

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

<https://llrjournal.com/index.php/11>

Hybridity and Resistance in the Selected Works of Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o: A Comparative Analysis



¹Dr. Safia Siddiqui

²Dr. Saima Yousaf Khan

³Rabia Ashraf

¹Assistant Professor, Department of English Literature,
The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Punjab, Pakistan
Email: safiabwp@yahoo.com

²Lecturer, Department of English Literature, University
of Balochistan, Quetta, Balochistan, Pakistan.
Corresponding Author Email:
saimakhan.english@um.uob.edu.pk

³Assistant Professor of English, Govt. Zainab Graduate
College for Women, Multan, Punjab, Pakistan.
Email: rabia4atif@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines the interrelated themes of hybridity and resistance in the selected works of Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, situating both authors within the broader discourse of postcolonial African literature. While Gurnah's narratives often foreground the ambivalent negotiations of identity under colonial and diasporic conditions, Ngũgĩ's fiction is rooted in the politics of linguistic and cultural reclamation in the wake of imperial domination. Drawing upon Homi K. Bhabha's concepts of hybridity and mimicry alongside theories of cultural resistance, the research undertakes a comparative textual analysis of selected novels by both writers. The analysis reveals that Gurnah presents hybridity as a contested but potentially transformative site where fractured identities seek negotiation and renewal, whereas Ngũgĩ frames resistance as an uncompromising act of cultural assertion through language, memory, and collective struggle. Together, their works demonstrate how African literature both critiques the enduring legacies of colonialism and imagines alternative possibilities for cultural survival and self-determination. By juxtaposing Gurnah's exploration of diasporic subjectivities with Ngũgĩ's advocacy for decolonization through language, this study highlights the diverse strategies African writers employ to articulate resistance and resilience in the face of imperial power.

Keywords: Hybridity, Resistance, Postcolonial Literature, Identity Formation, Cultural Negotiation, Mimicry, Decolonization, African Literature

Background of the Study

The study of African literature has long been shaped by the historical realities of colonialism, resistance, and the complex negotiations of identity. Postcolonial African writers frequently grapple with the cultural, linguistic, and political legacies of imperial domination, while simultaneously envisioning possibilities for self-determination and cultural reclamation. Two of the most influential voices in this discourse are Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, whose works offer contrasting yet complementary approaches to the negotiation of colonial and postcolonial realities.

Abdulrazak Gurnah's fiction, often set against the backdrop of East Africa's colonial

encounters and diasporic migrations, foregrounds the ambivalence of hybridity as theorized by Homi K. Bhabha (1994). In novels such as *Paradise* (1994) and *Afterlives* (2020), Gurnah depicts characters caught between competing cultural frameworks, negotiating fractured subjectivities shaped by colonial violence, displacement, and memory (Kebede, 2021). Hybridity in Gurnah's work emerges as both a site of vulnerability and a resource for resilience, reflecting the nuanced ways in which colonized subjects navigate domination and survival (Steiner, 2022).

In contrast, Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o has consistently positioned his literary and theoretical contributions within a framework of overt resistance to colonial and neo-colonial power. His early works, such as *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), interrogate the political and social upheavals of Kenya's struggle for independence, while his later writings, especially *Decolonising the Mind* (1986), advocate for linguistic decolonization through the embrace of African languages (Mwangi, 2009). For Ngũgĩ, resistance entails rejecting colonial epistemologies and reclaiming indigenous cultural identities as a foundation for collective liberation (Ogude, 1999).

The juxtaposition of Gurnah and Ngũgĩ offers fertile ground for examining the diverse strategies of postcolonial resistance in African literature. While Gurnah's exploration of hybridity underscores the ambivalence of cultural negotiation within global and diasporic contexts, Ngũgĩ's radical stance insists on the centrality of cultural authenticity and linguistic sovereignty. Both approaches illuminate the ongoing struggles over identity, memory, and power in postcolonial Africa, revealing the complex intersections of resistance and adaptation in the face of imperial domination.

