Chapter 8   Conclusions and implications

This study has, from the outset, been undertaken with two kinds of reader in mind. Firstly, an historical linguist, interested primarily in the discussion and application of theory and method. Secondly, an educated speaker of a Kamta/Rajbanshi/Northern Deshi Bangla lect, wanting to understand more about their mother tongue, its history, and its relation to other lects. My hope is that the study has been somewhat satisfactory for both kinds of reader, and also for those readers in whom the two interests are combined.

In this the final chapter, conclusions and implications are presented so as to address separately the concerns of these two kinds of reader. The conclusions presented in section 8.1 attempt to speak to the concerns of KRNB speakers, while conclusions listed in section 8.2 are geared towards the interests of historical linguists. The intention is not to repeat the historical argument of preceding chapters but to reflect on implications of this reconstruction for the contemporary status of KRNB on the one hand, and for historical linguistic methodology on the other.

8.1.   Conclusions for speakers of Kamta/Rajbanshi/Northern Deshi Bangla

It has not been the object of this study to construct a proof one way or the other on the controversial question of the contemporary status of KRNB. As argued in 1.7, the debate whether KRNB is a 'distinct language' or a 'dialect of Bangla' is for many on both sides not really about language at all, rather it is about social and *political* identity. Language status is used as a political symbol of social status—as a symbol of socio-political autonomy vs. subordination—and consequently, when it comes down to it, the debate is primarily about the status of the *speakers* not the status of the *language.* Of course, the two are interlinked, but it remains helpful to acknowledge the distinction. The debate on the socio-political status of speakers is a necessary one, but this is not the place for it. Therefore, it is my intention to remain as focussed as possible in this section on the issues surrounding the status of the language, and not get too bogged down in discussion of the socio-political status of its speakers.

Nevertheless, this much must be said: history has implications for the present, and a confused understanding of the past can lead to distorted thinking about the present realities. Furthermore, influential people with socio-political agendas (of whatever colour) can promote accounts of language history without proper consideration of the historical veracity of their statements. The simple villager, of course, has no such recourse to promote his own opinions in reply. A careful and critical reconstruction of history is necessary in order to protect the marginalised from the pseudo-historical ideologies which the powerful may wish to promote in order to justify their position.

The following conclusions may be justified on the basis of the historical reconstruction of preceding chapters:

1) A stage of linguistic history, termed in this study as 'proto-Kamta', is a justified historical reality. It is defined by linguistic changes that seem to have occurred between 1250 and 1550 AD in the community centred on Kamtapur—the relocated capital of the Kamrupa kingdom. This much is a *historical linguistic* statement, based on reconstruction of the chronology of linguistic changes. The chosen label of 'proto-Kamta' is also a historical statement, and is not intended as a justification for any contemporary political party or contemporary language name over another. The linguistic history reconstructed here shows that all KRNB lects—whether the 'Rajbanshi' of Morang district in Nepal, the '*sthaniyo bhasha*' (local language) of Rangpur in Bangladesh, or the 'Kamta' of Cooch Behar in India—share a common ancestor, which for historical reasons is termed proto-Kamta. *This common linguistic ancestor is not a fantasy created to justify a contemporary political position, but a historical entity reconstructed by the best historical linguistic methodology available to us.* On one occasion when collecting data with KRNB speakers in a remote-ish village, we were interrupted by a local official protesting that the people are "simply making up the language that you are recording" and "no-one speaks this way here"—in short that the lects in question *do not exist*. After taking information regarding the purpose of my research the official left, and, a little shaken, I returned to collecting the data from speakers whose linguistic tradition is no fantasy, but as argued in this study is almost 8 centuries old.

2) This historical stage, proto-Kamta, is reconstructed as historically parallel, not subordinate, to the historical emergence of proto-Bangla and proto-Asamiya from the common Magadhan stage. The implication of this statement is that the KRNB lects reflect a linguistic (and cultural) tradition equally as ancient as the Bangla and Asamiya linguistic traditions. This study thus confirms Clark's proposal, following Henry Frowde, that "Northern Bengali may be as old or older than standard Bengali" (1969: 85), and Grierson's statement that "Northern Bengal and Assam did not get their language from Bengal proper, but directly from the west" (Grierson 1903-28 Vol. 1: 126).

3) Kamta/Rajbanshi/Northern Deshi Bangla *is not bad, or corrupted Bangla.* Statements to this effect by numerous 19th and early 20th researchers (cf. those quoted in van Driem 2001) are simply a distortion of the historical reality. I find myself on the point of digression into the social status of the speakers, but will restrict myself to posing the following question: is it right that children who speak KRNB lects are ridiculed at school for using linguistic norms that are more ancient that the norms of Standard Colloquial Bangla? I intend no political statement whatsoever by this question, but merely to illustrate the fact that *the status of KRNB lects is historically misrepresented in contemporary north Bengal society.* See also the resolutions given in section 1.7.

