



Research article

Non-Native Authors' Motivations in the Writing of Bengali Grammars in English: Prefatory Texts from Halhed (1778) to David (2015)

Abu Ula Muhd. Hasinul Islam*

Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), University of Rajshahi, Bangladesh

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the prefatory texts of Bengali grammars in English authored by non-native writers, spanning from Nathaniel Brassey Halhed (1778) to Anne Boyle David (2015), to evaluate their practical goals and intended outcomes. Of the 21 descriptive and reference grammars identified, 19 were analyzed; 2 were inaccessible to the researcher. Most grammars were influenced by colonial administrative needs and scholarly demands, with missionary perspectives largely restrained. Findings reveal that no grammar explicitly adhered to any specific linguistic theory. However, methodological innovations can be noticed. Early works, such as those by Halhed (1778) and Carey (1801), emphasized Sanskritic influences, whereas later grammars by Forbes, Beames, and Page prioritized practical language-learning applications. More recent contributions, such as Thompson (2012) and David (2015), reflect a shift toward descriptive approaches, incorporating diverse linguistic samples, diglossic varieties, and digital technologies. David's grammar, developed as part of a project addressing lesser-documented languages, is particularly noteworthy for its digital advancements. The study concludes that non-native grammarians, influenced by diverse socio-political and professional motivations, have made significant contributions to Bengali grammaticography. It therefore encourages native Bengali linguists to build on this foundation and produce grammars in English that cover the full range of the language's varieties and registers, while incorporating digital technologies for global accessibility.

ARTICLE INFO

Article timeline:

Date of Submission:

19 January, 2025

Date of Acceptance:

07 May, 2026

Article available online:

24 June, 2026

Keywords:

Grammaticography

Bengali grammar

Bengali grammar in English

Non-native Bengali

grammarians

Introduction

Bengali grammars in English have a rich history that began with European missionaries, East India Company officers and scholars. The earliest example of Bengali grammar, *Vocabulario em idioma Bengalla, e Portuguez* by Manoel da Assumpcam (1743), was in Portuguese. However, it was Nathaniel Brassey Halhed's pioneering work, *A Grammar of the Bengal Language* (1778), that marked the start of a long tradition of Bengali grammars in the English language. Over the next two and a half centuries, this tradition has continued, with numerous non-native linguists contributing to the description and documentation of Bengali grammar in English. Notably, Rammohun Roy, a native Bengali, authored his Bengali grammar in English, *Bengalee Grammar in the English Language*, in 1826 before writing one in Bengali, *goudiya byakaran*, in 1833. Conversely, the first comprehensive Bengali grammar in Bengali, *Bangabhasar Byakaran: A Grammar of Bengali*

Language Adapted to the Young in Easy Questions and Answers, was produced by English missionary Reverend James Keith in 1820 (Hye, 2008). The proliferation of Bengali grammars authored by both native and non-native writers has persisted into the present day (Barman, 2022). Given that non-native authors began writing Bengali grammars before native authors and have continued their contributions to this day, an intriguing question arises: what motivated the non-native authors to compose Bengali grammars in English?

Selection of Grammars: A Rationale

Before selecting the grammars for this study, it is necessary to discuss what grammar is and explore its various types. Grammar can be defined as the description of a particular language, a prescriptive compilation of its rules, a description of linguistic competence, syntax or other linguistic elements. There is indeed no language

*Corresponding author: <abuhasinul@gmail.com>

without grammar (Chung & Pullum). Odlin (1994) categorizes grammatical description into four types: “grammar as prescription, grammar as description, grammar as an internalized system, and grammar as an axiomatic system” (p. 1). A language may have numerous types of grammars serving different audiences and purposes (Musa, 1991). In an atheoretical sense, grammars can be broadly classified as prescriptive, pedagogical, reference, and descriptive. It is not uncommon for a grammar to exhibit features of multiple types.

