



Kente: Cape Coast Journal of Literature and the Arts
Online ISSN: 2579-0285
<https://doi.org/10.47963/jla.v1i2.1895>

Kente

Cape Coast Journal of Literature and the Arts

An Open Access Journal
Online ISSN: 2579-0285

<https://doi.org/10.47963/jla.v1i2.1895>

Volume (1) Number (2) 2026

Page: 38-47

Editor-in-Chief
Professor Kwadwo Opoku-Agyemang

Managing Editor
Professor Rogers Asempasah

Additional Information

Submission guide: <https://journal.ucc.edu.gh/index.php/kente/about/submissions>

Contact e-mail: kente-journal@ucc.edu.gh

Archive: <https://doi.org/10.47963/jla.v1i2.1895>

**‘PHYSICIAN, HEAL THYSELF’: DISABILITY, AESTHETIC NERVOUSNESS,
AND DIASPORIC AUTHORITY IN TOPE FOLARIN’S *MIRACLE***

Mould, Joseph Martin
Sam, Aba Christabel

Department of English,
University of Cape Coast



ABSTRACT

The paper addresses a critical gap in disability scholarship on African diasporic literature where impairment is often read as a metaphor or as a social stigma without sufficient attention to its structural function within migrant religious spaces. Focusing on Tope Folarin’s short story *Miracle*, the paper examines how blindness operates within a Nigerian Pentecostal community in Texas. The study draws on Ato Quayson’s (2017) theory of aesthetic nervousness, particularly the typologies of disability as a signifier of ritual insight and disability as epiphany, supplemented by social and materialist disability models (Oliver, 1990; Brown, 2008). Through close textual analysis of the narrative, the analysis yields three central findings. First, the blind prophet’s impairment functions as ritual capital that authorises his charismatic legitimacy within the diasporic congregation. Second, his inability to heal himself produces aesthetic nervousness that destabilises his authority and exposes the commodification of disability within migrant religious economies. Third, the narrator’s failed healing generates epistemic reorientation through which faith, performance, and community survival are critically re-evaluated. The paper concludes that in *Miracle*, disability operates as a contested site where embodiment, belief and diasporic identity are negotiated. The paper contributes to disability and diaspora studies by suggesting how literary representations of impairment can function as a structural critique of charismatic authority within transnational contexts.

KEYWORDS: Aesthetic nervousness, diasporic Pentecostalism, disability studies, ritual insight, Tope Folarin

‘Thou hypocrite, first cast out the beam of thine own eye; and then shalt thou see clearly to cast out the mote out of thy brother’s eye’ (Matthew 7:5).

Introduction

Literary representations of disability have increasingly been examined as sites where cultural assumptions about embodiment, normalcy, and difference are negotiated and contested. Scholars such as Garland-Thomson, Mitchell, and Snyder have suggested that impairment in narrative fiction functions not just as a metaphor but as a structural device that organises ethical tension and reader response (Garland-Thomson 10; Mitchell and Snyder 222-223). Within postcolonial and diasporic contexts, however, disability is often treated either as a symbolic allegory or as evidence of social marginality, with limited attention to its epistemological and formal operations. In African diasporic literature in particular, the intersection between impairment, religious authority, and migrant precarity remains comparatively under-theorised.

In diasporic contexts, religious authority often assumes heightened symbolic significance because the trauma of displacement from one’s national and cultural origins creates a vacuum of identity. Thus, the diasporic congregation serves as a compensatory site where communal coherence is reconstructed, and moral hierarchies are stabilized against the backdrop of an alien host society. Within this framework, charismatic authority becomes intensified rather than incidental, as it uniquely mediates the tension between the loss of the homeland and the longing for belonging. Therefore, the blind prophet’s authority in *Miracle* must be read within this specific diasporic recalibration of legitimacy, where spiritual vision replaces physical displacement as the primary source of truth.

