

## MULTILINGUALISM AND THE LANGUAGE SITUATION IN NEPAL\*

**Tej R. Kansakar**  
Tribhuvan University  
Kirtipur, Kathmandu

### 1. BACKGROUND

Nepal represents a complex cross-section of linguistic and cultural diversity. The Census Report of 1991 records at least 60 different ethnic communities or castes and a distribution of over 70 languages spoken within the country's present day political boundaries. Grimes (1991) estimates a total of about 100 languages spoken in Nepal. This was perhaps calculated on the basis of over 30 distinct Rai languages which are usually subsumed in the Census Reports under the single heading of "Rai-Kirāt", and under the category of "other unspecified languages". These languages and their innumerable satellite dialects have genetic affiliations to at least four language families, namely Tibeto-Burman (about 56 languages), Indo-Aryan (14 languages), Austroasiatic/Munda (1 language), and Dravidian (1 language), together with one controversial language isolate — Kusunda. Despite the mutual influences among these languages of different genetic stocks, the channels of communication between groups of speakers are not ideal due to natural and social barriers of caste or professions.

Nepali, designated in the Constitution of 1990 as "the official language of the nation", claims 50.3% of the population as native speakers, and has a dominant role in the life of the country, including its extensive uses for official purposes, as the medium of instruction at various levels of education, as well as in commerce, law, and in the public communications media. Among the Indic languages of Nepal, Sanskrit, Nepali, and Maithili (11.8%) have a long history of written literature and a variety of modern linguistic descriptions including grammars, dictionaries and teaching materials, as do Tibetan, Newar (3.7%) and Limbu (1.6%) among the nation's Tibeto-Burman languages. There are, however, a large number of minority languages spread over a wide geographical area that are characterized by a declining number of speakers.

---

\* An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the Seminar on *The Teaching and Research in Linguistics at Tribhuvan University* on the occasion of the inauguration of the Central Department of Linguistics, August 2, 1996.

This trend toward the degeneration of Nepal's numerous languages can be seen clearly in the statistics compiled in the various Census Reports over the past four decades. But according to one demographer (V.B.S. Kansakar 1989:42) "the linguistic composition of the population of Nepal in different censuses seems to be rather ambiguous". This ambiguity arises from the failure to identify the ethnic origin of speakers of various languages or to recognize the distinction between a language and a dialect. The census of 1952/54 for instance recorded more than 54 languages, and these have progressively declined from 35 in 1961 to 17 or 18 languages in the reports of 1971 and 1981. I shall return to this problem later. There is therefore a strong case for adequate codification, description and expansion in the uses of these endangered languages, for their preservation, development and standardization. It is against this background that we need to examine the multi-lingual and multi-ethnic situation in Nepal, in the context of current democratic processes operating in the country.

## 2 GOVERNMENT POLICY AND LANGUAGE DEVELOPMENT

The configuration of Nepal's ethnic, cultural, and above all, linguistic diversity is a unique national asset. Governments in the past have not always recognized this reality, nor have they taken any measures to promote the various languages of the country. In my earlier paper "Language planning and modernization in Nepal" (Kansakar 1995) I referred to the absence of a clearly defined language policy and the government's failure to implement any consistent program of language planning in the country. The various Constitutions in the past had designated Nepali as the national language in view of its status as a *lingua franca* among diverse linguistic communities and its role in the national life of the country. While no one has disputed the status of Nepali as the national language, it was abundantly clear that the policy of His Majesty's Government was to promote only the use of Nepali in education, administration, publication, and the media. Only two Nepalese languages, Maithili and Newar, are introduced as optional/elective subjects in the school and higher education curricula. Recently, there has also been a considerable decline in the use of English as a medium of instruction in higher education. The Government's efforts to increase the use of Nepali at all levels of education, however, have not been matched by the production of an adequate number of textbooks or reference materials in Nepali. The situation that has prevailed in the country since the Rana regime is one of a single language policy where the non-Nepali speakers have been at a disadvantage in education, employment, and other social benefits. In Nepal where languages enter into dominant majority vs. minority relationships, it is important that language

issues not be politicized as they are in India, where tensions and conflicts on linguistic and communal lines come to the surface regularly (e.g. Hindi vs. regional language vis-à-vis English) or the Tamil-Telegu conflict in Sri Lanka arising plainly out of disputes over language issues.