Consequently, this study focuses on reference and descriptive grammars, excluding pedagogical grammars written by non-native authors. The primary objective of pedagogical grammars is to facilitate language acquisition, which differs significantly from the aims of reference and descriptive grammars. The latter are typically more detailed, aiming to document, describe, or analyze a language for scholarly or administrative as well as general academic purposes. By narrowing the scope to descriptive and reference grammars, this study emphasizes works that reflect a broader range of objectives, including administrative, academic, and linguistic documentation. Additionally, the prefaces of pedagogical grammars are often less detailed in discussing authorial intent, focusing instead on instructional strategies or learner outcomes. This practical distinction aligns with the study’s focus on uncovering the motivations behind the creation of grammars that contribute to linguistic scholarship and documentation.

Bengali reference and descriptive grammars in English by non-native authors

The first Bengali grammar in English by Nathaniel Brassey Halhed was published in 1778. Gradually, more non-native linguists composed Bengali grammar in English over the next two and a half centuries. In the 21st century, several grammars—both reference and pedagogical—have been authored by Hanne-Ruth Thompson, as well as one by Anne Boyle David, whose grammar represents the most recent Bengali grammar in English. The following table presents a chronological list of non-native authored Bengali reference and descriptive grammars in English.

Table 1: Bengali reference and descriptive grammars in English (19 in number) written by non-native linguists

Year	Title	Author (and Editor)
1778	<i>A Grammar Of the Bengal Language</i>	Nathaniel Brassey Halhed
1801	<i>A Grammar Of the Bengalee Language (1st edition)</i>	William Carey
1805	<i>A Grammar Of the Bengalee Language (2nd edition, with additions)</i>	William Carey
1818	<i>A Grammar Of the Bengalee Language (4th edition)</i>	William Carey
1819	<i>A Bengali Grammar</i>	Rev W. Yates (Ed. J. Wenger)
1821	<i>Rudiments Of Bengali Grammar</i>	Graves Chamney Haughton
1843	<i>A Grammar Of the Bengalee</i>	William Carey

Year	Title	Author (and Editor)
	<i>Language (5th edition),</i>	
1847	<i>Introduction to The Bengali Language (Vol 1)</i>	Late Rev. W. Yates (Ed. J. Wenger)
1847	<i>Introduction to The Bengali Language (Vol 2)</i>	Late Rev. W. Yates (Ed. J. Wenger)
1862	<i>A Grammar Of The Bengali Language: To Which Is Added A Selection Of Easy Phrases And Useful Dialogues</i>	Duncan Forbes
1885	<i>A Bengali Grammar</i>	Dr. Yeats and Dr. Wenger
1885	<i>A Bengali Grammar: Also an Asamese Grammar. Being the First and Last Parts of a Bengal Manual</i>	George Frederick Nicholl
1891	<i>A Grammar of the Bengali Language Literary and Colloquial</i>	John Beames
1913	<i>A Practical Bengali Grammar</i>	W. S. Milne
1920	<i>A Manual Of The Bengali Language</i>	J. D. Anderson
1934	<i>An Introduction to Colloquial Bengali</i>	W. Sutton Page
2010	<i>Bengali A Comprehensive Grammar</i>	Hanne-Ruth Thompson
2012	<i>Bengali</i>	Hanne-Ruth Thompson
2015	<i>Descriptive Grammar of Bengali</i>	Anne Boyle David (Ed. Thomas J. Connors and Dustin A. Chacón)

Table 2: Bengali reference and descriptive grammars in English written by non-native linguists (not available to the researcher)

Year	Title	Author (and Editor)
1967	<i>Colloquial Bengali Grammar</i>	A.G. McLeod
1997	<i>Bengali Reference Grammar</i>	W. L. Smith

Review of Literature

The body of literature on grammar writing, particularly regarding authorial motivation, is sparse. Ulrike Mosel (2006) observes, “While lexicography is a well-established branch of linguistics, represented in specialized journals and handbooks, grammaticography – the art and craft of grammars – is not” (p. 41). She further notes that “[i]n contrast to grammatical analysis, grammar writing is not taught in linguistic courses or described in textbooks” (Mosel, 2006, p. 41).

