http://www.casestudiesjournal.com/
Impact Factor: 4.428

African Renaissance and the Reclamation of Identity

(Voices, Visions, and Resistance in Anglophone African Literature)

Author Details :
AMADOU BOUNTY DIALLO Cheikh Loundou
Université Abdou Moumouni de Niamey | Département d'Anglais
oriondiallo@gmail.com

Abstract
this article examines how the concept of an African Renaissance — understood here as the sustained drive toward cultural self-determination, civilizational renewal, and psychological decolonization — shapes and is shaped by Anglophone African literary production from the late colonial period to the present. Through close reading of selected works by Chinua Achebe, Ngugi wa Thiong'o, and Wole Soyinka, the article argues that the literary text is not a reflection of Renaissance aspirations but one of the primary arenas in which those aspirations are contested, clarified, and sometimes fundamentally revised. Particular attention is paid to the entangled questions of narrative authority, linguistic sovereignty, gendered selfhood, and diasporic identity that run through this tradition. Instead of treating the Renaissance as an accomplished program, the article insists on its unfinished and internally contested character: the writers examined here agree on very little beyond the conviction that the story of Africa must be told differently, and that literature is where that retelling begins.
Keywords: *African Renaissance; Anglophone African literature; postcolonial criticism; decolonization; linguistic sovereignty; cultural identity*

Résumé
Cet article examine comment le concept de Renaissance africaine — entendu ici comme la dynamique soutenue vers l'autodétermination culturelle, le renouveau civilisationnel et la décolonisation psychologique — façonne la production littéraire africaine anglophone depuis la période coloniale tardive jusqu'au moment contemporain, et en est simultanément façonné. À travers une lecture rapprochée d'œuvres choisies de Chinua Achebe, de Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o et de Wole Soyinka, l'article soutient que le texte littéraire n'est pas un simple reflet des aspirations de la Renaissance, mais l'un des espaces privilégiés où ces aspirations sont contestées, clarifiées et parfois fondamentalement remises en question. Une attention particulière est accordée aux questions étroitement imbriquées de l'autorité narrative, de la souveraineté linguistique, de l'identité de genre et de l'appartenance diasporique qui traversent cette tradition. Plutôt que de traiter la Renaissance comme un programme accompli, l'article insiste sur son caractère inachevé et profondément disputé : les écrivains examinés ici s'accordent sur fort peu de choses, si ce n'est la conviction que l'histoire de l'Afrique doit être racontée autrement, et que la littérature est le lieu où ce récit alternatif commence.
Mots-clés : *Renaissance africaine ; littérature africaine anglophone ; critique postcoloniale ; décolonisation ; souveraineté linguistique ; identité culturelle.*

Introduction

The idea that Africa stands at a threshold of civilizational renewal is not new, and it has never been politically innocent. From the pan-Africanist writings of Edward Wilmot Blyden in the nineteenth century to the post-apartheid rhetoric of Thabo Mbeki in the 1990s, the language of Renaissance has served purposes that are as much political and ideological as they are cultural. This article is not concerned, however, with the Renaissance as a political slogan. Its interest is narrower and, it is argued, more consequential: the life of the Renaissance idea within the literary imagination, and the ways in which Anglophone African writers have used fiction, drama, and the essay to construct, complicate, and sometimes quietly dismantle the optimism that the word carries.

That optimism has always had to contend with a body of writing working against it. The colonial literary imagination did not ignore Africa; it actively constructed the continent as a space without history, without interiority, without the forms of social complexity that European culture reserved for itself. Achebe's famous dissection of Conrad in *'An Image of Africa'* (1977) makes this point with a directness that has lost none of its force over the decades since. The writers that are examined in this article are, in different ways and to different degrees, responding to that construction. What varies enormously between them is how they respond — and what vision of African life they offer in its place.

