

## Chapter: 1

### Parijat and *Blue Mimosa*

*Blue Mimosa (Shiris Ko Phool)* presents a big source of discussion on existential issues. Some characters prove themselves to be successful existentialist while some others have some existential crisis. Sakambari and Suyogbir have such existential issues in their lives. Sakambari seems to be a representative of successful existential character whereas Suyogbir face crisis due to outer forces. The main argument of this thesis is that will power of a person determines how successful existentialist he/she becomes in this world of meaninglessness.

Parijat is one of the greatest Nepali literary daughters of modern era. Her real name is Bishnu Kumari Waiba; Parijat is her pen name according to her choice. She was born in Darjeeling in middle class family in 1937 and died in 1992. Her childhood was deeply unhappy for her mother died when she was very young and one of her brothers had drowned shortly afterwards. Moreover, she suffered from physical sickness, that is, paralysis when she was twenty six, and was supported for much of her life by her sister Sukanya.

Parijat did not get married all over her life and lived single due to her personal preference and her physical ailments. She used to write poems and stories from her early school days. In 1959 her poem was published first time in *Dharti Patrika*. It was her starting point of formal literary journey.

Parijat was influenced by the Poems of Lekhanatha Poudel, Dharanidhar Koirala, Laxmi Prasad Devkota and Bhim Darsan Roka: She got inspired from them for her journey of poetry. She enhanced her poetic knowledge by studying Maxim Gorkey, Leo Tolstoy and Rahul Sanskrityan. During her life she created many writings including twenty one books. Among them ten are novels, four story

collection books and four essays. Similarly three are poetry collections.

She had only one philosophy or doctrine of humanism, Parijat was influenced by political thinkers Marx and Lenin. Once she said, “I would have committed suicide or be dependent on drug if I not found Marxism-Leninism in time” (Maskey). Her contribution to the Nepali literature and socio – political development is unforgettable. She sacrificed her precious time in different sectors in literary and political sectors. In this reference, Chauhan states:

Parijat being a versatile writer, didn't limit herself to writing only. In spite of adverse physical state, she was actively present in various literary and non literary organizations. She was involved in anti – Panchayat movement of 1978-9, and was later elected the president of the woman's wing under her party. She also devoted her works to secret awareness campaigns for women. She helped in the formation of *Pragatishil Lekhak Kalakar Sangha....* (56)

Parijat did not confine her to only literature but she was also active in politics and social services. She was aware with the dignity and genius of the literature and writing of literature.

Parijat was a self -setermined writer and would not be manipulated by common things. She says, “I am not the type of person and I do not have the habit of getting confused when one calls a black object white” (Sarup). She was equally active in literature and social work. Parijat's activism is often highlighted by many writers. In this connection, Prasai States:

Parijat came into contact with politics from 1969. She had openly declared herself a Marxist since then. A major group of the politicians' says- “Politics is to be done with literature” and another group of

politicians say, “There should be no hint of politics in literature,” but Parijat had her own views with regard to this subject. Though writers may lean over to politics, politics is not a written conduct. Parijat, who was steadfast in the belief that one should take interest in fulfilling human wants, had repeatedly –“I am not a litterateur to write political manuscripts.” (63)

People would not like an established writer to favor a political system but Parijat’s balanced stance saved her image as an honest litterateur.

Enduring the deaths of relatives, a tragedy with loved ones and facing domestic violence, she had to live with crippling disease from her adolescence. Rejecting intimacy with the who loved her until her death and knowing that there no escape from the reality of meaningless life, she lived in the world of despair, hopelessness wishing her death. As a result of the experience of such absurd, meaningless, hopeless life she created her most popular novel *Shirish Ko Phool* which has been translated into *Blue Mimosa*. The novel became the winner of prestigious award *Madan Puraskar* of 1965. The novel has been translated in different languages and prescribed in the curriculum of different universities. For her regular contribution to modern Nepali literary world, she is awarded by many prestigious awards and tribute. For her respect and memory many literary organizations and award of many genres are named after ‘Parijat’.

*Blue Mimosa* is novel on the existential issues. The main theme is the reflection of exploited and alienated modern world in the lack of existence. It is the story of an ex-army man. The novel explores the psychology of an ex-army man who has sexually exploited girls and lived alone in the meaningless and hopeless world. Its female protagonist Sakambari is very aware with her dignity and existence of her life,

like Parijat, herself. Sakambari speaks out her inner thoughts of life. We find that Sakambari is Parijat's alter ego. Because both seem lean and thin physically but psychologically very strong. Both are chain smokers, suffered by chronic disease, flower lovers and most importantly they both are the archetypal type of women. They remain single up to last moment of life. Suyogbir sounds to be a man with no real love for women. He tries to entangle them showing false assurance of love only for his physical satisfaction.

*Blue mimosa* is a novel that tells the feelings of a soldier and story revolves around the activities of that a man. The major character and protagonist of novel Suyogbir meets Shivaraj in a bar. They became friends. The ex-military man visits Shivaraj's home where he meets Sakambari, Mujura and Sanu, the three sisters of Shivaraj. Suyogbir visits Shivaraj's house repeatedly and they talk about war, flower, god etc. Plus he likes to get married to elder sister Mujura but falls in love with Sakambari, who is quite different from him temperamentally. One day he kisses her to reveal his love. After his kiss he never dares to meet her again. There comes the notice of Sakambari's illness. Shivaraj tries his best for her recovery but death takes Sakambari. Suyogbir and Shvaraj live in void world visiting bar and drinking.

Suyogbir Singh is an ex-army man spending leisure time living in Kathmandu. He had joined army without his interest but with the force of his family background. During the duty of army force he had raped and killed many girls. He now accepts them as crimes and laments but never shares with anyone. He repents himself for spending his youth senselessly in Death Valley. He is habitual to drown his grief in alcohol and smokes. He even feels very weak and submissive in front of Sakambari but falls in one sided love, and to reveal it he kisses her without her consent. It makes her so angry that she does not want even to glance at him. Now he finds this kissing,

as a vulgar act and suffers from great despair. Before he has time to confess, he receives a message of her death. It adds more pain and frustration to his heart but he does not leak his secret to others but lives alone meaningless life.

Sakambari, the heroine of *Blue Mimosa*, hates life and love. Even suffering from a chronic disease, she is a chain smoker and free type of lady. She is bold and straight forward, and she speaks out what comes in her mind. She neither follows the traditional rules and values nor seems weak in front of the male characters. She does not believe in god. When Suyogbir kisses her she does nothing to stop him but looks at him deeply in a strange way and vanishes through door.

### **Literature Review**

Parijat's *Shiris Ko Phool (Blue Mimosa)* has been interpreted in various ways. As a special piece of work, the novel has been praised regarding its language, subject matter and the philosophy in it.

Shreedhar Gautam observes the sense of alienation and meaninglessness of the novel and characters' responsibility of their own deed because they want to give meaning to their lives which belongs to the philosophy of existentialism. He puts his views the following way:

The *Blue Mimosa* impliedly reflects a sense of alienation and meaninglessness seen in our society. It conveys an idea that every person is responsible for his or her own deed, and it is for the individual to give meaning to one's life. It opposes cruelty, inhumanity, vulgarity and inequality in all forms. (4)

Gautam points out alienation, hostility, absurdity and responsibility in the novel.

Kreidl has analysed the writing feature of *Blue Mimosa* with the portrayal of ordinary people in society, but neither about the legendary heroes nor of mysterious

stories. The writer is concerned with the main values which everybody has to get along in the everyday life. He remarks:

The secret of her success was to portray the life of ordinary people, of the lower and middle people with whom her reader would identify. She also questioned the main values norms and restraints with which everybody has to get along but hardly anyone talks about. In *Blue Mimosa* her main characters disclose their most intimate, and vulnerable and human sides. (qtd.in Chauhan 52)

The novel portrays a true picture of ordinary people with their psychological problems. It is the aspect which Chauhan also focuses on. "The duty of a literature is not to create a hero. The work of a literature is to pickup and present heroes..." (qtd.in Prasai 56).