Despite the vast literature related to grammar, only a few books on grammaticography exist, such as those edited by Felix K. Ameka, Alan Dench and Nicholas Evans (2006); Thomas E. Payne and David J. Weber (2007); and Nakayama, Toshihide and Karen Rice (2004). Literature evaluating Bengali grammars written in English is even more limited. Four PhD scholars and a few others have addressed these grammars. Khondkar (1976) focused exclusively on the grammar of Manoel da Assumpcam. Qayyum (1982) examined the works of Nathaniel Brassey Halhed, William Carey, and Graves Chamney Haughton, emphasizing the influence of Sanskrit. Das (n.d.) analyzed the history of Bengali grammar from Manoel da Assumpcam to Suniti Kumar

Chatterji and others in the twentieth century. Barman (2022) surveyed 127 grammars and 216 books containing Bengali grammar or grammatical information, concentrating on the elements of grammar presented. Dasgupta (2014) critiqued William Carey for using an acrolect incomprehensible to the general public. The motivations behind why non-native authors composed these grammars remain underexplored, leaving room to investigate the diversity and intensity of their intentions.

Study Objective and Method

The aim of this study is to identify the motivations behind non-native authors' composition of Bengali grammars in English, as reflected in the prefaces of these texts. A descriptive and qualitative text analysis approach has been adopted, focusing on the prefaces of various grammar texts to discern the authors' intentions.

Grammar Writing Objectives: Discussion, Findings and Analysis

As existing literature does not fully outline the possible objectives behind grammar writing, this study hypothesizes several potential motivations. While the specific reasons of individual authors may differ, early Bengali grammarians in English, many of whom were colonial civil servants or Christian missionaries, likely had administrative or missionary objectives. Additionally, authors affiliated with colleges and universities may have written grammars for educational or commercial purposes. Grammars might also be created to serve the needs of the general public. Academic curiosity, cultural exchange, or scholarly pursuits may have influenced their work. Some grammarians may have been driven by personal interest, the desire to leave a legacy, or adherence to specific linguistic theories. Notably, any single grammar book may encompass multiple objectives.

Missionary objectives

Several early non-native grammarians were missionaries whose primary goal was to spread Christianity. By producing grammars of Bengali in English, they could facilitate communication with native speakers, assist in translating religious texts, and integrate more deeply into the local culture. Their grammatical works might have been part of their broader missionary activities, including education and evangelism.

Although Carey (1801, 1805, 1818) himself was a missionary, he did not explicitly mention missionary intentions in the prefaces of any editions of his grammar. Similarly, Reverend William Yates, another missionary, refrained from disclosing such motivations in his preface. Neither Carey (1801, pp. iii-v, 1805; pp. iii-vii; 1818, pp. v-vii) nor Yates (1847, pp. iii-v) revealed any religious or missionary intention in their prefaces of their Bengali grammar books; and this is why it can be said that these grammarians may have pursued their work from a predominantly academic and applied perspectives.

Colonial administrative needs

During the colonial period, British administrators and colonial officers required comprehensive knowledge of local languages to run the administration effectively. Creating grammars in English allowed them to establish a

standardized understanding of Bengali, aiding in administrative tasks, legal documentation, and communication with native Bengalis.

