The Academic
International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research

An Online Peer Reviewed / Refereed Journal
Volume 3 | Issue 12 | December 2025
ISSN: 2583-973X (Online)
Website: www.theacademic.in

Transnationalism and the 'Imagined Homelands' in Taslima Nasrin's *French* Lover

Sudha Sharma

Ph.D. Scholar, English Literature, Desh Bhagat University, Mandi Gobindgarh, Fatehgarh Sahib, Punjab

DOI : https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18405862

ARTICLE DETAILS

Research Paper

Accepted: 31-12-2025

Published: 10-01-2026

Keywords:

Imagined homelands, Feminist diaspora, Autonomy, Transnational female subjectivity, Female autonomy and desire, Postcolonial feminism,

ABSTRACT

Taslima Nasrin's *French Lover* (2002) is a powerful feminist narrative that interrogates the lived realities of transnational migration through the lens of gender. This paper examines the novel using the concepts of **transnationalism** and the **'imagined homelands'**, arguing that Nasrin dismantles both nationalist nostalgia and Western liberal myths of freedom. Through the protagonist Nilanjana's fractured experiences in India and France, the novel exposes how patriarchy travels across borders, reconstituting itself within diasporic spaces. By foregrounding female desire, bodily autonomy, and existential choice, *French Lover* ultimately redefines homeland not as a nation or culture, but as the self's right to freedom.

Introduction:

Diasporic literature has often been structured around binaries of **home and abroad**, **belonging and alienation**, **tradition and modernity**. However, Taslima Nasrin's French Lover disrupts these oppositions by presenting migration as a gendered and morally complex experience. Nilanjana's journey from India to Paris does not follow the familiar arc of liberation through mobility. Instead, Nasrin reveals how national borders fail to dismantle patriarchal control.

The title French Lover is deliberately **deceptive and ironic**, foregrounding not a romantic fulfillment but a critique of **transnational desire, gendered power, and the illusion of liberation**. On the surface, the phrase appears to promise a narrative of romance—suggesting escape from an oppressive Indian marriage into a liberating relationship with a European man. However, Taslima Nasrin uses the title to **interrogate and dismantle this fantasy**.

The 'French lover' refers primarily to **Benoir**, Nilanjana's lover in France. For Nila, Benoir initially represents freedom—emotional warmth, sexual autonomy, and relief from marital confinement. She associates 'Frenchness' with openness and modernity, imagining that love across cultural boundaries might undo the restrictions imposed by her homeland. This hope is reflected in her early perception of the relationship as an awakening:

> "With him, she felt for the first time that desire did not have to be hidden or apologized for (102)."

Yet as the narrative progresses, the phrase "French lover" acquires a more critical resonance. Benoir's attraction to Nila is shaped by **exoticism and possession**, reducing her to a racialised and erotic object rather than recognising her as an equal subject. Nila gradually realises that the relationship offers **emotional intimacy without ethical responsibility**, mirroring patriarchal structures she sought to escape. Her disillusionment is evident when she recognises that:

> "Even here, in a foreign land, she was only someone's body, never her own person (293)."

Thus, the title underscores the **continuity of gendered oppression across borders**. The lover may be French, but the dynamics of power remain familiar. Nasrin uses this irony to challenge the assumption that Western spaces—or Western men—naturally offer liberation to women from the Global South.

More significantly, the title foregrounds what the novel ultimately **rejects**. By naming the novel *French Lover*, Nasrin draws attention to the very category Nila must abandon. By the end of the narrative, Nila refuses to define herself through any relational identity—wife, lover, Indian woman, or immigrant. Her rejection of Benoir marks a crucial moment of feminist self-assertion as she rejects the choice of a lover who existed only in someone else's desire.

In this sense, the title operates as a **negative signifier**. It names a possibility that is explored only to be dismantled. The novel is not about becoming a "French lover," but about **outgrowing the need to be anyone's lover at all** in order to belong.

Ultimately, *French Lover* encapsulates Nasrin's central argument: **geographical movement and romantic attachment do not guarantee freedom**. True autonomy lies not in crossing borders or entering relationships, but in reclaiming the self as the primary site of belonging. The title, therefore, is

not celebratory but critical—exposing the seductive myths of transnational romance and Western liberation while affirming feminist independence as the novel's ethical core.