English itself is a problem here, and one the article does not attempt to resolve. The choice to write in the language of colonial education is a decision each Anglophone African writer must justify to themselves, whether or not they acknowledge it as a decision. Achebe, in his collected essays *Morning Yet on Creation Day* (1975), offered the most widely cited defense of that choice. He argues that the African writer's task was to fashion an English capable of carrying the weight of particular African experience without surrendering its reach as a medium of wider communication. The specific terms of that argument are examined in Section 7, which deals at length with the debate between Achebe and Ngugi on the language question. For now it is enough to note that the tension running through this tradition between the tools inherited from colonialism and the experience those tools are being pressed to express, is not a defect of Anglophone African writing but its defining creative condition.

The sections that follow move from the historical and institutional conditions that made the literary Renaissance possible, through close consideration of Achebe, Ngugi, Soyinka, and Adichie , to a sustained engagement with the language debate and a conclusion that resists the temptation to declare the African Renaissance complete.

1. before the Renaissance: Setting the Historical Stage

Any account of what the Anglophone literary Renaissance achieved has to begin with what it was working against. The colonial literary tradition had spent roughly two centuries developing a set of conventions for representing Africa that served, whether consciously or not, to justify European presence there. Africa appeared in this tradition primarily as landscape sublime, threatening, or morally blank and Africans appeared within it as extras, as obstacles, or as illustrations of the stages through which the European civilization had long since passed. This was not a fundamental ornamentation. The cultural dehumanization of Africa and the political project of its colonization were, as Achebe recognized, mutually sustaining.

The institutions that enabled the literary response to this tradition were, historically speaking, quite fragile. The Heinemann African Writers Series, launched in 1962, gave African writers access to an international distribution network that had simply not existed before. (Bejjit, 2019, p. 15). The journals Black Orpheus and Transition, and the Mbari Club in Ibadan, created the intellectual spaces for debate that were neither the missionary school nor the colonial administration's reading room.

What united the writers gathered under this umbrella was less a shared aesthetic stance than a shared conviction about what literature was for. To represent African social life with the seriousness and precision that Achebe brought to Umuofia, or that Soyinka brought to Abeokuta, was already a political act - not because the work declared itself political, but because it refused the terms under which African life had previously been represented. Soyinka made this point with characteristic sharpness at the 1962 Kampala Conference of African Writers, in a remark aimed at the celebratory self-proclamations of Négritude:

> *A tiger does not proclaim his tigritude, he pounces. In other words: a tiger does not stand in the forest and say: 'I am a tiger.' When you pass where the tiger has walked before, you see the skeleton of the duiker, you know that some tigritude has been emanated there.*
>
> *Wole Soyinka, at the 1962 Kampala Conference of African Writers*

The remark has been quoted so often that its edge has somewhat dulled, but its core argument remains sound. The literary Renaissance would prove its credentials through the quality of the work, not through the volume of its self-assertion. Whether Soyinka's own practice always lived up to this standard is a question the article returns to below. For now, his Kampala formulation stands as a useful statement of the principle that distinguished the best of the Anglophone tradition from its more rhetorically inflated moments.

2. Chinua Achebe

Things Fall Apart (1958) remains, sixty years on, the most widely read African novel in the English language, and the question of why this should be so is worth sitting. Part of the answer is formal. Achebe understood, with a precision that only a few of the first novelists possess, that the colonial archive could not simply be refuted; it had to be outwritten. His Umuofia is a world whose density of social life, whose moral seriousness and domestic comedy and tragic grandeur, make the colonial image look simply thin by comparison.