In Nepal too, the dominant language policy of the government has been questioned and resisted in recent years. The national referendum in 1979 raised the demand for assigning functional roles to various native languages so that each ethnic group could preserve and strengthen their linguistic and cultural identity. Following the restoration of democracy in 1990, the new Constitution recognizes all indigenous languages of Nepal as "national languages" and guarantees each community the right to preserve and promote its language, script and culture. The Constitution also asserts the fundamental right of each community to operate schools up to the primary level in its own mother tongue for imparting education to its children. Although this is a remote possibility for most minority languages which lack teaching materials, functional script, or written literature, the new Constitutional provisions provide grounds for hope and encouragement among various ethnic groups to work towards the preservation and promotion of their language, culture and educational opportunities in the mother tongue. Minority language groups such as Tibetan, Newar, Magar and Limbu have developed primary level materials in the mother tongue, and unwritten languages such as Chepang and Tamang are attempting to devise scripts for producing newspapers and other printed materials. While these are laudable enterprises, the majority of the languages of Nepal would need to elaborate orthographic, grammatical, and lexicosemantic features so that these languages could become more functional to meet the demands of a developing society. Such a requirement is but natural in a country like Nepal, where a large number of minority languages are poorly developed in form and usage. The national language, Nepali, itself lacks a comprehensive and authoritative grammar, and languages with rich literary traditions such as Maithili, Newar and the Kiranti languages still lag behind in standardization. In my 1995 paper on language planning I have referred to the importance of "status planning", where the national government must recognize the position of one language in relation to others. More specifically, there is a very urgent need to develop the functional uses of minority languages (or language varieties) in written and spoken social discourse. The use of a language in literacy programs and mass media (such as radio/TV broadcasting or publications) also serves to upgrade the status of a language, both socially and politically. The efforts that have so far been made by the recent democratic governments in Nepal to promote the uses of certain regional languages must therefore be seen as steps in the right direction.

### **3. THE NATIONAL LANGUAGES POLICY RECOMMENDATION COMMISSION AND THE MINORITY LANGUAGES**

One important Government-sponsored venture concerning the languages of Nepal was the formation of a National Languages Policy Recommendation Commission, which compiled vital information and data on the language situation in Nepal, and made a number of significant recommendations for the preservation and development of the country's minority languages in particular. The Commission submitted its Report to the Minister of Education, Culture and Social Welfare on 31 Chaitra, 2050 B.S. (1993), and among the 58 recommendations made under various headings, the following have been identified as the main ones:

1. To conduct a linguistic survey of Nepal in order to identify and determine the actual number of languages spoken in the country.
2. To promote the languages of the country through codification and linguistic descriptions, and to develop the uses of these languages in education, administration and as vehicles of mass communication.
3. To identify the endangered languages and take steps for their preservation.
4. To establish a Council of National Languages for the purpose of study, research and promotion of national languages.
5. To classify languages into three groups: first those with established written traditions, such as Nepali, Newar, Maithili, Limbu, Bhojpuri, Avadhi, Tibetan; the second with an emerging tradition of writing, e.g. Tharu, Tamang, Magar, Gurung and the Rai group of languages; and the third without any script or written literature that could be used for imparting primary education in the mother tongue. The third category would include a large number of minority languages including Bote, Byanshi, Chepang, Danuwar, Darai, Dhimal, Kagate, Kaike, Kham, Kumal, Jhangadh, Majhi, Sattar/Santhal, Thami and several languages of the Rai group.
6. To promote monolingual or bilingual education in the mother tongue and/or Nepali on the basis of the ethnic composition of students in particular areas.
7. His Majesty's Government to approve and support those primary schools in the mother tongue which have been established by the local people.
8. All children to have the right to receive education either in the mother tongue, mother tongue with Nepali, or Nepali alone.
9. Students at the lower Secondary level to have the option to study their mother tongue as a subject in place of Sanskrit.
10. To establish a Department of Linguistics in the University to promote study and research in linguistics, and to produce trained manpower in linguistics.

11. To organize a full-fledged Language Department within the Royal Nepal Academy, and to recognize and provide financial support to organizations associated with national languages.
12. To establish a separate administrative unit under the CTSDC of the Ministry of Education to develop curriculum, implement and promote mother tongue education.
13. To use the services of trained linguists to ensure more reliable compilation of language statistics in future Census Reports.

