The Text
An International Peer Reviewed Online Journal of Language, Literature and Critical Theory
ISSN:2581-9526

Intersecting Gendered Identities in Diaspora: A Study of Jhumpa Lahiri's *The Namesake*

Gopika B
Research Scholar (Full Time)
PG and Research Department of English
Sacred Heart College (Autonomous)
Tirupattur, Tamilnadu
ORCID: 0009-0003-2231-3200
&
F. Julian Xercies Rigley
Head (Research), Research Supervisor, & Assistant Professor,
PG and Research Department of English
Sacred Heart College (Autonomous)
Tirupattur, Tamilnadu

Abstract

Immigrant experience in literature is a site of layered, overlapping tensions that encompass gender, race, cultural belonging, and generational identity. This article examines the multidimensional experiences of gender as they manifest across immigrant subjectivities in Lahiri's novel. Drawing on Crenshaw's theoretical framework of intersectionality, the study investigates how gender intersects with race, class, and cultural belonging to shape the lived realities of both first- and second-generation immigrants within the Ganguli family. As Collins and Bilge observe, "intersectionality as an analytic tool gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves" (2). The first generation is represented through Ashoke and Ashima Ganguli, whose diverging responses to migration illuminate the gendered dimensions of diasporic existence. The second generation, embodied by Gogol and Sonia, foregrounds the tensions between cultural heritage and assimilation. The article also incorporates analysis of identity, labor, memory, and domination as they intersect within diasporic life. It contends that migration, as represented in *The Namesake*, is a layered, generationally differentiated struggle, shaped by the convergence of gender, culture, race, and belonging.

Keywords: intersectionality, gender, diaspora, cultural identity, immigration, second generation

© This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 (CC BY-NC 4.0) International License. https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Introduction

Jhumpa Lahiri occupies a distinctive position within South Asian diasporic literature, recognized for her sustained engagement with the psychological and cultural dimensions of the immigrant experience. Her debut collection, *Interpreter of Maladies* (1999), earned the O. Henry Award, the PEN/Hemingway Award, and the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction in 2000, establishing her reputation as a literary voice of considerable importance. Jhumpa Lahiri's fiction explores the lives of Indian immigrants as they negotiate cultural displacement, construct hybrid identities, and the complexities of marriage and family relationships within the American social and cultural landscape. Her first novel, *The Namesake* (2003), achieves critical recognition for its depiction of migrant experience and its attention to cultural conflict and generational division. The novel's subsequent adaptation into film by Mira Nair in 2007 further attests to its cultural resonance. *The Namesake* traces two generations of the Ganguli family across their immigrant lives in America, emphasizing the separate but intersecting burdens that each generation carries. The novel appeared on the bestseller list of The New York Times, cementing its place within contemporary American literary discourse (Jhumpa Lahiri Biography).

Intersectionality and Diasporic Identity

Kimberlé Crenshaw's concept of intersectionality was first articulated in her landmark 1989 article "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics," and subsequently elaborated as a formal theory in her 1991 publication "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." Crenshaw's framework posits that the forms of discrimination and struggle experienced by women, particularly women of color, are not reducible to a single axis of identity but emerge from concurrent and overlapping functions of gender, class, race, and other social categories. Collins and Bilge extend Crenshaw's framework into a generalized analytic tool, arguing that intersectionality "gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves" (2). Collins and Bilge's proposition carries significance in the context of diasporic literature, where characters inhabit multiple, often contradictory subject positions. Hall maintains that cultural identity "is a matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being'" (225). Hall situates identity as a process of continuous transformation rather

than a fixed possession. The processual understanding of identity helps us understand both generations of the Ganguli family, each of whom undergoes forms of becoming that are shaped by intersecting forces of gender, generation, and cultural location.

Lowe's critical framework illustrates the structural dimensions of immigrant identity formation. Lowe argues that "the administration of citizenship was simultaneously a 'technology' of racialization and gendering" (11). She focuses on the institutional mechanisms through which immigrant subjects are produced as racialized and gendered in relation to the state. Lowe's reflection that "Asian American cultural nationalism, or the construction of a fixed, 'native' Asian American subject, obscures gender" (76) brings to light the necessity of attending to gender as a category of analysis within South Asian diasporic fiction, a category that risks erasure within nationalist frameworks of cultural identity. Mishra's theory of diasporic imaginary contributes an ethical dimension to this analysis. "For diasporas to face up to their own ghosts, their own traumas, their own memories is a necessary ethical condition" (Mishra 7). The ethical imperative echoes throughout Lahiri's narrative, which persistently returns its characters to traumatic memories as a condition of diasporic self-understanding. Parreñas's analysis of gendered migration provides the socioeconomic framework through which the hidden causality of women's migration is understood. "Patriarchy, as it operates within a discrete system in the sending country... is a hidden cause of migration for women" (Parreñas 37). Displacement is structured by gendered compulsion rather than individual agency.

