English in the Bahamas and developmental models of World Englishes: A critical analysis

Stephanie Hackert, Alexander Laube, and Diana Wengler
Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München (LMU)

1   Introduction

Modeling Englishes has enjoyed quite some popularity since the late 1980s when the focus of research shifted from the description of individual varieties to attempts at explaining the entire "English Language Complex" (Mesthrie & Bhatt 2008: 3). One of the most influential models that have emerged in this context is Schneider's (2003, 2007) Dynamic Model, which, in essence, claims that "it is possible to identify a single, underlying, fundamentally uniform evolutionary process which can be observed, with modifications and adjustments to local circumstances, in the evolution of all postcolonial forms of English" (2017: 47). The realities of the twenty-first century, and primarily globalization and web-based communication, have dramatically altered the ways English is used around the world and have accelerated the diversification of the language. Schneider himself (2014: 28) draws attention to the limitations of the Dynamic Model in accounting for "this new kind of dynamism of global Englishes."

It is the explicit aim of Buschfeld and Kautzsch's "Extra- and Intra-territorial Forces" (EIF) Model to account for these "complex linguistic realities" (2017: 104). The EIF Model's basic assumption is that all Englishes have been shaped by a set of "forces", which can be divided into external ("extraterritorial") and internal ("intraterritorial") ones. These forces are viewed as "general mechanisms" affecting the development of any specific variety, the difference lying in the "concrete form" that they assume (2017: 116). This permits a unified treatment not only of postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes but also of the colonial and postcolonial periods for the former: "intra- and extra-territorial forces have always been the driving forces behind the (socio)linguistic developments in the territories throughout the process of colonization but also in postcolonial times" (2017: 116). The EIF Model builds on the basic components and assumptions of the Dynamic Model but integrates them in a "higher-level framework" (2017: 111), so that "all aspects of the model, most importantly the five phases and the four

parameters operating on them, can be explained in terms of such extra- and intra-territorial forces" (2017: 116).

A question that arises in this context is in what way the description and explanation of English in a postcolonial Anglophone nation such as the Bahamas fits into this new approach. In order to answer it, Section 2 of this paper looks into the Bahamas' sociolinguistic and linguistic history. We adopt Schneider's (2007: ch. 5) "countries-along-the-cycle" method and outline the history, identity constructions, sociolinguistics, and structural effects (2003: 56) that have shaped the use of English in the Bahamas and then turn to the effects of globalization as the most important twenty-first-century force affecting language use in the country. The EIF Model appears to suggest precisely this kind of treatment, in that Buschfeld & Kautzsch describe colonization as one of five "major subcategories" of extra- and intraterritorial forces and explicitly refer back to the Dynamic Model to account for it (2017: 113). As will become apparent shortly, even fairly typical postcolonial situations, such as the one found in the Bahamas today, present problems in this respect. In its focus on general forces, however, the EIF Model appears more flexible than the Dynamic Model, permitting, for example, the easy integration of postcolonial developments such as globalization.

In Section 3, we briefly summarize the advantages and disadvantages of the two models and offer some critical remarks on the developmental approach to World Englishes that are of a general nature. They are thus not specific to the application of either model to the Bahamas. They are also not necessarily original but have occurred, in one form or another, in previous publications dealing critically with theorizing in World Englishes, for example, Blommaert (2010), Canagarajah (2013), Hackert (2012a, 2014), Pennycook (2007), Saraceni (2015), or Seargeant (2012). In principle, what is at stake is that even recent models of English around the world are "tied to the linguistics and politics of the twentieth century" (Pennycook 2007: 12). More specifically, we discuss the following ideological complexes: that varieties are discrete entities which may be "transported" or "translocated" somewhere or even "travel" and "spread" themselves; that such varieties are describable in terms of a set of more or less consistent but clearly identifiable features; that a variety's most natural basis is the nation; and that all varieties of English undergo evolution, that is not just change but teleological development, whose designated endpoint is the coming-into-being of autonomous standard varieties.

2   The Bahamas as a postcolonial Anglophone country: From settlement to globalization

The Bahamas were a British colony for over three hundred years, with thousands of slaves imported between roughly the mid-seventeenth and early nineteenth centuries and a continuum

of varieties spoken today, "ranging from a creole retaining the most influence of the grammar of African and other languages (the basilect) to a variety of English whose grammatical differences from the standard English spoken elsewhere are negligible (the acrolect)" (Holm & Shilling 1982: ix). At first sight, they appear to constitute an uncontroversial case of a postcolonial speech community, so the Dynamic Model should nicely account for the linguistic and sociolinguistic situation that obtained there at least until the early years of independence. As noted in Section 1, Buschfeld and Kautzsch (2017: 113) also draw on Schneider (2003, 2007) to describe colonization as one of the forces that have shaped postcolonial Englishes.

Fundamental to the emergence of any postcolonial English is "the translocation of the English language to a new territory" (Buschfeld & Kautzsch 2017: 106). Having been raided and depopulated by the Spanish in the wake of Columbus's landfall in the archipelago in 1492, the Bahamas were first settled by English speakers when a group of religious dissenters from Bermuda came to the northern island of Eleuthera in 1648. In the following years, more settlers from Bermuda arrived in the Bahamas, but in 1670, when a joint colony with the Carolinas was established by Charles II, the Bahamas' "Bermudian connection […] was gradually replaced by a Carolinian one" (Hackert 2004: 35). This established a new but eventually long-lasting link with the American mainland.

Regarding the "Eleutherian Adventurers" (cf. Craton 1962: 57), there is no evidence as to what languages or dialects they spoke when they arrived on Bahamian shores. In terms of sociodemographics, blacks were among the earliest settlers, but whites outnumbered them during the initial colonial phase, and both population groups worked together in close contact in subsistence farming, fishing, or other small-scale enterprises (1962: 70). In terms of linguistic effects, this suggests some cross-dialect contact among white settlers but certainly not massive linguistic restructuring, as blacks must have had ample access to the settlers' dialects. The black population grew steadily during the eighteenth century, however, and blacks came to outnumber whites around 1760 (Craton & Saunders 1992: 151). The once intense contact between the two groups became more restricted, and so did the blacks' access to the white dialects of English (cf. Hackert 2004: 37–38). Nevertheless, it is still unlikely that a full-fledged creole existed in the Bahamas at the time.

