

***Parineeta*: Cultural Transition from Chattopadhyay to Sarkar**

Ritu Sen

Sharat Chandra Chattopadhyay's *Parineeta* (1916) was first adapted to film with Pashupati Chatterji's *Porinita* in 1942. Independent India saw celebrated film maker Bimal Roy present his adaptation of the novel in 1953 which was followed by Arun Ganguly's *Sankoch* (1976). The most recent adaptation of the novel was made in 2005 under Vidhu Vinod Chopra's banner and Pradeep Sarkar's direction. These multiple replications of a master work present a fascinating insight into the modus operandi of adaptation which allows for an assessment of the shifting value placed on relationships, institutions and norms, with the change in the status of the nation from colonial to postcolonial. This paper aims to study the cultural transition of the narrative from Chattopadhyay to Sarkar in terms of the placement of the author, director(s) as well as the narrative in varying stages of history.

In *Parineeta*, Chattopadhyay reflects on a wide range of issues from poverty to state of women to religiosity to social compulsions and most prominently the tussle between romance and social convention. The novel wears various signifiers of Sharat Chandra's socio-political affiliation, generally projected in an oblique manner. An example of the same is noted by Michael H. Hoffheimer in his paper *Rule of Law in Bollywood*¹ where he describes the refusal of tea by the heroine as "a symbol of submission of the female to the male's judgment" and suggests "the conservative social values of the male insofar as tea was still vaguely associated with modern and European values and had not yet become the national drink." In the novel, Lalita's uncle Gurcharan announces, in a matter-of-fact tone that Lalita does not partake of tea as her "Shekhar Da" does not approve of it. In another scene, Lalita is urged to have tea by Girin when she politely declines to do so. This is in keeping with the social mores of the early 1900s where tea was regarded as a 'European' product and as an 'addictive intoxicant'. Similarly Chattopadhyay's slant towards the plight of widows and orphans is conveyed through the character of Lalita who is an orphan. The portrayal of Lalita, like most of Chattopadhyay's heroines, reflects the fiery feminist stance² of the author where he sensitively projects the plight of such characters but also constructs them as women of great integrity and strength. Through the depiction of Gurcharan's monetary crisis, we are offered a glimpse into the problems of dowry as well as the socio-economic pressure of elaborate weddings. Thus, through his novels Sharat Chandra paints a laconic critique of the socio-cultural paradigms of the day. At the same time, it also promotes an understanding of the cultural practices of the time.

Thus, by projecting the culture of the 'native', through the description of cultural practices, Chattopadhyay was perhaps attempting to establish the contemporary (to our times), neo-colonialist belief that Indians already had an elaborate culture,

as opposed to the image of the 'barbarian' being projected by the colonizer. This agenda was in keeping with the reformist agendas of Nationalists (or nationalist agendas of Reformists) like Raja Ram Mohan Roy and Bankim Chandra Chatterjee, who were aiming to break the colonial construction of the past developed in historical accounts such as James Mill's multi-volume *History of British India*. It is conceded by most historians that the cultural domination of the colonized state was a planned agenda of the Imperial powers which co-existed with the politico-military governance. K.N.Panikkar writes in his essay *Creating New Cultural Taste*³:

All over the world transforming indigenous cultures had been the agenda central to colonial domination. Attempted with a view to ensuring the consent of the colonized, and distinct from the physical control exercised by military success and territorial conquest, the colonized state and its agencies, both through direct intervention and indirect influence, communicated and reproduced a cultural ideal attractive and powerful enough for the colonized intelligentsia to internalize and disseminate in society.⁴ (Panikkar, 151)

I would argue that Chattopadhyay's novel was an attempt to subvert this 'cultural' domination where the colonizer was attempting to replace heterogeneity in language, clothes and conduct with an anglicised homogenous 'culture'. Thus, the trouser and shirt was fast replacing the kurta and dhoti, when the 'babu' went to work in his office. English was gaining credence over the lingua-franca and this 'anglicised Indian' was moving away from the songs, rituals and religious practices of his time. The rigid caste system and the superstitious beliefs prevalent in the Indian society of the time, only strengthened the case of the above said transition. *Parineeta*, therefore, had a two fold agenda. It highlighted the trappings of culture (through Gurucharan's plight) as well as eulogized the ideal combination of 'tradition' and 'modernity' (through the character of Girin). Gurucharan becomes a spokesperson for all those who are the victims of the rigid demands of the 'community' which lays down the rules but does not offer any solutions. He lashes out at the Brahmin community:

