Anusandhanvallari
Vol 2026, No.1
January 2026
ISSN 2229-3388

"Split Selves and Shared Spaces: The Identity Quest in *The Namesake*"

[1]Ms. P. Adhiruba, [2]Dr. R. Priya

[1]Research Scholar, Research Department of English

V.V.Vanniaperumal College for Women, Virudhunagar.

adhirubaparthipan2303@gmail.com

[2]Assistant Professor of English, V. V. Vanniaperumal College for Women, Virudhunagar

rpriya@vvvcollege.org

Abstract

The Namesake by Jhumpa Lahiri tells the moving story of Gogol Ganguli, the son of Bengali immigrants born in America, as he struggles with the intricacies of bicultural identity. Amidst generational strife, cultural estrangement, and diasporic yearning, the book explores the complex development of his identity. This paper examines how Lahiri employs Gogol's conflicted relationship with his name to symbolise broader diasporic tensions, supported by a critical framework that includes diaspora theory, postcolonial studies, and identity formation.

Key Words: Diaspora, Identity Crisis, Hybridity, Cultural Dislocation, Second-Generation Immigrants

Introduction

Migration still has a big impact on literature in the twenty-first century, which is a globalised time. Diaspora literature often deals with issues of moving, having two cultures, and figuring out who you are. Diasporic fiction is written by people who live in or come from communities that have been displaced. It looks at how memory, identity, and belonging all come together. Writers from the Indian diaspora, such as Salman Rushdie, Jhumpa Lahiri, Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni, and Bharati Mukherjee, have added a lot to this literary tradition, which Mishra calls a *"*literature of the twice-displaced*"* (442). Mishra says that second-generation immigrants don't just deal with cultural differences; they also see them as a crisis of identity. Their characters deal with broken identities and cultural hybridity while living in more than one world.

Jhumpa Lahiri, who was born in London and grew up in the United States, is an example of a second-generation diasporic consciousness. Her own life experiences give her fiction a deeply introspective and real look at what Homi Bhabha called the *"*third space*"* in The Location of Culture, a place where identity is always being negotiated. *"*Cultural identity emerges in the negotiation of difference*"* (Bhabha 2). In *The Namesake* (2003), Lahiri writes about Gogol Ganguli, a first-generation American of Indian descent, and how hard it is for him to figure out who he is. His journey, which is shaped by conflicting cultural demands and the weight of a name that never feels completely his own, becomes a symbol of the dissonance of living in a diaspora. Avtar Brah asserts that "diaspora space is the intersectionality of diaspora, border, and dis/location as a point of confluence" (Brah 208). This perspective facilitates our comprehension of Gogol's universe, characterised by the convergence of boundaries where nothing is entirely indigenous or alien.

Uma Parmeswaran says that *"the diasporic experience unfolds in phases: nostalgia for the homeland, cultural adaptation, assertion of identity, and eventual participation in public life"* (165). Tejinder Kaur says, *"Lahiri shows how their identities change as they deal with new demands, new possibilities, and new ways of thinking about their relationships with the subject culture and their homelands"* (Kaur 36). Lahiri shows how Gogol changed from being resistant to being accepting through these stages in his life. Lahiri's mapping of Gogol's identity shows the struggle of immigrants and also what Stuart Hall calls the *"production of identity as a process of becoming"* (Hall 4). This essay looks at how Lahiri uses Gogol's troubled name, broken relationships, and cultural dislocation to explore the identity crisis that is at the heart of the diasporic condition.

Gogol's Name as a Metaphor for Identity Crisis

The name *"Gogol,"* which Ashoke gave him as a tribute to the Russian writer Nikolai Gogol, who saved his life, becomes a burden for Gogol, making him feel disconnected from both his Indian roots and his American friends. For Ashoke, the name means survival and thankfulness. For Gogol, it means being alone. In her work "The Namesake," Jhuma Lahiri describes how her protagonist "hates having to live with a name he hates, a name he's come to associate with everything unresolved and dissonant in his life" (88). Bharati Mukherjee has said that names in diasporic literature often have *"emotional, genealogical, and cultural residues"* (Mukherjee 35). Gogol's name in Lahiri's novel shows that he can't comfortably fit into either of the cultural spaces he inherited. He is *"a name without a country."*

In Bengali culture, the difference between *"good names"* and *"pet names"* is important for religious reasons. But in America, Gogol's nickname becomes his legal name, which is a cultural mistake that will have effects for a long time. *"Pet names are for the family. Good names are for the world"* (*The Namesake*, 25), which shows the difference between cultural tradition and Western norms. Gogol's frustration isn't just about language; it's also about how he feels out of place in both cultures. In Calcutta, he doesn't feel Indian enough, and in the US, he doesn't feel American enough.