Tope Folarin’s short story *Miracle* offers a pointed exploration of this intersection. Set in a Nigerian Pentecostal congregation in Texas, the narrative follows a young immigrant narrator who attends a healing service conducted by a blind itinerant prophet reputed to possess extraordinary spiritual gifts. The congregation regards the prophet’s blindness as confirmation of divine election, yet the narrative culminates in the prophet’s failure to heal the narrator’s deteriorating eyesight. This non-healing generates a moment of recognition in which the narrator perceives that communal faith depends upon both sustaining belief and overlooking contradiction. Blindness thus occupies a paradoxical position within the story: it legitimises charismatic authority while simultaneously threatening its coherence.

This paper argues that in *Miracle*, disability operates not as an incidental description but as a structural and epistemological hinge within diasporic religious space. Drawing on Quayson’s (2007) theory of aesthetic nervousness, particularly the typologies of disability as signifier of ritual insight and disability as epiphany, and informed by social and materialist models of disability (Oliver 128-30, Brown, 189-91), the paper undertakes a close textual analysis of the narrative. It contends that Folarin mobilises blindness to expose the unstable foundations of charismatic authority within migrant Pentecostal economies, thereby reconfiguring disability as a site where faith, performance, and material insecurity converge.

Contextualisation

The proverb ‘Physician, heal thyself’ is rooted in biblical literature and has long served as a rhetorical challenge to those whose authority is undermined by their own visible deficiency. Within literary and theological discourse, it functions less as a moral rebuke than as a test of credibility: the legitimacy of the healer depends on the coherence between claim and embodiment. In *Miracle*, this proverb provides an implicit organising principle. The blind prophet’s authority is measured against his inability to cure his own impairment, thereby placing bodily difference at the centre of a crisis of representation.

The association between disability and spiritual authority has deep historical roots. As Mitchell and Snyder observe (225), bodily difference frequently operates as a cultural

repository for anxieties and ambivalences that exceed ordinary social articulation. Blindness, in particular, has been repeatedly associated with prophetic insight, from classical tragedy to modern fiction (Schor 79-81). Within certain African cosmologies, physical affliction may also be interpreted as evidence of spiritual calling or exceptional access to the unseen. Folarin's narrative draws upon this tradition while simultaneously subjecting it to scrutiny. The prophet's blindness is not incidental; it is the visible sign upon which his charismatic authority depends.

At the same time, *Miracle* must be situated within contemporary Nigerian diasporic writing. Critics such as Okuyade Ogaga have noted that third-generation Nigerian authors frequently explore the tensions produced by migration, hybrid identity, and transnational religious practice. In this context, Pentecostal congregations in the diaspora function as sites of cultural continuity and as spaces of negotiation. Studies on transnational Pentecostalism (Anderson; Adogame) indicate that healing ministries often flourish within migrant communities marked by economic insecurity and limited institutional support. The promise of miraculous intervention addresses not only bodily affliction but the precarity of immigrant life.

Folarin's story is attentive to this socio-economic dimension. The healing service is sustained through the circulation of devotional commodities and the performance of collective expectation. Blindness, therefore, operates within a material as well as symbolic economy. It confers spiritual distinction, yet it also becomes entangled with systems of exchange and desire. By embedding the blind prophet within a diasporic Pentecostal setting shaped by aspiration and vulnerability, the narrative positions disability at the intersection of belief, commerce, and communal survival. This study adopts a qualitative interpretive methodology grounded in close textual analysis that situates Folarin's narrative within disability theory and diasporic literary discourse.

Theoretical Framework

Disability theory has long challenged the reduction of bodily differences to individual defects. The medical model, which construes impairment as pathology requiring correction, has been rigorously critiqued by proponents of the social model. They argue that disability emerges from institutional arrangements, environmental barriers, and normative expectations rather than from bodily variance itself (Oliver 113-115; Shakespeare). While this distinction remains foundational, literary disability studies have suggested that narrative representation exceeds both paradigms. Garland-Thomson, Mitchell, and Snyder observe that (225) disability in fiction frequently functions as a structuring principle that shapes plot, characterisation, and readerly response.