The novel's opening establishes this density immediately. Okonkwo is introduced in the character of a man with a specific athletic history and a specific social position:

> *Okonkwo was well known throughout the nine villages and even beyond. His fame rested on solid personal achievements. As a young man of eighteen he had brought honour to his village by throwing Amalinze the Cat. Amalinze was the great wrestler who for seven years was unbeaten, from Umuofia to Mbaino.*
>
> *— Things Fall Apart, Chinua Achebe (1958, p.3)*

The detail matters. Before the reader knows anything about colonialism or cultural clash, they know about a particular wrestling match and a particular local reputation. Therefore, Achebe is insisting, from the first paragraph, that this is a world with its own history, its own standards of excellence, and its own way of measuring a man. The colonial catastrophe that follows is not visited upon an abstraction but upon people whose lives have been carefully and specifically rendered. The novel's most articulate analysis of what colonialism does belongs not to Okonkwo whose tragic rigidity prevents him from understanding the process he is caught in — but to his more thoughtful friend Obierika who suggested:

> *The white man is very clever. He came quietly and peaceably with his religion. We were amused at his foolishness and allowed him to stay. Now he has won our brothers, and our clan can no longer act like one. He has put a knife on the things that held us together and we have fallen apart.*
>
> *— Obierika in Things Fall Apart, Chinua Achebe (1958, p.176)*

Obierika's analysis is remarkably clear-eyed, and it is worth noting what it does not do. It does not present the British as devils or the Igbo as innocent victims. The colonizer is described as clever; the colonized are described as having made the initial mistake of underestimating him. This refusal of simple vilification is itself a form of cultural self-respect. It treats Igbo people as historical actors capable of making judgements, some of them wrong, not passive objects in the European hands.

In *Arrow of God* (1964), Achebe extends this enquiry into the mechanics of colonial penetration through a study of spiritual authority under pressure. Ezeulu, the chief priest of the god Ulu, possesses a kind of absolute custodial power over his community's relationship to its past, and it is this very absoluteness that the colonial administration learns to exploit. The novel is perhaps more uncomfortable than *Things Fall Apart* precisely because it is harder to assign blame. Ezeulu's furthermore downfall does not simply portray the result of colonial cunning; it is the result of a collision between that cunning and his own formidable pride. Achebe is interested, throughout his career, in the ways that internal fracture makes conquest possible, a perspective that was, in the early 1960s, not universally welcome.

By the time of *Anthills of the Savannah* (1987), Achebe had shifted his gaze from the colonial period to the post-independence decades, and the mood was considerably darker. The novel's literary character, Ikem Osodi — a journalist whose writing provokes the military government into destroying him — articulates what is at stake in the continuing act of literary testimony:

> *The story is our escort; without it, we are blind. Does the blind man own his escort? No, neither do we the story; rather it is the story that owns us and directs us. It is the thing that makes us different from cattle; it is the mark on the face that sets one people apart from their neighbours.*
>
> *— Ikem Osodi in Anthills of the Savannah, Chinua Achebe (1987)*

This is Achebe at his most openly didactic, and the didacticism has attracted criticism. But the stakes Ikem describes are real enough. The struggle over who controls the story — who gets to narrate African history, African identity, African possibility — was not purely theoretical in 1987 and is not purely theoretical now. Achebe spent his career insisting that this struggle was one literature could engage, and Anthills may be both his most direct statement of that conviction and, in some ways, his most troubled test of it.

3. Ngugi wa Thiong'o: Decolonizing Language, Liberating the Mind

The question that runs through Achebe's work — can English carry the weight of African experience? receives its most radical challenge from Ngugi wa Thiong'o, whose answer, worked out over decades of writing and imprisonment and exile, amounts to a sustained no. Or rather: not without profound cost, and not indefinitely. The mind shaped by the colonizer's language, Ngugi argues in *Decolonizing the Mind* (1986), cannot be fully free of the colonizer's values, however fiercely it resists them. Language is not a neutral container:

> *Language, any language, has a dual character: it is both a means of communication and a carrier of culture. Culture carries, through the particular language that conveys it, the entire body of values by which we come to perceive ourselves and our place in the world.*
>
> *— Decolonizing the Mind, Ngui wa Thiong'o (1986 p.13)*

This argument is deceptively simple and, in its full implications, quite radical. If language carries culture, and if the culture carried by English is European, then the African writer who thinks and dreams in English is doing more than choosing a medium. She is, to some degree, choosing a set of perceptual habits, a hierarchy of values, a particular way of organizing what matters. The argument has attracted criticism most obviously, that it assumes a more direct and less mediated relationship between language and thought than the evidence supports — but even its critics have rarely been entirely comfortable dismissing it.