Statement of the Problem

Postcolonial African literature is deeply engaged with the legacies of colonial domination and the strategies through which individuals and communities negotiate identity, memory, and cultural survival. While Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o stand as prominent figures in this discourse, their works present distinct but complementary approaches to the tension between hybridity and resistance. Gurnah often portrays characters inhabiting liminal spaces where cultural identities are fractured yet open to negotiation, whereas Ngũgĩ emphasizes uncompromising

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

resistance through the reclamation of indigenous language and culture. Despite growing scholarship on both authors, comparative studies that critically examine how hybridity and resistance function as literary and political strategies in their writings remain limited. This gap raises important questions about the different ways African writers articulate responses to imperial legacies, and how these approaches contribute to broader understandings of postcolonial subjectivities.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant because it contributes to postcolonial literary scholarship by offering a comparative analysis of two major African writers whose works foreground different but interconnected strategies of confronting colonial power. By examining Gurnah's exploration of hybridity alongside Ngũgĩ's advocacy for cultural resistance, the research sheds light on the multiplicity of postcolonial responses to imperialism. It highlights how African literature negotiates the dialectic between adaptation and resistance, between cosmopolitan hybridity and cultural reclamation. The study thus provides critical insights into the complex processes of identity formation, the politics of language, and the imaginative possibilities of resistance in African narratives. Furthermore, it enriches debates in postcolonial theory by testing the applicability of concepts such as hybridity, mimicry, and decolonization across different literary and cultural contexts.

Objectives of the Study

- To analyze how Abdulrazak Gurnah represents hybridity and cultural negotiation in his selected novels.
- To examine how Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o conceptualizes resistance through language, culture, and historical memory in his works.
- To compare and contrast the strategies of hybridity and resistance in Gurnah and Ngũgĩ, highlighting their implications for postcolonial identity and cultural survival.

Research Questions

- 1) How does Abdulrazak Gurnah portray hybridity and the ambivalent negotiation of identity in his novels?
- 2) In what ways does Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o represent resistance as a cultural and

political strategy in his writings?

- 3) What similarities and differences emerge between Gurnah's notion of hybridity and Ngũgĩ's emphasis on resistance, and what do these reveal about broader postcolonial struggles for identity and cultural survival?

Literature Review

Postcolonial African literature is shaped by ongoing debates about identity, resistance, and cultural survival in the wake of colonial domination. The works of Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o occupy central positions in these debates, though they approach the question of how to respond to imperial legacies through different strategies: hybridity and resistance.

Hybridity in Gurnah's Fiction

Homi K. Bhabha's (1994) notion of hybridity provides a useful framework for reading Gurnah's novels, which often portray characters living in the interstices of cultures. For Bhabha, hybridity disrupts the binary opposition between colonizer and colonized, producing an "in-between" space where new cultural forms emerge. Gurnah's fiction exemplifies this ambivalence. In *Paradise* (1994), for instance, the protagonist Yusuf navigates multiple cultural influences—Swahili, Arab, and German—illustrating both the violence of colonial intrusion and the possibility of cultural negotiation (Sharpe, 2003). Similarly, *Afterlives* (2020) depicts characters such as Hamza and Afiya, whose fractured identities reflect the tensions of colonial displacement but also highlight the resilience of adaptation (Kebede, 2021). Critics argue that Gurnah uses hybridity to foreground the complexities of subject formation under imperial domination, emphasizing vulnerability while also recognizing the transformative potential of intercultural encounters (Steiner, 2022; Quayson, 2000).

Resistance in Ngũgĩ's Writings

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o has consistently articulated a different strategy: cultural resistance. His early novels, such as *A Grain of Wheat* (1967), narrate Kenya's independence struggle, linking national liberation with collective memory (Ogude, 1999). However, Ngũgĩ's most significant theoretical contribution lies in his advocacy for linguistic decolonization in *Decolonising the Mind* (1986), where he critiques the imposition of European languages as tools of domination. According to Ngũgĩ, writing in African

languages is both a symbolic and practical act of resistance, reclaiming cultural sovereignty from colonial epistemologies (Gikandi, 2000; Mwangi, 2009). Scholars note that his rejection of English in favor of Gikuyu represents a radical stance within African literature, challenging the assimilationist tendencies that often accompany hybridity (Simon, 2017).