4) While KRNB may have replaced an earlier Tibeto-Burman language, the shift from non-Aryan to Indo-Aryan language is *far from being unique to KRNB* and is no justification for ascribing inferior status to the KRNB lects. Klaiman writes that "It is a reasonable hypothesis … that descendants of non-Bengali tribals of a few centuries past now comprise the bulk of Bengali speakers" (Klaiman 1990: 512).

5) Since the 16th century (during the middle and modern KRNB periods), KRNB lects have not existed in isolation from broader Magadhan and NIA changes. During this period, central KRNB in particular has been shown to have undergone changes in common with Bangla and Asamiya. The KRNB, Bangla and Asamiya communities have in general *not been closed off from one another.* That is, while

their linguistic traditions are distinct from one another, they are yet intertwined, and not separate from each other. India has often been true to its motto: unity in diversity.

6) Furthermore, since the 16th century, the KRNB lects have undergone differentiation from one another. This diversification is not merely the result of 'contamination' with other languages—it is the natural course that the lects of differentiated speech communities also tend to become differentiated. Many speakers will tell me that "in Nepal they speak differently to us because they mix with Maithili" or "in Bengal they speak differently to us because they mix with Bangla", etc. etc. There is some truth to these statements, but they are far from being the whole truth of the matter. Some proto-Kamta features are maintained in parts of Nepal, or Bengal, etc. but have been changed elsewhere; some innovative and unique features have sprung up in each of these different regions, and are unrelated to the ecologies of language contact. Linguistic differentiation is just part and parcel of linguistic history. A consequence of this is that when speakers in Nepal and Cooch Behar use quite different linguistic varieties in songs, videos, newspapers, etc. this is not a denial of their linguistic history, but because of it. Their history has a common origin 500 years ago, but since then there has been much diversification—to the point where lects at different points in the continuum share low inherent intelligibility without acquired bilingualism. As a result, there are today *two* distinct standards emerging in the literature of KRNB speakers. The variety of *central Jhapa* features in an increasing number of publications aimed at speakers in Nepal and Bihar. The variety of *eastern Cooch Behar* likewise is increasingly used for publications aimed at the Rajbanshis and deshi Muslims of Northern West Bengal and western Assam.

7) The standardisation of Bangla, Asamiya, Nepali and Hindi, and the propagation of these standardised varieties during the 19th and 20th centuries has had significant effects upon the KRNB lects. The influence of Hindi has been reconstructed for Nepal KRNB (Rajbanshi) and Bihar KRNB (Surjapuri) in section 7.5.2.2; the influence of standard colloquial Bangla has been reconstructed for KRNB lects in West Bengal and northern Bangladesh; though the most significant influence is of

standard colloquial Asamiya upon the KRNB lects around Bongaigaon in Assam (cf. 7.5.4.2).

8) The absence of an early standardised form of KRNB used in written literature is not simply the fault of external powers. As I have undertaken this reconstruction of linguistic history it has struck me that *patronisation of Bangla and Asamiya written varieties by the Koch kings—rather than the mother tongue of their subjects—during the middle and modern KRNB periods is a major reason why these lects have been subsequently accorded the status of 'dialect' of either Bangla and Asamiya*. When Grierson categorised 'Rajbanshi' as a 'dialect of Bangla', I am quite sure that this was based on (a) the Indo-Aryan character of the lect; coupled with (b) the absence of a large written literature in the lect; and (c) the patronisation of written Bangla and Asamiya varieties by the Koch Kings. (Unlike Chauduri 1939, Grierson does not seem to have given much importance to oral literature when categorising Indo-Aryan lects).

9) Given this *modus operandi* behind the handing out of 'dialect' status in the *Linguistic Survey of India*, this status is not irreversible. With the development of an increasing written literature in the KRNB varieties of Jhapa and of Cooch Behar, the question of recognition becomes worthy of reconsideration. Let me reiterate that I am commenting here on the social status of the lects, not the socio-political status of speakers. The situation can be compared with the status of 'dialect of Bengali' given previously both to Asamiya and Oriya. Mohanty describes the following episode from 1869 during what he terms 'the Bengali language dispute':

> Dr. Mitra [an eminent Bengali historiographer] asserted that the population of Orissa being barely 20 lakhs [2 million] it would be an absurdity to maintain a separate language for so few people … In the course of the agitation attempts were not only made to prove that the Oriya language did not have a separate identity but books and articles were printed which distorted the history of the land. In 'Utkal Hitaisini' (the periodical of the domiciled Bengalis) it was said that this land owed its development in religion, language and administration to Bengal. (Mohanty 1982: 22-23)

As demonstrated by the present recognition of Asamiya and Oriya, the status of 'dialect' once given need not be irrevocably binding. The further example could be given of the recent recognition of Maithili.

