixed. Later, they split up and developed their literature and culture due to contrasting and competitive interests.

Arya emerged in the Saptasindhu region after Dravid and Kirat. The Aryans, however, are a post-Vedic ethnic group that emphasizes ethnic purity and maintaining ethnic superiority. The noun Aryan is more recent than the noun Hindu. In the past, Persian called Sapta Sindhu residents Hindu. These terms seem synonymous today, although history demonstrates different. As a result, Kirat entirely within Aryans is not historically accurate in totality. However, Linguist Pokhrel claimed that numerous Aryans in Nepal have evolved from Kirat and Khas (Pokhrel, 1998). Historian Naradmuni Thulung also supports the notion (Thulung, 1985).

Indo-European language family developed the Indo-Aryan branch. Indo-Aryan languages include Prakrit, Pali, Sanskrit, and others. Prakrit means "Natural, Informal", whereas Sanskrit means "Created language." Therefore, people spoke Prakrit informally, whereas Sanskrit developed formal language for literary, official, and religious purposes (Woolner, 1986). Prakrit was the first Indo-Aryan language, while Pali flourished around the time of Buddha before the year Christ was born (UpadhyaRegmi, 1990).

Sanskrit language

Researchers believed Arya arrived in the Sapta Sindh region between 1700 and 1500 BC. Evidence suggests that Indo-Aryans were the first to invade the Punjab Valley. In other words, the Sanskrit language and literature did not have to emerge until the Aryans arrived in the Indus Harappa region. Aryans wrote Vedas, mantras, and other texts in the Sanskrit language later between 1500 BC and 500 BC. This Vedic religion eventually gave rise to the Sanskrit language and Sanatan religion (Shaivism) (Sanijit, 2011).

Sanskrit is an old Indo-Iranian, Indo-European language family that originated and was maintained orally in the pre-Vedic period of 1700-1200 BC. Sanskrit originated from Greek, Latin, Tamil, and indigenous languages (Burrow, 2001). Linguists now classify Sanskrit Indo-Aryan as part of the Indo-European language family.

Scholars believe that Sanskrit came from several different sources. The language also serves as a repository for the larger community's ideas and culture. Scholars, for example, claim that Kirat Lepcha terms are in Sanskrit (India Inspires, 2014). Lepcha was Elamite in Mesopotamia and later Kirat with the Tibeto-Burman linguistic family in Nepal.

People think the Sanskrit language is the mother of languages; however, linguists believe that Sanskrit is a mash-up of words from multiple languages. Take a look at how the Sanskrit word formed. Sanskrit is called *Samaskirutham* in Tamil, which means *Sam/Samai* (cooked together) + *Kritam/Kirutham* (done/language). The deal gave birth to Sanskrit, the same meaning as English. Sanskrit means mixed language formed by cooking multiple languages in Tamil narrative. (Pandian, 2019; History in Hindi, 2020).

The priests and aristocrats constructed the Sanskrit language and then told the ordinary people that it had been given to them by God. Knowledge of Sanskrit became a marker of high social class during and after the Vedic period (Berger et al., 2016). However, Rigveda states that each Vedic word is compound in construct (Saraswoti, 1975).

Urdu Hindi languages

Urdu and Hindi are members of the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family. These languages can be traced back to *Khariboli*, a language spoken in Delhi's areas (About Hindi, 2022). During Islamic conquests and the formation of Muslim control in the north of India between the ninth and tenth centuries A.D., Afghans, Persians, and Turks adopted Khariboli as a common language of interaction with the local populace. Grierson (1906) divides Hindi into Eastern Hindi and Western Hindi. *Ardhamagadhi* was a Prakrit dialect that flourished between Eastern and Western Prakrit.

We have to trace the evolution of the Khas language in Karnali in the hilly region between those periods. Therefore, we must track the Khas to the Karnali zone and Khasan history back to the fifth century. Following the country's unification in the 18th century, Khas became the official language of Nepal. However, people are perplexed by the similarities between Hindi, Urdu, and Nepali. However, some Nepali linguists launched the *Jharrobadi* movement to demonstrate that Nepali is not the Hindi spoken in the hills (Jharrobadi Andolan, 2074).

Nepali language

Pandian argued that Prakrit, Pali, Sanskrit evolved the Nepali language (Pandian 2019). Therefore, the Khas dialect has become the Nepali language now. Native languages, Sanskrit, and other languages have all impacted it. Thus, it is safe to state that the Nepali language is a Khas influenced by Prakrit, Pali, native, Sanskrit, and other languages. However, it belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family.