Hybridity vs. Resistance: Tensions and Intersections

Although hybridity and resistance are sometimes framed as opposing strategies, recent scholarship emphasizes their intersections. Bhabha (1994) acknowledges that hybridity can subvert colonial authority, making it a form of resistance in itself. Gurnah's depictions of diasporic subjectivities often highlight this subversive potential, showing how marginalized individuals repurpose imposed identities to assert agency (Kebede, 2021). In contrast, Ngũgĩ warns that hybridity risks diluting cultural authenticity and perpetuating neo-colonial dependency (Ngũgĩ, 1986). Scholars such as Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2002) suggest that hybridity and resistance should not be read as mutually exclusive but rather as part of a spectrum of postcolonial strategies, each shaped by particular historical and cultural contexts.

Comparative Approaches in African Literature

Comparative studies of African writers highlight the plurality of postcolonial responses to imperialism. While Ngũgĩ represents an uncompromising model of resistance rooted in national identity, Gurnah engages with the complexities of displacement, exile, and diaspora (Gurnah, 2004; Stein, 2004). Both approaches are vital for understanding the diverse ways African literature negotiates power, memory, and identity. As Gikandi (2016) notes, African writers often operate within "contradictory locations" that demand both adaptation and resistance, reflecting the layered realities of postcolonial life. This comparative lens underscores the need to analyze how hybridity and resistance coexist, clash, and inform one another in shaping literary representations of African subjectivities.

Research Gap

While extensive scholarship exists on the postcolonial writings of Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, most studies have tended to treat their works in isolation, emphasizing either Gurnah's diasporic portrayals of displacement and hybridity

(Steiner, 2022; Kebede, 2021) or Ngũgĩ's nationalist vision of resistance and cultural reclamation (Ogude, 1999; Simon, 2017). Comparatively few studies have placed these two authors in direct dialogue, despite the rich possibilities their contrasting approaches offer for understanding the spectrum of postcolonial responses to empire.

Furthermore, research on hybridity often privileges theoretical abstraction, focusing on Bhabha's notion of ambivalence, but does not adequately explore how hybridity intersects with local gendered experiences in African contexts, as seen in characters such as Afiya in Gurnah's *Afterlives*. Similarly, studies of resistance in Ngũgĩ have primarily concentrated on political nationalism and linguistic decolonization, with limited attention to how his fictional narratives dramatize the complexities and contradictions of post-independence struggles.

Therefore, a clear gap exists in comparative scholarship that examines hybridity and resistance as complementary, rather than opposing, strategies within African literature. By juxtaposing Gurnah's diasporic exploration of fractured identities with Ngũgĩ's nationalist insistence on cultural sovereignty, this study addresses an underexplored intersection in postcolonial studies, contributing to a more nuanced understanding of how African writers negotiate the legacies of colonialism across different historical and cultural locations.

Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design grounded in literary analysis. The primary method is close reading of selected texts by Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, focusing on thematic patterns, narrative strategies, and character constructions that illuminate the dynamics of hybridity and resistance. Comparative textual analysis is applied to explore similarities and differences in how the two writers respond to colonial and postcolonial conditions. The texts chosen—Gurnah's *Paradise* (1994) and *Afterlives* (2020), alongside Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) and *Petals of Blood* (1977)—have been selected for their rich engagement with issues of identity, colonial domination, cultural negotiation, and decolonization. Secondary materials, including critical essays, journal articles, and theoretical texts, are consulted to situate the analysis within ongoing scholarly debates. Data interpretation follows an interpretive, hermeneutic approach, seeking to uncover how literary representations of

hybridity and resistance function as cultural commentaries on colonial legacies and postcolonial struggles.