The present study draws primarily on Ato Quayson's theory of aesthetic nervousness. In *Aesthetic Nervousness: Disability and the Crisis of Representation* (2007), Quayson argues that the presence of disability within narrative introduces a perturbation into the aesthetic field (Quayson 15-16). This perturbation arises from the tension between disability's social referentiality and its formal function within the text (12-13). Disability does not operate solely as a metaphor; rather, it generates structural instabilities that expose the limits of representation itself. Aesthetic nervousness becomes visible in moments where thematic intention and narrative unfolding diverge, where ethical unease interrupts aesthetic coherence, or where impairment unsettles the expectations through which readers apprehend meaning.

Quayson identifies several recurring representational patterns, two of which are especially pertinent here: *disability as a signifier of ritual insight* and *disability as epiphany* (Quayson 52-3). These categories require careful differentiation. Disability as a signifier of ritual insight refers to situations in which bodily impairment is culturally re-coded as evidence of spiritual access or sacred authority. Within particular cosmological frameworks, affliction becomes a visible mark of transcendence; impairment is transformed into symbolic capital that

legitimises the subject within ritual space. The authority derived from such attribution is communal in origin: it depends upon collective recognition and interpretive assent.

Disability as epiphany, by contrast, concerns narrative reorientation rather than ritual attribution. Here, impairment generates a cognitive rupture that reorganises perception. Epiphany does not sanctify bodily difference; it exposes the instability of the meanings attached to it. Where ritual insight consolidates authority, epiphany destabilises it. The two operations are therefore not identical stages but structurally distinct modes of representation. With these conceptual distinctions in mind, the narrative structure of *Miracle* can now be examined as a site where disability serves as a thematic presence and a catalyst for aesthetic tension and epistemological instability.

In *Miracle*, blindness initially circulates as ritual insight. The prophet's impairment functions as a visible confirmation of divine election within the diasporic congregation. Yet this attribution is precarious. When healing fails, blindness ceases to guarantee transcendence and instead produces aesthetic nervousness. The narrative reveals the fragility of the interpretive framework that had sustained charismatic authority. Epiphany thus emerges not as spiritual triumph but as epistemic dislocation. Disability moves from communal signification to narrative destabilisation, which exposes the contradiction embedded within the proverb that frames the story: the healer who cannot heal himself.

This interpretive model, however, may risk excessive formalism. Brown (90) contends that aesthetic nervousness requires supplementation by Marxist analysis, since disability is inseparable from the material conditions that produce and categorise bodily differences under capitalism. In diasporic Pentecostal contexts marked by economic precarity, healing ministries operate within circuits of exchange and aspiration. Disability, therefore, is not just a textual disturbance but a node within migrant religious economies. The prophet's blindness functions simultaneously as a symbolic surplus and as a commodifiable spectacle.

This materialist understanding of disability may be further extended through the work of Erevelles, who argues that disability cannot be separated from global formations of labour, migration, and inequality (25-27). Erevelles suggests that bodily difference acquires meaning within historically produced relations of power shaped by capitalism, colonialism, and transnational mobility. From this perspective, impairment is neither solely symbolic nor exclusively cultural; it is embedded within material structures that regulate vulnerability and survival. Read in this light, the blind prophet's authority in *Miracle* emerges from theological attribution and from diasporic conditions in which precarious migrant communities invest spiritual value in bodies that appear to mediate uncertainty and economic instability.

African disability scholarship further complicates the binary between medical deficit and spiritual exceptionalism. Ndlovu suggests that within many African theological frameworks, impairment may be interpreted ambivalently (Ndlovu 29-31), as a sign of calling, a curse, or communal testing which reveals a spectrum of meanings rather than a singular valuation. Such ambivalence is crucial to reading *Miracle*, which neither wholly sanctifies nor wholly demystifies blindness; instead, the narrative stages the tension between spiritual attribution and embodied limitation within a transnational setting.