10) A further lesson which can be learnt from the history of relations between Assam and Bengal is that controversial relationships between different language communities need not always remains so. Chatterji (1963) wrote that "at least one Bengali scholar settled in Assam … has sought to make partial atonement for the injustice done to Assam's language by serving the same language by his literary and other publications in it". Similar demonstrations of *rapprochement* between linguistically distinct communities are to be welcomed also in the case of relations between the Bangla and Kamta/Rajbanshi/Northern Deshi Bangla speech communities.

8.2. Conclusions for historical linguists

The findings of the present study are now evaluated for an audience of historical linguists, with a focus on the success or otherwise of the innovative methods which played a large part in this reconstruction. As these statements will be (hopefully) less controversial than those in section 8.1, they are outlined in a more summarised form and without too much hedging of the point.

1) While historical documentation of a language can be an aid to reconstructing its linguistic history, its absence does not negate the possibility of such reconstruction. This point may seem so obvious as to go without saying to historical linguists working in, for example, the Austronesian family of languages whose history has been quite thoroughly reconstructed despite the absence of historical documentation. However, as has been mentioned several times in this study, historical studies in Indo-Aryan have been almost exclusively of written varieties, using texts of different eras as the fixed points in establishing chronology of linguistic changes. Reconstruction of the history of unwritten Indo-Aryan lects has rarely been attempted.

2) Sociohistorical criteria for sequencing changes contribute more to historical reconstruction than linguistic criteria, because most innovations are linguistically

independent of each other. That is, of all the changes that a set of languages undergoes, only a few logically require a relative chronology due to bleeding and feeding of linguistic conditions. Other criteria must be used for sequencing, and in the absence of historical documentation (and perhaps even when it is present), sociohistorical criteria are the best (and may be the only) option available to the historical linguistic.

3) Sociohistorical sequencing need not be an *ad hoc* approach but can be formalised on the basis of a sociohistorical theory of language change. It has been one of the goals of this study to develop such a procedure and demonstrate both its theoretical well-foundedness and empirical usefulness.

4) A sociohistorical theory of language change, when applied to methodology of historical reconstruction, can substantially increase our ability to reconstruct linguistic history. This *theory* of change has been accepted by historical linguists for quite some time now, but little effort has been made to bring our *methodologies* in line with the *theory*. This study has (a) developed the sociohistorical theory so as to draw out the connections with reconstruction methodology, and (b) re-articulated the reconstruction methodology so as to be explicitly in line with the sociohistorical theory.

5) The re-articulated methodology is not *complementary* to the family tree model, but rather *subsumes* that model as well as others. This approach does not negate previous reconstruction which has assumed a family tree-like shape to linguistic history, but accounts both for why the tree diagram works in some cases, and doesn't work elsewhere. Where linguistic history is family-tree 'shaped' it is because the SCEs were characterised by division, or, because the historical linguist has chosen to only reconstruct propagation events that represent divisions of communities. The present approach subsumes such analyses, but also opens up new possibilities of analysis in cases of non-discrete division of lects—where propagation events occur through *reintegration* of speech communities as well as division.

6) Sociohistorical methods of reconstruction depend on a robust reconstruction of linguistic innovations, and a consideration of the phylogenetic diagnostic value of each individual innovation. Therefore, *historical linguistic reconstruction must always precede sociohistorical linguistic reconstruction*.

7) Sociohistorical sequencing of changes depends upon (a) disjunctions in the ranges of changes, and (b) sociohistorical or geographical phenomena which coincide with at least some of the incongruent ranges. When either of these factors are absent the method will be less succesful.

8) Reconstruction which stops at the linguistic innovations must either (a) depend on textual evidence to establish chronology of innovations (e.g. Chatterji 1926); (b) slip in unexamined sociohistorical assumptions about the 'normalcy' of SC division in the guise of a family tree model of change (e.g. Pattanayak 1966); or (c) conclude with a dialectological map instead of a coherent account of linguistic history (e.g. Maniruzzaman 1977). By viewing linguistic history through the lens of sociohistorical propagation of changes between speakers, the strengths of each of these three approaches are given a cohesive framework within which they can be integrated.

Interaction between speakers is the mechanism by which propagation of linguistic change occurs, and reconstruction of linguistic history is understandably more successful when founded on this principle.

References

Acharyya, N. N. 1966. *The history of medieval Assam (from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century).* Gauhati: Omsons publications.

Ahmed, Khan Chowdhuri Amantulla. 1936. *Cooch Beharer Ityhas (A history of Cooch Behar, in Bengali).* Cooch Behar: Published under the authority of the Cooch Behar State.