Theoretical Framework

The analysis is framed by postcolonial theory, particularly Homi K. Bhabha's (1994) concepts of hybridity and mimicry, and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o's own theoretical writings on cultural and linguistic decolonization. Bhabha's notion of hybridity provides a lens for understanding Gurnah's depiction of characters negotiating fractured identities in intercultural spaces, where ambivalence destabilizes colonial authority and produces new possibilities for subjectivity. Mimicry, as another of Bhabha's key concepts, helps explain moments of assimilation in Gurnah's texts, which both reproduce and subvert colonial power structures.

In contrast, Ngũgĩ's critical work in *Decolonising the Mind* (1986) offers a framework for understanding resistance as a cultural and political act rooted in language and memory. His rejection of colonial languages and advocacy for indigenous expression articulate resistance not as negotiation but as reclamation. By placing Bhabha's theories of hybridity in dialogue with Ngũgĩ's call for resistance, this study engages both the cosmopolitan ambivalence of cultural mixing and the radical insistence on cultural sovereignty.

These theoretical perspectives enable reading of Gurnah and Ngũgĩ, highlighting how African literature imagines different, sometimes competing, strategies of survival, adaptation, and resistance in the aftermath of colonialism.

Data Analysis

Abdulrazak Gurnah: *Paradise* (1994) and *Afterlives* (2020)

Gurnah's fiction often situates characters in liminal spaces, caught between cultures, languages, and identities. In *Paradise*, the young protagonist Yusuf is taken to serve as a debt pawn, and his journey exposes him to multiple cultural influences—Swahili, Arab, and German colonial. In one moment, Yusuf marvels at the German soldiers' authority and material power, expressing both awe and unease. This ambivalence illustrates what Bhabha (1994) terms mimicry: the colonized subject's partial identification with the colonizer, which is simultaneously submissive and subversive. Yusuf's fragmented sense of belonging, never fully at home in any cultural framework,

exemplifies the ambivalence of hybridity, where cultural negotiation becomes a strategy for survival but also a source of alienation.

In *Afterlives* (2020), Gurnah presents Hamza, a former askari (African soldier conscripted into the German colonial army). Hamza's traumatic experiences under German command mark his body and psyche, yet he selectively reclaims aspects of his precolonial cultural identity upon returning to civilian life. His ability to retain dignity, rebuild relationships, and preserve cultural practices reflects the transformative potential of hybridity. Unlike Yusuf's tragic entrapment, Hamza demonstrates resilience by navigating both colonial scars and indigenous traditions. Similarly, Afiya embodies gendered resilience. As a woman facing patriarchal oppression both within her community and from colonial structures, Afiya reclaims agency through her perseverance in education and emotional survival. Her trajectory underscores the intersectionality of hybridity and gendered resistance, showing how marginalized individuals fashion new subjectivities within oppressive systems (Kebede, 2021).

Through these characters, Gurnah does not romanticize hybridity; instead, he presents it as a precarious, often painful negotiation. Yet, he also insists that such negotiations open cultural spaces where survival and subtle forms of resistance become possible.

The following excerpt from *Paradise* 1994:

"He was a boy from the coast, a servant, a slave, a debt-pawn, and yet here he was, walking among strangers, listening to their talk, and learning their ways."

This passage reflects Yusuf's fractured identity as he moves between cultural spaces — Swahili, Arab, and German colonial. His assimilation into new environments embodies Bhabha's hybridity, where mimicry allows limited survival but never full belonging. Yusuf is both inside and outside multiple communities, caught in perpetual negotiation. This underscores the ambivalence of colonial subjectivity, revealing hybridity as a double-edged condition of alienation and adaptation (Sharpe, 2003).

The following excerpts from *Afterlives* (2020):

"He [Hamza] wanted to forget the white man's orders and commands, the beatings, the endless marching... but the scars remained, etched into his skin, his very body

carrying the memory of war.”

