Chapter :4

Viewers and readers:

The idea of audience is initially related to dramas but with the advent of motion picture and cinema halls, the essence of spectators or audiences jumped ahead to another level. With the evolution of cinema, the role of audience has taken a great leap. At this point of time, there is no possible way to treat theatre and film synonymously, especially when we talk of the audience's role. In a theatre performance both the performer or the actor and the audience affect each other, which brings out a kind of 'circular current', whereas, that is not so in films. So there is a need to move ahead with the role of audience in films, especially in adaptations. In this regard, it is pertinent to note that the role of audience is not limited to the act of watching scenes on the screen. Thus, speaking on the vital relation between films and audience reception Sandip Ray states, "films find their proper resting place in our memories. Even though they are born out of complex negotiations between technology , art and Society- they are incomplete without audience"[1] . Ray's point of view on films is a structure that can be completed only with the presence of audiences. Whether it is a drama, or a film, spectators or audience play a pivotal role.

Judith Mayne writes in his book *Cinema and Spectatorship*, " Spectatorship is not only the act of watching a film , but also the ways one takes pleasure in the experience, or not the means by which watching movies becomes a passion, or a leisure – time activity like any other. Spectatorship refers to how film – going and the consumption of movies and their myths are symbolic activities, culturally significant events."[2] Thus in a wider perspective, if spectators are believed to be the receiver of the content, served through a medium of art then the equation of the art and its receiver will be understandable in different levels. Here, it may be said that for any form of art, receiver and its role is essential. It is detrimental in nature. It is the receiver who

determines the viability of the work of art. The meaning of the art is achieved when it is received by the receiver. Christian Mertz, in his article "The Imaginary Signifier" opines that audiences are those who stay away from the film, which he compares to a mirror, and thus from a distance this spectator forms meaning of the film. "film is like the mirror. But it differs from the primordial mirror in one essential point: although, as in the latter, everything may come to be projected, there is one thing and one thing only that is never reflected in it: the spectator's own body. In a certain emplacement, the mirror suddenly becomes clear glass."[3]. He continues by saying, "it is always the other who is on the screen; as for me (as a spectator), I am there to look at him. I take no part in the perceive, on the contrary, I am all perceiving. All perceiving as one says all powerful …….. absent from the screen but certainly present in the auditorium, a great eye and ear without which the perceived would have no one to perceive it."[4] Mertz is very much clear that spectators are bestowed with the power of giving meaning to the film as here the spectator is "all perceiving". In his point of view spectators are decoders of the meaning of the film. They provide different interpretation of it. Believing in the illusion provided to them through cinema, they generate different point of view while watching same production. So there is a greater demand on the viewers when we watch a film. When we talk of adaptation, this demand on the part of viewers seems to be more. This demand grows because of the nature of adaptation and of translation.

Whenever a translator attempts to serve its readers the question of an ideal receiver remains a problem. The translator will always remain in confusion whether he is transmitting the essential content to be received by the receiver or not. Film is also an art form where importance of the receiver or the viewer is immensely felt. And especially in adaptations, where text gets translated in an entirely different medium, receivers or viewers play a crucial role. John Ellis writes in the *Introduction* of *The Literary Adaptation*, " the real aim of an adaptation is rather different. The adaptation trades upon the memory of the novel, a memory that can derive from actual reading, or as is more likely with a classic literature, a generally circulated cultural memory. The adaptation

consumes this memory, aiming to efface it with the presence of its own images. The successful adaptation is one that is able to replace the memory of the novel with the process of a filmic or television representation."[5] Here Ellis is right to say that adaptations can really erase the memory of the novel or any literary work while creating a fresh new memory to be stored. Creation of this new memory will not be possible without audiences who are expected to receive and draw the meaning of the audio visual text on screen. For recreating a lasting memory for the viewer, there is a need to understand how viewers respond to films, how they are involved and engaged in the viewing process. Martz's arguments have already been discussed in this regard and now it must be said that film text is meant for the gratification of the viewers, but it will not be wrong to say that the meaning of the film itself is a product of the spectator. Thus a spectator can be positioned as the receiver and the sender in the total process of viewing. Here it is to be said that in Michele Aaron's viewpoint there is a difference between viewer and the spectator. She claims that, viewer " according to cultural studies, is the live, breathing , actual audience member, coming from a specific socio-historical context. This viewer exists in sharp contrast to the spectator as 'subject'." [6]

Director as the reader :

Viewers and readers are on the same level where they are placed with the idea of receiving a narrative. Readers are those who read and while reading they try to get a mental image of the text. In this context the director of a film can also be regarded as another reader of the text. In adaptations his interpretation of the text is of real importance. Interpretation of texts or re-reading the text definitely gives its plurality. Thus Roland Barthes explains " the text is plural. This does not mean only that it has several meanings but that it fulfills the very plurality of meaning: an irreducible (and not just acceptable) plurality. The text is not coexistence of meaning, but passage, traversal; hence, it depends not on an interpretation, however liberal, but on an explosion, on dissemination. The plurality of the text depends, as a matter of fact, not on the ambiguity of its contents, but on what we might call the stereographic plurality ……. The reader of

the text might be compared to an idle subject."[7] Here it is very much clear that text is dynamic but every single reader is marked as an 'idle subject', who can provide newer meaning of the text. It is the reader who is bestowed with the power of giving meaning to the text."This is what happens in the text; it can be Text only in its difference … its reading is semelfactive ….yet entirely woven…. The intertexuality in which any text is apprehended, since it is itself the intertext of another text, cannot be identified with some origin of the text: to seek out the "Sources", the " influences" of a work is to satisfy the myth of filiation;"[8] . Barthes understanding on the plurality of text simply rests on the capability of the reader and the process of reading . Adding to this thought Malgorzata Marciniak thoughtfully stated ,

> The complexity of literary work represents a great challenge to every reader because the world it evokes is an open ended world that is left to be completed in the process of reading. The readers create their own private ideas about this world by piecing together fragmentary visions of both the directly articulated and indirectly suggested parts. An adaptation invites the viewers to discuss not only the film itself but also their private reading of the adapted text, for it gives them an opportunity to see how the cinematically active readers have responded to the book. We become part of an interpersonal artistic communication which is very rewarding because it allows us to get insight into an artist's creative mind and through this creative mind to the literary work."[9]

Thus, it may be said that adaptation includes new readers. It allows for the recruitment of new readers. In adaptations we often talk about the superiority of the written text but if we do not merely compare their relative merits over films, it happens that after the screening of the movie the literary texts get read. It's like bringing the text alive. It's like giving new life to the old text.

After life:

In case of adaptation the agenda is not merely to compare the literary text with the film where it is adapted. Adaptation also looks forward to the possibility of letting the film follow the road to reach the old literary text with a new taste. At this point , Walter Benjamin's use of the term "After life" seems meaningful. It is like bringing the text alive. It is like giving new life to the old text. Adaptation includes new readers. It allows for the requirement of new readers. When the Film re-reads the text, the receiver of the film or the spectator reads it too . In this sense the old text gets a new life through adaptation. This is what Walter Benjamin had to say when he wrote about the 'after life' of a text.