Halhed (1778) emphasizes, in his preface, the necessity of learning Bengali for effective governance following the establishment of the Supreme Court of Justice in Bengal. Referring to British colonial establishment, he says that much “still remains for the completion of this grand work (p. i-ii). He presumes that the native language Bengali is one of the most important means in “the cultivation of a tight understanding and of a general medium of intercourse between the Government and its Subjects; between the Natives of Europe who are to rule, and the Inhabitants of India who are to obey” (Halhed, 1778, p. i-ii). Halhed likened this necessity to the Romans learning Greek after their conquest of Greece. Then in several paragraphs, Halhed explained why the English officers should learn Bengali. He elaborated that the successful operation of government functions—including justice, revenue collection, and commerce—depended on proficiency in the language spoken by the majority (Halhed, 1778). Halhed also framed this endeavor as a means of enhancing the British Empire's reputation “by a liberal communication of Arts and Sciences, rather than by the effusion of blood” because in this way “her new subjects should as well feel the benefits, as the necessity of submission” (Halhed, 1778, p. xxv).

Carey (1805) similarly confirms that Bengal “as the seat of the British government in India” is “the center of a great part of the commerce of the East” and so knowledge of Bengali is “a very desirable object” (p. iii). He also mentions that the local population in the courts gives evidence in Bengali (Carey, 1805). Haughton shows that there was a necessity of learning Bengali by the “servants of the East-India Company in Bengal Proper” (Haughton, 1821, p. vii). Like Halhed, he also thinks that British civil servants need to learn the language so that they can influence the native Indians to exercise higher moral improvement (Haughton, 1821). In a similar fashion, Forbes (1862) further argues that, after Hindustanee, Bengali should be prioritized as the second language for officials serving across India.

Commercial and educational purposes

Grammars were also written to meet general practical needs. For example, merchants, diplomats, and colonial officials who interacted with Bengali speakers required prearranged resources to facilitate communication. English-language grammars would have been a practical tool for these individuals, aiding them in their professional and commercial activities. Educational objectives were another motivation behind the writing of these grammars. By producing grammars in English, authors created valuable resources for learners of Bengali, both native and non-native. These works served as reference materials for language studies, translation, and cross-cultural communication, thus supporting broader educational and scholarly initiatives.

Halhed (1778) emphasizes the commercial importance of Bengali, noting that “its adoption would be no less beneficial to the Revenue department” (p. xv) as the language was integral to commerce. He highlights an

“Angular advantage” of Bengali, describing its suitability for commercial accounting due to similarities between the Bengali system of numbers and the European system (Halhed, 1778, p. xvii). Carey (1801) admits that Bengali “has been much neglected from an idea that its use is very confined” but argues that it is “the universal medium of conversation and business throughout the whole of Bengal, except among the servants of Europeans” (p. iv). Like Halhed, Carey highlights the significance of Bengali in revenue collection, as commercial transactions were conducted in the language. In later editions of his grammar (1805, 1818), Carey reiterates this objective. Haughton (1821) confirms that the grammar “when first undertaken it was not designed for publication, but merely for distribution among the students of the language” (p. xiii-xiv). He refers to the syllabus of the Hailebury College established for the civil servants of the East India Company (Haughton, 1821). He also refers to the study of Bengali in the College of Fort William in Calcutta (Haughton, 1821).

Forbes (1862) laments that the substitution of Bengali by Sanskrit at the Hailebury College affected the production of Bengali books in Europe. In response, he intended his grammar to fill this gap and assist learners. According to Milne (1913), his only excuse for writing the grammar “is the hope that it will be of some help to those who propose to take the higher examinations in Bengali, such as the High Proficiency” (p. iii). He adds that his motivation stemmed from personal experience: “When studying Bengali, I found myself greatly hampered by the want of a Grammar dealing with the colloquial idioms of the modern language” (p. iii). Page (1934) emphasizes the practical focus of his grammar, stating that it aims to provide materials and support for students learning spoken Bengali. Drawing on years of experience teaching Bengali to beginners, he explains that “the greater part of the material has been actually used in class work at the School of Oriental Studies, and found so useful and effective” (Page, 1934, p. v). He notes that publishing the material in printed form was intended to save the time otherwise spent dictating it in class (Page, 1934, pp. v-vi).

Documentation and preservation

In some cases, the aim might have been to document and preserve the linguistic features of Bengali, especially if the language was undergoing significant change or faced the threat of being endangered.