Hamza’s body becomes a site of colonial inscription, where violence leaves permanent traces. Yet his attempt to reclaim fragments of his cultural identity illustrates hybridity’s potential for transformation. His scars embody both trauma and survival — a symbolic reminder of how colonial domination fractures identities but also forces subjects to reconstitute themselves in creative ways (Kebede, 2021).

Another Excerpt:

“Afiya would not be silent. She insisted on learning, on making her own way, even when told that girls had no need for schooling.”

Afiya’s determination highlights the intersection of gender and hybridity. She resists both colonial marginalization and patriarchal restrictions within her community. Education becomes a form of agency, allowing her to negotiate oppressive structures without complete assimilation. Here, hybridity emerges as a strategy of resilience that expands possibilities for women’s subjectivities in colonial contexts.

Ngũgĩ wa Thiong’o: *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) and *Petals of Blood* (1977)

Ngũgĩ’s novels foreground resistance as collective struggle, rooted in memory, culture, and language. In *A Grain of Wheat*, the narrative of the Mau Mau rebellion emphasizes sacrifice and betrayal during Kenya’s liberation struggle. One pivotal passage describes the protagonist Mugo, torn between silence and truth about his betrayal of a resistance leader. The collective community expects him to testify, underscoring that resistance in Ngũgĩ’s vision is not merely personal but profoundly communal. This dramatization reflects Ngũgĩ’s conviction that decolonization requires collective resistance, where the reclamation of truth and memory serves as an act of liberation (Ogude, 1999).

In *Petals of Blood*, Ngũgĩ critiques the betrayal of independence by neo-colonial elites who perpetuate exploitation under the guise of modernization. Through characters such as Munira, Wanja, and Karega, the novel portrays the struggle of ordinary Kenyans against systemic inequality and corruption. Wanja’s narrative, in particular, illustrates both victimhood and resistance; her survival in the face of exploitation symbolizes the endurance of marginalized women in postcolonial Kenya. Karega, as an activist teacher, articulates Ngũgĩ’s vision of cultural and political

awakening, emphasizing that resistance must continue beyond independence. Here, resistance is not framed as hybridity or negotiation but as a radical reclamation of sovereignty, aligning with Ngũgĩ's later call for linguistic and cultural decolonization in *Decolonising the Mind* (1986).

Ngũgĩ thus positions literature as a weapon of struggle. His characters embody the belief that liberation depends on rejecting colonial epistemologies, reclaiming indigenous languages, and mobilizing collective memory. Resistance, in his vision, is not a space of ambivalence but a determined strategy for cultural and political survival.

The following excerpt from *A Grain of Wheat* (1967)

“Mugo had come to believe that the only way to survive was to keep quiet. But silence, too, was a choice, a betrayal, a weight heavier than chains.”

Mugo's silence about his betrayal of a resistance leader dramatizes the ethical burden of colonial struggle. Resistance here is collective, not optional — neutrality equals complicity. This underscores Ngũgĩ's vision that liberation requires communal sacrifice and active participation, contrasting Gurnah's focus on ambivalence and personal negotiation.

Excerpts from *Petals of Blood* (1977)

“Wanja said, ‘They take our land, our sweat, our lives, and now even our children's hopes. But we are not broken. We will fight.’”

Wanja's voice embodies female resistance against both systemic exploitation and patriarchal oppression. Unlike Gurnah's subtle portrayals of resilience, Ngũgĩ dramatizes resistance as collective and uncompromising. Wanja's defiance symbolizes the revolutionary energy of the oppressed, aligning with Ngũgĩ's belief in reclaiming cultural and economic sovereignty beyond political independence (Mwangi, 2009).

Read the following lines:

“Karega knew that the struggle was not over. Independence had brought flag and anthem, but the people were still enslaved by poverty and corruption.”

Here Ngũgĩ critiques neo-colonial betrayal, showing that resistance must extend beyond formal decolonization to address structural inequalities. His characters embody a continued struggle against exploitation, reflecting Ngũgĩ's theoretical call

in *Decolonising the Mind* (1986) for cultural and linguistic liberation.