In his seminal essay "The Task of the Translator" Walter Benjamin argues that texts carry a 'moving truth than the resting truth'. This argument offers a different perspective on the viability of a text when it gets to move ahead. He argues that there is a 'truth content' and a 'material content' of a work of art. According to Walter Benjamin it is this moving truth of any work of art which validates the 'after life' of a text. For Walter Benjamin a work of art cannot be static in a specific time frame rather it moves in time. Sense of stability , or the sense of a stable text cannot be achieved by any work of art as it is transient. As there is no sense of stable text in visual media, adaptation can be authenticated by a text which is in a flux. To understand the issue of a continuously moving text there is a need to grasp on what Walter Benjamin had to say on it. Benjamin's argument will be beneficial in understanding a much greater reality of translation , which in return can be utilized in realizing the meaning of adaptation in much wider range. Walter Benjamin begins his essay *The Task of the Translator* with the following line, " No poem is intended for the reader, no picture for the beholder, no symphony for the audience"[10]. He is very much clear in his view that any work of art struggles to get its 'ideal receiver'. So, it is a clever idea to begin with a clean slate where a work of art is produced without any pre-assumption on how it will be received and who will be the receiver . In translation it appears to be a much greater issue as translation will

only be possible to those originals which carry their 'translatability' . In translation this question of receiver goes farther as translation comes much later than the original and thus their receivers must have to cater to the changes that appear with time. Thus Benjamin says, " just as the manifestations of life are intimately connected with the phenomenon of life without being of importance to it . A translation issues from the original not so much from its life as from its afterlife"[11] . Walter Benjamin claims here that translations are influenced more from the elements from its after life than its life ie. the original or the source text. It is for this reason the original remains as a referential text when translation offers new life or after life to the old text. It happens because of the leap in time " for a translation comes later than the original and since the important works of world literature never find their chosen translators at the time of their origin , their translations marks their stage of continued life."[12] Therefore it is very clear that translations will carry inputs from the stage of the continued life . These translations are not merely the transmission of the subject matter rather they have evolved in the process of survival and has reached to the 'age of its fame' . With such work of art the task of the translator is to translate the 'pure language' of the text while liberating the language imprisoned in the process of recreating the work. The 'after life' of the text will emerge when the translator will touch the original lightly adhering the laws of fidelity in ' the freedom of linguistic flux'. In this sense the freedom of linguistic flux can go with the laws of fidelity. Thus Benjamin's argument on the afterlife of a text is related to translation and this is the reason why it can be beneficial to understand the process of adaptation of a text into a film, which is in a way a translation of a literary text into a different medium. In such adaptations the reader of the literary text can also be the viewer of the film , who can handle the fidelity issue in 'freedom of linguistic flux' where the truth content of the text moves ahead to grow in its 'after life'.

On the issue of relation between the old and the new in an adaptation Marciniak's idea is a valid point. Referring to Hutcheon's idea Malgorzata Marciniak writes,

> According to Hutcheon, the real comfort lies in the experience of tensions between old and new , " in the simple act of almost but not quite repeating , in the revisiting of a theme with variations," Watching the film that resonates with echoes of a well known world , that emerges from a confluence of pleasurable memories and new ideas, is like prolonging the myth that lies at the origins of our being and does not cease to intrigue us and give us force. The appeal of adaptations is therefore rooted in the desire to witness a rebirth of this myth. The different filmic versions of one single book are all manifestations of the same wish to revisit " an old friend". The power which attracts the filmmakers is the desire to recreate and add some freshness to the familiar world. The power which draws the audience to an adaptation is the possibility offered by the film to see and hear what they imagined and learned to love in their own imagination , the wish to enter in a more sensual way into the beloved world created by the book.[13]

So , here it will be apt to say that the most provocative adaptations not only create initial dissonance for us as viewers /readers, just as Avant-garde works do , it leaves an everlasting effect on its spectators. Here it may be said that Adaptation includes readers with their own rights. Each adaptation can be judged as a result of individual reading process. Apart from the inclusion of individual reading, it includes inter-textuality too. Thus adaptation is not autonomous. Adaptation can never be understood as stand- alone artifact, rather it can be understood in terms of derivatives. It is a process of reconsidering source texts through derivatives. Adapting a text needs clear inter-textual references to the original work. 'Intertextuality' is the way through which texts refer to one another. This is the reason why 'intertextuality' remained at the heart of literary history and it will continue to influence the literary works of the future. Intertextuality hints that narratives are not closed , rather it is open to manipulation. Intertextuality offers a new way of seeing and transforming literature to fit in to the interest and the purpose of the creator of the adaptation.

So far, it is observed that adaptations include new readers but now it is essential to decode the term viewer. Though it may easily be said that viewers also read the filmic text so the viewer is a reader but it is definite that the viewing process separates viewers from readers. When readers read the text while creating mental images , viewers consume the visual text directly. Thus the basic difference between the two media lies in the 'seeing' and the 'imagining' meaning that while the film offers a visual image to the audience, the novel offers a mental image as George Bluestone in his pioneering work on film and literature *Novels into Film* maintains that " between the precept of the visual image & the concept of the mental image lies the root difference between the two media."[14] it can be said in the same vein , that there are fundamental difference in how the images produced in the two media are perceived. However , later commentators like Spiegel stress on the 'uniting factor' between the film form and the novel form drawing upon the modern novelist's attempt to maintain "a balanced distribution of emphasis in the tendency of what is looked at, who is looking, and what the looker makes of what she(the character) sees"[15]. Observing the convergence between the two art-forms, Kate Cohen also notes the breaking away from the earlier representational novels of the early 19th Century, which were more uninvolved in narrating or rather 'recounting' on event to more visual expression giving a new emphasis on ' showing how the events unfold dramatically rather than recounting them by the modern novelists like Conrad, Joyce, Faulkner and many more, who seems to be influenced by techniques of Eisensteinian Montage. In this context it can be said that the ultimate success or failure of adaptation depends upon reception. There is undoubtedly an inherent difference between reading a piece of literature and viewing on screen. Even the most faithful rendition of the novel cannot provide the experience of reading it.

Thus the reader- viewer dichotomy has always been an issue. The reader -viewer relation often initiates a debate between active/passive, reader/ receiver . It is initiated after Barth's declaration of "the death of the author"[16] while making the position of the reader important for any work of art. Thus in the viewing process too it has enabled a

more active position for the viewer. Development in the theory of intertexuality has developed the association of the reader with literature. In this total agenda of shifting importance from the author to the reader has empowered readers to a greater extent. Such importance on reader's response to art and literature has been equated with the position of viewers as Michele Aaron writes in her *The power of looking on* " individual's own role in determining the meaningfulness of cinema" [17] . Diana Rolnick elaborates in the preface of *The power of looking on* that in this book Aaron wants to highlight on " the spectator's submersion in and the submission to the text which must be understood as an inevitable part of the act of engagement."[18] According to Diana, Aaron writes about the passive spectators of French ideological cinemas who are powerless on the other hand she talks about the upsurge of individual agency with structuralism and a much active spectator. Unlike Aaron and many other thinkers like her, Miriam Von Schantz writes about 'new materialist spectatorship' . Here Miriam argues on 'the concept of the moving –image-body' or mib for short'[20] Moving apart from all those theoretical aspects where the spectator involves in the process of identification either consciously or unconsciously with the happenings on the screen, Miriam emphasizes that 'spectatorship is an act or 'an event rather than a position' , and she sees ' spectator and film as an event of becoming'[21].