Although Davis questions whether Quayson's typological scheme risks reinscribing categorical rigidity, he acknowledges its value in foregrounding disability as a disruptive force within literary form. The present analysis adopts Quayson's framework provisionally, attending to its explanatory power while remaining alert to its limits. Disability in *Miracle* is neither reducible to metaphor nor exhausted by sociological description; it is constitutive of the narrative's internal contradiction.

Thematic Revelation: Blindness as Structural Instability

Blindness in *Miracle* symbolises vulnerability within immigrant life and organises the narrative's central contradiction. At the level of communal perception, the prophet's impairment circulates as what Quayson terms a signifier of ritual insight. The narrator reports that:

‘His blindness is a confirmation of his power. It’s the burden he bears on our behalf; his residence in a space of perpetual darkness has only sharpened his spiritual vision over the years. He can see more than we will ever see’ (Folarin 12).

Blindness is thus re-coded as a sacrificial distinction rather than a deficiency. The impairment becomes symbolic surplus. It authorises the prophet within the diasporic Pentecostal economy, where visible affliction paradoxically confirms invisible election. The narrative's emphasis on gesture, the congregation's tactile guidance of the prophet, and the reverent modulation of tone in addressing him underscore how blindness is not concealed but ceremonially foregrounded as a visible sign of divine mediation.

Yet this ritual attribution depends entirely upon collective assent. The prophet's authority is not intrinsic to blindness; it is socially conferred. Here, the social model of disability (Oliver; Shakespeare) intersects with Quayson's typology. Blindness acquires meaning through interpretive framing. Within this congregational context, impairment becomes spiritual capital. However, the text does not allow this symbolic coding to stabilize. When the prophet interrupts his sermon with a cough and implores the congregation, ‘Just pray for me’ (Folarin 14), the structure trembles. The healer's dependency becomes visible. This moment produces what Quayson identifies as aesthetic nervousness (51): a perturbation in which the narrative cannot reconcile symbolic transcendence with embodied limitation. The prophet's blindness no longer functions securely as ritual insight; it begins to expose the fragility of the theological system that elevated it. It is crucial to stress that ritual insight and epiphany are not sequential stages but distinct operations. Ritual insight is communal and attributive. Epiphany is narrative and disruptive. The former consolidates authority; the latter unsettles it. In *Miracle*, blindness initially operates within the first register but culminates in the second.

The decisive shift occurs during the failed healing. The prophet explains that the ‘spirit of bad sight is strongly rooted’ (Folarin 19), thereby preserving doctrinal coherence. Yet the narrator perceives the strain in the performance. His non-healing becomes the narrative's epistemic rupture. Unlike ritual insight, which affirms communal belief, epiphany reorients perception. The narrator remains physically unchanged, but his understanding is transformed. He recognises that the congregation sustains itself through what he later terms ‘truths and lies’ (Folarin 21). These ‘truths’ are not trivial deceptions. They consist of genuine communal goods: cultural continuity, emotional refuge, and collective belonging within a precarious migrant landscape. Scholars of diasporic Pentecostalism (Anderson; Adogame) have shown that such churches provide vital networks of solidarity. Folarin acknowledges this function. The church is not merely exploitative. The ‘lies,’ however, reside in the cure-oriented logic embedded within the ritual. Blindness must be overcome to signify divine favour. Impairment is tolerated only as a prelude to a miracle. Here, the narrative implicitly critiques both medical and charismatic models that equate worth with restoration (Garland-Thomson; Titchkosky). The narrator's continued poor eyesight refuses narrative closure. It resists the compulsory resolution that disability must culminate in a cure.