Comparative Interpretation

Taken together, Gurnah and Ngũgĩ represent two distinct yet interconnected responses to colonial domination. Gurnah illustrates the ambivalent subjectivities formed in colonial and diasporic contexts, where hybridity becomes both a site of fracture and resilience. Ngũgĩ, in contrast, insists on uncompromising resistance, rooted in memory, language, and collective action. While Gurnah's hybridity reveals the fluid negotiations of identity in global contexts, Ngũgĩ's resistance underscores the urgency of cultural sovereignty. The juxtaposition reveals that African literature articulates a spectrum of strategies—from negotiation to rejection—through which colonized subjects confront imperial power.

Discussion

The analysis of Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o demonstrates how African writers employ distinct yet interconnected strategies to confront colonial domination and its aftermath. Gurnah's exploration of hybridity and fractured subjectivities highlights the ambivalence of cultural negotiation, while Ngũgĩ emphasizes uncompromising resistance through language, memory, and collective struggle. These findings resonate with and extend prior scholarship on postcolonial African literature.

Gurnah's characters—Yusuf in *Paradise* and Hamza in *Afterlives*—exemplify what Bhabha (1994) terms the "third space" of hybridity, where identity is neither fully colonizer nor colonized but formed in an ambivalent in-between. Scholars such as Steiner (2022) argue that hybridity in Gurnah's work is both traumatic and potentially transformative, as it allows for subtle forms of resilience while also revealing the psychological scars of colonialism. Similarly, Kebede (2021) emphasizes that Gurnah's narratives foreground the politics of memory, showing how individuals negotiate colonial legacies through fractured yet creative subjectivities. The present analysis affirms these interpretations but also extends them by highlighting the role of gendered hybridity in Afiya's trajectory, suggesting that hybridity intersects with patriarchal oppression to shape complex forms of resistance. Ngũgĩ's work, by contrast, underscores the necessity of resistance as reclamation. His

novels *A Grain of Wheat* and *Petals of Blood* portray resistance as a communal duty grounded in collective memory and cultural authenticity. This aligns with Ogude's (1999) argument that Ngũgĩ consistently narrates the nation through the lens of struggle, sacrifice, and betrayal. Furthermore, Ngũgĩ's theoretical intervention in *Decolonising the Mind* (1986) continues to influence debates on linguistic decolonization. Critics such as Gikandi (2000) and Mwangi (2009) contend that Ngũgĩ's rejection of English represents one of the most radical positions in African literature, emphasizing cultural sovereignty over cosmopolitan negotiation. The present analysis supports this perspective, showing how resistance in Ngũgĩ's fiction is not a temporary strategy but a long-term ethical imperative.

When read comparatively, Gurnah and Ngũgĩ illuminate the spectrum of postcolonial responses. Ashcroft, Griffiths, and Tiffin (2002) note that postcolonial texts oscillate between adaptation and resistance, reflecting the contradictions of colonial experience. Gurnah exemplifies the adaptive possibilities of hybridity, where fractured identities can be reconstituted in new cultural forms. Ngũgĩ, however, warns of hybridity's dangers, arguing that it risks diluting indigenous cultures and perpetuating neo-colonial dependency. This tension echoes Quayson's (2000) claim that postcolonialism is not a single trajectory but a set of overlapping practices negotiating domination, memory, and survival.

Thus, the findings of this study contribute to postcolonial scholarship by demonstrating that hybridity and resistance are not mutually exclusive but represent different strategies shaped by historical, geographical, and cultural contexts. Gurnah's diasporic focus highlights the fluidity of identity in transnational spaces, while Ngũgĩ's nationalist framework insists on cultural rootedness as the foundation for liberation. Together, their works illustrate the richness and diversity of African literary engagements with empire, memory, and identity.

Conclusion

This study has examined the representation of hybridity and resistance in the works of Abdulrazak Gurnah and Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o, situating both writers within the broader discourse of postcolonial African literature. Through close readings of Gurnah's *Paradise* (1994) and *Afterlives* (2020), and Ngũgĩ's *A Grain of Wheat* (1967) and

Petals of Blood (1977), the analysis has demonstrated how these authors articulate distinct strategies for negotiating the legacies of colonialism.