Keeping in mind this explanation of spectatorship as an act where the spectator and the film come together, there is also a need to deal with the term audience. Audiences are those who are expected to read any media content. Audience is important because all media texts are produced with an audience in mind. There are many theories to counter many issues related to the term audience.

The first of its kind is Hypodermic needle theory: Dating back to 1920's it was the first attempt to explain how audience respond to media. According to this theory people absorb media contents passively. According to this theory, it is believed that media contents are injected into the viewers. This theory came up at the very beginning of the

innovation of television and radio. Thus it can be considered that people believed if something is on television then it must be reliable.

The two step flow theory: In this theory also viewers are assumed to be passive but this passivity comes via one leader's opinion which often become intermediate to promote a message.

Cultivation theory: It suggests that any repeated message can influence people who watch any media content. It can even have effect on their values. For example dietary habits can be influenced with repeated message of the adverse effect of larger intake of sugar and salt.

Uses and gratification theory: According to this theory, audiences are viewed as active. It reflects on those aspects where audiences choose media contents for their own gratification. Audiences can easily select one over the other for their own satisfaction which may again be based on the usefulness of the media contents.

Reception theory: This theory describes how audiences receive and decode media codes. Here audiences gives meaning to the message conveyed through media.

All these popular theories try to analyse the most important part of any media production, be it a film or an advertisement ie. the audience. Audiences are those who read any media text. So the success of the media text in many ways depends on the makeup of the audience for which it is produced. Specifically if we talk about films , film industries are the money making industries and this is the reason why the relation between a film and its audience is very important. This industry often study tastes and opinion of its actual audiences through surveys, interviews and focus groups. Film industry maintains a close look on what is the present trend of stories appealing to the audiences and according to that the industry tries to manipulate the taste of its audience or viewers. The BFI Film Audience Network which was set up in 2012 in UK plays an important role in maintaining vigilance on the need of the growing film audience. Such institutions are helpful in understanding the need of viewers /audiences for the growth of

an industry. In this context it must be added that audience's taste vary from time to time and place to place. But at present Globalization has made it possible to incorporate a global audience who are ready to consume media texts with cultural contents from a different part of the world. Films are also crossing regional boundaries to reach out to a global audience. Rituparno Ghosh's films are also examples of such attempt. Knowing the fact that audiences are much intelligent and active in a globalised world, he has tried his hand in those areas that can initially work on the vital issues of the society. He tried to question on marriage, widowhood, condition of a spinster, position of a working mother, issues related to third gender and so on. In his adaptations he has tried to look into the old literary texts with new perspective. In the present study the selected texts are re-read by Rituparno. But if we talk about Spectatorship and viewers of these adaptations then there are many aspects to be observed . He has experimented with different elements to play with his spectators. It must be said that Rituparno has tried to use different vehicles of appropriation because he wanted to appeal his 21st century audience. In this regard Arghyakamal Mitra the editor of Chokher Bali remembers , " Choker Bali was one film which required a lot of editorial innovation. For instance, Ritu told me that his characters would talk and act as people of a bygone era; their actions would be rather slow paced . But I had to bring in touch of modernity in this period piece through the editing . although the characters and their actions appear a belonging to the early 20th century , the flow of the narrative had to be contemporary."[22] In films like *Chokher Bali*, Rituparno has experimented with many aspects of spectatorship. One can easily read this movie from a feminist point of view, while noting his experimental employment of the female Gaze through the character of Binodini.

Female gaze is a term newly developed to validate and to specify the existence of female desire. Female Gaze is a feminist theoretical term recognizing the existence of female sexuality. It represents the gaze of female viewer. It is a response to Laura Mulvey's term "the male gaze", which represents not only the gaze of the male viewer but also the gaze of the male character and the male creator of the film.[23] Mulvey's

proposition is often critiqued for its sole focus on male spectator. She has sidelined issues related to female desire and female spectatorship. Kaja Silverman and Mary Anne Doane are among those who tried to establish an argument for female spectatorship and female desire . When Kaja Silverman rejects Mulvey's gendered understanding of pleasure, Doane argues , " woman's relation to desire is difficult if not impossible. Paradoxically, her only access is to the desire to desire."[24] In another acclaimed work of hers, " *Film and the Masquerade: theorizing the Female Spectatorship*", Doane talks about masquerade " the mask of womanliness". She argues that femininity can be equated with that of a masque . This masque helps to dismantle the production of femininity in the overtly patriarchal setup. For understanding this female gaze , Mulvey's male gaze is to be understood properly.

Laura Mulvey's Essay "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" which was published in the *Screen* in 1975 is a seminal text in reading cinema and its gendered spectatorship. In this essay she is using Lacanian Mirror stage theory to describe her own proposition on pleasure. Here she focuses on the Mother/Woman's role in the child's move from the 'imaginary' to the 'symbolic' domain. In this case the symbolic domain is the screen and all those things happening there. Here *Screen* becomes like the mirror of Lacanian theory , where cinema allows for the loss of the 'I' while entering into the realm of symbolic. Mulvey thus concludes that " it is an image that constitutes the matrix of the imaginary, of recognition/ misrecognition and identification, and hence of the first articulation of the 'I' of subjectivity."[25]. She goes on to draw from the Freudian thought. According to her this unconscious is socially produced, which reflects ways of seeing. This way of seeing is coded by the language of patriarchy. As in the mirror stage, the subject in the Imaginary found the image to compensate for its lack and afforded narcissistic satisfaction. At this point she talks about pleasure which is mainly of two types : Scopophilia and Voyeurism. When Scopophilia is the pleasure derived from watching or looking itself , Voyeurism is the pleasure of taking other people as objects

and subjecting them through controlling and curious gaze. In Mulvey's words ,"The cinema offers a number of possible pleasures. One is Scopophilia . There are circumstances in which looking itself is a source of pleasure, just as , in the reverse formation , there is pleasure in being looked at….. developing scopophilia in its narcissistic aspect." [26] While getting pleasure through this gaze, cinema allows for the loss of the 'I'. This loss of I creates misrecognition with the hero of the film. Now the man on screen acts as the mediator of the woman as the spectacle for the spectator. Entering into the domain of the Symbolic – woman becomes image and man as the bearer of the look. Here the pleasure of looking has positioned male as active and female as passive. This active look of the male creates a world of fantasy on the female figure. Mulvey clarifies, " pleasure in looking has been split between active/ male and passive / female. The determining male gaze projects its fantasy on to the female figure which is styled accordingly."[27] The crux of her argument is that 'Screen' is like a window through which we can peep into the world of 'other' or the woman. Audience here are not being watched and thus they remain in a voyeuristic state as Mulvey claims, " hermetically sealed world which unwinds magically, indifferent to the presence of the audience, producing for them a sense of separation and playing on their voyeuristic fantasy. Moreover, the extreme contrast between the darkness in the auditorium and the brilliance of the shifting patterns of light and shade on the screen helps to promote the illusion of voyeuristic separation." Now it appears that for the audiences sitting in the dark, the man on the screen is making things happen. Here hero becomes the mirror image of the audience. In this case women loses in her looked-at-ness as now she is 'his'. Still she remains to be the source for anxiety. She is under the look of the camera. She is also under the look of the spectator and even under the look of the man who watch through the camera. This look is termed as the 'Gaze' which is basically of a man, thus it is termed as male gaze. On screen men are gazers and women are gazed at.