Another critic Sweta has pointed the reason of this novel's popularity of the real plot setting and real characters. The setting of the novel has succeeded to open out the real pain and grief of the society. It would easily impress readers' soul and mind. Sweta appreciates the work as:

I really appreciate the wonderful story, the plot the real setting, the real characters...and the situation of novel till it ends. The pain of running away from the feeling and passion. When Suyogbir says... "*Ma glass ma bhagchhu*"...The feeling is that we run away from pain...because we want to forget the pain.. pain that we are suffering in our life.

Story, characters, setting and the emotions of the major characters expressed in proper situations are what have made the novel a praiseworthy piece of literature.

Although many critics have opined that Parijat has told her life story through her characters in *Blue Mimosa*. However, she expresses the different view, "I have not

made any character tell my life story, but I have made Sisal, Sakambari and Suyogbir speak out my opinions and thoughts. To say basically, I don't get much difference in the theoretical aspect of my life and their life" (qtd.in Prasai 95). Parijat says her characters in *Blue Mimosa* namely Suyogbir and Sakambari speak out her opinions and thoughts. Her view in theoretical aspects between her characters and herself are similar but practical sides do not match with them.

Parijat's *Blue Mimosa* is most often criticized from the existential philosophy.

Kumar Pradhan upholds the same reference:

Parijat's novel *Blue Mimosa* has two main characters, Sakambari, a woman of ordinary looks who however attracts second character Suyogbir, an ex-soldier. The man has enough experience of physical relationship with Sakambari, who however cannot requite his sentiment. The characters are conscious of their existence in meaningless world, the anti-hero more so after the death of Sakambari which is brought sooner by the only kiss he imports her who is alienated to the extreme, even from any relation to the biosphere itself, and not simply from society as existentialist. She exists in isolation and so does Suyogbir. This sense of unrelatedness to the universe and the notion of purposelessness of experience make *Shirish Ko Phul* a novel of the absurd. (180-81)

The major characters of the novel are seen suffered by the alienated and meaningless environment. Even they are conscious to their existence though they have failed to gain.

In line of the same philosophy Chhatra Bahadur Rai has criticized the novel.

According to him, this novel is the turning point to the existential issues. It deals with

the personal individualism and existence. The leading characters of the story are manifested in the condition of existential obstacles, distractions and alienation. They are followed by despair and lack of existence. Rai emphasizes in this aspect of life:

.. the publication of *Blue Mimosa* in 2022 was the turning point. As a novelist Parijat's earlier novels deal with the conditions of existence of the individual person and their emotions, actions, responsibilities and thoughts. In these novels, the major characters go through many existential obstacles and distractions including despair, angst, absurdity, alienation and boredom. (80)

Rai points out the physical and emotional difficulties which the major characters undergo. According to him, the novel reveals different types of existential obstacles in human life.

Another critic Sonam Dolma has viewed *Shirish Ko Phool* as a discloser to inner opaque feelings of Nepali typical men, their feelings and visions to a woman as their wives are manifested through the activities of character, Suyogbir. He is sampled as a typical Nepali soldier. Dolma assures:

This novel also shows how typical a Nepali man perceives a woman to be, and their feelings about their wife. In this novel the feelings of a lonely person is shown very accurately, the feelings that they hate their loneliness yet hate to talk to others about it in case they make fun of their situation.

### **Organization of the Study**

The thesis is divided into three chapters. The first chapter is about the introduction to the thesis. In this chapter brief introduction has been given about Parijat and *Blue Mimosa*. A brief summary of the novel has also been included in the



chapter. Similarly literature review is also the part of the chapter. In this review available literatures have been consulted with comments. Organization of the study also finds space in this chapter.

The second chapter begins with the theoretical discussions pertinent to the analysis of the novel. Existentialism has been used as the tool for analysis. After theoretical discussion, textual analysis is incorporated in the second chapter. In textual analysis the two major characters namely Suyogbir and Sakambari have been the focus of the discussion regarding their existential issues. The third chapter is the conclusion summarizing the findings of the research. Finally there is works cited part that gives the details of the works from which the ideas have been borrowed.

## Chapter: 2

### Existential Issues in *Blue Mimosa*

The major characters in Parijat's *Blue Mimosa* are Suyogbir and Sakambari. These two characters bear different existential issues. Suyogbir undergoes existential crisis while Sakambari succeeds in the way she likes to lead her life. Regarding these issues of two different lives this chapter highlights on the features of existentialism in the selected characters. The following paragraphs first focus on the discussion of existential philosophy following the analysis of characters regarding their stand point.

#### Existentialism and Literary Analysis

Existentialism is a philosophy which emerged in 19<sup>th</sup> century and it developed up to 20<sup>th</sup> century. It studies the essence of human life or meaning of being. Existence is the core element or root of existentialism. Every conscious human being always remains in search of existence of life. In context of existence, personal choices, responsibilities, individual freedom and self decisive power are inevitable elements which lead us to the independency. Struggling with social stress, opposing the traditional values and to establish new identity belongs to existentialist movement. To establish and impose own authority and rules in daily life is also addressed to existentialism. It might be different from person to person. So it is vague philosophy too.

Most famous philosophers who propounded this philosophy are Soren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, Jean Paul Sartre and Albert Camus. "Kierkegaard was a 19<sup>th</sup> century *Danish* philosopher who has been labeled by many as the father of existentialism" (*Tehrantimes*). Kierkegaard criticized Hegel's philosophical system as being abstract and having nothing to do with human existence. Different philosophers of 20<sup>th</sup> century have different views on the philosophy but they focused on

individualism. Different locations and environmental situations determine the choice and will of individuals.

Existentialists believe that a person should be free to choose and be responsible without the force of ethnic rules, traditional values and laws of society too. “Why I am here in the world?” is the core essence of existence. In simpler term existentialism is philosophy concerned with finding the meaning of self through the own free will, own personal choice and commitment by the conscious mind.

Traditionally the belief was that human power and fate was constructed and directed by the super power of god. Christian existentialist Kierkegaard and some other philosophers used to think this way. But in the later period, existentialism reversed this idea. There is not any god and universal rules for human except the death at last. So every individual determines their fate following own choice freely out of compromise and compulsion. Even many religious philosophies define that there is meaning in the world which indicates the rational truths and objectivity but existentialism says even individual tries to credit meaning in world. But every person grabs the nature and constructs the meaning by one’s own not by the others and not for all, in opposition to the rationalism and empiricism. In the lack of exact meaning, life moves to existence and absurdity.

Existentialism is viewed as an idea that goes against the established system. Flew in *A Dictionary of Philosophy* talks about existentialism as:

A Philosophical trend or attitude, as distinct from a particular dogma or system. Its origins are attributed to \*Kierkegaard. It became influential in continental Europe in the second quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, through the writings of \*Heidegger, \*Jaspers, \*Marcel, and \*Sartre.

Existentialism is generally opposed to rationalist and empiricist

doctrines that assume that the universe is determined, ordered system intelligible to the contemplative observer who can discover the natural law that governs all being and the role of reason as the power guiding human activity. (115)

No matter what others say about the particular system or empirical theories, it is opposed to the systems of universe. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century existentialism, there is no natural law, no role of reason and no one governs others. Every person is a guide for own self. No one governs others but constitutes particular laws to spend life in comfortable way. In the part of individualism, there must be freedom instead of law to govern others. One does what s\he likes to do and there comes the personal choice. It does not follow those empirical doctrines and the opposite to it.