Gurnah foregrounds hybridity as a lived reality of colonial and diasporic subjectivities, marked by fracture, ambivalence, and cultural negotiation. His characters embody the precarious balance between assimilation and survival, yet they also reveal the creative possibilities of reconstituting identity within oppressive systems. By highlighting gendered experiences, particularly through Afiya in *Afterlives*, Gurnah further underscores the intersectional dimensions of hybridity, where resilience emerges in the face of both colonial and patriarchal structures.

In contrast, Ngũgĩ positions resistance as a cultural and political imperative. His narratives underscore the centrality of collective struggle, historical memory, and linguistic reclamation in the process of decolonization. For Ngũgĩ, liberation lies not in negotiating hybridity but in reclaiming indigenous epistemologies and rejecting colonial impositions. His vision of resistance is uncompromising, rooted in the conviction that cultural sovereignty is essential for true independence.

Taken together, the comparative analysis illustrates that hybridity and resistance are not mutually exclusive but rather reflect divergent strategies shaped by particular historical and cultural contexts. Gurnah's diasporic sensibility and Ngũgĩ's nationalist framework highlight the plurality of African responses to imperialism, illuminating how literature becomes a site of both negotiation and struggle. These findings affirm the richness of postcolonial African writing as it continues to grapple with the enduring consequences of empire while imagining alternative futures.

Ultimately, the study contributes to postcolonial scholarship by demonstrating that the dialectic between hybridity and resistance remains central to African literature's exploration of identity, memory, and cultural survival. In placing Gurnah and Ngũgĩ in dialogue, it underscores the necessity of reading African texts not through singular theoretical lenses but through comparative approaches that honor the multiplicity of voices, strategies, and visions that constitute the postcolonial condition.

References

Ashcroft, B., Griffiths, G., & Tiffin, H. (2002). *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. Routledge.

Liberal Journal of Language & Literature Review

Print ISSN: 3006-5887

Online ISSN: 3006-5895

- Bhabha, H. K. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. Routledge.
- Gikandi, S. (2000). *Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gikandi, S. (2016). "Between Languages and Cultures: Ngũgĩ, Translation, and the Postcolonial Text." *Research in African Literatures*, 47(4), 1–19.
- Gurnah, A. (1994). *Paradise*. Bloomsbury.
- Gurnah, A. (2004). "Writing and Place." *World Literature Today*, 78(3/4), 26–29.
- Gurnah, A. (2020). *Afterlives*. Bloomsbury.
- Kebede, M. (2021). "Postcolonial Ambivalence and the Politics of Memory in Abdulrazak Gurnah's *Afterlives*." *Journal of Postcolonial Writing*, 57(6), 789–803.
- Mwangi, E. (2009). *Africa Writes Back to Self: Metafiction, Gender, Sexuality*. SUNY Press.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1967). *A Grain of Wheat*. Heinemann.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1977). *Petals of Blood*. Heinemann.
- Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o. (1986). *Decolonising the Mind: The Politics of Language in African Literature*. James Currey.
- Ogude, J. (1999). *Ngũgĩ's Novels and African History: Narrating the Nation*. Pluto Press.
- Quayson, A. (2000). *Postcolonialism: Theory, Practice, or Process?* Polity Press.
- Sharpe, J. (2003). "Gender and Colonial Encounter in Abdulrazak Gurnah's *Paradise*." *Research in African Literatures*, 34(2), 59–72.
- Simon, G. (2017). "Language, Identity, and Decolonization in Ngũgĩ wa Thiong'o." *African Identities*, 15(1), 1–15.
- Steiner, T. (2022). "Ambivalent Hybridity in the Novels of Abdulrazak Gurnah." *Research in African Literatures*, 53(1), 45–63.
- Stein, M. (2004). "Mapping Diaspora in Abdulrazak Gurnah's Writings." *Postcolonial Text*, 1(2), 1–15.