Gendered Burden of Migration

Ashima Ganguli stands as the novel's unrelenting representation of the gendered burden of migration. Her experiences, organized by the convergence of culture, gender, and displacement, are intersectional. From the novel's opening pages, Lahiri prioritizes the affective and bodily dimensions of Ashima's displacement through her representation of pregnancy in a foreign country. Ashima's longing for the customs of her Bengali heritage, the nostalgic foods, the familiar routines, the familial proximity, registers the depth of her cultural dislocation. In Bengali tradition, pregnant women customarily return to their natal homes to give birth. It is a practice that ensures both physical comfort and emotional support. Lahiri captures Ashima's awareness of the absent custom: "She thinks to herself, women go home to their parents to give

birth" (4). Lahiri encodes Ashima's most profound grief by portraying the impossibility of inhabiting the gendered cultural scripts that would otherwise sustain her.

The institution of citizenship, as Lowe argues, functions as a technology of simultaneous racialization and gendering (11). Such a double function structures Ashima's early experiences in Cambridge. Her pregnancy unfolds within a medical institution that remains indifferent to her cultural and emotional needs, thus enacting the institutional erasure of the immigrant woman's subjectivity. Ashima's patriarchal conditioning deepens her isolation. Even in a moment of medical emergency, she hesitates to address her husband by name, adhering to the Bengali custom that "it's not the type of thing Bengali wives do" (Lahiri 2). Adherence to cultural norm, maintained even in the context of profound suffering, reveals how patriarchy, operating as a "hidden cause" (Parrenas 37) of women's migration and a shaping force of their behavior within it, continues to operate as a disciplinary mechanism across geographical displacement.

The experience of childbirth manifests Ashima's affective isolation. Ashoke's retreat behind the hospital curtain at the moment of her labor is a gesture that speaks to the gendered distribution of emotional labor within the immigrant household. While Ashima observes a white woman comforted by her husband during labor, her own marital relationship affords her no equivalent support. Her suffering is compounded by its enforced silence. She communicates her pain to neither Ashoke nor the nurse Patty, maintaining an emotional containment that illustrates the double bind of immigrant women who are rendered invisible by institutional structures and disciplined by cultural expectations to absorb their own distress. The textual representation of the erasure is well-defined: "No one hears her, no nurse rushes to her side" (Lahiri 4). Symbolically, it extends beyond medical neglect to capture the broader condition of the immigrant woman. Her voice was unheard and her presence unmarked within the dominant structures of her new society.

Ashima's sense of alienation encompasses the linguistic dimension of her displacement. Her grammatical error during labor, "as long as there are ten finger and ten toe" (Lahiri 7), produces a disproportionate distress that surpasses the physical pain of her contractions. The linguistic vulnerability registers as a form of social exposure. It is an involuntary revelation of her foreignness before the gaze of native speakers. Even in the mundane space of the grocery store, "her heart pounding for fear that she would not be understood" (Lahiri 160), the specter of linguistic judgment haunts her social interactions. These experiences collectively present the

matrix of domination. It is a structured organization of intersecting oppressions, gendered, racial, linguistic, that shapes Ashima's daily existence (Collins 18).

Ashima's cultural identity is a matter of 'becoming.' The arc of her characterization traces a form of becoming that is constrained and enabled by her diasporic condition. Although she remains enclosed within the shell of Bengali custom, signified by her *sari* and *kumkum*, she gradually undertakes a modest expansion of her social world following Ashoke's departure to Ohio. She secures her first employment in the library, cultivates American friendships, and hosts occasional social gatherings. These developments do not erase her relentless sense of displacement, but they signal the beginning of a self-determined negotiation with American modernity. It is only after Ashoke's death, however, that Ashima achieves something approaching genuine independence, carving out a subjectivity that stands above the constraints of cultural and linguistic insecurity.