The seven principles of existentialism are mentioned in a monthly e-journal: subjectivity; disbelief in god, choice as the ultimate evaluator, anguish (Anxiety), nothingness, absurd and death (Raosaheb 15-18). Man should follow the subjectivity to be his master.

In the *Theater: The lively Art* Edwin Wilson and Alvin Gold Farb's idea seems same to Raosaheb. To emphasize the subjectivity of existential principle he remarks:

A set off philosophical ideas whose principal modern advocate is Jean-Paul Sartre. The term existentialist is applied by Sartre and others to plays which illustrate these views. Sartre's central thesis is that there are no longer and any fixed standards or values by which one can live and that each person must create his or her own code of conduct regardless of the conventions imposed by society. Only in that way can one truly "exist" as a responsible, creative human being; otherwise, one is merely robot or automaton. Sartre's plays typically involve

people who are faced with the decision forcing them into an awareness of the choice between own living their own term and ceasing to exist as individual. (445)

Alienation directs the existentialism or existence, because a person should be left lonely to judge and evaluate own self and create the datum for own sake. An individual searches what is necessary and suitable for the situation and s/he moves towards periphery from the central or fixed standard values. Such person only does right decision. He/she can cease from the society easily.

Person's choice is the most important thing for the individual existence. If a person chooses for suicide that is also his choice. Those who are conscious with self respect and existence, they only choose the suicide in the lack of self esteem and existence. Because existentialism takes suicides as mode of existentialist feature, it is not the surrender. A person who lives following the fixed standards and values, he/she symbolizes automaton or robot in Sartrean view. In the same way Vesey and Foulker in *Collins Dictionary of Philosophy* state:

SARTRE, for his part, sees in the other not a fellow creature but an enemy, against whom one must maintain oneself. In either case, man is the architect of his own character (there are traces of ARISTOTLE here) and fate. Whereas Sartre was the main representative of atheistic existentialism, MARCEL was a deeply religious Christian: his existentialist approach sees the other as a necessary element for proper understanding of oneself. HEIDEGGER emphasises the fact that others live along with us and interact with us but is otherwise atheistic in outlook. He is much concerned with the meaning of human existence, as was Sartre after him. Both speculated about being and nothingness,

in a somewhat unclear and abstract fashion which rather runs against the central... (108)

In Sartre's view every man is creator of his character and fate himself but not the god. God's power and fate belong to the Aristotlian theory.

Kierkegaard and some of that century's existential philosophers were Christian. But Sartre's devotion was to the atheistic existentialism. Gaarder remarks, "The expression 'God is dead' came from Nietzsche" (456). To establish the own existence every person becomes enemy of others. For that the main thing is to understand oneself in between the others. In the absence of others there may be confusion to understand properly. And religious rules and central systems are far from the individual needs and choices.

Existence is to be valued. So to increase or build own value, everyone must be conscious. The traditional ongoing routine may be useless. So it has to be changed as new era. Every minute of time teaches us a new thing if we become careful with it. Every incident and step is important to learn or recycle our mind and resize our knowledge. To follow the practice in not fruitful to this context of existentialism. If we do so there would not be difference between the other animals and human being. So to establish individual existence, a human should be conscious every time and everywhere. In the subject of consciousness, Gaarder reveals:

The key word Sartre's philosophy, as in Kierkegaard's, is existence did not mean the same as being alive. Plants and animals are also alive, they exist but they do not have to think about what it implies. Man is the only living creature that is conscious of its own existence. Sartre said that a material thing is simply 'in itself,' but mankind is 'for itself.' The being of man is therefore not the same as the being of

things. (456)

A conscious and independent person or individual has the nature of being responsible of his /her activities. There is the trend of blaming others in our society. We have to create our characteristics so we have fixed goal ourselves. We have to move like this; I have this choice, I have to do this way, I have to be this... So I select this design for me. Not by the power of god and societal practice. There is no necessary to praise the others and blame too for the situations and incidents. Every conscious individual takes the whole responsibility of personal life. About this Gaarder adds:

This is not least the case as regards our ethical choices. We can never lay the blame on 'human nature', or 'human frailty' or anything like that. Now and then it happens that grown men behave like pigs and then blame it on 'the old Adam.' He is merely a figure we clutch at to avoid taking responsibility for our own action. (458)

It is human nature that every person tries to escape from mistaken act imposing it if providence. That concept is deeply rooted in society. So some people do the mistakes and blame that old Adam, whom we can say out of responsibility and human existence. To exist own selves, we have to become attentive to the result of the action. To get fruitful result one must do hard work being conscious. More than that, choice must be from the free soul without any compromise and compulsion. And result would come as an aspect. A responsible person only becomes conscious of that. If there seems any mistake, we ought to be responsible for that not blaming next person.

Franzoi emphasizes the role of the self in social being in *Social Psychology*:

Having examined the self as an object of attention and evaluation, and having explored some of the primary self- motive that impels us to action, it is now time to analyzes how the self operates as a social

being (Taylor 1998). We will examine how our social identities constitute a very important aspect of our self- concepts, and how we protect our self esteem in social relationships. (63)

“Sartre says that man feels *alien* in a world without meaning. When he describes man’s ‘alienation’, he is echoing the central idea of Hegel Marx. Man’s feeling of alienation in the world creates a sense of despair, boredom, nausea, and absurdity.” (457)

Man’s happiness must spring from the inner heart to become happy. If a person is doing something by his own interest and purpose, he completes perfectly. A person who remains alert to the self existence that only feels alienated, despaired, nauseous and absurd. Only in the lack of self identity, man feels bored. Those who cannot become successful to create meaning of “self”, feel alienated. The idea of Hegel and Marx is opposed to the idea of existentialism of 20<sup>th</sup> century.

If we compare the life with Hegelian and Marxist universally fixed empirical ideas, life moves to alienation and depression out of reality. In the lack of meaning, life becomes absurd. Individual only exists where s/he hears own self and moves freely. Actually existence possesses on essence. Old philosophy of Hegel and Marx searches essence which leads us to the alienation, despair, nausea and absurdity. Alienation and absurdity are often connected to existentialism.

In *Albert Camus and the Philosophy of the Absurd* Avi Sagi asserts:

On the surface, the absurd resembles alienation, but this is not so. The experience of alienation focuses on the process of detachment and separation. By contrast, the experience of the absurd assumes that unity and alienation coexist, and sole legitimate meaning of unity is the constant yearning for it. The yearning for unity does not eliminate



alienation, it intensifies it. The absurd thereby turns into a disharmonious experience constituted through two contrary elements, and is doomed to remain in this conflict of opposites. (Sagi 23)

Absurd resembles alienation in surface but are essentially different. Even alienation and absurd both are condition out from harmonious, alienation focuses to the detachment and separation. Absurd yearns for unity and existence but does not free from alien or cannot eliminate alienation. Absurd is disharmonious experience between two contrary elements. It is the experience of tension between the reality of alienation and unattainable ideal of unity.

Raosaheb in *The South Asian Academic Research Chronicle ISSN 2454-1109* speaks out the topic of absurd:

The acceptance of nothingness leads to the concepts of the absurd which becomes a leitmotif in Sartre's opinion of existentialism. Absurd is basically a state of alienation from the world. Accordingly, to become fully aware of the absurdity of life is for Kierkegaard, a way of experiencing it most meaningfully. The awareness of the absurdity of existence enables to transcend all superficial thought and discover the inner reality. But once the transcendental is dismissed altogether, the absurd becomes the final objective, and there is no further attempt to make it meaningful.

For Sartre absurdity is condition, there is no further chance to change or develop something to make meaningful. And according to Kierkegaard, the person who is aware to his absurd condition and suffers from that he is experiencing most meaningfully his existence.