If and when implemented, these recommendations could go a long way to solve the major language problems of illiteracy, degeneration of languages, and lack of intelligibility or poor communication among speakers of different languages and dialects. It is now two years since the Commission submitted its Report and there are no indications yet that the Government will accept the recommendations in letter and spirit. A one-day symposium on "Primary Education in the Mother Tongue", organized by the Primary Curriculum and Textbook Development Unit of the Ministry of Education, was held at the Kaiser Library on July 7, 1995 (Ashad 23, 2052) while the UML government was still in office. The meeting was largely unproductive, since members representing various language groups raised objections to the government's failure to implement the Commission recommendations. The responsibilities expected of the government have been clearly spelled out in the Report but there is no commitment thus far that the recommendations will be implemented. It appears that recent governments are concerned solely with political and economic issues, and linguistic and cultural questions still do not figure in the government's list of priorities. Anyway, I felt that the work of the Commission should not be wasted, as it was constituted by the then Congress government with the noble objective of understanding the language situation and the language problems that obtain in the country, and implementing the feasible aspects of the Report.

#### **4. LANGUAGE SHIFT AND LANGUAGE MAINTENANCE**

In a multilingual situation such as we find in Nepal, it is but natural to find cases of language dominance, positive or negative attitudes towards one language or the other, decline in language loyalty resulting in language shift, or efforts to maintain a language under the pressure of a multilingual area. These are some of the uniting and dividing forces which can operate in a multilingual setting. The most remarkable aspect of multilingualism in Nepal is the composition and distribution of speakers over wide geographical areas of the highlands and lowlands of the country. There are relatively few Indo-Aryan

languages (14 in all) spoken by larger portions of the population, while the more numerous Tibeto-Burman languages (about 56 in all) are characterized by very few speakers (e.g. Hayu/Vayu has only 233 speakers). This is clear from the language demography compiled in the Census Reports from 1952 to 1991.<sup>1</sup> Such a situation would naturally lead to areal pressure, particularly from the national language Nepali or any other dominant language of the area, and contributes to increased bilingualism in different parts of the country. Malla (1989:452) observed that despite the distinct decline in the percentage of Maithili, Bhojpuri, Avadhi and Tharu speakers in the Terai zones, “the mother-tongues of the majority of the population of some of these zones still continues to be non-Nepali”. This of course means that there are many areas in the Terai plains and elsewhere where Nepali remains a minority language, and it is important for the government to recognize this reality for administrative and educational purposes. However there have not been any sociolinguistic studies in Nepal apart from the 3-part *Studies in Bilingualism* (Subba et al., 1974-77). The proposed long-term research project on the “Sociolinguistic Survey of Nepal” (Hale 1993), if implemented, could also make substantial contributions to our understanding of Nepal’s linguistic configuration and the relationships that exist among languages and dialects in terms of attitudes and intelligibility. According to the Census Report of 1991, Nepali is used as a second language by over 18% (3,347,261) of the total population of Nepal as compared to 13.3% reported in the 1952/54 Census Report. This rapid spread of bilingualism has coincided with the declining trend in the number of speakers of many minority languages which show unmistakable signs of language decay and possible language loss. There have been very few attempts at the national or regional level to preserve and maintain the endangered languages. Of particular concern are languages like Majhi, Danuwar, Gurung, Magar, Darai, Chepang and many others, which according to the 1991 Census Report, record an alarming decline in the number of their active speakers (see the following table).<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix 1 for a comparative table of National languages and the number of their speakers.

<sup>2</sup> This report, however, left several endangered languages such as Hayu, Dura, Kusunda, Rautya, and Dumi unspecified by name or number of remaining speakers.

<i>Languages</i>	<i>Caste/Ethnic group</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Decline</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1. Majhi	55,050	11,322	- 43,728	79.4
2. Magar	1,339,308	430,264	- 909,044	67.8
3. Danuwar	50,754	23,721	- 27,033	53.2
4. Gurung	449,189	227,918	- 221,271	49.2
5. Darai	10,759	6,520	- 4,239	39.3
6. Newari	1,041,090	690,007	- 351,083	33.7
7. Chepang	36,656	25,097	- 11,559	31.5
8. Tharu	1,194,224	993,388	- 200,836	16.8
9. Rai/Kirat	525,551	439,312	- 86,239	16.4
10. Limbu	297,186	254,088	- 43,098	14.5
11. Tamang	1,018,252	904,456	- 113,796	11.1

A few languages, however, record an increase in the number of speakers, e.g.

