

Narrative in *Kumari Shova*

Vijay Malla maintains the distance between perception and narration in order to deal with controversial issue as superstition and exposes the prejudices of the characters from different ethnicities realistically without any authorial judgment.

Kumari Shova is the result of living a life that focalizer seems unable to acclimatize him. The outcome is the discernable evolution of cynicism, apathy and misanthropic tendencies. The focalizer's prejudice towards women's psychology in Vijay Malla's *Kumari Shova* is presented as the stereotypical image of women's psychology. The focalizer misrepresents the women's psychology as the other because of his prejudice against them and thereby the readers should apply the counterfocalization by analyzing the silences, gaps, ironic gestures as well as the sentiments of the focalized.

In *Kumari Shova*, moreover, irony functions as a means of discursive strategy that comprises the social and political scenario. Discursive communities make irony possible in interpreting –whether arising from the ironist's intension or from the rubbing together of the apparently said with the implied unsaid meaning. The social circumstances of irony make its politics inevitable in the mix of the said meaning with the unsaid one. Hence, the politics of irony is its discursive presence in the aesthetic, social, ethical, cultural, religious, economic, ideological and historical aspects of its contexts of use and interpretation. The focalizer portrays himself as an idealist who knows everything but in reality he does not. Irony in its simplest semantics can be defined as, in words of Samuel Johnson, " a mode of speech of which the meaning is contrary to the word" (qtd. in Enright 5). Malla's political irony emerges from the dialectical tension between the outward presentation of the characters as true revolutionist with better insight of social mobility and their inner reality, which is dark and full of ignorance.

Vijay Malla's *Kumari Shova* is set in Kathmandu. After its publication, it has attracted numerous critical responses. Vijay Malla's novel manages to explore every contemporary issues--fundamentalism and women's psychology with intimacy and insight. Conflict of religion has been analyzed from the viewpoint of male focalizer. Therefore, the present research analyzes the silences, gaps, ironic gesture as well as the ideology of the focalized and biased representation of the women's psychology.

In the novel, the author uses a variety of narrative techniques in order to convey his own impressions of the society with local customs and prejudices. So, he maintains the distance between the author and the narrator as well as characters through a limited heterodiegetic narrator and the focalizer who misrepresents the women's psychology because of his prejudice against them. Malla's novel documents the collapse of one kind of civility. The author narrates each of the characters through this narrative technique and disentangles prejudice and predisposition from those of his characters and thereby evaluates dramatically in relation to one another within their own frame. In this regard, Mieke Bal, one of the most famous narratologists defines focalization in terms of the relation of focalizer and focalized or the subject and the object of the focalization: "The subject of focalization, the focalizer is the point from which the elements are viewed that point can lie with a character, that character has advantage over other characters" (146). Malla has created quickly and privately motivated characters. He attempts to project the effects of superstitious beliefs in the focalizer.

Counterfocalization is essential for analyzing the effect of superstitious beliefs in the perceptions of the focalizer in Vijay Malla's *Kumari Shova*. It is difficult to distinguish the agent who speaks and the agent who perceives when Kumari Shova and her conflicting thoughts are presented, but the critical reading can easily

distinguish, as Genette claims, “[F]ocalizing and narrating which remain distinct even in ‘first person’ narrative, i.e., even when the two instances are taken up by the same person”(194). Focalization is a point of view from which story is narrated and the narration is only the story telling.

In *Kumari Shova*, the distinction between narrator, an agent who speaks and focalizer, the agent who perceives is obvious because the distinction is easily noticeable in third person narration. In this respect, critic Govinda Bhattari believes that the narrator of this novel is heterodiegetic who is not a character, but he is limited and can tell the story from his own perspective: “All these things were still imbedded in his memory, and these days they now began to come to mind repeatedly. The events that had occurred from his childhood on appeared before him one by one” (4). This narrative mode of *Kumari Shova* traces that the narrator is the centre of narration as well as the center of perception. But the reader cannot claim that the perception, prejudice, ideology and ignorance of focalizer is the author’s perception. Likewise, the same agent in *Kumari Shova* takes up the narrating and focalizing:

She had not known that one day she would have to leave the Kumari house and return to her own one. At first she was not aware of the fact that her right to be the Goddess Kumari was limited to a certain time only. She didn’t know that this right ended once disease; wounds, flaws, or menstruation appeared. It was amazing that she had not suffered any wounds in her childhood or been plagued by any dread diseases. (Malla 5)

As the center of narration, he presents from outside the fictional world but as the center of perception, he enters the fictional world and focalizes what he perceives.

There is the gap between the process of narrating and focalizing so a reader should analyze that gap. In addition, Mieke Bal illustrates the relationship between focalizer as subject and the focalized as the object of the focalization. The definition

of focalization refers to the relationship, each pole of the relationship, the subject and the object of focalization, must be studied separately: “The subject of focalization, the focalizer is the point from which the elements are viewed” (146). Bal views that the perceiver is the focalizer and who or which the focalizer perceives are focalized. Therefore, the reader should be critical whether the focalizer gives reliable image or not.

The focalizer’s horizon of understanding, attitude, ideology, gender, race and social beliefs affect the focalization. Similarly, the focalization of *Kumari Shova* is affected by the focalizer’s superstitious beliefs. Philip H. Pierce opines: “It has variously been assumed that Vijay Malla wrote *Kumari Shova* to help to lay to rest the so-called superstition that the first man to marry the Living Goddess Kumari after her decent from the throne would die a short time later” (Foreword). The focalizer’s understanding about the superstitious beliefs of the characters is his misunderstanding so the focalization is affected by this belief.

Furthermore, the face value of the text is determined by the focalizer’s judgment and trustworthiness. If the focalizer tries to impose his ideology, belief, and prejudice in the focalization, the reader has to apply counterfocalization by analyzing silences, gaps, ironic gestures, unreliable images, fantasized events and hypothetical ideas because Roland Barthes asserts: “The corollary of the death of the author is the birth of the reader” (qtd. in Peter Barry 66). The reader should critically examine the socio-cultural scenario of the focalizer and how he is affected by such beliefs, which are rooted in the contemporary society, as in *Kumari Shova*. Regarding the same issue, Karmacharya writes:

Kumari Shova is the story of a struggle between belief and unbelief. It depicts the love between a young woman and man. The former who in her childhood served as Nepal’s Living Goddess, believes, as social tradition accepts of her, that if she married her husband will soon die,

whereas her suitor believes that the death has made no such compact - that it is all mere superstition -and presses hard to marry her, come what may. (Foreword)

The narrative of *Kumari Shova* is presented only through the focalizer's assumptions that all the characters deeply believe in the superstition, but the narrator says that Upendra's mother easily gives permission to her son for marrying Shova. Thus it is the focalizer's pretension and ignorance since he could not give real image of Shova's conflicting thoughts, and therefore he only judges her from the angle of superstitious beliefs rather than the narrator's saying of her strong psychological confidence that made her Living Goddess.

Narrative discourse corrected preceding theories of narrative point of view, separating the function of focalizer -- who sees, from the narrator -- who tells. Gerard Genette points out, "Restriction of field is particularly dramatic because the very principle of this narrative mode implies in all strictness that the focal character never be analyzed objectively by the narrator" (189-92). In the novel, women are misrepresented because of superstitious beliefs. They have faced much more discrimination and misbehavior because of differences. Women have been kept as the symbol of loss, confusion and complicated lives, therefore, this novel can be analyzed from the angle of dramatic irony that involves a situation in a narrative in which the reader shares the author's knowledge of the future circumstances of which a focalizer is ignorant and "unknowingly acts in a way we recognize to be grossly inappropriate to the actual circumstances or expects the opposite of what we know" (Abrams 136-37).

Malla's novel gives a ground to work on the narrative technique precisely because the way the writer makes the narrator tell the story by employing different narrative perspectives that reshape and reflect events which have already happened. This research is a critical discussion of Vijay Malla's *Kumari Shova* from the light of

counterfocalization and politics of irony. Due to the biased representation about the women's psychology, the discourse of gender inequality exists in the text. Women's psychology becomes the medium of justifying focalizer's superiority by creating the discourse of superstitions; therefore, counterfocalization is necessary for disclosing the hidden discourse of the focalized. Theory of narrative technique will be applied as a tool for this research. The different perspectives in narrative technique, such as heterodiegetic narrator maintains the distance between the author, and the narrator as well as characters in order to deal with the focalizer's misrepresentations of women's psychology.

Counterfocalization resists the prejudice of focalizer that should be accorded the right and the space to negotiate their own conditions of discourse and practice, their difference as a rebellion against the hegemonic tendencies of the focalizer. Hence, to analyze the focalization and the hidden discourse of male versus female, the counterfocalization should be applied because it is used to make a focalization disclose more than focalizer himself knows about the rules and regulations that make possibility of reliable images. To deconstruct the focalizer's concept about male versus female, this reading is necessary because women's psychology has remained the focalizer's key representation of superstitions, even though its first recording, and indeed most subsequent examples, have been evidences of a rhetorical strategy of focalization. Similarly, the focalizer in Malla's *Kumari Shova* legalizes women's psychology because of his prejudice regarding women that assumes male as rational and female as irrational or superstitious.

Malla has an uncompromising sense of justice and humanity. He also satirizes the superstitious beliefs and adopts old rituals and produces dramatic effects on the modern age that criticizes violence and corruption in the society. Supporting this concept Basudev Tripathi reviews this novel: "Moreover, this novel offers an ironic view of the Nepalese towards the living goddess, Kumari. Malla emphasizes on

importance of new moral consciousness and tries to resolve issues of modern civil society in terms of those beliefs” (5). Although he uses myth, religion and employs traditional values, he expresses modern issues of contemporary Kathmandu. This novel is able to satirize the darkness of hearts of men as well as old and new values. The novel examines the interrelationship of ritual and community in Nepalese culture. The “living goddesses” are those women capable of the sacrifice needed annually to purify the community of its sins and allow it to start over again. The traditional ritual and wisdom are practised through the character of Shova. Shova has to suffer for the community’s beliefs because of ritual invalidated by the community’s practice of selecting an willing living goddess.

Malla illustrates how women’s psychology becomes the focalizers’ legitimized body for inferiorizing the women. The discursive formation of focalizer creates a complex field of values, meanings and practices through which the focalizer’s ideology is positioned as superior and women as inferior.

Malla views that the relationship between narration and perception is the relationship of unavoidable power. Therefore, the discourse, which is made by the focalizer, is used to misrepresent the women’s psychology. It is a focalizer’s style of thought based on an ideology and prejudice against women. There is no necessary reliability in focalization that constructs the women’s psychology.

Counterfocalization can be applied to analyze the gaps, silences, and errors of focalization and this is significant for regulating the narrative relations between male and female.

The focalizer distinguishes Upendra as rational and Shova as superstitious who cannot survive without Upendra. Hence, he presents images of women who could not do anything by avoiding the male’s supports. Indeed, the cultural politics of place and identity in Kathmandu is embedded in the legacies of patriarchal ideologies and practices that are channelized through the hidden discourse of superstitions that

produce geographical as well as cultural distance in which the categories of male and female and past and present constantly solicit. These cultural and geographical gaps are constructed through the binaries of focalizer's constructs. Focalizer's prejudice becomes a vehicle for patriarchy for killing the women's sensibilities. Indeed, Malla presents that women's psychology assumes their life as a provincial because of the cultural and political hegemony of male. The focalizer finds the living goddess' life, culture, religion, custom, is inferior because his own thought is influenced by the superstitious beliefs in himself.

The focalizer internalizes the cultural assumptions and shows that the nature and impact of superstitious beliefs accept women as inferior. He believes on superstitious beliefs that the people are irrational, emotive and superstitious. Focalization is inherent in a discourse that defines the identity of women in relation to men and it deliberately produces women as weak mentality in order to impose the male's ideology over women. The focalizer creates hierarchy of superiority and inferiority; this articulation is prerogative. Thus, the focalizer represents the male as intellectual, superior, rational, masters of the society and apostle of light but the women as degenerate, irrational and weaker.

Shova is presented as superstitious by producing the myth about weak psychology and irrationality of female. These prejudices demonstrate her as superstitious, therefore, the focalizer feels Upendra's responsibility of taking burden to treat Shova. He interprets Newari culture, custom and life- style as terrific. It shows that how he perceives Shova is more critically analyzed than who she is, therefore, the counterfocalization is more important than the focalization of Shova. In this way, focalization is not an airy fantasy of the focalizer but a legitimized body of prejudice and cultural practices in which there has been considerable material investment like

discourse and power. As a result, Malla provides platform for counterfocalization as an alternative project that can be used to question the fixed and stereotypical construction of women. The focalizer's prejudice creates the discourse of women, therefore, counterfocalization is necessary for disclosing the hidden discourse of focalizer because his thought distorts the traditions and forms of cultural life and expressions and he creates binary opposition between masculine and feminine by representing women as weak. He represents people as superstitious because his thought depends on the concept of fixity and prejudice of Shova. Regarding the same vein, Malla analyses how 'living goddess' Shova is presented as superstitious.

This research analyzes how the focalizer shapes his discourse within the frame of ideology to represent superstitions, questions and presents from a different perspectives and rules that how he imposes his discourse within the power/knowledge relation. Through the perception of focalizer, we can observe how such patriarchal discourses encourage the male to rule over the female whether in the cultural or political form. The focalizer's perspective finds Shova's life, culture, religion, custom, and language as inferior because he sees all things from the patriarchal point of view.

