
Colonial Language, Indigenous Culture: Negotiating Identity and Resistance in Postcolonial Literature

Dr. Adi Ramesh BabuAssociate Professor & Head, Dept of English, Govt. City College (A)
Hyderabad

Article Received: 15/03/2026**Article Accepted:** 28/04/2026**Published Online:** 30/04/2026**DOI:** 10.47311/IJOES.2026.8.04.753

Abstract

Colonial language has had a multifaceted impact on indigenous culture, identity, and literary expression in postcolonial societies. This paper explores how postcolonial writers manage the conflict between the language imposed by colonial powers and the cultural practices of their own communities. Informed by the works of Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka, R. K. Narayan, and other selected Indian and African writers, the research paper examines language as both a remnant of colonial rule and a tool for cultural resistance. Ngugi's advocacy for reviving indigenous languages stands in contrast to Achebe's innovative use of English to capture African experiences. Soyinka, like R.K. Narayan, adapts colonial language by incorporating African cultural references, whereas R.K. Narayan employs English to depict Indian social life, customs, values, and local realities. The paper contends that postcolonial writers do not passively accept or entirely reject colonial languages; rather, they transform them to convey indigenous experiences, negotiate cultural identity, and subvert colonial assumptions. The study thus sees language as a key arena for cultural negotiation and resistance.

Keywords: Colonialism, Postcolonial Literature, Colonial Language, Indigenous Culture, Cultural Identity, Language and Resistance

Colonialism was not simply a political system by which European powers seized territories and managed their economic resources. It was also a cultural and intellectual framework that sought to govern knowledge, education, language, history, literature, and representation. Thus, the colonial project functioned both externally and internally within the colonized subject. Political control could be sustained via military and economic strength, but cultural dominance demanded a more profound influence on how colonized

peoples perceived themselves and their surroundings. Language emerged as one of the most effective tools for this intervention. English and French were adopted in numerous colonized societies as languages used in administration, education, employment, Christianity, law, and social advancement. As a result, the colonizer's language gained prestige, while indigenous languages were often relegated to secondary status. Thus, the issue of language continues to be one of the most contentious topics in postcolonial literary studies.

Frantz Fanon offers a crucial foundation for grasping the connection between language and colonial power. In *Black Skin, White Masks*, he writes, "A man who has a language consequently possesses the world expressed and implied by that language" (18). Fanon's observation implies that language is not a neutral tool for communication. Learning a language also means entering a specific cultural and symbolic system. In a colonial context, this becomes particularly important because the language being taught often carries with it the cultural values, literary traditions, historical accounts, and social hierarchies of the colonizing nation.

A colonized individual who acquires the colonial language may thereby obtain access to education and upward social movement, yet at the same time feel estranged from the language and culture of the community in which they were born. Fanon's argument thus highlights the core contradiction that still defines postcolonial linguistic experience: the language of colonial power can simultaneously serve as a tool for advancement and as a cause of cultural alienation.

In *Decolonising the Mind*, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o elaborates this argument more clearly. For Ngũgĩ, colonialism aims not just to dominate land and economic output but also to govern the inner thoughts and perceptions of the colonized. He famously describes language as possessing a "dual character. It functions both as a means of communication and as a carrier of culture" (13). This difference is fundamental to his theory. Language conveys ideas among people, yet it also transmits memories, histories, values, traditions, attitudes, and shared experiences across generations. Ngũgĩ consequently contends that substituting an indigenous language with a European one is not simply a shift in vocabulary; it can transform the cultural bond between an individual and their community.

Ngũgĩ's argument becomes particularly forceful when he discusses colonial education. His own childhood experience of learning in Gikuyu and later being forced to use English becomes evidence of the psychological effects of colonial schooling. He recalls how English was elevated within the educational system while the African languages of the students were devalued. In this context, the colonial classroom becomes a cultural battlefield. This difference is fundamental to his theory. Language conveys ideas among people, yet it also transmits memories, histories, values, traditions, attitudes, and shared

experiences across generations. Ngugi consequently contends that substituting an indigenous language with a European one is not simply a shift in vocabulary; it can transform the cultural bond between an individual and their community.

