

I. Introduction

Writer

Parijat, the Nepali name for a species of jasmine with a special religious significance, is the pen name adopted by Bishnu Kumari Waiba, a Tamang woman who was born in the Tea-Estate of Darjeeling in 1937 A.D. She was the daughter of Kalu Sing Waiba and Amrita Moktan. She has been hailed by her contemporaries as one of the most innovative and first modern novelist of Nepal. The themes and philosophical outlook of her poems, novels and stories are influenced by her Marxist and feminist views and her own personal circumstances. Parijat suffered from a partial paralysis since her youth and ventured from her home only rarely during the past twenty years. She was unmarried and childless, a status that was not usual for a woman in Nepalese society and that is due partly to her illness and partly, it seems due to personal preference. Despite her disability, Parijat is a formidable force in Nepali literature, and her flower-filled room in a house near Balaju has become a kind of shrine for progressive Nepali writers.

Parijat is a beautiful, intense-looking woman. She is concerned with a Nepali tribal group of antiquity but of uncertain origin. She is a Buddhist by birth and her childhood was deeply unhappy. According to Lama Religion, she was named Chheku Lama. Her mother died while Parijat was still young, and an elder brother drowned shortly afterward. At the age of about thirteen, it seems that she became passionately involved in a love affair that ended in heartbreak and a period of intense depression.

She received her early education in Darjeeling. In 1950, the family moved to Kathmandu where Parijat attended college and completed B.A. in 1960 A.D. from Padma Kanya Campus, and later she had her Master's Degree in English Literature.

Since she was a middle class family and taught in school until she was afflicted with a crippling disease that had made her an invalid till the end of her life. Her father subsequently became mentally ill. Parijat's memories, which Abhi Subedi describes as "Confessional and Intimate" (Subedi, 213), were serialized in *Ruprekha* (outline) and volume of reminiscences have appeared. In view of this background of tragedy and hardship, it is not surprising that most of Parijat's writings evince an attitude of alienation, pessimism and atheism.

Works

Parijat had started to write informally since she was the student of class six. Her poems were published when she was nineteen and since her short stories and poems have appeared in the literary magazines of Nepal. Parijat is more popular as a novelist. But the sense of disillusionment and frustration which is there in her novel, is found in her poems too.

Her first and probably only collection of poems entitled *Akanksha* (Aspirations) was published in 1953. These poems do not reveal the Parijat of the latter times. Since 1980s she has also written several new poems. These differ from her earlier poetry in that they are less personal and more social. Her second collection of poems is very highly regarded, although it does perhaps represent an earlier phase in her development as a writer. All these poems are written in the first person and are deeply subjective. Some of the earliest compositions, such as *Sohorera Jau* (Sweep Away) are simple lyrics. Others, such as *Gopal Prasad Rimal Ko "-Prati" Prati* (To Gopal Prasad Rimal's "To-") have political undertones. Parijat's political views are overtly leftist in the early 1970s, she attempted to initiate a literary movement "Dubbed Ralpa" (an apparently meaningless term) that would combine ideas drawn from existentialist thought with the values of Marxism.

The majority of Parijat's poems spring from her physical condition and from a profound atheism and moral despair. *Mirtyunko Angaloma* (In the Arms of Death) expresses a hope that the doctrine of reincarnation is not true and that the death will be a final release. Her most famous poem *Lahurelai Ek Rogi Premikako Patra* (A Sick Lover's Letter to Her Soldier) contains the line "Love does not die, you have to kill it", which sums up very well the antisentimental view she holds of human life. Like the contemporary writers, Parijat believed in the dissolution of traditional values and the elimination of plot in a story. Since life is plotless, story is supposed to mirror life, and should also be plotless. Parijat has written many stories in this style. In 1966 her first novel, *Blue Mimosa* was published and received the Madan Puraskar, the only award offered in Nepal, for the best novel of the year.

Critical response to the novel was of two kinds. On one side were those who said the philosophy of the novel was decadent, its substance vulgar and obscene, its theme foolishly imitative of the west. On the other side, were those who felt that Parijat brought Nepal into the world of modern literature.

The social novel has not had a long history in Nepal. It is perhaps thirty or forty years old. Before that, narrative prose was derived mainly from the religious writings and sacred books of Hinduism and Buddhism. Even since then the hundred of novels that have written generally reflect the traditional values of religion and culture, sometimes in imitation of Indian literature, sometimes derived from the soil of Nepal. A few of the novels are considered good and rest trite, but almost all of them accept rather than question the ideals and values of the past. The heroes and heroines are usually ideal in looks and behaviour. Pure love and heroic action, especially of the famous Gurkha Warriors, are celebrated. Happy or at least sentimental, endings are the result.

Thus, it is easy to see that Parijat's novel strikes a new note here. She overturns most of the expectations raised by previous novels. Her main characters are anything but ideal. Sakambari is skinny, she smokes, she wears glasses. Her ideas about war and religion are iconoclastic, her ideas about sex are abnormal. Mujura, a less important and less interesting character, is the traditionally ideal woman who lowers her eyes when speaking to a man. Suyogbir Singh is not a typical hero. True, he is a Gurkha Warrior, but one whose memories, released by Sakambari's goading words are of guilt and misery. Their love affair is outlandish. The differences in age, in temperament, in experience make union impossible, yet though the relationship is absurd, the pain and frustration are genuine. Even the setting of the novel gives only glimpses of the idyllic beauty of Nepal; it focuses instead on the unsettling life of the city. All traditional values are rejected because the world in which we find ourselves in Parijat's novel is not exclusively that of Hindu or Buddhist culture but the world of the alienated and the absurd.

The novel especially reminds us of Albert Camus and Sigmund Freud. It is the amalgamation of existential and psychological issues which are juxtaposed. Parijat had found in them an affinity to her own feelings about life. But she maintains that the characters and situations described in her novel reflect, at least metaphorically, the life of Kathmandu. She sees life in Kathmandu as complex, difficult and frustrating. She portrays it as an empty, sterile place where meaningful life has come to a standstill and the motions of life go on as a matter of routine. The psychological background to the novel is Suyog's memories of his sexual exploitation of Burmese tribal women during his military service. His infatuation remains almost wholly unexpressed and Sakambari dies. In her death there is an underlying suspicion that Suyog's single clumsy attempt to reveal his feelings to her is in some way responsible.

Prijat's second novel, *Mahattahin* (The Ignoble, 1968), is a novel of existentialist nihilism. The nameless hero or anti-hero of the novel is shown in futile search for the 'self' in his existence and is in perpetual confrontation with his own insignificance in the scheme of things. In this the individual revolts against the given situation of life. In her third novel, *Baisko Manchhe* (The Man of Prime Youth, 1992), Parijat attempts to combine existentialism with Marxist thought. Her other novels are *Toribaribata Ra Sapanaharu* (From the Mustard Field and Dreams, 1977), *Parkhalbhitra Ra Bahira* (Inside and Outside the Wall, 1978) and *Antarmukhi* (Introvert, 1978).

It is ironic to find that Parijat's novels reflect the emptiness of life just at a time when Kathmandu has become a hippie center for those who are fleeing the emptiness of western life. Many westerners are turning toward the affirmation of Hindu and Buddhist philosophy to water the dry roots of their life. Parijat has created Bari is that sort of individual who has successfully created her intellectual and social norms in the novel. It is not only Bari, but as a whole Parijat's project is to create her own social and intellectual norm through the form, structure, plot and theme of the novel. Bari has been presented as a rebellious warrior, Suyogveer and Shivaraj are in victimized form and other minor characters as well as offstage characters are also the symbolic and ironic characters to reflect the holistic formation of social normality in the novel. In short, Parijat has created her own unique norm by challenging to the so-called chauvinistic social norms of contemporary time. She has crossed the attitudinal barriers of social norms with her unique characters.

Literature Review

Since the first publication of Parijat's *Blue Mimosa* (1965) numerous critics have expressed their opinions on the different aspects of the novel. Most of them have

focused on the existential aspect as the main subject matter of the novel. In this regard Prof. Dr. Abhi Subedi comments in his book *Nepali Literature: Background and History* (1978) that Parijat, a modern Nepali writer follows an existential trend in her writings. Her novel *Blue Mimosa* establishes her to this stand which is completely based on existential philosophy. At the same time, he warns to Shankar Lamichhane, the preface writer of the book that he tends to take the novel sometimes out of its range.

The novel is different in its theme and characters than many other traditional novels. Sakambari, one of the characters, is compared with the archetypal woman. Despite her beauty she has an aura about her that attracts men towards her. Another character Suyogbir is compared with an agnostic Buddha. He had fought many battles and had slept with many women while he was on the front but none of them had left any impression on his mind. He falls in love with Sakambari who is an emaciated and mysterious lady. In contrary to Suyogbir's past experiences, Sakambari's death shatters him much. He does not see any meaning in his life. Subedi's expression goes as follows:

Parijat (1937) emerged as a novelist of the existentialist trend after the roaring success of her novel *Shirishko Phool* (Which is published in English as *Blue Mimosa*). Shankar Lamichhane has written a long preface to this book, which tends to take this novel sometimes out of its range. But the novel itself is enough to stand on its own. She has created a woman character in this novel who represents the absurdity of existence. Her name is Sakambari. She is an emaciated and a mysterious lady. She is reminiscent of all the archetypal women. She is

not beautiful but she has an aura about her that attracts men towards her and they cannot see beyond her. Suyogbir falls in love with her.

Suyogbir is an ex-army man who had fought many battles and had slept with many women [. . .]. After her death he does not see any meaning in life, [. . .]. He becomes like an agnostic Buddha. (120-21)

Here, Subedi presents *Shirishko Phool* as the existential novel and Sakambari and Suyogbir are truly the existential characters.

Similarly, Kumar Pradhan insists on the existentialism of the novel. He notices that the characters of the novel are conscious of their existence. They are living in meaningless world. There is not any emotion in their life and action. They are frustrated and alienated extremely. He highlights the situation both of Sakambari and Suyogbir in the novel. He sees similitude between Parijat's Suyogbir and Camus' Sisyphus. Both are the anti-hero and living in the absurd world. As an anti-hero Suyogbir is not simply alienated from the society but he does feel himself alienation. They follow the rule of purposelessness in their behaviour. The above idea is justified through the following excerpt:

Parijat's novel *Shirishko Phool* (The Acacia Flower, 1965) 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 a 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 *Shirishko Phool*, a novel of the absurd. (180-81)

Here, Kumar Pradhan sees the characters of the novel are conscious of their existence and they are living in the meaningless world.