Counterfocalization also questions the idea of fixed images of the focalizer who imposes the stereotyped discourse of superstitions. The discourse also has some ill-effects on the economies of the social interventions that are able to exploit the women because the power often develops the communities to serve their own discourse. For example, during the period of Indra Jatra, people seek to pray the Kumari and these activities are associated with the discourse of superstitions by the focalizer. However, it is not the part of Kathmandu valley as it is mentioned in the narrative part. Moreover, The focalizer can not believe that the people have distinct

ideology and they have their own standards that should be judged from their own particular social context, not from his eyes. He does not think that people's identity should be judged from the social, cultural and historical perspectives of their own. He does not accept their identity but he constructs fixed identity as superstitious for people. This representation is projected by the past of the community. This vision of culture produces the ideologies that are used to create the worldview, visions and images of the people. Thus, simply, the focalized are misrepresented.

II. Narratology and Its Significance in Politico-cultural Studies

Narratology is the theory about narrative that is a systematic set of generalized statements about the particular set of reality in texts, therefore, the readers are able to see the events of a novel through their eyes. It is the term used since 1969 for the analysis of narratives. It is the theory of narrative that helps to understand, analyze and evaluate narratives. This term has been derived from the French word 'narratif' that refers to spoken or written account of connected sequential events. It includes narrative techniques; narrator, narration and so on and narrative refers to the oral or written discourse. Moreover, the narrator is an extremely significant element in a novel that comprises events, characters and settings. Without essential information about characters, events and settings the narrative would not be well formed. Sometimes narrator does not present him/herself as an actor and sometimes s/he participates in the actions and narrates the story in a chronological order. Narrative requires a narrator, a story and events because all these elements are essential in a narrative story.

Henry James's theory on narrative marks the transition from classical to modernism. Later on critics Percy Lubbock, Joseph Warren Beach and others popularized James's ideas, and they are called Jamesian school of narrators. These narratologists developed the idea about "showing versus telling" or in other words "scene verses summary" (Beach 62). Henry James rarely uses the first person narrative. His novels are usually written in the third person, which is less intrusive and more dramatic. Rather than being simply 'told' we are shown action and characters as they develop through significant scenes. This kind of ideal way of showing in third person narration is also dramatic and psychologically immediate. In this regard, Henry James writes:

There is no economy of treatment without an adopted or related point of view, and though I understand under certain degrees of pressure under a represented community of vision between several parties of the action when it makes for concentrative, I understand no breaking up of the register no action of being recording consistency that does not rather scatter and weaken. (37-38)

The plot of the novel is less tight and less guided by cause and effect than that of a novel for the novelist uses description not used by the novelist. The follower of Henry James, Percy Lubbock makes the distinction between 'showing' and 'telling'.

However, his main focus is on the former rather than latter.

Critics from 1930 to 1950 paid attention to the modes of representation of inner life developed by the modernist. Free indirect style, stream of consciousness and interior monologue became the centre of critical stage. The critics after 1950s paid attention to the system. Their systematic study derives from linguistics, aesthetics, philosophy, as well as from comparative study of anthropology, religion and myth. The theory of narration aims at defining the narrative point of view, narrative structure, narrative perspective and narrative manner. Though these terms are employed in the theory of narrative, they do not clarify the difference between the vision through which the elements of fabula are presented and the identity of voice that verbalize the vision.

The novel is a created world of values and attitudes and the author is assisted with his/her search for an artistic definition of these values and attitudes by the controlling medium offered by the devices of narrative technique. In other words, narratives often seem to have bits we have seen or heard before...and the kind of things people do in narrative seem to repeat themselves over and over again. Narrative

typically seems to have a “trajectory.” They usually go somewhere, with some sort of development and even a resolution, or conclusion, provided. Narratives have to have a ‘teller’ and the ‘told about’ no matter how much backgrounded or made remote or invisible but ‘teller’ and ‘told about’ are always important. In this respect, despite its special characteristics, narrative is language communication like any other, requiring a speaker and some sort of addressee. Narratives are richly exploitative of the feature of language called displacement. In this respect they contrast sharply with such modes as commentary or description. Narratives involve the recalling of happening that may not be merely spatial but more crucially, temporal remote from the teller and audience. Scholes and Kellogg define narrative by giving emphasis on the presence of a story and a storyteller: “All those literary works which are distinguished by two characteristics: the presence of a story and a storyteller”(4).

But Traugott and Pratt define narrative by giving emphasis on ‘representation of past experience, “essentially a way of linguistically representing past experience, whether real or imagined”(qtd. in Toolan 6). After giving many definitions on narrative, Michael J. Toolan defines narrative “as a perceived sequence of non-randomly connected events”(7). Toolan emphasizes on ‘non-random connectedness’ which means that a pure collage of described events, even in given sequence, does not count as a narrative. Thus, the question of who narrates the story or through whose eyes the events are narrated is an important element that the literary critics seek.

Countering the Discourse of Focalizer

As Edward Said, a postcolonial thinker, believes narrative as a set of representation, a form of domination, is entire historical, modern and postmodern inhumanity. In narrative, focalizer exercises his/her biasness or prejudice while representing ‘Others’ who are called marginalized. Biased representation of

marginalized is to be taken as 'not democratic' and 'not humanistic', so he attempts to articulate a new humanism that moves beyond parochialism and relates to what he called "secular criticism". In this regard he writes:

For a reader of texts to move immediately, however, from a quick, superficial reading into general or even concrete statements about vast structures of power or into vaguely therapeutic structures of salutary redemption(...)is to abandon the abiding basis for all humanistic practice. That basis is at bottom what I have been calling philological , that is, a detailed, patient scrutiny of and a lifelong attentiveness to the words and rhetorics by which language is used by human beings who exist in history: hence the word "secular" as I use it, as well as the word "worldlyness." (Said 61)

Representations for him are a means of exercising cultural hegemony. Furthermore, his critical humanism is always a dialectical concept, self-knowledge with self-criticism generating oppositions that could neither absorb nor avoid: that is mixed feeling of reverence and revulsion-an admiration of great monuments of civilization that constitute the archive of humanism and disgust at humanism's underside of suffering and operation. This critical humanism can do justice to marginalized only after the application of a theory of "contrapuntal reading" that is giving attention to the suppressed or victims and response to it. This is how his critical humanism is inclusive and democratic. In this regard what concerns here is "humanism as a useable praxis for intellectuals and academics who want to know what they are doing, what they are committed to as scholars"(6).

By showing the severe defeat of traditional humanism and post-structuralism, he further asserts, "it is possible to be critical of humanism in the name of humanism

and that, schooled in its abuses” (11). So his “core of humanism is the secular notion” (11).

As a result his technique of contrapuntal reading is “to know is to know how a thing is made, to see it from the point of view of its human maker” (11), that is similar to Vico’s idea. He gives more emphasis on sociopolitical context; however, we need to be critical of language of the focalizer since “language is where we start from as humanists” (28). In this regard, for him:

Humanism is the exertion of one's faculties in language in order to understand, reinterpret, and grapple with the products of language in history, other languages and other histories. In my understanding of its relevance today, humanism is not a way of consolidating and affirming what "we" have always known and felt, but rather a means of questioning, upsetting, and reformulating so much of what is presented to us as commodified, packaged, uncontroversial, and uncritically codified certainties, including those contained in the masterpieces herded under the rubric of "the classics."(Said 28)

So humanism is related to the use of language and its politics: who uses it, to represent whom is more important here.

The term focalization was first used in narrative discourse by Gerard Genette who developed the theory of narrative points of view, by separating the function of the narrator from that of the focalizer: "The two instances of the focalizing and the narrating which remain distinct even in "first person" narrative, i.e. even when the two instances are taken up by the same person" (194). For Genette, focalization, point of view, narrative perspective and narration (storytelling) "remain distinct" not only in third person but also in first person narrative (190). In other words he distinguishes

between who sees and who tells as focalizer and narrator respectively. The relationship of focalization must be studied separately with the subject and the object of the focalization. The first one is the focalizer or it is the point from which the elements are viewed. In this regard, Badri Prasad Acharya insists on the requirement of counterfocalization. In the process of perception, she/he imposes her/his discourse, prejudice and bias regarding his/her gender, class, caste and ethnicity, therefore, counterfocalization is necessary to analyze the text in which irony is deployed:

[I]mpression which is given on the surface level caused by limited figural focalization can't be taken at 'face value' as it provides entirely misleading impression on the surface level. . . The focalizer, whose 'eyes' are used to understand the novel, cannot understand himself. He is not ready to take his responsibility for his own action because he 'cannot'. (Acharya 5-6)

Counterfocalization always deconstructs hierarchy between male and female psychology as the superior race and inferior race. The narrative discourse has created superstitions to institutionalize male's power. The superstitions always have the shifting quotation in discourse. Counterfocalization attempts to re-examine the narrative relationship that emerges in resistance to narrative perspectives employed in discourses of cultural and literary world.

For patriarchy, it is male's duty to interpret females and they have to be interpreted by them. By its effect, they create the hierarchy of superior male and inferior female. In other words, the narrative always creates binaries regarding the female as inferior. This means that narrative represents the female what they want it to be, but not the female as it is. Counterfocalization attacks patriarchal thought about the female. In this regard, counterfocalization discloses that female is not based upon

the interpretations of the focalizer. Narrative criticism attempts to reexamine the narrative relationship and perspective that is employed in discourse of cultural and the text dealing with narrative relation. But counterfocalization provides women's psychology individually to oppose a sense of inferior identity, for example, ideas of culture, race and nation.

There the political purpose of counterfocalization is to expose the falsity of this mode of presenting the narrative subject as superstitious. A simple distinction between center/margin, male/female psychology, rational/ primitive represents very efficiently the violent hierarchy on which narrative is based. Counterfocalization presents an ongoing tension between male and female. To this day, women's psychology remains as key representation for the males as superstitious that is evidence of rhetorical strategy of narrative rather than evidence of an objective fact.

Male writers feel that it is necessary to write about females due to the patriarchy. They began writing about women's psychology and they (mis) represented the female. The paradox lies between the real meaning of representation and the politics associated with it. Focalization is a structure of meaning, a code of system of signs that refers not to objective reality. The most important function of narrative is to reveal the ways in which the world is colonized in various manners. Due to the narrative, females are compelled to accept that they are the innate part of their degeneration. Classifying females as far basic and degenerate, either dangerous or alluring, continues narrative. Focalization is useful for describing the success of fictional power over women's psychology who may far outnumber any occupying force, but whose desire for self-determination has been suppressed by hegemonic notion. After couched in terms of social order, stability and advancement, all of them

are defined by power. They accept themselves as less human, less rational, and inferior thinking that they have no strong mentality.

The novel of identity and difference becomes conspicuous in the process of standing for the superstition because representation is always of something or someone, by something or someone. One can easily identify the distinction between the agent who speaks (narrator) and the agent who perceives (focalizer). In this way, they represent the females from males' perspective according to their own interest, taste and the use of their own vocabularies. Even if patriarchy claims for representing the female, the patriarchal hegemony may be counted. When women's psychology is being represented in literacy text, it fulfils the patriarchal interest and purpose because of the patriarchal hegemony.

Theory of focalization was refined by Mieke Bal, who emphasizes upon the autonomous role of the focalizer. External focalization means the focalization which is not related with the inside aspect of the narration while internal focalization is related with the inside aspect of the narration. It occurs within the story, i.e. it directly touches the inside aspects such as event, setting and character. In focalization vision means the agent that sees. This relationship is the component of the story part of a narrative text. X says that Y sees what Z is doing is the fine example of understanding focalization. With the understanding of readers this relationship differs. In many contexts focalization belongs to the story or this relation is that of between linguistic text and fabula. It involves a character; focalizer though some unpersonified position can be adopted. We also have two types of focalized: viewing from outside and within. In outside focalized, literally visible aspects are reported while in within focalized, internal facts about characters and events are reported.

Narrator is the agent who narrates or speaks and focalizer is the agent who perceives within the fictional world. The narrator who is anonymous remains "outside" the fictional world and focalizer is 'within, the fictional world. The narrator can only tell the story but cannot perceive or see because he/she is not the participant within the fictional world, whereas focalizer can perceive the events or actions as the participant within the fictional world but focalizer may not necessarily narrate the story. Focalization is point of view, i.e. a point from which events in any text are observed. So we can say that focalization is the narratological term, which refers to the relation between vision that is seen or "perceived" and the person who sees. The focalizer creates discourse on the basis of his own horizon of knowledge, patriarchal thought, language, life-style and culture that are imposed.

Narrative is produced and is manipulated by power in order to maintain the sense of superiority and authority. The males think that it is their burden to civilize the females, to educate them and to make them humans. Patriarchal narrative rule, knowledge and power are imposed through narrative discourse. We hope to explore within the shared but differentiated space of the focalizer; the hierarchies of production, power, knowledge that emerge in tension with the extension of the domain of reason and of citizenship. The fallible narrative has been created by the fixed internal focalization in homodiegetic or heterodiegetic novel whether the novelists create their protagonists, ironically or not because focalizer is not the writer's image.