Aikhenvald, A. I. U. and Robert M. W. Dixon (eds.). 2001. *Areal diffusion and genetic inheritance: problems in comparative linguistics.* edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Andrews, Avery. 1985. The major functions of the noun phrase. In Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description.* 62-154. Cambridge/New York: Cambridge University Press.

Anttila, Raima. 1989. *Historical and comparative linguistics.* Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Anttila, Raimo. 1972. *An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics.* New York: Macmillan.

Bandyopadhyay, Asitkumar. 1991. আঞ্চলিক বাংলা ভাষার অভিধান (*A dictionary of dialectal Bengali language).* Kolkata: Calcutta University Press. I.

Barma, Dharma Narayan. 1991. *A step to Kamata-Behari language.* Adhikari: Minati Barma.

Barma, Dharma Narayan. 2000. কামতাপুরী ভাষা-সাহিত্যের রুপরেখা. Tufanganj: Raydak.

Barua, B. K. 2003. *A cultural history of Assam: early period.* 4th edition. Guwahati, Assam: Bina Library.

Baruah, Sanjib and Colin P. Masica. 2001. Assamese. In Jane Garry and Carl R. Galvez Rubino (eds.), *Facts about the world's languages: an encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present.* 43-47. New York: H.W. Wilson.

Bhakat, Dwijendra Nath. 2004. Origin, formation and development of Rajbansi language. In Dwijendra Nath Bhakat (ed.), রাজবংশী ভাষা প্রসঙ্গ. 37-47. Golakganj (Assam): Centre for Ethnic Studies and Research (CESR).

Bhattacharya, Pramod Chandra. 1975. Sino-Tibetan (Boro) elements in Assamese, Bengali and north-eastern Indic languages. *Indian Linguistics* 36 (3): 240-246.

Bhattacharya, Sudhindra Nath. 1943. State of Bengal under Jahangir. In Ramesh Chandra Majumdar and Jadu Nath Sarkar (eds.), *The History of Bengal.* v.1,2, bibl., illus., maps. Dacca: University of Dacca.

Bhattacharya, Tanmoy. 2001. Bangla. In Jane Garry and Carl R. Galvez Rubino (eds.), *Facts about the world's languages: an encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present.* 65-71. New York: H.W. Wilson.

Bhattacharyya, Sudhindra Nath. 1929. *A History of Mughal North-east Frontier Policy.* Calcutta: Reprinted 1994 by R.N. Bhattacharya, Calcutta, and 1998 by Spectrum, Gauhati.

Blench, Roger and Matthew Spriggs. 1998. General introduction. In Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs (eds.), *Archaeology and language II: archaeological data and linguistic hypotheses.* 209-261. London / New York: Routledge. One world archaeology, 29.

Bloch, Jules. 1920. *La formation de la langue marathe*. Paris: E. Champion. Bibliothéque de l'école des hautes études; 215, Sciences historiques et philologiques.

Bloomfield, Leonard. 1935. *Language*. London: George Allen & Unwin.

Boehm, Ed. ms. Case Marking in Dangaura Tharu. 4/14/2004. 11p.

Bubenik, Vit. 2003. Prākrits and Apabhramśa. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages*. 204-249. London / New York: Routledge.

Cardona, George and Dhanesh Jain (eds.). 2003. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. edition. London / New York: Routledge.

Chambers, J. K. and Peter Trudgill. 1998. *Dialectology*. 2nd edition. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge textbooks in linguistics.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1926. *The origin and development of the Bengali language*. Reprinted 1985. New Delhi: Rupa.

Chatterji, Suniti Kumar. 1963. *The place of Assam in the history and civilisation of India*. Calcutta: Bengal publishers, 14 Bankimm Chatterji Street.

Chaudhuri, Sambhu Chandra. 1939. Notes on the Rangpur dialect. *Indian Linguistics* 7: 297-315.

Chaudhuri, Sambhu Chandra. 1940. North Bengali Dialects: Rajshahi. *Indian Linguistics* 7: 418-431.

Choudhury, Pratap Chandra. 1966. *The history of civilisation of the people of Assam to the twelfth century A.D.* 2nd edition. Gauhati: Dept of Historical and Antiquarian Studies in Assam.

Clark, Robert Henry. 1969. A study of the religious customs and practices of the Rajbangshis of North Bengal. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Hartford Seminary Foundation, 598p.

Comrie, Bernard. 1978. Ergativity. In Winfred P. Lehmann (ed.), *Syntactic Typology*. 329-394. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Croft, William. 2000. *Explaining language change: an evolutionary approach*. Harlow, England / New York: Longman. Longman linguistics library.

Damant, G. H. 1873. On the dialect of the Palis. *The Indian Antiquary* V (II): 101-102.