Dr. Shreedhar Gautam's ideas about the novel are not different from the ideas of Subedi and Pradhan. His commentary of the novel is matched with the idea of the existential philosophy. He observes directly the sense of alienation and meaninglessness of the novel and the characters' responsibility for their own deed; it is because they want to give meaning to their life. He explains the scene of cruelty and inhumanity which are the major characteristics faced by any existential characters. Dr. Gautam writes:

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)

Krishnahari Baral and Netra Atam see a spark of war and its consequence through this novel. They analyze the terrifying condition of war which alters human life into the meaningless where everybody knows the absurdity of his or her existence though no one can escape from it. Baral and Atam annotate that *Shirishko Phool* has raised the question of existence out of the terrifying condition of war. Human beings are aware of their meaningless life though they are compelled to live in absurdity (150).

Michael James Hutt talks about the psychological issue and the complexity of the novel in his book *Nepali: A National Language and Its Literature*. According to him, Suyog's memories of his sexual exploitation during his military service; his unexpressed wild and foolish love towards Sakambari and his clumsy attempt to reveal his feeling to her that causes her death, all are responsible to psychological analysis of the novel. Besides, the novel is something different than what it seems in surface. His extract goes as:

The psychological background to the novel is Suyog's memories of his sexual exploitation of Burmese tribal women during his military service. Although it is not a long novel (92), *Shirishko Phool* is deceptively complex: there are a number of sub-plots; and many of its events are invested with symbolic significance. Suyog's infatuation remains almost wholly unexpressed and Sakambari dies. Her death is not the melodramatic demise of the traditional Nepali heroine, however: there is an underlying suspicion that Suyog's single clumsy attempt to reveal his feeling to her is in some way responsible. (214-15)

Sandra Zeidenstein emphasizes on the uniqueness of the novel. According to her, this novel *Blue Mimosa* breaks the tradition of prose writing, which was established long ago in the history of Nepali literature. The hero and heroine are usually ideal in look but anything more. In different relationship, inhumanity, frustration, absurdity, lack of pure love and unhappiness are the major characteristics of the novel which overturns the trend of previous novels. She writes as:

Thus it is easy to see that Parijat's novel strikes a new note here. She overturns most of the expectations raised by previous novels. Her main

characters are anything but ideal. Sakambari is Skinny, she smokes, she wears glasses. Her ideas about war and religion are iconoclastic; her ideas about sex are aberrant. Mujura, a less important and less interesting character, is the traditionally ideal woman who lowers her eyes when speaking to a man. Suyogbir Singh is not a typical hero. True, he is a Gurkha Warrior, but one whose memories, released by Sakambari's goading words, are of guilt and misery. Their love affair is outlandish. [. . .], the pain and frustration are genuine. (II)

Britta Stovling notices the inflamed humanity in *Blue Mimosa*. She thinks that there is lack of love and consistency of power between men and women in the novel. She says lack of love or inability is more perilous than hatred. The fire of hatred can make the thing purer than destroying it but the situation out of love like a contagious disease. Impliedly she sees the suppressed condition of women all over the world through this novel. She reminds the domination of chauvinistic society upon female in her essay in *Parijat Smirti Granth*. Her expression goes as follows:

Parijat's novel *Blue Mimosa* deals with the lack of love as the curse of our planet, as a contagious disease. Not hatred. The fire of hatred can cleanse. Inability to love though I is a void that finally kills also the killer. The killer is called a hero. The novel, in other words, is on the asymmetry of power between the sexes, unleashed upon women's abused bodies. (167)

Dr. Ingrid Kreidl does not obtain from talking about the feminist issue in Parijat's novel *Blue Mimosa*. According to him, Parijat is a tradition breaker. She does not take the subject of her writing from the glorious legends of the gods and religious heroes. Her writing deals with the issue of the life of common people, like middle class

people and lower middle-class people who are suppressed and abused by male in the society. Parijat questions the main values, norms and restraints with which everybody has to get along but hardly anyone talks about them. Her *Blue Mimosa* is developed with the philosophy concerning the reality of women's life. Women are nothing to the man's eye more than physical satisfaction. It reflects the male atrocity, suppression, cruelty to women, to accept the typical female role. It raises the burning issue of tussle between male and female. This can be clarified through Dr. Kreidl's expression:

. . . But the subjects Parijat dealt with had nothing to do with the glorious legends of the gods and religious heroes. The secret of her success was to notary the life of ordinary people, of the middle and lower middle class people with whom her readers could identify. [. . .] In *Blue Mimosa*, her main characters disclose their most intimate, vulnerable and human sides. Skinny Sakambari, well educated and well read, her hair cut short and glasses on her nose, has made up her own philosophy concerning the sense of a women's life. Comparing men to bees attacking blooming flowers, she prefers to die rather than to accept the typical female role. Pity poor Suyog, who falls in love with her. The emotionless, cool Gurkha soldier [. . .] Sakambari opens his eyes, telling him: The war we fight in someone else's name, under someone else's order is a crime committed by one individual against another. (170)

RD Yuyutsu Sharma points out an error on the side of publication of the novel *Blue Mimosa*. His article from Kathmandu Post entitled "Sixty-Sixth page of *Blue Mimosa*" explains some erroneous issues of the famous literary works of the world. Nepali literature is too no exception so far as such errors, internal or external are concerned.

His saying "World literature is riddled with such mistakes" makes clear that errors lead to confusion and serious miscomprehension of the text. According to him, such factual error is existed in Parijat's *Blue Mimosa*. The sixty-sixth page of the novel has not been printed for last many years which is very crucial one; it refers Shiva Raj's determination of not committing suicide and last line of the page is central to Parijat's idea about nihilism. He points out that *Blue Mimosa* is a famous novel and is being studied as textbook in several colleges and universities but hardly anyone talk about the mistake. He annotates:

But then there is another phenomenon we are unaware of only recently I have been told that sixty-sixth page of Parijat's famous novel *Shirishko Phool (Blue Mimosa)* has not been printed for last many years. [. . .] The last page of the book is very crucial; it refers to Shiva Raj's resolve of not committing suicide [. . .] "I shall be living in meaningless world and from now on I shall always accept that I am living in a Maha Sunya, a void". [. . .] very clearly it shows how careless and flippant our literary criticism is towards the text of Nepali literature. (4)

Therefore, it seems that critical reviews focus mostly to the single subject matter of the meaninglessness, uselessness of love, life etc. in the novel. Some of the articles published often in newspapers about Parijat and her novel *Blue Mimosa* have also given regularity to the same kind of critical responses. Aparajita Acharya can be taken as an instance. Her expression in her article in *The Kathmandu Post* on Jan.6, 2008, is as follows:

The tale reminds uncertainable within the boundaries of a lone philosophy with its characters running from one and of the spectrum to

the text. If a parallel sought in their forms, the story perhaps can be better aligned with existential nihilism. (5)

Here, to some extent her expression in this article seems a little bit wide in interpretation in comparison to other critics but she is also not far from the shadow of the mentioned critics. But, none of the critics quoted above has dealt with the issue of "Female Self" that is untouched issue, which my research undertakes to investigate in the novel *Blue Mimosa*.

II. Female Self

The Development of the Self

Numerous critics have commented upon the development of the 'self', among them, some have been described below. The women writers of the Romantic era conceptualized the self in a very different way. Dorothy Wordsworth imaged the female self as: "a 'floating island', one that responds to the currents of water and air, one that no firm moorings, that appears, 'food, safety, shelter' to birds and plants even as it may itself be absorbed into the lake, 'to fertilize some other ground" (Mellor, 186).

This is an extremely suggestive metaphor, enabling us to see that the Romantic-era women writers often embraced what such modern feminist psychologists as Nancy Chodorow in the *Reproduction of Mothering* have taught us to call a *relational self*. This self has no firm ego boundaries, and experiences its place in the world as and entanglement in shifting relationship, with family members, friends, lovers, co-workers. As Keats, who shared this feminine sense of the self as relational, described it: 'the poetical character itself . . . is not itself – it has no self – it is everything and nothing –' (letter to Richard Woodhouse, 27 October, 1818). (186). To develop the political implications of this relational self, one might invoke the French feminist Luce Irigaray's concept of a 'placental economy', grounded on the image of the pregnant woman who experiences herself always as two-in-one. A relational self does not make economic or political decisions based on the assessment of self interest what contemporary economists call 'rational choice,' but rather on what Irigaray calls a practice of 'gift giving' of submerging one's personal desires into a desire for the good of one's family or the whole community.

Experiencing their selves as relational rather than autonomous encouraged the women writers of the Romantic Period to focus on the ways that self interacts with other people, how it functions in relation to the wider community. As Austen insisted, following Wollstonecraft in this regard, the best marriages are those grounded in a relational love, a correct assessment of the genuine compatibility between two people who mutually respect, esteem, and love each other.

When Mutual respect is absent, what can be then, it is clarified through the following extract: "When such mutual respect is absent, when the feminine self finds no other into which she can merge then she feels – not the confidence of the transcendental ego holding its own against the imperatives of nature – but rather desolation" (186).

More than any other writer in the Romantic era, the poet Felicia Hemans explores the causes and the effects of female loneliness, despair, even suicidal depressions. In her poems and plays, such loneliness is almost always produced by men – men who abandon their female lovers, men who leave home to fight war, to make money, to explore and conquer new lands.

Irving Babbitt, a chief proponent of the theory of New Humanism puts his view somewhat different about the self. He says, "We should have broken on temperament by supplying others." He talks about 'ethos' that means convention, tradition and morality. Man is not civilized by birth but by applying ethos he becomes civilized one. Ethical self is such a power, which works upon man himself or a power that sets him/her apart from other animals. Babbitt puts his ideas in his work "Romantic Melancholy" about the self as:

If a man is to escape from his isolation he must, I have said, aim at some goal set above his ordinary self which is at the same time his unique and separate self. But because this goal is set above his ordinary self, [. . .] possession of his ethical self, the self that he possesses in common with other men. Aristotle says that if a man wishes to achieve happiness he must be a true lover of himself. [. . .] that he means the ethical self. (775–76)

Here, Babbitt says that man enters into the ethical self with the help of others. He can see equality in each and every man. Then a sense of public life emerges in him. Even Aristotle agrees and says, “Put the breaks on the temperament and impulse and tend to become ethically efficient.” Therefore, ‘Ethical self’ can obtain happiness but Romanticists replaced this ethical self by temperament and mood, so they expressed emotion and feelings. They are dissatisfied with the achieved happiness turns into melancholy. They express their own self, which is their ‘emotional self.’