Benoir is the eponymous 'French lover' in Taslima Nasrin's *French Lover*, and his character functions less as a romantic hero than as a **symbolic figure** through whom the novel critiques, 'Western liberal masculinity and the myth of transnational emancipation'. Initially presented as sensitive, affectionate, and emotionally available, Benoir appears to offer Nilanjana (Nila) an alternative to the emotional sterility and patriarchal domination of her marriage. However, as the narrative unfolds, his character reveals the subtle operations of **power, exoticism, and possessive desire** embedded within cross-cultural intimacy.

At the beginning of their relationship, Benoir is attentive and verbally expressive, traits that sharply contrast with Kishanlal's emotional indifference. For Nila, this attentiveness creates the illusion of equality and freedom. She perceives Benoir as someone who "listened without commanding," and for the first time, desire seems disentangled from guilt. This early portrayal aligns with the common diasporic fantasy of Western men as emotionally progressive and sexually liberated.

Yet Nasrin gradually dismantles this illusion by exposing Benoir's attraction as deeply shaped by **racial and cultural difference**. His fascination with Nila is tied to her otherness—her accent, skin colour, and perceived sensuality. Nila becomes aware that to Benoir she represents mystery and novelty rather than a fully autonomous individual. Her realisation that she is valued more as an experience than as a subject marks a turning point in the relationship:

> "To him, she was an adventure—foreign, dark, and desirable (250)."

Benoir's liberalism is thus revealed as **conditional**. While he encourages Nila's sexual freedom, he does not fully recognises her intellectual or emotional independence. His affection does not translate into ethical responsibility. Unlike Kishanlal's overt patriarchy, Benoir's control operates through affection and expectation rather than command. This subtler form of dominance is more insidious, as it masks inequality beneath the language of love and choice.

Furthermore, Benoir's relationship with Nila is marked by an unwillingness to confront the structural realities of her marginalisation as an immigrant woman. He remains largely insulated from the racial and economic vulnerabilities she faces, enjoying the privileges of his 'Frenchness' without acknowledging

the asymmetry of their positions. His love, though seemingly genuine, remains self-centered and transient.

By the later stages of the novel, Nila recognises that Benoir's desire, like her husband's authority, seeks possession rather than partnership. Her disillusionment culminates in the realisation that even this relationship demands her emotional compromise, and that even in love, she was expected to give more than she received.

Benoir thus emerges as a **representative figure rather than a fully individualised character**. He embodies the Western liberal male who appears progressive but remains implicated in patriarchal and racial hierarchies. Through him, Nasrin critiques the assumption that transnational romance offers an escape from gendered oppression.

In rejecting Benoir, Nila does not merely end a love affair; she dismantles the illusion that freedom can be achieved through romantic affiliation with the West. Benoir's character, therefore, is essential to the novel's thematic structure: he exposes the **limits of Western liberalism**, the persistence of power within intimacy, and the necessity of feminist self-definition beyond romantic dependence.

Drawing on Salman Rushdie's notion of the **'imagined homelands'**, this paper argues that Nasrin exposes the homeland as a regulatory fiction—particularly oppressive for women. The novel refuses sentimental nostalgia and questions the promise of transnational freedom, presenting autonomy as a precarious yet necessary alternative.

Nilanjana (Nila), the protagonist of Taslima Nasrin's *French Lover*, can be read as a paradigmatic figure of the **gendered transnational subject**, whose identity is shaped at the intersection of patriarchy, migration, and cultural displacement. Her character becomes legible through the combined lenses of **Simone de Beauvoir's feminist existentialism**, **Homi K. Bhabha's postcolonial theory of hybridity and the "third space"**, and **Salman Rushdie's concept of the imagined homelands.** Together, these theoretical frameworks illuminate Nila's movement from objecthood to self-definition.

Simone de Beauvoir's assertion in *The Second Sex* that "one is not born, but rather becomes, a woman" provides a foundational framework for understanding Nila's early characterisation. Within her marriage to Kishanlal, Nila is constructed as **the Other**—a being whose existence is defined relationally, not autonomously. Marriage reduces her to a functional role: wife, caretaker, sexual object. Her sense of

erasure echoes Beauvoir's claim that patriarchy denies women transcendence by confining them to immanence.

Nila's reflection that marriage has rendered her invisible as she becomes a shadow—present, yet unseen—captures this condition of immanence. Her suffering is not merely emotional but ontological; she exists *for* another rather than *for herself*. Beauvoir argues that liberation begins when a woman recognises this condition and chooses herself as a subject. Nila's gradual awakening—through desire, refusal, and solitude—marks her existential rebellion against imposed femininity.