Mulvey suggested "Woman then stands in patriarchal culture as signifier for the male other, bound by a symbolic order in which man can live on these phantasies and

obsessions through linguistic command by imposing them on the silent image of woman still tied to her place as bearer of meaning, not maker of meaning"[28] where " the split between spectacle and narrative supports the man's role as the active one of forwarding the story , making things happen . The man controls the film fantasy and also emerges as the representative of power in a further sense: as the bearer of the look of the spectator, transferring it behind the screen to neutralize the extra –diegetic tendencies represented by woman as spectacle."[29]

This elaboration on the meaning of gaze can be sensed in Rituparno's film *Chokher Bali* too, where he has played with different aspects of Mulvian gaze. Madhuja Mukherjee writes, " the scene in which Binodini wears the red velvet Blouse is actually reframed through Ashalata's look and it thereby appears like a critical shift within Bengali cinema. In a self conscious and skillful way , the film problematised the ' gaze of the camera' and allowed the woman to become the bearer of the look."[30] It is not only this particular scene which capture's a different angle of Rituparno's directorial skill rather in totality it says a lot. If we concentrate on the central character of the film Binodini, it appears that she is not willing to become a 'signifier for the male other' . She denies to be the 'bearer of meaning'. She has employed her own gaze to view at the male subjects – breaking the patriarchal norm. Mulvey suggests woman on screen are objects of scopophilic pleasure of male spectatorship . She says that as the narrative unfolds woman on screen loses her general looked at ness and subjects herself to the controlling gaze of male protagonist, becoming 'his' woman . In *Chokher Bali* Rituparno has reversed such narration where the woman is occupied. The character of Binodini is instrumental in doing so as she rejects to go under any patriarchal control. Neither she accepts Mahendra nor does she go to Behari. Thus she maintains to carry a self which cannot be owned.

On the other hand Rituparno's Binodini carries an 'active look' , we may call it a female gaze that has the capacity to reveal the truth about the subdued desire of woman. In the film Binodini gazed on both Mahendra and Behari. These male characters are objectified . Through the gaze of Binodini, spectators will be provided with the

scopophilic as well as voyeuristic pleasure. In one particular scene from that film , where Binodini mocks at Mahendra while he totally gets into her control is perfectly filmed to represent the character of Mahendra as an object of Binodini's Gaze. Even with Behari she does the same . She is the onlooker here. Behari's physical features are projected in detail as she gaze at him. The camera is set to capture this desired look of this widow and by this the Gaze is transferred to the audiences. Even the use of a binocular is specifically highlighted to provide an understanding on the female Gaze that Rituparno wants to surface through this film . Along with the binocular, the glass door of Mahindra's room, through which Binodini used to peep into the room is strategically repeated toward the end of the film. When Ashalata reads the letter of Binodini , a boy peeps through the same door , thus continuing that gaze . It can be said here that Rituparno Ghosh has played a lot with the use of female gaze with the story which is set in 19th century Bengal and where a widow is expressive enough to reveal her suppressed desire. This attempt to highlight the female gaze through the character of Binodini carries a telling effect in the cinema . This allows the audiences to see the world from a female's point of view. This strategic use of Binodini's gaze has provided the spectators an opportunity to delve deep into the world of feminine desire creating an androgynous position for the male viewers.There are many occasions where viewers get to see through the eye of Binodini. The camera channels this gaze of Binodini at different situations. When Binodini looks through the Binocular her gaze reach out to the audiences. This Binocular serves as an instrument through which the female gaze of Binodini is communicated. Binodini's gaze at Behari , at Mahendra and at the wrestlers doing their regular physical exercises are some of the scenes which are explicitly shown in the film. Rituparno's understanding on the feelings and emotion of a woman is better executed through such attempts. Most importantly by this way he has paved a clear way for his audiences to experience what he desire's to tell. Audiences are given the chance to participate in the realm of the auteur's perspective to unleash a woman's desire. Thus his moves are set to feed his audiences with some critical perspective about the world around them. Rituparno Ghosh's expected audience is thus active and intelligent, they are not passive spectators . They can not be

injected with loaded information, rather they thought over the content of the film critically and react to it.

Rohit K Dasgupta tries to explain audience of Rituparno while referring to Christie's concept of viewers,

> "The fact that audiences are essential for films has been understood for the 100 years , ever since the first Indian cinema graced the screen. It is also true that within the corporatization structure that dominates Indian Cinema today (Ganti,2003) , the mythic viewer/ audience is an even more important figure than they were earlier. But how can we define an ambiguous concept as 'the audience'. In the case of Ghosh , it is even more difficult to conceive of who his audience really is . Christie(2012:11) has argued that there are two concepts of audience that dominate the history of cinema. One is the imagined audience , which is based on the film-makers' own assumption and projections of who is most likely to watch their film, and second is the economic or statistical audience, which is recorded in terms of admissions or box office receipts. Christie, however, also notes that there is a third category of audience- the individual spectator which looks at how film impacts our own physiology and consciousness."[31]

Being a director , who mostly direct films in a regional language , it is definite that his audiences are concentrated in a particular language boundary. But with his expansion with projects in Hindi and in English his economic and statistical audiences expanded. The imagined audience for Rituparno cannot be identified in its specificity, but he imagined an audience who has the power to appreciate a piece of work and at the same time have the power to reject it. Thus when asked by "Kaustav Bakshi :

> But didn't your *Chokher Bali* prepare this section of audience for *Antarmahal* ? I mean the former had explicit love –making scenes and more importantly a poignant scene where Binodini menstruates!

> Rituparno answered: " Yes, all that I guess, was overlooked , simply because I was working with a Tagore novel. The sexual explicitness was tolerated for it was accommodated in the larger context of the novel's essential 'sanctity'. Yet, a lot of people have raised objections.[32]

In this comment it is clear that Ghosh has an accurate understanding of his audience, specifically those who speak Bengali and worship Tagore and his works .These audiences are essentially expected to raise questions on the films fidelity to the original text. But unexpectedly Ghosh has utilized this deep rooted emotion attached with the works of Tagore to explore with his freedom as a cinematographer. It is for this reason that the taboo of menstruation could be handled with such ease in *Chokher Bali*. Though it is very much expected that criticism will follow any bold attempt but Ghosh never controlled his instinct to be bold in fright of criticism. Ghosh's attempts are criticized by many but he never compromised in his creative pursuit to convey his imagination draped in his characters through his films. In *Chokher Bali* too he has used his own reading of Tagore's text to reach out to the audiences with a different outlook. It is definitely not possible without the knowledge of the expected reaction from his audiences, his viewers. Ghosh's views expressed in different interviews shows that he had a deep faith on his viewers who are not passive but very much active and intelligent to handle the loaded massage of his film. Wimal writes about Ghosh's idea about his viewers. Talking about his view on freedom he says, "…..his belief that viewers are intelligent and independent minded and the notion of passive spectators that has been commented upon by many theorists should be regarded. Ghosh , too, had great faith in the intelligence and powers of discernment of ordinary viewers. The emancipation of spectator that Ranciere talks about is a vital aspect of his or her freedom. And one of the aims of Ghosh as a film-maker was to promote this emancipation of the spectator by encouraging his or her critical participation."[33] This expected critical participation of the intelligent viewers must have pushed him forward to come with a challenged narrative through his films. The emancipation of spectators through critical participation is the driving force which led

him forward in experimenting with different issues. In *Chokher Bali* his venture into the less talked about area as that of the sexual desire of a widow, the taboo behind menstruation, the strength of woman without man must be left loose to be read by the viewers. Thus in one of the interviews with Nermeen Sheikh for Asia Society Rituparno said,

> In the letter she writes when she leaves, Binodini mentions her own *desh*, which is not "country," it should not be translated or read as country; it should be read as a space, a space or domain. The events in her life are of course taking place at the same time as the freedom struggle in which women were not included. So a woman does not have a country of her own, just as she has no surname of her own; a woman has the country of her husband, she belongs to the country of her husband, as she carries his name. But a woman can have a space. It is better for a woman not to be confined to a particular country, not to be confined to a particular identity. A male can never change his identity; a woman can. For an independent woman, therefore, I would wish to define it as space or domain. And that is what Binodini speaks of at the end.[34]

This statement of Rituparno Ghosh is like clarifying his intention to his viewers in the film. He emphasizes in reading the film and its content in a much critical way. His expectation from his viewers is to re-read the film to get closer to what Tagore wanted to say through his writings.

