Advanced International Journal for Research (AIJFR)
E-ISSN: 3048-7641 ● Website: www.aijfr.com ● Email: editor@aijfr.com

The Cultural Nexus and Ambivalent Identities in The Namesake

Ms. Sristy Sharma[1], Dr. Devendra Kumar Sharma[2]

[1]Research Scholar, Dept. of English and MELs,
Banasthali Vidyapeeth, Niwai, Tonk (Rajasthan), India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Dept. of English and MELs,
Banasthali Vidyapeeth, Niwai, Tonk (Rajasthan), India.

Abstract

The Namesake (2003) by Jhumpa Lahiri centres around diaspora, culture, ambivalence, name, and identity. In the novel, Lahiri doesn't display culture as merely a backdrop. Instead, she demonstrates how culture is malleable and bends between the two worlds of preservation and transformation. Thus, culture is a space that evolves and progresses. In The Namesake, it acts as a juncture, a nexus where diaspora people experience the challenges of living in a distant land, while at the same time feeling nostalgic about their own culture. In all, they face cultural tensions, and these challenges are visible in cultural habits, languages, and rituals. This cultural nexus can offer comfort at times, but it can also be unsettling. Moreover, Lahiri's focal character, Gogol Ganguli, exhibits this cultural conflict through his name. His name serves as a symbol of his efforts to maintain his life in America alongside his Indian familial roots. In this way, he exhibits the emotions and struggles of the second-generation immigrants. He can neither escape nor resist these conflicts. Therefore, this paper seeks to understand how Jhumpa Lahiri represents such cultural tensions. This paper also explores how identity gets influenced by ambivalence or culture. The plot of The Namesake suggests that these crossings can be difficult. But they also offer ways to understand oneself and find a sense of belonging while stuck in the juncture.

Keywords: Cultural nexus, Ambivalent Identity, Diaspora, Hybridity, Third Space

1. Introduction

In The Namesake, a gradual movement across borders, memories, and everyday routines is presented. The shift from India to America is not shown as a complete departure followed by a stable arrival. Instead, a sense of incompleteness is maintained throughout the narrative. India is carried into American spaces through memory, habit, and silence, even as new lives are being formed. What is remembered is often found to be different from what is lived, and what is inherited is not always aligned with what is chosen. Rather than dramatic cultural clashes, attention is given to quiet adjustments through which immigrant lives are shaped. The condition of being in between is thus portrayed as a lasting state rather than a temporary phase.

Lahiri's focus is not on dramatic conflict. Quiet, inward forms of struggle are experienced by her characters. They surface in hesitation, in unspoken expectations, and most noticeably, in names. The experience of migration in the novel is marked by what is carried silently rather than what is openly expressed. As Lahiri notes in the novel, the immigrant condition often produces "a constant sense of alienation, the knowledge of and longing for a lost world" (Lahiri, 2003, p. 26). This longing persists over time. It simply changes its form.

Reading The Namesake naturally leads into the concerns of diasporic cultural studies. This field does not view migration as a single event, but rather as an ongoing process. It asks what happens after relocation, when daily life must be rebuilt in unfamiliar surroundings. Language, food, ritual, and memory take on new meanings in this process. The kitchen becomes a site of memory. The accent becomes a marker of difference. Home becomes something imagined as much as something lived. Avtar Brah reminds us that diaspora is shaped not only by movement but also by "the lived tension between where one is from and where one is" (Brah, 1996, p. 181). Lahiri's novel captures this tension with remarkable restraint.

A useful way of interpreting this experience in The Namesake is offered through the concept of a cultural nexus, which is not conceived as a physical place. It is a meeting point where cultures overlap in everyday life. It appears in small moments. Ashima is cooking Bengali food with American ingredients. Family gatherings are held in suburban houses that never quite feel like home. Naming ceremonies that take place far away from their cultural origin. These moments may seem ordinary, but they hold emotional weight. For Ashima, America is never entirely made familiar. Life there is lived as a prolonged state of waiting. The sense of being a foreigner is captured by Lahiri, who describes it as "a sort of lifelong pregnancy" (Lahiri, 2003, p. 49). The image captures both hope and discomfort at once.