CONCLUSION

Linguists believed that the Negrito language family, which began in Nepal, vanished with the race's displacement. The Dravidian language family was the second language family. Austro-Asian has likewise replaced indigenous peoples speaking this Dravidian language, which is on the verge of extinction. The linguist believes that Kirat, who now conveys the Tibeto-Burman language, used to chat the Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic languages. The Tibeto-Burman languages replaced the Austro-Asian, Dravidian language family, an ancient tongue. As a result, Tibeto-Burman languages increased in Kirat and Mongol households. The Indo-European language family then arrived in Nepal. In Nepal, Nepali Khas, a member of the Indo-European language family, is currently prevalent, functioning as a link between the country's disadvantaged languages.

REFERENCES

1. About Hindi (2022, February 21). The University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. <https://linguistics.illinois.edu/hindi/about-hindi>
2. Balikci-Denjongpa, A. (2003). "Ritual in Sikkim: Expression of Cultural Identity and Change Among the Lhopos" in P. Christiaan Kelleher (ed.). In Tibetan Borderlands, PLATS 2003: Tibetan Studies: Proceedings of the Tenth Seminar of the International Association for Tibetan Studies Oxford 2003. Leiden: Brill, pp. 127–156.
3. Berger, E; Israel, G.; Miller, C.; Parkinson, B.; Reeves, A.; Willams, N. (2016). World History: Cultures, States, and Societies to 1500. University of North Georgia Press Dahlonega, Georgia. <https://ung.edu/university-press/books/world-history-cultures-states-societies-to-1500.php>
4. Bhandari, B.N & Bhandari-Poudel, S. (2004). Urau Bhasa Ra Sanskritiko Ek Jhalak, Nepal Urau Dharmakarma Samaj Sewa, Lalitpur.
5. Bhandari, P. (2022, March 1). Triangulation in Research: Guide, Types, and Examples. Scribbr. <https://www.scribbr.com/methodology/triangulation/>
6. Burrow, T. (2001). The Sanskrit Language, New Delhi, Motilal Banarsidass Publication.
7. CBS (2011). Census Report-2011. Central Bureau of Statistics, National Planning Commission, Nepal.
8. Chang, K.C. (1986). The Archaeology of Ancient China (4th ed.). New Haven: Yale University.
9. Chazan, M. (1995). The Language Hypothesis for the Middle-to-Upper Paleolithic Transition: An Examination Based on a Multiregional Lithic Analysis. *Current Anthropology*, 36 (5), pp. 749-768.
10. Chemjong, I. S. (2003). History and Culture of the Kirat People. (K. Y. C. Lalitpur, Ed.) (4th ed.). Lalitpur: Kirat Yakthung Chumlung Lalitpur.
11. Danielou, A. & Gabin, J. (2003). Shiva and the Primordial Tradition: From the Trans to the Science of Dream. Inner Traditions, Rochester, Vermont 05767.
12. David, E., Simons, G., & Fenning, C. (2019, February 10). Ethnologue: Languages of the World. <http://www.ethnologue.com>
13. Ethnologue (2022, March 1). Ethnologue: Language of the World. <https://www.ethnologue.com/language/sat>
14. Ghosh, N. (1951). Early History of India. Allahbad: Indian Press.
15. Gibbons, A. (1992). Mitochondrial Eve: Wounded, But Not Dead Yet. *Science*. 257 (5072), pp873-875. DOI: 10.1126/science.1502551
16. Grierson, G. A. (1906). Linguistic Survey of India. <http://www.joao-roiz.jp/LSI/Sumer, and Elamite>
17. Hieu, L.T. (2020). Community Organization Forms of Mon-Khmer Linguistic-ethnic Groups: An Interdisciplinary Approach. *Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies*, 3(4): 16-27, 2020; Article no.AJL2C.5
18. Historical-Comparative Linguistics (2022, March 2). What is the Department of Historical-Comparative Linguistics? The University of Cologne. <https://ifl.phil-fak.uni-koeln.de/en/>
19. History in Hindi (2020, August 29). Harappan Civilization Mohenjo Daro Indian Tribe in India. History in Hindi. [Video] Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/17Xzy612kBA>
20. India Inspires (2014, July 24). Myths about Sanskrit [Video file]. <https://youtu.be/2O4oaDaO36Y>
21. Genesis of Magar (2022, March 5). Genesis of Magar. Nepal Magar Tourism Society. <https://www.magartourismsociety.org/genesis-of-magar.html>
22. Jharrobadi Andolan (2014, Poush 16) Jharrobadi Andolanika Aguwako Awasan. Nepal Samaya. <https://nepalsamaya.com/samaj/2017-12-31-182300-10095>

