

I. Hindu Rituals and Politics

Nepal is a small country, located between two giant countries India and China. It has direct influence on culture and religion from India due to the open border system. Northern part of it has been influenced by China culture and customs. Various types of religions are prevalent in Nepalese society. Hinduism is one of them, which has its domination on the society of Nepal. It is the religion having several distinct cultures, customs, rites and rituals. Hinduism is one of the world religions. Axel Michaels writes, "Nevertheless, Hinduism is counted as one of the major world religions in the world. With more than 663 million followers, it even from the third largest religious denomination- after Christianity (1.67 billion) and Islam (881 million) and before Buddhism (312 million) and Judaism (18.4 million) ". (18)

The one who follows Hinduism is called a Hindu. Persia is Hindu's origination. In the history of origin of Hinduism, it is said that the Hindus (Aryans) came to India and started to settle on the Shore of Indus River. Axel Michaels remarks "In fact the term "Hindu" is a foreign appellation used initially by the Persians for the population living on the Indus river (Linguistically derived from the Sanskrit *Sindhu* , meaning river or sea)". (13)

Hindus came up with their customs and religion. Earlier, Nepal was a part of great Indian continent called "Mahabharata". It couldn't remain untouched of Hindu influence. Hindus extended in most of the parts of the world including the European continent.

Vedas, Puranas, Epics, Dharmasastras, Manusmriti are the books written in Sanskrit language which Hindus consider as the divine language. R. C. Zaehner clarifies about the spoken language of Hindus, coding *Veda* thus:

The sacred language of the Hindus is Sanskrit, and Sanskrit is itself a development and formalization of the more ancient “Vedic” in which “Vedas” were composed. It is an Indo-European language with very links with Iranian group of language spoken through out of first Persian Empire. (18)

These books are called holy books and they were the prime sources to rule the society culturally and religiously. They deal with the proper conduct of social life being based on discipline and morality. Most of them focus on sacraments which are called ‘Samskaras’ in Hinduism. Sixteen Samskaras are privileged in Hindu culture though there are other sacraments as well. For the number of Samskaras, Pandey further comments, “At present sixteen are the most popular Samskaras [...]. The latest Paddhatis have adopted this number.” (23)

Sixteen Samskaras include rituals from conception to death. Each of them has its distinct space and worth. Samskaras are said to be done for the purification of body, soul and spirit. Dr. Rajbali Pandey writes:

Manu says, “By performing the Samskaras, Conception, Birth-rites, Tonsure, and Upanayana, seminal and uterine impurities are washed away.” He (Manu) again adds, “The bodily Samskaras of the twice-born sanctify this life as well as the other.”[...] . Another purpose of the Samskaras was the attainment of heaven and even Moks(h)a or liberation. (29/31)

Naming ceremony

Naming ceremony (Nwaran or Namakaran) is one of the chief sixteen Samskaras or sacraments. It is done to name newly born child for its identification.

Pandey further remarks:

Br(i)haspati with a poetic exaggeration remarks about the desirability of name : Name is the primary means of social intercourse, it brings about merits and it is the root of fortune. From name man attains fame [...].The new child was blessed to become firm like a stone, strong and crushing like an axe and grow into an intellectual man. Therefore, naming ceremony is very praiseworthy. (78)

It is consider that naming ceremony purifies the impure bodies of child and mother. P. Thomas remarks, “A family in which a child born is considered ceremonially unclean for ten days and the Namakaran is preceded by a minor purificatory ceremony.” (88)

Naming ceremony is done on the day of eleventh or twelfth of child birth. An astrologer or a priest names the child by observing the position of stars in universe on the auspicious time of child birth. He counts stars (Nakshytra) and names the child for its fame and prosperity. About it, Thomas further remarks:

Namakaran ceremony is popular among Hindus. It is usually performed on the tenth or twelfth day of a child’s birth. [...] The Hindus attach great importance to names. The name is suggested by the family astrologer. Usually he makes a pretext of studying the child’s horoscope and suggests three or four names which the father of the child may choose. (88)

Different Pandits or sages have their arguments on the naming ritual, its time, day on which it is performed and how it is organized with the first letter. Wendy Doniger with Braoven K. Smith in their translated version of “The Laws of Manu” mentions; “The name- giving should be done for him on the 10th day (after birth) or the 12th day

or on excellent lunar day or movement or under a constellation that has good qualities.” (20)

The priest who performs naming ceremony is an authorized person to conduct the rituals of sacraments. He performs rituals by chanting Vedic Mantras as he is born in Brahmin caste which is said to be the first class and the other castes; the second class. According to Pandey:

We can broadly divide the purpose of Samskaras into two classes. The first class is popular and superstitious, which is motive by unquestioned faith and native simplicity of the unsophisticated mind. The second class is priestly and cultural. Its origin is due to conscious forces governing the development and evolution of society, when human beings try to improve upon nature. The priest, though not beyond the ordinary man and the street, and he introduced considerable refinement and culture into social customs and rites in a variety of ways.(25)

Except Brahmins other castes haven't got the authority to perform rituals of any rites in Hindu society because other castes are considered to be lower on rank than Brahmins. Wendy Doniger with Braoven K. Smith further explains, “[...] The very birth of Brahmins is a constant incarnation of Dharma (God of religion), for the Brahmin is born to promote religion and to procure ultimate happiness [...] he is born above the world the chief of all creatures” (11).

It is named “Sharma” to Brahmins as they are regarded godly images, “Varma” to Chhetriyas as they are thought strength, “Gupta” to Vaishya because they are considered as merchant and “Das” to Sudras because they are regarded as servants

specially helps to other three castes. The Sanskrit scholar Dadhiram Marasini points:

Nama cha dwyakshram chaturaraksharam wa sukhodhyam
sharmantam brahmanshya, varmantam chhetriyasya, guptantam
vaishyasya sudrasya cheti.” (Name is given of two or four letters and
after first name adding Sharma, Varma, Gupta and Das to Brahmin,
Chhetriya, Vaishya, and Sudra respectively made it listen to the child.)
(223)

In Vedic period all people were considered equal. No caste division was there.

According to P. Thomas, “It is interesting to note that there is no mention or sanction for the caste in Rigveda, the most ancient and sacred book of Hinduism” (23).

But Manu, an educated man, made laws, rule and regulations in his book called “The Laws of Manu”. He divided castes into four groups by the virtue of their birth, color and professions done since their ancestors. Edward J. Jurji writes, “The book of Laws, the code of Manu, of about 200 BC, uses the term ‘Varna’ in a complicated context with something other than a rigid color connotation” (61).

The four castes still prevalent in Hindu society are Brahmins, Chhetriyas, Vaishyas, and Sudras. According to Manu caste division has been done by the will of god. Manu ranked Brahmins top mostly. He glorified them as learned, intelligent, pure, wise, and civilized and the incarnation of god by the virtue of their birth because it is regarded that they are born from the head of Brahma (the god). Brahmins are given authority to do whatever they like even to kill man called Sudras. Thomas writes, “[...] If a Brahmin kills a Sudra, the crime is equivalent to Brahmin killing a cat, an ichneumon, the bird chasha, a frog, a dog, a lizard, an owl, or a cow” (19).

It is said that Chhetriyas are kept below Brahmins as they are considered to be born from the shoulders of the god. Their duty is to rule the country and guard its armies. They are the force who protects the nation as well as Brahmins and other people. The dynasty of Shah King is the example of Chhetriya ruler in Nepal. Anantaraj J. Rawal states, “A Chhetriya should give a gift to Brahmin and should worship Narayana. He should take care of the people of his state like his own son. He shouldn’t return from the battle field should either win or die [...] he is called Raja (The king)”(30).

Vaishyas are regarded to be born out of the waist of Purusha (the god). As merchant, they are given task to engage in business to promote economic side of nation. Their duty is to worship Brahmins and to feed the people of the nation. J. Rawal further describes:

The BUP (*Brahmavaivartapurana*) mentions only the functions of the Vaishyas who constitute the third order of the society. It states that performing trade agricultural tasks, worship of Brahmins and god and observing of the vows are the major functions of Vaishya. This is accordance with the rules of Dharmashastras. (30 / 31)

Sudras are thought to be born out of the feet of god. They are called untouchable and still it is prevalent in society. Dalits are not allowed to enter Brahmins’ houses and they are avoided to touch the water publicly. Caste division of Manu gave them the duty of serving to other three castes and they are regarded as servants. Rawal states, “Their special duty is the service of Brahmins. This is also in accordance with the rules of the Dharmashastras”(31).

Due to the role rank of birth, these Sudras have been considered to be poor, dirty and uneducated and ugly. They are given the title “servants or peasants” for

long. Another critic P. Thomas describes, “Their status, according to the Hindu Law books, is very low in social scale. [...] The principal social duty of a Sudra is to serve the three higher castes specially the Brahmins”(19).