Feminists took from Freud the idea that identity is formed by social influences and, therefore, there can be no essential self. It meant that no single factor – being born a boy rather than a girl, for example – could predetermine an individual’s identity. Freud argued that in the first months, the child has no real sense of self: it is unable even to distinguish where it ends and mother begins, and certainly has no concept of its own gender. During this period, the child, whether boy or girl is encapsulated in an intense, satisfying love relationship with the mother. Gender identification is achieved through the oedipal complex.

Like Freud, from whom Jacques Lacan takes his preliminary ideas of unconscious and sexuality, Lacan was accused of chauvinism and biological essentialism, yet he says instrumental in opening up Freudian theory to ideas about

language that proved incredibly fruitful for feminism. Lacan's ideas about the self are as:

This jubilant assumption of his specular image by the child at the *infans stage*, still sunk in his motor incapacity and nursling dependence, would seem to be exhibit in an exemplary situation the symbolic matrix in which the *I* is precipitated in a primordial form, before it is objectified in the dialectic of identification with other, and before language restores to it, in the universal, its function as subject. (898)

Here, Lacan clarifies the ideas in the above extract. For Lacan, sexual difference is founded in language. Only when the child comes to recognize itself as 'I' – during what is called the mirror phase – does it begin to recognize sexual difference. Recognition comes with attainment of language, by which the world is known, categorized and expressed. Using language, the child begins to construct and maintain a stable self-identity in which self and other are distinct, where previously the child and the mother had been indistinguishable. It is through language that the authority of the father is maintained, and the connection with the female which threatens the autonomy and self-identity of the child is served. Julia Kristeva describes the opposing stages of 'semiotic' and the 'symbolic' in the following extract:

The semiotic activity, which introduces wandering or fuzziness into language and, *a fortiori*, into poetic language is, from synchronic point of view, a mark of [. . .] life/death and from a diachronic point of view stems from the archaisms of the semiotic body. Before recognizing itself as identical in mirror and consequently, as signifying, this body is dependent vis-à-vis the mother. (1168)

From the above extract, according to Kristeva, the semiotic phase occurs with the pre-linguistic and pre-oedipal state of maternal closeness. It is the moment before language in which the child knows no boundaries and does not distinguish self from other, as the child matures and enters into the symbolic stage where he starts to recognize his identical self. The symbolic is the social state, in which bodily desires are controlled and repressed, and the authority of the father is recognized. The symbolic is always working to continue to repress the semiotic. The idea of the irrepressible unconscious is significant for feminism: it demonstrated that the symbolic state was neither as natural nor as stable as would be believed, and consequently, that it could be overthrown.

By referring the journal *Questions Féministes* in her book *The New Feminist Criticism*, Elaine Showalter includes the ideas about the self. Editors of the journal *Questions Féministes* point out:

It is . . . dangerous to place the body at the center of a search for female identity . . . The themes of otherness and of the body merge together, because the most visible difference between men and women, and the only one we know for sure to be permanent . . . is indeed the difference in body. This difference has been used as perfect to ‘justify’ full power of one sex over the other (trans. Yvonne Rochette Ozzalloa NFF, p.218). (252)

Ideas about the body are fundamental to understanding how women conceptualize their situation in society; but there can be no expression of the body unmediated by linguistic, social and literary structures.

The Relation of Human Beings to Nature: Men Control and Women Nurture

In regard to the relation of human beings to nature, the male Romantic poet often positions himself, as did Wordsworth at the end of *The Prelude*, on top of a mountain, looking down on the natural world, a nature that he claims to understand and therefore speak for. Such a moment is an instance of what Burke and Kant both called the 'sublime', the encounter of the finite human mind with the infinite power of God or universe. This encounter first overwhelms the mortal poet but then leads to an experience of mental empowerment, one in which the poet feels he can either join with or hold his own against this divine creative power, as does Coleridge in 'This-Lime Tree Bower My Prison' or P. B. Shelley in 'Mont Blanc.' To consider the above description of the romantic male poets, it gives the clear sense of men control nature.

But women writers both condemned this concept of the sublime and offered an alternative model for the appropriate relationship of human mind to nature. For instance, Mary Shelley in her novel *Frankenstein* (1818), offered the most powerful and enduring critique of the male scientific and poetic attempt to appropriate and speak for Mother Nature. Instead, Romantic women writer suggested, human beings should see Mother Nature as a friend and co-worker, one with needs of her own, a potentially powerfully with whom we must cooperate and who will reward our devotion to her. Charlotte Smith, in her poem 'Beachy Head' (1807), brilliantly, images this alternative interaction with nature. In this regard, Smith ends by invoking her hero, Parson Darby, a retired clergyman who devotes his life to rescuing shipwrecked sailors. Rather than celebrating his regular encounters with the sublime, Darby does what he can to mediate the elemental powers of nature. He does not attempt to *speak for* nature. Charlotte Smith's point is clear:

The infinite variety of elemental power of nature is far too great for any one mind or linguistic system to encompass. The most we can do is to respect nature, to describe her with reverence, to be grateful for her bounty, and to try to remain in harmonious balance with her.

(Mellor, 188)

To consider the male and female writers' views about the nature and its relation with human beings, Romantic male writers thought that man controls the nature whatever it is violent, terrific where man is considered as sublime but it seems that Romantic women writers have taken Mother Nature as a friend, co-worker and women as nurture.

Mortification and Gratitude

In Jane Austen's fiction *Pride and Prejudice*, as Stuart Tave pointed out:

Words are always carefully chosen. Here two frequently repeated words define what happens to Darcy and Elizabeth, proud and prejudiced characters: 'mortification' and 'gratitude.' First the pride of both Darcy and Elizabeth must be mortified; mortification is the word that means both a process of humiliation and ascetic purification, of sacrificing one's former self in order to be born again into better self.

(Mellor, 195)

In what circumstance does one typically feel gratitude? The word Jane Austen chooses to describe Elizabeth's feeling for Darcy in her novel *Pride and Prejudice* is not perhaps what we would expect, not 'love' or 'desire' – it is 'gratitude.' Austen expects us to recognize that gratitude is an emotion produced when there is an unequal relationship, when one person has greater power than another. It is an

emotion most often felt, perhaps, by children or, in the popular literature of the Romantic era, by slaves, as in Maria Edgeworth's novella, the *Grateful Negro*. In *Pride and Prejudice*, gratitude is overwhelmingly felt by Elizabeth rather than Darcy. She 'fancies' that she has 'power' over him, but in fact – once Lydia elopes – Elizabeth is forced to rush home, humiliated and impotent.

Only Darcy's 'ardent love' brings on the renewal of his proposal, a proposal which Elizabeth accepts 'with gratitude and pleasure.' For she has come:

to comprehend that he was exactly the man, who, in disposition and talents, would most suit her. His understanding and temper, though unlike her own, would have answer to all her wishes. It was union that must have been to the advantage of both; by her ease and liveliness, his mind might have been softened [. . .] she must have received benefit of greater importance (iii.8). (196)

The Essentialism Debate

There are different views about 'female self' among feminist writers, where essentialists take it as 'essence.' If there is a single identifiable theme running through every feminist debate, it is the question of essentialism: is there an innate and natural difference between men and women? Is a woman a woman because she is biologically female, or because she behaves like a woman? As the French Feminist Luce Irigaray puts it so succinctly: 'equal or different?' Essentialists believe that because women are biologically different from men, they are also psychologically and emotionally different. Difference, they argue is not something to be overcome as though it were shameful not to be a man, but sometimes to celebrate: women should be proud to be women. They argue that feminism should work to liberate women

from a system of male centered value and beliefs, and should empower them to discover their own uniquely female identity. This identity is frequently described as being more empathetic and co-operative, more connected to others and more accepting of multiple viewpoints, unlike male identity, which is monolithic, authoritarian, and founded in a rationalist belief in one truth.

Anti-essentialists such as Simon de Beauvoir, however argue:

that sexual difference is a consequence of cultural conditioning.

Society has created woman as other, and the means by which this difference has been created must be exposed and discredited, so that women can achieve their full potential as the equals of men. (Tolan, 323)

Essentialists counter this argument by insisting that preoccupation with equality serves only to perpetuate the assimilation of women into a masculine society. Essential female values are overwhelmed in a male system, and women need to identify and assert their difference. Anti-essentialists respond that the emphasis on difference perpetuates a misogynistic belief system that has traditionally worked to exclude women from the male sphere. The writer who became the most notable advocate of beauvoir's anti-essentialism was the American radical feminist Shulamith Firestone. Her 1970 text, *The Dialectic of Sex* was dedicated to Beauvoir, and pursued many of the same arguments begun in *The Second Sex*. Like Beauvoir, Firestone believed that technology could be employed to free women from the restraints placed upon them by their biology. Firestone believed that:

It was not biological in itself that created inequality – ‘man’ and ‘woman’ were for her neutral categories of difference – but rather it

was the reproductive function that happen to fall to the female body; by employing technology to lift the task of reproduction from women, equality could be achieved. (Tolan, 323–24)

It was clear that both Firestone and Beauvoir had assumed that culture was a gender-neutral project that men participated in, and from which women were excluded.

Beauvoir had implicitly accepted the rationalist mind-body divide that situated male reason in the mind and female instinct in the body, and had fought to promote women to rational equality with men. In defiance of this reasoning, essentialist 'difference feminism' posited that the domination of masculine culture had suppressed an alternative, feminine culture, and that the only way women will achieve a liberation of any value would be to reclaim their female heritage and to celebrate woman's potent connection with nature and the body.

Mary Daly, the American feminist theologian, in her 1978 book, *Gyn/Ecology* wrote one of the most radical essentialist accounts of gender relations. Like Beauvoir, Daly argued that religion, law and science were all methods of patriarchal control working to define and limit women. Daly began a feminist critic of Christianity, arguing that the image of 'God the father' was constructed to validate the rule of the father in patriarchy. In *Gyn/Ecology*, Daly advised women to reject the tools of patriarchy, including religion and language, and 'wildize' themselves. Her emphasis is on language as a tool of patriarchy.