"It is the tradition of this society that we must function according to the desires of the community. So mortgage your house if you have to, but marry off your daughter and then offer a lavish feast to the community. Later you may lose your house, you may become a homeless destitute but no one from amongst this community is going to come forward to help you. Our community is full of people who are like stones. Ever ready to hit out, to criticize but never ready to help."⁵ (Pg. 32)

On the other hand, Girin offers help to a fellow 'indian' (*voh hamare samaj ke nahi hain lekin hamare desh ke toh hain*. Pg 29) and doesn't want any credit for it. He is then the prototype of the ideal Indian man who places humanity (*manavta*) before tradition (*riti*). Moreover, the novel highlights the cultural nuances of Bengali society dwelling upon the traditions and social mores of the era. From the historical perspective, it catered to the cultural sensibility of a state which was grappling with the hegemonic hold of culture and tradition, on one hand and the political domination of the British Empire, on the other. Lalita's quiet integrity,

Gurucharan's kindness and Girin's selfless service are representatives of India's great traditions and *sanskar*. At the same time, through the internal vacillation of the protagonist, Chattopadhyay projected the tussle in the psyche of the middle class intelligentsia, torn between the 'theory of divine dispensation' and a fledgling sense of the greatness of the 'Oriental'. The final decision of the protagonist to subvert authority and tradition is a reflection of the subversion of both the physical 'oppressor' (the empire) and the metaphoric version (hegemonic traditions).

Bimal Roy's adaptation of *Parineeta* comes nearly forty years after the novel's publication. Roy's film *Parineeta* is a post-colonial response to the narrative both in terms of being created in the post-colonial era, and as an attempt to promote a nationalist cultural agenda. Bill Ashcroft comments in his iconic work *The Empire Writes Back: Theories and Practice in post-colonial Literature*, "The crucial function of language as a medium of power demands that post-colonial writing define itself by seizing the language of the centre and replacing it in a discourse fully adapted to the colonized place."⁶ Roy's use of film as a language to promote the above said national cultural agenda is noteworthy. The post-colonial response seen in Roy's film, centers around the concept of reform in hegemonic cultural practices as well as promoting the 'identity' of the new Indian. This is an extension of the process of 'reversal' initiated by Chattopadhyay where Roy makes an overt move to subvert the cultural hegemony of the Empire, which is even more palpable in the 1950s. The cultural domination of the colony had been a slow, deliberate process which had been so intrinsically internalized by the colonized masses that even after the physical removal of the British, their domination continued. It was this domination that Roy challenged in his work, especially in the trilogy created in the 1950s from Chattopadhyay's novels. Michael Hoffheimer offers various reasons for this affinity of the director towards Sharat Chandra's novel:

First, their implicit social criticism promoted the reform agenda of Bimal Roy who with other filmmakers in the decade following Independence participated actively in the national cultural movement, working to popularize progressive political values and championing social and legal reform. Filming Saratchandra's novels provided a vehicle for validating the literary heritage of the new nation and for established Bimal Roy's own Bengali culture as an important constituent of the emerging national identity. (Hoffheimer, 18)⁷

Roy followed the basic plot of the novel in his adaptation where Lalita (Meena Kumari) and Shekhar (Ashok Kumar) portrayed the dilemmas of Bengalis in the 1920s as the film outlined the socio-political graph of the era and left an indelible mark on the "national cultural movement", as an extension of the agenda followed by Chattopadhyay. The film amalgamates the general sense of unrest due to the conflicted 'third space' Bengal had become in the backdrop of the Partition of 1905. The male lover is anti imperialist in his outlook, close to the author's vision of Shekhar, and the film, at some level, is a means to promote the still fresh nationalist sentiment of the population. Roy steered towards realism in all his works but he stripped this film off most Bollywood prerequisites and created

a narrative which leaned towards the documentary style. In his trademark cryptic style, he inserts realism into the narrative at various levels. So if poverty is to be showcased in Gurucharan's household, then a little girl from the household too will be starkly aware of the limitations poverty brings. When asked in jest about the occupation of the groom her doll bride would marry, this little girl responds by saying, "*baap bada babu hai, ladka ussi daftar main chota babu. Hum gareebon ko koi rajkumar toh milega nahi.*" It is indeed a laconic insert which clearly portrays how even the dreams of the poor are bereft of hope.