Hindus have been ruling society making people believe what is written in holy books as divine truth. Hindu society ran with Hindu rites, rituals, culture and customs giving prime position to Brahmins and still it is in practice. History glorified certain people giving supreme power as higher race and dominated other people suppressing much, declaring them untouchable. By the virtue of caste division, people were treated with social practices differently that gave a way to arise the voice of marginality. In course of time, many changes go frequently. Various principles have been developed which speak from the side of margin. 20th and 21st are the centuries which make people be aware to search their own identities, rights and positions in the societies worldwide. Several movements have been launched to bring the equality and to subvert the hierarchy created socially knowingly or unknowingly from the time of human civilization.

The political movement of Nepal in 2066 got tremendous political and cultural transformation. The ancient ruling king as a chief ruler was thrown out and replaced with President. Multiparty system with people’s democracy has been through different practices. The existing Hindu Kingdom Nepal got name replacing “Secular Nepal” and ‘the kingdom of four Varnas and thirty six castes’ said by late king Prithvi Narayan Shah has been changed with multi castes (ethnic), multilingual and multi cultural Nepal is a Republican country. The slogan of federal Nepal is also being raised in the country is going through a process of constructing constitution after the election of Constituent Assembly 2008. In the new Nepal the new kind of perspective

should be brought. So that every culture, ethnic group, customs and religion will get chance to be equal rather than staying in hierarchy.

In the name of Samskaras in Hindu society, it is seen that there is the power domination of certain caste over other multi castes with regard of superior and inferior, touched and untouched. It needs to deconstruct the history which praises the fixed caste by virtue of their birth, color, mind and job. History is power construct and it uses its all efforts to make people believe it as natural as the ecosystem. Aryans claimed themselves as the incarnation of god creating history by writing holy books; *Vedas, Puranas, Laws of Manu*, Epics like *Mahabharata* and *Ramayana* where they tactfully saved their position equal to the supreme power (God). Kewal Motwani writes, “Manu gave his teaching to the world, telescoped in to one word, Dharma. Dharma, he said, is the beginning, the middle and the end of the cosmic and the mundane drama”(6).

With the magic weapon called ‘Dharma’ (religion) Hindu lawmakers (Aryans) made their network of power that is kept hidden in every rite and ritual, culture and custom which is known as ‘Samskaras’. It can be dealt only with the lens of new historicism.

It is clear that naming is an important ritual that has its reflection of Brahmin communities. Though many researchers have given their views in their own way describing the Samskaras based on exact scriptures and Hinduism, which was rigid and hierarchal. Now in the context of present secular, global, ethnic and republic Nepal, the ritual naming ceremony (Nwaran) is seen essential to be researched. Every culture and religion is going through the process of constructing new history, so, centre in ancient period doesn’t remain centre forever rather it requires to use the spectacles of new historicism for equality.

II New historicism

New historicism as a term refers to the parallel reading of the literary and non literary texts usually of the same historical period by giving equal weight on the basis of the special and temporal background. Moreover, new historicism blurs the hierarchy that privileges either the literary text over the nonliterary text as in new criticism or the non literary text like history over literary text as in old historicism or biographical historical criticism. Likewise it also accentuates the cultural, political, social and economic ambience of the historical period embedded within the text at the time of its production. New historicism even exhumes and questions the singular reality, objective truth, and other established facts. For this the role of the new historicists is to “go –between at once within the field and external to it” (Veeseer 21). Thus, a new historicist analyses any text whether it is literary or non literary, being within the historical period when the text is produced. Nevertheless, he also encompasses all the external circumstances that help to produce the text indirectly. Therefore, the text is the outcome of the socio economic and politico cultural atmosphere, which is deeply embedded in the text that becomes the instrument to analyze the text for the new historicists. So new historicists view that history should be constantly revisited, rewritten and reread along with the demand of time.

New historicism, as a critical approach to literature, undoubtedly rejects both the autonomy of the individual genius of the author and the autonomy of the texts. Instead, it views the literary text as only fore grounded form of socio -economic, politico- cultural milieu. So, it is obviously inseparable from the historical ground; and the author is also in the grip of the historical circumstances of the period of the texts’ production as Frye says, " A history is a verbal model of a set of events external to the mind of the historian” (400). But “it is wrong to think of a history as model

similar to a scale model of an aero plane or ship, a map or a photograph” (White 400). In other words, it is one discourse among many cultural discourses.

The term new historicism had been baptized decades before but it got its recent meaning in early 1980s through the work of the prominent new historicist Stephen Greenblatt, who first of all took it to analyze particularly the works of Renaissance period. Latter in the broader sense, it occupied a place as a critical approach to see literary and non literary works, cultural and non cultural matters equally being based on their historical context. Thus, it blurs the hierarchy, prejudices and biases of the literary and non literary, cultural and non cultural texts particularly to give privilege to the former over the latter. Moreover, new historicism even changes its jaundiced eye to view history as objective, monolithic, linear, causal, static, homogenous and authentic by implanting another eye that sees everything equally according to socio-economic, political and cultural aspects. Thus, new historicists take history as the matter of interpretation, perception, and it is subjective. So, new historicism dismantles all these traditionally established facts and proceeds by taking history as heterogeneous, unstable, progressive, processual and preamble. By taking this fact in to consideration, H(arold) Aram Veaser writes:

Louis Montrose thought new historicism equally unprogrammatic, saying new historicists are,” actually quite heterogeneous in their critical practices”, and Catherine Gallagher added that the “phenomenon” was one of “indeterminacy”. As for the most recognizable new historicism, Stephen Greenblatt declared that new historicism was “no doctrine at all” and made other disavowals that provoked one reviewer to say, “The general himself is [...] swearing

that he is no theoretician, that his invention of the term new historicism was virtually accidental". (1)

From this excerpt, it is said that history is the representation in the form of narratives or stories. So, it is the matter of perception. History is always the part and partial because the histories are the products of the same historical society. So, there is no adequate totalizing explanation of history. But, in contrast to this history is dynamic, unstable interplay among discourses through which historians can analyze it; however, the analyses will always being incomplete because there is no definite, authentic and universal history.

New historicism is a practice rather than a doctrine. History veers according to the interest of the power holders. To elaborate this opinion upon history, a renowned critic Hans Robert Jauss, in his "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory", clarifies the absence of objective truth within history in this way:

For the positivistic view of history as the "objective" description of a series of events in an isolated past neglects the artistic quality as well as the specific historical relevance of literature. A literary work is not an object which stands by itself and which offers the same face to each reader in each period. It is not a monument which reveals its timeless essence in a monologue. It is much more like an orchestration which strikes ever new chords among its reader and which freeze the text from the substance of words and makes it meaningful for the time. (75)

Another critic Laurence Lerner puts his view in his 'History and Fiction' "[...] for history is simply the result of writing and (even more) the ideology of the historian. This would mean that the past is unknowable" (437). So it can be said that the definition and interpretation of history is based on ideology and interest of historian,

and other socio-political, cultural, economic and even material embeddedness can be viewed on the basis of his /her location despite all the historical circumstances. Thus, it is hard to grasp the past authentic history completely in a direct and objective way since it is largely based on the ideology of the historian.

From all these aforementioned extracts of different theorists and critics, it is clear that any historical text does not have objective truth. Rather it is the product of socio-economic, politico-cultural circumstances of contemporary historical period. So the text can not remain untouched by historical context and it is equally ineluctable from the clutch of time and place-specific milieu. If any text claims to be 'objective', it will accidentally lose its artistic or aesthetic aura. Any text can not remain as a monument to display its same fact to the different viewers of different period. Instead, it is a podium from where the conductor announces the changes of scenes and actors on the basis of time and place.

Dealing with history as the 'objective truth', the so-called recorded facts accidentally happen to be mixed with fictional account in its textual form. The tendency of new historicism to view its history as literature and literature as history is thus confined within the boundary of the 'tantalization of histories' and 'historicization of texts' by blurring the age-old demarcation between history and fiction, which ultimately become inescapable in to each other. Now, the literature and history, therefore have neither their 'beginning' nor 'ending' because they emerge as the negotiable product in the society. New historicism blurs hierarchy between literary and non literary, cultural and non cultural texts and the tendency to see the former in the light of the latter one. It subverts the hierarchy of high and low, good and bad, elite and popular culture. New historicists, therefore, observe the history, fiction and culture with the same eye and with equal importance. To paint the golden

color in this opinion, Laurence Lerner further opines, "[...] history tries to be true. [...] All history must be consistence with itself [...] there is only one historical world"(439-40). From these sentences, one can claim that the written or recorded history is merely the representation of those who are in power. These power holders twist history according to their interest by any hook and crook. The elites group and the power holders try to maintain their status-quo by hiding the reality of the past. Thus, as a repercussion of power politics the persons who are in power [mis]interpret it or hide the fact according to their interest. This mire of power politics of elites intentionally tries to create the top most position in society either through history or culture.