The late eighteenth century, then, saw the arrival of thousands of loyalists and their slaves, who migrated to the archipelago in the wake of the American Revolutionary War (1775–1783). As a result of this migration, the Bahamian population tripled, and the proportion of blacks rose from one-half to three-quarters (Craton & Saunders 1992: 179). Most of the immigrant blacks originated from the Gullah-speaking regions of South Carolina and Georgia or

from the coastal areas of Virginia, where a creole was also spoken at the time (cf. Hackert & Huber 2007: 297). The imported creole flourished particularly on the southern islands, where large groups of slaves were left to fend for themselves soon after their arrival, because the Bahamian plantation economy had quickly failed on account of both economic and environmental reasons (Craton & Saunders 1992: 304).

In the decades following the abolition of the slave trade in 1807, immigration to the Bahamas was dominated by large numbers of "liberated Africans" seized from foreign slave ships by British naval patrols (Craton & Saunders 1998: 5–12). In general, the nineteenth century was characterized by racial segregation and poverty. When tourist arrivals increased at the turn of the twentieth century, the economic situation started to improve. The American Prohibition of the 1920s also resulted in new business opportunities. While Prohibition came to an end by 1933, the tourism sector continued to flourish and wealth came to the islands. A major political milestone was the founding of the Progressive Liberal Party in 1953, which aimed at shifting the political power to the black majority and led to major changes in institutional structures and political ideology, the latter turning toward the "Bahamianization" of politics, education, and the media (cf. Storr 2000: 251–254; Minnis 2009: 106–107). In 1973, the Bahamas gained independence from Britain. Nevertheless, they have remained in the Commonwealth of Nations, and the influence of the former colonial power is still visible in the country's institutional structure and traditions, such as school uniforms or wigs in court.

One immediately apparent problem in applying the Dynamic Model to the Bahamian situation is that it is difficult to structure the country's colonial and postcolonial history into five phases (Schneider 2007: 56). For one, it appears unclear as to what exactly should count as the foundation phase. Following Schneider (2007: 33), we would have to consider the years after the Bermudian settlement in 1648: "English is brought to a new territory by a significant group of settlers, and begins to be used on a regular basis in a country which was not English-speaking before." And in fact, we seem to be dealing with a fairly "normal" settlement colony initially, even though no indigenous (IDG) population strand was present. This is not untypical, either, in that most creole-speaking communities began exactly with the kind of "homestead" phase that is suggested by the sociodemographic makeup of the early Bahamian colony (cf. Chaudenson 2001). The missing IDG strand is also unproblematic; as suggested by Schneider (2007: 62), slaves:

> took the role of an IDG group. Socially, they were the one important, erstwhile 'other' group the STL [i.e., settler] strand speakers were faced with. Linguistically, […] like

IDG groups slaves approached and acquired the target language, English, and accommodated and restructured it to their own purposes.

As noted above, though, between 1783 and 1785 Gullah speakers swamped the black population segment. Their variety must have quickly replaced the settlers' dialects and early slaves' approximations to those dialects as the dominant community language; it must have also functioned as the target of acquisition to later arrivals, primarily those confiscated from slave ships. The "foundation" of contemporary Bahamian Creole, thus, was laid not with the first settlement of English speakers from Bermuda, but with the later, massive shift in demographic makeup brought about by the loyalist immigration. Should we, then, assume a delayed foundation phase? Or two separate foundation phases? Or should we abide by temporal sequence and count the 1648 founding of an English-speaking community in the Bahamas as decisive, despite the fact that this early settlement could not possibly have exerted the kind of strong linguistic "founder effect" that Schneider (2007: 23), following Mufwene (2001), ascribes to the earliest population in any language contact situation?

As regards the other periods of Bahamian colonial and postcolonial history, their dating in terms of the phases of the Dynamic Model involves the same difficulties as do those of other Anglophone Caribbean countries, such as Barbados (Schneider 2007: 219–224) and Jamaica (2007: 227–234). In order to solve these difficulties, Schneider himself recognizes creole formation as a "very special instantiation of the Dynamic Model" (2007: 60), with "structural nativization […] in the forms of partial language acquisition in language shift as well as creolization" beginning as early as phase 1 (2007: 62), and phases 2 and 3 becoming blurred, on account of the fact that "a core political feature of phase 2, a stable colonial status, coincides with the central linguistic component of phase 3, nativization, i.e. creolization" (2007: 227). If this is done and the temporal sequencing and presence of fundamental sociopolitical and structural parameters are waived, then the Bahamas, like other creole-speaking communities, can be integrated into the Dynamic Model, but such a move obviously obviates core aspects of the model. Phase 4, by contrast, is unproblematic. Schneider predicts "cultural self-reliance" following political independence (2007: 48) as a central component of this phase, involving not just the naming of a new variety – "X English" instead of "English in X" (2007: 50) – but also its codification in dictionaries and its use in literary works. We see all of this in the Bahamas, with the production of the *Dictionary of Bahamian English* (Holm & Shilling 1982) and of numerous poems, plays, novels, and short stories (e.g., College of the Bahamas 1983; cf. Dahl 1995) as well as with the collection of folk tales (e.g., Glinton-Meicholas 1994) flourishing from the 1970s onward.