The text engages the critique advanced by Bolt about the metanarrative of blindness (Bolt 6) as privileged insight. Folarin does not entirely escape the trope; he invokes it deliberately. Yet he destabilises it by denying the prophet epistemological supremacy. The

blind healer does not ‘see’ more clearly than the sighted. Instead, the partially sighted narrator acquires interpretive clarity through non-healing. Insight is relocated from spectacle to reflection. In this respect, the story subverts rather than reproduces the blindness-as-transcendence metanarrative. Brown’s materialist intervention further clarifies this instability (Brown 186-88). The prophet’s ministry circulates through commodities, books, tapes, and anointing oil, rendering blindness both a sacred sign and an economic instrument. Disability here operates within a migrant religious marketplace. The aesthetic disturbance is therefore inseparable from material exchange. The healer’s impairment produces reverence, but also revenue. This dual function intensifies the narrative contradiction: blindness generates authority while simultaneously exposing its commodification. Thematic revelation thus emerges not through miraculous transformation but through unresolved tension. The narrator’s unchanged eyesight becomes structurally significant. It prevents the text from collapsing into triumphalist theology. Instead, it foregrounds the ambivalence of diasporic survival. Faith sustains; performance stabilises; illusion circulates. Disability occupies the point at which these forces intersect. Blindness in *Miracle* therefore performs three simultaneous functions: it authorises ritual insight, generates aesthetic nervousness, and culminates in epiphanic reorientation. These operations are not conflated but layered. The narrative’s power resides precisely in refusing to allow any one register to dominate completely.

Non-Healing as Epiphanic Disruption

If blindness initially functions as ritual insight within the congregational economy, its refusal to yield a cure generates a distinct narrative operation: epiphany. This shift must not be misread as a simple progression from authority to disillusionment. Rather, it marks a structural reorientation in the narrative’s epistemology.

Quayson’s category of disability as epiphany refers to moments in which impairment reorganises perception without being resolved (Quayson 147-49). In *Miracle*, the narrator’s deteriorating eyesight is not cured; instead, it becomes the medium through which he apprehends the instability of charismatic performance. The prophet’s declaration that the ‘spirit of bad sight is strongly rooted’ (Folarin 19) attempts theological containment. Yet the rhetoric exposes strain. Authority now depends upon explanation rather than demonstration. This moment generates aesthetic nervousness not because the miracle fails, but because the interpretive framework must compensate for failure. The congregation does not revolt; it adjusts. The narrative thereby reveals that charismatic systems survive through elasticity rather than empirical validation. The narrator’s body becomes the site of this revelation. His impairment persists. There is no spectacle of transformation, no triumphant testimony. Instead, the absence of cure produces clarity. The epiphany lies not in restored sight but in altered understanding. In other words, the text implicitly resists the curative imperative critiqued within disability studies. Garland-Thomson reminds us that Western cultural narratives frequently equate bodily normalisation with moral redemption. Folarin refuses this arc. The narrator’s unchanged condition disrupts the expectation that disability must culminate in restoration to secure narrative meaning. At the same time, the story does not adopt an uncomplicated celebratory model of disability as diversity. The narrator still desires a cure. His disappointment is real. Shakespeare cautions against romanticising impairment by ignoring lived difficulty. Folarin honours this complexity. The epiphany does not erase vulnerability; it reframes it. This reframing complicates Bolt’s concern regarding blindness as privileged insight. The prophet embodies the classical trope; the narrator dismantles it. Within this context, insight is not inherent in blindness. It emerges from critical reflection upon its performance. In this way, Folarin neither wholly reproduces nor entirely abandons inherited literary conventions. He stages their tensions.