In this sense, the new historicists remind us that it is treacherous to reconstruct the past as it really was – rather than as we have been conditioned by our own time and place to believe that it was. In other words, as far as the historical narrative includes complex set of symbols consisting of sign, symbol, icons, allegory-shared also by the fictional or cultural documents, therefore it can never claim the ‘objective truth’. The historians apply the figurative and discursive language. In this regard, Hyden White says:

For the historian’s aim is to familiarize us with the unfamiliar, he must use figurative rather than technical language [...]. All historical narratives presuppose figurative characterization of the events they purport to represent and explain. And this meant that historical narrative, considered purely as verbal artifacts, can be characterized by the mode of figurative discourse in which they are cast.(404)

From all these above mentioned excerpts, it can be stated that ‘historical writing can never be scientific’. It always becomes entangled in tropes, figurative language.

History can be set over against science by virtue of its will of conceptual rigor and failure to produce the kinds of universal laws that the sciences characteristically seek to produce. Similarly, history can be set over literature since its interest in the actual rather than the possible, which is supposedly the object of representation of literary or cultural works. Thus the 'objective truth', 'singular reality' and 'unified universal truth' are questioned by new historicism under the influence of Foucault and White.

There are some tenets of new historicism to portray its difference from other literary genres. It is the 'parallel study' or the 'equal weighting' of the literary and non literary text produce in the same historical era, is one of the first foremost major tenets of new historicism. Likewise, blurring the age-old demarcation or hierarchy between literary and non -literary texts, fact and fiction, elite and popular culture, vertical and horizontal practice of reading, is another equally important feature. To take history is the matter of perception and interpretation and its heterogeneous, unstable, flexible characteristics are other tenets of new historicism. Since new historicism is based on the matter of perception and interpretation, there is no final, singular, exact meaning of any texts. In this sense, history can be taken as the permutation of past for it must be constantly rewritten and reviewed on the basis of historical background.

Subjectivity, as opposed to the 'objective truth', can be taken as the penultimate tenet of new historicism because new historicism firmly denies the 'objective truth' as fact for history is invented or constructed by those elites who are in power. Last but not the least, the shift from the singular, objective monolithic 'history' to the multiple, subjective and heterogeneous 'histories' and the embedded socio-economic, politico-cultural circumstances are at the apogee among the tenets of new historicism.

Thus, new historicism, by embracing the possibilities of the sub version of the twisted history of the power holder in the form of culturally recorded facts, possibilities of exhibiting the embedded cultures of contemporary period, and possibilities of dismantling of the hierarchies 'eschews totalities, teleologies, and grand narrative, turns to details, local knowledge and what Frank Lentricchia calls, "The gritty ground-level texture of life"(Veese 4). For Veese, the new historicists' assumptions of expressing, unmasking, critiquing and circulating the embedded religio-cultural, socio-political materials on to the common ground for the assess of all the people change the unchangeable, alter the unalterable, and separate the inseparable human truths.

Old historicism observes the historical events as new historicism but being static and with the singular, monolithic, unified spectacles. So, it can't step further according to the demand of time. In contrast to this stability of old historicism, new historicism emerges out to accelerate the history further challenging the elitist's interest to maintain their status-quo. This helps to raise the voices of marginalized and suppressed people to be heard even by the elitists and the power holders. Therefore, new historicism instantly has become popular since its emergence in the 1980s. It unlike being old historicism raises the issues that have been so far ignored, and even exhumes all the embedded elements that help to ransack the then contemporary historical, social, cultural, political and economic issues. For this new historicism is a process which spreads its tentacles to the heterogeneity, multiplicity, instability and indeterminacy. But, on the other hand, old historicism is static homogeneous, unified and authentic.

Traditional historical critics have taken social and intellectual historical context as 'background' information necessary to appreciate fully the separate world

of art, one which a work of art is used as independent or autonomous corpus. New historicists reject not only this distinction but also the separation of artistic works from their creator and audiences, on the other way, traditional historians, thinking history as monolithic, having single narrative plot with a series of events of linear, causal relationship, believe that the so-called single, unified, universal, authentic history can be obtained through objective analysis, which is impossible for new historicists. Moreover, Old historicists observe the events from the 'top', whereas new historicists analyze the events from the 'bottom'. In other words, the old historicists view any event from elitists' perspective, whereas new historicists view it from marginalizes' perspectives.

Hegelian notion of "the Will To Live" is the bottom line of incipient for Nietzsche's "Will To Power", which ultimately leads to sow the seeds of new historicism. The Hegelian idea of "the Will to Live" and "the Spirit of Age" is moving towards the perfection slowly and gradually, which is unattainable for Nietzsche. So, he brings the idea of "Will to Power" to counter Hegelian idea. For Nietzsche everything is in the network of power that determines truth, and is relative and subjective. Thus, the truth is something like alchemist, which can not be attained. Nietzsche thinks power as pervasive everywhere and the only important thing in the world. Everyone desires for it by all his means of hooks and crooks. In this matter, Nietzsche posits, "The only thing that all men want is power, and whatever is wanted is created by those who are in power. So, truth is also shaped by power. The hitherto excepted truth as the representation no longer exists in Nietzsche because he says that life can never be understood in term of ultimate truth. Any form of writing, claims Nietzsche, cannot represent truth since writing is presented through "a mobile wanted for the sake of power. If some thing is wanted more than something else it must

represent power.” (qtd. in Adams 511) Nietzsche further says, “Truths are illusions of which one has forgotten that they are illusions”(qtd. in Adams 636). Therefore, truths are the matter of perceptions and interpretations, and there is no ultimate truth.

Nietzsche’s central point is that an individual and culture that concentrate too much on history alone loses the ability to act since the action required forgetting. According to him, when one completely indulges in the past, he/she loses the promise of future. Historical sense, for him, no longer preserves life but only mummifies it. He even claims that super –saturation is one of the causes of modern decadence. By taking all these facts into consideration, Nietzsche proposes the concept of suprahistorical being or superman who is able to create history to solve the problem of history.

Thus Nietzsche questions the singular reality, essence, and the absolute truth when he announces “the death of the god”. Similarly, he celebrates the heterogeneity, multiplicity, fragmented self in the matter of meaning of any text.

Foucault has significant contribution to drag new historicism up to its maturity. Foucault, as a genealogist thinker, refuses to say history as evolutionary process, a continuous development toward the ‘present’. Neither was history regarded as an abstraction, idea or ideal, or as something that began ‘in the beginning’ and would reach to ‘the end’ – a movement of definite closure. To understand Foucauldian idea of history, it is necessary to conceptualize the notions of power, discourse and knowledge/ truth. The text, for Foucault, is verbal formation in the form of ideological products or cultural construct of certain historical era. That’s why; it is not also outside the network of power, discourse and representation since these are social, cultural products and are taken for granted in certain historical context. Thus, historian can not escape the “situatedness” of time, and the “embeddedness” of the

social practices. In addition to this, text, for him, speaks the power structures, oppositions and hierarchies which are after all the products and propagators of power since the text never reflects or represents preexisting entities and orders of historical situation. It is there by obvious that history is always written from the perspective of historian, and the position, a historian occupies in society determines the history he writes.

Discourse: Truth and Power

‘Discourse’ is a Foucauldian concept which deserves the equal position to construct the ideas of power and knowledge. Discourse is one of the disciplines. Discourse creates power, which ultimately creates knowledge that is truth. So, there is the network of discourse, power and knowledge. But all of these components are subject to change because truth becomes a perpetual object of appropriation and domination. This implies that discourse is always in the process of formation, co relation and transformation which take place after a certain epoch. Discourse is produced within a real world of power struggle. It is used as a means of gaining and sometimes even subverting power. For Foucault, discourse is a center human activity. So, he is interested in the process how discursive practices change over time. It means that meaning of any discourse depends on those who are in authority. The discursive practices, however, have no universal validity but are historically and culturally dominant ways of controlling and preserving social relations of exploitation.

In another way, all discourses are the inventions of the power struggle and there are no absolutely ‘true’ discourses but it is only the matter of how much more or less powerful ones. Discourse is directed to obtain power. In other words, every discourse is in the persuasion of power. Foucault opines that discourses are deeply rooted in social institutions, and that social and political power operates through

discourse, which is the ordering force to govern every institution. Moreover, power can not function in the absence of knowledge/ truth. Hence, discourse creates such a space where by the social, moral, religious and political disciplines always control human behavior directly. There fore it is a means of achieving power since discourse is indispensable from power. This becomes more obvious when Foucault says:

Indeed, it is in discourse that power and knowledge joined together [...] . To be precise, we must not imagine a world of discourse divided between accepted discourse and excluded discourse, or between the dominant discourse and the dominated one; but as a multiplicity of discursive elements that can come into play in various strategies [...] . Discourses are not once and for all subservient to power or raised up against it, any more than silences are. (100-101).

In this sense, discourse is always on the way of persuasion of power whether it be of accepted or excluded, and of dominant or dominated. So, it is inextricable from power.