### **Major Characters in Blue Mimosa**

In *Blue Mimosa* Suyogbir and Sakambari, the vertebral bony characters of the novel are extremely the victim of the existential crisis. Suyogbir is a dynamic type of character. He gains many changes up the last of novel. But Sakambari is static character who remains same from beginning to end of the novel. They remain totally in the opposite direction in the story. Suyogbir follows the old Hegelian theory of essence but Sakambari accepts the 20<sup>th</sup> century existential philosophy. Suyogbir always hides his feelings and choices behind the curtain of worldly rules. He distrusts himself and others. Sakambari always does what she likes freely and she herself is very possessive kind of character. At the end of the novel Sakambari who is very conscious about the existence boldly faces deaths and Suyogbir accepts life only spending his time drowning in the pond of depression with company of alcohol. Sakambari protests against the opposing elements to protect her- self existence but Suyogbir never lives happily instead he lives collecting the memories of self-deceiving events of his past time.

### **Suyogbir**

Suyogbir, the absurd character is an ex-army man who had fought in the 2<sup>nd</sup> world war in Burma. He is physically strong, fit and fine character but psychologically and emotionally weak. Internally he cheats himself. He seems normal from outer appearance but in reality he is vacant. He has committed a lot of crimes. According to his narration, in his youth he used to see ladies as playing materials and love as the physical passion. Now he is not satisfied with his own life style. He lives in rented room of Kathmandu alone and does some occasional job when he likes it and leaves it without reasons. He has repentance for the activities of his army period and the physical relationship with some ladies. He had relation not only with one but

with three ladies and abused them to fulfill his sexual passion. So his mind remains always in conflict with himself.

He had joined army without his own interest but partly because of his parents' interests and partly of the warrior blood of his caste. He is spending his retirement life of 46 year with pension. Skin disease was the cause of his discharge. "That after a while because of some kind of skin disease, may be scabies, I was discharged from the army and was able to draw a pension" (6). His retirement life is running with alcohol day by day in bar and he passes his absurd life. He has not been married yet. But he hides his inner sufferings and never tells even to his close friend Shiva Raj either. The opportune period of his life he spent in war without any ambition of victory and fear of defeat. He fought in the war and he lost many things but didn't get physical loss even a scar in his skin in battle. Here the scar mean the scar of wound made by the battle activities like cut injury, broken bone and any part of organs and burnt scars of bomb blasting, etc. He has mentioned that not to be wounded is his unlock and that to murder someone is mentioned as chance, "I've done some fighting, but I've never had a chance to kill anyone" (6). But he has three untreatable and unforgettable deep scars in his inner side and he never reveals out.

Shivaraj is very curious about the war and he asks frequently about that.

Suyogbir explains about war in the bar in the alcoholic mood to Shivaraj:

I didn't go to war to get something by giving up something else. I didn't get a thing but I certainly lost something. I didn't give up by knowingly; it went by itself. What could I do? In other words, I came back emptied. Do you understand why I'm not bored with life? I came back to spend the rest of my life in my own way, spending each day as it comes. I came back empty. (7)

In his drunken stupor, Suyog explains that his involvement in the army and the war was not with expectation of gain. That is why he quit without any repentance. He joined the army and left it on his own with no pre-plan. It means he has no pleasure of hope and goal in the life. He does not see value of living life. He is beyond his planned existence. War itself is the game of power and authority. He has spent his youth in the field of battle, but unknowingly he has fought. In old age he has accepted his guilt. He has regretted and has feeling of humiliation but without sharing it with others.

Suyogbir is the antagonist and an honest narrator of the novel too. He honestly narrates all activities and experiences of his past and present. During his visits to Shibaraj's house, he meets Sakambari in some special way. He is usually shattered and mocked by her. Behind her uniqueness and boldness he feels some strangeness to her. However, he gets fascinated by her physical appearance. He truly asserts, "I saw only the rise and fall of her breasts on her thin body as she breathed. I felt pleasure but it is not right for me to feel that way or to show my feelings" (15). He suddenly desires for body of Sakambari in the atmosphere of unconscious mind without love. He always tries to observe the physical appearances of ladies indirectly and feels the hunger for one. So he is a vulgar character.

Suyogbir is the chain smoker and drunkard. But when Sakambari calls him an old soldier, a criminal and drunkard; he feels dtressed and considers her as cruel woman. At first encounter, he liked Mujura as an ideal Nepali lady and desired to get married to her. Unexpectedly, he falls in one sided love with Sakambari, who is twenty one year younger than him. Sometimes he feels guilty for the difference of their age and sometimes of the opposite philosophy of the life and love with Sakambari. He never openly talks with others especially about Sakambari. He cannot

dare to confront with her from the beginning to the end of the novel.

When Suyog goes to Shiva Raj's home, Sakambari shows and explains to him about the orchid and its insect killing nature. He understands more clearly about the nature of Sakambari and her wills. He finds himself more torn and separated in the absence of her when Shiva tells him Sakambari is going to the Terai for some time. Suyogbir once used to believe life meaningless, love illusion and women as play things. Beyond established social norms and values, he has fallen in one sided love with a girl who is twenty one years younger than himself. He has true love for her. Really he does not want to repeat the crime he has committed in past days. Now he has learned to respect women. He, in no way, wants to spoil the Chastity and purity of Sakambari. He wants to embellish his heart and soul with her presence.

His need of companionship can be understood as a product of his sense of alienation in his middle age. His love for Sakambari is not temporal though but it is self centered. In this moment he realizes the affection and love to Sakambari, not the Physical but the spiritual love but he had not accepted this type of love before in his life though he has involved physically with three girls in death valley and has raped them. He passes the days visiting her home and bar. Hagewald in a journal says:

Although Suyogbir had sexual relationship with women, he admits to never truly having loved a woman (15). For him, the question of power is very important in love, and he asks, "How many women had I taken onto my lap and then treated with contempt" (31). Before approaching Sakambari to Kiss her at the end of the book, he looks at her and thinks, "I was proud to say that this much I had had of Bari, having defeated her, it was my victory" over a woman, to be the one who takes, who is victorious, but never too involved to be woundable. Such

“love” compensate him for a lack of power and success in his general life. This is why it irritates him when he suddenly feels alone and empty when Sakambari leaves for a month in the Terai. It never happened to him before that the woman decided to “leave”, to withdraw her presence, and leave him alone. (195)

Suyog sounds to be a man with no real love for women. He just entangles them, showing false assurance of love only for his physical satisfaction.

Even after her arrival from the Terai also Sakambari keeps on mocking his weak point. He frequently visits Shivaraj and meets Sakambari. Once he meets Sakambari alone in the garden. Instead of revealing his love to her, he directly kisses her without her consent. But she does not react to him immediately. She does not scream out, neither does she protest and pounce. But she looks through the gold rimmed glasses deeply at him and that glance leaves the bruise that goes straight to his heart. In the state of suffocation she leaves him. He has no chance to clarify his state of heart and no time to lament of his crime now. She vanishes through the door and he never gets chance to meet her.

### **Sakambari**

Sakambari is the female protagonist of *Blue Mimosa* by Parijat. She is twenty four years old lady who is physically weak and sick. She has tall and extremely thin body with slender fingers and very large breast. Her hair style is short almost up to head and black deepest sparkling eyes with gold rimmed glass. She has totally different perception on life. She is a very conscious lady. She is also a chain smoker who welcomes death. Sakambari and Suyogbir presents opposite behavior to each other. She is straight forward and he does not accept her as a normal woman and mentions her voice as bullet, “Her voice burst in on us like a bullet” (3).

Sakambari is not the kind of woman who immediately feels helpless and hesitates to speak what comes in her mind and thoughts. She calls the name of her elder brother Shiva and his friend Suyogbir. She directly calls Suyogbir an old soldier, “She’s really an outspoken woman. How easily she calls me first ‘soldier’ and then ‘old man’” (17). Even she is not accepted as an ideal woman in the conservative society, but her brother Shiva Raj trusts her more than him-self.