What the narrative stages, however, is not a simple displacement of inherited spiritual cosmology by modern scepticism, but their uneasy cohabitation within diasporic space. The prophet's blindness operates within a recognisably African Pentecostal epistemology in which bodily affliction may signify election or exceptional access to divine knowledge (Ndlovu; Adogame). Within that interpretive frame, impairment is neither accidental nor merely pathological; it is spiritually legible. Yet the narrator's emergent consciousness introduces a countervailing reflexivity shaped by exposure to secular rationalism and by the social re-coding of disability articulated within modern disability discourse. Crucially, the story does not allow either framework to triumph. The congregation continues to believe; the narrator continues to belong. His insight does not culminate in rupture but in awareness. The tension between ritual insight and critical reflection, therefore, becomes constitutive rather than transitional. In Quayson's terms, aesthetic nervousness prevents the consolidation of a single epistemic regime: traditional attribution and modern scepticism remain suspended in dynamic relation, each incomplete without the other, each revealing the limits of its own explanatory sufficiency within the precarious terrain of migrant religious life.

Epiphany, Performance, and the Ethics of Communal Survival

The epiphanic reorientation emerges precisely at the point where ritual authority encounters embodied contradiction. The prophet's incapacity to heal himself exposes the structural tension between charismatic performance and corporeal reality, and it is within this fissure that the narrator's consciousness begins to reconfigure. The narrator's recognition that a community is composed of 'truths and lies' (Folarin 21) constitutes the narrative's most ethically charged insight. This formulation cannot be dismissed as cynical relativism. Rather, it reveals the structural ambivalence sustaining diasporic Pentecostal life.

The 'truths' are concrete and socially verifiable. The church offers immigrants cultural continuity within a disorienting American environment. It provides linguistic familiarity, ritual coherence, and collective affirmation. As Anderson and Adogame demonstrate, migrant Pentecostal congregations often function as parallel infrastructures of belonging, compensating for economic and institutional marginality. Within such conditions, ritual healing operates as a theological spectacle and a technology of communal resilience. Faith, even when empirically unverified, organises hope.

These are not illusions. They are material and affective supports. To reduce them to deception would be analytically crude. The 'lies,' however, operate at a different register. They reside in the theological presupposition that bodily difference is evidence of spiritual deficiency and that divine favour manifests through normative restoration. The healing ritual depends upon a cure-oriented logic. Blindness, within this framework, is tolerable only as a prelude to miracle. When cure fails, explanation substitutes for transformation. Quayson's aesthetic nervousness becomes ethically revealing. The discomfort generated by non-healing exposes the limits of the representational system. Disability unsettles the coherence of charismatic authority, but the community absorbs this instability through reinterpretation. The narrative thereby demonstrates that faith structures do not collapse under contradiction; they metabolise it.

Brown's materialist critique deepens this insight. As Erevelles similarly observes, disability emerges within global arrangements of inequality that structure whose bodies become repositories of collective expectation, a dynamic that becomes particularly visible within migrant religious economies sustained by uncertainty and hope. The healing ministry circulates through commodities, books, recordings, and anointing oil. embedding spiritual authority within migrant economies. Blindness becomes a sacred sign and economic instrument. This does not reduce faith to fraud; rather, it reveals the entanglement of devotion

and survival under conditions of precarity. The 'lie' is not a simple fabrication. It is the tacit agreement to suspend scrutiny to preserve collective hope. At this juncture, the ethical stakes sharpen. Titchkosky argues that disability rhetoric often organises social responses (Titchkosky 3-5) in ways that appear compassionate while reinforcing normative hierarchies. In *Miracle*, the congregation's intense desire for a cure may be read as an expression of care. Yet it also reaffirms the assumption that impairment is a lack. The narrator's persistent poor eyesight resists incorporation into triumphalist testimony. His body becomes the quiet remainder that the ritual cannot assimilate. The ethical revelation, then, lies not in exposing fraud but in recognising ambivalence. The community survives through a delicate balance between belief and performance. The ritual healing service is at once sincere and theatrical, sustaining and constraining. The narrator's epiphany does not lead to rejection of the church. It leads to awareness. The narrator's own bodily vulnerability, though less visibly marked, participates in the same economy of expectation and disappointment. Disability in the narrative thus exceeds singular embodiment and becomes a relational field in which belief and corporeality intersect. In this respect, Folarin reframes disability as an epistemological catalyst. Blindness does not only symbolise vulnerability; it reveals the moral compromises embedded within diasporic survival. The congregation must sustain hope to endure economic and cultural instability. Yet this hope is structured by narratives that marginalise bodily differences. Disability thus occupies the fault line between communal preservation and ideological exclusion.