In terms of the narrative, Sharat Chandra's novel and Roy's film avatar cover common ground where the central dramatic conflict in each arises from the opposition between the individual and the community. Both Chattopadhyay and Roy's *Parineeta* firmly situate the conflict between erotic attraction and its moral ramifications, brimming with conflict, internal and external. Roy's exposition of the society of his time has a terse critical edge and encourages the viewer to construe the narrative as representative of India as a whole. For instance, Roy projects the harshness of poverty, as depicted by the novelist, emphasising again on the unrelenting hold of the *samaj*. The film does not see Gurucharan converting into the Brahma Samaj but the character delivers a powerful speech deploring the stoic pose of his own community (Brahmin) in the face of his need and misfortune. He revolts by deciding to marry *ucch kul ki ladki*, his niece Lalita to the *neech kul ka ladka* Girin. It is this decision that leads to the building of the wall between the two houses by Nabin Rai. Thus, Roy contemporizes the key agendas of the novel replacing the 'solution' (*Brahmo Samaj*) offered by Chattopadhyay by the angst against the domination of the community over the individual.

There are various other pointers in the film which project the cultural position of both the director and his narrative. The little girls, who populate Gurucharan's home, are all fascinated with the idea of marriage. They prattle ceaselessly about impending weddings, claiming marriage as the only destiny for women (*byayh nahi karegi toh kya barrister banegi*). They extol the virtues of a wife as being one who is obedient and in complete accordance with the wishes of her in-laws (*jaa ke ab sasuraal main rehna, saans sasur ki sewa karna, sab kuch sehna kuch na kehna, aanchal rakhna sambhaal ke*). Above all, the position of Lalita, who defends her husband with quiet reserve, (*main unke kaamon ka vichaar nahi karti*), even when she is all but forsaken by him, highlight the qualities of a 'good' wife, who never finds fault with her "*swami*", and is the picture of quiet compliance (*sab kuch sehna, kuch na kehna*). Lalita is constantly shown as a girl who is proficient in all house hold chores (*saakshaat Annapurna*) but not very bright at studies. Shekhar realizes how much he misses her only when he finds his room in disarray after she stops managing his belongings. When he hears of her impending marriage, he is shaken for various reasons but he chooses to express just one, "*mere kaam naukar chakar toh kar nahi sakte, paraye ghar jaane se pehle mujhe sab samaan samjha jaana*". Thus, on the surface Roy is constructing the image of the ideal *pativrata* in Lalita but as subtext he is also commenting on the utilitarian role she plays as the *patni*. Also, both the novel and Roy's film use the masochistic response where the prosperity of a man is judged on the basis of the amount of jewellery his wife

wears. Therefore when Shekhar, who thinks Lalita is married to Girin, notices the rags in which Lalita is dressed, he remarks "*yeh kya pehna hua hai tumne? Suna hai tumhare pati toh badi paise waale hain. Who tumhara maan nahi karte?*" On another level, the film projects the relationship of Shekhar and Lalita in keeping with the Krishna-Radha mythology. The song, *chali radhe raani ankhiyon main paani, apne mohan se mukhda mod ke*, further evokes the mythic response the director wishes to generate. It is clearly an effort on the part of the director to obliquely project Bengali culture on a pan-India setting, where he translates the language (Bengali) and transforms the medium (film) to reach out to those sections of the country (non-Bengali, illiterate) who were beyond Chattopadhyay's reach.

In sharp contrast to the 1950s *Parineeta*, the 2005 version moves the narrative to 1960's Bengal and aligns the narrative to the period film genre. In Sarkar's version, the change in the spatio-temporal setting creates a narrative remarkably different from the parent text as well as Roy's film. On the surface level, the setting of the narrative moves ahead by almost 40 years and Sarkar introduces a fresh emphasis on minor characters (Charulata, Koel) which were underplayed in the both the novel and Roy's film. In the words of the producer, co-script writer, "It's like the basic idea is the same but a completely new screenplay."⁸ This last adaptation created in the postcolonial space introduces the oppressor-oppressed equation as subtext and emphasizes on the element of nostalgia. It also provokes thought on the newer (in relation to Chattopadhyay and Roy's work) concepts of location, mimicry, Diaspora and the hybrid.