Discourses, according to Foucault, are produced in which concepts of madness, criminality, sexual abnormality, and so on are defined in relation to sanity, justices and sexual normality. Such discursive formation massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in the particular period. Foucault argues that the rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or rational, have the power to silence what they exclude. His main point, here, is that meaning of any discourse depends on those who control it. For example the scientist who first claimed ‘the earth revolves round the sun’ was punished and his truth was ignored because for the people who were in power had another version of truth: ‘the sun revolves around the

earth' so truth can be proved wrong by power. People recognize particular piece of philosophy or scientific theory as truth, only if it fits the description of truth laid down by the intellectual, cultural or the political institution of the day, by members of ruling elite or the existing ideologies of knowledge. Every system of knowledge establishes rules for exclusions or discrimination and it always implies taking side. Systems of knowledge establish rules and procedures governing the particular epoch by exclusion and regulation. Foucault regards the nature of discourse as an event in time since it is not only that which represents, struggles or systems of domination, but the object through which and with which we struggle, the power we seek to possess. For him, as for Nietzsche, any attempt to produce and control discourse is 'will to power'. Every instant of discourse embodies power struggle, as Foucault argues, "Discourse is a violence that we do to things"(qtd. in Selden 60). Truth itself becomes not an unchanging universal essence but a perpetual object of appropriation and domination. This implies that a discourse is always in a process of formulation, co relation and transformation, which takes place after a certain epoch.

In "Truth and Power", Michel Foucault, using techniques gathered from psychology, politics, anthropology and archeology, presents the analysis of the flow of the power and power relations. According to Foucault, power is not always repressive, and it circulates in the same direction rather it also bears the qualities of productive and creative potentials. So it is not only the means for the ruthless domination of the weak by the stronger and subjection, sub-version, but it functions in consent as that of Gramsci's 'hegemony'. Hence, power does not move in one direction in stead it circulates in all directions, to and from all social levels at all times. And the vehicle through which power circulates never reaches its destination.

Thereby, power is never ending process, and in the way of formation. In this regard, new historicist has a great affinity with Foucault as he states:

Power is everywhere: not because it embraces everything but because it comes from everywhere [...]. Power comes from below, that there is no binary and all –encompassing opposition between ruler and ruled at the root of power relation, and serving as a general matrix- no such duality extending from the top down [...]. There is no power that is exercised with a series of aims and objectives. (93-95)

From this definition of power and its scope, it is obvious that power does not inmate through hierarchy. It subverts the traditional concept of taking power as only the tool for subjection and domination since it turns the negative conception of power upside down. This means to say that power is all pervasive, and deserves equal weight.

Foucault sees every action and every historical event as an exercise in the exchange of power. Structure organizes and broadens the wave of power. The society is a huge wave, and much of the power tends to be concentrated towards the higher echelons. Power flows simultaneously in different directions and different volumes according to the various terms of ‘power relations’ in the ‘network’ of power exchange. Regarding power in truth Foucault says,

Now I believe that the problem does not consist in drawing the line between that in a discourse which falls under the category of scientific truth and that which comes under some other category, but in seeing historically how effects of truths are produced within discourses which in themselves are neither true nor false.(1139)

Following Nietzsche, Foucault denies that history can ever be objectively known. "Historical writing can never be a science. It always becomes entangled in

tropes"(Selden 102). "Any form of writing," claims Nietzsche, "can not present truth." Nietzsche denies that there is any reality behind the appearance of the world. "All discourses, including history", according to Foucault, "are produced within a real world of power struggle [...]. Claims to objectivity made on behalf of specific discourses are always spurious: there are no absolutely 'true' discourses, only more or less powerful ones"(qtd. in Selden 102).

According to Foucault, every discourse is meant to obtain power. In other words, every discourse is involved in power. He views that discourses are rooted in social institution and that social and political power operates through discourse. Discourse is the ordering force that governs every intuitions and culture. Hence, the discourse is inseparable from power. Discourse is a means of achieving power. The social, moral, cultural and religious disciplines always control human behavior directly by means of discourse. So, people at times can not do whatever they feel like doing. The discursive formations have enabled intuitions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding 'the other'. Such discursive formations determine and constrain the forms of knowledge and types of normality of a particular period. These discursive practices have also the power. Truth is being told, with 'facts' to back it up, but a teller constructs that truth and chooses those facts. In fact, the teller of story or history also constructs those very facts by giving a particular meaning to events. Facts do not speak for themselves in either form of narrative; "The tellers speak for them making these fragments of the past into a discursive whole"(qtd. in Hutcheon 56). According Foucault, truth is not outside power, or lacking in power. It is rather a thing of this world which is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraints in a society. So, each society has its own regime of truth. Furthermore, the power diffuses itself in the system of authority and the effects of

truth are produced within discourses. But the discourses in themselves are neither true nor false. Foucault argues, “Truth is linked in a circular relation with system of power which produces and sustains it, and to effects of power which it induces and which extend it”(qtd. in Adams 1145).

Thus, Foucault sees truth as a product of relations of power and it changes as system changes. History is narrative and it is in the form of discourse. It is entangled in the power relations of its time. Cultural works mentioned in history are not secondary reflections of any coherent world- view but the active participants in the continual remaking of meanings. In short, all the texts including history, culture and literature are simply the discourses which seek the power of ruling class- the power to govern and control. Another aspect Foucault discusses about in course of writing history genealogy. By following the footsteps of Nietzsche, Foucault takes genealogy as a critical approach which analyses the incidents, and gives detail analyses of society in general. Genealogy as a philosophical critical approach undertakes to expose the inextricable connection between knowledge and power, and subsequently the connection between all claims to absolute truth and different forms of power as it is said that knowledge is power. Unlike the tradition one, genealogical history is the history of oppressed people, not about the rulers but about the ruled one. It tries to explore into race, body and desire. It also attacks the supposed coherence of subject. Moreover, Foucauldian genealogical concept opposes the notion of lofty origin in history. His is the genealogy, which apparently seems as the reinterpretation and re-evaluation of the historical events in the counter relation to power, is reconstruct the history through the marginalized and oppressive perspective.

Foucault opines that every epoch of history is not connected with each- other rather it is a kind of fragmented series of events, a chain of unrelated events.

Genealogists even consider the insignificant and minor events as significant because they do not believe in the point of perfection. They do not believe in the possibility of teleology and the concept of origin. History, for them, is not linear and cyclic. Critics see Foucauldian terms like archeology and genealogy as tools for studying the history. The function of genealogy is to expose the body totally imprinted by history and the process of truth. Foucault takes genealogy as a synchronic method to deal with history, whereas archeology as diachronic. Genealogy, for him, is Nietzschean effort to undermine all absolute grounds, and demonstrate the origins of things only in the relation to and in context with other things.

Among the three- fold bundles of genealogical history, it is more interesting to pay the attention in its scope. Attacking the supposed coherence of a thinking 'subject' is the first area where genealogy dwells upon. Secondly, genealogy dissolves the fiction of singular human identity. The attack upon the notion of the origin/truth in historical investigations is the third one. In the same way, the idea of history as discontinuity is the penultimate one. As last but not the least, genealogy focuses not upon ideas or historical mentalities but upon the 'body' so as to show it totally imprinted by 'history'. Besides this, as genealogical historian Foucault, departing from the traditional concept, reforms the role of a historian having three- fold tasks. A historian, while confronting the 'one' reality, should be in favor of the use of history as 'parody'. In this view, Linda Hutcheon is close to Foucault as Hutcheon as well takes history simply as parody. The second task of historian should be directed against a 'singular human identity'. And the final task is the investigation of a historian which should be directed against 'objective truth'.

Through the observations of all these aforementioned features, it can be stated that Foucault's genealogical concept is to reconstruct the history by subverting the

linear history, by seeing into the histories of events. Genealogy reconstructs the history through the marginalized and dominated people's perspective that is the new historical perspective to take all the neglected bodies of the society altogether. This perspective comes in sharp contrast to the historical one and creates a new history which is not the final one but the emergence of a history which may have more histories within it and related to it. Thus, the embryo of new historicism has been planted through the emergence of Nietzschean and Foucauldian ideas of history which challenge the singular, homogenous, monolithic, universal, unified history to embrace the histories of heterogeneity, multiplicity, instability, progressive, processual and ever-changing in course of time and place.

New historicism, though a 1980s phenomenon, has equal significance in reading the literature of any period based on the framework of contemporary time and place along with the embedded social, political, cultural and even economic aspects.

In this way, new historicism deals with the power perspective that is discursively hidden under the surface of poetics in the name and fame of rituals like naming ceremony as well. Power is everywhere and history is the outcome of certain historians who write it being guided by 'will to power'. Through the spectacles of new historicism, it can be seen that history is power construct and it is instable, untruth and dynamic which changes when the power gets changed. So, it needs to rewrite the history from the perspective of marginal.