Another challenge in the application of the Dynamic Model to the Bahamian context is that the "identity constructions" (Schneider 2007: 31) we find in the various phases of the country's history do not conform to the model's predictions. Most importantly, phase 3 (which, as noted above, is said to fall together with phase 2 in creole-speaking societies) is supposedly characterized by a reduction in the gap separating STL and IDG speakers: "Both population groups realize and accept the fact that they will have to get along with each other for good, and therefore, for the first time, the STL and IDG strands become closely and directly intertwined" (Schneider 2007: 41). The history of demographic and power relations in the colonial and early postcolonial Bahamas contradicts such assumptions (cf. Curry 2017: 120); in fact, it suggests the opposite. A divergence in group identities must have already taken place in the eighteenth century, as more and more free blacks and slaves came to the islands and gradually outnumbered the white settlers. In the nineteenth century, increasing racial segregation and the arrival of more blacks from Africa, who claimed "a greater ethnic authenticity" (Craton & Saunders 1992: 359) and tremendously influenced social life, religion, and art in the Bahamas, led to a shift in self-consciousness and attitudes among the black population, so that "the Afro-Bahamian society developed an identity of its own" (Cash et al. 1991: 220). And even though the country's road to independence was markedly less violent than that of other Anglophone Caribbean nations, such as Jamaica, there is no reason to assume that substantial sociopsychological accommodation between black and white Bahamians would have taken place during decolonization. Rather, there is evidence that the life- and speechways of the two groups remained separate, if not segregated, in the majority of situations (cf. Craton & Saunders 1998: 91).

More generally, it appears doubtful whether sociolinguistic identity formation in creole-speaking communities is best described in terms of "processes of convergence" between the colonizers and the colonized (Schneider 2003: 242). While Schneider emphasizes the "common language experience and communication ethnography" shared by the two population groups in advanced colonial contact situations, resulting eventually in "the emergence of an overarching language community with a set of shared norms" (2003: 243), numerous creolists have pointed out that creole formation is neither the coming-into-being of a linguistic compromise nor the more or less successful approximation to a linguistic target, such as the European settler dialects, by the socially subordinate population. It is just as well possible that the laborers did not actually seek to sound like the power holders but that the retention or augmentation of linguistic differences by the colonized served to mark both social distance from the colonizers and soli-

darity among themselves. In this way, nascent creoles would have functioned not only as indicators of a new, hybrid sociocultural identity but also – and maybe equally importantly – as a means of linguistic empowerment and resistance to hegemony (Jourdan 2008: 373).

Phase 4 in the formation of any postcolonial English, finally, is said to be characterized by an emphasis on ethnic and linguistic homogeneity (Schneider 2007: 49). Interestingly, with the exception of the Haitian immigrants and their "Bahaitian" offspring (cf. Léger & Armbrister 2009: 22, 27–29), ethnicity is not often commented on explicitly in the Bahamas (cf. Bethel 2007). Black-white relations are not much of a public issue, but there is also no emphasis on ethnic unity. Regarding language, it is certainly true that in all Anglophone Caribbean countries, "the newly achieved psychological independence and the acceptance of a new, indigenous identity" has resulted in "a new, locally rooted linguistic self-confidence" (Schneider 2007: 49), which has mostly transformed the creoles into carriers of a particular cultural-historical heritage and has led to their encroachment on standard English in domains like education, politics, and the media (cf. Hackert 2004: 56–64). However, in the Bahamas, this has definitely not promoted an emphasis on linguistic homogeneity (Schneider 2007: 51), if one abstracts away from the frequent denial by creole speakers that they use anything but "the Queen's English" (cf. Hackert 2004: 31) – a form of self-deprecation common in such speech communities. Despite occasional claims concerning decreolization (cf. Shilling 1978: 178; Seymour 1995: 17–40, 55) and a limited amount of "bilateral accommodation historically and currently" (Childs et al. 2003: 26), black and white vernaculars have not only remained remarkably distinct in structural terms, but they are also consistently described as different by Bahamians themselves. Differences between black speech from different locations are also frequently noted, as in "Eleuthera people is talk more like Americans" or "Cat Island people does talk bad" (cf. Hackert 2004: 7). This self-description is in stark contrast with at least some linguistic treatments of the Bahamian situation, where "Bahamian English" is taken to subsume both black and white vernaculars (e.g., Childs & Wolfram 2004; Reaser & Torbert 2012), despite the same authors' own findings of a "constant ethnic divide between the communities with reference to salient features" (Childs et al. 2003: 26–27). In sum, the relationship between black and white speech in the Bahamas appears to be more accurately captured by Shilling's (1980) reference to a "non-continuum" (cf. the title of the paper) than by the term "Bahamian English."

Even standard English in the Bahamas is remarkably non-uniform. The emergence of new norms in the Anglophone Caribbean was first described for Jamaica by Shields-Brodber (1997) as a process of bifurcation, leading to the emergence of two forms of standard English: a traditional, British one, more often professed than actually used, and a local, creole-influenced

one, heard in the speech of prominent actors, politicians, and other public figures. Recent work on standards of English in the Caribbean context has shown, however, that things have become even more fluid than predicted, and this holds true not only for speech production but also for the perception of norms. Thus, initial work on the three Caribbean subcomponents of the International Corpus of English (e.g., Deuber 2009, 2010; Deuber & Youssef 2007; Hackert 2012b; Laube fc.) reveals tremendous amounts of morphosyntactic variation, particularly but not exclusively in the most informal of text types, that is conversations; studies on educated accents show the persistence of some but not all creole features even at the highest acrolectal levels (e.g, Irvine 2004) as well as considerable variation between British and American pronunciations (e.g., Deuber & Leung 2013); and sociolinguistic studies have shown a fluidity in language attitudes and use hitherto unimagined (e.g., Jamaican Language Unit 2005; Oenbring & Fielding 2014). Thus, "traditional attitudes to 'low' and 'high' language have become diluted" in the postcolonial Caribbean (Craig 2006: 108), in the sense that the use of English or creole is no longer determined exclusively by social status but often indicates choices of style and register (cf. Deuber 2014). Attitudes toward and the adoption of pronunciation or vocabulary features from different standard varieties are also much more variable than envisaged by the Dynamic Model. This has been shown for Trinidad and Tobago (e.g., Deuber & Leung 2013; Hänsel & Deuber 2013); as for the Bahamas, initial work (Kraus & Laube fc.) points in the same direction. In sum, with regard to standards of English, the Anglophone Caribbean appears to be heading not toward endonormativity but toward a stable "multinormative" orientation (Meer & Deuber this volume). While the emergence of a homogenous, national standard is thus one of the crucial components of the Dynamic Model, this component appears to be highly problematic in the case of the Anglophone Caribbean.