Crucially, the narrative refuses resolution. The narrator is neither healed nor expelled. Faith continues; doubt persists. This refusal of closure prevents the story from collapsing into either denunciation or endorsement. Instead, Folarin sustains the tension between ritual insight and epiphany, between affirmation and critique. Disability becomes the site at which diasporic identity negotiates its own contradictions. Thematic revelation in *Miracle*, therefore, culminates not in miracle but in moral complexity. The 'truths' sustain life; the 'lies' secure coherence. Blindness exposes both.

Conclusion

This paper has argued that in Tope Folarin's *Miracle*, disability operates not as incidental description nor as exhausted metaphor, but as a structural hinge through which diasporic faith, charismatic authority, and communal survival are rendered mutually interrogative. By drawing upon Quayson's typologies (Quayson 52-55) of disability as signifiers of ritual insight and disability as epiphany, the analysis has shown that blindness in the narrative initially circulates as symbolic capital within a Nigerian Pentecostal congregation in Texas. It authorises the prophet's spiritual legitimacy through culturally recognisable frameworks that align bodily affliction with divine election. Yet this ritual attribution proves precarious. The prophet's inability to heal himself and the narrator's subsequent non-healing generate aesthetic nervousness that destabilises the coherence of charismatic performance and exposes the fragile interpretive agreements upon which diasporic religious authority depends. Disability thus moves from communal validation to epistemic disturbance, and in so doing reveals the limits of both spiritual exceptionalism and curative ideology. Crucially, the narrative does not resolve this disturbance through sceptical triumph or theological vindication. Instead, it sustains a dialectical coexistence between inherited cosmological interpretation and emergent critical reflexivity. The congregation persists; faith continues; the narrator remains within the communal fold even as his perception is irrevocably altered. The epiphany occasioned by non-healing does not abolish belief but renders it ethically complex to expose what the narrator terms the 'truths and lies' that underwrite immigrant survival. These 'truths' consist in genuine networks of solidarity, affective sustenance, and cultural continuity within conditions of migrant precarity (Anderson; Adogame). The 'lies' reside in the tacit perpetuation of cure-

oriented assumptions that construe bodily difference as spiritual deficiency. By refusing narrative restoration, Folarin resists the compulsory resolution through cure that disability scholarship has long critiqued (Garland-Thomson 6-8; Titchkosky, 3-5), while equally avoiding romanticisation of impairment. Yet the narrative does not wholly dismantle the structure it interrogates. Rather, it preserves a measured ambiguity that allows faith to persist even as its performative mechanisms are exposed. The critique is therefore not annihilative but diagnostic.

The contribution of this paper lies in foregrounding disability as cultural epistemology within African diasporic religious space. While previous readings of *Miracle* have emphasised migration, faith, or commodified charisma, this analysis has shown that impairment structures the narrative's ethical and aesthetic architecture. In extending Quayson's framework through attention to materialist critique (Brown 86-88) and African theological discourse (Ndlovu 29-31), the paper has demonstrated that aesthetic nervousness in this text is inseparable from migrant economic precarity and from the circulation of spiritual commodities. Disability here is neither reducible to metaphor nor confined to sociological commentary; it constitutes the narrative's principal site of tension between embodiment, belief, and authority.