III. Hindu 'Samskaras'(Rituals): Their Origin and Importance

Every society bases on its own typical history. Society is the mosaic of various cultures, rites, customs and rituals. Hindu society also is fixed on its own distinct historical paradigm. It has been getting its spirit on the foundation of cultural history that has been ruling the entire Hindu society since the beginning of human civilization. Sacraments (Samskaras) are the prime identities of Hinduism. Raj Bali Pandey in his introductory of *the Constitution of the Samskaras* gives his view:

The Samskaras are a complex combination of various elements. They express believes, sentiment and knowledge of the ancient Hindus about the nature of human life and the universe and their relation with the super human powers that were supposed to guide or control the destiny of man. The Hindus believed that man requires protection [...]. So we find a mixture of religious and secular factors in the Samskaras. (1)

A society or a social group gets its own identity by its typical rites, rituals, cultures and customs. Hinduism also has its distinct position in the heritage of religious world. It has been controlled and conducted by social, cultural and theological codes, rules and regulations. Still the Hindu society has been getting its spirit alive on the flesh, blood and breathes of conventional history that makes the people believe all historical things true like divine truth.

Though, time has changed with the various new practical and scientific thoughts and principles and old historical, cultural and ritualistic things are taken as worthless, but, still the Hindu society is getting its motion with the hierarchical society created by age long history.

Vedic period was the period that had been ruled by *Vedas*. *Vedas* were very ancient books which are the prime sources of Hindus to govern the society. About the

origin of *Vedas* Raj Bali Pandey writes, “The Vedas are universally recognized as the primary source of Hindu Dharma [...] the oldest document of the religious literature of the Indo – Aryans is the Rig-Veda” (1/2). About the initiation and importance of Rig-Veda , the another writer called Louis Renou states, “Rig-Veda a difficult text which contains hymns addressed to the god, [...] maybe dated from the middle of the second millennium BC, is the most ancient literary document of India and one of the most ancient of indo- European world” (22).

Sacraments are the framework of each religious society. Hindu scriptures also deal with the importance, worth and value of sacraments which are known as Samskaras in Sanskrit. Dr. Raj Bali Pandey, showing sacraments mentioned in Rig-Veda, remarks:

It (Rig-Veda) contains hymns used by the priest in the sacrifices to high gods, we catch glimpse of popular religion in several places. Moreover, there are a few specific hymns that are particularly concerned with popular rites and the ceremonies. The wedding, the funeral, the conception, the birth rite are narrated in them [...]. Thus, there are those hymns that are general applicability in the sacramental rituals [...]. It is in the Grhyasutras that we find directions for all sorts of usages, ceremonies, rites, customs and sacrifices, the performance and observance of which were binding on the Hindu householder [...]. The Puranas deal with ceremonies, customs and usages and fasts and feasts of the Hindus and then throw light on many parts of the Samskaras.(2/11/16)

Hindu books indicate the purpose of Samskaras or sacraments apparently. Dr Pandey states, “ Yajnavalka also endorse the same view- some kind of impurity was attached

to the physical side of procreation and lying in the womb. Therefore, it was thought necessary to remove that impurity from body performing various Samskaras”(48).

Naming Ceremony: Poetics and Politics

The ‘Naming Ceremony’ is one of the sixteen Samskaras of Hindu culture. It is the ritual which is performed on the tenth or twelfth of the day of child birth.

Naming has its own distinct importance. Dr Pandey writes, “ Ever since man evolved a language, they have tried to give names to things of daily use in their life[...]. The Hindus very early realized the importance of naming persons and converted the system of naming into a religious ceremony”(78). About the origin of 'Naming Ceremony' of Hindus Dr. Pandey further writes, “*Naman* or name is a word of common occurrence in the Sanskrit literature and each found even in the earliest work of the Indo- Aryans, the Rig- Veda. Names of the objects and persons are found in the Vedic literature” (78/79).

Naming has its own identity, value and holy importance in Hindu sacraments. It is considered that naming ceremony purifies the impure body of child and mother. P. Thomas remarks, " A family in which a child born is considered ceremonially unclean for ten days and the Namakaran is preceded by a minor purificatory ceremony" (88).

Though, naming has its own pious importance and worth, the historians did a power politics making status a determining factor in the composition of the name. Dr Pandey states:

The name of Brahamana should be auspicious that of a Kshatriya should denote power, that of a Vaisya wealth and that of Sudra contempt [...]. The name of a Brahmana should contain the idea of happiness and delight, the name of a Kshatriya should denote strength

and ruling capacity, the name of a Vaisya wealth and ease and that of a Sudra should contain the idea of obedience and servitude. (81)

As authority is guided by the 'will to power' every individual [historian] is driven by the power as well. So, they just want to hold and have power because having power they get rights to dominate the poor as the way they want. They want to establish their own monopoly. It can be observed in naming sacrament too, indicating Rig-Veda Pandey says, "Different casts should have different surnames. Sarman was added to the name of a Brahman, Varman to that of a Kshatriya, Gupta to that of a Vaisya and Dasa to that of a Sudra"(81). Here, Sudra is regarded as 'Dasa' the servant whereas Brahmin is regarded as 'Sarman' the intelligent, master and the divine like character. Here is a question that how Dasa (servant) can be assumed for success and prosperity as mentioned in Dharmasastras that Pandey writes, "The adoption of a second name (middle name) is assumed for success and distinction in life" (132).

The mainstream history always glorifies the authority which discursively preserves its position higher in society by using all the means of communication – oral, written and visual and all the media. It is a bitter reality that keeping all the means of communication under the control of power, the authority suppresses the downtrodden class making unheard ever. The same condition is seemed when the right to perform the naming ceremony is given to the Brahmin who is authorized to purify the other three castes from impurity of child birth. Dr. Pandey writes:

The Brahmins assembled there said, 'may the name be established'. After it the father formally made the child salute the Brahmins who blessed it, repeating its name every time, 'Be long-lived, beautiful child! Be long lived for the sake of heaven; for the sake of almighty

god and for the sake of this beautiful world! They also recited the verse
 ‘thou art Veda etc’ .85

About the given supreme position to Brahmin in Rig-Veda, another writer Radhakrishnan writes, “Nobody could understand the mystery of it all, except the priest who claimed for himself the dignity of a god on earth [...] without them, the sun wouldn’t rise [...]. No wonder the priest claimed for himself a divine dignity” (125 /126).

When Manu divided Hindu society into four castes, social disorder, conflict and condemnation got planted in society. Kenneth W. Morgan writes:

In the name of caste system the Hindus have developed too much class hatred and too little of the spirit of cooperation. The caste system with its rigid walls of separation is bound to pass away, as it has become completely out of place in modern world conditions. But the underline principle of Varnadharma is valid for all time, in the ideal society wealth, numbers, and power should sub-ordinate to character and culture. (19)

Earlier Vedic period was equal to all, every one was considered equal by birth. Louis Renou writes, “There is no difference in castes: this world having been at first created by Brahma entirely Brahmanic” (14). But when castes were divided then gulf between castes to castes created. K. M. Panikkar writes, “The seer of the early Vedic period know-nothing of caste. [...] one discovers only classes, not castes. The elements which go to form castes were however there so that gradually a gulf was created between one order and another”(26). Likewise, another critic, Jayaram V, showing the bad effect of caste system in Hindu society, writes, “The caste system divided the society vertically and horizontally in to several groups and bred distrust

and resentment. It promoted disunity, distrust and caste prejudices among the people”(11).

The castes division gave the supreme position to Brahmins in Hindu society. The writers of Hindu creed generated power through castes and Samskaras. Elsewhere, Brahmin is defined with divine images. It can be clear when we observe P. Thomas’s remark. Mr. Thomas states :

Every member of a Brahmin’s body is said to be a centre of pilgrimage. The holy Ganges is in the Brahmin’s right ear, the sacred fire in his right hand, and all the holy places on his right foot. The Brahmin’s mouth is the mouth of the most exalted of the god and everything put in it is sure to bring prosperity to the world, hence, the need for feeding Brahmins by all who desire happiness in this world and the next. (10)

This exaltation of the Brahmins has a background of social need. By creating a class of men devoted to the pursuit of knowledge and the study of the law, the ancient Hindus hoped to build their social structure on unshakeable foundation. Practically every law book dwells at length upon the benefits that accumulate from giving present to Brahmins. Thomas further states, “Heinous sins are atoned for by giving them presents. If a man sells his cow, he will go to hell, if he gives her in donation to a Brahmin he will go to heaven” (11).