She is self centered character who is very much conscious of the self existence and free wills. She negates to follow the traditional rules of marriage and family. She does what she likes; she frequently smokes whenever she likes, cuts her hair as short as she likes and speaks what she feels right clearly. Her choice is death that she gains at the end of the novel. For her, death means not the loss but the gain as her choice. For her death is not to surrender before the undesired. She is creative and creates the philosophy of insect trapper orchid. That is concerned to women psychology in the patriarchal society.

Sakambari, the life hating character, has planted the Orchids in her garden bringing from a special place. Her hobby is flower, “Flowers are my hobby” (12). Orchid has special characteristics. It has insect killing nature. Sakambari explains to Suyogbir about its nature of killing insect with extreme pleasure.

But Suyogbir asks her hesitatingly about the purpose and use of flower. If the bees are not allowed to settle on flower, what is the use of it. As a flower lover, Sakambari puts the emphasis on it strongly, “But she didn’t treat it lightly. Blowing the cigarette smoke from her mouth, she said, “The flower won’t be spoiled; it is secure” (14). In her thought flower should bloom for itself. If there should be a fall, then it is only for itself in own will but not fighting with insects. He connects the flower and bumblebee with the philosophy of life. Flower reflects women and bee

men. Life and love hater Sakambari prefers the freedom of flower or freedom of own self and strongly claims not to struggle with bees but to struggle for the own choice. Suyogbir asserts the compulsion of flower to struggle with insects and that is actually not the fight itself but love.

She rejects love or marriage as she takes it as an act of being submissive and dominated, but prefers singularity. She draws the demarcation of individuality to exist. That is why she never wants to get married and she likes to spend her life freely. When her younger sister elopes, she expresses her negative response, “An impulsive girl. What a hurry she was in to get married” (49). She is a lady of 24 years and is totally different from other ladies. Then she seems to forget her completely and centers in herself. Bari seems aware of the ultimate nothingness of her practical identity. So she seems careless about her body and her disease. She does not take cancer seriously and smokes carelessly even if she is an educated lady.

### **Shiva Raj, Mujura and Sanu**

In contrast to Sakambari, we find Mujura the elder sister and Sanu the youngest one as normal to common women whom he had met. Sanu is of sixteen years fashionable modern girl. She looks pretty and shy like other conservative ladies. She does not address her eye directly with him when she speaks and respects, saying brother Suyog. Even he likes to get married to Mujura, he cannot beg her hand with Shivraj. In the eyes of Suyogbir Mujura is an ideal woman to make a wife but he does not love her.

Shivaraj the brother of Sakambari, is about thirty-year old bachelor. He has the responsibility of three sisters and mother. He too is drunker and smoker. He puts deep interest to listen about war with Suyogbir, however, he never gets to listen to the reality of war experiences. He loves and trusts Sakambari more than himself but fails



to survive her at the last.

### **Major Characters' Existential Stance in *Blue Mimosa***

Suyogbir and Sakambari are the major character in the novel *Blue Mimosa*. The story revolves round these characters. Though there are some other characters contributing some roles to the novel, they have no significant part in the mainstream story. Further the main point of this thesis is the existential issues of the major characters. therefore, the following paragraphs are the discussion on the existential standpoints of Suyogbir and Sakambari.

Suyogbir is an example of absurd character of *Blue Mimosa*. He spends the alienated, meaningless condition all over his life. Suyogbir, the vulgar character of story, is living in frustration and self distrust. He never dares to share his inner melancholies of life with anyone but puts them behind the curtain difficultly. He is neither honest with himself nor with the society. He always tries to hide himself from the reality and escapes with the effect of alcohol. He is vicious and inimitable but honest narrator of the novel. He falls in love with twenty one year younger lady Sakambari, but it is one sided love in his matured age. He is not happy and satisfied with his early past experiences but he hides those bitter truths within himself and shows normalness with others. So he cannot speak openly with any one and especially with Sakambari.

Suyogbir faced and experienced of 2<sup>nd</sup> world war. War itself is the subject of power and existence too. He is not aware to the responsibility and individuality. He is neither responsible to the catastrophe of those three ladies' whom he had abused and killed during his service in army nor to Sakambari whom he kissed disturbing her freedom and causing her death. He is alive up to the end of the story and follows a life of alienation and void from the starting. His life has no goal and direction but only

frustration. In this context Hagewald writes in the *Journal of South Asian Literature*:

He is empty inside and without direction, feeling forced to go on living without meaning. His inner development, which makes him regard his deed as crimes, and which allowed him to give in to love, makes life seem even more difficult for him. He knows that eventually he cannot conceal the truth about his spoiled and meaningless life, but pretend that everything is all right. He asks, "where in this world is there a curtain," It is enough to pretend not to see....Deliberately saying "There is curtain," we deceive ourselves for nothing." Suyog continues to live in an illusion and in an absurd empty world because he does not value morality and honesty. On one hand, this makes his deeds seem less important and dramatic to him, but on the other, it also proves his life to be empty and meaningless (201).

Hagewald comments on Suyogbir's nature of concealing the truth and living in illusion, ignoring the value of honesty and morality. This is the major cause behind his absurd life.

From the beginning of his life he has moved according to the direction of his family not his own will. He had no interest to join army force. His family had interest in the army so they sent him because there was stirring blood of the warrior Kshetri veins. According to the traditional belief, he is of warrior blood or caste so he has to join such force. He has no interest and choice in his life except only to sink in the drowsiness of alcohol and to kill time and to spend life. He is not the creative type and not ambitious either for his activities.

Suyogbir finds Shiva Raj who is also another drunkard in bar and they develop friendship in between them on the effect of alcohol and cigarette there. Regarding

their age, Shiva is younger but equal to Suyog for drinking and smoking. As time goes by, they become close friends for bars. Both of them seem to hide the truth. Shiva is very much fascinated to listen to the war story which Suyogbir had faced so he asks him credulously. Because Shiva thinks that army men have more special experiences and newer capacity than the ordinary people in society. So Shiva asks him, “isn't it wearisome for you to hang around here this way after your experience in the war?”(6). In response to this Suyogbir says, “There was nothing special in my army record. It was just luck that I was made a Subedar. It was only because I did a decent job in office. I have never killed a man” (6). He only wants to evade Shiva from that subject of war, his unforgettable crime and the unavoidable reality. This is his dishonesty to his friend. He makes himself civilized and honest before friend Shiva suffocating himself inside in guilt. Shiva starts to take him home.

An honest narrator and antagonist Suyogbir narrates his emotional attraction towards Sakambari. She is a girl who never wants to get married but likes to live freely throughout her life. He often goes to Shiva's house to meet him and passes time talking with Shiva's sisters in Shiva's absence. Gradually Sugogbir falls in love with Sakambari. In his earlier meeting, she clarifies him how she is different kind from other ordinary ladies and those he had met. Her philosophy of flower or the philosophy of life and love is in fact totally different from others. She expresses her views as:

When they are aware of the sound of the bumblebee or black-bee or hornet, these pouches that look like bud open their mouth. I don't know what there is in them, but the insects leave the flowers and enter them. When a bee has entered the pouch, it closes its mouth. Inside, the insect dies of the suffocation. This is very interesting. There's no insect

here now or else you could see for yourself Suyog Ji. (13)

Perhaps Suyogbir understands the secret of her philogophy of flower. She connects it with the relation between men and women. It clearly reveals the power of women to trap men, symbolizing flowers as women and insects as men.