Significantly, Nila's rejection of both husband and lover aligns with Beauvoir's insistence that romantic dependence is not freedom but another form of submission. Nila does not move from one man to another as saviour figures; instead, she chooses **ethical solitude**, asserting her right to selfhood beyond relational validation.

Homi K. Bhabha's concept of **hybridity** and the **"third space"** is crucial for analysing Nila's diasporic position in France. As an Indian woman in Paris, Nila inhabits an in-between space—neither fully Indian nor fully French. In theory, this liminality could enable cultural negotiation and new identity formation. However, *French Lover* exposes the **limits of hybridity for racialised women**.

Nila's relationship with Benoir illustrates what Bhabha calls **mimicry**—a partial adoption of Western norms that promises inclusion but never grants equality. Benoir's fascination with Nila is rooted in her difference; she is desirable precisely because she is not French. Thus, the third space becomes a site of **exoticisation rather than empowerment**.

Rather than enabling hybridity, transnational space intensifies surveillance of Nila's body and desire. She is disciplined by Indian morality and objectified by Western liberalism. Nasrin thereby critiques the celebratory tone of postcolonial hybridity theory, suggesting that for women like Nila, the third space often reproduces hierarchies instead of dismantling them.

Nila's ultimate refusal to assimilate—emotionally or culturally—marks a withdrawal from the false promise of hybridity. She rejects the demand to be intelligible either as a "good Indian wife" or an "exotic liberated woman," exposing both identities as patriarchal constructs.

Salman Rushdie's concept of the **imagined homeland**—a place reconstructed through memory, longing, and narrative—takes on a sharply gendered inflection in *French Lover*. For Nila, the homeland is not a

source of nostalgia but a site of betrayal and moral coercion. India persists in her consciousness as an internalised authority that regulates female sexuality and obedience.

Rushdie views the imagined homeland as fragmented and unstable, but Nasrin radicalises this idea by showing how the homeland becomes a **portable prison** for women. Even in France, Nila feels watched by the moral codes of her origin culture. The homeland travels with her not as comfort but as surveillance.

Crucially, Nila does not desire return. Unlike many diasporic protagonists, she refuses the sentimental logic of homecoming. This refusal transforms the imagined homeland from a lost paradise into an ideological fiction that must be dismantled. Her declaration—"She would be her own country"—redefines belonging as self-authored rather than inherited.

Reading through Beauvoir, Bhabha, and Rushdie, Nila emerges as a figure who **exposes the inadequacy of dominant theories when gender is ignored**. Beauvoir explains her struggle for existential agency; Bhabha reveals the violence embedded in cultural in-betweenness; Rushdie clarifies the haunting power of the homeland. Yet Nasrin goes beyond all three by insisting that freedom for the transnational woman lies not in synthesis, hybridity, or return, but in **ethical refusal**.

Nila's character ultimately embodies a feminist politics of negation—she refuses marriage, romantic dependency, cultural loyalty, and nationalist nostalgia. Her solitude is not defeat but resistance. In this sense, Nila is not merely a diasporic subject but a **counter-theoretical figure**, forcing us to rethink transnationalism itself from the standpoint of female autonomy. Nilanjana in *French Lover* reconfigures Beauvoir's feminist subject, destabilises Bhabha's celebratory hybridity, and dismantles Rushdie's imagined homeland by asserting autonomy as the only viable home for the transnational woman.

Nila's marriage to Kishanlal is revealed not as a romantic or stabilising institution but as a **mechanism of erasure**. Marriage becomes another border regime—restricting mobility, voice, and selfhood. Nila recognises that marriage has made her *"invisible"* rather than secure. She reflects that she is treated *"like an object brought from elsewhere."* Rather than seeking reform within marriage, Nila **refuses its logic entirely**. This aligns with a **radical feminist negation**, not Beauvoir's call for equality within institutions, but a rejection of institutions that reproduce women's subordination. Her eventual exit from marriage is not framed as loss but as **epistemic clarity**—she sees marriage as structurally incompatible with autonomy.

Nila's affair with Benoir initially appears to offer emotional and sexual freedom. However, she gradually recognises that this relationship merely **repeats the same gendered asymmetries** under the guise of Western liberalism. She realises she is *"desired, not understood."*Benoir's love reduces her to *"exotic difference."*Here, *French Lover* dismantles the idea that **romantic love equals emancipation**. Nila's refusal to remain in the relationship is crucial: she negates the assumption—common even in some feminist narratives—that intimacy is necessary for female fulfilment. Her solitude becomes **chosen**, not imposed. This directly revises Beauvoir's model: Nila does not seek reciprocity with a man but **withdraws from the gendered economy of desire altogether**.