This cultural nexus is not stable. It shifts with time and with generations. For the first generation, it offers continuity and emotional survival. Cultural habits help them endure distance from home. For the second generation, these same habits are often experienced as burdens rather than sources of comfort. What was once meant to preserve continuity is gradually felt as limiting. At this point, Stuart Hall's understanding of identity becomes particularly useful. Identity, according to Hall, is not treated as fixed or rooted in a single origin but is understood as something that is "always in process" (Hall, 1990, p. 226). Within The Namesake, this ongoing process is quietly lived rather than consciously recognised. The characters are shaped by shifting positions between cultures, even when such shaping is not fully perceived or articulated by them.

The idea of ambivalent identity emerges naturally from this condition. Ambivalence refers to the experience of being emotionally divided. It is not confusion alone but the presence of opposing feelings at the same time. One can feel attachment and distance together. Belonging and estrangement coexist. An ambivalent identity does not settle comfortably into one culture. It remains unfinished.

Gogol embodies this ambivalence most clearly. His name becomes the first site of conflict. It does not belong neatly to either Indian or American culture. It marks him as different before he understands why. Discomfort with his name is increasingly felt by Gogol as awareness of how he is perceived by others grows. He changes it, hoping the change will simplify his life. Yet the past remains attached to him. Lahiri notes his frustration when she writes that he "hates having to explain his name, hates having constantly to

correct people" (Lahiri, 2003, p. 66). The act of renaming does not resolve his unease. Its form is merely altered by the action, without being resolved.

Freedom is offered to Gogol by his life in America, yet his sense of disconnection is also deepened. Neither is his parents' cultural world fully embraced by him, nor is complete integration into American society achieved. His identity is left unsettled, shaped continuously by forces from both worlds. Homi Bhabha's idea of the "third space" is helpful here. This space is not about choosing one culture over another but about living within contradiction (Bhabha, 1994, p. 37). Gogol lives in this space, even when he resists it.

Importantly, ambivalence in The Namesake is not portrayed only as a problem. It also creates possibilities. New ways of belonging are created through the experience of existing between cultures. Identity becomes flexible rather than fixed. Contradictions do not cancel each other out. They exist side by side. This reflects the broader diasporic condition, which is rarely about clear resolution.

Diasporic cultural studies often emphasize hybridity and cultural mixing. Lahiri's novel complicates this view. While cultural blending is present, it is accompanied by discomfort, loss, and uncertainty. Ambivalence here is shaped by cultural forces such as family expectations, memory, and ritual. It is produced socially, not just emotionally. When these forces pull in different directions, identity becomes fragmented.

Looking at ambivalent identity through the lens of a cultural nexus allows a more layered understanding of diaspora. Migration is neither purely a loss nor purely a gain. It is both at once. The cultural nexus becomes the site where these contradictions are lived daily. Life in diaspora remains unstable and constantly changing. Each generation renegotiates its sense of self.

Although the experiences of a Bengali American family are followed in The Namesake, the tensions explored are not limited to a single community. Questions of belonging, naming, and inheritance are raised wherever migration reshapes everyday life. Emotional weight is often carried by small choices, while family expectations are felt even when they are resisted. Clear resolutions are not offered by the novel. Instead, identity is shown as provisional and continually negotiated, shaped by memory, loss, and adjustment. Belonging is shown not as a permanent state, but as a condition that is repeatedly reshaped and negotiated over time.

Research Gap and Conceptual Intervention

And yet, after reading a good number of these studies, a certain quiet lack is felt. Most analyses stress either nostalgia or hybridity. Hybridity often remains an abstract category, invoked without close attention to how it is embodied in daily practice. Theories are named, but often treated as metaphors rather than lived processes. This is where the phrase 'cultural nexus' becomes useful. A nexus is a knot, a small point where threads tangle. In The Namesake, these knots are domestic and ordinary: naming rituals, family meals, language use, festivals, and silences. These acts quietly produce identity. Ambivalence grows there. Theoretical scaffolding supports this move. Bhabha's Third Space explains in-betweenness, Pratt's Contact Zone highlights unequal encounters, and Turner's liminality captures suspension. The cultural nexus gathers these insights into a single, practice-focused idea. It locates ambivalence not only in theory, but in lived, repeated actions.