Bold Sakambari begins to express her thought to him openly but it makes him chilled. She becomes excited for the suffocation of bees extremely. In surprising and hesitation mood, he asks her:

If the bees can't settle here, what's the use of this flower...why should bloom without any purpose... A flower must have some kind of purpose. If that flower has the power to kill without having some special blossom or treasure to yield, then what's the meaning of its special characteristics? Since a flower has to fade and fall, why can't it die fighting an assailant? (14)

Suyogbir tries to establish the positive relation between the flowers and insects. He means to say that males should not be put in suffocation by females. His words sound as if he is trying to convince her to his purpose.

She heavily replies that the flower would not get spoiled and it would be secure. If a flower buds and opens for itself then there is no compulsion to fight with insects and to fall suffering by the sting of it. In the compulsion of to fall once, flower will fall by own will and for own-selves not by other's force. Here flower refers to the women and bees to male gender. The fight and struggle refer to the physical relation in between two sexes. Sakambari in these lines opposes the patriarchal system representing Parijat's views. Parijat has presented this female character as a revolutionary character to fight for female freedom.

Suyogbir feels the hunger of physical passion with Sakambari for a while and

concealing that emotion, he tries to convey his disagreement with her philosophy that struggle and fight with insect is not the real struggle in fact. But Sakamari strongly reacts to such subject and confronts with the idea that there is no inevitability to love and suffering in it. And it is possible to live out one's life alone in own way freely. Such individual free choice is the base of existentialism which the existentialists give emphasis.

In many meetings and conversations with Sakamari, Suyogbir sees her as a different type of girl who is a lover of death. Through his regular visits, he becomes accustomed to Sakamari's nature and behavior. Whether she is young a blossoming lady, she always seems as if she is unconscious of it. And it seems as if she has no interest in outside amusement. But she makes Suyogbir speechless calling him old, drunkard soldier and criminal too.

Suyogbir admits that he participated in war but declares he did not kill anyone, inspite of being the murderer of three innocent ladies, hiding his bloody hands inside the suffocation. To his explanation, Sakamari grabs point and responds, "Every killer ought to write his crime on his forehead. It isn't always apparent on the surface" (27). It makes him feel as if he is a man of low-esteem and more haunted by his past crimes. About this Robert S Feldman asserts:

The fact that we make such judgments of ourselves indicates that there is an important evaluative component of self, known as self-esteem. Self-esteem is a person's general acceptance of himself or herself, or the degree to which people see themselves as individuals of worth. If you have high self-esteem, then, you generally feel respect for and accept yourself, while if you have low self-esteem, you generally lack respect for, reject, and negatively judge yourself. (12)

Level of self-esteem helps a person to maintain his/her stance. Sakambari is of high self-esteem, so she evaluates herself of high worth. She has the self confidence and self respect in general. But Suyogbir is in the opposite condition. Because of his crimes, he is in guilt and has no confidence in himself. He has lack of self esteem so he has no courage to judge himself positively or as a person of high self esteem. He cannot accept himself positively and losses his worth.

Both of them are conscious about their morality but Sakambari is self-responsible and has free choice. She never hides her feelings inside her but Suyogbir gets frightened with the predetermined rules and fears revealing to his feelings. He moves in the outer world hiding his feelings and ignoring the choices. Those who prefer own choice and live free, they only can have high self esteem and judge themselves worth of value.

Conscious person only feels bored and anxious in the life. People who are aware about existence only experience the domination and partiality in life. So they only protest against those elements hampering their existence. Those who are not conscious with the self existence do not give emphasis on individual creativity and freedom. They follow the traditions and search for only universal essence. Someone who creates the self of high worth exists as an individual human being. Sakambari's view is that people who follow those social laws and traditional norms are only living like other animals which are also living beings. An individual, who remains freely, can create own rules and judges oneself in the level of high value. But in lack of self respect, a person judges himself/herself as of low esteem and of low importance.

The thing which interests Sakambari is smoking and flowers. She smokes continuously. Suyogbir teases her, "You will get cancer this way, Bari" Moreover she always answers, "It will be welcome" (32). Although she knows very clearly that

smoking may cause cancer and that may lead her to death, she is not afraid of it.

Sakambari's obsession toward death is clearly through the given expressions in the novel. She is not interested in man and sex. So she is a woman who has no interest in the worldly things. She has the different idea towards the existence of god. She tells Suyogbir that it is useless to wash the crime before god after committing it. She says that it is just foolishness and better idea is to wash it before man. She is careless about how much others are hurt by her reason. Her face always brightens at every mention of the death and mortality.

For Suyogbir, girl and marriage are ironical things. In the name of marriage, he remembers Mujura as an ideal Nepali woman and wants to decorate his room with her and wants to write "my wife" in her forehead but cannot dare to beg her hand with Shiva Raj. However he in fact has fallen in love with Sakambari. In the process of Bari's leaving Kathmandu for one month Suyogbir feels a new experience:

I cannot say exactly what, but something happened that had never happened before in my life-a new experience. "Bari won't be here after tomorrow." That was enough to make me feel as if I were flung by a forceful blow onto a vast plain of reality, where dreams, fantasies, hypocrisy, did not exist, only reality. I felt like a bottle from which the liquid is escaping, unable to collect it again. (41)

He feels alone, paralyzed and naked in the absence of Bari. In his life he has this first miserable feeling over a woman in his forty-six of age. This feeling is not the sexual type of hunger.

He feels ashamed and asks himself, "Who is Bari? Why should her absence affect me as a man this way?" (42). Shiva sends her by bus but Suyog cannot even go to bus and say good bye to her, because he has no confidence to speak in front of Bari

and to confront her. Even in the absence of Bari, he keeps visiting her home and takes satisfaction with the knowledge that Bari is intimate with Shiva and Shiva is intimate with him. What a pitiable condition of Suyogbir! He wants to reveal his feelings to her but cannot because of his distrust in himself and he is very much aware with those predetermined essence of the world. He is worthless in front of Sakambari.

Suyogbir falls in love with Sakambari but it is an unrequited love or he is attracted toward her unknowingly and without his will. He says, “What is Sakambari? What is there in her?” (39). It means he cannot understand her importance in fact. Suyogbir tries to quench his thirst of love through the acquisition of Sakambari. His every endeavor is guided towards her. He sees a dream of beautiful world with her.

As time goes by, Suyogbir cannot suppress his desire of love to Sakambari. When he meets her, he begins to feel enraptured. He forgets where he is. He cannot control himself. He is unable to realize the situation consciously, so he trembles. Impassioned Suyogbir holds her white neck and kisses her soft lips forcefully. In this regards he narrates how he loses himself control:

Feeling no satisfaction, I lost my desire. As if I awakened from a frightening dream I was completely soaked with sweat; my heart was trembling. What could I do? I couldn't change the situation. I couldn't take back my boldness. I felt dizzy. The mimosa trees and Sakambari, too, began to seem far away. (77)

Sakambari becomes utterly cold and speechless. She has no response at all. She neither does protest nor pounces on Suyogbir. She does not make any noise. The reason might be either her choice is not to react immediately in that time or she might have thought that immediate reaction may follow the traditional practice of the world. She goes straight through the door into her house. She vanishes and never meets



Suyogbir again.

Actually Sakambari prefers death as a weapon to exist. She chooses freely her choice of death and kills Suyogbir according to her philosophy of flower. Orchid kills insects and Sakambari kills Suyogbir psychologically. She succeeds in her passion to kill the bumble bee. Suyogbir remains wandering, here and there in the world of absurdity.