In the religious creeds which are the texts of history, Sudras are considered the savage, dirt, uneducated, untouched and second soul. P. Thomas states, “Their status, according to the Hindu law books, is very low in the social scale [...]. The principal social duty of a Sudra is to serve the three higher castes, especially Brahmin”(19). The writers of the Hindu scriptures tried to suppress other three castes through the

historical lines which are still very strong to control the society. They used Sanskrit language and stopped Sudras to read Vedas to avoid them to know the reality of the text. They tried to keep them ever ignorant, illiterate and dark. P. Thomas writes:

The Sudra is not allowed to read the Vedas, the most sacred of Hindu religious books. If a Sudra transgresses this law, his tongue is to be cut off. If he listens to the reading of the Vedas, molten lead is to be poured in to his ears [...]. If a Brahmin kills a Sudra, the crime is equivalent to a Brahmin killing a cat, an ichneumon, the bird chasha, a frog, a dog, a lizard, an owl, or a cow. (19/ 20)

These lines are the proof of the tyrant view of the fixed elite group which was power drunk and driven by will to power. In the name of god they did very hatred task by dividing the equal mean to different castes according to their color and professions, forever. So, obviously there is no truth in their history. It is merely a fictional one. K. M. Panikkar writes:

The fact is that the fourfold castes were merely a theoretical division of society to which the tribes and the family groups were affiliated [...].The census today given the names of more than 3000 castes, with innumerable sub-divisions among them. The fourfold division is therefore, merely a fiction – a platonic myth. (21/ 22)

Manu, writing “The Laws of Manu”, preserved the higher positions of Brahmins in every field of the state. He let Brahmins the way to enter in each and every sector of the nation. Kewal Motwani, translating ‘Manu Dharmashastra’ writes:

A Brahmin is a man of wisdom and there is need of wisdom in every walk of life, in every field of social activity. So, we are Brahmins in the educational institutions working as teachers; in family – economic

institutions as preachers and priests, ministering to the religious and spiritual needs of people engaged in distributing food and wealth among other groups, and in the state as judges, legislators and philosophers – statesmen. (70)

Throwing glimpse on the historical facts that automatically highlight Brahmins, Motwani further writes, “The king as the head of judicial system should appoint a Brahmin well –versed in law who should assist him in the administration of justice. This legal advisor together three other Brahmins, constitute the full bench”(142).

History is subjective and is not an exact science by any means. Historians make own interpretations, based on acceptable methodology. Person who holds power only can write history and such history only sings a song evocation for him. As power creates truth, history focuses about Sudras, Vaishyas and Chhetriyas became truth for them. Thus, historians write history which is beneficial for them. They can twist the truth easily and write about their wish. In the same way, Hindu lawmakers who were in power wrote history making Sudras unclean, untouches, of low caste and spirit who only can survive serving other three castes. But it was not mere fact. Therefore, no history about caste division and their definition is reliable and objective one. Every history is guided and expressed by historian’s motif, which can be observed in the statement of Dakshinarajan Shatri, "Two kinds of gods there are- the gods are the gods, and the learned and studying Brahmans are human gods. Between these two is the sacrifice divided. The sacrificial gifts are for the gods, the presents are for human gods, the learned and studying Brahmans" (193, Himadri’s quote from Satapatha Brahmana).

Among the four castes, Brahmin is known as the superior caste because of his birth in his family. The religious lawmakers, the godly recommended leaders, priests to teach

the other people, the builders of Vedas and the readers are Brahmins. They are the ones chosen by god to perform the sacrifices.

Historians may believe they are being objective, but their own views of what is right and wrong, what is civilized and uncivilized, what is important and unimportant, and the like will strongly influence the ways in which they interpret events. K. M. Panikkar writes:

The ideal view is that Hindu society is divided into four castes, the Brahmins or the priestly class, the Kshatriyas or the fighting class, Vaishyas or the trading class, and Sudras, the working class. Now, it would be obvious even on a causal examination that this fourfold division is only ideological and not in any manner based on fact. It is, as we propose to show, only an ex-post facto systematization on a horizontal basis. (19)

That is why, what is written and believed in Hindu scripture is totally subjective and is not authentic. For most traditional historians, history is a series of events that have a linear, causal relationship: event A caused event B, event B caused event C and so on. Furthermore, they believe we are perfectly capable, through objective analysis of uncovering the facts about historical events and those facts came sometimes reveal the spirit of the age that is, the world view held by the culture to which those facts refer. It is written in translated version of 'Manu's code of Law' by Patric Olivelle about the occupation of social classes. Patric Olivelle writes:

To Brahmins, he assigned reciting and teaching the Vedas, offering and officiating at sacrifices, and receiving and giving gifts. To the Kshatriya, he allotted protecting the subjects, giving gifts, offering sacrifices, reciting the Veda, and avoiding attachment to sensory

objects, and to the Vaishya, looking after animals, giving gifts, offering sacrifices, reciting Veda , trade [...] a single activity did the lord allot to the Sudra, however, the undergoing service of those very social classes. (91)

In above lines, there is the idea of power and knowledge. The historian, Manu, creates a discourse that creates power, which ultimately creates knowledge that is truth. So, there is the network of discourse, power and knowledge. Manu's discourse has created social hierarchy in Hindu society which is now filled up with conflict, fragmentation and violence. Wendy Doniger writes, "The Vedic ideology once described by Sylvain Levi as 'brutal' and 'materialistic'" (xxiv). Similarly, another critic Jayaram V, criticizing, about another Hindu law book named 'Manusmriti', states, "It was created to enslave the human minds of Indian continent like a cow bound by a chain to a pole" (1).

History can not be exact; it can never be science. So there is always chance to be omission and addition. History is also like literary texts and there is a kind of discourse situated within a network of cultural discourses- religious, political, economic, aesthetic- which both shape it and, in their turn are shaped by it. History itself is a text, an interpretation, and there is no single history. So, the age long history of Aryans presented caste system is not true one. And the Samskaras defined under the castes are also not authentic. Especially the ritual naming ceremony that varies in performance i. e. different days in naming, putting different middle names according to the castes also is only hypothetical and fictional. They are discursively created with power perspectives by historians, with various advantages. So that it is totally bad for those suppressed group and advantageous for the elite group who control the society and wrote history according to their desire. Jayaram V writes:

Caste system has been the bane of Hindu society for centuries. In terms of impact, it did much greater damage for a much longer period to a great many people than the slave system of the western world or the witch – hunting practices of medieval Europe. The Hindu caste system was a clever invention of the latter Vedic society, justified by a few law makers. The upper castes found it convenient to retain and perpetuate their social and religious distinction and political and economic advantages. (Hindiism/h_caste.asp/ 3)

Discourses are produced in which concept of higher and lower caste, touchability and untouchability, upper class and lower class, divinely image and non-divinely image, master and servant, pure and impure, protector and protected, pardoner and pardoned, emancipator and emancipated, white and black ruler and ruled and so on are defined in relation to justices and religion, sins and emancipation. Such discursive formations massively determine and constrain the forms of knowledge, the types of normality and the nature of subjectivity, which prevail in the particular period. The rules and procedures, which determine what is considered normal or rational, have the power to silence what they exclude. The meaning of any discourse depends on those who control it and they won't like to disclose it. They ever keep it under their control. Every system of knowledge establishes rules for exclusion or discrimination and it always implies taking side. Furthermore, system of knowledge establishes rules and procedures governing the particular epoch by exclusion in regulation. About, how Aryans established their majesty position in Hindu society by creating a discourse, Jayaram V states:

The Rig- Vedic people won over the society not through the power of sword as some historians want us to believe but through their superior

skill in debate and magical ritualism which they used to gain royal patronage of the local kings. Well defined code of conduct, rewards and punishment and purification procedure became necessary to regulate the inflow of new members in to the Vedic society and their integration into the existing framework castes with out disturbing the social structure and the dominance of the priestly class.(3)

It is said that power can make two plus two five. It can establish its unshakable world using techniques gathered from psychology, politics, culture, custom, religion, anthropology and archeology. Every action and every historical event can be seen as an exercise in the exchange of power. Power organizes the structure which regulates and broadens the tides of power. The society is a huge wave, and much of the power tends to be concentrated towards the higher echelons. In Hindu society, caste system, purposes of sacraments and their performances divisively, also, is the outcome of power. About, how caste system was laden by the then elite Aryans in the contemporary society by writing their scriptures, Jayaram V writes:

The caste system was enforced with the help of law books such as *Manusmriti* and the support of king who considered themselves as upholders of Dharma. The forces of tradition, superstition, religious belief, fear of punishment also create an important role in its success [...]. The caste system was preserved and enforced mostly through the royal support.(4/5)

Any historian can not escape the “situatedness” of time, and the “embeddedness” of the social practices. It is there by obvious that history is always written from the perspective of historian, and the position, a historian occupies in society determines the history he writes. Regarding the so-called divine truth and

holiness of Hindu scriptures and about Hinduism itself K. M. Panikkar writes, "There has been no such thing as a uniform stationary unalterable Hinduism whether in point of belief or practice [...]. There are sound principles underlying it [...]. Hinduism is a movement, not a position, a process not a result, a growing tradition, not a fixed revelation. (90/ 91)

Language is another means of discourse that creates power, which ultimately creates knowledge that is truth. With the help of language, power functions in consent as that of Gramsci's 'hegemony'. Sanskrit is the language of Hindus who regard it as the divine language. R. C. Zachner writes, "The sacred language of Hinduism is Sanskrit and it is the language of god, in which Vedas were composed" (18). Wendy Doniger also states, "In Manu, the Veda is regarded as both immanent and transcendent" (xli). Except Brahmins other three castes are under the hegemony of books written in Sanskrit language. They sincerely obey what is written in *Vedas*, *Puranas* and *Dharmashastras* regarding as their responsibility and religion. So, Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras greatly respect to Brahmins as Monier William writes, "The Brahmins are supposed to constitute the central body, around which all other classes and orders of beings revolve like satellites"(58). Being hegemonized, these three castes Kshatriyas, Vaishyas and Sudras adore their gifts to Brahmins to get emancipation and prosperity in this present world and the next. They regard Brahmins pure, holy, pious and divinely image as P. Thomas states, "By virtue of his supposed origin from the head of Brahma, the creator, the Brahmin is considered the heights of the caste"(11).