23. Johanson, D. (2001, April 7). Human Evolution: Origins of Modern Humans: Multiregional or Out of Africa?. American Institute of Biological Sciences. ActionBioscience- promoting bioscience literacy. <http://www.actionbioscience.org/evolution/johanson.html>
24. Jones, W. (1807). The works of Sir William Jones. London: Printed for J. Stockdale and J. Walker
25. Khatri, P. (1997). Nepalka Dharmik Mat Ra Samajik Samrachana. Kathmandu, M.K. Publishers, and Distributors.
26. Logan, J.R. (1853). General Characters of the Burma-Tibetan, Gangetic, and Dravidian Languages. The Journal of the Indian Archipelago and Eastern Asia. Volume 7, January, pp105-137.
27. Loganathan, K. (2005). Om in Sumeria: Sumerian Tamil. Ulagan. <https://sites.google.com/site/sumeriantamil/om-in-sumeria>
28. Luce, G.J. (c. 1912-1978). Papers of Gorden Hannington Luce. National Library of Australia.
29. Matasovic, R. (n.d.). Comparative and Historical Linguistics. Linguistic Anthropology, Department of Linguistics, University of Zagreb, Croatia.
30. MoPE (2017). National population report 2017. Kathmandu: Ministry of Population and Environment.
31. Pandian, A. (2019). Ancient Indian Religion Part 4. Ancient India APN.
32. Pariona, A. (2018, February 18). Language Families of the World. WorldAtlas.com, <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/language-families-with-the-highest-number-of-speakers.html>
33. PhyangSamba, M. B. (2019). Phyang Sambare Mundhum. Manuscript submitted for publication.
34. Pokhrel, B. K. (1998). Khas Jatiko Itihas, Biratnagar, Udatta Anusandhan.
35. Prapannacharya, Swami (2000). Prachin Kirat Itihas, Panchthar, Kirateswar Prakashan.
36. PTI (2018). Dravidian language family is 4,500 years old: study. The Hindu. <https://www.thehindu.com/sci-tech/science/dravidian-language-family-is-4500-years-old-study/article23314180.ece>
37. Ramasamy, V. A. (2021). List of Tamil words in the Mongolian language. Academia Edu. https://www.academia.edu/70318900/List_of_Tamil_words_in_Mongolian_language
38. Roy, H. (1988). Language, Saussure and Wittgenstein. Routledge. p. ix.
39. Sanijit. (2011). Religious Development in Ancient India. Ancient History Encyclopedia. <https://www.ancient.eu/article/230/religiousdevelopments-in-ancient-india/>
40. Saraswati, D. (1975). Om RigVeda: Hindi Bhasya. Delhi-6, Arya Samaj.
41. Shall Explore (2018 March 31). Subhash Limbu's Asian Boy's Shocking Ancestry DNA Test Results. [Video File] Retrieved from <https://youtu.be/2IAQYWRS8k>
42. Sidwell, P. and Blench, R. (2011). 'The Austroasiatic Urheimat: the Southeastern Riverine Hypothesis.' Enfield, NJ (ed.) Dynamics of Human Diversity, 317–345. Canberra: Pacific Linguistics.
43. Southworth, F. (2012). Rice in Dravidian. SpringerOpen, 4 (3-4), 124-148. <https://thericejournal.springeropen.com/articles/10.1007/s12284-011-9076-9#Sec1>
44. Stadler, K., Blythe, R. A., Smith, K., and Kirby, S. (2016). 'Momentum in Language Change.' A Model of Self-Actuating S-shaped Curves. Language Dynamics and Change, 6: 172.
45. Tashakkori, A & Teddle, C. (2003). Handbook of mixed methods in social and behavioural research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
46. Thulung, N. M. (1985). Kiratko Nalibeli (1st ed.). Biratnagar: Angur Kandangwa, Biratnagar.
47. University of Cambridge (2007). New Research Confirms 'Out Of Africa' Theory Of Human Evolution. Science Daily, <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2007/05/070509161829.html>
48. UpadhyayRegmi, C.M.(1990). Nepali Bhasako Utpatti (4th ed.). Kathmandu, Sajha Prakashan.
49. VanDriem, G. (2005). Tibeto-Burman vs Indo-Chinese: Implications for population geneticists, archaeologists and prehistorians. In S. Laurent, B. Roger, & S. Alicia (Eds.), The Peopling of East Asia: Putting Together the Archaeology, Linguistics, and Genetics, London, UK: Routledge Curzon, pp81-106.
50. Wang, W. (1996). Genes, dates, and the writing system. International Review of Chinese Linguistics, 1(1), 45-46.
51. Woolner, A. C. (1986). Introduction to Prakrit. Motilal Banasasidass Publication. 003-4.
52. Wright, D. W. (2015). International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences (Second Edition), Amsterdam: Elsevier, [2015]. ISBN-13: 978-0080970868
53. Yarshater, E. (1989). Persia or Iran, Persian or Farsi. Archived 2010-10-24 at the Wayback Machine, Iranian Studies, vol. XXII no. 1.