As usual, he remains with the shots of alcohol in the dark cloud of cigarette remembering her golden head with white long neck. He digests all his hidden crimes with the effects of alcohol and cigarettes. Feeling empty, he always lives in alienation, hugging chaos and despair only to kill the time. That is why he has existential crisis as an absurd character. In the context of this subject Avi Sagi asserts:

The feeling of absurd, according to Camus, grows from several sources. The first is the break in chain of meaning in everyday life: “the chain of daily gestures is broken, in which the heart vainly seeks the link that will connect it again” (The Myth of Sisyphus, p. 19). Existence becomes a sequence of moments lacking a context of meaning that unites them and endows them with coherence, meaningless, disjointed routine. This oppressive sense draws sense draws its power from the yearning for the lost unity. At least implicitly Camus assumes that only a unified context can confer meaning on the random sequence of events and isolated details. (50)

Any disturbance in the chain of usual activities causes absurd feeling in an individual. Such disruption leads a person to alienation. Suyogbir's separation from Sakambari is such a break after he kisses her. It leads him to even greater degree of absurdity and depression.

In *The Myth of Sisyphus* Camus reveals:

Rising, tram, four hours in the office or the factory, meal, sleep and Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday and Saturday, according to the same rhythm-this path is easily followed most of the time. But one day the 'why' arises and everything begins in that weariness tinged with amazement....Weariness comes at the end of the acts of a mechanical life, but at the same time it inaugurates the impulse of consciousness. It awakens consciousness and provokes what follows... At the end of the awakening comes, in time, the consequence: suicide or recovery. (11-12)

Repetition of the same action causes weariness and feeding up to a person. There comes the frustration if there is no positive change. If the situation continues, a person is forced to think of suicide.

We can see Suyogbir in the same condition in the novel. He does special but follows the same routine in the alienation. To kill the day, his routine is going to bar drinking, alcohol, gossiping with Shiva Raj, returning late night, smoking, waking up late morning and drowning in the past guilty experience. But in the later days he was more despaired because of the weariness. He becomes more alert for his meaning of living the life and gets only absurdity in the acknowledgment. In the same way, the absurd hero of *The Myth of Sisyphus*, Sisyphus, lives in the same repeating activities rolling the same rock in the same process time and again. In the absurd drama, *Waiting for Godot* by Samuel Beckett, the absurd characters Estragon and Vladimir repeat the same action in everyday life which seems meaningless and absurd. The antagonist of the novel Suyogbir also does the same, so he is the absurd character.

In the absurd condition and lack of self importance, Suyogbir is in the pitiful

condition and he reveals pain in this way:

I wanted to find out whether my life had any value or not, whether the wheels of life had passed over me meaninglessly, whether I had grown old for nothing. I turned the page of my past history, one by one, and in this way I sought my value. I wondered, who can give me any value, who can give me importance? What place is there for me in this age? What solace may be set apart for my life? What justice is given me at the hands of civilization and progress? What reward at the hands of mankind? Here is my refuge? (51)

By this time, Suyogbir has become conscious enough about what he did, is doing and will do. He now searches the meaning of life, which he cannot. Now he realizes life should have some meaning, values, images, love and many more, but he has lived without them.

### **Sakambari's Successful Existence**

Sakambari is also the pivotal character of *The Blue Mimosa*. She has the self possessed and individualistic traits. She creates her own morality and philosophy of life; and moves in own way and ideas. She does not follow the predetermined values and formality. She is conscious of her choices, responsibility and she is indifferent to the essence of the world. But she is very careful about her existence and identity. She chooses anything by her free choice. The master of her life is herself.

In *The Myth of Sisyphus* Camus says, "I draw from the absurd three consequences which are my revolt, my freedom and my passion" (48). Those who have such three elements, passion of knowledge, revolting power and choice of freedom they only can exist. Sakambari in *The Blue Mimosa* has all these qualities. So she exists in her role of heroine. Camus adds more:

...the exact degree to which suicide is a solution to the absurd. The principle can be established that for a man who does not cheat. What he believes to be true must determine his action. Belief in the absurdity of existence must then dictate his conduct. It is legitimate to wonder, clearly and without false pathos, whether a conclusion of this importance requires forsaking as possible an incomprehensible condition. (7)

Individual confidence is prior to rules and system in the existential philosophy. If some conscious people prefer to kill own-self in the case of personal choice as the solution to meaningless life it is their choice. It is the solution for them.

In *The Myth of Sisyphus* Sisyphus negates the suicide. He continues his absurd process. For one who is alert to the devalued of his/her existence, suicide is taken as one treatment to exist. At least they can escape from the alienated hopeless and meaningless situation. In the novel, Sakambari hugs death at last where her freedom of choice works and her existence moves to high esteem. She is the lover of death too. She not only hugs death but she also challenges those who devalue her. She returns the venom of hatred that poisons to Suyogbir and leaves him in suffocation. She succeeds to exist according to her philosophy of flower or life. She traps Suyogbir most dangerously being the Orchid in the garden.

Regarding of individualistic and conscious nature of Sakambari, in a journal Rai mentions as:

Bari, a self possessed and mechanical lady, is the heroine. She is individualistic and exists... When her brother, Shivaraj, introduces her with Suyogvir for the first time, she seems indifferent towards the formality that new guest expects as a social behavior. The singularity

of her existence here seems to be the result of her awareness of the futility of the world. (81)

Sakambari is succeeds to exist because of her creativeness and individual free choices.

### **Suyogbir in Crisis**

Suyogbir, an absurd character, who is a fugitive from world war II always remains in distress. He is conscious about the universally predetermined worldly essence but not for self existence. He does not create his own self but follows the traditional formalities. He converses with Shivaraj only for the formality. He does not feel comfortable when he goes to Sakambari's birthday party without any birthday gift. He sees Sakambari as slut and cruel when she speaks in straightforward manner and judges Mujura as an ideal woman to get married who is very conservative. Those all factors indicate that Suyogbir follows the traditional rules and regulation which are not of worth. He gives priority to the being but not to exist. Domination upon female is the fruit of venom in patriarchal society from the ancient period. Suyogbir follows this convention while serving in the army. Male hegemony is the root of female domination. Suyogbir shows his power in the beginning which leaves the untreatable scars in his mind. It plays the important role to spend his life with frustration and anarchy.

It is true that people express their inner thoughts in their drunken stupor. During a conversation with Shiva while drinking, Suyogbir expresses his thoughts, "Simply to suffering life doesn't make life meaningful, Shivaraj. All lives are meaningless. This life I'm leading now isn't a reaction to my suffering. We suffer until we die" (7). He has suffered in his life but his life is still in pain and suffering. He finds no way out to wipe out suffering until death. He hides his past experiences

secretly in his chest which makes him weak and feels agonized.

Suyogbir has no hope to improve the way of life even till the end of it. In the same reference of his army life he expresses his inner feelings of low self esteem of himself:

I didn't get a thing but I certainly lost something. I didn't even give it up knowingly; it went by itself. What could I do? In other words, I came back emptied. Do you understand why I'm not bored with life? I came back to spend the rest of my life in my own way, spending each day as it comes. I came back empty. (7)

Suyogbir himself declares that he is empty. He lost all things. But he says again he is not bored with his life, because he has lost his all things unknowingly. He can only spend the day without doing anything or without any achievement. So he is living a meaningless life.

Psychologically weak, Suyogbir feels all his activities meaningless. He finds himself alone and hopeless comparing to the street dog. In this reference Anuja Khadka posted in a blog:

Suyogbir too finds his life and love meaningless, when he realizes his love for half-age younger lady is unacceptable. He is so conscious about his old age and his own past experiences. He drowns into depression and despair and tries to get out of it eventually. Suyogbir even compares his life with a street dog. A lonely man, Suyogbir throughout the novel is frustrated and depressed in anyway.

Suyog was crazy about Sakambari and at the same time he is too new it that there was no matter between that girl and self because of age gap. It causes great despair to him.

Like an existentialist, Suyogbir goes against morality, values of the society.