Nila is repeatedly pressured—by other immigrants and by memory—to perform "Indianness" or Bengali femininity as cultural loyalty. She rejects being a *"representative woman."* She resists nostalgia that feels *"manufactured."*Unlike celebratory diaspora narratives, Nila refuses **cultural nostalgia as obligation**. This refusal destabilises Bhabha's idea of hybridity as inherently productive. Nila's position is not a playful "in-between" but an **unhomely refusal to belong at all**. Her identity is not hybrid but **unanchored by choice**. India is never recuperated as a redemptive site of origin. Memory does not heal; it constrains. Home appears as *"a place that no longer exists."*The past offers *"no shelter."* This directly dismantles Rushdie's idea that the homeland survives as a creative imaginary. For Nila, memory is **disciplinary**, not liberatory. The nation does not provide coherence or meaning—only expectations of female sacrifice. Thus, she rejects both **return** and **remembrance** as feminist strategies. The novel ends not with reconciliation, romance, or belonging, but with Nila alone—materially uncertain but psychically intact. She accepts being *"without anyone."* Solitude is described as *"honest."* This is the novel's most radical move. Nila's solitude is not melancholic exile but **political refusal**. She rejects:Marriage, Romance, Nation,Culture, Diasporic community. What remains is **autonomy as ontology**. Here, *French Lover* reconfigures transnationalism itself: not as movement between homes, but as **a feminist refusal of home as a category**.

Transnationalism emphasises the sustained ties migrants maintain across national borders. Yet feminist scholars caution that such mobility often masks unequal power relations. Women's transnational lives are frequently mediated through marriage, family, and dependency. Rushdie describes the imagined homeland as "a version of India… constructed from memory" (*Imaginary Homelands*). In *French Lover*, this imagined homeland operates less as a source of identity than as a **disciplinary force**. Nila carries India with her not as cultural belonging, but as a set of moral injunctions governing female sexuality, obedience, and sacrifice. Nasrin thus reworks transnationalism as a **psychological and ethical condition**,

rather than merely a spatial one. Nilanjana is the emotional and ideological center of the novel. She is neither a passive victim nor a triumphant migrant heroine. Instead, Nasrin presents her as a **woman in transition**, painfully aware of her own desires and limitations. Early in the novel, Nila reflects on her marriage as an erasure of self- marriage had turned her into a shadow—present, yet unseen.

Her displacement is both geographical and existential. In France, she is alienated not only by language and culture but by the realization that freedom is conditional. Her body becomes the site where Indian morality and Western exoticism intersect. Yet Nila's greatest transformation lies in her refusal to replace one form of dependency with another. By the novel's end, she rejects both marital security and romantic illusion, asserting that she did not want love that demanded her silence.

Nila embodies Nasrin's feminist vision of autonomy as an ongoing struggle rather than a final destination. Kishanlal, Nila's husband, represents the **patriarchal reproduction of homeland values in exile**. Though geographically distant from India, he clings to its gender norms, expecting obedience, chastity, and emotional submission. He polices Nila's behaviour while enjoying male privilege when he asserts that a wife was not meant to question. She was meant to adjust.

Kishanlal's character reveals how diaspora does not necessarily weaken patriarchy; instead, it often intensifies control over women as a means of preserving cultural identity. He transforms the Parisian apartment into a symbolic extension of the homeland, demonstrating that the imagined homeland travels with the migrant. Benoir, Nila's French lover, initially appears as an alternative to marital oppression. However, Nasrin gradually exposes the limitations of this relationship. Benoir's fascination with Nila is entangled with racial and sexual exoticism- to him, she was mystery—brown skin, foreign tongue, untamed desire.

Though less overtly oppressive than Kishanlal, Benoir still positions Nila as an object of pleasure rather than an equal subject. His presence critiques Western liberal masculinity, revealing how freedom offered to the migrant woman remains fragile and transactional. In *French Lover*, marriage functions as a vehicle of female migration but also as a structure of confinement. Nila's movement across borders does not dismantle patriarchal authority; instead, it relocates it. The institution of marriage becomes a mobile homeland, carrying its moral codes intact. Nasrin exposes how women's migration through marriage often results in **double marginalisation**—as wives within private spaces and as racialised others in public ones. India, as an imagined homeland, exerts a constant presence in Nila's consciousness. Even in

France, she feels watched by internalised norms of honour and shame and the eyes of her homeland followed her everywhere.