Beauvoir had fought against the belief that women had a peculiar connection to nature, seeing it as another tactic for defining women as less human than men, but essentialist feminists valued the concepts of harmony and synthesis. Eco-feminists argued that women, nature, and the Third World are all victims at the hands of an

exploitative male capitalist technology. Anti-essentialists criticized eco-feminism for its acceptance of the patriarchal equation of women with nature.

Women as the Subject of Feminism

For the most part, feminist theory has assumed that there is some existing identity, understood through the category of women, who not only initiates feminist interests and goals within discourse, but constitutes the subject for whom political representation is pursued. But *politics* and *representation* are controversial terms. On the one hand, *representation* serves as the operative term within a political process that seeks to extend visibility and legitimacy to women as political subjects; on the other hand, representation is the normative function of a language which is said either to reveal or to distort what is assumed to be true about the category of women. For feminist theory, the development of a language that fully or adequately represents women has seemed necessary to foster the political visibility of women.

Recently, this prevailing conception of the relation between feminist theory and politics has come under challenge from within feminist discourse. The very subject of women is no longer understood in stable or abiding terms. There is great deal of material that not only questions the viability of 'the subject' as the ultimate candidate for representation or, indeed, liberation, but there is very little agreement after all on what it is that constitutes, or ought to constitute, the category of women. The domains of political and linguistic 'representation' set out in advance the criterion by which subjects themselves are formed, with the result that representation is extended only to what can be acknowledged as a subject.

Foucault points out that juridical systems of power produce the subjects they subsequently come to represent (4). Juridical notions of power appear to regulate

political life in purely negative terms – that is through the limitation, prohibition, regulation, control and even 'protection' of individuals related to that political structure through the contingent and retractable operation of choice. But the subjects regulated by such structures are, by virtue of being subjected to them, formed, defined, and reproduced in accordance with the requirements of those structures.

Judith Butler points out:

If this analysis is right, then the juridical formation of language and politics that represents women as "the subjects" of feminism is itself a discursive formation and effect of a given version of representational politics. And the feminist subject turns out to be discursively constituted by the very political system that is supposed to facilitate its emancipation. (4)

The political construction of the subject proceeds with certain legitimating and exclusionary aims, and these political operations are effectively concealed and naturalized by a political analysis that takes juridical structures as their foundation. Feminist critique ought to understand how the category of 'women', the subject of feminism is produced and restrained by the very structures of power through which emancipation is sought.

As Butler refers Denise Riley's title suggests, *Am I that Name?* is a question produced by the very possibility of the name's multiple significations. If one is a woman, that is surely not all one is; the term fails to be exhaustive, not because a pregendered 'person' transcends the specific paraphernalia of its gender, but because gender is not always constituted coherently or consistently in different historical contexts, and because gender intersects with racial, class, ethnic, sexual and regional modalities of discursively constituted identities. As a result, it becomes impossible to

separate out 'gender' from the political and cultural intersections in which it is invariably produced and maintained.

Judith Butler puts her suggestion about the subject of feminism:

My suggestion is that the presumed universality and unity of the subject by feminism is effectively undermined by the constraints of the representational discourse in which it functions. Indeed, the premature insistence on a stable subject of feminism, understood as a seamless category of women, inevitably generates multiple refusals to accept the category. These domains of exclusion reveal the coercive and regulatory consequences of that construction, even when the construction has been elaborated for emancipatory purposes. (7)

To trace the political operations produce and conceal what qualifies as the juridical subject of feminism is precisely the task of a *feminist genealogy* of the category of women. In the course of this effort to question 'women' as the subject of feminism, the unproblematic invocation of that category may prove to preclude the possibility of feminism as a representational politics. The identity of the feminist subject ought not to be the foundation of feminist politics, if the formation of the subject takes place within a field of power regularly buried through the assertion of that foundation. Perhaps, paradoxically, 'representation' will be shown to make sense for feminism only when the subject of 'women' is nowhere presumed.

The Compulsory Order of Sex/Gender

By considering different writers' ideas about sex, Butler puts her description in her book, *Gender Trouble*. Although the unproblematic unity of 'women' is often invoked to construct solidarity of identity, a split is introduced in the feminist subject by the distinction between sex and gender. Originally intended to dispute the biology-is-destiny formulation, the distinction between sex and gender serves the argument that:

Whatever biological intractability sex appears to have, gender is culturally constructed: hence, gender is neither the causal result of sex nor as seemingly fixed as sex. The unity of the subject is thus already potentially contested by the distinction that permits of gender as a multiple interpretation of sex. (9-10)

If gender is the cultural meanings that the sexed body assumes, then a gender cannot be said to follow from a sex in any one way. Taken to its logical limit, the sex/gender distinction suggests a radical discontinuity between sexed bodies and culturally constructed genders. The presumption of a binary gender system implicitly retains the belief in a mimetic relation of gender to sex whereby gender mirrors sex or is otherwise restricted by it. In this context, Butler's extract goes as:

When the constructed status of gender is theorized as radically independent of sex, gender itself becomes a free-floating artifice, with the consequence that *Man* and *Masculine* might just as easily signify a female body as a male one, and woman and feminine a male body as easily as a female one. (10)

Butler has presented the ideas about sex and gender from "Variations on Sex and Gender: Beauvoir, Witting, Foucault" an essay of her own. "If the immutable character of sex is contested, perhaps this construct called 'sex' is a culturally constructed as gender, indeed, perhaps it was always already gender, with the consequence that the distinction between sex and gender turns out to be no distinction at all" (10-11). It would make the sense, then, to define gender as the cultural interpretation of sex, if sex itself is a gendered category. Gender ought not to be conceived merely as the cultural inscription of meaning on a pre-given sex; gender must also designate the very apparatus of production whereby the sexes themselves are established.

The Body Politics of Julia Kristeva

Butler presents this section, "The Body Politics of Julia Kristeva", was originally published in *Hypatia*, in the special issue on French feminist philosophy, vol. 3, No. 3, Winter 1989. Kristeva's theory of the semiotic dimension of language at first appears to engage Lacanian premises only to expose their limits and to offer a specifically feminine locus of subversion of the paternal law within language. According to Lacan, the paternal law structures all linguistic signification, termed 'the symbolic,' and so becomes a universal organizing principle of culture itself. This law creates the possibility of meaningful language and, hence, meaningful experience, through the expression of primary libidinal drives, including the radical dependency of the child on the maternal body. Hence, the symbolic becomes possible by repudiating the primary relationship to the maternal body. The 'subject' who emerges as a consequence of this repression becomes a bearer of this repressive law.

Kristeva challenges the Lacanian narrative which assumes cultural meaning requires the repression of that primary relationship to the maternal body. Butler presents Kristeva's ideas about semiotic here:

the "semiotic" is a dimension of language occasioned by that primary maternal body, which not only refutes Lacan's primary premises, but serves as a perpetual source of subversion within the symbolic. For Kristeva, the semiotic expresses that original libidinal multiplicity [. . .]. In effect, poetic language is the recovery of the maternal body within the terms of language, one that has the potential to disrupt subvert, and displace the paternal law. (101-02)

Moreover, Kristeva describes the maternal body as bearing a set of meanings that are prior to culture itself. She thereby safeguards the notion of culture as a paternal structure and delimits maternity as an essentially pre-cultural reality. Her naturalistic descriptions of the maternal body, effectively reify motherhood and precludes an analysis of its cultural construction and variability. She sees the maternal body manifest in poetic speech.

Kristeva, in her work, *Revolution in Poetic Language* (1974), argues for a necessary causal relation between the heterogeneity of drives and the plurivocal possibilities of poetic language. Differing from Lacan, she maintains that poetic language is not predicated upon a repression of primary drives. On the contrary, poetic language, she claims, is the linguistic occasion on which drives break apart the usual, univocal terms of language and reveal an irrepressible heterogeneity of multiple sounds and meanings. Kristeva thereby contests Lacan's equation of the symbolic with all linguistic meaning by asserting that poetic language has its own modality of meaning which does not conform to the requirements of univocal designation. In

"Motherhood according to Bellini", Kristeva suggests that, because the maternal body signifies the loss of coherent and discrete identity, poetic language verges on psychosis. The cathexis of homosexual desire can be achieved according to Kristeva, only through displacements that are sanctioned within the symbolic, such as poetic language or the act of giving birth:

By giving birth, the woman enters into contact with her mother; she becomes, she is her own mother; they are the same continuity differentiating itself. She thus actualizes the homosexual facet of motherhood, through which a woman is simultaneously closer to her instinctual memory, more open to her psychosis, and consequently, more negatory of the social, symbolic bond. (107)

According to Kristeva, the act of giving birth does not successfully reestablish that continuous relation prior to individuation because the infant invariably suffers the prohibition on incest and is separated off as a discrete identity. In the case of the mother's separation from the girl-child, the result is melancholy for both, for the separation is never fully completed.

In this context, Butler presents the ideas from *The History of Sexuality* by Michel Foucault, where he argues that the fictitious category of sex facilitates a reversal of causal relations such that 'sex' is understood to cause the structure and meaning of desire:

the notion of "sex" made it possible to group together, in an artificial unity, anatomical elements, biological functions, conducts, sensations, and pleasures, and it enabled one to make use of this fictitious unity as

a causal principle, an omnipresent meaning: sex was thus able to function as a unique signifier and as a universal signified. (117)

For Foucault, the body is not 'sexed' in any significant sense prior to its determination within a discourse through which it becomes invested with an 'idea' of natural or essential sex. The body gains meaning within discourse only in the context of power relations. Sexuality is an historically specific organization of power, discourse, bodies, and effectivity. Kristeva, safeguarding that law of a biologically necessitated maternity as a subversive operation that pre-exists the paternal law itself aids in the systematic production of its invisibility and, consequently, the illusion of its inevitability.

Bodily Inscriptions, Performative Subversions

Categories of true sex, discrete, gender, and specific sexuality have constituted the stable point of reference for a great deal of feminist theory and politics. These constructs of identity serve as the points epistemic departure from which theory emerges and politics itself is shaped. In the case of feminism, politics is ostensibly shaped to express the interests, the perspectives, of 'women'. But, what circumscribes that site as 'the female body'?