His selection of popular Bollywood star like Aishwarya Ray for this film is again a great move to reach out to the masses. The Hindi dubbing of the film is again an essential step to cross the regional boundary for those audiences who do not understand Bangla. Along with this the English subtitle of this film like many other films of Ghosh, has enabled a global audience to come closer to his film. It is the statistical data of audiences which is essential for the commercial success of the film but this data also

shows to what extent the content of the film is consumed .In the case of adaptation along with the film, it is the literature , which gets new consumers, new readers and in Walter Benjamin's term this offers the 'after life' of the text. For *Chokher Bali* ,Tagore's text in translation is showcased to a larger reading public providing it its 'after life'. It is not simply the truth with *Chokher Bali* , but it is the common truth with all his adaptations be it *Noukadubi, Chitrangada or Raincoat*.

In *Chitrangada : A Crowning Wish* , Rituparno Ghosh has dealt with different cinematic techniques to bring in a dreamlike sequence in the film. *Chitrangada: The crowning wish* is an adaptation of Tagore's dance drama *Chitrangada*. In maintaining the essence of a dance drama the narrative of the film moves around a stage performance. So there is a shift in narration. The narrative involves intricacies to move in time and in place . The narrative also involves a movement from a dance drama enacted on stage to the story of the protagonist . This kind of movement in the film takes place to draw a line of connection between what is happening in the drama- within the film. Thus there is a 'play within a play' technique used by the director. This film *Chitrangada : The Crowning Wish* is enabled with many such elements which can amuse its audience while striking them with hard hitting thoughts. It is a film which asks some serious questions on the issue of quest between body and that of self. It is very much obvious that Rituparno has prepared a strong ground in this film to communicate his knowledge on the miseries of queer people living in a heterosexual world . This communication is to be made with his audiences through the beautiful cinematography of this film. Daisy Hasan writes "Rituparno Ghosh spoke of his endeavor to make films which provided audiences with a unique experience of viewing , an experience that would be impossible to narrate after the film had been viewed. In Chitrangada, which seamlessly merges the depiction of everyday reality with a dream like state – where past present and future are inextricably linked so that characters move fluidly across time and state of mind are personified- we see something of what he may have intended."[35] This depiction of dreamlike quality in the film has the quality to drag its spectators to travel from the world of certainties to the

world of uncertainty and to the world of dilemma. The realization of this uncertainty and dilemma is essential to come closer to the world of the queer. Rituparno's art in this film carries the thread of the present media culture but in a thoughtful note. Analysis on media culture have shown that variety of issues are addressed through media but the most frequent structures of such issues are –"identity and power, youth , gender, sexuality, ethnicity, and race"[36] In our transgressive cultural practices when we are used to watch a projection of extreme culture in media- the viewers who are watching and participating in this process of presentation- are actually served with changing cultural norms, values and standards . Within such a scenario Rituporno Ghosh has created such type of cinemas which does not live up to the expectation of the present media culture, on the contrary he has successfully dealt with innovative concepts and techniques which can easily reflect on issues of identity , power , gender . *Chitrangada: The Crowning Wish* is such a film , where the director talks about gender, sexuality, power and identity , where he has projected the changing cultural norms and the need of the change. This need is communicated to the audience in a very subtle manner through the story line of the film which is intertwined with Tagore's dance drama *Chitrangada*.

Chitangada: A crowning wish, appropriates Joan Dean's argument published in an article titled as "Adapting History and Literature into Movies*"*, included in American Studies Journal which says,

> the stage space is a limited horizontal plain as opposed to the immense vertical plain of the movie screen. The stage has three dimensions and a movie two. But the absence of the space-time continumm is a movie provides one iric depth. This is partly created by the sensation of inevitable flow. With the theatrical audience each member of the audience individually chooses where to look, who to listen to , or who or what to hold on to most attentively. In a movie , the camera keeps making that choice ……the camera decides what you see , and where you look and even who your ears perk up to the most… the camera is your eye[37].

In *Chitrangada ; The Crowning Wish* this striking difference between the viewing experience of a drama and a film is merged . It involves two sets of audience, one set of audience gets to see the dance drama going on inside the film, and the other set of audience / viewers are served with a layered narrative. These viewers get to see both, the film and the drama . The characters of the film at times become the spectator of the dance drama and react to its outcome. On the other hand the viewers sitting in the dark hall to watch the movie is provided with a cinematic journey from the screen to the stage. Thus it is a complex web of response and interaction knitted between the film and the spectator which even includes the drama and its audience. In this situation the audience of the film are carried forward and shifted from the cinematic to the theatrical with the use of the camera. Audiences see through the eye of the camera thus for them it is very much smooth to position themselves in different situation and shifting narrative of the film .

Along with the shift from the dance drama on stage to the narration of the film , there are other shifts too . The shift between the real and the fantasy world positioned the spectators in a realm of trance which eventually helped them to realize the in between ness of the protagonist. Therefore it can be imagined that such complex structure must have involved strong technical involvement. Indranil Ghosh , an art Director who worked for Rituparno in *Chitrangada;The Crowning wish* says, " As an artist , there was so much to do; the magical reality of the stage , the middle class home, the hospital room, the screen which often moved apart to reveal a fantasy world, and the constant shift from real to the fantasy. This is an important film; it was his vehicle to challenge all the gender controversies surrounding him and he showed his audience that he was beyond simple binaries."[38] His audience are served with such an adaptation of Tagore's *Chitrangada* , which no one could think of. Audience is left with very difficult questions which could shook their belief on the viability of the normalized heterosexual norm of the society. These questions are put through different angles using different tools in this film. Music is also such an instrument through which Rituparno could build his argumentative world which carries audiences from the real world happenings to the world of imagination and