Mieke Bal, defines focalization in terms of the relation of the focalizer and the focalized or the subject and the object of the focalization:

Focalization is the relationship between the vision of the agent that sees and that which is seen [...]. It refers to a relationship; each pole of that

relationship, the subject and the object of the focalization, must be studied separately. The subject of focalization, the focalizer is the point from which the elements are viewed that point can lie with a character, that character has advantage over other characters. (146)

The focalizer is the subject of focalization and the focalized object is the subject of action. Though focalization could be categorized into many other types, the researcher will focus on focalization in terms of perspective of the fixed external focalizer and the telling of the narrator. Zero focalization is exemplified in the classical narrative. In such narrative, one finds neither the focalized object nor any focalization. In internal focalization, one finds three types of focalization: fixed focalization, variable focalization, and multiple focalizations. When focalization lies with one character, which participates in the fabula as an actor is internal focalization whereas when focalization lies not with character it is called external focalization. It includes the character's feelings and thoughts.

The narrative literature produces the stereotypical images of the non-male as the superstitious. So this research attempts an accurate definition of doing justice to the application of counterfocalization in a cultural context. The researcher simply considers the politics associated with the concept of counterfocalization. In this context, one who represents is more important than what is being represented because of the unequal distribution of power among genders and that ultimately affects discourse of one culture. Fictional ideology is to govern the female politically and culturally. Here, counterfocalization means representing the women's psychology.

Counterfocalization recovers lost histories and explores mechanism of repression and subjugation. It is critical study on the inextricable relationship between knowledge and power. Its has long emphasized on the conscious ways in which a

model narrative regime went above creating the categories or social hierarchy; the lower classes, women, and superstitious marginalized people are also more specifically concerned with questions of power and culture; especially the messy commingling of the social and the cultural or of the supposedly autonomous self and the cultural/ political institutions that in fact produce that self. The term 'superstitious' is male's direct representation of the women's psychology. So counterfocalization carries out a fact that the patriarchy does not represent the reality but it always represents the females by means of various images. It questions the cultural discourse of suspicious on the part of women psychology and seeks to undermine the fictional subject. It is marked by a methodological self-consciousness rather than the old historicist faith in the transparency of signs and interpretive procedures. Counterfocalization is interested in questions of circulation, negotiation, profit and exchange, i.e. how activities that purport to be above the market, including literature are in fact dominated by the existing values.

The methods and discourse of patriarchal scholarship confine inferior cultures to a position of subordination. Female come to inhabit a realm without development or power, one that exactly corresponds to be position of inferiority. In Rimmon Kenan's emotive focalization "scenes are represented in a noticeably idiosyncratic way" (79). The ideological focalization is related to explicit or implicit evaluation of different classes or genders. In such focalization there is only the role of focalizer for creating the image but no role for narrator and the author for creating the picture in the novel. The image, which the readers receive, is fully colored by the focalizer. Jonathan Culler has the similar opinion about the focalizer's role. He says, "Narrative (unreliability) can result from the limitation of point of view, when we gain

the sense that the consciousness through which focalizations occurs is unable or unwilling to understand the events" (90).

Counterfocalization questions and even subverts the issues of power, epistemology, subjectivity, and ideology that have influenced critics not only in literary studies but also in political science, narratology, and anthropology. It takes this position further by then claiming that all cultural activities may be considered as equally important texts for historical analysis. Male-centric discourse not only creates truth to rule, but it also contains the possibility of resistance against "superstitions". It also has the ability to pick up common terms and give them new meaning, thus changing the way critics addressed such pervasive issues as power, discourse, discipline, subjectivity, sexuality, and government. Counterfocalization first tries to understand what focalization is, what problem it tries to solve and what superstitious problems it creates in doing so, and, of course, when it arose historically, in both the long run and short term.

Counterfocalization's accusation is the idea that difference, so integral to this concept of writing, is itself elevated to transcendent status. As a result, a primordial status is granted to the notion of writing: the novel of representations, which was previously gathered up into an image of the author, is now extended within gray neutrality. The privileges of the author are effectively sustained by attributing a transcendental causality to writing itself, and they are effectively reintroduced into criticisms the religious principles of hidden meanings requiring interpretation. Counterfocalization takes some pains to reveal the interests at stake in choosing one frame of reference over superstitions.

Counterfocalization attempts to define the constituents of a certain kind of society. The act of creation within a notion of- society is a natural occurrence and

self-conscious project of collecting and organizing knowledge could be applied. Hence these historians began their researches with a purpose, although their idealized goal was focalization without prior interpretations, only what really happened, as critics repeatedly state, was rigorous scientific rules of evidence and interpretation were marshaled to produce results of a definite ideological tendency. Counterfocalization has presumed on this discursive friendship and has explained literary effect as an entirely historical phenomenon.

In the fixed internal focalization, the focalization goes with a single focal character. It is the 'fixed character bound focalization' or 'mono focalization'. This type includes only one person's thoughts and feelings. This type of focalization has the limited point of view of the single focal character. There remains more possibility for the fallibility of the narration, if focalization of the so-called focalizer is ignorant or self-justifying, biased or deceptive in the serious issues, as Acharya asserts:

[T]he reader can receive an image that is just as complete or incomplete, more complete or less complete than the image the characters have of themselves. As the focalizer determines it, he should not be ignorant or biased towards the focalizeds. Otherwise, narrative turns into fallibility. . . (46)

Hence, the reader has to reread the narrative discourse that serves the narrative purpose in an effective manner because it attempts to design the fixed geographical, cultural and political concept about the marginalized people in the mind of the readers. So counterfocalization seeks throughout the work to make sense of how our contemporary society is structured differently from the society that preceded us. It has been particularly influential precisely because it tends to overturn accepted wisdom,

illustrating the dangers inherent in those reforms that were designed to correct the barbarity of previous periods.

This is the written representation of the characters' inner thoughts impressions and memories or 'immediate speech' as if directly overhead without the intention of summarizing and selecting. In Genette's view, such restriction of field is particularly dramatic, because the "very principle of this narrative mode implies in all strictness that the focal character never be analyzed objectively by the narrator" (189-92). In variable focalization, the focalization goes on to several characters. It shifts from one character to another. The readers are forced to accept with the image given by many characters. They give their feelings and thoughts turn by turn. This kind of mode is supposed to be more reliable. The third type of internal focalization is multiple-focalization. In this type of focalization, same event is seen through several focal characters; readers get the different views upon the same event or person.

External focalization presents the agent being situated outside the story and functioning as the focalizer. This focalization is always heterodiegetic. It is possible for the entire story to be focalized by external focalizer in the third person narrative as in Malla's *Kumari Shova*. The protagonist "performs in front of us without our ever being allowed to know his thoughts and feelings as the narrator does not tell us immediately all that he knows" (Bal 190). In external focalization the character tells us the things, which are observable or external, what the characters say and do. In Bal's view the narrative in this mode can be objective, as "the events are not presented from the point of view of the characters" (149). She says that external focalization is "non character bound focalization" (148).

Genette replaces the concept of "who sees?" with the broader sense "who perceives?" "Who sees?" is the traditional point of view of the conventional type of

view, reflector, window observer and so on: "We must replace who sees? with the broader question of who perceives?" (64) The crucial evidence for deciding who is focalizing is the presence or absence of verbs of experiencing such as "looks", "see", "touch", "smell", "think," 'dream' and others which are taken as perception in a broader sense. It is clear that the focalization is not limited with the narrow sense of creating but it has broad area. So Jamesian term 'reflectors,' mirrors and others are only the metaphors. In Mieke Bal's view every perception indicates the activity of focalization. She writes, "Any act of perception represented or presented in whatever form (narrated reported, quoted or scenically represented) counts as a case of focalization" (250). Further, she distinguishes focalized into perceptible (P) and non perceptible (NP)

Post-Genettean narratologist, Rimmon Kenan separates psychological variation from cognitive (internal focalizer's limited knowledge), to emotive (emotions and feelings). The only legitimate way of obtaining knowledge became the imposition of this norm to create the master narrative of the time. The narrative relation is maintained and guided by narrative discourse that licensed with power that becomes the sole force of focalization. So, the world is governed and dominated by discourse rather than material, military or political power. The mission of 'knowing subject' to civilize the superstitious people by the means of one perspective, methodology and discourse that ultimately was established as the norm. This is the only attempt upon Bal's "the facets of focalization the major ones being perceptible psychological and ideological" (82) makes it more clear. As in the perceptual focalization, when the same agent is narrator and focalizer, he can portray the large descriptive scene, whereas if he is a character within the narrative, he can give a limited view of that spatio-temporally limited observer.

A narrative study incorporates the problem of focalization in narrative under its subject of study. The term counterfocalization is always related to the notion of interpretation that pervades each and every cultured phenomenon that transcends the natural impulse to deplore all misrepresentation. This concept of counterfocalization is connected with the basic issue of cultural theory. Mieke Bal, a post Genettean narratologist, who clarifies and systematizes narratology, the theory of narrative technique, talks about the use of narratological concepts like focalization in difference to other theories like cultural studies, feminism and other political or ideological and psychological studies.

The reader can receive an image that is just as complete or incomplete, more complete or less complete than the image of the characters of themselves. As the focalizer determines it, he should not be ignorant or biased towards the focalizeds. Otherwise, narrative turns into fallibility because of the lack of knowledge or ignorance of the focalizer. Counterfocalization analyzes literary texts as socio-political discourses. It is difficult to introduce this school in a number of different approaches to focalization- and culture often gets lumped together under the category. As a result, counterfocalization questions the possibility of misreading and misguiding; how writing interacts with the social and material practices of focalization. To avoid such danger of misreading, counterfocalization is needed and to investigate the power- relation in the focalization. Thus, readers have to be critical by means of alternative reading depending on silences, gaps, and ironic gestures. Counterfocalization questions their mission of focalization in various forms. Narrative technique is not only the mode of dramatic elimination but more particularly of thematic definition that is a means of a coherent and vivid presentation.

In the theory of narratology, counterfocalization is connected to the concept of counter discourse because interpretation is power; therefore, language is the perfect instrument of focalizer that is based on certain knowledge, which helps to form truth. Patriarchal discourse always forms images about the females and aims at ruling and dominating over them. Thus, the agent of focalization is always in a discursive and hegemonic role. Those who have power have control of what is known and the way it is known, and those who have such knowledge have power over those who do not.

The focalizer or observer determines the image we receive of focalizeds, his/her ideologies concerning race, gender, and sexuality. Counterfocalization has presumed on this discursive friendship and has explained literary effects as an entirely historical phenomenon. It explores the transition from a culture of spectacle to a cerebral culture. Whereas, in the former, punishment gives effects on the body in public disnovels of torture, dismemberment, and obliteration, and in the latter punishment and discipline become internalized and directed to the constitution and, when necessary, rehabilitation of social subjects.

Counterfocalization explores the transition from what he terms a culture of spectacle to a cerebral culture. Hence, historians began their researches with a purpose, although their idealized goal is focalization without prior interpretations, only what really happened, as critics repeatedly state rigorous scientific rules of evidences and interpretations that are marshaled to produce results of a definite ideological tendency. The readers should try to analyze whether his evaluation or understanding of the focalized is biased or not. Bal further analyzes how the condition of the focalizer as well as that of focalized may remain enigmatic, i.e. difficult to understand on surface level as she says:

The distinction [between focalizer and the focalized] is of importance for an insight into the power structure between the characters. When in a conflict [...] one character is allotted other CF-P and CF-NP, and the other exclusively CF-P, then the first character has the advantage [...]. It can give the reader insight into [his] feelings and thoughts while the other characters cannot communicate anything. Moreover the other characters will not have insight which the other which she/he doesn't know, cannot adapt himself to them or oppose them. Such an inequality in position between characters is obvious in the co-called 'first person novels' but another kind of inequality is not always clear to the reader. Yet the latter is manipulated by [focalizer] informing an opinion about the various characters consequently the focalization has strongly manipulative efficient. (Bal 153).

The fictional world in the narrative texts is to keep sight of the difference between spoken and unspoken words of the characters. So even the words spoken by focalized but unheard by the focalizer, the suffering of them have to be studied and felt by the readers. Prejudice of the focalizer may cause his/her deceptive vision.

Thus, the emergences of multiple narrative literary theories and critics have provided us numerous opportunities to interpret a text from various views and perspectives. Counterfocalization signifies the point at which the various forms of opposition are articulated as a resistance to the operation of focalization in political, economics and cultural institutions. It emphasizes the need to reject narrative power and restore local culture, language and tradition. Unlike earlier attempts to reverse racist stereotypes, the struggle against the focalizer should take, as its aims not only complete national autonomy but the transformation of social and political

consciousness. While differentiating these two contestants, male is placed in superior position and the female is placed in inferior position. It marginalizes the women's psychology. So, theory of counterfocalization does justice to the marginalized females.

Interrelation between Politics of Irony and Counterfocalization

Irony refers to the discrepant gap between what is said and what is intended to say because it emerges from a contrast between what is implied by actions and what is their actual outcome. Irony in its simplest semantics can be defined as a mode of speech of which the meanings is contrary to the word that sounds ironical concept and function as dynamic. This relationship of said and the unsaid with cultural ramification becomes double consciousness that leads the blacks to the sad reality. Focalizer's existing views create sets; a scene for the very use and comprehension of the politics of irony as irony is always social and political that gets heated at the edge provoking responses from those who get it. Irony is a political issue that involves relations of power based in relations of communication with issues such as exclusion and inclusion, intervention and evasion, thereby making the functioning of irony inevitably political. Irony in certain discursive situation is complex; therefore, it happens because of such discursive communicative process in which irony itself comes into being in the relation between intensions and interpretations. The pretended ignorance of speaker hides a skeptical attitude towards some opinions. The speaker who provides some clues makes the sharp ironic undercutting of he ostensible inevitable meaning that is called verbal irony arises from the sharp contrast between the expressed meaning and the implied ironic meaning.