The sex/gender distinction and the category of sex itself appear to presuppose a generalization of the 'body' that preexists the acquisition of its sexed significance. This 'body' often appears to be a passive medium that is signified by an inscription from a cultural source figured as 'external' to that body. In this context, Butler writes:

Any theory of the culturally constructed body, however, ought to question 'the body' as a construct of suspect generality when it is figured as passive and prior to discourse. There are Christian and

Cartesian precedents to such views which, prior to the emergence of vitalistic biologies in the 19th century, understand the 'body' as so much inert matter, [. . .] the fallen state: deception, sin, [. . .] of hell and the eternal feminine. (164)

There are many occasions in both Sartre's and Beauvoir's work where the 'body' is figured as a mute facticity, anticipating some meaning that can be attributed only by a transcendent consciousness, understood in Cartesian terms as radically immaterial.

Wittig suggests that a culturally specific epistemic a priori establishes the naturalness of sex. Butler refers that even within Foucault's essay on the very theme of genealogy; the body is figured as a surface and the scene of a cultural inscription: "the body is the inscribed surface of events." In a sense, for Foucault, as for Nietzsche, cultural values emerge as the result of an inscription on the body, understood as a medium, indeed, a blank page, in order for this inscription to signify, however, that medium must itself be destroyed – that is, fully transvaluated into sublimated domain of values. By maintaining a body prior to its cultural inscription, Foucault appears to assume a materiality prior to signification and form. Because this distinction operates as essential to the task of genealogy as he defines it, the distinction itself is precluded as an object of genealogical investigation. Butler presents the ideas from Mary Douglas's *Purity and Danger* where Douglas remarks that "the body is a model that can stand for any bounded system. Its boundaries can represent any boundaries which are threatened or precarious" (115).

The construction of the 'not-me' as the object establishes the boundaries of the body which are also the first contours of the subject. Kristeva writes:

nausea makes me balk at that milk cream, separates me from the mother and father who proffer it. "I" want none of that element, sign of their desire, "I" do not want to listen, "I" do not assimilate it, "I" expel it. But since the food is not an "other" for "me", who am only in their desire, I expel *myself*, I spit *myself* out, I abject *myself* within the same motion through which "I" claim to establish myself. (qt. in Gender Trouble, 169-70)

According to Butler, acts, gestures, and desire produce the effect of an internal core or substance, but produce this on the surface of the body, through the play of signifying absences that suggest, but never reveal, the organizing principle of identity as a cause. Such acts, gestures, enactments, generally constructed, are performative in the sense that the essence or identity that they otherwise purport to express are fabrications manufactured and sustained through corporeal signs and other discursive means. That the gendered body is performative suggests that it has no ontological status apart from the various acts which constitute its reality. Wittig understands gender as the workings 'sex', where 'sex' is an obligatory injunction for the body to become a cultural sign. Gender is also a norm that can never be fully internalized.

If gender attributes, however, are not expressive but performative, then these attributes effectively constitute the identity they are said to express or reveal. The distinction between expression and performativeness is crucial. If gender attributes and acts, the various ways in which a body shows or produces its cultural signification, are performative, then there is no preexisting identity by which an act or attribute might be measured; there would be no true or false acts of gender. That gender reality is created through sustained social performances means that the very notions of an essential sex and a true or abiding masculinity or femininity are also

constituted as part of the strategy that conceals gender's performative character and the performative possibilities for proliferating gender configurations outside the restricting frames of masculinist domination and compulsory heterosexuality. Thus, genders can be neither true nor false, neither real nor apparent, neither original nor derived. I have taken Western writers because their ideas and concepts helped me to analyze the novel *Blue Mimosa* with the issue of search for female self.

The above mentioned feminist approaches and related informations to them help us to see why female protagonist of Parijat's novel *The Blue Mimosa* shows her disregard to male dominated actions by challenging the established norms and values. The feminist discourse has given us a perspective to observe and analyze the novel along the times of feminist critique. It has enabled us to understand the psyche, intellect and the feelings of female and their urge to bring about significant changes in the society so that woman will shape her an independent self.

III. Search for Female Self

Parijat, an existentialist feminist novelist, in her novel *Blue Mimosa*, presents a female protagonist, Sakambari who is in search for self and autonomy in the patriarchal society. Women, in the Panchayat system, or in whatever political systems were subjected and dominated by the males. It was necessary to break such system and ideology to emancipate women from the corrupted society.

Sakambari, the protagonist of the novel *Blue Mimosa*, engages herself in verbal diatribe with males and shows her disregard to male dominated actions. This sort of doings shows the clear glimpse of debate as well as struggle by Sakambari for the freedom and emancipation from the male dominated world. She does not agree with the chauvinistic norms and values, which are restraints for the autonomous self for her. Defining feminists in terms of their work Maria Mies says, "Feminists are those who dare to break the conspiracy of silence about the oppressive, unequal man-woman relationship and who want to change it" (6). She talks in favour of women autonomy. For her autonomy is the feminist effort to maintain and recreate the innermost subjective human essence in women. The feminists claim to autonomy means a rejection of all tendencies to subsume the women's question and the women's movement under some other apparently more general theme or movement. Feminists are in search of a situation where there is no center, no hierarchy, no official and unified ideology and no formal leadership. There should be dynamism, diversity, as well as the truly humanistic environment.

The sense of difference has been felt by the female because of increasing self-awareness among women, changes in their relations with men, and desires to extend their social roles. Thus, these changes in consciousness led women to search their

selfhood. There are always men when the time comes for in decision making. The participation of female in decision making is taken as valueless. Males make decisions about female's life themselves. The feminists are searching or fighting for their participation in decision making.

In the same case, Sakambari is an ideal girl with different attitudes and behaviours than other girls in the society. She also seeks her participation in decision making about her life. She is an obstinate, enigmatic, jealous and self-emphatic character. She wants to live and die only for her sake on her own way by keeping away from love and marriage. She rejects marriage as for her it is a kind of chain of patriarchal domination upon female. She does not like to be interrupted and praised by others, especially males. Her ideas about war and religion are iconoclastic. She smokes and wears glasses. Her opinion of sex is aberrant. She presents herself boldly to her brother and other male characters as well. Suyog's love affair with her and her unwillingness to submit herself to male desires suggests a revolutionary idea. The protagonist dares to overcome the male chauvinism and establishes her life style of sophistication to give a sense of femininity. She likes the life without the presence of male. She gets everything sufficient in her life. More than this she has freedom and individuality in this life. She can handle her life as she wishes. There lies her autonomous existence. In short, Sakambari is a revolutionary girl who tries to establish her own independent self and consolidate her self identity.

Before entering into the text for interpretation of the novel *Blue Mimosa*, it is relevant to tell something about relational self. Because it is necessary to unravel about the relational self in which how does it work in regard to the female protagonist, Sakambari with other characters in the text. In this regard it is noteworthy to take the ideas from the women writers of the Romantic era, where they conceptualized the self

in a very different way. Dorothy Wordsworth imaged the female self as 'a floating island' in which she tried to show the relationship as circulation by relating the ideas of 'water and air', 'food, safety, shelter' to birds and plants and 'to fertilize some other ground'. By embracing the ideas of self of Romantic women writers, modern feminist psychologist Nancy Chodorow in *The Reproduction of Mothering* called a relational self instead of female self. This self has no firm ego boundaries, and experiences its place in the world as an entanglement in shifting relationship, with family members, friends, lovers and co-workers. By sharing this feminine sense of the self as relational, John Keats described it: 'the poetical character itself . . . is not itself – it has no self – it is everything and nothing –' (letter to Richard Woodhouse, 27 October, 1818).

To develop the political implications of this relational self, one might invoke the French feminist Lucy Irigaray's concept of a 'placental economy', grounded on the image of the pregnant woman who experiences herself always as two-in-one. A relational self does not make economic or political decisions based on the assessment of self interest what contemporary economists call 'rational choice', but rather on what Irigaray calls a practice of 'gift giving' of submerging one's personal desires into a desire for the good of one's family or the whole community. Experiencing their selves as relational rather than autonomous encouraged the women writers of the Romantic period to focus on the ways that self interacts with other people, how it functions in relation to the wider community. Similarly, the female protagonist of the novel *Blue Mimosa*, Sakambari by experiencing her self as relational to focus on the ways that self interacts with her family members and other male and female characters as she always does. Thus, it can be said that her self is not only autonomous but also relational.

The door of the events opens with the reference of the third meeting of narrator with Shivaraj in the bar who is taking Suyogveer to his home towards Bishalnagar. Suyogveer sees a compound encircled by mimosa trees when he reaches there. Shivaraj introduces his sister Sakambari, 24-year-old girl with thin body. She also seems strange in nature. This sort of entrance of the main character is one of the purpose of Parijat to depict her unique character to question to the general expectation of the patriarchal norms and values should be in any female characters of that society. In this very context, about Sakambari, her dresses, way of behave, way of walking, her structures, the narrator vomits:

. . . I saw a woman of twenty six. Unnoticed by my friend, I studied her colouring, her clothes, her height and weight, her expression, the way she walked, everything. In her white sari and sleeveless white blouse, with her long hair loose, she could not be called an ugly woman.

Noticing us she glanced our way and then, without curiosity, walked towards the well. (1)

At this point Parijat has presented her character in a different way that is a unique manner, which is opposite to traditional norms and values. Her clothing, colouring, height, weight, expression and ways of behave has been presented in a unique form from the beginning part of the novel *Blue Mimosa*. It seems that by seeing Sakambari's own way of dealing, Suyogveer is in confused. In our traditional manner, wearing a white sari and blouse and keep hair loose has been taken as not good. Because this type of wearing is used by a widow in the society which is taken in negative way, in the so-called male-rooted society.