The successful student is encouraged to identify with the colonial language, while the indigenous language is linked with failure, backwardness, or illiteracy. Ngugi therefore views linguistic decolonization as a vital component of cultural liberation. His assertion that “Language as culture is the collective memory bank of a people’s experience in history” (15) underscores the significance of the connection between language and historical awareness. Ngugi’s stance gives rise to an important controversy. If European languages are fundamentally tied to colonial domination, should postcolonial writers entirely reject them? Can literature from Africa or Asia, written in English, truly be considered postcolonial when English itself stems from colonial history? Ngugi’s response differs significantly from Chinua Achebe’s. Ngugi eventually gave up using English as the main language for his creative writing and switched to Gikuyu, whereas Achebe supported the idea of adapting English into an African literary language. This disagreement goes beyond a mere conflict between two writers; it reflects two distinct theories of cultural resistance.

Achebe does not reject the colonial history of English. Instead, he questions whether the language can be adopted and reshaped. He contends that African writers ought to develop English that can convey African experience. Achebe argues that English “will have to be a new English” tailored to its African context” (62). This position disputes the idea that a language is forever tied to the culture that once held dominance over it. In Achebe’s fiction, English is reshaped by Igbo proverbs, oral traditions, idiomatic expressions, untranslated terms, indigenous ideas, and African narrative styles. For example, *Things Fall Apart* does not simply render African culture into standard British English. It restructures English to allow Igbo social values, beliefs, conflicts, and oral traditions to function within the novel.

Achebe’s position thus constitutes an act of linguistic appropriation. The colonial language arrives in Africa as a tool of domination, yet the African writer returns it imbued with African experience. This is where the debate turns contentious. From Ngugi’s viewpoint, adopting English might preserve the existing power structure, as English remains dominant in publishing, education, and literary acclaim. From Achebe’s viewpoint, however, completely rejecting English might prevent African writers from having access to a language that can bridge ethnic and national divides. English can serve as a shared medium of communication among communities that speak different indigenous languages. The disagreement therefore extends beyond culture to include audience, accessibility, education, publishing, and political communication.

Bill Ashcroft, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin offer a helpful theoretical framework for understanding this controversy via the concepts of “abrogation” and “appropriation.” In *The Empire Writes Back*, the authors describe how postcolonial writers contest the assumed dominance of metropolitan English and reshape it according to their own cultural contexts. Their argument helps us see why African, Indian, Caribbean, and other postcolonial varieties of English should not be viewed merely as flawed forms of British English. The colonial language can be reshaped from the periphery and adapted to include experiences that were left out of metropolitan literary traditions. Therefore, the postcolonial writer is not required to choose between completely rejecting language or passively accepting it. Another option arises: transformation.

This change is evident in Wole Soyinka’s literary work. Soyinka’s use of English is intimately linked to Yoruba mythology, ritual, performance, history, and traditional modes of thinking. His writing shows that the colonial language can be integrated into an indigenous cultural framework. This is significant because Soyinka’s stance complicates a straightforward divide between English and Yoruba. The debate is no longer about whether English is inherently colonial or indigenous, but rather what cultural role the writer enacts through its use. Though the language may reflect a colonial past, the meanings generated through it can question colonial assumptions. Soyinka’s work thus shows that cultural resistance can occur via transformation instead of rejection.

Achebe and Soyinka also highlight the significance of orality in postcolonial literature. Including proverbs, folktales, myths, songs, rituals, and oral traditions in English prose disrupts the conventional ranking that places European literary works above indigenous oral cultures. Achebe’s incorporation of Igbo proverbs is particularly important, as they serve as a vehicle for conveying indigenous knowledge into the colonial language. English is thus made to carry an African worldview. The process involves more than just translation. It represents a restructuring of the literary language from the inside out.