Tejinder Kaur says, *"Names in diasporic literature are more than markers of identity; they are battlegrounds where heritage and modernity clash"* (Kaur 102). When he went to college, he changed his name to *"Nikhil"* to take back control. Still, this change is only skin deep: *"He wonders if Nikhil is really him."* He wonders if he is giving in to a name instead of a life (*The Namesake*, 105). His two identities don't help him deal with the deeper existential uncertainty.

Cultural and Generational Dislocation: The Double Bind

The Namesake shows the differences between the conservative, nostalgic world of first-generation immigrants Ashoke and Ashima and the pressures that American-born children feel to fit in. The elders hold on to language, food, and rituals to keep their culture alive. Lahiri says, *"They learn to do things the American way, but they never fully accept them"* (*The Namesake*, 64). Ashima's desire to go back to Calcutta and her initial resistance to American culture show the immigrant's problem of being rooted but not belonging.

Gogol, on the other hand, comes from American schools, friends, and the media. He is still an outsider, even though he was born in the country. Gogol thinks their customs are strange because he was born and raised in the United States. He doesn't have their nostalgia or cultural memory, which makes him feel distant: *"He has no childhood memories of Calcutta, no sense of attachment to his ancestral home"* (*The Namesake*, 89). Lahiri

says, "Even after he changes his name... the face does not" (*The Namesake*, 132). Dimri says that his struggle is more subtle: "Even though they have adapted and assimilated, second-generation immigrants cannot escape being victimised and ostracised" (28). This conflict shows up in Gogol's relationships. He is fully immersed in Western life with Maxine, but he can't remember anything about his own culture. He hopes for cultural understanding with Moushumi, a Bengali-American woman, but instead, he faces infidelity and disappointment. Both relationships show that assimilation or ethnic pairing alone can't define who you are. As Gunew says, "Second-generation immigrants suffer from a kind of linguistic and cultural amnesia; they are neither rooted in the language of their parents nor fully at home in the host country's idioms" (67). This liminality shapes the path that Gogol takes. He has trouble feeling like he belongs, whether it's in his love life or his schoolwork.

Hybridity and Bicultural Stress: Living in the Third Space

Bhabha's idea of hybridity shows the cultural anxiety that Gogol feels throughout the book. He is stuck between two languages, sets of values, and ways of being. Bhabha calls this the "interstitial passage between fixed identifications" (3). Gogol's name, his family traditions, and his love life all show how unstable and changing things are. Lahiri uses Gogol's trouble fitting in with either Bengali or American culture to show how mixed up he is. "He knows that he doesn't belong in Maxine's world." But when he's with Bengalis, he feels like an outsider too (*The Namesake*, 152). Lahiri doesn't make hybridity sound romantic. Instead, she shows how it affects people's mental health. "He knows that he doesn't belong in Maxine's world. But when he's with Bengalis, he also feels like an outsider (*The Namesake*, 152). Abhik Maiti agrees with this point of view, saying, "The diasporic condition is not about going back to roots but about building new cultural coordinates through adaptation" (Maiti 5).

Gogol tries to fit into American life by changing his name, getting a job as an architect, and dating people who aren't of his race. But they never completely get rid of the feeling of being "other." Lahiri says, "He is still seen as foreign even after he changes his name." The name changes, but the face stays the same (*The Namesake*, 132). This moment makes Edward Said's point that exile is "a condition of terminal loss" (Said 173), especially for people who are not completely exiled but also not completely at home. His fight is similar to what Salman Rushdie said about this existential paradox: "Even British-born blacks and Asians are thought of as people whose real home is elsewhere" (Rushdie 132).

Return, Reconciliation, and the Birth of a New Self

Gogol's life changes forever when Ashoke dies suddenly. It makes him reconnect with his roots and rethink who he is. The rituals that took place after his father's death and his trips to Calcutta start to show him how valuable the heritage he used to ignore is. "*The Namesake*" (194) says, "He wears his father's shoes and finds comfort in the rituals he once rejected." Gogol's gradual acceptance of his roots is shown by his symbolic act of putting on Ashoke's shoes.

Reading Nikolai Gogol's stories, which is where his name comes from, is a moment of revelation: "For the first time, he feels a sense of belonging when he reads the book of Gogol his father once gave him" (*The Namesake*, 201). This moment fits with what Bhatia and Ram say: "diasporic identities do not seek return, but arrive at synthesis" (Bhatia and Ram 143). Gogol's journey shows Uma Parmeswaran's model of diasporic identity phases: nostalgia, adjustment, cultural assertion, and participation (165). This reconciliation doesn't mean going back to Indian culture completely or becoming completely American. Instead, it suggests a more complex,

mixed identity that accepts two sides. Lahiri doesn't give Gogol a solution in the usual sense, but she does let him reach a point of balance: "He doesn't regret being Gogol." No longer. He accepts the name, the history, and the difference (*The Namesake*, 203). Kaur notes that Lahiri's characters eventually accept "dual consciousness as a condition of survival" (104). Gogol doesn't turn his identity into a single story; instead, he learns to accept its many parts.