Here, Parijat has presented the female protagonist in the bold and boyish manner where she does not feel shame like a traditional woman. She presents her as

boy and does what a boy can do, whatever, whenever and wherever the matter is. It does not affect her. She likes to live her life in her own style. She wants to create her own 'self'. She presents her in this manner and says, "My name is Sakambari" (3). This expression gives the clear picture of 'boyish' and 'bold' behavior of Sakambari which helps to create her an independent self and consolidates her self identity by challenging the preexisted social rule and regulations that have kept women under domination and prejudices for a long time. Suyogveer does not keep him silent while Sakambari abruptly appears nearby. By becoming startled, he speaks:

"My name is Sakambari." Her voice burst in on us like a bullet. Startled, I turned toward the door and saw a woman of twenty-four. She was about five-feet-three, fair, with very large breasts on an extremely thin body. She wore gold-rimmed glasses on deep-set sparkling black eyes. Her hair was cut very close to her head, in the style of ancient Hebrew soldiers, and her small, white lobes wore earrings of black stones. (3)

From the above expression, here, Parijat tries to create a world of life style from the side of female with the help of the female protagonist, Sakambari in the novel *Blue Mimosa*. We can see here, Sakambari's way of wearing ornaments, glasses on deep-set, her style of cutting hair very close to her head that means very short-cut hair like a boy's style and style of wearing earrings are totally different. This message shows that Sakambari's unique manner and extraordinary behaviours which are very opposite to traditional lifestyle, norms and values. These all clarify that Sakambari does not like to be subjected and dominated by the patriarchal society rather she wants to create and establish her own lifestyle of sophistication to give a sense of femininity. In short, Sakambari presents herself as a revolutionary girl by wearing distinct dresses and

ornaments which are supposed to be unsuited to the preexisted society. So, she creates her own different self identity equals to males.

Parijat has been able to create that sort of atmosphere in the novel *Blue Mimosa* where the male characters such as Shivaraj and Suyogveer have become helpless and sublimated. When Sakambari enters into the room where they are sitting. At this point by seeing her extraordinary looks and way of behave, Parijat makes Suyog to speak:

She came into the room. The atmosphere froze. I wanted to laugh in turn at her name, her behaviour, her looks, but my laughter also froze. In that atmosphere I could not laugh at all, I could not do anything. I saw quite clearly that my friend was embarrassed. He blushed, but tried to cover his embarrassment by saying, "This is my middle sister. She passed her I.A. exams in the first division, but now she stays at home because her health is poor." He did not repeat her name and I had already forgotten it. I looked up when she said "Namaste" and [. . .]. Taking two cigarettes from the package lying on the marble table, she strode toward the door. (3-4)

When we observe and consider the above mentioned extract from the male characters, we can say that the extraordinary behaviours, looks and lifestyle of the female protagonist, Sakambari, are dominant and superior to the males. It can be proved that when she enters into the room where Shivaraj and Suyogveer are sitting that they became startled by seeing her strangeness. Even the atmosphere froze as Suyogveer says. It means they are afraid of and cannot speak too by her look. She does not feel shame to smoke towards her brother and other male characters as well. She does

whatever she likes and speaks whatever she wants. What other people say that does not affect her.

It is noteworthy to indicate and give short glance on the contrasts between Sakambari and Mujura. In this way, it can be understood through this expression:

Now I've done it! I've got to go. Bari won't be asleep. If she finds out about this, she'll explode. [. . .]. She's asleep by now. Bari does not get to sleep until close to midnight. Besides, it's not Mujura's nature to oppose anyone. She doesn't complain if I drink. But Bari doesn't care what people think; she gets angry. And that makes me care for her even more. (10)

From the above expression by Shivaraj, Parijat shows the contrasts between Sakambari and Mujura, where Mujura is presented as a traditional girl who does not oppose anyone, she does not complain if Shivaraj drinks. She lowers her head when speaking with male characters. On the other hand, Sakambari does just opposite to Mujura. She does not care what people think; she gets angry when her brother drinks. It means she overlaps the male power as Shivaraj represents. All these clues show that Sakambari plays the important 'boyish role' in the novel to control male characters. Her role seems more dominant and superior to male character to show her separate autonomous self towards the male-rooted society. "She was not the kind of woman who immediately feels helpless" (12). She is a bold woman who does not feel any hesitation to speak with anyone.

Sakambari is that sort of bold and courageous lady, who can make to feel serious and startled Suyogveer, an ex-army and her brother Shivaraj too. She speaks

as if she is commanding a soldier or someone else without any hesitation. This kind of way of behave or way of talking makes Suyogveer to call her a bold woman:

What a bold woman. She must be to call her brother Shiva. When I paid no attention to her words, she spoke again. "Didn't you hear me?" Then, pretending to be surprised, I said, "No I was just wondering where these orchids that are hanging on the wall come from. I haven't seen them anywhere else around here." (12-13)

How far Sakambari is bold and strict lady, it is clarified through the above extract, and gives that sort of sense of behave of Sakambari.

Parijat has uniquely presented the female protagonist as if she has the capacity of resistance. Sakambari as a protagonist who resists and gives the bitter and short cut answers to the questions of male characters. In this context the narration is relevant from the side of Suyogveer has been extracted here:

. . . I asked, "If the bees can't settle here, what's the use of this flower?" [. . .]. But she didn't treat it as commonplace. Blowing the cigarette smoke from her mouth, she said, "The flower won't be spoiled; it is secure." (14)

It is the metaphoric description of life of Sakambari who compares her with a mimosa flower and Suyogveer with a bumblebee. It is said that mimosa flower falls with a single touch or kiss of a bumblebee in metaphoric sense that is the relationship between Bari and Suyogveer. Whatever it is does not affect in Bari's personality. She wants not to settle the bees on the flower because it buds for itself and opens for itself. It falls for only for itself. It falls by its own will. This is the encounter of Bari with the male characters. By revealing Bari's philosophy about life, Parijat has attempted to

create her own norms and values about life distinct from the traditional norms.

Sakambari said:

"If a flower buds for itself and opens for itself and, as if accepting some compulsion, falls whether it fights the black-bee or not, then why should it fall suffering the sting of the black-bee? It falls only for itself. It falls by its own will." (14)

The expression of Bari gives the clear cut sense of her philosophy about life.

Metaphorically Sakambari says that she does not need any help from male and she is herself lonely sufficient for living. She can live her life without the presence of a male partner who has been doing suppression and domination upon female for a long time. In nutshell, she does not like to be interrupted by especially males. She wants to live and die only for her sake on her own way. This type of philosophy of life helps her to enhance a process to create an autonomous self-hood for her and women in general. Bari describes about the flower as a life-killing will and it can fade and fall by its own will which is meaningful and truth in its own position. This kind of indirect expression is her effort to define the cultural, social and intellectual space of the life by reconstructing a new kind of social norm.

Not only that even in the context of love too, Bari defines that one can live a complete life without being in mutual love. "It is love, that's all, love. And there is no inevitability about love either or about suffering in love. It is possible to live out one's life alone . . . alone" (15). So her concept of love, life, marriage etc. all are in a kind of static and challenging form to the contemporary social system, rules and regulations etc. Parijat is trying to question upon the social and cultural definition of life, love and death to create her intellectual space. In every step she is focusing in the life style of Sakambari who wants to fight with the social system of life in the contemporary

society. In another words, through this example Parijat is trying to construct her cultural, social and intellectual space within the existing norms of the society in rebellious form.

The manner of talking of Bari is like a boy does which is taken as normal in the society whatever he does normal in the society whatever he does behave with the people. Similarly, she does not hesitate to speak. She just says whatever comes into her head. She does not care how much she embarrasses someone. In this context the narrator said:

I thought, she just says whatever comes into her head. She does not care how much she embarrasses someone. She is really an outspoken woman. How easily she calls me first 'soldier' and then 'old man'. I think she even embarrasses her brother a bit. (17)

In this way, Bari is presenting her 'boyish' behaviour. She does not discriminate whether man or woman, whatever it is. She does equal behave to all equally. In every manner of her activities, we can see 'boyish' performative role which seems very superior and dominant towards the male characters that makes them to be helpless and cool in front of the female character especially Bari. So Bari plays a dominant performative role with her manner of burst talking in the novel *Blue Mimosa*.

Sakambari not only challenges to the social norms and values but she also hates and questions to the 'Present Giving and Receiving' system of the society which is under the male rule and regulations. The following extract is relevant and Shivaraj says, "The day after tomorrow is Bari's birthday. You're invited. Please don't bring anything like a present when you come. Bari doesn't accept that sort of thing. She'd be likely to throw it back in your face" (22).

The concept of Bari about the cultural values and norms has been presented by Parijat in different way by challenging to the preexisting system of the society. Parijat questions even to the present giving and receiving system of the society during that period. When Suyogveer is invited for the birthday party of Bari, Shivaraj requests not to bring any kind of presents because Bari hates it and she may throw it back to his face. She says that it is the traditional cultural concept related to patriarchy or created by it. It is another example of Bari's revolutionary as well as unique behaves through which Parijat attacks over the so-called civilized norms of the society.

On the occasions of the celebration of her birthday party, Bari puts question marks in regard to wishing for living which has been traditionally followed that she does not like to accept. It is noteworthy to understand through this expression:

Sakambari stood at the side of the couch lighting a cigarette. Opening a bottle, Shivaraj said, "Long live Bari. May her birthday come often?" "May Bari grow old! That is Shiva's wish", cried Bari. I felt her mockery. Shiva objected. "That doesn't mean 'grow old,' it means 'live for many yours'." (26)

In the same way, when there is the discussion of old age, Bari views that there is no any meaning of being old and she wishes to die in time. This means she objects Shiva's wishes for her long living. Her interpretation of living and dying is also based upon her own philosophy. By rejecting her brother Shiva's wishes, in return she says, "What's the use of living? Why live to be old? Shiva, you don't know how to bless; you should say, 'Die in time.' What is there that is really worth living for?" (26) At this point Parijat is creating her own space in the society about the meaning of living, being old and dying, being in different than that of the societal concept. According to her there is no any effect in living and dying as the society takes it. Bari would like to

be defined as whatever other say it does not affect to her. This shows Bari's resistance towards male norms and values that helps her to be different from others. To be different is to be a rebellious. That is why it is a kind of tool which she uses it as a weapon to fight for emancipation and autonomous self.

When the subject matter of war comes Parijat defines it as a crime. For whatever reason one may define the war as meaningful and significant but over all it is a crime. Parijat's this concept can be understood through Bari's expression:

"War is a crime, Shiva. The war we fight in someone's name, under someone's orders, is a crime committed by one individual against another. Every killer ought to write his crime on his forehead. It isn't always apparent on the surface." (27)

So Parijat is trying to create her own norm in terms of war too. People might have shown their glorious achievement through war. But Parijat shows her ant-war concept. She says that it is a kind of crime, for whatever reason we might fight. It is useless.