Rather than longing for return, Nila experiences the homeland as a site of betrayal—one that denied her individuality. Nasrin thus dismantles nationalist sentimentality and reveals how the homeland can function as a tool of gendered discipline. France is not idealised as a space of emancipation. Despite its liberal ethos, Nila encounters racism, loneliness, and sexual objectification. Nasrin critiques the assumption that Western modernity guarantees women's freedom, emphasising that patriarchy adapts to cultural contexts rather than disappearing. This theme aligns *French Lover* with postcolonial feminist critiques of Eurocentric feminism. One of the most radical aspects of *French Lover* is its unapologetic articulation of female desire. Nasrin refuses to moralize Nila's sexuality, presenting it instead as a form of self-knowledge and resistance. Nila's body becomes a site of contestation—claimed by husband, lover, nation, and culture—but ultimately reclaimed by herself. This reclamation marks a decisive break from patriarchal narratives of sacrifice. The novel's most significant intervention lies in its redefinition of homeland. Nila's rejection of both India and France as sites of belonging leads to a feminist existential conclusion that she would be her own country.

Home, in Nasrin's vision, is not a geographical or cultural space but the right to live without fear, submission, or imposed identity. This reimagining challenges nationalist, diasporic, and romantic narratives alike. *Taslima Nasrin's French Lover* offers a profound feminist critique of transnationalism by exposing the persistence of patriarchal power across borders. Through Nilanjana's journey, the novel dismantles the myth of the imagined homeland as a site of comfort and belonging, revealing it instead as an ideological structure that regulates women's lives.

By refusing both nostalgic return and Western assimilation, Nasrin articulates a radical vision of autonomy grounded in selfhood rather than nation. *French Lover* thus redefines diaspora not as a movement between places, but as a struggle for ethical and existential freedom—a struggle that remains unfinished, fragile, and deeply necessary. By refusing the consolations of nostalgic return, *French Lover* dismantles the idea of the homeland as a stable moral refuge. For Nilanjana (Nila), Bangladesh is not a lost Eden but a site of patriarchal discipline, religious surveillance, and gendered violence that continues to exert power even from afar. Memory, rather than offering belonging, becomes a burden—what Avtar Brah would call a '*homing desire' without a home*. Nasrin thus rejects the sentimental nationalism that often structures diasporic longing, exposing how the rhetoric of cultural roots can reinscribe the very oppressions from which women flee.

At the same time, Nasrin is equally sceptical of Western assimilation as a liberatory endpoint. France, often imagined in exile literature as the space of sexual freedom and individual choice, reveals its own exclusions. Nila's relationship with Benoir exposes the asymmetries of power embedded in interracial intimacy: the Western male gaze eroticizes the "exotic" migrant woman while denying her full subjecthood. Cultural integration here demands not equality but erasure—of language, history, and agency. Assimilation, Nasrin suggests, merely replaces one regime of domination with another, operating through desire rather than law.

It is within this double refusal—of nationalist nostalgia and liberal assimilation—that Nasrin articulates a radical vision of autonomy. Freedom in *French Lover* is not territorial but ethical; it is grounded in the right to self-definition rather than citizenship, marriage, or cultural belonging. Nila's gradual withdrawal from both the Bengali diaspora community and her French lover signals a movement toward what Simone de Beauvoir terms *existential freedom*: the difficult responsibility of choosing oneself in the absence of guarantees. Autonomy here is precarious, lonely, and incomplete, yet it is the only space in which genuine agency becomes possible.

Consequently, *French Lover* redefines diaspora not as a linear movement between origin and destination but as a continuous struggle within the self. Diaspora becomes a condition of fracture and negotiation, where identity is not recovered or assimilated but relentlessly questioned. Nasrin's ending refuses narrative closure, underscoring that ethical freedom is never fully achieved but must be continually asserted against social, sexual, and ideological constraints. This unfinished struggle—fragile yet indispensable—constitutes the novel's most radical claim: that for women in exile, freedom lies not in belonging anywhere, but in the ongoing refusal to be owned by any place, ideology, or desire.

Works Cited

Nasrin, Taslima. *French Lover*. New Delhi: Penguin India, **2002**.

Rushdie, Salman. *Imaginary Homelands: Essays and Criticism 1981–1991*. London: Granta Books, **1991**.

Beauvoir, Simone de. *The Second Sex*. Paris: Gallimard, **1949**.

(English trans. London: Jonathan Cape, **1953**.)

Bhabha, Homi K. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge, **1994**.

Vertovec, Steven. "Conceiving and Researching Transnationalism." *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, London, **1999**.