Discussion

The Namesake stages ambivalence not as a single dramatic conflict, but as a set of knots where cultures meet. These knots or cultural nexuses are visible in names, spaces, generational ties, and everyday rituals. Gogol's life is marked by such nexuses, each producing both tension and creativity. By reading these nexuses through Bhabha's hybridity, Pratt's contact zones, and Turner's liminality, we can see how Lahiri dramatizes identity as an unsettled process. Gogol's name is more than just a word. It shows how cultures meet in daily life. Even small things can shape identity.

a) Naming as Cultural Nexus

Names are never neutral. In The Namesake, Gogol's name is the most obvious nexus where cultures meet and clash. It embodies ambivalence: he belongs to two worlds yet fully to neither.

Ashoke names his son after the Russian writer Nikolai Gogol, whose book once saved his life during a train accident. Yet when this name is transplanted into American soil, it becomes strange, burdensome. Gogol himself resents it: "He hates having to live with it, with a pet name turned into a proper one, the public cradled within the private" (Lahiri, 2003, p.76). Here, the name is a 'contact zone' (Pratt, 1991, p. 34). For Ashoke, it is memory, survival, tradition. For Gogol, it is embarrassment, misfit, and dissonance. The nexus creates ambivalence because the same signifier carries conflicting meanings across cultures and generations. Scholars have noted this. As Banerjee argues, "Naming is both an act of belonging and estrangement; it inscribes diasporic subjects within memory even as it distances them from assimilation" (Banerjee 2010, p. 120). Gogol's name makes him visible in both directions, i.e., tied to his Bengali roots, marked as foreign in America. Bhabha's concept of hybridity illuminates this further. Gogol is forced into a "Third Space" (Bhabha 1994, p. 7), where neither identity feels complete. His attempt to rename himself "Nikhil" in college is not an escape but another ambivalence. Nikhil gives him access to new social circles, but it feels like "a borrowed name" (Lahiri, 2003, p. 105).

The name, then, is a cultural nexus that generates ambivalence precisely because it refuses finality. As Chowdhury observes, "The oscillation between Gogol and Nikhil enacts the impossibility of a settled diasporic self" (Chowdhury 2013, p. 56).

b) Spatial and Temporal Crossings

If names are personal nexuses, spaces are collective ones. In Lahiri's novel, Boston, New York, and Calcutta become cultural nodes where identity is tested and unsettled. Ashima's first winter in Cambridge is an early example. She feels the absence of Calcutta in every detail: "For being a foreigner, Ashima is beginning to realize, is a sort of lifelong pregnancy- a perpetual wait, a constant burden" (Lahiri, 2003, p. 49). This description echoes Turner's liminality: she is "betwixt and between" (Turner 1969, p. 94). Ashima's sense of exile shows how space itself becomes a nexus; the American apartment is layered with memories of Bengali homes. For Gogol, spatial crossings mark his evolving ambivalence. His first visit to Calcutta overwhelms him: "He feels no nostalgia for the place, no longing at all. It means nothing to him" (Lahiri, 2003, p. 111). Yet later, after Ashoke's death, Calcutta becomes charged with meaning. He realizes that he has "a place in the world" tied to these ancestral streets (Lahiri, 2003, p. 189). The same space carries different resonances across time, producing ambivalence not only spatially but temporally. Scholars of diaspora stress this instability. Avtar Brah writes that "diaspora space is the point at which

boundaries of inclusion and exclusion are contested" (Cartographies of Diaspora, 1996, p. 209). Lahiri dramatizes this: for Ashima, America excludes; for Gogol, India excludes. Both navigate boundaries that shift depending on context. Mobility intensifies this. Gogol moves between coasts, cities, and relationships. Each move destabilizes him. He is never fully rooted, always provisional. Clifford notes that diasporic identities are "routes rather than roots" (Clifford 1994, p. 302). Gogol's routes make his identity more fluid, but also more uncertain. The cultural nexus here is not just one place but the crossings themselves. Airports, train rides, and visits become nexuses where identities are suspended, renegotiated, and ambivalently felt.