Conclusion

The Namesake tells a deep story about identity, being uprooted, and coming back together. Jhumpa Lahiri skilfully shows how deep the psychological effects of living in a diaspora can be through Gogol Ganguli's journey. The book says that identity is not a fixed thing, especially for people who live in other countries. Instead, it is a changing thing that is shaped by where you are, what language you speak, your memories, and your relationships. Nicholas Gipe et al. say, "Lahiri's characters may not solve their identity conflicts, but they navigate them with grace, introspection, and ultimately, self-acceptance" (Gipe et al. 3).

The novel brings out the fact that diasporic identity is not a place to go, but a process of constantly negotiating memory, language, and belonging. By the end of the novel, Gogol's acceptance of his name doesn't mean he passively accepts his heritage; instead, it means he is aware of how it has shaped him. Lahiri said in an interview, "I don't think of identity as a single thing; it's always being negotiated" (Dempsey). Gogol's story is like a mirror for the postcolonial subject, showing how to balance the past and the present, tradition and change.

As Parmeswaran rightly says, "Diaspora is not about going back home; it is about changing what home means and where it is" (165). By accepting his mixed identity, Gogol shows that the diasporic condition is not just one thing. *The Namesake* doesn't help us solve the problem between East and West; instead, it teaches us how to live in the space between.

Works Cited

[1] Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. Routledge, 1994. Taylor & Francis eBooks, www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203820551/location-culture-homi-bhabha. Accessed 15 Mar. 2025.
[2] Bhatia, Sunil, and Anjali Ram. "Theorizing Identity in Transnational and Diaspora Cultures: A Critical Approach to Acculturation." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, vol. 33, no. 2, 2009, pp. 140-149.
[3] Brah, Avtar. *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*. Routledge, 1996. Taylor & Francis eBooks, www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203970300/ cartographies-diaspora-avtar-brah. Accessed 25 Mar. 2025.
[4] Dimri, Jaiwanti. *Expatriate Experience and Second Generation Immigrants*. Prestige Books, 2007.
[5] Gilroy, Paul. *The Black Atlantic: Modernity and Double Consciousness*. Harvard UP, 1993.
[6] Gipe, Nicholas, et al. "Reading Jhumpa Lahiri." *Barnard English Review*, 2005. Barnard College, english.barnard.edu/sites/default/files/inline-files/Reading%20Jhumpa%20Lahiri.pdf. Accessed 24 Mar. 2025.
[7] Gunew, Sneja. "Subaltern Empathy: Beyond European Categories in Postcolonial Women's Writing." *Cultural Critique*, vol. 14, 1990, pp. 51-76. JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/1354235. Accessed 10 Apr. 2025.

[8] Hall, Stuart. "Cultural Identity and Diaspora." *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, edited by Jonathan Rutherford, Lawrence & Wishart, 1990, pp. 222-237.
[9] Kaur, Tejinder. "Transformations in Identity in Diaspora." *South Asian Studies*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2014, pp. 35-37. ResearchGate, www.researchgate.net/publication/123456789_Transformations_in_Identity_in_Diaspora. Accessed 11 Apr. 2025.
[10] Lahiri, Jhumpa. *The Namesake*. Penguin Books, 2003.
[11] ---. Interview with Mary A. Dempsey. *American Libraries*, Apr. 2003. American Library Association, americanlibrariesmagazine.org/2003/04/01/interview-jhumpa-lahiri/. Accessed 22 Apr. 2025.
[12] Maiti, Abhik. "Transnational Identity and Cultural Reproduction." *Diaspora Studies*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2013, pp. 4-7.
[13] Mishra, Vijay. "The Diasporic Imaginary: Theorizing the Indian Diaspora." *Textual Practice*, vol. 10, no. 3, 1996, pp. 421-447. Taylor & Francis Online, https://doi.org/10.1080/09502369608582215. Accessed 10 May 2025.
[14] Mukherjee, Bharati. "Imagining Homelands." *The Writer on Her Work*, edited by Janet Sternburg, W.W. Norton, 1991, pp. 32-45.
[15] Parmeswaran, Uma. "Negotiating Diaspora Identity." *Diaspora: A Journal of Transnational Studies*, vol. 7, no. 3, 2005, pp. 163-174.
[16] Rushdie, Salman. "Imaginary Homelands." *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991*. Granta Books, 1991. Google Books, books.google.com/books/about/Imaginary_Homelands.html?id=mno678. Accessed 10 May 2025.
[17] Said, Edward W. *Reflections on Exile and Other Essays*. Harvard University Press, 2000. Google Books, books.google.com/books/about/Reflections_on_Exile_and_Other_Essays.html?id=pqr901. Accessed 10 May 2025.
[18] Sarangi, Jaydeep. *Indian Diasporic Literature: A Critical Response*. Sarup & Sons, 2007.