Parijat is intending to depict the enigmatic character of Sakambari here. She does not look happy in regard to be called by her pet name although most women are pleased and happy to be called by their pet name, because to be called by women with pet name is a traditional way of male system. It has been a kind of chain to sublimate and dominate women which keeps women in passive position and commodifies them as things for satisfaction of male desires. The way of calling with pet name, women have been kept under the shadow of silence, passivity by so-called civilized males. They are deprived of their own self identity, freedom and rights from the primitive era. It has been killing the intellectual capacities of women for a long time due to their

unawareness in thinking and doing. So it seems that Bari is not in favour of pet name.

This can be understood through this expression of Suyogveer:

There was no change in Bari. It was difficult to see the look in her eyes behind the glasses sparkling from the electric light. Most women are pleased and happy to be called by their pet name, but Bari did not look as if she were. Casually, she said, "you may call me whatever you like." (27)

In this regard, because of the concept of Parijat on pet name, she has tried to construct her own norm in the favour of women by questioning to the contemporary societal system. So Bari is presented in this manner who does not like to be called by her pet name, because it has been used by the so-called intellectual males to keep women under the shadow of submissive position. It seems that she is guided by her own-truth to create her self identity.

Parijat, in this sixth part of the novel has been intending to depict the unnatural presentation of Bari. She has been presented as an odd character in her concept and appearance. She always plays with cigarette and when Suyogveer says that she will be suffered from cancer, one of the very dangerous diseases of contemporary period, she welcomes it easily without any kind of seriousness. Her unique characteristic feature can be seen with her expression, "you'll get cancer this way Bari", and she always answered, "It will be welcome" (32). So it seems that Parijat's one of the main characters has been presenting here in the form of guided by her own-truth. It is her another effort to create the female self of Bari.

The seventh part of the novel starts with the reference of Suyogveer's waiting to Shivaraj being in Shiva's living-room. At that time Suyogveer sees Bari, living flat

on her back on the green grass. Bari comes near to him when she sees to Suyog and says that she was on her way to the temple with her mother. Suyog asks her if she believes in God. During that time Bari's definition of God, temple and her belief is also different than that of the contemporary society's concept. Parijat wants to define god and its existence through her own way. She is indifferent about the existence of god. And at the same time, she does not have a good opinion of man either. She believes on "idea god" rather than the "god". Parijat's concept of God can be understood through this sort of definition of God:

"I asked her, "Do you believe in god and worship, Bari?" "I do and I don't." [. . .]. It's only a stone. You can commit any crime in front of it and it won't tell anyone. That's why I do believe. And in time of need you can shake it by the shoulders and it won't say anything. That's why I don't believe [. . .]. Don't say 'god,' say 'the idea of god'. It's only a concept." (35-36)

In this manner, Bari's dual concept on the existence of god is very important key point of Parijat to define the concept of god. The contemporary social concept of the existence of god is to pray any stone statue or temple as blindly. But Parijat focuses to the 'idea god' rather than the statue god. She does not mean that one should completely reject the concept of god. But the way of regarding god in only the form of stone-god or temple-god is being questioned by her. It is a kind of message to the society that one should not blindly be the priest of stone-god rather it should be taken in terms of our day to day experience. One should follow the 'idea god' to make the life balanced in the society rather than blindly following the idea of praying only stone-god because Parijat sees the male image in the stone-god or temple-god which has been becoming an obstacle for the emancipation of women for a long time. The

stone-god can not wash our every crime. We should do good in our life which includes the concept of the 'idea-god'. The real existence of god lies in our idea-god concept. So Parijat tries to question to the blind acceptance of the existence of god by forming her own norms in terms of the existence of god which is different and challenging concept towards the preexisted social norms and values.

Parijat, in regard to the sins done by human beings, says that man should have the power of understanding about the god because washing away one's sins before the idea of god is completely meaningless. It is just foolishness. At this point Sakambari says:

"Washing away one's sins before the idea of god is completely meaningless. It's just foolishness. . . But please don't give my ideas such importance. . . It is better to wash away one's crimes before men. One can lighten them a little and find peace. Man has the power of understanding, that's all." (38)

Why people pray by bowing to the lifeless statue when they have done sins and crimes with human beings? Here, Parijat raises the question mark upon it. It is god who does not understand as a lifeless statue about the feelings of human beings. What is right and wrong it can not differ. That is why Parijat says that it is better to wash one's sins and crimes before men not before that lifeless statue because man has the power of understanding. So, Parijat is creating the spectrum of society according to the view of Sakambari which is completely distinct than the concept of the contemporary society. This gives the glimpse of resistance or difference of Bari with the previous male concept rooted in the society.

In regard to the sense of alienation, Parijat is trying to flash out which Suyogveer feels as a new experience that had never happened in his life as he said. It is the matter, that is, Bari is going to leave for Terai tomorrow. He said:

"Bari won't be here after tomorrow." That was enough to make me feel as if I were flung by a forceful blow on to a vast plain of reality, where dreams, fantasies, hypocrisy, did not exist, only reality. I felt like an empty vessel, like a bottle from which the liquid is escaping, unable to collect it again. Like a tree standing alone in the earth, Paralyzed, unable to follow the cranes flying from its branches. (41-42)

We can understand that Bari is that kind of character whose help or accompaniment is being needed to Suyogveer and Shivaraj, whatever her behavior is and whatever she embarrasses them. That is why, all clues show that Bari is a kind of energy and force what she provides them all the time. So, Bari presents herself as a guardian especially among the male characters.

The 9th part starts with Suyogveer's efforts of forgetting to Bari by touching the insect-killing orchids after the departure of Bari towards Terai. After a month Bari returns. She appears with her long hair. It had grown long enough to cover her ears and neck. Suyog requests her to let it be long. But Bari behaves oppositely. The expression is as Suyogveer vomits:

I like long hair on women, so one day I said to her, "Bari, long hair really suits you. You should let it grow." When I went there three days later, she was waiting with an inch of hair. She was like a widow who had come from hardware with a shaven head or a madwoman who had just cut her hair. (48)

It is Bari's way of behave. Her behave of cutting long hair into short, her dressing, wearing glasses, smoking cigarettes, manner of speaking, all of these show the performative behaviours and manners of Sakambari. These activities are so distinct and extraordinary to the male characters and others. Because Suyogveer represents the patriarchy who likes only traditionally accepted norms and values, where Bari's performative activities to him seem odd and unacceptable. That's why Bari's way of living is distinct than the others. She is living for herself and want to do according to her own will rather than other's wish. Through this example too Parijat is focusing to give the new way of life in context of Bari.

Similarly, when there is the reference of Sanu's elopement, Shivaraj feels being insulted for some days in the society because his sister did not follow the social rule of marriage. Mujura and his mother resolve on compromise. Mujura says that if they care for each other no one can do anything about it. They will be able to settle down and build a life. Sanu was not a girl of bad character. But Bari does not take much interest on it and simply reacts and forgets it soon. When Shivaraj asked Bari, she merely said, "An impulsive girl. What a hurry she was in to get married" (49). It is another example of Bari who is not more serious and strict-follower of the social rules and regulations. Bari rejects marriage and for her it is a kind of chain of patriarchal domination upon female. So, after all Bari fights with the social norms all the time to create her own 'female self' in the society.

In the 11th, 12th and 13th chapters the narrator turns towards his history. He remembers his past in Kachin Village of Makhring in Burma, where he has committed three serious crimes during the Second World War. They are raping a Chin girl, head-hunter's daughter, his remembrance of orchids that bloom in the Burmese forest in relation to the Matinchi whose virginity has been used by him and raping a Kachin

girl, a buffalo-herding girl. These all activities show the hidden nature of so-called civilized and intellectual men. If we talk about the nature of man which has been accepted as so-called civilized. Whatever a man does whether barbaric or criminal that is taken as usual by the society on the contrary, when a woman does something little wrong that is not acceptable. Thus, Suyogveer is presented as a representation of patriarchy according to Parijat. So he presents his activities that are not dissimilar from any notorious criminal. His barbarism causes him to commit lots of murdering and rape that proves him as a rude in the human personality in the society. He shows his beast nature. He rapes and enjoys with Kachin girl's body and finally she dies due to his barbarous hands. He expresses his actions in this way:

I began to play with her. All through the night I toiled with the naked body of a woman. I played with every part of her, enjoyed every pleasure. If I were an animal I would have been satisfied, but my human instincts were not satisfied I gave her water to try to bring her to consciousness, but crushed by a gun and a man's passion, she did not move. It did not seem as if I had been playing with her body for a long time. I scratched her naked breasts with my savage nails until they bled. I bit her lips, her cheeks, her neck until they bled. (55-56)

On this point, Parijat tries to reflect here the inhumanistic nature of men with the help of Suyogveer's expression which is superficially visible among all. Whatever it is bad from the side of males which is taken as usual, where women have been victimized and commodified due to their activities. That's why Parijat objects and challenges them by creating her own norms in the favour of women. By comparing Sakambari with that of the victimized chin girl, Parijat is saying that Sakambari is strict, bold and boyish character who always resists with male characters where as chin girl can not resist

with males. So she is being raped and died from the hands of male. She is unable to show her heroic role but Bari is able to show her superiority upon male characters.

Parijat presents Shivaraj as a member of the patriarchal society who wants to create the good image in the society by marrying Bari with an educated and cultivated man of the society. But Bari rejects and challenges his interest where she takes marriage as a chain of domination by males upon females. His interest can be clear through this expression:

In our talk that day, Shiva said that he was going to keep Bari at home this year. Then he would send her to college since she was so bright.

After she had passed her B.A. he would think of marrying her. He was looking for someone who was educated and very cultivated. (73)

Shivaraj is wishing to marry with an educated and very cultivated man and wants to give the continuation to the contemporary social norms. But Bari breaks the social male rules and norms by keeping away her from love and marriage because she wants to live and die only for her sake on her own way to create her autonomous and independent self.

The fifteenth part is the climax part of the novel *Blue Mimosa*. During this period, Bari, to whom Suyogveer had kissed her soft lips, holding of her white neck where she didn't move even an inch. Bari does not react rather she remains silent. To be remain silent is a kind of opposition from her side. She indirectly rejects the unacceptable activity which has been unexpectedly done by Suyogveer upon her. That has made her strong to be rebellious because if there is no any suppressive activity done upon someone who can't be rebellious and can't resist. He or she can be only

passive by following and accepting anything happens upon her or him. When Bari remains as silent that challenges Suyogveer where he afraid of Bari due to his activity.