Anne Boyle David’s *Bengali: A Comprehensive Grammar* (2015) stands out as a rare example explicitly focused on documentation and preservation. David acknowledges the contributions of grammarians like Suniti Kumar Chatterji and Hanne-Ruth Thompson but remarks that “[t]here [are] far fewer up-to-date resources in English than one would expect for a language of at least 200 million speakers” (p. ix). From the Series Editor’s Preface, it is understood that the grammar has come out “of research conducted on several under-described languages at the University of Maryland Center for Advanced Study of Language” (David, 2015, p. ix). Moreover, the Foreword refers to the project as “the painstaking work of producing grammars for neglected and under-resourced languages” (David, 2015, p. vii).

David’s grammar incorporates XML technology to make it digitally parsable and accessible online, strengthening its utility as a documentation tool. Among the grammars discussed, this is the only one with such a clear emphasis on preservation through modern technological methods.

Academic curiosity and cultural and scholarly exchange

For some non-native linguists, academic curiosity and a desire to advance comparative linguistics were key motivations for writing Bengali grammars. Bengali, as a major language with a rich literary tradition, offered a unique opportunity for linguists to contribute to linguistic research. The production of these grammars also facilitated cultural and scholarly exchange, which made Bengali more accessible to Western scholars and promoted a deeper understanding of South Asian languages and cultures.

In this context, Carey (1805) discusses the practical application of learning Bengali for visitors and tourists, emphasizing the importance of understanding the local language for cultural, commercial, and scholarly purposes. In the case of his Bengali grammar, the focus definitely is on Bengal region and the Bengali language. G. F. Nicholl’s (1885) preparation of the ‘Bengali Manual,’ which includes his grammar—*A Bengali Grammar: Also an Asamese Grammar. Being the First and Last Parts of a Bengal Manual*—reflects a similar academic motivation. He appears to have been academically motivated, aiming to make a scholarly contribution, as evidenced by his decision to publish parts of the grammar early. Hanne-Ruth Thompson (2012) also illustrates the dual motivations of personal and academic interest. While she admits she was “in the process of leaving academic life at Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London,” she resolved that her “work on Bangla [would] go on” (p. xvi). Her longstanding association with SOAS, a centre for cultural and linguistic studies, undoubtedly shaped her focus on fostering cultural and scholarly exchange between South Asia and the West.

Personal interest and legacy

For some authors, personal interest in the Bengali language or the desire to leave a scholarly legacy may have been the driving forces behind their grammatical endeavors. Thus, writing a grammar could be viewed as a significant intellectual achievement that contributed to both personal and professional prestige.

Reverend William Yates’s *Introduction to the Bengali Language* (1847) offers an example of legacy-driven grammar writing. According to the editor’s preface, Yates, upon leaving India, entrusted his manuscript to an editor, expressing his concern that “it would entail too much labour upon [the editor] to publish it during [Yates’s] absence” (p. vi) and so he requested him to keep all the papers until his return. This gesture reflects his commitment to his work and his dedication suggests a strong desire to create a lasting impact in the field of grammaticography. Similarly, Nicholl’s (1885) decision to hasten the publication of parts of his planned manual indicates a commitment to leaving a scholarly mark, even before the complete manual was finalized. Hanne-Ruth Thompson’s personal connection to Bengali

is also noteworthy. Reflecting on her more than two decades of involvement with the language, she recalls how its “beautiful sounds and rhythms almost instantly cast its spell over [her] and has not let [her] go since” (Thompson, 2012, p. xv). Her deep personal interest, combined with her academic affiliation as a faculty member at SOAS, underscores her dual motivations of passion and scholarship.