The mode of communication available to Ashima during the early years of her migration stresses her diasporic marginalization. Letters from Calcutta arrive months after dispatch. Telephone calls occur rarely and exclusively in the context of crisis. Emotional weight of communicative deprivation is registered in Lahiri's account of Ashima's first phone call with her mother after nearly three years of separation: "In spite of her dread she feels thrill; this will be the first time she's heard her mother's voice in nearly three years" (Lahiri 44). The simultaneity of dread and thrill encodes the emotional complexity of diasporic longing. Connection, when it finally arrives, is mediated by the anticipation of loss. The news of her father's death, received at a geographical remove that prevents any final farewell, is a devastating instantiation of this diasporic condition.

Migration as Trauma and Renaissance

Ganguli's migration is structured by a different set of forces, located less in gender subordination than in the traumatic imperative of survival and the existential possibility of self-renewal. Ashoke's intellectual formation as a reader, his passage through literary worlds without physical travel, is violently interrupted by the train disaster of his early twenties. It is an event that transforms his relationship to space, risk, and the future. The words of his fellow passenger Ghosh, "pack a pillow and a blanket" (Lahiri 20), function as an instruction for departure and an imperative of survival, crystallizing the moment at which Ashoke's migration ceases to be a

possibility and becomes a necessity. For Ashoke, migration to America constitutes a mode of escape from death's shadow and from Calcutta's haunting memories, an act of existential renaissance undertaken despite familial resistance.

Mishra's suggests it is a necessary ethical condition for diasporas to face their own ghosts, traumas, and memories (Mishra 9). Ashoke's entire existence in America is shaped by the memory of train disaster and by the survivor's guilt. His choice of Gogol's name is a memorial practice. It is a form of diasporic remembrance that binds his son to the literary object that saved his life. The naming practice illustrates the extent to which trauma and memory persist within the diasporic subject, structuring their most intimate relationships and decisions. Unlike Ashima, Ashoke adapts with relative ease to American cultural life. He tolerates Maxine's casual use of his first name, embraces his children's independence, and directs the conventions of American academic and social life with apparent comfort. However, adaptation does not indicate an absence of gendered awareness. Ashoke's understanding of his wife's suffering is registered in a moment of profound self-reproach: "Feeling that it is his fault, for marrying her, for bringing her here" (Lahiri 33). The recognition depicts the internal tensions within the immigrant male subject, who participates in structures of patriarchal authority while experiencing guilt before the suffering those structures produce. Ashoke's character complicates any straightforward mapping of gender onto victimhood, revealing instead the intersecting responsibilities and guilts that constitute the immigrant husband's subjectivity.

The irreversibility of diasporic loss is presented through the experience of parental death in absentia. Both Ashoke and Ashima are orphaned within a decade abroad: "Within a decade abroad, they are both orphaned" (Lahiri 63). The deaths of their parents, Ashima's father of a heart attack, Ashoke's parents of cancer, Ashima's mother of kidney disease, unfold at a distance that excludes any possibility of final presence or farewell. The migrant's existential condition of divergence between two identities is captured in Lahiri's observation that "even those family members who continue to live seem dead somehow, always invisible, impossible to touch" (Lahiri 63). Lahiri conveys the fundamental paradox of diasporic belonging. Continued existence of beloved others in the homeland is no guarantee of emotional proximity, and the migrant's relationship to those others is perpetually mediated by distance and the impossibility of touch.

The Text

An International Peer Reviewed Online Journal of Language, Literature and Critical Theory

ISSN:2581-9526

Hidden Causes of Women's Migration and the International Division of Labor

Parrenas's renders the structural underpinnings of women's migration that remain concealed beneath the surface of individual narratives. Her argument that patriarchy, as it functions within a discrete system in the sending country, constitutes a hidden cause of migration for women (37) enables a reading of Ashima's displacement as structurally determined rather than individually chosen. Ashima does not migrate as an autonomous subject pursuing personal ambition. She migrates as the wife of Ashoke, following the logic of a patriarchal system in which women's spatial mobility is determined by the decisions of their husbands. Her migration demonstrates the gendered compulsions that produce women's international movement while rendering those compulsions invisible within dominant narratives of immigrant aspiration.

Parreñas observes that women's migration and entrance into domestic and reproductive labor constitute an international division of reproductive labor (29). Although Ashima's situation differs from the Filipino domestic workers Parreñas analyzes, the structural logic she identifies is directly applicable to Ashima's experience. Ashima's reproductive labor, the care of her children, the maintenance of Bengali cultural practices within the home, the preparation of traditional foods, the organization of social gatherings for the Indian immigrant community, is a form of cultural reproductive labor that sustains the diasporic community's connection to its heritage. Labor is rendered invisible within both the domestic sphere, where it is naturalized as feminine duty, and within dominant American culture, which does not recognize its cultural significance.