The treatment of the male protagonist, Shekhar, who is presented as a hybrid, vacillating between the culture of the 'suppressor' and the 'suppressed' is important as it elucidates the changes seen in the larger structure of the film, and by extension, in the audience to which the film caters. Shekhar's character is portrayed as a musician instead of a lawyer in Sarkar's version. He carries an anglicized outlook with accented English, liberally peppered with very 'English' phrasal responses such as the oft repeated 'not bad'. He plays the guitar as well as the piano with élan and transports *robindra sangeet* to Hindi lyrics to the backdrop of western instrumental accompaniment. Poles apart from his counterpart in print, Shekhar imitates Elvis Presley complete with the cigarette dangling from his lips, singing "I'm so lonely I could die" as he nonchalantly gets into a Tuxedo. The art décor of his room, with antique Bengali furniture mingling with European object-de-art adds to the hybrid element in the character. He vacillates between the kurta-dhoti and tuxedos and participates in European style 'birthday celebrations' as well as *durga puja* festivities. This pendulistic movement links him with Chattopadhyay and Roy's Shekhar who wavered in his desire to conform to social norms (by obeying his father) and submits to his desire (by marrying Lolita). However, the primary difference between these versions is that while the hero's vacillations were governed by internal conflict in Chattopadhyay's creation, Sarkar's Shekhar is governed by external forces, like the guile practiced by his father or the constant presence of Girish in Gurcharan's household. This change is insightful and suggests that Sarkar evades textual fidelity as he wants to project a hero who is a victim of destiny rather than capriciousness. Also, as *Parineeta* released so close to Bhansali's *Devdas*, the

plot similarities of a fickle protagonist set in an opulent, colonial Bengal might have deterred Sarkar from portraying the character as it was etched in the book. Thus, Sarkar's Shekhar cannot be charged with ambivalence as he is moved through a plot where simulations lead to misunderstandings. Sarkar also takes care to paint Gayatri as an opportunist and thereby further justifies the substitution of brides in the very Bollywood climax.

Lolita's household is also not quite as impecunious as Roy's and the brood of unmarried/married daughters is also missing. In fact, the loan which leads to the monetary crisis in the story is taken for Gurcharan's medical expenses rather than dowry, as shown in the novel/Roy's film. Lolita is shown as a 'simple' Bengali girl, who can cook, sing and dance, as well as work (another deviation from the previous narratives). She is however, far more complex than the "*laxmi, saraswati ka ek hi roop*" Lalita painted by Roy, as she is not as submissive as her predecessors. She grows jealous of Gayatri Tanya, (the girl Navin proposes as a match for his son Shekhar), as she identifies Gayatri as 'superior' due to Gayatri's British way of living. It is interesting to note how it leads her to 'mimic' Gayatri by wearing 'high heels' to work. Here, it is also enlightening to see how Shekhar inadvertently classifies the 'anglicized' Gayatri as superior to the 'Indian' Lolita. It is this perception of Shekhar's that leads Lolita to mimic Gayatri. The baking of cakes by Lolita is another instance of mimicry (not Gayatri's) which points towards the assimilation of one culture into another. The disdain with which Gayatri holds 'cooking' (*cake... Flurry's se mangaya hai*) is similar to the *memsahib's* approach to chores (as perceived by the Indian). Thus, it is a three tiered mimicry pattern, where the wealthy intelligentsia imitates the British way of life and they in turn are the model for other Indians down the socio-economic ladder.

Other young male characters in the film, Hari and Girish are also seen in European clothes. Shekhar's biting sarcasm, (*suit pehen ke puchka kha raha hai saala*) on Girish's ability to retain his identity even in English clothes/English environs, is an important indicator of the new Hybrid (Girish). Girish's portrayal as a successful entrepreneur, settled abroad, seems to suggest the socio-economic reversal (white is dominated by brown/black) the Diaspora aspires for. He has risen above the 'slave mentality' which characters like Shekhar and Navin (Shekhar's father) are still victims of and represents greatness through his ability to compete with the English, without compromising his 'identity' as an 'independent' individual. The character has its genesis in Chattopadhyay's novel but it is a far more nuanced and confident version of the original.

Navin's character is projected as the arch villain whose guiding principle is 'profit' over everything else. His greed seems to personify the colonial process where the imperial power plundered the colony, justifying it under the banner of 'civilizing the barbarian hordes'. So, just as the British Empire plundered the East, as it proclaimed greatness for bringing 'civilization' to the colony, Navin disguises his motive of usurping Gurucharan's *haveli* by giving a loan he knows Gurucharan can never repay. Though, this plot is an intrinsic part of Chattopadhyay's novel, in Sarkar's film, Navin is used as the all in all metaphor for the exploitation of the British. Navin's oppression of his wife and son rekindles