<i>Languages</i>	<i>Caste/Ethnic group</i>	<i>Speakers</i>	<i>Increase</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
1. Bengali	7,909	27,712	+ 19,803	39.9
2. Sherpa	110,358	121,819	+ 11,461	10.3
3. Rajbanshi	82,177	85,558	+ 3,381	4.1

In my paper on language planning referred to earlier (Kansakar 1995), I had attributed this decline primarily to lack of language loyalty among mother-tongue speakers. This situation could lead to two consequences: the prevention of language spread and maintenance on the one hand, and a gradual shift from mother-tongue to the second language, which in most cases is Nepali. I had also assumed that the primary factor that has contributed to this process might be economic or professional, rather than deliberate attempts to downgrade any minority language. The culture or lifestyle of a people can be decisive in language survival if minority groups are conscious of their history or ethnicity, and are determined to preserve and promote their linguistic and cultural identity. In the western and eastern hill regions of the country, for instance, the Khas Brahmins and Chhetries who are predominantly Hindus co-exist with the Mongoloid communities, e.g. the Magars and the Gurungs in the west, the Sherpas in the north, and the Tamangs in the east. These Tibeto-Burman ethnic groups follow shamanism or Lamaist Buddhism and speak their own languages. Although there is a tendency towards language decay and possible language loss among some of the small linguistic communities, the social and cultural practices of the Indic and Tibeto-Burman speakers have remained distinct. In other words, there has not been any real homogenization, because

cultural integration is a painfully slow process. What we can deduce from this fact is that linguistic habits change more rapidly than beliefs in religious or cultural systems. A parallel case can be found in the Newar population whose language loyalty has been noted as "one of the strongest in Nepal" (Malla 1989:456). We however need to distinguish between Hindu and Buddhist Newars, and it is my impression that language loyalty and cultural consciousness are breaking down more rapidly among the Hindu Newars than the Buddhist Newars. The Newars who are affluent or occupy high positions in the bureaucracy, whether Hindus or Buddhists, also reveal greater tendencies to drift away from their linguistic or cultural roots. The fertile southern Terai plains, the strongholds of the Maithili-Bhojpuri-Avadhi speakers, have also attracted increasing numbers of settlers from the hills. Although this has promoted bilingualism to some extent, a close interaction between the hill and plains people has not taken place and apparently will take more time. Another dimension to this problem is the spread of education, which unfortunately has resulted in the neglect of minority languages by the speakers themselves. The growth in education has created a new breed of young elites who adopt modern lifestyles and are indifferent to the development of their mother-tongue or the preservation of their traditional culture. All of us have met individuals who find it degrading to speak in their mother-tongue in public. Along with progress in education, other socio-economic processes are taking place, thus encouraging social mobility and social change. In this context, it is but natural for minority communities to aspire towards upward social mobility through greater proficiency in the national language or a foreign language such as English, as a key to success in life. We may point to this reality as a factor in language decay but we must at the same time realise that "the ultimate test of efforts for maintenance or change rests with the people" (Williamson 1991:135-136). In other words, if there is ethnic commitment and social integration from within the community, a language and the culture of its speakers will survive, however unfavourable or hostile the circumstances may be. The situation that currently prevails in Nepal may not be unique after all: it is an inevitable part of the sociology of all natural languages.

## 5 CONCLUSION

The language situation in Nepal is indeed very complex, so that one of the priorities that needs to be set by the government is the formulation of a consistent, well-organized language planning policy based on all available linguistic data and information. Whatever the status of the individual languages, it will be necessary for a government agency or the University to undertake sociolinguistic surveys on a regional basis to determine the language