Lowe's argument that the administration of citizenship functions as a technology of racialization and gendering (11) contextualizes the structural conditions within which Ashima performs the invisible labor. American state's mechanisms of citizenship and belonging produce Ashima as a racialized and gendered subject whose labor and identity are undervalued and overdetermined. Her cultural reproductive labor sustains a diasporic community that remains, in structural terms, subordinate to the dominant culture's norms and values. Lowe's contention that Asian American cultural nationalism obscures gender (76) centers the risk of reading diasporic experience through a culturally nationalist lens that subsumes gender difference beneath a unified ethnic identity.

Migration as Cultural Conflict

Gogol Ganguli's experience of migration is distinct from that of his parents, shaped by the particular tensions of second-generation identity formation. Gogol does not migrate. He is born into diaspora, inhabiting from birth a subject position as a process of becoming. He is shaped by his Bengali heritage and by the American cultural context in which he is raised. The dual conditioning produces in Gogol a form of intersectional identity characterized by persistent tension between the expectations of his family's cultural community and the freedoms offered by American individualism.

The contrast between Bengali and American hospitality, embodied in the difference between Gogol's home and Maxine's family's home, functions in the novel as a meditation on cultural difference and its affective consequences. On his first visit to Maxine's home, Gogol encounters the American liberal parenting model: a handshake greeting, wine offered without consideration of his preferences, and a casual indifference to whether he has been adequately fed. Lahiri's observation that "Lydia pays no attention to Gogol's plate" (133) translates in miniature the broader difference between Bengali hospitality, which is organized around the principle of the guest's comfort, and American social interaction, which foregrounds individual autonomy and the performance of informality.

Maxine's family home functions according to a logic of freedom and openness that Gogol finds both seductive and disorienting. The unlocked doors of her family's house symbolize a mode of social existence organized around trust and openness, in contrast to the locked doors and planned security system of the Ganguli home, which signify the constrained and overprotective orientation of Bengali parenting. Maxine's parents exercise no pressure upon their daughter regarding her professional choices or romantic relationships, while the Gangulis' parental authority is exerted through constant monitoring, telephone surveillance, and the demand for familial presence at weekends. Cultural asymmetry reaches its acute expression when Ashima objects to Maxine's casual address of Gogol's parents by their first names. The moment of cultural transgression is visible in the incompatibility of the two cultural systems, and Ashima's subsequent prohibition against Gogol's marriage to Maxine which underlines the

extent to which cultural belonging and marital choice remain entangled within the immigrant family.

Gogol's experience at the intersection of generational, cultural, and racial identity represents the matrix of domination. It is a structured organization of intersecting oppressions and identity categories that shapes his possibilities of self-determination. Parental expectations that constrain Gogol's choices are not the product of individual parental disposition but reflect the broader structures of cultural nationalism and gendered expectation that function within the South Asian immigrant community. Lowe argues that Asian American cultural nationalism obscures gender (76). The cultural nationalist imperative to preserve a fixed Bengali identity subsumes the individual gendered experiences of Gogol and Sonia beneath a collective demand for cultural continuity. Gogol protracts the negotiation with his names. His Bengali pet name, Gogol, and his formal name, Nikhil, function as competing identity signifiers. Gogol marks him as a child of the diaspora, embedded in his parents' history and trauma, while Nikhil promises the possibility of an American self, liberated from the weight of that history. Lahiri traces Gogol's gradual movement toward an acceptance of the complexity his names translate, a movement that constitutes a form of diasporic self-understanding enabled, ultimately, by his father's death and the recovery of the literary object, Gogol's short stories, that bound father to son across the distance of cultural difference.

Migration as Assimilation

Sonia Ganguli's characterization offers a counterpoint to Gogol's ambivalent negotiation of cultural identity. From childhood, Sonia demonstrates a settled sense of self and a clarity of desire that distinguishes her trajectory from that of her brother. She embraces American cultural life with a confidence and directness that her parents characterize as quintessentially American, at her rice ceremony, her playful gesture of pretending to place a dollar in her mouth prompts the family's observation that "this one is the true American" (Lahiri 63). This symbolic moment, in which Sonia's Americanness is inscribed upon her body during a Bengali cultural ritual, encodes the complexity of her diasporic identity. She is inside and outside the cultural scripts her family performs.