As for linguistic globalization effects, these are generally assumed to involve the worldwide spread of features of American English (cf. Schneider 2006: 67). As Buschfeld & Kautzsch (2017: 114) state, globalization "finds expression in, for example, linguistic and also cultural influences coming from the Internet, U.S. popular culture, and modern media as well as trading relations between countries." The Bahamas have longstanding ties with the North American mainland. As outlined above, there was, first, the early colonial Carolinian connection, followed by the mass immigration of loyalists in the wake of the American Revolutionary War. Bahamians have always been traveling to the North American mainland to visit relatives, obtain an education, find work, or – more recently – simply go shopping. Finally, there is tourism, which, in fact, is the most important economic sector in today's Bahamas, next to banking,

and the vast majority of tourists have always come from the U.S. (cf. Bahamas Ministry of Tourism 2019).

A feature that might be taken as indicative of recent linguistic Americanization in the Bahamas is the growing number of radio and television newsreaders and hosts, particularly on private channels, whose accent is rhotic. Most Englishes in the Caribbean, including Bahamian varieties, are traditionally non-rhotic (cf. Wells 1982: 590), but rhoticity appears to be spreading in various forms of contemporary Bahamian speech (cf. Kraus 2017), which suggests that American accents now enjoy considerable prestige, at least in public contexts. Still, we would claim that what we are dealing with in the Bahamas is not primarily postcolonial Americanization qua globalization. A study of so-called "pseudo-titles" (Bell 1988: 326), i.e., determiner-less descriptive structures in front of name NPs, as in *former U.S. president Bill Clinton*, for example (Hackert 2015), found that these structures, which are generally said to have originated in *Time* magazine (cf. Quirk et al. 1985: 276) and thus clearly constitute a "diachronic Americanism" (Algeo 1992: 287), were used liberally in Bahamian newspapers even before independence and that Bahamian journalists have, in fact, been leading their American (and British) colleagues in their development, in terms of both length and complexity. American influence on Bahamian English is thus not a recent phenomenon but involves long-standing economic, cultural, and personal links.

3   Developmental models of World Englishes and the Bahamas: Some critical remarks

As shown in Section 2, a close examination of three core components of Schneider's Dynamic Model, that is developmental phases, identity constructions, and structural effects, in the Bahamian context reveals difficulties in the application of the model. Some of these difficulties are specific to the Bahamian situation; as noted by Childs & Wolfram (2004: 436), "[o]ne question concerns the significance of different founder English varieties that range from British and American English dialects to Gullah […]. Another matter is the past and present relationship between Afro-Bahamian and Anglo-Bahamian varieties." Other issues, such as the blurring of phases and the continued lack of linguistic homogenization, appear to be of a more general nature, at least with respect to the Anglophone Caribbean. While the EIF Model builds on the Dynamic Model's basic components and assumptions, it still appears to offer some advantages over the latter, even in the description of postcolonial Englishes.

Most importantly, it explicitly acknowledges the fact that colonial and postcolonial history cannot be separated from each other and that most sociolinguistic and linguistic developments that have affected English speakers around the world in postcolonial times are neither

necessarily ascribable to the influence of the former colonial power nor truly endocentric but often owed to the rise of the United States to global superpower status in political, economic, and cultural terms. The Bahamian case is unusual in that American influence long predates independence, but the EIF Model describes "Americanization" not as a purely postcolonial phenomenon but as a general force operating on the development of different Englishes at different times (Buschfeld & Kautzsch 2017: 111). By turning to a flexible set of forces, thus, the EIF Model elegantly accounts for the longstanding regional and supraregional ties linking the Bahamas with Britain and the U.S. and for how they have led to the sociolinguistic and linguistic complexity that characterize the Bahamian situation today.

That said, the EIF Model's primary aim is not an improved theory of postcolonial Englishes but an attempt at a unified account of postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes, which is achieved through the integration of the Dynamic Model in a "higher-level framework" (Buschfeld & Kautzsch 2017: 113). In consequence, this means that the EIF Model does not fully emancipate itself from the Dynamic Model; rather, as Buschfeld and Kautzsch themselves note, the former is based on the latter's core components, in particular "the five phases and the four parameters operating on them" (2017: 116). In this way, the EIF Model "inherits" a number of problems affecting the Dynamic Model, two of which we would like to highlight now.

First, there is the focus on national varieties. Up to this point, we have been refraining from a discussion of what we mean by "X English" (Schneider 2007: 50) in the Bahamian case. What exactly is "Bahamian English"? Definitely, the major variety in the contemporary Bahamas is Bahamian Creole, the language of black Bahamians in private and/or informal interaction. As shown by Hackert (2004), however, even urban Bahamian Creole as used in Nassau today shows tremendous variation. Also, as noted in Section 2 of this paper, the life- and speechways of the various Bahamian islands have always displayed considerable differences. Then there are white vernaculars, which constitute a "non-continuum" with black Bahamian speech (Shilling 1980). Finally, there is standard Bahamian English, which, as we have seen, does not appear to be heading toward uniformity, either, but continues to show a multinormative orientation. In sum, there really is no such thing as "Bahamian English," despite its repeated evocation in the linguistic literature (e.g., Childs & Wolfram 2004; Reaser & Torbert 2012).