abilities and attitudes of each target group. For example, what are the intelligibility ratings between different languages and dialects; what is the nature of bilingualism in each area in terms of mutual comprehension and extent of use; and what advantages or disadvantages are perceived by a bilingual person? It might also be very revealing to conduct area-wide surveys of the language attitudes of a speech community towards the standard language. The very restricted use of Nepali in the Terai regions of Nepal is well known, and although there is no open opposition to the imposition of Nepali in administration and education, Hindi continues to serve the function of a *lingua franca* in many parts of the southern plains. Similarly the study of the impact of language on social, political and educational fields can also provide essential input to language policy and its implementation. The Report of the National Languages Policy Recommendation Commission has made a good beginning by preparing a groundwork for sociolinguistic research which can be of great value to government planners, education officers and administrators who need to formulate various policies on management of human resources. Another area that the government ought to regard more seriously is the question of basic education in the mother-tongue, bilingual education, and adult literacy programmes. The constitutional provision for mother-tongue education, for example, is a welcome step but does not involve any government participation or commitment to the programme. If direct financial or material support is not feasible, the government should at least provide policy direction and co-ordination in curriculum and textbook development or development of teacher expertise. The Commission's recommendation to establish a Chair or a separate administrative unit under the CTSDC/Ministry of Education to implement and co-ordinate the mother-tongue education programme is therefore relevant and laudable.

At the community level there is an equally urgent need to promote awareness of the rich heritage of a language and the culture of its speakers. Bandhu (1995) in his paper on "Linguistics in Nepal" provided many practical suggestions to fulfill the aspirations of various linguistic and ethnic communities. Some of the commendable ideas he raised include the promotion of minority languages through their use as media of instruction in basic primary education and literacy programmes, the preservation of languages which are facing extinction, and the training of manpower to develop the potential for linguistic research by Nepalese scholars themselves. He has rightly pointed out that "the promotion of a language involves selection of norms, standardization, cultivation and elaboration of the language" (p. 14). The decision to use a minority language such as Magar as a medium of instruction at the primary level, for example, would require decisions about the script, as well as an

extensive elaboration of Magar vocabulary to provide terms for modern school subjects like mathematics, science, social studies, etc. Further, there will be questions about what forms of vocabulary or grammar are to be chosen for the preparation of teaching materials or what dialect variety would represent the standard form of the language. All these tasks obviously require a good deal of expertise and sufficient background in descriptive and applied linguistics. The Central Department of Linguistics which has now been established in the University can fulfill the long-term need to produce trained manpower in linguistics and to create an institutional framework for future programmes of teaching and research on the languages of Nepal. The initial effort or desire to preserve and promote a language, however, must come from the speakers themselves. The government, the Royal Nepal Academy, or the University can of course sponsor survey projects, descriptive and comparative studies, workshops on teacher education, or production of teaching materials in the mother-tongue to help support the process of standardization by developing new uses of a language, thus extending its communicative functions to respond to the needs of a modern state. Toward this end, linguists and language teachers must take the initiative to conduct basic research on the lesser known languages, particularly those that have not been described, so that we have a better understanding and insight into social structure and inter-cultural communication systems. Any addition to our knowledge of the sociology of Nepalese languages would be relevant to the development needs of Nepal and at the same time contribute to the country's ideal of achieving national integration through recognition of cultural pluralism. A multilingual state with an emerging democratic system cannot continue to follow a monolithic language policy.

# APPENDIX 1: A COMPARATIVE TABLE OF NEPAL'S LANGUAGES AND NUMBER OF SPEAKERS.

<i>Language</i>	<i>1952/54</i>	<i>1961</i>	<i>1971</i>	<i>1981</i>	<i>1991</i>
<b>A. Indo-Aryan</b>					
1. Nepali	4,013,667	4,796,528	6,060,758	8,757,361	9,302,880
2. Maithili	918,211	1,130,402	1,327,242	1,668,309	2,191,900
3. Bhojpuri	16,335	577,357	806,480	1,142,805	1,379,717
4. Tharu	359,594	406,907	495,881	545,685	993,388
5. Awadhi	328,408	477,090	316,950	234,343	374,638
6. Urdu	32,545	2650			202,208
7. Hindi	80,181	2867			170,997
8. Rajbanshi	35,543	55,803	55,124	59,383	85,558
9. Bengali		9915			27,712
10. Danuwar	9138	11,624	9959	13,522	23,721
11. Marwadi		6176			16,514
12. Majhi	5729	5895			11,322
13. Darai	3084	1645			6520
14. Kumal	3510	1724			1413
[15. English					2784]
<b>B. Tibeto-Burman</b>					
1. Tamang	494,745	528,812	555,056	522,416	904,456
2. Newar	383,184	377,727	459,979	448,746	690,007
3. Rai Group	236,049	239,745	232,264	221,353	439,312
4. Magar	273,780	254,675	288,383	212,681	430,264
5. Limbu	145,511	138,705	170,787	129,234	254,088
6. Gurung	162,192	157,778	171,609	174,464	227,918
7. Sherpa	70,132	84,229	79,218	73,589	121,829
8. Chepang	14,262	9247			25,097
9. Dhimal	5671	8188			15,014
10. Thami	10,240	9046			14,400
11. Thakali	3307	4134		5289	7113
12. Jirel	2721	2757			4229
13. Raji	1514	801			2959
14. Byanshi	1786				1314
15. Sunuwar	17,299	13,362	20,380	10,650	
16. Lepcha		1272			
17. Meche	523	938			
18. Pahari	864	3002			
19. Hayu	233				