Certain limitations, however, must be acknowledged. The analysis has focused on a single short story within a broader corpus of Nigerian diasporic writing. A comparative investigation of additional contemporary authors would highlight whether the structural deployment of disability observed here represents an emergent literary pattern or a singular artistic strategy. Moreover, further interdisciplinary engagement with ethnographic studies of migrant Pentecostal communities might deepen understanding of the reciprocal influence between lived religious practice and its literary representation. These limitations do not diminish the present argument but rather indicate avenues through which the intersection of disability studies and African diaspora literature may be further refined. In *Miracle*, the healer who cannot heal himself becomes the axis upon which faith and doubt, tradition and reflexivity, performance and embodiment revolve. Blindness does not yield a miracle; it yields recognition. It is within that recognition, unsettled, unresolved, yet lucid, that Folarin locates the moral complexity of diasporic belonging.

Author Bio

Joseph Martin Mould holds a BA and an MA from the University of Ghana and the University of Cape Coast, respectively. He is currently pursuing an MPhil in Literature at the University of Cape Coast, Ghana. His research engages memory, identity, African autobiography, and disability studies. He is a member of the Literature Association of Ghana (LITAG).

Christabel Aba Sam holds a PhD in Literary Studies, an MPhil in English Language, and a Bachelor of Education (English option) degree from the University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana, where she currently works as a Senior Lecturer in the Department of English. Her current research interests include African Women Writers, Masculinity Studies, Postcolonial Futures, Spatial Politics, and Ghanaian Popular Culture. She remains curious and engaged with historical questions about gender and sexualities in African environments, and with the practice of oral history in Ghana and beyond. Christabel has published both single and co-authored papers in prestigious outlets, including Scopus- and/or Web of Science-indexed journals. She is currently embarking on a new book project about men and masculinities in Ghana's sonic spaces. Christabel is a fellow at the African Multiple Cluster of Excellence, both at the Lagos ACC and the Bayreuth Academy in Germany.

Works Cited

- Adogame, Afe. *The African Christian Diaspora: New currents and emerging trends in world Christianity*. Bloomsbury, 2013.
- Anderson, Allan. *Spirit-filled world: Religious Dis/continuity in African Pentecostalism*. Springer, 2018.
- Bolt, David. *The metanarrative of Blindness: A re-reading of twentieth-century Anglophone writing*. University of Michigan Press, 2014.
- Brown, Nicholas. Marxism and Disability. *Meditations* vol. 23, 2008, pp. 186-93.
- Davis, Lennard J. *Aesthetic Nervousness: Disability and the Crisis of Representation*. Ato Quayson. New York: Columbia University Press, 2007, p. 246
- Erevelles, Nirmala. *Disability and difference in global contexts: Enabling a transformative body politic*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011.
- Folarin, Tope. Miracle. *Transition*, no. 109, 2012, pp. 73–83
- Garland-Thomson, Rosemarie. *Extraordinary bodies: Figuring physical disability in American culture and literature*. Columbia University Press, 2017.
- Mitchell, David T., and Sharon L. Snyder. *Narrative prosthesis: Disability and the dependencies of discourse*. *The Disability Studies Reader*, edited by Leonard J Davis, 4th ed., Routledge, 2013, pp. 222-35.
- Ndlovu, Hebron. L. African beliefs concerning people with disabilities: Implications for theological education. *Journal of Disability & Religion*, 20. 1–2, 2016, 29–39.
- Okuyade, Ogaga. Continuity and renewal in the endless tales of a continent: New voices in the African novel. *Ariel: A Review of International English Literature*, vol. 44, no. 1, 2013, 1–24.
- Oliver, Michael. The Politics of Disablement: New Social Movements. *The politics of disablement*. London: Macmillan, 1990, pp. 112-31.
- Quayson, Ato. *Aesthetic nervousness: Disability and the crisis of representation*. Columbia University Press, 2007.
- Schor, Naomi. Blindness as metaphor. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, vol. 11, no. 2, 1999, pp. 76–105.
- Shakespeare, Tom. *Disability rights and wrongs*. Routledge, 2006.
- Titchkosky, Tanya. Life with dead metaphors: Impairment rhetoric in social justice praxis. *Journal of Literary & Cultural Disability Studies*, 9.1, 2015, 1–18.