Irony is primarily concerned with social and political scenario and it functions in context. It is the fact that irony happens in all kinds of discourses in common

speech as well as in highly crafted aesthetic form. The politics of irony focuses on issues of gender, race, class, and sexuality. Feminist, gay and lesbian criticism has taught about the textual complexities of the gender and sexual politics involved in studying discursive strategies. Malla creates tension between ideals and reality. Thus, the politics of irony lies in the activities of focalizer who searches for the isolated and ideal life but in reality his life is full of ignorance and he involves in the social circumstances. Such a function of irony lies in the realization of the power that lies in its potential to destabilize with critical ends and ideological contradictions so not to let the marginal resolve into the coherent and potential oppressive dogma. This is the irony, for instance, that feminist theorists and other marginalized ones see as working to deprive, in the words of J. Butler, "hegemonic culture and its critics often claim to naturalized or essentialist gender identities" (qtd. in Hutcheon 32).

Irony lies in the structure of human existence because despite one's consciousness about his/her limitations to grasp the inherently elusive and protean nature that reduce it to order and coherence, which is inevitably conditioned to be failure. The next type of irony is dramatic irony, which involves spoken words. The ironic effect of the dramatic irony depends on the author's ironic intention shared with the audience. However, unlike verbal irony, it involves characters' action in a particular situation; unlike Socratic, the characters' misinterpretation is not based on pretension but on the ignorance of the characters about the actuality. Thus readers are required to "infer meanings which are in a sense not in the world themselves: all literary meanings in this view become a form of irony" (Booth 7). Irony, therefore, is a mode of reflecting the paradoxes and incongruities implicit in the structure of universe and in our existence.

Character' beliefs and actions become ironic within that dramatic situation because they are very different from the reality of their actions. Dramatic irony is achieved by lending its ignorant characters; what they believe and act, so the inevitable reversal of the situation or the recognition of the reality generates intense tragic or comic irony. The term dramatic is used to connote a powerful sense of exciting and gripping situation that can also occur in narrative fictions. Dramatic irony is a situation in which readers know more about the immediate circumstances or future events of which a character is ignorant because the audiences come to detect a discrepancy between characters' perceptions and actions and the reality. Here so, literature is the representation of the fact of paradox, which shows how human beings maintain and poise balance over such contradiction.

Such an ironic sensibility becomes political when, as Du Bois claims, it leads the black to the sad reality of "always looking at one's self through the eyes of other" (qtd. in Davis 46). Many people in majority culture lack the ability to see in a quality; they cannot get enough distance from themselves, it is the context that an existing community creates that sets such as scene for the very use and comprehension of the politics of irony. As in the words of Hutcheon, the "cutting edge" of irony "is always social and political" that "gets heated" at the "evaluating edge" provoking responses from those who get it and in those who become victim of it (2) . Irony is a political issue that involves "relations of power based in relations of communication with issues such as exclusion and inclusion, intervention and evasion, thereby making the functioning of irony inevitably political. Our nationality, male or female, working class or not, all these factors condition the interpretation of the specific function of ironic meaning.

The function of ironic meaning gets its political edge even out of the ironist's intentional and the interpreter's interpretative move with a certain attitude towards both, therefore, said and the unsaid meanings of irony are in certain discursive situation. In other words, irony is complex in "the intentional transmission of both information and evaluative attitude other than what is explicitly expressed" (11). The interpretations of irony, as Christine Kerbrat – Orecchioni says, "brings into novel, besides their linguistic competence, the cultural and ideological competences of ironist and audience" (qtd. in Muecke 40-41). Reading or interpreting irony is at once reading or interpreting life itself where we read character and value, thereby referring to our deepest convictions. It is because of its very nature of foregrounding the politics of human agency in this that irony has become an important discursive strategy. Its discursiveness comes from the interpreter and the ironist as the agents who perform the act of attributing both meanings and motives, and do so in particular situation and context for a particular purpose, and with particular means.

Such an attributing irony involves both semantic and evaluative inferences. Similarly, "the semantic dimension of irony "is influenced by the receiver and by "the surrounding tension –filled environments" (Hutcheon 12). This study, therefore, argues that politics of irony happens because of such a discursive communicative process in which irony "itself comes into being in the relation between meanings, between intensions and interpretations" (13). Its "semantic and syntactic dimensions cannot be considered separately from the social, historical and cultural aspects of its contexts of deployment and attribution" (16-17). In such a context, the interpreters' interpretations are not simply a matter of the "subjective attitude of either interpreter or ironist, but are the function of the culture, language, and social context where both participants interact with each other and with the text itself" (91). In this light, the

political meaning of irony is not only substitution of the identity and position of both the ironist and the audience but is a matter of interpretation.

Thus, the context for the construction of irony is always crucial to interpret its meaning and politics. This point further clarifies that the politics of irony is a relational strategy in the sense that it operates not only between said and unsaid meanings, but also between people: ironist and interpreters. Irony being relational discursive strategy has its politics means that irony can be used either to undercut or to reinforce both conservative and radical positions. To put it more explicitly, irony can be provocative when its politics is conservative or authoritarian as easily as when its politics is oppositional or subversive. It depends on who is using and attributing it and at whose expense it is seen to be. The politics of irony, in this sense, at once forces a distinction between irony that might function constructively to articulate new oppositional positions, and irony that would work in a more negative and negativizing way where the ironist would stand outside of system in a position of power.

The social complexities and their political intricacies generalize theory of irony. It is the fact that many fine analysis of particular political dimension of feminist, gay, lesbian or postcolonial irony are specific, “the interpreter, and the circumstances surrounding discursive situation; it is these that mess up neat theories of irony that see the task of the interpreter simply as one of decoding or reconstructing some “real” meaning . . . a meaning that is hidden” (Hutcheon 11). The social circumstances make irony possible in interpretation whether arising from the ironist's intention or from the rubbing together of the apparent said with the implied unsaid meaning. Inevitable is the mix of the said meaning with the unsaid one. For Hutcheon subversive political irony gives voice to the marginalized people, whereas conservative political irony mocks at the marginalized.

The use of irony from the position of power, especially by the dominant authority, generates irony's conservative political function. Such an elitist use makes the irony as weapon for negating, thereby becomes largely destructive. In this context, the notion of irony as a negation appears to be held by almost everyone who has been on the receiving end of an ironic attack or by those for whom the serious or the solemn and the univocal are the ideal. Obviously, the last group includes not only the humorless but those elites whose political commitments lead them to desire for didactic purpose and an unambiguous discourse of engagement. The totalitarian regime uses or attributes irony in order to materialize dangers in the protective cover of repressive irony.

The interpreters and the ironists are the major participants in the ironic game. The interpreter may –or may not – be the intended addressee of the ironist's utterance, but he or she is the one who attributes irony and then interprets it. The interpreter is one who decides whether the utterance is ironic or not, and then what particular ironic meaning it might have. The ironist is the one who intends to set up an ironic relation between the said and the unsaid, but may not always succeed in communicating that intention. Irony, therefore, is seen as both empowering and embleasuring and it is often the transideological nature of irony itself that is exploited in order to recode into positive terms what the patriarchal discourse reads as a negative, in which silencing of women's voice is transformed into the willed silence of the ironic and traditional manner. Thus, irony is the intentional transmission of both information and evaluative attitude what is explicitly presented. One of the significations of the verb 'to mean' is 'to intend', but interpreters 'mean' as much as ironists do, and often in opposition to them. To attribute irony where it is intended and where it is not – or to refuse to attribute irony where it might be intended is also the act of a conscious agent.

These social dimensions of irony make its politics inevitable, as its discursive presence is not only a matter of an intended message encoded in the text but also it is mostly produced by interpreters in a dynamic of the said meaning with the unsaid one. In the encoding and decoding process irony is equally culturally specific but must be shared by both participants who came to some sort of agreement on how the counters of through are to be constituted. This is the precondition of inter subjective communication. It happens in the space between (and including) the said and the unsaid; it needs both to happen. What I want to call the 'ironic' meaning is inclusive and relational: the said and the unsaid coexist for the interpreter, and each has meaning in relation to the other because they literally "interact" to create real 'ironic' meaning. The 'ironic' meaning is not, then, simply the unsaid meaning, and the unsaid is not always a simple inversion or opposite of the said: it is always different other than and more than the said.

It undermines stated meaning by removing the semantic security of "one signifier, one signified" and by revealing the complex inclusive, relational and differential nature of ironic meaning-making" (Hutcheon 12-13). The whole communicative process does not only distort the meaning but also make it possible by those different worlds to which each of us differently belong and which form the basis of the exceptions, assumptions, and preconceptions in ironic discourse. It involves a simple decoding of a single inverted message and it is more often a semantically and combining said and unsaid meanings. Irony is also a culturally shaped process. It is the community that enables the irony to happen. It is the irony, which creates relationship between the ironist and the interpreters; "the shared context necessary to understand irony would be the most basic one: that is, the very possibility of conceiving of a made of discovers in which one can say one thing but convey

something else” (Hutcheon 91). Like all other communication, irony always acts in cultural specificity that relies on the presence of a common memory shared by addresser and addressees. While an ironist purposes in the interpretation, it will permit particular allusions particular ellipses without endangering comprehension guard.

The politics of representation in the practice of cultural studies examines how the knowledge connects with power, intertwines irony with wider historical and socio-cultural contexts "a discursive strategy" for analyzing the politics of representation (Hutcheon 194). Irony relies on mutually shared factual background information to set up what has suggestively been called the interindividual territory of recognition. The success of irony depends upon a lack of disparity or, perhaps more accurately, some degree of coincidence between interpreters and ironists' senses of the rules determining when to speak and when to be silent, and when and where and by what means and in what form tone, and code who may say to whom:

This ironic unsaid meaning is no merely a static message encoded in the text, but must be produce by the audience in a dynamic interface with the text, and it is the instability of the exchange that gives irony both its power and its limitations as a discursive mode. Because of this instability, Hutcheon argues that irony has "transideological" politics; it can be used for both conservative and progressive ends . . . while the progressive politics of irony has been extolled by many feminists, African Americans, queer theorists. (Davis 27-28).

Irony involves social interaction as an inquiring mode to avoid the single and dogmatic. It becomes a special kind of substitute for silence where in the irony's working as self- protective suggests that irony can be interpreted as a kind of defense mechanism. Discursive communities are defined as the overlapping condition that

makes the irony politics. The social space where culture meets in is the contact zones of politics of irony.

The political use of irony gets heated within the social circumstance. Moreover, it involves forms of social practice of interaction between participants in particular situation like irony's complex semantics. Communities too are relationally defined just as are people within them because there have been forceful attacks on those uses of the word "community" that ignore "the mobility, multiple forms of contact, and numerous levels and modes of interconnectedness of contemporary life" and thus forget "contemporary communities are not only internally complex and highly differentiated but also continuously and rapidly reconfigured" (B.H. Smith 168).

The dialectical power of altered arises from the said and the unsaid. The unsaid is related to the repressed, marginalized and colonized; it is not just unsaid, but unsayable within the hegemonic homogenous discourse. Muecke says that politics of irony is like a gyroscope with corrective function that keeps life on straight course, stabilizing the unstable and the excessive stable where the ironic observer's awareness of himself or herself as an observer tends to enhance his / her feeling of freedom (4). The dimension of irony is difficult to treat in isolation without keeping it not only one perspective on the receiver but also the surrounding environments.

The political function of irony is to use it in a positive and constructively progressive way where it is used as a powerful tool or even as a weapon in the fight against a dominant authority by demystifying or subverting the repression. Oppositional theorists like feminists, postcolonialists, and other marginals use this function of irony where, as Culler's irony that no prison can contain" (qtd. in Hutcheon 28). In such a use, irony is not taken, as Belsey reminds, as "authoritative

because its meanings are implicit than explicit" (qtd. in Hutcheon 29). The recourse to irony's multivocal instability is exploited by the oppositional theories at the expense of necessarily univocal social commitments in which irony not only works to point to the complexities of historical and social reality but also has the power to change that reality. So, the subversive function is the mode of the unsaid, the unheard, the unseen relishing their power in their structural forms.

Irony is a discursive strategy operating at the level of language, which has intrinsically subversive, self-questioning, and internally dialoguing mode functions tactically in the service of a wide range of political positions, legitimating or undercutting a wide variety of interests. Political function of irony has established ironic discourse as, in Terdiman's words, a "counter discourse" (qtd. in Hutcheon, 184). In this view, irony's intimacy with the dominant discourse contests with its strength to relativize the authority and stability in part by appropriating its power. So, just as the uncanny fashion, it can be seen as at once constitution and disruptive or any discursive structure or controlling intention. Morrison describes the kind of history or art with an eye to the uncanny as possessing a constant presence of haunting. The counterdiscursive function of irony rests on irony's denial over certainties by unmasking the world as an ambiguous and instable, is frequently exploited in oppositional theories.

It is the irony's politics that gives, in Fisher's words, a "survival skill, a tool for knowledge acknowledging complexity, a means of exposing or subverting oppressive hegemonic ideologies, and an art for affirming life in the face of objective troubles" (qtd. in Hutcheon 26). One option for survival is to integrate himself in "the flow of life's stream, where men and women go by thick as dust, revolving and jostling one another like figures cut out of cork and weighted with lead just sufficiently to keep

them in their proudly upright posture" (12). Irony becomes a political method when it deconstructs and decentralizes the dominant discourses on the premise that have often been used as a weapon of dominant cultures to keep the subservient in their place. Contrapuntal reading of the Said also gives focus to critical humanism, which tries to do justice upon marginalized voice by subverting the hegemonic discourse of the narrator that is focalizer. In this respect, counterfocalization, critical humanism and subversive political irony all these overlap with each other because all these three modes are used to give 'voice to the voiceless'. In the succeeding chapter the present researcher is going to apply these theoretical tools in Vijaya Malla's *Kumari Shova*.