Das, Dhirendra Nath. 1990. The dialects of Goalpara and Kamrup: a comparative analysis. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Gauhati, 340p.

Das, Nirmal. 2001. উত্তরবঙ্গের ভাষাপ্রসঙ্গ: *A collection of investigative papers on some sociolinguistic situations of North Bengal*. Kolkata: Sahitya Bihar.

Dasgupta, Dipankar. 1978. *Linguistic studies in Juang, Kharia Thar, Lodha, Mal-Pahariya, Ghatoali, Pahariya*. Calcutta: Anthropological Survey of India, Government of India.

Dasgupta, Probal. 2003. Bangla. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages*. 351-390. London / New York: Routledge.

Dash, G.N. 1982. *Descriptive morphology of Oriya*. Santiniketan, West Bengal: Visva-Bharati Research Publications.

Datta, B. 1971. Dialects of Goalpara district. *The Assam Academy Review* 1: 53-74.

Driem, George van. 2001. *Languages of the Himalayas: an ethnolinguistic handbook of the greater Himalayan region*. Leiden / Boston: Brill.

Enfield, N. J. 2003. *Linguistic epidemiology: semantics and grammar of language contact in mainland Southeast Asia*. London / New York: Routledge.

Eppele, John and Jonathan Grimes. 2001. The Rajbanshi of Nepal: a sociolinguistic study. Nepal National Languages Preservation Institute.

Ferguson, C.A. and M. Chowdhury. 1960. The phonemes of Bengali. *Language* 36: 22-59.

Ferguson, Charles A. 2000. Diglossia. In Li Wei (ed.), *The bilingualism reader.* 65-80. London: Routledge.

Gait, Edward Albert. 1905. *A history of Assam.* Repr. Calcutta 1963: Thacker Spink & Co.

Geraghty, Paul A. 1983. *The history of the Fijian languages.* Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.

Gopal, Ram. 1966. *Linguistic affairs of India.* London: Asia publishing house.

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

Goswami, Golok Chandra. 1966. *An introduction to Assamese phonology.* Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Institute.

Goswami, Golok Chandra and Jyotiprakash Tamuli. 2003. Asamiya. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages.* 391-443. London / New York: Routledge.

Goswami, Upendranath. 1970. *A study on Kamrupi: a dialect of Assamese.* Gauhati: Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies.

Goswami, Upendranath. 1974. The language of north Bengal and western Assam. *Journal of the University of Gauhati* 1.

Grierson, George Abraham. 1877. Notes on the Rangpur dialect. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* xlvi (Pt. I): 185-226.

Grierson, George Abraham. 1903-28. *Linguistic survey of India.* Calcutta, Repr. Delhi 1967: Motilal Banarsidass.

Grierson, George Abraham. 1980 [1887]. *Seven grammars of the dialects and subdialects of the Bihari language, spoken in the province of Bihar, in the eastern portion of the North-western Provinces, and in the northern portion of the Central Provinces. Part VIII.* Varanasi: Bharatiya.

Habib, Irfan. 1982. *An atlas of the Mughal Empire: political and economic maps with detailed notes, bibliography and index.* Delhi: Oxford University Press.

Haldar, Gopal. 1986. *A comparative grammar of East Bengali dialects.* Calcutta: Puthipatra.

Hodgson, Brian Houghton. 1880. *Miscellaneous essays relating to Indian subjects.* London: Trubner.

Hull, David L. 1988. *Science as a process: an evolutionary account of the social and conceptual development of science.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press. Science and its conceptual foundations.

Huson, Daniel H. and David Bryant. 2006. Application of Phylogenetic Networks in Evolutionary Studies. *Molecular Biology and Evolution* 23 (2): 254-267.

Hutchins, Edwin and Brian Hazlehurst. 1995. How to invent a shared lexicon: the emergence of shared form-meaning mappings in interaction. In Esther Goody (ed.), *Social intelligence and interaction.* 53-67. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Islam, Safiqul. 1992. রাজশাহীর উপভাষা (*The dialect of Rajshahi).* Dhaka: Bangla Academy.

Jha, Subhadra. 1985 [1958]. *The formation of the Maithili language.* New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal.

Joshy, Rose Chand and Maina Joshy. ms. A write-up on Kamta/Rajbongshi: Phonemic summary.

Kakati, Banikanta. 1962. *Assamese, its formation and development*. 2nd. edition. Revised and edited by Golockchandra Goswami. Reprinted 1995. Gauhati: Lawyer's Book Stall.

Katre, Sumitra Mangesh. 1968. *Problems of reconstruction in Indo-Aryan*. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.

Keller, Rudi. 1994. *On language change: the invisible hand in language*. London / New York: Routledge. Trans by Brigitte Nerlich.