c) Intergenerational Tensions and Identity

The novel highlights how ambivalence operates across generations, with the parents representing cultural preservation while the children navigate fluid and evolving identities. This contrast creates tension but also mutual transformation. Ashima and Ashoke try to preserve Bengali customs abroad. Ashoke insists on naming ceremonies, Bengali gatherings, and visits home. Ashima carefully cooks with ingredients carried from India. Their practices reflect what Clifford calls "the power of return narratives" (Clifford, 1994, p. 311). They maintain identity through repetition, even in displacement. For Gogol, this resilience is restrictive. He views Bengali gatherings as suffocating, rituals as irrelevant. His ambivalence emerges in rejecting yet never fully abandoning them. "For years he had been resistant to her, embarrassed by her accent, her eccentricities, her lack of American polish. But now, more than ever, he respects them" (Lahiri, 20030, p. 276). This shift illustrates how ambivalence is generational. Parents seek continuity; children seek assimilation. Yet neither achieves stability. As Mishra writes, "Diasporic identity is not homogenous; it is fractured by generational difference and conflicting investments" (Literature of the Indian Diaspora, 2007, p. 18). The cultural nexus here is the family itself- a site of ambivalence. For Ashima, it is about preserving memory. For Gogol, it is about negotiating freedom. Their shared life knots these goals together, producing tension but also belonging.

d) Rituals, Language, and Food

Finally, ambivalence is most visible in the smallest details of everyday practice- rituals, language, and food. These nexuses are lived in daily life, showing how culture continues and changes. Lahiri presents immigrant rituals as forms of adaptation. Birthdays blend Bengali sweets with American cakes, and weddings mix different traditions. Death rituals are observed imperfectly, yet sincerely. As Ray notes, "Rituals in diaspora are fragments, stitched together from memory and adaptation" (Ray, 2004, p. 92). Each ritual is a point where cultures meet, creating a mix of old and new, not fully one or the other.

Ashoke and Ashima speak Bengali at home, but Gogol slips into English. His bilingual world is a contact zone. At times, translation fails. Ashima feels a gap when her children cannot speak Bengali fluently. But English also feels incomplete, not close enough. Language becomes a place of both connection and loss.

Food is another way culture shows itself. Ashima cooks fish curries and samosas, but also learns to make American dishes. Gogol eats hamburgers with friends, yet also returns to his mother's kitchen for comfort. As Banerjee observes, "Food becomes a metaphor for the half-familiar terrain of diaspora — nourishing yet unsettling" (2010, p. 124). Ambivalence is shown in every meal, as both new ways and old traditions are mixed. In daily life, this feeling is experienced quietly, not dramatically. It is felt in the taste of food, the flow of conversation, and the small awkward moments in rituals.

The cultural nexus is made visible in these simple everyday acts that shape identity. Through naming, spatial crossings, generational divides, and everyday practices, The Namesake dramatizes ambivalence as a lived condition. Theory helps frame this. Bhabha shows hybridity, Pratt shows contact zones, Turner shows liminality. But Lahiri grounds these abstractions in names, homes, families, and meals. The concept of the cultural nexus brings these together. It highlights the knots where cultures meet, not smoothly, not violently alone, but ambivalently. Gogol's identity is made of such knots. His story shows that diaspora is not about fixed belonging but about living with ambivalence as an ongoing condition.

Conclusion

This study has looked at how The Namesake presents ambivalent identities through the idea of the "cultural nexus." The novel shows that identity is shaped where cultures meet. These points are not stable. They shift. They hold both comfort and discomfort. They carry belonging and estrangement at the same time. The analysis moved through four key areas. First, names Gogol's struggle with the names "Gogol" and "Nikhil" shows that a name holds much more than just a word. It is memory, family, history, and choice. His name becomes a junction of cultures. It connects him to the past while pulling him toward a new world. Second, places. Boston and Calcutta become cultural crossroads. Movement between these spaces creates uncertainty and sharpens the sense of not fully belonging anywhere. Third, generations. Ashoke and Ashima try to keep their culture and traditions alive, while Gogol and his sister face uncertainty. This shows how cultural heritage and doubt often exist together in-migrant families. Fourth, rituals and everyday life. Food, festivals, and language look ordinary, but they carry quiet tensions. They show how identity is built and rebuilt in daily acts.