III. Politics of Counterfocalization in Malla's *Kumari Shova*

Deployment of a Fixed Internal Focalizer

Vijay Malla's *Kumari Shova* attempts to demystify the fictional endeavor by representing the relation between patriarchy and position of female regarding the narrative discourse. The dominant model of power relation in societies is the opposition between the superiority of the patriarchy and supposedly inferiority of the matriarchy:

[S]ay what you want, Upendra , but Babukaji did die because of me. His death came because he was thinking of marrying me. I'm becoming more and more convinced of it. That's why, I'm telling you to give up the idea of marrying me. I really am a husband-killer. It's certain death for those who wish to destroy my virginity, Upendra.

(157)

The fixed internal focalizer imposes his ideology that does not create a friendly atmosphere in which these discrete communities are able to interact, and enrich a new consensual culture in which they recognize reflections of their own identity.

Counterfocalization accepts the poststructuralist denial of centre, presence and coherence to embrace postmodernist logic that cultures are artificial arbitrary products of endless series of interactions and exchanges.

The fixed internal focalizer creates the concept of fixed and center in terms of Malla's *Kumari Shova* in which females are misrepresented. Females are presented by the prejudice of male focalizer. The stereotype and prejudice constructed about females is the main focus of the study: "Upendra , thus halted, spoke, "Shova , noone can do a thing to me. Don't worry. But look, if you start getting too anxious, you'll have another attack of hysteria. Calm down. I'll be back" (154). Counterfocalization

highlights the hypocrisy of the males' fear of illustrating the mission of the knowing subject to civilize the superstitious females and by that means to fulfill the fictional motive developed only one sided one perspective methodology and discourse, which ultimately was established as the norm. The only legitimate way of obtaining knowledge became impossible of this norm to create the master narrative:

Terrified, she managed to beat the door forcefully with her fist, but it didn't budge. She looked out through the lit in the door's keyhole. Babukaji was standing watching outside with a dagger in his hand, laughing. She looked out from the keyhole with increasing terror; Banukaji appeared to be motionless, like a stone statue. And suddenly that stone statue changed into a statue of Bhairav, and from the latter's mouth a voice emerged. "If you want to save your Upendra, do what Babukaji says. Upendra will live, and this Babukaji will die. Rest assured, Upendra will live and Babukaji die. Do you understand? Babukaji will die, Babukaji will die." And the sound could be heard of Bhairav forcing a laugh. (108)

The story of contacts and interchanges between patriarchal and matriarchal system has a long focalization, but it is always limited by a sheer distance, or in some cases by simple cultural incompatibility, mostly based on the premises of different religions or different ideological systems.

The focalizer's mentality cannot allow him to be aware about his own identity culture and existence and he cannot distinguish between his prejudice and the social prejudice. The women's psychology understands itself as peripheral to patriarchic values. The focalizer always likes to talk about patriarchal traditions because he

thinks that patriarchal traditions is only the source of imagination and feelings and evokes life experience:

But Upendra! Why, he knew nothing whatsoever about these things, or else ignored them! All he knew was that he took a fancy to Shova, that he loved her, and that he wanted to pass his days in her embrace. About all those other things he didn't care a fig. He didn't even want to think about them, but if he had to be attached, he gave no importance to them. He was free of worry, or it could be said rather than the subjects he did worry about were different ones. And he was a different kind of person. He was simply taken with her. He was free of fear and trepidation- unflinching, unshrinking. (6)

The fixed internal focalizer is grounded in a certain historical context because he does not provide more insight into the patriarchic discourse. Patriarchal discourse legitimizes the female as superstitious and uses them as source of objects.

Malla centralizes his ideas on what actually happens in cultural interaction between males' and females' psychology. The women's psychology cannot escape a complex and paradoxical relation with the male. Being victimized by patriarchal mentality, the focalizer legitimizes female as irrational. By evoking it, the focalizer claims that everything that is related to male is rational and that of female is irrational. He thinks that her future is meaningful only in relation to male:

Upendra was taken aback at seeing such a sudden change of behavior that came over Shova. She rolled her eyes around in all directions-wide open-unconscious of what she was doing. She seemed to Upendra to be having another attack of hysteria. Taking hold of her, he said, "What

happened to you? What happened? It's me, Upendra, Upendra. Look at me."(104)

The males' construction of self and superstitious other is integral to the political and cultural extensions of patriarchic power across the globe. Malla claims that social construction of superstitions is not mental exercises of the males; under focalization, negative contractions of the women's psychological superstitions established certain structure of domination through which the male triumphed.

Legitimizing superstitions and practices are at the very heart of uneven material and political terrains of fictional worlds as the work shown the nexus of narrative discourse and ideology within the fictional process that has been explained. So many of the conceptual binaries that were illustrated as fundamental to its structure of power have problem. Binary oppositions like core/periphery, inside/outside and self/superstitious have given ways for legitimizing the identity of powerless people:

This dream may have caused Upendra wonder, but it wasn't difficult for him to piece together logically whence it had arisen. The things that Shova had seen in her fit of hysteria had assuredly left their impression on his unconscious, and that was the reason, it seemed, that these strange sorts of occurrences were being expressed in his dreams. (73)

The women's identity is not stable because the males legitimize it through their own perspective. Moreover, the male's identity has no origin in him and is not a fixed entity but is differential in relation to the patriarchal discourse about the superstitions.

Malla's writing concerns about the narrative discourse and power, which also has some ill effects on the economies of narrative. He claims that the narrative power is able to provide benefits to the males. This power often developed their colonies to

serve their own needs and the characters are parts of the process of fixing relation between male and female:

Upendra said immediately, “but I’ve proposed to you not once but a thousand times. I love you, I go around everywhere with you, but have I died? What do you say to that? You weren’t the reason he died: it was only the liquor or a mistake in his driving – no other reason. And tell me, why did that fellow die? Did he die because of you? How many people do you suppose die these days in the world from accidents or disease? (156)

The purpose of this research is to problematize focalization and the focalizer who represent them from the patriarchal perspective. He constructs their identity from the point of view of patriarchal civilization, culture and writing traditions. Most of characters go through the same dilemma that causes the futility of human existence.

The focalizer violently distorts the pulse of the reality of the females and rationalizes his mission of finding truth. After distorting the women’s psychology, the focalizer evokes his desire to construct the females as superstitious or irrational. The women’s psychology has to be legitimized by the focalizer whose duty is to study and research on them. In the process of research on women’s psychology, violence and exploitation become the important methods to generate the truth. In this way, who the females are is less important than what the male says about them:

Dhanmaya was of the firm conviction that Shova was not ill, sick or anything of the sort; it was simply that the goddess had come to her. Thus, she had sent her horoscope to their astrologer, and had had worship performed for her at various shrines in temples of their family deity, and even in Kumari’s house. (64)

The narrative discourse assigns truth and imposes patriarchal ideology upon the females to exercise masculine power. The truth about superstitions depends on the self that is the strategy of the patriarchal ideology, which guides the focalizer. So the focalizer internalizes the patriarchal ideology and constructs meaning around this internalization. In this way, he misrepresents culture, custom, religion and myth due to the exclusively patriarchal perspectives but not inclusive humanist perspective.

Males always pretend to be sympathizing over the weakness and helplessness of females: “She couldn’t decide whether to say something or not to Upendra the next morning. Restlessness stirred within her, accompanied by even sharper head pain. An odd fear was taking hold of her” (33). Fixed internal focalizer imposes patriarchy that always represents binaries regarding the females as inferior, superstitious, irrational, and male as superior, universal, rational and so on. The subjects related to women’s psychology have to be legitimized by the male whose duty is to do study and research on them.

Patriarchal Norms and Values and Focalization

The focalizer always represents females as superstitious, powerless, irrational and desiring to acquire the so-called traditions. As a result, the focalizer is guided by the beliefs of patriarchy which present males as superior and the females as inferior. Women’s psychology is not stable because the focalizer legitimizes it by means of his own perspective. Moreover, the male's identity has no origin in him and is not a fixed entity but is differential in relation to the patriarchal discourse about the superstitions.

Malla researches the alternative locations for observing the simply distorted images or substituting a real image of the female and tries to give true voice that gives its ontological consistency to women’s psychology and its fundamental structure.

Being legitimized by this mentality, the focalizer (mis)interprets the women's psychology for imposing the definition of inferiority to defend her own civilization:

Shova's incoherent talk caused Dhanmaya inner turmoil, but she looked on speechless, unable to express a word; with her eyes she merely signaled a helpless look to her sister-in-law. Rajamati signaled back to remain quiet [. . .]. Mother, you all must think I'm crazy, but I'm not, you know. Can't a lorry run over Upendra? She said, steadying herself slightly. After Manik had gone off, some calmness returned to her. (116)

It is the male-centric self that centers towards the male's mission to prolong it for fulfilling his desire. They wish to define themselves as superior and rational by calling the women's psychology as inferior. The process of defining the superstitious female is focalizer's prejudice against women. Superstitions are within the focalizer himself and he imposes it to the female. In this way, the binary opposition between male and female has no validity. As a result, the focalization of superstitious female is false.

When Shova is being (mis)represented, it fulfills the patriarchal interest and purpose because of the patriarchal hegemony. Although there is certainly true of Newari context, focalizer's intentions are undoubtedly to infect his narrative with the suggestion that all fictional endeavors might be similarly arranged. Malla deconstructs the historical process of constructing identity.

The focalization involves implanting of the consolidation of focalizer's prejudice that signifies the continuing control. So, it is a new form of domination, though less overt, it is more insidious. Shova's connection to focalizer matures from initial interest to sexual thought. But the focalizer's response to her remains stuck in sexual ambiguities. Given this failure of love connection, representatives arrive in the

society. Kumari Shova comes over the fear of death as focalizer states, but she achieves a permanent and real sense of self and an ability to deal with evil. Finally she forces powers, her ultimate sacrifice. Cleanliness may or may not be close to godliness, but for Malla, mendacity was surely close to mortality.

The focalizer's deception concerning the presence of Shova adds a problematical term to the truth/ falsehood opposition; "Upendra, you can shout all you like; I don't want to marry you. I don't want to marry you and be called a husband-killer, no matter what you tell me!" Shova, too, retorted angrily" (157). He remains self-possessed, ultimately giving nothing to narratives, but Shova ironically secures sense of self or the ability to deal with evil.

The novel is centered on the narrative of the male because he tries to impose the patriarchal ideology in the forms of politics, identity, culture and language. They follow the male-centric assumptions that males are rational and females are irrational. The females are fixed by the narrative discourse and it misrepresents social phenomena according to the patriarchal taste. Furthermore, counterfocalization problematizes the idea of patriarchy that represents females from male's own perspective. The women's psychology is always shown as inferior, barbaric, irrational and in need of leadership, incapable of self-governance and in managing their resources. Patriarchy is always at the apex of everything, and source of every significant activities:

She was now amazed that she too had once, in her childhood, been enthroned as the goddess Kumari, the living goddess. As such, did she understand the mystery behind it, enough to know what it meant? The only thing people ever did was to worship her and make offerings to her of incense, flowers and sacred items of food. (3)

Counterfocalization claims that patriarchy is not the investigator but the propagator of patriarchic power and hegemony. Female has to depend upon the patriarchal discourses and they are victimized by male's struggle for defining. The narrative always dominates the females because the males always (mis)represents the social, political, geographical and individual situation of the females.

The perception is that Shova is terrified but the narration emphasizes that Shova could protect herself physically as well as mentally. Having eventually to lose that illusion, the focalizer uses a form of witchcraft to entrap Shova's story. In the vanity of his ideal self-image the focalizer just will not face up to the reality of his own unattractiveness. The satirical style comes from the tension between Shova's narration and perception: "Her mind had been shaken since then and had remained so up through the next day" (3). The obvious unrealistic idealization of himself is an irresistibly powerful and attractive personality, and his inability to see, or accept, the truth of the situation: Shova finds him repulsive and frightening. If we do not think the style here is satiric. In that case, the readers will want to work out their own views and arguments the reasons for them, but, as long as they always base their arguments on the evidence of the text, they will be able to build a coherent case.

The discourse of patriarchal officers represents everything about the females as inferior. Their discourse is served through the institution whether the male or the female constitutes them. Such discourse empowers males to rule over the females. Counterfocalization's mission is to exhibit the illusion of the stable self-superstitious binary division, which is a mere discourse, constructed by patriarchal power in a long narrative. In *Kumari Shova*, Upendra is living an ideal life but he is neither sure how to express his real images in reality. His idealism is not used to real life. The reality is that he is unaware about the other people and is able to know his own prejudice. His

position is similar to the idea of politics of irony because it is simple antiphrasis that can be understood by a straightforward meaning.

The focalizer, on the other hand, attempts to remove himself from the 'world as will' to live in the abstracted realm of the 'world as idea'. With such an attempt, we know that Malla has a great deal of sympathy towards the victim. The focalizer thinks he has thought himself the world of reality; but he is, while still a body, irrevocably in it, tied in by all kinds of drives, whether they are the unpredictable propulsions of 'wind-currents', or those of compassionate desire -- or desire disguising itself as compassion. The focalizer is indeed under the dominating influence of the voice -- and text when he portraits the driver who proposes Shova. It is the kind of leakage or punctuation, which cannot be blocked, a gap or wound open to reality, which cannot be sutured. In the form of total instinctive obedience to the basic appetite of survival, eating and sexuality -- operates totally through him, unhindered or interrupted by any of the deferments and displacements consequent upon self-consciousness.