Considering Obi Wali’s controversial stance makes the African debate even more complex. Wali maintained that authentic African literature ought to be composed in African languages. His stance anticipated and shaped the subsequent linguistic debates linked to Ngugi. The debate among Wali, Ngugi, and Achebe highlights an unresolved issue: should African literature be defined by the language it is written in, or by the culture and historical context it embodies? If authenticity is judged solely by language, African writers who write in English or French might be left out. If authenticity is defined solely by cultural experience, then the colonial language could become an acceptable vehicle for African expression. This unresolved contradiction lies at the heart of postcolonial literary theory.

The Indian situation adds another layer to this debate. English in India follows a distinct historical path compared to its development in many African societies, despite both being closely tied to colonial education and governance. Indian writers have employed English to convey social, cultural, religious, political, and regional experiences. R.K. Narayan's fictional town of Malgudi stands out as a particularly significant example. Though he writes in English, his fictional world is clearly Indian. His characters, customs, social relationships, beliefs, occupations, and moral conflicts are rooted in Indian life rather than being imitations of English society. English serves as a medium through which the everyday experiences of Indians become visible to a broader readership.

In the famous foreword to *Kanthapura*, Raja Rao clearly highlights this linguistic issue. He recognizes the challenge of conveying Indian cultural experience in English: "One has to convey in a language that is not one's own the spirit that is one's own" (v). Rao's statement embodies the core contradiction at the heart of Indian English literature. Though English stems historically from colonialism, Indian writers can adapt it into a language that conveys Indian sensibility. Rao further insists, "We cannot write like the English. We should not" (v). This is not about rejecting English; it's about rejecting imitation.

Rao's argument gains greater significance when considered in conjunction with Ngugi. Both writers acknowledge the risk of linguistic dominance, yet they propose different remedies. Ngũgĩ aims for cultural recovery using African languages, whereas Rao seeks cultural transformation through English. Rao portrays English as an integral component of India's intellectual landscape, while setting it apart from the emotional realm of Indian vernacular cultures. Thus, his *Kanthapura* becomes an experiment in getting English to reflect Indian narrative rhythms, mythology, oral storytelling, and village culture. The result is not purely British English nor merely a direct translation of Kannada. It is a developing idiom in Indian English literature.

Salman Rushdie develops this argument further. In *Imaginary Homelands*, he provocatively asserts that "English is an Indian literary language" and contends that there is no inherent conflict between English literature and Indian literature. Rushdie's stance is significant because it rejects the notion that English has always been foreign to India. His argument also brings up a challenging political issue: can a language imposed via colonial rule become part of the cultural legacy of the once-colonized? For Rushdie, the answer is largely positive. For Ngũgĩ, however, adopting such a stance could risk ignoring the unequal dynamic between English and indigenous languages. Therefore, the controversy remains unresolved and continues to grow.

Edward Said's *Orientalism* adds another crucial perspective to the argument. He shows that colonial power was maintained not only by armies and governments but also

through mechanisms of representation. The East was frequently portrayed using Western frameworks that cast the Orient as foreign, mysterious, undeveloped, illogical, or inferior. Postcolonial literature disrupts this representational framework by enabling formerly colonized peoples to take on the role of creators rather than being portrayed solely as subjects. Language thus becomes a tool of politics. When an Indian or African writer portrays their society in English, they are not merely switching languages; they may also be altering the perspective from which that society is depicted.

Nevertheless, the act of representation itself continues to pose issues. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak challenges the notion that granting marginalized individuals access to a dominant language automatically empowers them to speak out. In “Can the Subaltern Speak?” She contends that systems of representation can hinder marginalized groups from securing a meaningful platform for expression. Her controversial formulation states, “There is no space from which the sexed subaltern subject can speak” (307). Spivak’s argument is especially pertinent to postcolonial language, as even a postcolonial writer employing English may not portray all marginalized groups with equal representation. In postcolonial societies, class, caste, gender, education, and access to publishing reinforce additional layers of social hierarchy.