<i>Language</i>	<i>1952/54</i>	<i>1961</i>	<i>1971</i>	<i>1981</i>	<i>1991</i>
<b><i>C. Austric/Munda</i></b>					
1. Sattar/Santhal	16,751	29,485	23,853	28,207	33,332
<b><i>D. Dravidian</i></b>					
1. Jhangadh/ Dhangadh	4832	9140			15,175
Others	70,340	114,302	487,060	764,802	50,4171
Unspecified	752	6432			9157
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>8,235,079</b>	<b>9,412,996</b>	<b>11,555,983</b>	<b>15,022,839</b>	<b>18,491,097</b>

## REFERENCES

- BANDHU, Chudamani. 1993. "Language planning in the Nepalese context." Paper presented to the National Language Policy Symposium, Kathmandu. [In Nepali.]
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. "Linguistics in Nepal." Paper presented to the National Conference on Social Sciences in Nepal, Center for Nepal and Asian Studies/Tribhuvan University, Kathmandu, September 13-15.
- COOPER, Robert L. 1989. *Language Planning and Social Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- GRIMES, Barbara F. (ed). 1991. *The Ethnologue: the Languages of the World*. Texas: Wycliffe Bible Translators.
- HALE, Austin. 1993. "Sociolinguistic survey of Nepal: a proposal." Research Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies/TU-Summer Institute of Linguistics.
- HANSON, Gerd. 1991. *The Rai of Eastern Nepal: Ethnic and Linguistic Grouping*. Findings of the Linguistics Survey of Nepal. Edited with an Introduction by Werner Winter. Kathmandu: Linguistic Society of Nepal—Centre for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- KANSAKAR, Tej R. 1993. "The Tibeto-Burman languages of Nepal: a general survey." *Contributions to Nepalese Studies*, 20.2:165-173.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. "Language policy and language planning in Nepal." *The Rising Nepal*, January 7.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. "Language planning and modernization in Nepal." Paper presented to the 16th Annual Conference of the Linguistic Society of Nepal, November 27.
- KANSAKAR, Vidya Bir Singh. 1989. "Population of Nepal." *Nepal Perspectives on Continuity and Change*, ed. by K.P. Malla, 28-50. Kirtipur: Center for Nepal and Asian Studies.

- Malla, Kamal P. 1989. "Language and society in Nepal." *Nepal Perspectives on Continuity and Change*, ed. by K.P. Malla, 445-466. Kirtipur: Center for Nepal and Asian Studies.
- National Languages Policy Recommendation Commission Report*. 1993. Kathmandu: Prajna Bhavan.
- POKHAREL, Madhav P. 1993. "Language policy and language planning that need to be adopted in Nepal." Paper presented to the National Language Policy Symposium, Kathmandu. [In Nepali.]
- Statistical Year Book of Nepal*. 1994. Kathmandu: Central Bureau of Statistics.
- SUBBA, Subhadra et al. 1974-77. *Studies in Bilingualism*, Parts I, II & III. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University Institute of Nepal and Asian Studies.
- TOBA, Sueyoshi. 1992. *Language Issues in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Samdan Books and Stationers.
- TROYER, Les. 1974. "Linguistics and development in Nepal." *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 1.2:107-118.
- WILLIAMSON, Robert C. 1991. *Minority Languages and Bilingualism: Case Studies in Maintenance and Shift*. Norwood, New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation.
- YADAV, Ramawatar. 1992. "The use of the mother tongue in primary education: the Nepalese Context." *Contributions to Nepalese Studies* 19.2:177-190.
- YADAVA, Yogendra P. 1993. "Language development in Nepal." Paper presented to the National Language Policy Symposium, Kathmandu. [In Nepali.]