We should note that the focalizer has distinctly opposite attitudes towards Shova. He has maintained an attitude of the most correct and exquisite towards women as towards everyone else. We can be a way of keeping women at a distance quite as effectively as, if in a more civilized way than, the overt and hysterical, if not discernibly sexual; his feminine eyelashes are noted. It suggests that that can become, as it were, over civilized and thereby lose contact with those deeply natural instincts towards the other sex on which nature's reproductive drive depends: "She began to feel inner agitation and fear. The goddess within her had perhaps taken to manifesting the way she did, and to be up in arms at Upendra, out of displeasure at Shova's companionship with him" (84). The focalizer chooses to make his hermitage. In an important vignette about midway through the novel Malla makes the reader aware on

the origin of focalizer's cynical and illusioned attitude toward life. This profoundly affects the focalizer, and stays with him, and a fortnight later he starts on his travels. He leads a wandering life and avoids contact with others. Malla indulges in a little formula damsel-in-distress rescue, and focalizer brings Shova to his solitary, where they slowly develop a kind of heaven.

Here we are given a description of Shova's thoughts as Upendra reflects on his own failure to gain Shova's affections, despite his effort for weeks, and focalizer's thought on his success in apparently doing so. Since the extract is partly concerned with Shova's attitudes, the main tension rests between his view of himself and what he actually achieves. The focalizer has an ideal view of himself in which he is overpowering force full of personal fascinations. That vision of him comes into conflict with Shova's desire for safety.

The focalizer is unable to express his feelings for the life of himself, let him verbalizing his affectionate feelings alone for Shova. Then there is Shova young, soft, and beautiful, yet courageous. The idea of how Upendra elopes with Shova is so thinkable, with her troubled pasts, starting a new life by getting away from everything. It is hilarious how he describes the characters. The focalizer faces a dual dilemma: he's fallen in the trap of gender issue. Preserving Malla's literary elegance, people opt for a simmering escalation of tension:

One could easily estimate how many people throughout the city had died the past year from those who came to make a circuit around, while she was making such an estimate the day before, it had occurred to her that she too would die, all those she was fond of would die, all the celebrants would; none would be spared one stroke of fate or another. (3)

The focalizer, a man of moral sensitivity, functions in a corrupt and derelict world demanding process of self-examination and self-discovery. Malla, to be sure, conveys in this novel the fundamental pessimism and melancholy that stamp his view of the human condition.

The focalizer came back to the girl, who asks no questions, with her strange air of knowing or understanding everything. But at the same time, he also shows how the power of redemption unfolds in the decisions and the actions, which focalizer strenuously enacts in the course of the novel's happenings. In him, we can see a deep, agonizing struggle going on between his habit of detachment and his instinctive need to involve him in the life-process as he tears his self away from the doubts and fears, which prevent one from putting trust in life. The focalizer moves out of his self-chosen isolation of the human being. The focalizer searches for the true reason and ideal life but in reality his ignorance involves in the social circumstances.

Ironic Portrayal of the Focalizer

Malla applies politics of irony in *Kumari Shova* to excavate the tension between traditional and modern beliefs. The ironic mode of *Kumari Shova* creates a paradoxical harmony between the saying and the doing. The focalizer convinces that Shova's world is full of disappointment and unhappiness. He also suggests that the conflictual thought of Shova is one of isolation in order to avoid these disappointment and social circumstances. The focalizer cannot present the real images. He calls himself as idealist but he cannot avoid the social circumstances that influenced him.

The activities of the focalizer are related to the concept of politics of irony as it happens in the space between (and including) the said and the unsaid. Malla views on the space between ideal and reality in focalizer's activities:

Upendra became animated and bellowed out, “Shova, your brain’s not working right! You’ve got this abject feeling that you’re the cause of some horrible wrongdoing. It’s all illusion. Just a while ago you were afraid that Babukaji would run over me in his lorry. So you thought you’d marry him, finish him off and then come back to me. Am I right or not? Now that he’s dead, you’re torturing yourself with guilt for him being so. You’ll become permanently ill! But listen, I’m not going to let that happen. I love you; you love me. What’s mine is yours- you have full rights to it- and what’s yours is mine. (157)

The focalizer is influenced by the receiver and by the surrounding tension that happens a discursive communicative process in which it comes into being in relation between intensions and interpretations. Without hope, without love, without trust, life is but a living death. Upendra, Malla’s hero of *Kumari Shova*, is a complex man we are deeply drawn, to – for he has the heart and he has the high ideals if not the trust.

The whole communicative process is not only distorted but also made possible by those different worlds to which each of them which form the basis of the exceptions, assumptions, and preconceptions of the focalizer that involves a simple decoding of a single inverted message and it is more often a semantically and combining said and unsaid meanings. The focalizer had once been enchanted by the spell of the superstitions, which suggests that he was not conscious to say about his destiny, like a man bewitched. Thus, the more he tries to expose his beliefs, the more he evokes his ignorance. Malla’s style is often ironic- appreciating it is part of the sheer pleasure of reading him. This episode in the novel as a whole is ironic that this thought occurs just at the moment when he is about to lose control over his beliefs,

through his spontaneous acting of presenting Shova. The focalizer dwells on the idea that nobody anywhere in the society is unable to escape from the superstitious beliefs.

Shova said slowly, “Upendra , enough of this talk . You’ll be waiting for me even if Babukaji dies.” And suddenly she took hold of Upendra’s hand and said, “Upendra, I really couldn’t bear to see you die; I really couldn’t. Call it weakness on my part call it anything. This is something my mind is impregnated with. I can’t scrape it away. No matter how much I try, I can’t get rid of it.” [. . .] Holding her, Upendra stroked her and said, “keep on trying, Shova; try to get rid of this superstition. One day it’ll go away. It will. Believe me, I won’t die from marrying you.” (153)

Narration has been infected by focalizer's skepticism and analytical view that never manages to find a way after that to engage with the social circumstances or other people. His view attempts at engagement in awkward and almost depends on his own superstitious beliefs. Malla uses a great line to describe his approach to other people's emotion. The focalizer claims that all people in the society are superstitious. Shova is set apart by her past.

We read much of the focalizer's 'inertia', just as we hear a lot about a similar social sphere as focalizer assumes that Shova has similar position in the society. That all the evolutionary options were, as it were, still open, are clear from such comments as, when focalizer attempts to present Shova’s life in society that took him in the direction of unreliability. As the modes of existence are present in the society, there is a great deal of difference between the two poles. The focalizer seems the very opposite of the gentleman who, by contrast, looks martial who has tries to renounce the lawless jungle of the world without realizing that it is quite out of his power to

force it to renounce him. There are also some odd, and potentially disturbing similarities. The characters are almost perfectly constructed, and they drive the story. The main character has to be one of Malla's most complex heroines. Shova, the female protagonist is a starting combination of innocence and power. The setting is masterfully described, with typical Malla's depth.

Malla's *Kumari Shova* points out the insignificance of individual lives within the context of the social circumstances. The focalizer, resolves to lead a life free of commitment, refusing to take roots in any specific place. The focalizer involves in society, continually experiences the impossibility of absolute detachment that is unavoidable to the very action of speech leads to communication and involvement. An aspect of social circumstances invades even the ideal thoughts; politics of irony illustrates the gap between what is said and what is intended. Thus, this irony emerges from a contrast between what is implied by actions and what is their actual outcome, what is said and what is meant, or what is thought about a situation and what is actually the case. The pretended idealism of focalizer of *Kumari Shova* camouflages his ignorance about the social circumstances. The focalizer, living alone to avoid emotional entanglements, nonetheless rescues Shova. Shova's connection to the focalizer matures from initial interest of gender relationship regarding sexual life. But the focalizer's response to her remains stuck in sexual possession. Even at last he himself is found to be superstitious for he believes upon the culture, tradition, religion, destiny even though he studied science. Here, Upendra, student of science, having unscientific mind creates ironic stance. The focalizer, Upendra believes that others are most superstitious however; he is more superstitious than the others. Eventhough, Upendra was the student of science, he believes on traditional idea that

all will die soon who marry Shova because Upendra becomes happy when Babukaji dies.

Malla's *Kumari Shova* analyzes the conflict between the traditional and modern beliefs, a conflict novelized out dramatically in the emotional relationship of Upendra and Shova. Finally, the focalizer remains self-possessed, ultimately giving real image of Shova, but ironically without a secure sense of self or the ability to deal with the superstitions. It is therefore, his false pride that leads focalization to the false mode. Although he does attempt to become prejudiceless, and free from superstitions, a stance that would involve his total freedom from allegiance to a specific place, he nevertheless fails.

The individual's endeavor to free him from archaeology is, in the form of human relationships or attachment to a place is doomed to failure. Furthermore, since man does not live in a vacuum, focalizer, for all his prejudices, finds himself obliged to come into contact with society. It is another impulse that leads to the focalizer's involvement with Shova, the former Kumari. Although she is a female, there is a certain amount of resemblance between the girl and her benefactor.

Malla is generally acclaimed as one of the most important fiction writers of the modern era, and attention to his work has increased exponentially since writers acknowledged his centrality. While earliest studies tended to work within historical, political studies have mined the fiction in order to unearth other meaning. Recently, a Nepalese context has emerged as significant in his studies. These issues are the prime of Malla's writing. As a result, his writings are analyzed from the light of politics of irony. Malla has remarkable contribution in the field of fiction writing: innovation in form and narrative technique, and profound exploration of human conditions. Though it is by no means good to generalize any writer's preoccupation with certain themes, it

is at least commonly regarded that Malla explores men's relationship between man and society:

Do you understand me, Babukaji? [...] Choose a woman who does. Love one who wants to enjoy the world. What will you have from ascetic, a useless aversion, but disdain, expulsion and me? So go, look for someone else, fix on her and make her your life's companion. What I'm saying probably seems perverse to you. What can I do? That's how the talk of an ascetic is." And she went smiling to her room. (124)

To Malla, the time for one's testing or evaluation comes when s/he is placed in a situation where no public codes function. And at that time s/he gets enlightenment and self-acknowledgement.

The focalizer portrays himself as idealist who knows everything but in reality he knows nothing, therefore, politics of irony functions as a means of discursive strategy that comprises the social and political scenario which makes irony possible in interpreting whether arising from the ironist's intension or from the rubbing together of said with the implied unsaid. Likewise, focalizer considers himself as knowing reality but he cannot know his own prejudice in crisis due to his ignorance:

Shova drank her tea, put the cup back on the saucer, shoved them away and, looking at her aunt, said, "Auntie, I was talking to Upendra about marrying Babukaji. Upendra is willing to wait for me until he dies. Since it's the first husband I strike down, let that scoundrel first die!" (154)

This novel clarifies how the patriarchy attempts to create the marginal position for female people. They view that male is the land of charm, peace and harmony, and migrated people are responsible for creating disorder in the community. Female is not

what it is but it is female by the narrative. The focalizer establishes an identity that creates gulf between the female and the male.

The description of the unfortunate Shova before her escapes also contributes to the central tension that involves relations of power based in relations of communication with issues such as exclusion and inclusion; thereby making the functioning of irony inevitably political as focalizer's reaction to the reality of the situation and the style in which they are expressed. The focalizer's first response is unbelievable, preferring to think, it is 'a survey trick', an underhand practical. When his vanity never allows him to consider that Shova finds him intimidating. He interprets her attitude as submission to the force of his personality. He is so egocentric that he cannot see the reality although it is fairly obvious that Shova is an impoverished and young woman without a friend or protector.

The focalizer is unsure at his early stage of the relationship and feelings with the other persons. The tension here is very subtle: both hero and heroine are living an ideal life of mutual love, but neither of them is sure how to express their happiness or love in reality. So, the ideal is the love of two lovers who are not used to loving or being loved, the reality of uncertainty about each other, and their inability to show their own deep feelings. Thus, the focalizer wants to shun the social activities and stay in isolation but in reality, he involves in the social experiences as superstitious beliefs:

She had sensed that Upendra kept following her with his eyes, and others had also latched on to this. Usha had said to her in just at the time, "He seems to have fallen for you from the first glance. Now that he's in your hand, don't let him go, Shova, hold on tight." Shova had, in fact, guessed that Upendra was impressed by her looks. No matter

how hard men put on airs of being indifferent, they let their feelings show through an expression in their eyes. (7)

This situation is related to the idea of the semantic dimension of irony that is difficult to treat in isolation. Life has a way of being messy and intrusive, Malla knows it, and so he brings the conflict of the story to the island, undeservedly bad reputation following to the focalizer.

If the focalizer's heart does indeed love, and passionately, then Shova's heart has within the unconditional devotion perhaps only a woman can fully express. The tragedy of focalizer is that he so rarely knows how to express female's feelings. We can see how this relates to the central tension of the conflict between ideals and reality, but the point that expresses it baldly. It is by looking closely at the language that we can appreciate how Malla powerfully gives voice to the voiceless by using subversive political irony. Malla's characters have depth and motion; plot is not overwhelming, but enough to hold suspense; dialogue is real and revealing.