the memory of 'slave driving' and his intrigues of separating the young lovers echo the 'divide and rule' policies of the Empire. The building of a wall which separates Lalita and Shekhar's house by Navin is again taken from the novel. With the Bengal partition in the temporal background, Chattopadhyay might have been influenced by the idea of a forced physical divide between two spaces. However, the breaking of this wall by Shekhar in the climax of the film, is suggestive of a more contemporary (in terms of the 1960s setting) break from the 'slave mindset'. Therefore, Sarkar's film uses the freedom struggle as a subtext to the romantic drama, with the 'suppressed' overcoming the shackles of the 'suppressor' by force, as shown in the breaking of the wall by Shekhar. It thereby echoes the 'militant' outlook of Chattopadhyay who promoted the forceful expulsion of the colonizer.

The 'contemporisation' of Chattopadhyay's novel is also influenced by the commercial instinct, which is at the heart of most Bollywood ventures. The producer had dabbled in period cinema with *1942 A Love Story* which was not a resounding box office success. He, therefore, tried a more modern approach to the period drama with *Parineeta*. Therefore, the brother-sister like bond between the protagonists of Chattopadhyay's work and the *radha-krishna raas* as seen in Roy's film is replaced by erotica in Sarkar's film. The love making scene where Lolita and Shekhar consummate their relationship is an anomaly if seen in the social setting of the 1960s. Even the change of Lalita's name to Lolita seems to be motivated by Nabokov's erotic *Lolita*. The bare back of the female protagonist was flashed copiously in the pre-release publicity of the film. Chopra seemed to want to move away from the 'clean' image by adding just a little dash of 'masala' to his 'family entertainer'. Also, the grandeur of *Parineeta* imitated the imposing sets of Sanjay Leela Bhansali's highly successful adaptation of Chattopadhyay's *Devdas*. The film seems to cater to the Bengali Diaspora as it celebrates the traditional ethnic homeland with great sensitivity and detail. The nostalgic factor of the film is very high as Sarkar's direction pays tribute to the Calcutta of his youth. Iconic places like the Victoria Memorial, Moulin Rouge, Flurry's Bakery, *Puja Pandals*, Hoogly River and the Howrah Bridge form an integral part of the narrative and captures the fervor they could excite in the average middle class Bengali. It is also not a co-incidence that Lolita is dressed to resemble Charulata, a character from Satyajit Ray's immensely popular eponymous work *Charulata*, which was itself based on Tagore's novella *Nashtanir*. The song *soona man ka aangan* incorporates Tagore's song *Phoole Phoole Dhole Dhole* and in both *Parineeta* and *Charulata*, this song is sung while Charulata and Parineeta are each on a swing. Furthering Tagore's presence in the film is the credits role in the opening montage which is played out to the backdrop of Tagore's *amar shonar bangal*¹⁹ clearly defining the Location of the film.

In postcolonial terms Location is less concerned with the analysis of a particular geographical area and its relationship to identity; but rather, with the analysis of the social, cultural, religious and linguistic processes which constitute cultural identity regardless of the specific location in which this occurs. This results in a more sophisticated analysis of political struggles against colonialism and takes into account both the migrations of Diaspora communities and their interaction

with other social groups, being indigenous peoples or other cultural Diasporas. V.S.Naipaul writes in 'Prologue to an Autobiography', "Our own past was, like our own India, a dream." John McLeod analyses the above statement as follows, "Naipaul points out that migration alters how migrants think about their home and host countries."¹⁰ If Bengal were to be considered as the central point of dispersion, then Sarkar's *Parineeta* is a Diaspora's nostalgic recounting of his mother land¹¹

"I belong to the 1960s. That's why *Parineeta* is based in that period. That was when I became a teenager, went from school to college, fell in love. I know the moments, the feelings, the nuances, gestures. You will see all this in *Parineeta*. When people make films, they are just replaying their experiences." <http://www.rediff.com/movies/2005/jun/09sarkar.htm>