Ngugi's English-language novels were, before he renounced the form, among the most searching explorations of the Kenyan colonial and post-colonial experience in any literary medium. *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) is built around the independence celebrations of December 1963, but it is less a celebration than a reckoning. The novel's narrative structure fragmented, multi-vocal, working backward and forward through time — formally enacts the moral confusion of a community trying to account for itself after years of the Emergency. Its central figure, Mugo, carries a secret that the novel only gradually reveals: that he betrayed the freedom fighter Kihika to the colonial authorities. The independence celebrations provide not relief for us but a setting for public confession and communal judgment.

What makes this novel remarkable is its refusal to distribute blame tidily. The colonial administration is brutal, but it is also shown working through African intermediaries. The liberation movement is heroic, but it has its informers, its petty opportunists, and its moments of vengeful excess. Ngugi has not written a tale of pure victims and pure oppressors; he wrote about a society in which colonialism has contaminated almost everything it touched, including the resistance to it. This moral complexity is, arguably, the novel's most honest feature and its most enduring achievement.

Taking into account the linguistic turn announced in *Decolonizing the Mind*, it was enacted in practice through *Devil on the Cross* (1982) and *Matigari* (1986), both composed in Gikuyu and subsequently translated. It appears urgent that Ngugi was explicit about what this shift meant:

> *I believe that my writing in Gikuyu language, a Kenyan language, an African language, is part and parcel of the anti-imperialist struggles of Kenyan and African peoples. In schools and universities our Kenyan languages — that is the languages of the many nationalities which make up Kenya — were associated with negative qualities of backwardness, underdevelopment, humiliation and punishment.*
>
> *— Decolonizing the Mind, Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986, p.28)*

The Kenyan government's response to *Matigari* as they seize copies of the novel after reports that people in Kenya were asking about a man named Matigari who was travelling the country demanding justice, is one of the more remarkable episodes in the history of literary censorship. It also illustrates, with unintentional clarity, exactly the point Ngugi was making: that a story told in the right language, reaching the right audience, can acquire a social life that exceeds anything its author controls but at which price. If each writer decide to write in his own mother tongue, the personal restriction each writer impose on his work may prevent each work to get a deserved recognition for his art.

4. Wole Soyinka: Myth, Mortality, and the Integrity of Art

Soyinka's relationship to the African Renaissance is more oblique than Achebe's or Ngugi's, and more philosophically demanding. Where Achebe reconstructs the historical social world that colonialism disrupted, and Ngugi interrogates the ideological machinery of colonial culture, Soyinka builds his literary universe from the resources of Yoruba cosmology — particularly the figure of Ogun, the deity who embodies creative energy and destructive force in the same person. This is not mere ornamentation. For Soyinka, the deepest damage colonialism inflicted was not economic or even political but metaphysical: it severed Africans from the philosophical frameworks through which their ancestors had made sense of existence, suffering, and transition.

On one side, at the 1986 Nobel Prize ceremony in Stockholm, Soyinka made this claim at the highest possible public platform:

> *I stand here today, as a direct descendant of that creative matrix which, for at least two millennia, produced masterpieces of visual art... I belong to a people who would not exchange their gods for alien ones.*

— Wole Soyinka, Nobel Lecture, 'This Past Must Address Its Present' (1986)

The declaration is deliberately provocative. Of course no, Soyinka is not claiming African cultural superiority; he is just refusing that asymmetry of the colonial encounter, which demanded that Africans exchange their frameworks for the European ones while receiving nothing equivalent in return. The Nobel platform gave him the rare opportunity to say this without mediation, and he took it.