The focalizer's achievement of the society is not complete. He has a flaw: he can still be touched. So, despite his deep distrust of action, despite his sense that this world is not worth touching, and perhaps not substantial enough to grasp, despite his having nothing worth holding on to, he is vulnerable, penetrable, touchable. But later he says to Shova that when one's heart has been broken into in the way, all sorts of weaknesses are free to enter. His conviction is that who forms a tie is lost, but on impulse he does form ties. The focalizer feels a secret touch in his heart, handled, grabbed by any of the alien predators drifting around.

The differences and oppositions are not stable for the change with the context: circumstances do not make the gentleman, but they may reveal the latent egoist as Meyers says, "disturbing mixture of tragedy and irony" (419). Malla also works

through distinctions and oppositions; between focalizer and narrator two very distinct groupings. He brings them into confrontation to reveal a number of problematical similarities-within-difference and differences-within-apparent similarities which make it impossible to emerge from the book with any clear and stable sense of any to emerge out of evolutionary progress – whether natural or social. And its impossibility for any certainty about the affixing in any approbatory or derogatory way of the labels of primitive and civilized. Yet a feeling for problematic aspects of ideas of evolution does pervade the book.

The focalizer thinks that the society is superstitious but in reality he himself is superstitious. Shova is described as a dreamer who has an ideal of silence but actually she is destroying all tranquilities and thoughts, until it becomes in expressing tedious. It would seem almost as though language, always threatens to take one out of the world of action, or tries to render one capable within it. Shova, in her capacity, retains her integrity with focalizer who is transparent to her, existing in a world made ambiguously transparent by his own thought, effectively dis-integrates. The focalizer tries both to 'read' and 'renounce' the world, and find no enabling attachment to the world, not even in the elusive but present form of Shova. When Shova is full of her 'passionate purpose' and engages in action, thinking not of herself but of Upendra, the focalizer says that all power of combining words have vanished in the tension of her mind.

The conflict, however, does not pit the saving power of love against the deeper impulse that is destroyed by romantic love. In comparison to reality, manuscript suggests that Malla intended *Kumari Shova* to be a study of deviant religious experience, yet apparently it is sensed that he lacked the convictions of the required themes. When Shova is alone and suddenly confronted by one of the villains, she

feigns sympathy for their plan, and begins to work duplicity that even focalizer is unaware of.

Shova, in a way, sacrifices herself for the sake of her benefactor, dies of gratitude. Shova is strong, presumably to save Upendra, but Upendra's inability to face the prevalent destruction causes renders upon her. He personifies preciously as he collides with the power of the world and finds that he cannot kill the invisible God within him. It is beautiful how the devotion, charm and innocence of Shova were slowly ploughing up the fallow ground of focalizer's heart. The truth is that nobody out here can boast of having known him well:

I understand what you said. You don't want to go through with the marriage rite and come to live with me? All right, in that case see how brave I am. Today I'm going to take you up, clasp you to me, drag you off, tie you up and carry you away. I have no fear that I'm going to die from marrying a Dyo Maihu like you. And you have no reason to fear either, Shova. Agreed?" Upendra spoke laughingly, having grabbed hold of her. (158)

The focalizer is calm and moves noisily to perform the social activities. The description of her appearance is also false. Thus, the language of this novel also expresses the silence, the reverence of the moment. Shova, the representative of societal activity is based on fictions created by males. Since mankind has replaced the natural with the unnatural, and persists in believing that the unnatural is the natural. Nature herself rages in the background through the final act of the tragedy, shivering, trembling and shuddering, much in the way that the natural elements because human beings fail to survive.

In this way, focalization becomes ironic in relation to the idealistic vision of the focalizer. Malla tells Shova's story, not revealing all at once, and she is the most intriguing part of the novel so it is a very clever technique until the end. That dimension of the novel is like a mystery and a good one. The focalizer has chosen a life of solitude and it is slowly revealed that he has a very complex reason for doing so. The love story is a little weak though. By contrast, his picture of male-to-female relation has an unusual intensity and is offered as a bulwark in a dangerously unreliable world. One must concede that in some stories, the stable relationship between men is specifically non-sexual, most often it is contrasted with the instability of a passionate sexual relationship between man and woman. At times the portrayal of relations between male and female suggests a love affair or the solitary yearning of one another.

Malla combines two distinct selves in his focalizer, a man of action and a man of inaction, or an observer. In *Kumari Shova*, Malla tries to balance these two opposing tendencies in his own character. The focalizer has chosen inaction but that choice soon becomes clear that it is not his one choice to make. The world and its other inhabitants also have a say in that. The focalizer may not want to be involved in the world but just by existing, he has already involved as a relational strategy that operates not only between meaning but between people that come into being as the consequences of a relationship, a dynamic, performance, different meaning makers bringing together. The focalizer is not able to avoid the world for a time because eventually the world finds everyone. Though that meeting puts focalizer in touch with the world for the first time. It also puts him in contact with some of the world's more unsavory aspects.

The focalizer is related to many of Malla's characters and indeed incorporates more deeply than most of other characters. He feels in some way 'caught', 'seeing clearly the plot of plots and unconsumed by the lucidity of his mind'. The focalizer, the man admits at one point that he has managed to refine everything. Malla does not celebrate renunciation in *Kumari Shova* rather he explores and exposes its dangers and limitations. The saddest moment in the book occurs when Shova is dying, and focalizer, with his infernal mistrust of all lives finds that he dared not to touch her. She who touched him, and brought him alive again, back into reality – at the end he could not properly and confidently reciprocate that 'touch'. It is a telling, and terrible, indictment, of the life, which he has inherited from gender ideology.

So, the focalizer's motives echo the widespread attitude that sees its own way of life, as the only correct one, and that endeavors peacefully or forcibly to impose the same lifestyle upon what it deems to be the alien, the unknown, and therefore the unnatural, that which needs to be reformed and restrained, since the unknown at liberty is threatening and frightening. In that sense, the focalizer intents upon the reformation of a structure he believes to be less than perfect. Belief in facts implies a belief in the stability of reality and the universality of knowledge, and the focalizer's fascination with facts intimates a quest for knowledge.

One of the contradictions inherent in his nature lies in the fact that this fierce perception believes in hard facts also functions as an artist. His artistic nature is another setback in his relationship with society; if pure detachment from society turns out to be unattainable, a life of pure art is equally unachievable and focalizer's efforts as the indifferent artist is fated to be abortive. The focalizer's stride forward can only result in tragedy since the unnatural actually resides in the very stride that he is aiming at. The pure spirit of love and devotion and sacrifice wakens him from his

sterile negations. It shows that among other things, this girl poses a crucial language problem for the focalizer, a problem which centers on the phenomenon of nomination that is all lucidity and all impotent inertia. It is clear how profoundly Malla intends radical political irony for the voiceless. But the following words are even more important, particularly bearing in mind what has been said about the key words 'automatic' and 'will'. The focalizer perceives that Shova was not automatically obeying a momentary suggestion. She was under influences more deliberate and of greater potency. She had been prompted, not by her will, but by a force that was outside of her and more worthy.

Shova is, by contrast, living life at the present. She is the opposite paradoxical being – patriotic and non-at-home, in place and powerless though she will exert and exercise her own kind of power in the world outside the paternal library. The 'charm' of the 'ghostly voice' of her father constantly exerts a pressure away from all engagement with the physical, negating the reality of 'desire'. It is exactly now that focalizer finds Shova 'unreadable'. She is rarely so direct and articulate. It is as if she is specifically countering the voice of the focalizer, which has just 'spoken' out so firmly against the 'cruel consolation of love' – as if to say, from the grave, one should try *not* to love a woman. The negative forces of the paternal interdiction and prohibition, with its imperatives of repression and refusal, are up against the direct solicitations of the living. The focalizer now finds Shova to be like a script in an unknown language, or even more simply mysterious.

This novel is not one of Malla's crowning achievements but it is the best one he wrote. It does seem appropriate. Author's note tells his glimpse of a girl in Kathmandu who suggested the character of Shova in his imagination. *Kumari Shova* is the story of a woman named Shova who leads an isolated life. Malla's style is

amazing that someone could write so well who did not learn it until later in life and who always spoke it with a heavy polished accent. The focalizer never comes clear in his miserable isolation from others, and Shova, the fleeing girl in distress. Formerly, in solitude and in silence, she has been used to think clearly and sometimes even profoundly, seeing life as flattering optical delusion of everlasting hope, of conventional self- deceptions, of an every- expected happiness. But she is troubled; a light veil seems to have before her mental vision; the awakening of a tenderness, insistence and confused as yet, towards an unknown woman. Gradually silence, a real silence, has established itself around her.

Personally through the majority of the novel, the focalizer is not the truly well defined character. Much of what we learn of him is revealed indirectly through the observations of others, but somehow Malla manages to use this method to flesh out a complex and intriguing figure in focalizer. The unsaid does get said in a hidden way – as the negative residues of a repressed history. Discursive irony, therefore, can also be linked with the question of writing alternative histories and unearthing repressed memory.

The girl Shova at the end is the one exception; perhaps the one thing that found most gratifying is the way in which her character developed as the novel neared its climax. The notes also comment on the narrator's shifting viewpoint. There are often both contextual signals and specific textual makers that work to lead the interpreter to recognize or to attribute irony:

What meaning attached to all these things? What meaning did this banal life hold? Within this inner turmoil, her thoughts came to rest upon Upendra, and then her own hopes plummeted. Upendra, her very own Upendra, would one day also be caught in the noose and carried

off, and they would be separated forever: neither would ever be able to meet, see or touch the other, and an impenetrable black veil would overspread the world. (3)

As is always the case when discussing the particular situation of ironic meaning, what is involved here is in fact a general problem in all communication because focalizer makes a whole life that has been lived in isolation is irony. It was an illusion that the best way to survive was to drift oneself into oblivion. The novel has a happy ending, but Malla's view of the world probably would not permit it. Malla depicts of good and evil battling each other in the society.

The focalizer's activities are socially shaped because it enables to be happened which creates gap between the saying and the interpretation. Although the focalizer pursues this ideal apparently with considerable success, it breaks down on two critical occasions. The irony also lies in language. The politics of irony stems from the idea that the character is contemplating a lifetime of tranquil, if lonely, isolation, but that actually he is on the brink of an involvement with reality that will erupt terrible violence.

Significance and the Need of Counterfocalization in Malla's *Kumari Shova*

The misreading of culture under fictional rule is focalizer's tendency to decode the past and thus understands the superstitions as they are framed and fashioned at the edge of focalization:

She wanted to collect her courage and instill herself with vigor, but for some reason Uppendra's pitiful eyes thwarted her every attempts, and Babukaji's harsh voice and features gave rise to fear in her heart. She shrank and breathed in her indecision. At first she was flustered and felt fear. She could not decide whether to leave her room or not. Her

aunt's highly anxious and somber face caused a strange counteraction in her. She stood up suddenly, looked at herself in the mirror and arranged her hair, and while straightening out her sari, she made the decision that if anything happened, this would be her last contact with Upendra, his house and his family. In a burst of passion she strode boldly out. (132)

Counterfocalization is centered on the subject of hostility between the males and the female's psychology. Mostly there is conflict in case of politics, identity, culture and many superstitious aspects.

There is representation of the females as the superstitious that is characterized by the narrative relation between men's and women's psychology:

Love? Looking into his face, she had merely smiled. Her mind was set at ease at the notion that Upendra knew nothing of the other things. But if he were to find out, would he still love her as much as he did now? Even if she didn't tell him, couldn't he find out about it from some other quarter? Even if she hid it, how could it remain concealed: wasn't it something that everyone knew about? Of course everyone knew. (13)

Narrative is inherent in a discourse, which defines our identities always in relation to what we are not, and therefore what females are not must be demolished as superstitious.

Counterfocalization investigates how the males misrepresent females as inferior and uneducated. The narrative discourse represents their social phenomenon according to the patriarchal taste. Similarly, they feel that every thing that is connected with patriarchy is taken as supreme and sacred. Malla's writing concerns

about the narrative discourse and power, which also has some ill effects on the economies of narrative. This power often develops focalization to serve male's own needs and the characters are parts of the process of fixing relationship of superstitions. The focalizer presents his mentality that has certain stereotypes to represent, and tries to imitate the life style of patriarchy:

Shova , lost in her own thoughts, said softly, “I want to see you live forever. I couldn't marry because you will die. May you go on living – that's the long and short of my wish? Do you know what I dreamed? That driver Babukaji ran over you with his lorry. I'd like to kill the scoundrel while I'm still alive. I want to marry him and kill him so that he can't turn around and kill you. If they say that the first person I marry will die, then may that first person be that evil, dishonest drunkard!” (152-153)

Through the discursive strategies, the focalizer constructs females as speechless, voiceless because the males speak of themselves instead of speaking to the superstitious females in the process of interpreting their behaviors and culture.

Malla presents the narrative situation and brings a view of an obsessed life that is the cause of focalizer's prejudice. The narrative discourse assigns truth and imposes patriarchal ideology on the females to exercise male hegemony. Truth about superstitions depends on the self that is the strategy of the patriarchal ideology, which distorts the image of living goddess:

Right, our love will be deathless. Even if there's no marriage, our love will be deathless. But one thing: let's assume I marry Babukaji and he dies. Would you then marry me, Upen?” [...] whatever it is, I know

what's going on inside! Upendra, why can't you forget your love for me? Auntie, tell him to. This is a love that's causing me torture. (154)

The mission of the narrative discourse is to legitimize the biases and superstitions. It defines them through such a narrative dynamics, simultaneously existing as perpetrators and legatees of historical disenfranchisement and the politics of forgetting. Focalization is necessary for focalizer for oppression.