Linguistic theories and methodology

That the evolution of linguistic theories may influence the writing of grammars is evident in *bangla sangbartanee byakaran* (Chakrabarty, 2016) and *sanjanani byakaran* (Bhattacharja, 1998). These two Bengali grammars authored by native Bengali scholars in Bengali are theory-laden as evident from the titles. Theory-laden grammar writing began as early as Pāṇini’s *Aṣṭādhyāyī* in ancient India and continued through Greek, Roman, medieval, and early modern linguistic traditions. However, the systematic application of linguistic theory as we understand it today was most prominently established in the 19th century with historical-comparative linguistics and reached its full development in the 20th century with modern theoretical frameworks. Eventually, non-native authors, mostly being of European origin, could have been motivated by contemporary linguistic theories and sought to apply or test these theories on Bengali, contributing to broader linguistic discourse. Differing methodological approaches are also presumed in this connection.

Although Halhed doesn’t reveal any specific theory of grammar that he may have followed, his frequent references to Sanskrit origins of Bengali demonstrate a methodological inclination. At one place while referring to three classes in Sanskrit e.g. Dhaatoos, Shabdās and Avyas, he comments that in coping up with these Sanskrit classes in Bengali “... the art of the Grammarian has found room to expand itself, and to employ all the powers of refinement” (Halhed, 1778, p. vii). Like Halhed, William Carey too has talked about Sanskrit origin of Bengali. Though not influenced by grammatical or linguistic theories, Carey (1801) followed one practical approach that is to “lay down rules, in as concise a manner as possible” (p. iii) assuming the learners of Bengali are already acquainted with grammar of a language. While referring to Sanskrit influence, Nichol (1885) points out that it is unwise to learn Sanskrit to learn Bengali, as even foreigners understand that Bengali has been put under Sanskrit in an unnecessary manner. Another methodological point he mentions is that his book uses “Roman dress” (Nicholl, 1885, p. v-vi) to present Bengali as the publisher wanted to save spaces.

Forbes (1862) has arranged the Bengali grammar following his grammars on Persian and Hindustani as those have been successful in his sense. According to him, “[i]n works of this kind methodical arrangement is a matter of far greater importance in aiding the student’s memory than writers seem to have generally taken into consideration” and so his conscious effort is to include every paragraph “as a stepping-stone to that which immediately follows” (Forbes, 1862, p. vii). He has excluded the section on prosody thinking of it to be of “little utility to the student” (Forbes, 1862, p. ix). His

methodology lies in the fact that the British resident in Bengal not only has to be able merely to speak the language, fluently and grammatically, himself but also ought to be able “to understand the numerous grades of people who speak the language fluently but not grammatically” (Forbes, 1862, p. ix).

At this point, a shift in grammaticographic methodology in the selection of sample language can be found. Beames’ (1891) objective is very clear: “I have especially aimed at making the work useful to those who desire to understand the spoken language of Bengal” (p. xxx). He also ensures that contemporary Bengali has been enriched with “copious resuscitation of Sanskrit terms ... [which are] often unintelligible to the mass of population” (Beames, 1891, p. xxx). Therefore, his methodology was to present such Bengali that would prepare the European students to communicate with the lower and middle classes. Milne (1913) writes in a similar tone, “...but none of the Grammars give much assistance towards an understanding of the living tongue of to-day” (p. iii). That is why “[t]he examples given in [his] book are to a very large extent expressions which [he] [has] actually heard in conversation or phrases taken from the works of standard authors” (p. v). The objective of W. Sutton Page (1934) lies in similar track as he hopes that his grammar should be of use not only to beginners but also to European residents in Bengal intending to “carry on a conversation in Bengali” (p. v). He confirms that “[t]he whole of the Bengali matter contained in the book is in the purely colloquial style” and further asserts that it is “the first attempt that has ever been made at a grammar of spoken Bengali as distinct from the Bengali of books” (Page, 1934, p. v). He has also included four Bengali stories with English translations. As a result, his grammar was the first to attempt a systematic treatment of spoken Bengali, incorporating phonetic transcription using the International Phonetic Alphabet to aid pronunciation.