The focus on national varieties has been underlying the World Englishes enterprise ever since its inception. One of the greatest achievements of the paradigm has been the wide recognition that contemporary English is a language of "pluricentricity and multi-identities" (Kachru 1991: 4) and no longer a monolithic entity that originated in England and therefore belongs to the "best" speakers, that is, educated British (or Americans) setting down their own speech

patterns as those most widely "received" (cf. Hackert 2012a: 115–117). The ideological under-pinnings to the pluricentric approach came from postcolonial writers such as Chinua Achebe, Raja Rao, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, or Gabriel Okara, who had championed the use of localized versions of English as a way of appropriating the former colonial language and making it bear the weight of the postcolonial experience. For these writers, political decolonization necessi-tated linguistic decolonization, and the creation of new nations necessitated the establishment of new languages along exactly the lines Noah Webster had advocated for American English in the late eighteenth century. As Allsopp (1996: xix) sketches the Caribbean situation upon inde-pendence, "these territories include[d] twelve independent nations in their number, each with a linguistic entitlement to a national standard language."

In its focus on the tranformation of "English in X" into "X English" (Schneider 2007: 50) and the "countries-along-the-cycle" method that we also applied in Section 2 in describing the Bahamian situation, the Dynamic Model does not really appear to question this traditional focus on national varieties. But as Saraceni (2015: 67) aptly puts it, "the idea of many Englishes isn't fundamentally different from that of one English. […] the idea of plural Englishes entails the same principle: many ones. If there is one English for the English, there can be one for the Americans, one for the Singaporeans, one for the Ghanaians, one for the New Zealanders and so on. One plus one plus one plus one." The World Englishes concern with national varieties has been exposed to a lot of criticism (cf., e.g., Schneider 2017: 37; Deshors 2018: 3), and, accordingly, Buschfeld & Kautzsch (2017) explicitly propose to implement the "post-varieties" approach called for by Seargeant and Tagg (2011). While much of their argument still revolves around territorially based varieties, albeit non-postcolonial ones as they appear to be emerging in Namibia for example, they also take into account "any other type of English developing beyond national boundaries," particularly in web-based communication (Buschfeld & Kautzsch 2017: 105), and consider the forces affecting the use of English "both on the national level, but also on the different groups of speakers within and ultimately also across particular countries" (2017: 113), eventually "zooming in to […] the idiolects of individual speakers" (Buschfeld et al. 2018: 25). These forces include the usual sociolinguistic suspects: age, ethnicity, social sta-tus, and gender. In a way, however, this World Englishes-cum-sociolinguistics approach may be said to be subject to exactly the criticism leveled above: "[o]ne plus one plus one plus one." While a proliferation of lects certainly permits more "granularity" (2018: 25), it remains to be demonstrated in what way such a move increases any model's explanatory power.

This is because, in principle, neither the inclusion of new, transnational variety types nor the increase in "granularity" down to the idiolect solves another fundamental problem in

World Englishes theorizing: that of the conception of "varieties" as more or less homogenous, stable, bounded sets of features. This conception is not unique to varieties studies but still underlies much contemporary linguistic thought, following Saussure's famous dictum of language as "un système où tout se tient" (cf. Koerner 1996/97). While such an approach may have been important in early twentieth-century linguistics to bring the discipline in line with theoretical and methodological advances in other sciences, it has become questionable in postmodern times, with language widely recognized as social practice crucially premised on speaker agency, mobility, and mixing. However, it still shines through the conception of English as a thing that can be "relocated" (Buschfeld et al. 2018: 18) or is seen as "moving, expanding and growing" independently (2018: 16).

That said, the identification of the characteristic features of any postcolonial or other English often has not even taken the perspective of the system as a whole but follows what Saraceni (2015: 80) calls the "spot the difference" approach: "phonological, lexical, grammatical and syntactic peculiarities are meticulously singled out and displayed as proofs of the ways in which new varieties of English have evolved" (2015: 81). The feature approach replaced an earlier focus on "errors" committed by non-native speakers of English and emphasized the systematicity and legitimacy of postcolonial varieties as well as their sociocultural contingency. While traditional descriptions of new varieties of English often proceeded in anecdotal fashion, the advent of corpus linguistics made large-scale, quantitative comparisons possible, based on the insight that varieties differ not only in basic rules and categorical qualities, but also in statistical preferences and co-occurrence patterns (cf. Schneider 2007: 46). The EIF Model, however, still appears to be premised on the idea of feature checklists, one of its primary aims being to determine whether a particular form of English found in a particular (national) context constitutes a variety or not, for which Buschfeld and Kautzsch suggest the employment of a criteria catalogue crucially based on "nativized linguistic features" (2017: 109). An interesting proposal for overcoming the limitations of the varieties-as-sets-of-features paradigm is Schneider's notion of "Transnational Attraction," which explicitly recognizes "the appropriation of (components of) English(es) for whatever communicative purposes at hand, unbounded by distinctions of norms, nations or varieties" (2014: 28). Even though Buschfeld and Kautzsch (2017: 113) describe it as "too simple" and its precise implications for theorizing World Englishes actually remain to be spelled out, this proposal may eventually turn out to be more suitable for capturing the linguistic and sociolinguistic dynamics of postmodern forms of English than feature checklists.

Second, given their shared diachronic focus, developmental stages constitute an integral part of both the Dynamic Model and the EIF Model. As has been shown in Section 2, it is difficult to match Bahamian history with the Dynamic Model's five phases. A more fundamental problem in applying the latter to creole-speaking societies is the assumption of a gradual reduction in linguistic variability along the developmental path of any one variety. In creole studies, we encounter this assumption in the once-popular decreolization hypothesis; the Dynamic Model posits the emergence of a homogenous, national standard as the culmination phase in the development of any postcolonial English. This, as we have seen, is equally problematic in the case of the Anglophone Caribbean. The EIF Model puts a question mark around endonormative stabilization (Buschfeld & Kautzsch 2017: 117), but whether this question mark indicates general doubts about the validity of the concept or simply that it has not yet been attested for any non-postcolonial English is not clear (2017: 118–119). That said, in their phasal structure, both models are premised on the idea that new varieties of English undergo not merely change but directional development, every phase having a predetermined end point or goal. Particularly two of these end points, that is, nativization and stabilization, are problematic concepts, at least with regard to Anglophone Caribbean creoles.