Khondakar, Abdur Rahim. 1998. বরেন্দ্র ভূমির ভাষা (The language of the land of Barendra). In Md. Momtazur Rahman, A.K.M. Zakaria, Saifuddin Chowdhuryet al (eds.), বরেন্দ্র অঞ্চলের ইতিহাস (*A history of the Varendra region*). Rajshahi: Office of the Divisional Commissioner.

Kirch, Patrick Vinton and Roger Curtis Green. 2001. *Hawaiki, ancestral Polynesia: an essay in historical anthropology*. Cambridge, U.K. / New York: Cambridge University Press.

Klaiman, M.H. 1990. Bengali. In Bernard Comrie (ed.), *The world's major languages*. 490-513. New York / Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Koch, Harold. 1996. Reconstruction in Morphology. In Mark Durie and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.), *The comparative method reviewed: regularity and irregularity in language change*. 218-263. New York: Oxford University Press.

Koch, Harold and Pascale Jacq. 2003. Towards the reconstruction of Pama-Nyungan verb inflection. Centre for Research on Language Change, Australian National University. 8p.

Kodesia, Krishna. 1969. *The problems of linguistic states in India*. Delhi: Sterling.

Koul, Omkar N. 2003. Kashmiri. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages*. 895-952. London / New York: Routledge.

Labov, William. 1965. On the mechanism of linguistic change. In Charles W. Kreidler (ed.), *Georgetown University monograph series on languages and linguistics, no. 18*. Reprinted in John J. Gumperz and Dell Hymes (eds.), *Directions in sociolinguistics: the ethnography of communication*. (Second edition, 1986), 512-538. London: Basil Blackwell.

Labov, William. 1966. *The social stratification of English in New York City*. Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Labov, William. 1994. *Principles of linguistic change: internal factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Labov, William. 2001. *Principles of linguistic change: social factors*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Ladefoged, Peter. 1971. *Preliminaries to linguistic phonetics*. [Rev. edition. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Ladefoged, Peter and Ian Maddieson. 1996. *The sounds of the world's languages*. Oxford, UK / Cambridge, MA: Blackwell. Phonological theory.

Lass, Roger. 1997. *Historical linguistics and language change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge studies in Linguistics, 81.

LeDoux, Joseph E. 1998. *The emotional brain: the mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. 1st Touchstone edition. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1992. *Historical linguistics: an introduction*. 3rd edition. London / New York: Routledge.

LePage, Robert B. and Andrée Tabouret-Keller. 1985. *Acts of identity: creole-based approaches to language and ethnicity*. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lynch, John, Malcolm Ross and Terry Crowley. 2002. *The Oceanic languages*. Richmond, Surrey: Curzon. Curzon language family series; 1.

Majumdar, Durgadas. 1977. Koch Bihar, West Bengal District Gazetteers

Majumdar, Paresh Chandra. 1970. *A historical phonology of Oriya*. Calcutta: Sanskrit college.

Majumdar, Ram Prasad. 1955. A dark chapter in the history of Bengal. *Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society* XLI (Part I): 59-67.

Majumdar, Ramesh Chandra and Jadu Nath Sarkar. 1943. *The History of Bengal*. Dacca: University of Dacca.

Maniruzzaman. 1977. Controlled historical reconstruction based on five Bengali dialects. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Mysore, 410p.

Marshall, Jonathan. 2004. *Language change and sociolinguistics: rethinking social networks*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Masica, Colin P. 1991. *The Indo-Aryan languages*. Cambridge / New York: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge language surveys.

Masica, Colin P. 1992. South Asia as a sociolinguistic area? In Edward C. Dimock, Jr., Braj B. Kachru and Bh. Krishnamurti (eds.), *Dimensions of sociolinguistics in South Asia: Papers in memory of Gerald B. Kelley*. New Delhi: Oxford & IBH.

Mendoza-Denton, Norma. 2002. Language and identity. In J. K. Chambers, Peter Trudgill and Natalie Schilling-Estes (eds.), *The handbook of language variation and change*. xii+807. Malden, MA / Oxford: Blackwell.

Milroy, James. 1992. *Linguistic variation and change*. Oxford: Blackwell. Language in Society, 19.

Milroy, James. 1997. Internal vs external motivations for linguistic change. *Multilingua* 16 (4): 311-323.

Milroy, Lesley. 1987. *Language and social networks*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Blackwell.

Misra, Haripriya. 1975. *Historical Oriya morphology*. 1st edition. Varanasi: Bharata Manisha.

Mohanty, Nivedita. 1982. *Oriya nationalism: quest for a united Orissa 1866-1936*. New Delhi: Manohar.

Morrison, David A. 2005. Networks in phylogenetic analysis: new tools for population biology. *International Journal for Parasitology* 35: 567-582.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The ecology of language evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Cambridge Approaches to Language Contact.