Thompson (2012) explicitly informs that her grammar “aims to give a linguistic description of the Eastern Indo-Aryan language Bangla” (p. xv). She does not refer to any theory but she is straightforward in her grammaticographic methodology of including language samples. She explains that “Bangla is a diglossic language” and comments that “Bengalis on the whole are still very much in awe of its high literary” variety (Thompson, 2012, p. xv). She also admits that some European and American scholars also inadvertently contributed to this value judgment. She has been keen on doing away with this hierarchical thinking because to keep up with the living language, unlike traditional grammarians she has “taken sentences from spoken language, letters, contemporary journals, newspapers, adverts, high and low literature and non-fiction. The language described in this book is, quite deliberately, a non-specific Standard Colloquial Bangla” (Thompson, 2012, p. xv).

Though Ann Boyle David’s grammar stays theory-neutral, it uses modern technology and technology-based approaches. David (2015) says, “[i]n our description we have tried to be theory-neutral without being simplistic” (p. xii). She admits that any abstract description of a language is necessarily informed by theory at some level

and they “aim to be theoretically informed in as broad a way as possible, such that the descriptions and explications in this grammar will be of use not only to descriptive linguists, but to others from a variety of theoretic backgrounds” (David, 2015, p. xii). Moreover, they have intentionally created “a formal grammar which can be used to feed a morphological parser” that has been made available online to purchasers of the book (David, 2015, p. xii). Since its primary aim was to build a morphological parser, later the whole of this grammar was built around XML (Extensible Markup Language), a technology used for encoding and processing text to be both human-readable and machine-readable and XeTeX, a typesetting system that supports both Unicode and complex scripts. So this is the only grammar that has used such digital technology.

Conclusion

The analysis of prefatory texts and content reveal that the motivations of grammar authors significantly influenced their methodologies and the features of their grammars. Colonial and missionary objectives prioritized prescriptive rules and Sanskritic influences to meet practical, administrative and religious needs. Academic curiosity and scholarly exchange fostered comparative frameworks and detailed linguistic analysis. Instructional goals encouraged descriptive approaches, user-friendly formats, and accessibility for diverse audiences. These objectives, rooted in the authors’ socio-political and professional contexts, highlight the diversity in approaches adopted across different periods.

Among the seven hypothesized objectives for Bengali grammars, the missionary objective remains inconclusive, as no prefatory texts explicitly reveal its presence. Most of these grammars were shaped by

colonial administrative needs and were tailored for use in non-native educational institutions. Though none of the authors employed any specific linguistic theory, some employed deliberate methodologies in selecting language samples by focusing on diglossic, standard, or colloquial varieties. The latest grammar (David, 2015) is particularly notable for its use of digital technology and its development as part of a project that treated Bengali as a less-documented language. To meet the growing demand for accessible Bengali grammars in English, native Bengali linguists should build on existing grammaticographic resources to produce works in English that cater to both local and international audiences. These grammars should explore the full spectrum of the language—high and low varieties, colloquial and standard forms—while incorporating innovative grammatical frameworks and technologies. Such efforts would not only preserve the linguistic richness of Bengali but also foster deeper global engagement with the language).

Acknowledgement

The author thanks Prof. Swarochich Sarker, Institute of Bangladesh Studies, Rajshahi University and Prof. Rubaiyat Jahan, Institute of Education and Research, Rajshahi University for their supervisory guidance.