fantasy. This magical reality of Chitrangada is visualized by the auteur to convey the unheard and unrealized truth of those who live on the margin of the society. In this film the world of communication between the real and the unreal is created with the help of many technicians and its impact is heightened with the help of music. Thus Debojyoti Mishra , the music composer of *Chitrangada* recalls " it was about musically creating the surreal transformation of *Chitrangada*". Mishra adds " he tried his best to come out of his space with this film, working opposites, creating a new vocabulary."[39] This new it. Audience vocabulary is made with the investment of useful thoughts while selecting essential components to lift up the outcome of the film. Music is one of such instrument. As this adaptation is on a dance drama therefore dance moves are to be choreographed with proper music. When the dance drama is of Tagore , Rituparno couldn't think beyond using Tagore's song but the challenge was to do something new with of Bengal already had seen much with this particular dance drama of Tagore. So Ghosh moved ahead with a film like *Chitangada ;A Crowning Wish,* which aims to portray a challenging content. In this film the dance drama of Tagore runs with another narrative, so there is a transition from the dramatic sequence to the narrative of the film. In maintaining this transition there is a need of a thread which can connect these moves inside the film. in this context music, and background score proves to be that connecting cord . These have played a vital role throughout the film. Viewers are given the taste of Tagore with a difference through the use of the particular song '*Bodhu Kon Aalo Laglo Chokhe*'. The surreal transformation as pointed out by Mishra can be felt easily when this song helps to jump from the stage to the operation theatre with the stretch of the same line ' *kon alo laglo chokhe'.* The surreal effect is intensified with the focus of the camera to the two bright lights of the operation theatre which appears to be two big eyes which are flooded with light. Thus the transformation of Chitrangada on stage is very aesthetically compared with the transformation expected in Rudra through the sex reassignment surgery. The effect of this scene is enhanced obviously with the use of music. Thus music says a lot to the viewer about what is happening and what is going to happen next in the film . Music carries the viewers forward in the narrative.

Interestingly the music involves the beat of the percussion as the percussionist Partho plays it. This beat of the percussion directly involves Partho in the tale of Chitrangada and that of Rudra. The beat from the drum sounds alien within the totality of music in the film. But this alien sound is helpful in positioning Partho as the intruder in the life of Rudra just like Arjuna in the life of Chitrangada. Viewers are presented with this kind of transitions throughout the movie but in the latter half of it, the shift is more from the world of Rudra's imagination to the real life happenings. These movements in the narrative have helped in doing justice with the original text, ie Tagore's dance drama. For example, it is very interesting to see how Rudra the protagonist of the film draped in a hospital gown moves into the dance drama of Tagore holding the beats of the background score and then flows with the lines of the text *Chitangada.* Audience is provided with the dance drama originally performed on stage along with an interpretation of it through the narrative of Rudra's journey as a third gender. In a way Rituparno has played with the total viewing experience of the spectators who followed the title of the film . At this point words of David Bordwell echoes as he said, " Several conventions operate here . The competent viewer watches the film expecting not order in the narrative but stylistic signatures in the narration : technical touches … and obsessive motifs. …. This strategy becomes especially apparent in the convention of the multi-film work…"[40] In a larger perspective this kind of reading of the text proves to be the vehicle with which the director could cross the boundaries of gender , and identity. This is the reason why this film got its viewers in LGBTQ community also. In many ways it can connect specifically with those who travel through the same road of neglect and suffering. In the article "Rituparno Ghosh , a film-maker who pushed the envelop , dies at 49" it is highlighted that , "his own movie Chitrangada , which was released last year, reworked Tagore's dance drama about the romance between the warrior prince Arjun and Chitrangada, the Manipur princess who dresses like a man to protect her land… "Rituparno slowly and gradually gave his audiences a dose of trangressive material," Biswas said" . This same article highlights Sridhar Rangayan's words which applauds Rituparno's guts in revealing the bleak world of queer through films like *Chitrangada*

"…..Chitrangada was screened at the Kashish Mumbai International Queer Festival, held in Mumbai from 22-26. Festival director Sridhar Rangayan said Arekti Premer Golpo, Memories in March, and Chitrangada " Question issues of identity and sexuality in a very Indian way and talk about contemporary issues within a mainstream framework."" [41]

Another adaptation in this study is *Noukadubi; The Ship Wreck.* In this adaptation, Rituparno came up with a very neatly woven story . At the very first look of the film it appears that, this time he has chosen a very subtle story which can easily entertain audiences. But in this film the novel of Tagore is re-read by Rituparno to highlight on the issue of marriage and the position of women in it. This sort of reading of the text is communicated with the audience with a much intense cinematography. Those audiences who came to watch the film with a prior reading of the text gets to see an adaptation which live up to the expectation of a reader turned viewer. Without much alteration the narrative of the film has followed the original text to a greater extent.

In this adaptation also the auteur gets the chance to leave his mark. With his imagination this adaptation is elevated to that level where the author of the original text becomes a character of the film. It is in a way an encounter of the readers with the author of the text. Hemnalini, the heroin of the film is madly in love with Tagore and appreciate his creative talent. Through Hem's passion for Tagore viewers are provided with an experience which allowed them to linger in the literary world created by the artist, where the artist himself is active in his creative pursuit. On the screen the art and the artist is mixed up to create a different whole. Watching the film is like knowing the world of Tagore. Viewers are not provided with the character of Tagore in flesh and blood rather they are given the feeling of his presence in the backdrop. Characters speak of him as of their contemporary and thus spectators are left with a feeling of pleasure of knowing the writer as a person. The gratification of those viewers who read his works are heightened through this inclusion of references of Tagore as a character involved in the process of narrating the story. On the other hand those viewers who have not read this particular novel on which the film is based on or any of his writings , are served with the desire to

know Tagore and his works. In a way it is like propagating Tagore's works for a global audience. The way Hemnalini praise Tagore and crave for his new releases , is enough to develop a longing in the viewers to come closer to this writer called Tagore.

It is all the more technical to use songs written by Tagore while dealing with Tagore's own literary creation. Though it is not new with this film but its use in referring to Tagore as a character is very much new in this film. Therefore it is really much interesting to realize how much technicalities are involved to create the content called 'Tagore' in this film. It is like promoting Tagore and his literary talents to generate new readership of his works. It may be said that with the translation of this Tagore's novel from its pages to the screen , an 'after life' is given not only to the text but also to its writer. Tagore reincarnates through the imagination of this auteur and that too in the world of his own literary creation. In this film Tagore is imagined in his youth for whom a beauty like Hemnalini can shower all her affection. It is the portrait of Tagore which is kept along with his written works in Hemnalini's room. For her Tagore is beyond any criticism. It is like hero worshiping for her. She can only asks for Tagore's books to be kept in an almirah from the man of her love. Thus Hemnalini becomes an eye for the viewers with which Tagore can be seen. In this sense the viewers get a filtered image of Tagore through the desire and affection of the female protagonist in this film. To be specific it is the capacity of Rituparno Ghosh as a film maker , which enabled him to think beyond the usual and that is what happened in this film .

For this film Rituparno's collaboration with Subhash Ghai, a renowned filmmaker from Bollywood, gave him the opportunity to release this film in two languages.This kind of release helped him to target a larger audience. This targeted audience get to see a story which can easily be accepted with any other popular bollywood film . As the novel has a very complex web of a story , audiences rarely get a chance to move beyond it . The story creates a kind of urge in the viewers to know what is going to come next, just like any other suspense thriller. This element of suspense in the film has provided it a popular

base . It is a consumable kind of film for the moviegoers. It has a touch of a commercial cinema which appeals to popular masses.