While on the other hand, *Death and the King's Horseman* (1975) remains this meticulous work in which this philosophical argument finds its most powerful dramatic expression. The play opens with Elesin Oba, the king's horseman whose ritual obligation is to follow his recently dead lord into the afterlife, moving through the market in a state of celebration. The play's famous Not-I bird sequence - in which Elesin and the Praise-Singer exchange a parable about all those who, when death announced itself, turned away and said 'Not I' - establishes immediately that this is not a play about African customs as curiosity or spectacle. It is a play about the nature of obligation, about what it costs to be the kind of person who does not say 'Not I' when the moment arrives.

When the colonial District Officer Pilkings intervenes arrogantly to prevent the ritual, his action even though seemingly motivated by what he regards as humanitarian concern. Soyinka's genius makes this concern legible, Pilkings is not a villain but he lacks the humility to acknowledge that he does not know everything while showing with equal clarity that it enacts a form of profound violence. The tragedy that follows nevertheless illustrates a combine addition of facts: Elesin's personal failure, the fatal hesitation at the threshold that makes his son Olunde's sacrifice necessary. It is the rupture of a metaphysical compact that no administrative act can repair. Soyinka's prefatory note explicitly warns against reading the play as a cultural-clash drama; the metaphysical dimensions he insists on are not decorative. They are the point.

5. The Language Question: Sovereignty, Strategy, and Pluralism

No debate in Anglophone African literary criticism has been more persistent, more generative, or more resistant to resolution than the one over language. It is, at bottom, a debate about what decolonization actually requires — whether it demands the rejection of colonial instruments or their transformation, and whether these are genuinely different things or two descriptions of the same process. The two most powerful positions in this debate are those of Ngugi and Achebe, and they have been in productive antagonism for over half a century.

Ngugi's case rests on his analysis of what colonial language education actually did to African students. It was not merely a matter of suppressing indigenous languages; it was a matter of systematically linking those languages to shame, backwardness, and punishment, while linking European languages to intelligence, advancement, and social legitimacy. The effect, he argues, was a form of psychic colonization that survived the departure of the colonizer:

> *Thus language and literature were taking us further and further from ourselves to other selves, from our world to other worlds... The colonial child was made to see the world and where he stands in it as seen and defined by or reflected in the culture of the language of imposition.*
>
> *— Decolonizing the Mind, Ngugi wa Thiong'o (1986, p.12)*

The strength of this argument is its attention to the experiential reality of colonial education the humiliation of being caught speaking Gikuyu in the school corridor, the prizes awarded for English composition and not for anything composed in an indigenous tongue. These are not abstractions. Ngugi is writing about something that happened to specific children in specific classrooms, and its effects on the way those children grew up to think about themselves.

Achebe's response is less a rebuttal than a different framing. He does not deny the violence of colonial language education; he argues that the violence does not settle the question of what to do with the language one has,

nevertheless, inherited. He claims that English can be remade in the service of African experience, that the act of appropriation and transformation is itself a form of decolonization:

> *The African writer should aim to use English in a way that brings out his message best without altering the language to the extent that its value as a medium of international exchange will be lost. He should aim at fashioning out an English which is at once universal and able to carry his peculiar experience.*
>
> *— Morning Yet on Creation Day, Chinua Achebe (1975)*

One objection to this position raised by Ngugi and others is that 'international exchange' is not a neutral phrase. The readership for which this internationally exchangeable English is intended is, in practice, largely European and North American. To write for that readership is to accept certain assumptions about what requires explanation and what can be taken for granted, about whose cultural references need glossing and whose do not. Achebe's Things Fall Apart carries a glossary of Igbo terms. No European novel carries a glossary of its cultural assumptions. The asymmetry is not accidental.