Nathan, Mirza, II. 1936. *Baharistan-i-Ghaybi: a history of the Mughal Wars in Assam, Cooch Behar, Bengal, Bihar and Orissa during the reigns of Jahargir and Shahjahan*. Shillong: Government of Assam, Department of Historical and Antiquarian Studies. Trans by Moayyidul Islam Borah.

Ngwazah, Liahey, Scott Turner and Matthew Toulmin. 2006. A Sociolinguistic survey of the Kamta, Rajbanshi, and Surjapuri languages and dialects in West Bengal, Assam and Bihar states of India. New Life Computer Institute.

Nichols, Johanna. 1996. The comparative method as heuristic. In Mark Durie and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.), *The comparative method reviewed: regularity and irregularity in language change*. 39-71. New York: Oxford University Press.

Oksaar, Els. 1999. Social networks, communicative acts and the multilingual individual. Methodological issues in the field of language change. In Ernst Hêakon Jahr (ed.), *Language change: advances in historical sociolinguistics*. viii, 308. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter. Trends in linguistics. Studies and monographs, 114.

Pal, A.K. 1966. Phonemes of a Dacca dialect and the importance of tone. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal* 7: 1-2.

Pattanayak, Debi Prasanna. 1966. *A controlled historical reconstruction of Oriya, Assamese, Bengali and Hindi.* The Hague: Mouton & Co. Janua linguarum: Series practica, 31.

Pawley, Andrew and Malcolm D. Ross. 1993. Austronesian historical linguistics and culture history. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 22: 425-459.

Pawley, Andrew and Malcolm D. Ross. 1995. The prehistory of Oceanic languages: a current view. In Peter Bellwood, James J. Fox and Darrell Tryon (eds.), *The Austronesians: historical and comparative perspectives.* 39-74. Canberra: Dept. of Anthropology, Australian National University.

Pawley, Andrew and Timoci Sayaba. 1971. Fijian dialect divisions; eastern and western. *Journal of Polynesian Society* 80 (4): 405-436.

Pischel, R. 1981 [1900]. *A grammer of the Prakrit languages.* Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Trans by Subhadra Jha.

Purkait, Nikhilesh. 1989. বাংলা অসমীয়া ও উড়িয়ার উপভাষার ভৈগোলিক জরিপ (*Dialect geography of Bengali, Assamese, and Oriya).* Calcutta: Subarnarekha.

Ramachandran, Subhadra. 2001. Oriya. In Jane Garry and Carl R. Galvez Rubino (eds.), *Facts about the world's languages: an encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present.* 528-30. New York: H.W. Wilson.

Ray, Tapas S. 2003. Oriya. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages.* London / New York: Routledge.

Rennell, James and Brahmadeva Prasad Ambashthya. 1975. *Memoir of a map of Hindustan or the Mughal Empire and his Bengal atlas.* Patna: N.V. Publications.

Ross, Malcolm D. 1988. *Proto Oceanic and the Austronesian languages of western Melanesia.* Canberra: Pacific Linguistics C-98, Australian National University.

Ross, Malcolm D. 1997. Social network and kinds of speech-community event. In Roger Blench and Matthew Spriggs (eds.), *Archaeology and language I: theoretical and methodological orientations.* 209-261. London / New York: Routledge. One world archaeology, 27.

Ross, Malcolm D. 1998. Sequencing and dating linguistic events in Oceania: the linguistics/archaeology interface. In Roger Blanch and Matthew Spriggs (eds.), *Archaeology and language II: archaeological data and linguistic hypotheses.* 141-173. London / New York: Routledge. One world archaeology, 29.

Ross, Malcolm D. and Mark Durie. 1996. Introduction. In Mark Durie and Malcolm D. Ross (eds.), *The comparative method reviewed: regularity and irregularity in language change.* 3-38. New York: Oxford University Press.

Sanyal, Charu Chandra. 1965. *The Rajbansis of North Bengal: a study of a Hindu social group.* Calcutta: The Asiatic Society (Monograph series v.11). Asiatic Society, Calcutta. (Monograph series v.11).

Sarkar, Jadu Nath. 1943. Transformation of Bengal under Mughal rule. In Ramesh Chandra Majumdar and Jadu Nath Sarkar (eds.), *The History of Bengal.* v.1,2, bibl., illus., maps. Dacca: University of Dacca.

Saussure, Ferdinand de. 1966. *Cours de linguistique générale.* 3rd edition. Paris: Payot.

Sen, Sukumar. 1960. *History of Bengali literature.* New Delhi: Sahitya Akademi.

Sen, Sukumar. 1971. *An etymological dictionary of Bengali, c. 1000-1800 A.D.* Calcutta: Eastern.