He by Hagedwald:

Suyog continues to live in allusion, in an absurd and empty world because he does not value morality and honesty. On the one hand, this makes his deeds seem less important and dramatic to him, but on the other, it also proves his life to be empty and meaningless. Thus Parijat's novel aims to show that one, like Sakambari can only give meaning to one's life oneself. (201)

He always emphasizes for worldly objectivity. So he cannot turn to self possessiveness, free choice and individuality. This type of Suyogbir does not value the honesty and morality. He is not honest with himself either. He pretends as if all is well from the beginning to the last of the story. For the war he sacrifices all things but he gets only the memory of his crimes which make him suffocated. In old age his one sided love to Sakambari multiplies his pain again. From the starting to the end he tries to escape from the reality in the support of alcohol and cigarette. He always lives in despair in the empty world without meaning. In this context he remembers and speaks about Sakambari after her death: "You left me meaningless. Now you are compelling to Shiva Raj to kill himself. Sakambari, I want to go around with this message branded on me: life is failure, life is misfortune, man is miserable whichever way he turns" (97). Suyogbir expresses his pain in the absence of Sakambari. He finds his life meaningless without her.

### **Chapter: 3**

#### **Suyogbir and Sakambari as the Counter Parts in Their Existential Issues**

Sakambari is very creative and free type of lady. She gives importance to the individual freedom. She speaks what comes in her mind and does what she likes. She negates the traditional values of conservative society and creates her own philosophy of life alluding it with the flower. She does not like to move following predetermined rules. She prefers death and hates to love and life. She protects her flower from insects planting Orchid and trapping the insects by it. For her, life should be free from all traditional bondage and one should live for one's sake not for others. She is very conscious about her existence. Bold and straight forward Sakambari is cynic and impudence. She does not react immediately to sudden kiss of Suyogbir, but reacts with heaviest slap of death. She is atheistic and says there is no 'god' but 'idea of god' and that is only man's concept. She is totally different from other people. That is why she is in favor of individualistic and freedom of life.

Suyogbir is docile and submissive type of character. He is also conscious about his meaning of life but follows the predetermined values. He is always haunted by his past criminal activities in Death Valley and tries to repeat the similar activity again with Sakambari but he changes in course of the. He is of low esteemed man and lack of confidence. He hides one thing in his mind but speaks and does another because of the force of social rules and morality but he actually cannot follow. He always drinks alcohol to escape from inner pain of his activities. Even he prefers to get married to Mujura because of her behavior of typical Nepali ideal woman, but he cannot beg her hand. He never listens to himself but runs after the family and social forces. He follows formality only and feels uneasy to go to birthday party without present. From beginning to the end of the story, he shows normalness but is living in meaningless and hopeless alienated world in absurdity.



Two major characters are very conscious about their existence. Both want to exist in the world. But they are totally opposite to each other. Sakambari follows 20<sup>th</sup> century existentialism of Nietzsche and Sartre, whereas Suyogbir follows Hegelian rules. Sakambari makes her master herself but Suyogbir frightens with the outer forces and pretends to follow the social traditions and rules. Suyogbir has committed crimes and he is afraid, and regrets in guilt. He has lost the confidence. Sakambari, a bold and psychologically strong lady, follows her free choice. She creates rules for herself. She has nothing to hide because she is straight forward. Sakambari gets her wishes from the beginning and up to last, that is, her 'death'. She exists even after death according to her choice and the philosophy of the 20<sup>th</sup> century existentialism. Suyogbir lives a lonely life with alcohol in meaningless and hopeless situation. He exists in Absurdity.

The discussions above have made it clear that Sakambari is the representative figure of existentialist whereas Suyogbir has not succeeded to become a successful existentialist. Sakambari has been able to exist with her wills making her freedom untouched by traditional rules. Her nature of living single life, not surrendering to marriage and love continues from her childhood to death. In one point, she slips away from her stance when she is kissed by Suyogbir but that is not of her choice. It was unexpected and a sudden act of Suyogbir.

When we look at Suyogbir, we find him to be existing with some crisis. One crisis he faces is at the time of joining army. He joins it not with his choice but with the desire of family members and the legacy of his Kshetri blood. During his army life, he goes ahead according to his choice, but unlike an existentialist, he chooses such activities which he later finds to have been wrong and suffers from lamentation. Getting married to Sakambari or Mujura and living an existential life are his desires but he fails to achieve that and it proves that he is living with existential crisis.

Therefore, regarding their existence, Sakambari and Suyogbir appear to be counterpart to each other.

### Works Cited

- “Books from Western Literature Appear in Persian.” *Tehrantimes Iran’s Leading International Daily*. Culture 27 July 2019. [www.tehrantimes.com](http://www.tehrantimes.com). Accessed, 4 Aug 2019
- Chauhann, Janga B, “Understanding Parijat Through the Prism of her Biography.” *Bodhi: An Interdisciplinary Journal*. Vol 2 No.1, Department of Language and Mass Communication K.U., 2008.
- Dolma, Sonam. *A Book Review on: Shirish Ko Phool*. 2013.  
<https://medcomjunkies.wordpress.com>. Accessed, 4 April. 2019.
- Fieldman, Roberts. *Adjustment: Applying Psychology in a Complex World*. U. of Massachusetts, 1976.
- Flew, Antony. *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. Pan Books, 1984.
- Franzoi, Stephen L. *Social Psychology*. Marquett University, 1991.
- Gaarder, Jostein. *Sophie’s World*. Translated by Paulette Moller, Berkey Books, 1996.
- Gautam, Shreedhar. ‘Parijat and Blue Mimosa.’ *The Kathmandu Post*. 17 Feb. 2005  
P4.
- Hagewald, Julia A.B. “The Mimosa Flower: Parijat’s Reflection on The Meaning of Life.” *Journal of South Asian Literature*. vol: 29, No. 1. 1994, [www.jstor.org](http://www.jstor.org)
- Khadka, Anuja. *Shiris Ko Phool by Parijat-Books*, 2011.  
[www.anoozaak.wordpress.com](http://www.anoozaak.wordpress.com). Accessed, 2 July. 2019.
- Maskey, Mahesh K. "Remembering Parijat." 11 May, 2019.  
[www.google.nagariknetwork.com](http://www.google.nagariknetwork.com). Accessed, 4 July. 2019.
- Parijat. *Blue Mimosa*. Translated by Tanka Vilas Varya, Orchid Books, 2012.
- Pradhan, Kumar. *A History of Nepali Literature*. New Delhi Sahitya Academy, 1984.

- Prasai, Narendra Raj. *The Legend of Literature; a Biography of Parijat*. Ekta Publication, 2003.
- Rai, Chhatra Bahadur. "Bari: An Existential Heorine in Blue Mumosa." *Jodem: Journal of The Department of English*, vol. 3, The Department of English Mahendra Multiple Campus, 2011, PP. 80-82.
- Raosaheb, More Vijay. "Existentialism: A Philosophic Stand Point to Existence over." *The South Asian Academic Research Chronicle*, vol 3, 1 Jan 2016. [www.thesaarc.com](http://www.thesaarc.com). Accessed, 20 Aug. 2019.
- Sagi, Avi. *Albert Camus and the Philosophy of Absurd*. Translated by Batya Stein, 2002.
- Sarup, Kamala. *Love Literature and Parijat*. 6 April. 2005. [www.scoop.co.nz/stories/H2054/sooo48.htm](http://www.scoop.co.nz/stories/H2054/sooo48.htm). Accessed, 20 August. 2019.
- Sweta. *Shirish Ko Phool: Review*. 14 Nov. 2009, [www.aakarpost.com](http://www.aakarpost.com). Accessed, 4 April. 2019.
- Vesey, G., and Foulker P. *Collins: Dictionary of Philosophy*. Harper Collins Publisher. 1990.
- Wilson, Edwin, and Alvin Goldfrab. *Theater: The Lively Art*. Mc Graw Hill, 1991.