Neither position, taken alone, is wholly satisfying which perhaps the point is. The debate has not been resolved because it reflects a genuine and ongoing tension within the project of decolonization itself. What it has produced, however, is a literary tradition remarkable for its self-awareness about the conditions of its own production. African writers working in English have had to think about what they are doing and why in ways that writers working in majority languages are rarely required to do. This enforced self-consciousness has not been a disadvantage.

Conclusion

The African Renaissance, as this article has traced it through six decades of Anglophone literary production, is not tending toward completion. Each of the writers examined here has understood it differently, pursued it through different formal choices, and arrived at different assessments of how much has been achieved and how much remains to do. What they share is not a scheme but a refusal: the refusal to accept the colonial verdict on African humanity as the last word, or even a particularly reliable word, on the subject. It is worth being honest about what the literary tradition has and has not been able to accomplish. It has produced a body of work — *Things Fall Apart, A Grain of Wheat, Death and the King's Horseman,* and much else — of the kind that endures, that continues to be read by people who have no stake in its cultural politics, that has permanently altered what the novel can do and what it can carry. This is not nothing. In a tradition where so much writing is received as political testimony first and literature second, the sustained achievement of literary quality in service of cultural argument is in itself remarkable.

What the literary tradition has been less able to do — and perhaps less able to do than its practitioners have sometimes claimed is transform the material conditions it describes. The neo-colonial arrangements that Ngugi anatomizes in *Petals of Blood* and *Matigari* have not been dismantled by the existence of those novels. The erasure of African historical complexity that Achebe spent his career combating persists in countless forms, some of them considerably more sophisticated than anything Conrad managed. Literature does not solve these problems. It helps people understand them more fully, feel them more acutely, and perhaps find in that understanding the beginning of something else. That is not a modest claim, but it is a precise one.

In *An Image of Africa (1977),* Achebe made the foundational charge against the tradition that the Anglophone Renaissance was formed to answer:

> *Conrad was a thoroughgoing racist. That this simple truth is glossed over in criticisms of his work is due to the fact that white racism against Africa is such a normal way of thinking that its manifestations go completely unremarked.*

— Chinua Achebe, 'An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness' (1977)

What Achebe's own novels, and the tradition that followed them, have accomplished is to make that normality somewhat harder to sustain. Not impossible — the evidence of any given week's news coverage would suggest that the project remains very far from complete. But harder. That difficulty, created and maintained through the patient labor of literary form, is what the Anglophone African Renaissance has, at its best, produced. And it is what the next generation of writers, working in whatever languages they choose, will have to both inherit and extend.

References

Achebe, Chinua. *Things Fall Apart*. Heinemann, 1958.

---. *Arrow of God*. Heinemann, 1964.

---. *Morning yet on Creation Day: Essays*. Heinemann, 1975.

---. "An Image of Africa: Racism in Conrad's Heart of Darkness." *Massachusetts Review*, vol. 18, no. 4, 1977, pp. 782–794.

---. *Anthills of the Savannah*. Heinemann, 1987.

Bejjit, Nourdin. "Heinemann African Writers Series: History, Editorship, and Markets." *Logos: Journal of the World Publishing Community*, vol. 30, no. 1, 2019, pp. 12–27, https://doi.org/10.1163/18784712-03001003.

Emecheta, Buchi. *Second-Class Citizen*. Allison & Busby, 1974.

---. *The Joys of Motherhood*. Heinemann, 1979.

Ngugi wa Thiong'o. *A Grain of Wheat*. Heinemann, 1967.

---. *Devil on the Cross*. Translated by the author, Heinemann, 1982.

---. *Decolonizing the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. James Currey, 1986.

---. *Matigari*. Heinemann, 1987.

Soyinka, Wole. *Death and the King's Horseman*. Methuen, 1975.

---. *Aké: The Years of Childhood*. Rex Collings, 1981.

---. "This Past Must Address Its Present." *Nobel Lecture*, Nobel Foundation, 8 Dec. 1986, www.nobelprize.org/prizes/literature/1986/soyinka/lecture/.