No language can be divine and godly. Every language is holy and pious by their virtue of task to share human feelings and emotions. All languages are equal. That is why; the doctrine of Veda is untrue, unstable and subjective.

For the Hindu law- makers (Aryans) outcaste Sudras saying untouched, savage and second soul. They glorify Brahmins denoting all power in their hands with the image of the incarnation of the god, who is considered the entire essence of human world. P. Thomas writes, "The Brahmins are the most intelligent caste among the Hindus"(16). All the time they superiorised the Brahmins and they inferiorised the other three castes especially Sudras. About the typical features of Vedas, Wendy Doniger writes:

The Veda was established quite early on as unquestionable revelation, regarded as both massive and magnificent, the source of all knowledge and as the canonical touchstone for all subsequent 'orthodox' truth claims. Co-relatively, the Vedic sacrifice became the paradigm of all praxis in post Vedic Hindu traditions. (xli)

Obviously, power twists the truth and truth is not outside the power, or lacking in power. It is rather a thing of this world which is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constrains in a society. So, each society has its own regime of truth which goes changing when the power changes. H. C. Chakravarti defining the philosophy of 'Upanisada' writes:

The system of castes consists that the law of social life should not be cold and cruel competition, but harmony and cooperation. Society is not a field of rivalry among individuals. The castes are not allowed to compete with one another [...]. It should be universal and developed, an ethical code applicable to the whole of humanity.(79)

Here, the historians tried to twist the fact because to categorize a society into caste system is itself a contradictory and full of violence. Hierarchy in the society can cause social, racial and ethnic conflicts, but, being witty and powerful, they passed the

dogma of castes is to create a harmony and cooperation in society after fragmenting it. Chakravarti further states, "Indiscriminate racial amalgamation was not encouraged by the Hindu thinkers"(71). He says "They make caste is really custom" (71).

Aryans were the historians to write their theological and religious scriptures, codes and laws. They gave feedback to the Brahmins to circulate their power over human society. They fixed Brahmins' position chainless generation to generation.

Chakravarti remarks:

The Brahmins were allowed freedom and leisure to develop the spiritual ideas and broadcast them; they were freed from the cares of existence [...]. They are said to be above class interests and prejudices, and to possess a wide and impartial vision. They are not in bondage to the state, though they are consulted by the state.(77)

None can be freed from the care of existence and can be above the class interests and prejudices. It is also not relevant that one can be out of bondage of state. As an author is a cultural construct, the historians who wrote history were affiliated by the political and cultural circumstances that they lived in. So that history written by them is subjective, untrue and full of prejudices.

The Hindu lawmakers, being driven by the 'will to rule' over entire Hindu society, tactfully formed their supreme position. Pointing exalted position of a Purohita, Dakshinarajan Shastri writes," The concluding chapter of the Aitareya Brahmin shows the exalted position of a Purohita, the gods do not eat the food of a king who has no Purohita. Therefore, a king should select a Brahmana as Purohita. The Purohita is the Ahavaniya fire, the Purohita is Agni"(192). The god is only the man made thing, neither it eats any food nor rejects it. The concept of God has already been under -erased when Nietzsche declared 'the death of god'. It means

not only the fellow of Brahmin caste can be Purohita; a learned and wise fellow from any caste can be a Purohita or a Pandit. So, their history is entangled with power motif. It is not objective, linear and causal rather it is only preamble, subjective and fictional.

History can not be represented in pure form for it always remains relative to the narrators' prejudices and preoccupations. In the introductory chapter of the translation of 'The Laws of Manu', Wendy Doniger comments about the agendas that Manu tried to deal with. Doniger writes, "But this agenda is not merely political; Edward Said was wrong when he said it was all politics" (xlvii). Further, she writes, "Some of it is politics, and we are grateful to Said for raising our consciousness of this uncomfortable fact, but some of it is not politics, and here he has put us on the wrong scent" (xlvii). Analyzing the agendas of Manu, further she states:

Brahmins (like all the rest of us) have at least two agendas; they do have a political agenda, but they also have an intellectual agenda. The laws of Manu may well have been inspired in part by the desire to establish Brahmin status over physical force (Kshatriyas) and economic power (Vaishyas) but it was also inspired by the desire to solve the human intellectual, psychological and logical problems of killing and eating, making love and dying. (xlvii)

The power holders twist history according to their interests by any hook and crook. The elite groups and the power holders try to maintain their status -quo by hiding the reality of the past. Thus, as a consequence of power politics the persons who are in power misinterpret it or hide the fact according to their interest. The bog of power politics of elites intentionally tries to create the top most position in society by either religious history or culture. Talking about the supremacy of Brahmins that is

mentioned in 'the Laws of Manu' Donigger writes," The whole world is under the power of gods, the gods are under the power of 'Mantras', the 'Mantras' are under the power of Brahmins, the Brahmins is therefore our god"(12).

Thus, Hindu lawmakers avoided Sudras' generation to read Vedas and other Hindu scriptures being feared of the potential danger over their status-quo of generations to come. They tried their best to preserve their status- quo by making a great ladder of hierarchy, creating caste system. Kancha Ilaiah comments over entire Hindu society in his book 'Why I Am Not A Hindu' and he writes,"A Hindu family is hierarchical [...]. The children are trained not to get involved in production-related tasks, which Brahmins condemn as 'Sudra' task. Similarly, their friendship with Dalitbahujan (Sudra) children is censured. 'Upper' castes speak of Dalitbahujan as ugly and so- called untouchable caste" (9). Kancha tries to dig up the core reality of the intention of Brahmins on the preservation of their status-quo, writing, "If he (teacher) was a Brahmin he hated us and told us our faces that it was because of evil time- because of *Kaliyuga*, that he was being forced to teach Sudras like us" (12). He further writes, "For them Sudra is an abusive word; Chandala is a much abusive word"(9).

Furthermore, Kancha justifies analyzing Hindus holy books which preserve the corruption of their heroes entangling them with the image of god. He writes,"In fact Brahminical culture eulogizes negative heroes and negative heroines. For example, Krishna who encourages one to kill one's relatives is a hero [...]. Arjun, who kills his relatives, is a hero"(17). Here, it can be observed that power can do anything that it likes. It can twist even the evil things to good as well. Arjun and Krishana who commit the genocide are being praised as gods whereas Kancha like so-called 'Dalits' are being hated in the name of untouched by the virtue of their birth.

The one who murders one's relatives is the culprit of genocide either he is Krishna or Arjun. But historians hid the fact, so that their history is untrue and is not authentic.

The social, moral, cultural and religious disciplines always control human behavior directly by means of power network. The discursive formations have enabled intuitions to wield power and domination by defining and excluding 'the other'. Such discursive formations determine and constrain the forms of knowledge and types of normality of a particular period. These discursive practices have also the power. About the laden truth discursively in the name of caste, rites and ritual, religion and customs, in Hindu society, Kancha Writes, "For and foremost the caste system itself sets up a certain type of power relations" (36).

Cultural critics believe that the dominant class defines 'high' and 'low' culture in order to reinforce its own image of superiority and thus its own power. Wendy Doniger writes:

In texts like Manu, the absolute authority of both Vedic knowledge and practice was brokered by a priestly class who borrowed from the 'prestige of origins' that the Veda and the scarifies represented even well they embraced anti- Vedic pacifistic principles, extending as the ancestral and the most religious duty. (xlii)

Similarly, another writer Jayaram V writes, "there are countless scholars who justify Hindu caste system quoting chapter and verse from the scriptures, ignoring the fact that they were convenient interpolation or authorized by bigoted scholars in an otherwise sacred lore to justify a cruel and unjust system using the very authority of God" (9).

History is the representation in the form of narratives or stories. It is the matter of perception. History is always the partial because the histories are the products of

the same historical society. There is no adequate totalizing explanation of history. So, it is not definite, authentic and universal. Justifying the Hindu religious history, K. M. Panikkar writes, “Hindu religion gives a sanction to inequality based on birth seems to be untrue”(28). He, furthermore, clarifies about the partiality of history, by writing, “It is the most unequivocal repudiation of the divine origin of caste system based on birth: the most categorical denial of brahminical claims of inherent superiority” (28).