Funding Statement

This study was supported by a doctoral fellowship awarded by the Institute of Bangladesh Studies (IBS), Rajshahi University.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

References

- Ameka, F. K., Dench, A. & Evans, N. (Ed.) (2006). *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Barman, J. (2022). *Bangla byakaranar itihās* (History of Bangla Grammar).
- Beames, J. (1891). *A Grammar of the Bengali Language Literary and Colloquial*. The Clarendon Press.
- Bhattacharja, S. *sanjanani byakaran* (Generative Grammar). Dhaka, 1998.
- Carey, W. (1801). *A Grammar of the Bengalee Language (1st edition)*. The Mission Press.
- Carey, W. (1805). *A Grammar of the Bengalee Language (2nd edition)*. The Mission Press.
- Carey, W. (1818). *A Grammar of the Bengalee Language (4th edition)*. The Mission Press.
- Carey, W. (1843). *A Grammar of the Bengalee Language (5th edition)*. The Mission Press.
- Chakrabarty, U. (2016). *bangla sangbartanee byakaran* (Bengali Generative Grammar). Deys Publishing.
- Chung, S. & Pullum, G. “Grammar,” *Linguistic Society of America*. <https://www.linguisticsociety.org/resource/grammar>
- Das, N. (n.d.). *Bangla bhashar byakaran o tar kramabikash* (The Grammar of the Bengali Language and Its Evolution). PhD diss.: Calcutta University.
- David, A. B. (Ed. Thomas J. Connors and Dustin A. Chacón). (2015). *Descriptive Grammar of Bengali*. De Gruyter, Mouton.
- Forbes, D. (1862). *A Grammar of The Bengali Language: To Which is Added a Selection of Easy Phrases and Useful Dialogues*. Wm. H. Allen.
- Dasgupta, P. (2014). “Judges and Grammarians in Britain’s Liberal Pedagogic Performance: a Diglossic Approach to Colonial Bengal,” *Droit et Cultures*, Vol. 67, 2014-1, 151-186.
- Halhed, N. B. (1778). *A Grammar of the Bengal Language*. The Endorse Press.
- Haughton, G. C. (1821). *Rudiments of Bengálí Grammar*. Cox And Baylis
- Hinkel, Eli. (2018). “Descriptive versus Prescriptive Grammar.” *The TESOL Encyclopedia of English Language Teaching*, 2018, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0053>
- Hye, M. A. (2008). *bideshider sanskrita o bangla bhashacharcha* (Study on Contribution in Sanskrit and Bengali Language by Foreign Scholars). Dhaka University.
- Jespersen, O. (2006) *Essentials of English Grammar*. Routledge.

- Milne, W. S. (1913). *A Practical Bengali Grammar*. The Cotton Press.
- Mosel, U. (2006). "Grammaticography: The art and craft of writing grammars" in Ameka, F. K., Dench, A. & Evans, N. (Ed.) (2006). *Catching Language: The Standing Challenge of Grammar Writing*. Mouton de Gruyter.
- Musa, M. (1991). "rabindranather baijññika bakaraner dharana" (The concept of Rabindranath's scientific grammar), in *bhashachinta: prasanga o paridhi* (Reflection on Language: Context and Scope). Bangla Academy.
- Nakayama, T. & Rice, K. (Ed.). (2004). *The Art and Practice of Grammar Writing*. University of Hawai'i Press.
- Nicholl, G. F. (1885). *A Bengali Grammar: Also an Asamese Grammar. Being the First and Last Parts of a Bengal Manual*. W. H. Allen & Co.
- Odlin, T. (1994). *Perspectives on Pedagogical Grammar*. Cambridge University Press.
- Page, W. S. (1934). *An Introduction to Colloquial Bengali*. W. Heffer & Sons, Ltd.
- Payne, T. E. & Weber, D. J. (Ed.). (2007). *Perspectives on Grammar Writing*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Qayyum, M. A. (1982) *A Critical Study of the Early Bengali Grammars: Halhed to Haughton*. Asiatic Society of Bangladesh.
- Rahim, K. A. (1976). "Preface" in *The Portuguese Contribution to Bengali Prose, Grammar & Lexicography*. Bangla Academy.
- Thompson, Hanne-Ruth. (2012). *Bengali*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Yates, Late Rev. W. (Ed. J. Wenger). (1847). *Introduction to The Bengali Language (Vol 1)*. The Baptist Mission Press.