Though this film has got some content that can appeal popular masses but it raises some serious issue. Rituparno's touch as a director has given it a new dimension. He has adapted this popular novel of Tagore to explore the institution of marriage. Rituparno is often termed as a women's director for his understanding of the emotion and sentiment of women , and in this film also he has shown his acute understanding of a feminine world which guided him to ask questions on women's desire . Viewers are handled in such a manner that they follow the narration to come across these questions. A woman's identity decided by the man in his life is channeled through the mishap of the shipwreck. After the ship wreck the narrative is shifted to that angle where viewers will reread the text adapted for the film. With this reading on screen spectators find themselves in the track of pealing out layers of the institution of marriage where woman is objectified and utilized by men for their own comforts. So here viewers watch Rituparno's interpretation of Tagore's novel through which they can delve deep into the story of Ramesh, Hemnalini, Sushila(kamala) and Nalinksha. With this reading viewers can easily get a sense of instability that is attached with the tems like home and marriage. Referring to the portrayal of the character of Sushila, Zinia Mitra argues, " the film singly focuses on the negotiations that occur in the life of a woman through , what she believed to be her marriage , that transforms her from Kamala to Sushila and then again the negotiation towards being a different Kamala by painfully eliminating her brief and happy identity as Sushila." [42] Kamala's condition is a telling truth that justifies the question on the stability of a woman's position in the concept of marriage and home. Even Hemnalini is also part of the same truth where all the possible happiness in her life is attached to one man or the other. This truth is brought to the centre of this film with the use of songs. *Khela Ghor Badhte Legeche* is the song which run with the narrative while appropriating its meaning with it. In its translation loosely it will mean "I m going to prepare my play house." Another song that has been used thoroughly in the film is *Tori Amar* which means ' my

boat'. With these songs the director has justified the content of the film and its layered meaning . It is like transmitting the auteur's reading of the text to its audiences. His reading of the text thus offers a picture of a patriarchal set up where the meaning of freedom and identity is different for a woman. Having a correlation with this thought Sangeeta Dutta and her co-authors write in the article, *The world of Rituparno Ghosh : texts , contexts and transgrassions*, " Ghosh deals with the idea of freedom and agency in all his films. Victimization and exploitation especially through parochial conservatism and patriarchy is not always physical , he reminds us"[43] .This kind of comments leads Rituparno's works to a different level and specifically when it is his work based on Tagore's literary creations , viewers easily fit into the chair of a reader.

Raincoat is another important work of Rituparno Ghosh. In this film he has tried his hand in a short story written by O Henry. This is Rituparno's first Hindi film . In this film he has casted Aiswariya Ray against Ajay Devgan. In this tight narrative which mostly shot indoor, tells a gripping story of Mannu and Neeru. Though this film is an adaptation of O'Henry's *Gift of the Magi* still there is not much resemblance with the original story. Alterations are many, so it can be said that this film is loosely based on the short story of O' Henry.

In this film Rituparno has re-written the short story of O' Henry to fit it into the Indian scenario. It may be argued that it is an intercultural translation. So in translation and transmission of a story that has a different cultural content through the medium of film , the director needs to incorporate a lot to make the film presentable to those viewers who tends to follow a different cultural setup. The important part of this adaptation is that it holds the spirit of the original work. In this sense this adaptation can be read as a cultural production. In such cultural productions by filmmakers from all part of the world , there seems to be a specific goal. It would not be wrong to say that one of such goal is audience. Production of films will be meaningless if it is not being watched. Thus whether it is adaptation or not, films are meant to be watched. In this adaptation too, it seems that the Indianised narrative is a step by the director to make it believable and

acceptable in Indian context. Thus the names of characters are also changed to suit with the language Hindi.

Within this kind of appearance given to the original story , Rituparno Ghosh has illustrated the meaning of love, sacrifice and the claustrophobic reality of suppressed desires. Though there is nothing much happening in the film but viewers realize the untold suffering of the hero and the heroin of the film. Here too, Rituparno moves into the realm of the closeted desire of a woman who is vulnerable into the system of prearranged marriage. While reading the original text, readers usually feel the presence of a prolonged desire. Thus in the film the narrative runs through a lonely atmosphere. This loneliness is heightened with the dark shade of colour used for this film. The grayish look is apparently matching with the theme of the film. It must be said that the total viewing experience is handled with the brilliant use of light. Apart from this , the effect of a lonely and depressed journey of life is justified with beautifully designed track and background score.

Most of the songs used in this film are written by Rituparno himself. Songs like *Mathura nagarpati kahay tum gokoli jao* ; *Piya tora kaisa abhiman* and *Akele hum nadiya kinare* are written by Rituparno in Maithili, which is a mixture of Sanskrit, Hindi and Brijbhasha. These songs relate with the story and become a part of it. With this involvement the essence of the narrative is intimated to the audience. The spirit of the original text can thus be re-read in this adaptation. The emotion , the sentiment and the feeling of lack from O'Henry's story is truthfully generated through the film. The private emotions of Jim and Della reaches to the reader through reading the text while viewers can directly be the part of these private emotions as the camera provides an opportunity to look inside the house and the life of Neeru . All the doors and windows are closed in this house so that Neeru can prevent outsiders to intrude in her personal life and her personal and closeted feelings , but spectators can intrude inside Neeru's home and into her private emotions, holding the hand of the director with the eye of the camera. So it must be said that the private is intruded not only by the spectator but also by the

characters like Mannu and the tenant are seen to peep into Neeru's home. This kind of intrusion is fore grounded to make the audience realize about a gap between the world outside and inside of Neeru's home. Even the title of the film *Raincoat* can be read as a symbol of a cover that shield from the rain or it may be said that it prevents the individual to freely access the desired happiness. This happiness is blocked in many aspects and the climax of the film reinstate this. The climax of the film equates happiness with that of sacrifice. Through such a climax , audiences who have already read the original text of O'Henry can immediately connect the film with its source.

" here I have told you the story of two children who were not wise . Each sold the most valuable thing he owned in order to buy a gift for the other."[41] – these lines from the last paragraph of O'Henry's Gift of the Magi echoes in the climax of the film . The valid meaning of this line is kept with the story of Mannu and Neeru. It appears that for keeping a link with the original story the auteur has re -written the end to justify the story and by doing so he has drawn a line that can help the viewers to rethink on the source text. Here it is to be said that, despite all these efforts the short story of O'Henry reaches to the audience with different cultural input. But here it is interesting to see how the interplay of cultural contents bring a difference in viewers. For Indian audiences the film is very much into the cultural and social context. Indian audience can easily relate to the story. It is all because the costume, music, set, language and situation of the story tells a lot about its cultural baggage. So it is definitely an Indian version of O'Henry's story. But when the same film is viewed by audiences who are very much alien to its cultural contents, its reception will be different. They will receive a new interpretation of the old text with a much newer thought and questions. These differences in acceptance occur because in such adaptations the regional and historical specificities are altered. Along with these alterations the particulars of the text are also indigenized for a different audience. Rituparno Ghosh's *Raincoat* is thus an indigenized production of O'Henry's *The Gift of the Magi*.