Bari falls sick day by day but does not leave eating. This shows that Bari plays the silent performative role being rebellious towards male. This silent behaviour makes startled to Suyogveer and other characters as well. Suyogveer remembers Bari's concept of life in this context that "why a flower should fall suffering the sting of the black-bee. It falls only for itself. It falls by its own will" (88-89). At the same time, Parijat is trying to reflect the concept of life of Bari who never wants to be sublimated by males. Rather she wants to live and die for her individual sake, that carries her at the point of departure of life for death which becomes helpful to shape her independent and autonomous self that can make her distinct from others. Here Parijat is trying to create the static new kind of status by taking the base of Bari's life and her philosophy about life.

To be remained unmarried is unacceptable according to the so-called civilized male dominated social norms and values. It is a kind of old and traditional blind concept which has been followed by all the members of the society to keep women under the power and domination of males. It has been taken as a means to commodify women to fulfill their desires since the primitive era of human civilization. Thus, it is Bari, the protagonist of the novel *Blue Mimosa* who breaks and rejects this type of the so-called chauvinistic societal norms and rules. Instead, she creates her own norms and values in order to establish her own 'female self' which is independent and autonomous in search of identity of women in general.

It has been described that about the 'sickness, silence and boldness' of the protagonist, Sakambari here. In regard to Bari's boldness and boyish behaviour,

Suyogveer tries to say something by questioning upon her. This can be understood through this extract:

I thought, I am weak and cowardly, but Bari is not. What is the matter with her that she is keeping silent this way? Has no one asked her? Isn't she bursting to talk? Why isn't she reacting? Her character never suggested this behaviour. (91)

With the help of this expression, Parijat has tried to reveal the inner-conflict and silent-struggle without speaking to oppose the suppressive and oppressive activities by males upon female which has been done upon her by Suyogveer. She tries to defend this type of criminal activity by remaining silent, which is very dangerous one for others too. Because she wants to be different by showing her strange behaviour and way of living in dominant performative roles as well as in manner. It reflects her extraordinary and boyish behaviour that helps to search her individual governed-self in the society.

At the last stage, in regard to the sickness of Bari, Suyogveer regards himself as a victim of his emotion for whatever he did with Sakambari. Suyog sees the fallen Blue Mimosa when he reaches to Bari's house. When he reaches to the front door Shiva's cook informs that Bari had died. This news shocks him badly. Here fallen blue mimosa symbolizes the death of Sakambari whatever the cause of fall of a flower either touch of a bumblebee or anything else that does not affect. It falls only for itself. It falls by its own will. Similar events have been occurred in Bari's life. She is a bold character who lived for herself and died for herself by questioning to the privileged social norms. It would be insignificant to say that Bari died due to Suyog's single kiss. Parijat wants to give the autonomy in the life style of Bari whether she is loved by Suyog or not is not her concern. If any woman dies with a single kiss of a

man there would be the piles of the dead body of women in this world in every minute. So Parijat does not show that Bari was died with Suyog's single kiss. Rather Bari is a heroine of her novel who struggled to challenge the social norms and died according to her will as she used to wish. At this point Parijat has created new kind of space by challenging to the social norms of contemporary society mainly through the revolutionary character Sakambari.

It has been narrated that the death of Bari happened due to the single kiss of Suyogveer but it is not that reality as it is said. To make smooth this speculation Parijat had tried to clarify through this extract:

". . . For one moment I could not think at all. My mind was completely empty. As I returned to normal my first thought was that Sakambari no longer existed in this world - a frightening truth, Sakambari's death had come - a hard reality, that inert presence of limitless misery which could not be removed, which no amount of ornaments could decorate, which idealistic sentiments could not conceal. Bari's death was a certainty, a fact." (97)

There have been made so many speculations regarding the death of Bari. Whatever the matter is that does not affect. The reality is that she died according to her will as she used to wish. Death is a bitter reality, a certainty and a fact. No one can conceal and deceive death. We can prove and understand from the above mentioned extract. Instead of bowing down she chooses death. She takes death as the world of 'light and freedom' easily because her submission to male is a barrier to create her independent self in the patriarchal society in the favour of women.

It could be understood that Suyog's single kiss did not affect her life and death because she has been remained unmarried and childless by rejecting marriage where she has run her motion of life to death. Without being sublimated and dominated by male wish and desires. Rather she has presented her 'like a boy' which proves her bold, boyish and unique behaviours. So, Parijat has presented Bari as a rebellious warrior, where Suyogveer, Shivaraj and other characters are in victimized form. Bari is that sort of individual who has successfully created her intellectual and social norms in the novel *Blue Mimosa*. It is not only Bari but as a whole Parijat's project is to create her own social and intellectual norms and concept. In nutshell, Parijat has uniquely constructed her own distinct norms by challenging to the so-called fittedness of social norms of contemporary time. She has crossed the attitudinal barriers of social norms with her bold and unique characters.

Thus, it can be said that through the image of the bold, strict and courageous lady protagonist, Sakambari who by challenging and disregarding male norms and dominated actions, she has been able to create her distinct autonomous and independent self. Lastly Parijat, the novelist, is advocating the female self in general in the novel *Blue Mimosa*.

IV. Conclusion

Though the novel has been analyzed and interpreted in different perspectives, but this research analyzes how the protagonist of the novel *Blue Mimosa* attempts to free herself from patriarchal boundaries by establishing her self and autonomy.

The original background of this novel is the Panchayat period. Women were dominated and oppressed by the patriarchal society. Thus, Parijat has written this novel to emancipate women from the discriminatory social rules and regulations. The protagonist, Sakambari is fighting for women's freedom and selfhood.

According to the social rules and regulations, women should only involve them in the household works. It was restricted for women to involve in outward and extra activities. Sakambari has rebelled against the conservative male ideology. This novel is an attempt to introduce women's entity with their name with males to introduce them. The woman protagonist Sakambari involves herself in smoking and debating as a revolt against patriarchal society for the emancipation and selfhood of women.

Parijat in this novel seems to be against women's dependence on men because such dependence defeats the very purpose of meaningful life. Sakambari rejects any marriage proposal, as marriage for her is a bondage for women's life. Sakambari's play with smoke, wearing glasses, sitting on the ground of an open garden surrounded by mimosa trees are her boyish qualities which prove that she is not less in any sector than males.

Sakambari raises the feminist voice for freedom from male domination. She has shown masculine qualities to show equality among all. She is so determined in her aim that she never surrenders before males. She rejects the decision made by Shivaraj

and Suyogveer seeking her participation in decision making. So they cannot force her to follow their decision directly. Sakambari's death becomes a great shock in Shiva's and Suyog's life whose accompaniment she was. After her death they felt loneliness and frustration. This shows the necessity of women in the society in regard to equality in different sectors. Thus, instead of following the patriarchal rules and regulations living there, she struggles further to get freedom and self. Parijat is a woman with full understanding of women's status and their power in society. So, Parijat herself can be taken as a feminist writer. That is why her portrayal of Sakambari in the novel *Blue Mimosa* correlates with her ideas of the female as being equal in society.

Thus, we can conclude that Parijat has demonstrated Sakambari as a conscious, bold, courageous and rebellious woman who fights for women's rights against patriarchy. Her courageous and bold behaviour help her to challenge the patriarchal society and get victory over it in order to attain the autonomous and independent self.

Works Cited

- Acharya, Aparajita. "Parijat in *Shreerish Ko Phool*". *The Kathmandu Post*. Jan. 6, 2008:5.
- Adams, Hazard. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. Ed. Hazard Adams. New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Atam, Netra and Krishna Hari Baral. *Upanyas Siddhanth Ra Nepali Upanyas*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 2056.
- Babbit, Irving. "Romantic Melancholy." Adams 775-76.
- Beauvoir, Simone de. "The Second Sex." Adams 993-1000.
- Butler, Judith. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. Ed. Linda J. Nicholson. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Chapagain, Ninu and Khagendra Sangraula. *Parijat Smirti Grantha*. Kathmandu: Parijat Smirti Kendra, 2051.
- Gautam, Shreedhar. "Parijat and Blue Mimosa." *The Kathmandu Post*. Feb. 17, 2005:4.
- Hutt, Michael James. *Nepali: A National Language and its Literature*. New Delhi: Sterling Publishers, 1998. 214-15.
- Kreidl, Ingrid. "Parijat-A Writer of the People". *Parijat Smirti Grantha*. Kathmandu: Parijat Smirti Kendra, 1994.
- Kristeva, Julia. "From One Identity to Another." Adams 1168.
- Lacan, Jacques. "The Mirror Stage as Formative of the Function of the I as Revealed in Psychoanalytic Experience." Adams 898.
- Lamichhane, Shankar: Preface. *Shirishko Phool*. By Parijat. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 1965.

- Mies, Maria. *Patriarchy and Accumulation on a World Scale: Women in International Division of Labour*. London: Zed Books Ltd., 1986.
- Parijat. *Shirishko Phool*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 1965.
- Pradhan, Kumar. *A History of Nepali Literature*. New Delhi: Sahitya Academy, 1984.
- Roe, Nicholas. *Romanticism*. Ed. Roe. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Sharma, RD Yuyutsu. "Sixty-Sixth Page of Blue Mimosa." *The Kathmandu Post*. Feb. 09, 2003:4.
- Showalter, Elaine. "Feminist Criticism in the Wilderness." *The New Feminist Criticism*. Ed. Showalter. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985. 252.
- Stovling, Britta. "The Influence of Humanity in Blue Mimosa." *Parijat Smirti Grantha*. Kathmandu: Parijat Smirti Kendra, 1994.
- Subedi, Abhi. *Nepali Literature: Background and History*. Kathmandu: Sajha Prakashan, 1978. 120-21.
- Tolan, Fiona. "Feminisms." *Literary Theory and Criticism*. Ed. Patricia Waugh. US: Oxford University Press, 2006. 322-37.
- Varya, Tanka Vilas, Trans. *Blue Mimosa*. By Parijat. Kathmandu: Joshi Printing Press, 1972.
- Wollstone Craft, Mary. "A Vindication of the Rights of Women." Adams 394-99.
- Zeidenstein, Sondra. "Introduction." *Blue Mimosa*. Trans. Tank Vilas Varya. Kathmandu: Joshi Printing Press, 1972.