As Schneider (2017: 46) himself observes, the idea that new languages pass through characteristic phases in their development is not original but has enjoyed popularity in contact linguistics ever since the publication of Hall's pidgin-creole life cycle, and, in fact, the similarities between the two models are striking. Similar to pidgins, postcolonial Englishes start out as a basic means of intercommunication used by incipiently bilingual speakers. The nativization phase occupies center stage in both models. What is involved in the transition from pidgin to creole is nativization in a demographic sense, that is, the coming-into-being of a community of first-language speakers, with structural consequences following, but demographic nativization has been found to be much less important for creole formation than once assumed. In the Dynamic Model, by contrast, nativization is defined in a purely structural sense, that is, as the emergence of a new, recognizably distinct local dialect through "regular use of English" by adult bilingual speakers (Schneider 2017: 50). The term "nativization" is thus understood differently in creole studies and World Englishes, though this is not usually overtly stated. Just as creoles supposedly develop into more standard forms if they remain in or come into contact with their lexifier ("decreolization"), so postcolonial Englishes are said to inevitably undergo endonormative stabilization.

Other than indicated by Schneider (2017: 46), however, cyclical accounts of creole origins no longer "figure […] prominently" in creole studies, simply because they have been found

to be inconsistent with both sociohistorical facts and diachronic linguistic evidence (cf., e.g., Kouwenberg & Singler 2008: 8–10). With regard to the Anglophone Caribbean, it has been demonstrated convincingly, for example, that creole continua must have existed from the earliest period of language contact and that it is wrong to automatically associate the existence of a continuum with decreolization, as implied by the once-popular term "post-creole continuum." In other words, creole continua do not mark a transitional stage in the development of any creole from (more or less homogenous) basilect to (more or less homogenous) acrolect. Rather, in many speech communities, they appear to constitute highly variable but stable sets of linguistic resources from which users draw in order to index particular situational meanings and position themselves in social space.

That said, the idea of evolution has a much longer history in linguistics than suggested by Schneider's (2017: 46) reference to Hall; in fact, it has played a significant role in linguistic theorizing ever since Charles Darwin published his *Origin of Species* (1859). Unfortunately, linguistic evolution is not a neutral concept at all but carries a heavy ideological baggage (cf. Hackert 2014; Mufwene 2015). In the nineteenth century, an evolutionary account was thought to explain, among others, the global spread of English as well as its rise to world language status (cf. Bailey 1991: 106–117). The standard variety of any language was described as the "fittest," commanding the widest range of functions and understood by most members of the speech community (Paul 1891: 53). Viewed from this angle, neither accounts celebrating the "spread" of English and its worldwide "indigenization" nor the idea that postcolonial varieties of English undergo evolution (rather than just change), advancing toward a stage of endonormative stabilization, are entirely value-free, and even though a hierarchization of varieties is explicitly rejected (cf. Buschfeld et al. 2018: 21), comparisons of varieties according to developmental stages attained are not, either.

4   Conclusion

Our task in this paper was to apply the latest World Englishes model, Buschfeld and Kautzsch's Model of Extra- and Intra-territorial Forces (2017), to the Bahamas, thereby putting it to the test and comparing its suitability to that of other models. The Bahamas were a British colony for over three hundred years and as such would seem to fall squarely within the domain of Schneider's (2003, 2007) Dynamic Model, which is explicitly geared toward the description and explanation of postcolonial Englishes. Buschfeld and Kautzsch's primary concern, by contrast, is not with postcolonial Englishes but with integrating non-postcolonial Englishes into a unified framework of varieties of English around the world (2017: 122). Not surprisingly, the

EIF Model does not have much to say about postcolonial Englishes that is new; in fact, colonization is treated as one of five categories of extra- and intraterritorial forces (2017: 113–114), together with language policies, globalization, foreign policies, and sociodemographic background. What is more, the "overall setup" of the Dynamic Model and its "major assumptions" are not challenged by the EIF Model. Rather, the Dynamic Model is "an integrative part" of the latter and provides the "major components of the overall conceptual framework" (2017: 121–122). For our test, therefore, we initially fell back on the Dynamic Model and examined the history, identity constructions, sociolinguistics, and structural effects (Schneider 2003: 56) that have shaped the use of English in the Bahamas in colonial and early postcolonial times. We then looked at the effects of globalization as the most important twenty-first-century force affecting language use in the country.

Our findings indicate that, in its fairly rigid "principles" and "parameters" approach (Schneider 2003: 234), the Dynamic Model ran into problems in accounting for the blurred phases, unusual identity constructions, and continued lack of linguistic homogenization that we observe in Bahamian history. In its focus on colonial developments, it also cannot explain more recent phenomena affecting speakers of English around the world, particularly in the form of American cultural and linguistic influences. By integrating colonial and post-colonial Englishes into a unified account, the EIF Model is able to do precisely this. In its focus on a flexible and interacting set of "extra- and intraterritorial forces as the general mechanisms behind the development" of any type of English (Buschfeld & Kautzsch 2017: 116), it also elegantly accounts for "Americanization" scenarios, such as we find it in the Bahamas, where, on account of longstanding economic, cultural, and personal ties with the North American mainland, local forms of speech have long been shaped by American influences or must, in fact, be described as genuinely American-origin in the first place.

The EIF Model is an offshoot of the Dynamic Model and as such based on some fundamental components of the latter, most notably its focus on the identification of clearly definable (national) varieties and its teleological character, that is, the assumption of a particular set of developmental phases, each endowed with a specific end point or goal. These two theoretical conceptions have a long standing in linguistics but may not actually be entirely suitable to the description and explanation of contemporary English in all its variety and complexity. Nevertheless, in its emphasis on the general forces impacting on all users of English in both colonial and postcolonial times, the EIF Model has made an important contribution toward accounting for unity and diversity among forms of English around the world today.