But this indigenized nature of the story will never be communicated to those viewers who gets to watch the film before reading the text. Even such interpretation of O' Henry's text can also be received as a totally new venture. It will be considered as a new story by those who will come to the theatre without any prior reading of the text. In this regard Linda Hutcheon appropriately writes in his article *In Defence of Adaptation as Cultural Production* " what happen to the literary text…..if I buy and read the book after seeing the movie, I read it differently than I would have before I had seen the film : in effect, the book, not the adaptation , has become the second and even secondary text for me. And as I read , I can 'see' characters as imagined by the director of the film ; the cinematic version has taken over , has been colonized , my reader's imagination . The literary 'source' text , in my readily , experimental terms , becomes the secondary work. It exists on an experimental continuum , in other words , with its adaptation . it may have been created before but I only came to know it after." [45]Linda's elaboration in the above statement tends to be true not only with *Raincoat* but also with other three adaptations taken up for this study. Whether it is Tagore's texts or of O' Henrys' , viewers can turn up to be a reader after watching these adaptations and then it will not be beyond possibility for these readers to relocate and research the filmic text in the printed pages of the book.

Thus it may be said at this point that, adaptation relies on the power of the collective knowing audience, who have read the same text . This audience became a coherent of writers who also read and evaluated each other's work. Readers must have to have the knowledge of the source text to understand the nuances of the moves made by the adapter. Adaptation exercises reach back to the past while drawing heavily upon the reader/ viewers of the present , while bridging the gap between two time periods.

It is observed that the fidelity question attached to adaptations can be answered with the response of the audiences or the spectators. Those who have a pre reading of the texts on which the film is made can ask questions related to the truthfulness of the director on re-telling the story on screen but those who haven't read the text can never

have doubt on the visual they get to watch on screen. It happens to be the first hand interaction of the spectators with the context of the film, thus they don't have any previous idea to compare with. Comparison with the reading of the original text can only bring out questions of fidelity but without this comparison the adaptation will become a totally new creation. Without prior information on the subject of the film , audiences will consider the film to be made on the script chosen by the director. On the contrary those spectators , who have already read the text on which the film is based, are quite keen to compare the film with the original text . The discussion of this chapter can thus be concluded with the words of Julie Sanders, who has rightly said, " Adaptations and appropriations are endlessly and wonderfully , about seeing things come back to us in as many forms as possible"[46].

Notes:

1. Sandip Ray. A Directory of Bengali Cinema. Foreword. Ed. Parimal Roy and Kazi Anirban. First edition. Kolkata: The Colour of Art,2013.Print.
2. Judith Mayne. *Cinema and Spectatorship* . Routledge: London.1993.1.Print.
3. Christian Mertz. " *The Imaginary Signifier*." Ed, Braudy , Leo. Film Theory and Criticism. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.,822.Print.
4. Mertz 823.
5. John Ellis . " The Literary Adaptation" Introduction." *Screen* .23 (1982): 3-5.Print.
6. Michele Aaron .*Spectatorship: The Power of Looking On*. London: Wallflower.2007.127Print

7. Roland Barthes. “From Work to Text”. The Novel an anthology of criticism and Theory 1900-2000. Ed. Dorothy J. Hale. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing. 2006.238. Print.
8. Malgorzata Marciniak. “ TheAppeal of Literature to Film Adaptations.” Lingua Ac Communitas 17 (2007): 62. Print.
9. Walter Benjamin. “The Task of the Translator”. *Selected Writings vol.1*. Edited by Marcus Bullock and Michael W. Jennings. London: The Belknap press of Harvard University press, 1996. 253.Print.
10. Benjamin 254.
11. Benjamin 254.
12. Benjamin 254.
13. Marciniak 62.
14. George Bluestone. *Novels into Film*. Berkely & LA: University of California Press, 1957.1. Press.
15. Alan Speigel, *Fiction and the Camera Eye: Visual Consciousness in film and the Modern Novel*. Charlottesville: University press of Virginia, 1976.55. Print.
16. “Death of the author” is an essay by Roland Barthes. This seminal essay changed the traditional literary criticism.
17. Michele Aoron 126.
18. Michele Aaron. *Spectatorship: The Power of Looking On*. Introduction. London: Wallflower .2007.Print.
19. Miriam Von Schant. New materialist Spectatorship: The Moving-Image-Body, the Mockumentary and a New Image of Thought.Networking Knowledge 8.5. Orebro University. September 2015. Web.
20. Von Schant 2.
21. Von Schant 4-5.
22. Arghakamal Mitra. “Crew”. *Rituparno Ghosh Cinema, Gender and Art*. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York: Routledge, 2016.270. Print.

23. The source of the information on gaze is Wikipaedia.

24. M.A Doane, *The Desire to Desire: The Woman's Film of the 1940s*, England: Macmillan , 1987.9. Print.

25. Laura Mulvey. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema". Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings. Eds. Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen. New York: Oxford UP,1999:836.Print.

26. Mulvey 836.

27. Mulvey 837.

28. Mulvey834.

29. Mulvey 838.

30. Madhuja Mukherjee. "En-gendering the detective: of love , longing and feminine follies." *Rituparno Ghosh Cinema , Gender and Art*. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York : Routledge ,2016.143. Print.

31. Rohit K. Dasgupta. "The World of Rituparno Ghosh An Introduction". *Rituparno Ghosh Cinema , Gender and Art*. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York : Routledge ,2016.20. Print.

32. Kaustav Bakshi. "I Know my city can neither handle me nor ignore me : Rituparno Ghosh in conversation with Kaustav Bakshi. Silhouette. :A discourse of Cinema.Vol.10. Kolkata:2013. 4. Print.

33. Wimal Dissanayake. Rituparno Ghosh and the pursuit of freedom." Rituparno Ghosh Cinema , Gender and Art. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York: Routledge,2016. 56. Print.

34. Nermeen Sheikh " Rituparno Ghosh and the intellectual film of India." Interview . Asia Society. Asia Society.Org.2005. Web

35. Daisy Hasan. " 'Kissed on one cheek and slapped on the other':Rituparno Ghosh's *Chitrangada* as an allegory of oppositional readings". Rituparno Ghosh Cinema , Gender and Art. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York: Routledge,2016. 56. Print.

36. Gary Hall and Clair Birchall(ed), *New Cultural Studies*, Hyderabad: Orient Black Swan, 2009.Print.

37. John Dean. "Adapting History and Literature into Movies". *American Studies Journal* . Dec 14, 2016. Web.

38. Indranil Ghosh. "Crew". *Rituparno Ghosh Cinema , Gender and Art*. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York: Routledge , 2016. 273. Print.

39. Debojyoti Mishra. "Crew". *Rituparno Ghosh Cinema , Gender and Art*. Ed. Sangeeta Datta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta. New York: Routledge , 2016. 275-276. Print.

40. David Bordwell. "The Art Cinema as a Mode of Film practice". *Film Criticism*, 4.1, 1979.59.Print.

41. Shamik Bag. "Rituparno Ghosh , a film-maker who pushed the envelop, dies at 49".*Mint*. May 30, 2013. Web.

42. Zinia Mitra. Tagore's Noukadubi and Rituparno 's Inspiration: Interrogating Marriage and Home. Silhouette .Dec 29,2011.Web.

43. Sangeeta Dutta, Kaustav Bakshi and Rohit K. Dasgupta . "The world of Rituparno Ghosh: texts , contexts and transgressions".South Asian History and Culture, New York: Routledge, 2014. Web.

44. O' Henry. *The Gift of the Magi*. New York:Diversion Books, 2015. 6.Print.

45. Linda Hutcheon. *In Defence of Literary Adaptation as Cultural production*; vil10 Issue2 May 2007. MC Journal . Retrieved from media culture.org.au.

46. Julie Sanders . *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London and New York: Routledge, 160.Print.

****