As it is the time of 21st century, the entire world has been practicing its practice of harmony on the inclusiveness and secularism. The world is spinning around the pivot of single word ‘humanism’. In such very condition, the orthodox concept of religion, culture, custom and so-called civilization should get changed. It is not justifiable to discriminate humans by the virtue of their color, birth, race and profession. Louis Renou shows the definition of caste by the virtue of their color as mentioned in Hindu scriptures like this, “The color of the Brahmins was white, that of the Kshatriyas red, that of Vaisya yellow, and that of the Sudras black” (141). He further writes, “If the caste of the four classes is distinguished by their color, then a confusion of all castes is observable” (141). Renou, questioning about the caste division, further states, “Desire, anger, fear, cupidity, grief, apprehension, hunger, fatigue prevail over all us; by what, then, is caste discriminated ?” (141). Adding other more common features of humans, he, by questioning, writes, “Sweat, urine, excrement, phlegm, bile, and blood are common to all, the bodies of all decay, by what, then, is caste discriminated?”(141).

Since the concept of center has already been dismantled by the emergence of post structuralism, no center remains centre forever. That is why, every human should be treated by the virtue of their tasks. If he/ she is praiseworthy by his/her task, he/ she should be justified with the honor of dignity either he/ she belongs to any race and

group. Defining its meaning of a praiseworthy line, from Geeta, K. M. Panikkar writes, "[...] life has to be organized on the basis of *guna* (quality) and *karma* (action) (28). Here is no doubt that it is a commonly reliable principle. For the true justice of religion, there should be the establishment of the world of honor, respect and dignity at once. Jenny Rolness, a Norwayzian writer, under a topic 'Not in God's Name', writes, "A true religion involves respect and regard for all living beings" (The Kathmandu Post, Thursday, November 26, 2005, 7).

To give the voice to the marginalized people like Sudras, Kshatriyas and Vaishyas Hindu historians present them in lower status than Brahmins, should need to blur the demarcation between them. They should know the reality of rites and rituals and their intensive purpose kept discursively under them. Manu's concept that Monier-Williams clarifies, "A Brahmin, whether learned or unlearned is a mighty divinity, whether consecrated or unconsecrated" (57) is totally bias, full of prejudices, untrue and politically affiliated, which needs to be rewritten.

IV. Conclusion

Poetics of 'Naming ceremony', according to various castes, differs from its politics that is obviously power driven. It is viewed that both Samskaras and their purposes and importance are stories, a human construct. Not only fiction, but history too is the creation of human subjectivity. As in fiction, the prejudices and preoccupation of the narrator (historian) function in the writing of history- either it is cultural or religious. The politics of Samskaras esp. *Naming ceremony* stresses the fact that history can never be represented in an objective and unbiased way; it rather remains relative to the historicity of the historian. The historians are ones who make history coherent and intelligible through the use of points of view and interpretations that are always partial, provisional, power driven and in the final analysis, as subjective as artistic constructs.

To categorize the entire society under 'Varna' or 'Caste' and to give their duties according to their color and tasks, and to deal them with the virtue of caste, is not justifiable. It was the task done by those elite persons who were in power and it is the culture which, still, is in practice, and is the continuation of the same system which is entirely dominated by power perspective of certain persons, Brahmins.

Present Nepal is the very secular one; the faith on god has become very optional. It is observable that, in search of justice, those fellows, who are regarded as 'Sudras' or 'untouched', have been changing their religion to Christianity or Buddhism. Still, ritualistic practices are done on the guidance of Hindu creeds which ever avoid equal humans on the basis of their color, caste, touchability and untouchability. Furthermore, various social violences have been taking place. Those, who are outcast, are struggling to snatch the center created by Hindu dictators, since age long before.

To deal equal humans with the system of caste and untouchability, and to conduct the sacraments like Naming Ceremony differently i.e. putting middle names (Sharman, Varmana, Gupta and Dasa) according to the caste division is the result of power politics. The same effect of caste system still prevails in the mind of many Hindus. Temples, feasts, Pooja, pious ceremonies, social functions i.e. Puranas, public taps are under the siege of caste prejudice.

Even, with the flow of worldwide changes, every culture, religion, language, art, custom, economy, politics and everything get affected, and is getting influenced, too. The fast step of modern scientific discoveries, worldwide travel of information, technology, emergence of various theories and their experimentation and the development of education, the life of individual as well as society is not exception of dynamism. But, still there is the hegemony of old religious Brahmin history in the mind of these so-called 'Sudras', 'Vaishyas' and 'Kshatriyas', who themselves like to preserve the glory of caste system and the rituals performed under the guidance of it. It is not a justice in the name of religion. So that, it needs to encourage the people to know about the reality of the politics hidden under the poetics of any rites, rituals, custom, and culture which glorify the position of certain group top mostly. If ceremonies are important, they should be impartial to all humans as they are equal by birth. None can deny naming ceremony because when new infant gets birth, it needs naming for its identity. But, the politics that happens in the name of 'Naming Ceremony' should get ended. Everyone is close to the god, pious spirit and the eternal world. That's why, old assumptions of the history, which are regarded the truth, are untrue and they should be analyzed through the lens of New Historicism and to give the equal voice to the marginal ones, in the paradigm of human world, there needs to rewrite the entire history which is bias, one sided, full of prejudices and fictional.

Works cited

- Adams, Hazard, ed. *Critical Theory Since Plato*. 3rd ed. New York: Harcourt, 1992.
- Chakravarti, S. C. *The Philosophy of Upanisad*. Delhi : Seema publication, 1980.
- Doniger, Wendy and Brain K. Smith, trans. *The Laws of Manu*. India: Penguin Books India, 1991.
- Foucault, Michel. *The History of Sexuality*. Trans. Robert Hurley. Vol. 1, New York: Random House, 1990.
- ...*The Archeology of Knowledge*. Trans. A. M. Sheriden Smith London: Tavistock Publications Ltd. 1972
- Ilaiah, Kancha. *Why I am not a Hindu*. Culcutta: Samya 16 Southern Avenue, 1996.
- Jauss, Hans Robert. "Literary History as a Challenge to Literary Theory." *Literature in the Modren World*. Ed. Danis Walder. Oxford and New York: OUP, 2004. 72-79
- J. Jurji. *The great Religions of the Modern World*. Prinston New Jersey: PUP, 1946.
- J. Rawal, Anantaraj. *Indian Society Religion and Mythology*. New Delhi: D. K. Publications, 1982.
- Jacobus, Louis Renou. *Hinduism*. London: Prentice Hall International, 1961.
- Lerner, Laurance. "History and Fiction". *Literature in the Modern World*. Eds. Danis Walder. Oxford and New York :OUP, 2004. 436-43.
- Marasini, Dadhiram. *Karmakanda Bhaskar*. Nepal: MSU Press, 2054BS.
- Michal, Axel. *Hinduism: Past and Present*. India: Orient Longman Pvt. Ltd. 2005.

- Mogan, Kenneth W. *religion of the Hindus*. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1953.
- Motwany, Ketwal. *Manu Dharmasastra*. Madras: Ganesh and Co. (Madras) Pvt. Ltd., 1958.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. Paul Edwards, et al. Vol. 5. New York: MacMillan, 1967.
- ..."On the Use and Abuse of History". *Critical Theory Since 1965*. Eds. Florida: Florida State University Press, 1980. 152-96.
- Olivelle, Patric. *Manu's Code of Law*. New Delhi: OUP, 2005.
- Pandey, Raj Bali. *Hindu Samskara : Socio Religious Study of the Hindu Sacraments*. India: Motilal Banrasidas, 1989.
- Panikkar, K. M. *Hinduism and The Modern world*. Allahbad: Kitabistan, 1938.
- Radhakrishnan. *Indian Philosophy: Transition to The Upanishad*. New York: The Mac Millan Company, 1923.
- Rolness, Jenny. *Not in God's Name*. Kathmandu: The Kathmandu Post, Thursday, Nov. 26, 2009.
- Shastri, Dakshinaranjan. *Origine and Development of The Hindu Rituals*. Culcutta: Allahbad: Patna: Bookland Pvt. Ltd. 1963
- Thomas, P. *Hindu Religion: Customs and Manners*. Bombay: Treasure House of Books, 1956.
- Veese, H. Aram. *The New Historicism Reader*, New York: Routledge, 1994.
- V . Jayanarayan. *Hinduism* [http://www. Hinduwebsite.com](http://www.Hinduwebsite.com). 2010
- White , Hayden. "Introduction to Metahistory" *Literature in the Modern World*. Ed. Dennis Walder. Oxford and New York: OUP, 2004.
- Willams, Monier-Monier. *Hinduism*. Delhi: Rare Books Delhi, 1971.

Zaehner, R. C. *Hinduism*. New York: OUP, 1962.