Patriarchal ideology is not directly imposed upon females but people have accepted male's superiority like focalizer. This novel intensifies how focalizer attempts to create the marginal position for female. Counterfocalization is seen as a political economy designed to ensure one-way flow of thought about the female as passive, perpetual losers, barbaric and irrational. Counterfocalization discloses the fact that the males exploit the women's psychology through the ideology of focalization. The patriarchal ideology novels important role for Upendra because he represents that everything related to male or patriarchy is superior and courageous:

Wasn't this an unnecessary access of feeling, an unnecessary disnoval of love, and unnecessary worry on her part? Why was she unable to check in time this unbalanced behavior of hers? Wasn't this her own fault? Upendra was for her no longer merely a mass of flesh a young man attracted to her or an innocent, reproachless and noble individual.

(9)

Counterfocalization has disclosed that there is no narrative interest without patriarchal involvement and intervention. The identities of males as human beings are only fertile in patriarchy because focalizer thinks that his individual identity as human being is only fertile in patriarchy. Focalization becomes the instrument of domination and measuring rod of rewriting the civilization and culture of the female. The male shapes

the politics as well as the economy of the females. The search for independent present of the females depends on the new modes and techniques of the male itself.

Malla suspends and interrupts the teleology of the narrative state. He reminds us that the images produced by the conditions and their enemies are wholly contingent, yet necessary for, the self-realized needs of narrative. When we relate this novel in Newari context, we can observe the writer's intentions that are undoubtedly to inflect his narrative with the suggestions that all fictional efforts can be arranged similarly. Furthermore, Malla deconstructs this focalization, much as an ethnographer might peel back the recursive identity construction of superstitions in contexts. The more the focalizer tries to legitimize the inferiority of female people, the more he evokes his painful superstitious beliefs:

Shova, fixing her eyes on Kumari in the chariot and mentally bowing her head before her, said, "It must have been the same when I was young, Usha, exactly the same." And her memory of sitting in the chariot in the same manner as now came back of itself, and she began to recall how and when she had been seated in the chariot and drawn around in it. Ruppees, coins that were offered to her kept striking her body, and how one struck her face so hard as to cause pain. (28-29)

Malla locates portentous moments strategically in suspension when an increasing defensive narrative begins making plans for a final reckoning with its superstitions. This novel also examines the ways in which narrative discourse operated as an instrument of power. The focalization is fictionalized of focalizer and he legitimizes gender biases superstitions. The focalizer as an oppressor represents patriarchy. No matter what he focalizes, he distorts the narrative. The effects of narrative dominates psyche of the women by the male narrative power.

Social, cultural and political focalization is allegorically enveloped in this novel. The focalizer internalizes the patriarchal ideology and is ready to create harmony by accusing females. He creates narrative discourse that stereotypes the female as irrational, superstitious and emotional. In this way, the narrative discourse deliberately produces its 'superstitions' in order to create identity and to impose the narrative power over the superstitions:

Suddenly a memory came back to her- Asan Chowk, where the way had been covered with tomatoes, potatoes, onions, egg plants, spinach and fruits that the countless shopkeepers piled up on the ground to sell. There were hordes of people, people everywhere: people bargaining, rickshaws ringing bells in the competition to negotiate road crossings, people filling their sacks with purchased vegetables, and others yelling and screaming. (10)

The females are destined to accept the patriarchal domination because of the patriarchal ideology. Males use their discourse for rationalizing their domination. Malla's writing concerns about the narrative discourse and power, which also have some ill effects on the economies of the narrative interventions throughout this novel. He claims that narrative power exploits the women's psychology because this power is often developed male's colonies to serve their own needs.

The male projects the females. This linear vision of focalization produces the patriarchal ideologies that are used to create the worldview and visions. In this way, the actions of the females are simply misguided and interrelated falsely.

Counterfocalization resists representations by patriarchy. Female are rejected to give any significant role. If any role is given, that is always a secondary and negative for narrative. The patriarchy creates the fixed relationship between male and female.

Patriarchy sees the females for various purposes and later on, they make discourses about them on the basis of their own horizon of knowledge. Malla's novel *Kumari Shova* should not be classified, however, as merely an interesting piece of local color, nor even as study of a period that is tracing the growth of anti-female sentiment:

Now [...] now a fear and apprehension was stirring like a fish in the bottomless depth of her [...] was there no escape from it? Couldn't she live quietly and not think about him? If Upendra had no interest, why should she have any? She got to look at the varicolored fish in the small aquarium in her elder brother's room. Fish! She would have to be ever restless the way fish are. She would have to renounce her hopes of lasting happiness and, steeling her heart and live a resolute life. (11)

While focalizing *Shova*, the focalizer represents her as superstitious. Females are represented from his own understanding and imagination. He imposes the patriarchal discourse to these females; "I've told you, leave the thinking to me. Stay in your little world and continue the work I set you" (255). The narrative discourse, regarding *Shova*, does not signify the real images that are lurking at the very centre of fictional discourse. Malla suspends the narrative. The focalizer reminds us that the images he produces are wholly contingent or, yet necessary for, the self-realized needs of narrative expansion and hegemony.

Counterfocalization questions the focalizer's biased representation of the female as "superstitious". The stereotype constructed by the patriarchy about female is the main focus of the counter reading. The focalizer's chaotic mind is affected by the prejudice: "Shova had seemed depressed to the point of being seriously troubled. Even though he had wanted to talk to her along the way, she had been trying to put

him off” (36). This example evokes his desire to construct the females as superstitious. He always waits to be imposed by the authority of male. His concern is not for the will to understand independent or dependent, but his concern is about narrative that allows him to be independent or not:

Shova had made the decision to broach the fearful topic to Upendra, a person of nobility, smiles with high spirits. Would she now have strength and courage to do so? She steeled herself by stretching out her sari – collecting her forces, as it were. Upendra was walking in front of her. She saw only his back and shoulders regularly swaying amidst the talk and laughter. Slowly, with the memory of his guileless, trusting and innocent face, her resolution crumbled, her body weakened, and a feeling of utter weariness came over her. (46)

The focalizer speaks through and by virtue of the patriarchal imagination that is dominated by prejudices. The focalization, not only suppresses the attitudes but it also aborts the possibility of resistance to it from the patriarchy. It can also be originated from domination.

This dissertation analyses the patriarchy's biased perception of the female as the superstitious in relation to Malla's *Kumari Shova*. The stereotypes and prejudices constructed by males are the main focus of the study. Malla illustrates the picture of living goddess Kumari who is stereotyped by the focalizer, a male. He always thinks that male is superior to female. In this way, by imposing the narrative discourse, focalizer represents females as superstitious.

Thus, to conclude this chapter, counterfocalization, subversive political irony and Saidian critical humanism became the apt tool to do justice to the marginalized voice of Shova, her mother, her brother, the truck driver and others since we have to

find out the possibility of the marginalized voice from the 'unsaid' meaning out of the said one that is taken as elitist discourse.

IV. Conclusion

The politics of counterfocalization in *Kumari Shova* critically analyses focalizer's discursive form that encompasses the strangely enabling constraints of discursive context and foregrounds the particularities not only of space and time but also of gender, ethnic and sexual choice with the application of theoretical tools like counterfocalization, subversive irony and critical humanism. Focalizer in *Kumari Shova* illustrates the discursive idealism that makes the social circumstances ironic that is mixture of the said meaning with the unsaid. He exercises his power in a discursive form. His activities are always crucial to interpret meaning and find politics in a relational strategy between said and unsaid meanings. Therefore, Malla's novel emerges from the dialectical tension between the outward representation of the characters as true revolutionist with better insight of social mobility and their inner reality that is dark and full of ignorance. The focalizer portrays himself as idealist who knows everything but in reality he knows nothing. Furthermore, he considers himself as savior but he does not know that his own life is in crises because of his ignorance.

The focalizer convinces that Shova's life is full of disappointments and suggests that the ideal life is one of the isolation in order to avoid this disappointment. The focalizer as an idealist is isolated because he cannot avoid the superstitious beliefs that have influenced him. As a result, the tension between idealism and pragmatism creates a tension between the saying and doing. Focalizer's social circumstances make interpretation possible whether they have arisen from the ironist's intention or from the rubbing together of the apparent said with the implied unsaid meaning. Focalizer's purpose is to mix the said meaning with the unsaid one. It is the writing that is in control of the materials and knows clearly the effect he is trying to

achieve. The focalizer may or may not be the intended addressee of the ironist's utterances but he is the one who attributes irony.

The wider tension between ideals and practices that the focalizer has been discussing makes ideas memorable. The focalizer can only sit and look at Shova. The detail of his conversation shows that he is awkward in speech, speaking without diplomacy and being content mainly with silence and waiting. He feels a divine enchantment, at the novelty of having such a woman to care for, but he cannot express his feelings, activities in words. Shova is in a similar position: She would rather stare at the gloom of the forest than look at the focalizer. More than this, she is frightened of betraying herself. The reason seems to be that she thinks of her love for Upendra as a revelation of something best concealed because he appears for the need of her love. The focalizer seems as if he has no idea what she is feeling. As Shova feels as if she cannot show it in any way, therefore, her ideal can be expressed only through some act of absolute considerations. Hence, the use and interpretation of irony takes place in the dialectic form of perception and narration.

The focalizer's discursive forms are the complex configuration of shared knowledge, beliefs, values, and communicative strategies but that is the condition of gap between ideal and practical. In their discourse, the political meaning, in the whole communicative process, is not only altered and distorted but made possible by those different micro political power relations of patriarchic discourse to which each of us differently belong to. And from the basis of the expectations, assumptions, and preconceptions, we bring to complex processing of discourse of language in use. Irony, therefore, rarely involves a simple decoding of a single inverted message in this novel; it is more often a semantically complex process of relating, differentiating, and combining said and unsaid meanings with some evaluative edge.

Counterfocalization discloses the illusions of the focalizer as he expresses his ideologically shaped process, involves forms of social practice of interaction between participants in particular situation. The focalizer seeks inner reality of Kumari but the gender bias always affects his mentality. It is the critical point in focalizer's life, which is clarified by counterfocalization. The sense of loneliness occurs not a long time before or after Kumari's decision to seek an ideal of isolation, but in the very hours of renunciation of social reality. As a result, the two contradictory impulses occur almost simultaneously. Thus, counterfocalization critically analyses focalizer's discursive form, discursive context and particularities of space, time, gender, ethnic and sexual choice. Malla, by deploying such unreliable focalizer, tries to give the picture of how focalizer, with his biased and ideologically guided view, misrepresents the focalized. It is because the focalizer is the representative of biased and superstitious society during Malla's time.

Thus, to conclude, counterfocalization, political irony and contrapuntal reading of Saidian critical humanism are useful to do justice to the marginalized voices of Kumari Shova, her mother, her brother, truck driver and others in *Kumari Shova* because we have to find out the possibility of the marginalized voice from the 'unsaid' meaning out of the said one that is taken as elitist discourse.

Works Cited

- Abrams, M.H. *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. 6th ed. Harcourt: Banglore, 1993.
- Acharya, Badri P. *Requirement and Implication of Counterfocalization in J. M. Coetzee's Disgrace*. Kirtipur. CDE, 2005.
- Bal, Mieke, *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997.
- Booth, Wayne C. *A Rhetoric of Irony*. Chicago; The University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Chambers, Ross. "Reading and Being Read: Irony and Critical Practice in Cultural Studies." *The Minnesota Review* 45(Fall-Spring 1995): 113-30.
- Conway, Daniel W., and John E. Seery, eds. *The Politics of Irony: Essays in Self Betrayal*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1992.
- Culler, Jonathan. "Narrative." *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Davis, Kimberly Chabot. "Male Filmmakers and Minority Subjects: Cinema Verite and the Politics of Irony in Hoop Dreams and Paris is Burning." *South Atlantic Review* 64.1(Winter 1999): 26-47.
- Enright, D.J. *The Alluring Problem: An Essay on Irony*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.
- Genette, Gerard . *Narrative Discourse: An Essay in Method*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1980.
- Hutcheon, Linda. *Irony's Edge: The Theory and Politics of Irony*. London: Rutledge, 1994.
- Kenan, Rimmon. S. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. London: Methuen, 1983.
- Magil, Frank N. *Masterpiece of World Literature*. New York: Harper, 1998.

Malla, Vijay. *Kumari Shova*. Trans. Philips H. Pierce. Kathmandu: Royal Nepal Academy, 2001.

Mallios, Peter. "Kumari Shova: An Island Tale." *Trade Paperback* 6 (July 2003): 1-4.

Meyers, Jeffrey. "Lord Nelson and Malla's Kumari Shova." *Homosexuality and Literature* 17 (1980): 419-26.

Muecke, D.C. *Irony and the Ironic: The Critical Idiom*. New York: Methuen, 1982.

Pandey, Beerendra. "Deconstructing Irony: Reading Paul de Man." *Literary Studies* 15 (February 1996): 51-55

_____. "A Paradigm Shift in the Representation of Violence in Partition Short Stories by Women: Political Irony in Shauna Singh Baldwin's 'Family Ties.'" *The Atlantic Literature Review* 5.3-4 (July-December 2004. New York): 105-11.

Said, Edward. *Humanism and Democratic Criticism*. New York: Columbia UP, 2004.

Walsh, Richard. "Who is the Narrator?" *Poetics Today* 18.4 (1997): 130-42.