Shahidullah, Muhammad. 1966. *Buddhist mystic songs: oldest Bengali and other eastern vernaculars*. Rev. and enl. edition. Dacca: Bengali Academy.

Shapiro, Michael C. 2003. Hindi. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages.* 250-285. London / New York: Routledge.

Shapiro, Michael C. and Harold F. Schiffman. 1981. *Language and society in South Asia*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass. Series in linguistics, 1.

Shukla, Shaligram. 2001. Bhojpuri. In Jane Garry and Carl R. Galvez Rubino (eds.), *Facts about the world's languages: an encyclopedia of the world's major languages, past and present.* New York: H.W. Wilson.

Sircar, Dines Chandra. 1952. Spread of Aryanism in Bengal. *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Letters* XVIII (2): 171-178.

Southworth, Franklin C. 1958. A Test of the Comparative Method (A Historically Controlled Reconstruction based on four modern Indic Languages, Panjabi, Hindi, Bengali and Marathi). Ph.D. Dissertation, Yale University.

Southworth, Franklin C. 1964. Family-tree diagrams. *Language* 40 (4): 557-565.

Spate, O. H. K. and B. H. Farmer. 1954. *India and Pakistan: a general and regional geography*. 1st edition. London: Methuen.

Sperber, Dan. 1996. Anthropology and psychology: towards an epidemiology of representations. *Man* 20: 73-89.

Tagare, Gajanan Vasudev. 1948. *Historical grammar of Apabhramsa*. Poona, India: Deccan College. Deccan College dissertation series, 5.

Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Thurgood, Graham. 1999. *From ancient Cham to modern dialects: two thousand years of language contact and change*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press. Oceanic linguistics special publication; no. 28.

Tiwari, Udai Narain. 1960. *The origin and development of Bhojpuri*. Kolkata: Asiatic society.

Toulmin, Matthew. ms. A grammar sketch of the Rajbanshi language as spoken in Mahayespur, Jhapa, Nepal. 65p.

Toulmin, Matthew. 2002. Mui Tui Bangla, Rajbanshi or Kamatapuri? A study of language, ideology and classification in north Bengal. Honours Dissertation, Department of Linguistics, University of Sydney, 114p.

Toulmin, Matthew, Yogendra Yadava and Tika Ram Poudel. In prep. Rajbanshi. In Tatiana Oranskaia (ed.), *New Indo-Aryan Languages.* Moscow: Nauka. Languages of the World.

Trask, R. L. 2000. *The dictionary of historical and comparative linguistics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Trudgill, Peter. 1974. Linguistic change and diffusion: Description and explanation in sociolinguistic dialect geography. *Language in Society* 3: 215-246.

Trudgill, Peter. 1986. *Dialects in contact*. Oxford / New York: Basil Blackwell. Language in society, 10.

Turner, Ralph Lilley, Sir. 1962-1966. *A comparative dictionary of Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford University Press. Accessed online at http://dsal.uchicago.edu/dictionaries/soas/.

Turner, Ralph Lilley and Dorothy Rivers Turner. 1966-71. *A comparative dictionary of the Indo-Aryan languages*. London: Oxford University Press.

Verma, Manindra K. 2003. Bhojpuri. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages.* London / New York: Routledge.

Verma, Manindra K. and Karuvannur Puthanveettil Mohanan. 1990. *Experiencer subjects in South Asian languages.* Stanford, CA: Published for the Stanford Linguistics Association by the Center for the Study of Language and Information Stanford University.

Verma, Sheela. 2003. Magahi. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages.* London / New York: Routledge.

Weinrich, Uriel, William Labov and Marvin I. Herzog. 1968. Empirical foundations for a theory of language change. In W.P. Lehmann and Y. Malkiel (eds.), *Directions for historical linguistics.* 95-195. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Whyte, Brendan R. 2002. *Waiting for the Eskimo: An historical and documentary study of the Cooch Behar enclaves of India and Bangladesh.* Melbourne: The School of Anthropology, Geography and Environmental Studies, University of Melbourne.

Wilde, Christopher Pekka. ms. Preliminary phonological analysis of Rajbanshi with notes on orthography problems. 34p.

Wolfram, Walt and Natalie Schilling-Estes. 2003. Dialectology and Linguistic Diffusion. In Joseph and Janda (eds.), *Handbook of Historical Linguistics.* 713-735.

Yadav, R.K. 1966. *The Indian language problem.* Delhi: National Publishing House.

Yadav, Ramawatar. 2003. Maithili. In George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain (eds.), *The Indo-Aryan languages.* xix, 1061. London / New York: Routledge.

Zograph, G. A. 1976. *Morfologicheskii stroi novykh indoariiskikh iazykov.* Moscow: Nauka.