Sonia distances herself from her family for the duration of her education, returning only upon the occasion of her father's death. The pattern of departure and return is characteristic of

the second-generation immigrant woman's negotiation of autonomy and familial obligation, a negotiation shaped by the gendered expectations of the immigrant household as much as by individual desire. Sonia's does not simply inhabit a fixed American identity but continuously negotiates the terms of her belonging in relation to both her American present and her Bengali heritage. Her return to her mother after Ashoke's death, and her sustained emotional support of Ashima during the period of grief, reveals the continuing force of familial obligation and affective responsibility within the second-generation woman's life, even as she maintains the spatial independence that distinguishes her trajectory from Ashima's.

Where Gogol swings between the rejection and acceptance of his cultural heritage, Sonia achieves a form of equilibrium that her brother does not. The matrix of domination (Collins 18) operates differently upon Sonia than upon Ashima. While Ashima's gendered subjectivity is produced within the constraints of first-generation patriarchal expectation and cultural isolation, Sonia's is formed within a context that affords her greater structural freedom while retaining the emotional and relational claims of diasporic kinship. Sonia's characterization illustrates the extent to which the gendered experience of migration is differentiated not only by generation but by the particular intersections of gender, autonomy, and familial structure that characterize each individual's position within the diasporic household.

Conclusion

Lahiri's narrative structure in *The Namesake* is a deliberation on the layered, intersecting nature of diasporic experience. The Ganguli family's migration unfolds across parallel but diverging paths, each shaped by a distinctive configuration of gender, generation, culture, and personal history. For Ashoke, migration functions as an act of existential renaissance, an escape from the traumatic past enabled by the accident of survival and the imperative of Mishra's ethical condition. to face one's own ghosts and memories as a necessary form of diasporic self-understanding (Mishra). For Ashima, migration constitutes a condition of profound gendered displacement, structured by the hidden patriarchal causes that Parreñas identifies (37) and perpetuated by the institutional erasure that Lowe's theorization of citizenship as a technology of racialization and gendering illuminates (11).

The second generation's experience, embodied in Gogol's cultural ambivalence and Sonia's integrative equilibrium, reveals the extent to which diasporic identity constitutes, a

matter of 'becoming' as well as of 'being' (Hall 225). The intersecting pressures of cultural nationalism, gendered expectation, and racial positioning produce within both Gogol and Sonia forms of subjectivity that are irreducible to any single axis of identity. Collins and Bilge's claim that intersectionality gives people better access to the complexity of the world and of themselves (2) is realized, within the novel, as a narrative condition. Lahiri's characters achieve self-understanding precisely through their engagement with the layered complexity of their intersecting identities.

The matrix of domination, as Collins theorizes (18), is not simply a structural backdrop to the novel's action but constitutes the very medium within which the Ganguli family's lives unfold. The overlapping oppressions of gender, race, class, and cultural displacement organize the characters' possibilities of self-determination, belonging, and community. Lowe's observation that Asian American cultural nationalism obscures gender (76) serves as a caution against readings of the novel that subordinate its careful attention to gendered difference beneath a unifying narrative of immigrant aspiration or ethnic solidarity. Lahiri insists upon the specificity of gendered experience within diaspora, and it is this insistence that makes it an indispensable text for intersectional analysis. *The Namesake* is a layered struggle shaped by the convergence of gender, culture, race, and generational position. The Ganguli family's diverse responses to displacement illuminate the multiple ways in which intersecting systems of power produce differentiated forms of diasporic experience.

Works Cited

Collins, Patricia Hill. *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment*. Routledge, 1990.

Collins, Patricia Hill, and Sirma Bilge. *Intersectionality*. Polity Press, 2016.

Crenshaw, Kimberle. "Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics." *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, vol. 1989, no. 1, 1989, pp. 139–67.

Crenshaw, Kimberlé. "Mapping the Margins: Intersectionality, Identity Politics, and Violence against Women of Color." *Stanford Law Review*, vol. 43, no. 6, 1991, pp. 1241–99.

"Jhumpa Lahiri Biography." *Chicago Public Library*, https://www.chipublib.org/jhumpa-lahiri-biography/. Accessed 8 Sept. 2025.

Lahiri, Jhumpa. *The Namesake*. Houghton Mifflin, 2003.

Lowe, Lisa. *Immigrant Acts: On Asian American Cultural Politics*. Duke UP, 1996.

Mishra, Vijay. "The Diasporic Imaginary and the Indian Diaspora." *Asian Studies Institute, Victoria University of Wellington*, 1996.

Parrenas, Rhacel Salazar. *Servants of Globalization: Women, Migration, and Domestic Work*. Stanford UP, 2001.