5   References

Algeo, John. 1992. What is a Briticism? In Joan H. Hall, Nick Doane & Dick Ringler, eds. 1992, *Old English and new: Studies in Language and Linguistics in Honor of Frederic G. Cassidy*. New York, London: Garland, 287–304.

Allsopp, Richard, ed. 1996. *Dictionary of Caribbean English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bahamas Ministry of Tourism. 2019. Tourist demographics 1996–2015, <http://www.tourismtoday.com/sites/default/files/all_bahamas_demographics_1996_to_2016.pdf> (last accessed February 22 2019).

Bailey, Richard W. 1991. *Images of English: A Cultural History of the Language*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Bell, Allan. 1988. The British base and the American connection in New Zealand media English. *American Speech* 63.4: 326–344.

Bethel, Nicolette. 2007. On why race matters. *Bahama Pundit*, <https://www.bahamapundit.com/2007/05/on_why_race_mat.html> (last accessed January 28 2019).

Blommaert, Jan. 2010. *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Buschfeld, Sarah & Alexander Kautzsch. 2017. Towards an integrated approach to postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes. *World Englishes* 36.1: 104–126.

Buschfeld, Sarah, Alexander Kautzsch & Edgar W. Schneider. 2018. From colonial dynamism to current transnationalism: A unified view on postcolonial and non-postcolonial Englishes. In Sandra C. Deshors, ed. 2018, *Modeling World Englishes: Assessing the Interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 15–44.

Canagarajah, Suresh. 2013. *Translingual Practice: Global Englishes and Cosmopolitan Relations*. London: Routledge.

Cash, Philip, Shirley Gordon & Gail Saunders. 1991. *Sources of Bahamian History*. London: Macmillan.

Chaudenson, Robert. 2001. *Creolization of Language and Culture*. Revised in collaboration with Salikoko S. Mufwene. London/ New York: Routledge.

Childs, Becky, Jeffrey Reaser & Walt Wolfram. 2003. Defining ethnic varieties in the Bahamas: Phonological accomodation in black and white enclaves. In Michael Aceto & Jeffrey P. Williams, eds.2003, *Contact Englishes of the Eastern Caribbean*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–28.

Childs, Becky & Walt Wolfram. 2004. Bahamian English: phonology. In Edgar W. Schneider, Kate Burridge, Bernd Kortmann, Rajend Mesthrie & Clive Upton, eds. 2004, *A Handbook of Varieties of English, Vol. 1: Phonology*. Berlin/ New York: de Gruyter, 435–449.

College of the Bahamas. 1983. *Bahamian Anthology*. Oxford: Macmillan.

Craig, Dennis. 2006. The use of the vernacular in West Indian education. In Hazel Simmons-McDonald & Ian Robertson, eds. 2006. *Exploring the Boundaries of Caribbean Creole Languages*. Mona: University of the West Indies Press, 99–117.

Craton, Michael. 1962. *A History of the Bahamas*. London: Collins.

Craton, Michael & Gail Saunders. 1992. *Islanders in the Stream: A History of the Bahamian People. Vol. 1: From Aboriginal Times to the End of Slavery*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Craton, Michael & Gail Saunders. 1998. *Islanders in the Stream: A History of the Bahamian People. Vol. 2: From the Ending of Slavery to the Twenty-First Century*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia Press.

Curry, Christopher. 2017. *Freedom and Resistance: A Social History of Black Loyalists in the Bahamas.* Gainesville, FL: University Press of Florida.

Dahl, Anthony G. 1995. *Literature of the Bahamas 1724–1992: The March towards National Identity*. Lanham: University Press of America.

Darwin, Charles. 1859. *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection, Or the Preservations of Favoured Races in the Struggle for Life*. London: John Murray.

Deshors, Sandra C. 2018. Modeling World Englishes in the 21st century: A thematic introduction. In Sandra C. Deshors, ed. 2018, *Modeling World Englishes: Assessing the interplay of Emancipation and Globalization of ESL Varieties*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 1–14.

Deuber, Dagmar. 2009. 'The English we speaking': Morphological and syntactic variation in educated Jamaican speech. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 24.1: 1–52.

Deuber, Dagmar. 2010. Modal verb usage at the interface of English and a related Creole: A corpus-based study of *can/could* and *will/would* in Trinidadian English. *Journal of English Linguistics* 38.2: 105–142.

Deuber, Dagmar. 2014. *English in the Caribbean: Variation, Style and Standards in Jamaica and Trinidad*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Deuber, Dagmar & Glenda Leung. 2013. Investigating attitudes towards an emerging standard of English: Evaluations of newscasters' accents in Trinidad. *Multilingua* 32.3: 289–319.

Deuber, Dagmar & Valerie Youssef. 2007. Teacher language in Trinidad: A pilot corpus study of direct and direct creolisms in the verb phrase. In *Proceedings from the Corpus Linguistics 2007 Conference*.

Glinton-Meicholas, Patricia. 1994. *An Evening in Guanima: A Treasury of Folktales From the Bahamas*. Nassau: Guanima Press.

Hackert, Stephanie. 2004. *Urban Bahamian Creole: System and Variation*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

Hackert, Stephanie. 2012a. *The Emergence of the English Native Speaker: A Chapter in Nineteenth-Century Linguistic Thought*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Hackert, Stephanie. 2012b. Variation in educated speech: The case of Bahamian English. In Monika Fludernik & Benjamin Kohlmann, eds. 2012b, *Anglistentag 2011 Freiburg: Proceedings*. Trier: WVT, 21–36.

Hackert, Stephanie. 2014. The evolution of English(es): Notes on the history of an idea. In Sarah Buschfeld, Thomas Hoffmann, Magnus Huber & Alexander Kautzsch, eds. 2014, *The Evolution of Englishes: The Dynamic Model and Beyond*. Amsterdam: Benjamins, 282–300.

Hackert, Stephanie. 2015. Pseudotitles in Bahamian English: A case of Americanization?. *Journal of English Linguistics* 43.2: 143–167.