To carry the analogy forward, it is also the reflection of Bengali culture, language and society as conceived of in the 1960s, but from the point of view of the 21st century. The Bengali culture as seen in the *Parineeta* of 2005 is a decorated version of the actual space. It is laced with the music, attire and sets of a Calcutta which has been popularized by the 'Star Television Generation'. Perhaps, that is why most viewers do not question a Bengali groom in a black *Sherwani*, though it is entirely out of sync with the cultural ethos of the time. Neither do we raise our eyebrows at the palpable deviations from the mother text. As stated above, Roy did not veer away from the novel because it enjoyed a great level of audience familiarity. For Sarkar, this compulsion did not exist as the average modern hybrid Bengali is largely unaware of Chattopadhyay's work. However, like Roy, Sarkar's film too, fulfils a cultural criterion by invoking that image of Bengal which the modern Bengali, and the nation, identifies with. Therefore, Roy's realistic work charged by a "cultural agenda" is replaced by Sarkar's eulogy to the culture of Calcutta in the 1960s, or rather by the Bengali culture popularized by Bhansali's *Devdas* and soaps like *Kasauti Zindagi Ki*. That explains the cosmopolitan tilt of this period film, as seen in the sets, costumes, language and music used in the film.

In 1914, the story captures the cultural climate of Bengal, and by extension India, roping in the colonial element of the time. It showcases *Parineeta* as a girl devoted and dependant on her 'elder' lover Shekhar, who in turn, vacillates between Eros and the established ethos. Later, Bimal Roy in 1953 retains the conflict of subversion and submission to filial/social demands against the backdrop of a starkly realist setting. He showcases *Parineeta*, as a woman caught in the changing culture of modern India, but reaching the zenith of her potential/happiness only as 'the married woman'. Finally, Sarkar in 2005 romances Calcutta of the 1960s on screen, presenting *Parineeta* as an independent woman, who asserts her sexuality with confidence and breezes past the traditional notions of 'morality'. She is laden with a fierce feminism where she stands out as the 'elder' in the relationship with Shekhar, constantly 'mentoring' him. Although, Shekhar too, moves away from tradition and openly confronts filial authority to reclaim his love-object, it is *Parineeta*, who truly reflects change by transcending the closeted identity of 'the Indian woman' and providing a fresh perspective to the socio-cultural clime of the era. However, what firmly binds her to her precursors

is the concept of 'love and commitment', where she too finds her ultimate identity as 'the married woman'.

Thus, a cyclic movement of meaning can be traced in the treatment of the narrative as the author's anti-colonial and nationalistic stance evolves to represent the national cultural movement promoted by Roy and eventually, in 2005, it transforms to a Bollywood romantic retro saga with a subtext which connects it to the nationalist movement Chattopadhyay was inspired by.

Endnotes

- ¹H. Hoffheimer, Michael. *Rule of Law in Bollywood Translations of Devdas and Parineeta*. University of Mississippi. Social Science Research Network. Web. 13 Jul. 2010.
- ²Chakravarti, *Introduction to Srikanta*, p.76. ("In the context of the Bengali society and particularly of Bengali literature, Saratchandra has been a great liberalizing force on the side of women").
- ³Panikkar, K.N. *Colonialism, Culture and Resistance*. OUP, 2007. Print.
- ⁴Panikkar, K.N. *Colonialism, Culture, and Resistance*. OUP, 2007. Print.
- ⁵*Samaj ki riti yehi hai ki biradari ko saath leke chalo. Makaan girvi rakh kar, bechkar, ladki ki shaadi karo aur biradari ko pritibhoj do. Baad main makaan chin jaane par jab aap sadak pe aa jaate hain toh biraadri main se koi uthkar nahi aata. Hamare log patthar hain. Aalochna karne ke liye sabse aage lekin sahayta karte samay sabse peeche*". *Parineeta*. Sharat Chandra Chattopadhyay. Diamond Publications. 2009. Print.
- ⁶Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths, and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*. Routledge, 1989.38. Print.
- ⁷Hoffheimer, H. Michael. "Rule of Law in Bollywood Translations of Devdas and Parineeta". *Florida Entertainment Law Review* 32.
- ⁸*The Hindu*. Web. 10 June 2005.
- ⁹*Amar Shonar Bangla (My Golden Bengal)* is a 1905 song written and composed by the Bengali poet Rabindranath Tagore from undivided India, the first ten lines of which were adopted in 1972 as the Bangladeshi National Anthem. The song was written in 1905 during the period of *Bongobhanga* (1905 Partition of Bengal) - when the ruling British empire had the province of Bengal (of undivided India) split into two parts.
- ¹⁰McLeod, John. *Beginning Postcolonialism*. 2000. Pix Publications, 2010.209. Print.
- ¹¹"I belong to the 1960s. That's why *Parineeta* is based in that period. That was when I became a teenager, went from school to college, fell in love. I know the moments, the feelings, the nuances, gestures. You will see all this in *Parineeta*. When people make films, they are just replaying their experiences." Web. 9 June 2005.