Seen together, these areas show how ambivalence grows out of lived intersections. Theories of hybridity, liminality, and the contact zone help explain this process. Bhabha's idea of hybridity shows how new identities are formed in-between. Pratt's idea of the contact zone shows how differences in power and constant negotiation influence cultural interactions. Turner's liminality describes the feeling of suspension, of being neither here nor there. The "cultural nexus" fits among these ideas. But it adds a more grounded focus. It highlights the specific spaces: names, homes, meals, and rituals, where cultures cross and identities are unsettled.

Ambivalence in the novel is not simply confusion. It is a condition of migration. Identity in diaspora cannot remain fixed. It moves with memory, with travel, with relationships. For Gogol, identity is not a single answer. It is a series of negotiations. At times, it feels like a loss. At other times, it opens the way for growth. Ambivalence, then, is not failure. It is a way of living across more than one world. This approach has wider use. The cultural nexus can be applied to other diasporic texts and contexts. It links theory with practice. It brings abstract ideas back to daily life. It shows how culture is not only discussed in theory but also cooked in kitchens, spoken through names, or lived in family rituals. It reminds us that the everyday is where identity is made. There is space for future research. The cultural nexus can be studied across South Asian, African, or Caribbean diasporas. It can be tested against new forms of migration, including digital and climate-driven movements. Gender and class may also change how cultural nexuses are lived. Such work will deepen our understanding of how identity is carried, negotiated, and transformed in migration. To close, The Namesake teaches us that identity is never final. It is always in motion, always made at crossings. Gogol's story shows how names, places, generations, and rituals all work as cultural junctions. These junctions do not give easy answers. They create ambivalence. But they also allow new

ways of being. The cultural nexus helps explain this truth. Living between cultures is not just a challenge; it can also give life meaning. Lahiri's novel reminds us that identity is never fixed. It is formed at the crossings of experience, shaped by memory, and lived in everyday moments.

List of References

1. Banerjee, M., *Jhumpa Lahiri: Writer of Diaspora*, Routledge, 2010.
2. Bhabha, H. K., *The Location of Culture*, Routledge, 1994.
3. Brah, A., *Cartographies of Diaspora: Contesting Identities*, Routledge, 1996.
4. Chowdhury, E., "Naming and Negotiation in Jhumpa Lahiri's *The Namesake*", *South Asian Review*, 2013, 34 (3), 55–70.
5. Clifford, J., "Diasporas", *Cultural Anthropology*, 1994, 9 (3), 302–318.
6. Dutta, B., "Diasporic Identity and Journey in Jhumpa Lahiri's *The Namesake*", *GRFDT Online*, n.d.
7. "Exploring Bicultural Ambivalence in Jhumpa Lahiri's *The Namesake*", *ResearchGate*, 2018. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326679794_Exploring_Bicultural_Ambivalence_in_Jhumpa_Lahiri%27s_The_Namesake_Representational_Diasporic_Identities_in_Indian_Anglophone_Fiction
8. Hall, S., "Cultural Identity and Diaspora", in J. Rutherford (Ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, Lawrence and Wishart, 1990, pp. 222–237.
9. Lahiri, J., *The Namesake*, Houghton Mifflin, 2003.
10. Mishra, V., *Literature of the Indian Diaspora: Theorizing the Diasporic Imaginary*, Routledge, 2007.
11. Pratt, M. L., "Arts of the Contact Zone", *Profession*, 1991, pp. 33–40.
12. Ray, S., *En-Gendering India: Woman and Nation in Colonial and Postcolonial Narratives*, Duke University Press, 2004.
13. "A Case Study of 'Gogol' in Jhumpa Lahiri's *The Namesake*", *SSRN*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4592286
14. Turner, V., *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure*, Aldine, 1969.