This critique is crucial for analyzing Indian and African literature, as the term “postcolonial” may mask significant internal variations. A writer with a university education who writes in English might criticize colonialism while also addressing educated elite. Therefore, using English might confront colonial discourse in one way but simultaneously reinforce social inequality in another. Spivak’s intervention stops postcolonial criticism from assuming that all indigenous voices are equally represented.

Homi K. Bhabha offers an alternative perspective on this complexity via the ideas of hybridity and the “Third Space.” Bhabha contends that cultural meaning does not stay static within a simple binary of colonizer and colonized. The colonial encounter creates a liminal cultural space where identities are translated, negotiated, and reshaped. He writes that the “Third Space” enables cultural signs to be “appropriated, translated, rehistoricised and read anew” (55). This concept is especially helpful in understanding writers like Achebe, Soyinka, Narayan, Rao, Rushdie, and subsequent Indian and African authors. Their English is not merely British English relocated to a different geographical area. It is a literary language that blends influences from local histories and cultural practices.

Bhabha’s position, however, can also be contrasted with Ngugi’s. If hybridity comes to be the main way of understanding postcolonial identity, it risks overlooking the material inequalities left behind by colonialism. Cultural mixing does not always occur under the same circumstances. Although English may seem like a blend in literature, it still holds more institutional influence than indigenous languages in education, employment,

publishing, and global scholarship. Ngugi's focus on linguistic hierarchy thus continues to serve as a vital corrective to theories that applaud cultural hybridity without adequately scrutinizing unequal power dynamics.

The debate can also be broadened to include contemporary Indian English writers. Writers including Mulk Raj Anand, Anita Desai, Salman Rushdie, Amitav Ghosh, Arundhati Roy, and Kiran Desai have each developed distinct approach to blending English and Indian cultural experiences. Their works often incorporate Indian vocabulary, local dialects, mythological elements, cuisine, traditions, social customs, multilingual conversations, and culturally distinctive references. This development shows that English in postcolonial literature is not a static linguistic system. It is constantly adjusted by the cultures in which it functions. This same phenomenon can be observed in contemporary African literature. Authors including Ngugi wa Thiong'o, Chinua Achebe, Wole Soyinka, Gabriel Okara, Ayi Kwei Armah, and later figures like Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie illustrate varied responses to the issue of language. Some prioritize indigenous languages; others use English while integrating African linguistic and cultural elements. Their disagreement should not be oversimplified as merely a matter of choosing between tradition and modernity.

Thus, the controversy should not be simplified to whether English is good or bad for postcolonial cultures. Such a black-and-white approach is insufficient. English serves simultaneously as a remnant of colonial rule, a tool for education and social advancement, a means of global communication, a source of literature, and a vehicle by which indigenous cultures resist colonial portrayals. Likewise, using an indigenous language can serve as a significant step in cultural revitalization, yet restoring language by itself does not automatically address issues of class, gender, caste, audience, or institutional power.

References

- Achebe, Chinua. "The African Writer and the English Language." *Morning Yet on Creation Day*, Heinemann, 1975, pp. 55–62.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. Routledge, 2002.
- Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994.
- Fanon, Frantz. *Black Skin, White Masks*. Translated by Charles Lam Markmann, Pluto Press, 1986.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. James Currey, 1986.
- Rao, Raja. *Kanthapura*. Oxford UP, 1989.
- Rushdie, Salman. "The New Empire within Britain." *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and*

Criticism 1981–1991, Granta Books, 1991, pp. 129–38.

Said, Edward W. *Orientalism*. Pantheon Books, 1978.

Soyinka, Wole. *Myth, Literature and the African World*. Cambridge UP, 1976.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Can the Subaltern Speak?” *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, edited by Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois Press, 1988, pp. 271–313.