Hackert, Stephanie & Magnus Huber. 2007. Gullah in the diaspora: Historical and linguistic evidence from the Bahamas. *Diachronica* 24.2: 279–325.

Hänsel, Eva & Dagmar Deuber. 2013. Globalization, postcolonial Englishes, and the English language press in Kenya, Singapore, and Trinidad and Tobago. *World Englishes* 32.3: 338–357.

Holm, John & Alison Shilling. 1982. *Dictionary of Bahamian English*. Cold Spring, NY: Lexik House.

Irvine, Alison. 2004. A good command of the English language: Phonological variation in the Jamaican acrolect. *Journal of Pidgin and Creole Languages* 19.1: 41–76.

Jamaican Language Unit. 2005. The Language Attitude Survey of Jamaica, <https://www.mona.uwi.edu/dllp/jlu/projects/Report%20for%20Language%20Attitude%20Survey%20of%20Jamaica.pdf> (last accessed February 22 2019).

Jourdan, Christine. 2008. The cultural in pidgin genesis. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John V. Singler, eds. 2008, *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 359–381.

Kachru, Braj B. 1991. Liberation linguistics and the Quirk Concern. *English Today* 7.1: 3–13.

Koerner, E.F.K. 1996/97. Notes on the history of the concept of language as a system 'où tout se tient' *Linguistica Atlantica* 18/19: 1–20.

Kouwenberg, Silvia & John V. Singler. 2008. Introduction. In Silvia Kouwenberg & John V. Singler, eds. 2008, *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell, 1–16.

Kraus, Janina. 2017. A Sociophonetic Study of the Urban Bahamian Creole Vowel System. PhD dissertation, LMU Munich.

Kraus, Janina & Alexander Laube. Fc. 'Broken English', 'Dialect' or 'Bahamianese'? Language attitudes and identity in The Bahamas.

Laube, Alexander. fc. Style and variation in Bahamian English. Ph.D. dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Unversität München (LMU).

Léger, Frenand & A. Philip Armbrister. 2009. Factors affecting the teaching and learning of Haitian Creole in the Bahamas. *International Journal of Bahamian Studies* 15: 22–35.

Meer, Philipp & Dagmar Deuber. 2019. Standard English in Trinidad: Multinormativity, translocality, and implications for the Dynamic Model and the EIF Model. In Sarah Buschfeld & Alexander Kautzsch, eds. 2019, *A Joint Approach Towards Postcolonial and Non-Postcolonial Varieties*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Mesthrie, Rajend & Rakesh M. Bhatt. 2008. *World Englishes: The Study of New Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Minnis, Edward A. 2009. At the Intersection of Tourism, National Identity and Bad Service: The Case Study of *The Fergusons of Farm Road*. MA thesis, University of Carleton.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2001. *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mufwene, Salikoko S. 2015. Race, racialism, and the study of language evolution in America. In Michael D. Picone & Katherine Evans Davies, eds. 2015, *New Perspectives on Language Variety in the South: Historical and Contemporary Approaches*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 449–474

Oenbring, Raymond & William Fielding. 2014. Young adults' attitudes to standard and non-standard English in an English-Creole-speaking country: The case of The Bahamas. *Language, Discourse & Society* 3.1: 28–51.

Paul, Hermann. 1891. *Principles of the history of language*. Translated from the second edition of the original by H. A. Strong. New and revised edition (1890). London: Longmans, Green & Co., <http://archive.org/stream/cu31924026442586#page/n5/mode/2up> (last accessed February 26 2019).

Pennycook, Alastair. 2007. *Global Englishes and Transcultural Flows*. London: Routledge.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Reaser, Jeffrey & Benjamin Torbert. 2012. English in the Bahamas. In Bernd Kortmann & Kerstin Lunkenheimer, eds. 2012, *The Mouton World Atlas of Variation in English*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 169–179.

Saraceni, Mario. 2015. *World Englishes: A Critical Analysis*. London: Bloomsbury.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2003. The Dynamics of New Englishes: From Identity Construction to Dialect Birth. *Language* 79.2: 233–281.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2006. English in North America. In Braj B. Kachru, Yamuna Kachru, & Cecil L. Nelson, eds. 2006, *The Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Blackwell, 58–73.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2007. *Postcolonial English: Varieties Around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2014. New reflections on the evolutionary dynamics of world Englishes. *World Englishes* 33.1: 9–32.

Schneider, Edgar W. 2017. Models of English in the World. In Juhani Klemola, Markku Filppula & Devyani Sharma, eds. 2017, *The Oxford Handbook of World Englishes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 35–57.

Seargeant, Philip. 2012. *Exploring World Englishes: Language in a Global Context*. London: Routledge.

Seargeant, Philip & Caroline Tagg. 2011. English on the internet and a 'post-varieties' approach to language. *World Englishes* 30.4: 496–514.

Seymour, Chanti. 1995. The decreolisation of Bahamian English: A sociolinguistic study. MA thesis, Georgetown University.

Shields-Brodber, Kathryn. 1997. Requiem for English in an 'English-speaking' community: The case of Jamaica. In Edgar W. Schneider, ed. 1997, *Englishes Around the World: Studies in Honour of Manfred Görlach. Vol. 2: Caribbean, Africa, Asia, Australasia*. Amsterdam: Benjamins. 57–67.

Shilling, Alison. 1978. Some non-standard features of Bahamian Dialect syntax. PhD dissertation, University of Hawaii.

Shilling, Alison. 1980. Bahamian English – a non-continuum? In Richard R. Day, ed. 1980, *Issues in English Creoles: Papers from the 1975 Hawaii Conference*. Heidelberg: Groos, 133–145.

Storr, Juliette. 2000. Changes and challenges: a history of the development of broadcasting in the Commonwealth of the Bahamas, 1930–1980. PhD dissertation, Ohio University.

Wells, John C. 1982. *Accents of English. Vol. 3: Beyond the British Isles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.