

**Gendered Bengali: Expectations and Challenges,
in Ashapurna Devi's 'Chhayasurya' and Partha
Pratim Chowdhury's Chhaya Surya
[Chhayasurya], and Sharadindu
Bandyopadhyay's Dadar Kirti and Tarun
Majumdar's Dadar Kirti**

Anirban Ray

Abstract: *The paper offers a comparative study between two filmic 'adaptations' from two Bengali texts: (i) Chhaya Surya [Chhayasurya] (1963) adapted by Partha Pratim Chowdhury from Ashapurna Devi's short story 'Chhayasurya' (1988[?]: 130–139), and (ii) Tarun Majumdar's Dadar Kirti (1980), 'adapted' from the novella/novel Dadar Kirti by Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay ([1982] 2011: 259–289). With close textual and filmic references, the paper explores (i) the conceptions of masculine and feminine and connotations of the two, (ii) artistic expressions internalizing gender as well as challenging it, (iii) male interactions interpreted by domestic women, and (iv) women's interlocution in perspectives on heterosexual coupling and marriage.*

Keywords: Love, negotiated marriage, femininity, masculinity, effeminacy, artistic vocation, literature-film 'adaptation.'

I. The Scope of the Paper

A shift of conjugal responsibilities occurs from the parents to their married sons/daughters before and after the three-day event in negotiated (arranged) Indian (Bengali) marriages. Post-marriage, when the sons and daughters (who had yielded to the parental choice of locating the partner/bridegroom/bride try to communicate the failure of compatibility to their parents, the parents argue that following the marriage it is their children's responsibility to turn the coupling (fixed by the parents) into a successful affair. In other words, the parents having generated a partner/bride/bridegroom based on observation (according to their generational, temporal, and appreciated standards), refuse to take the responsibility further after the wedding is

completed (implying that they [the parents of the bride and bridegroom] refuse to accept that their choices had been unsuccessful). Pre-negotiated-marital exploration of sexual compatibility is still not quite concomitant with the Indian mindset. In many cases the parents pursue the marriage negotiation not keeping in mind their children's happiness as the foremost cause, but as a display of their own social prestige in having married their children, with apparent success, befitting the family's economic position. When youths (of both sexes, undergoing marital negotiations) confront their parents forwarding the logic that they cannot commit to a located partner/bride/bridegroom within such a limited time before marriage, their logic is sometimes countered with the parental logic that some of them (the parents, especially the elderly married women) had seen their husbands for the first time in marriage halls/spaces. This self-justification has elements of both pride and obedience being able to accept parental decisions; simultaneously it contains hurt pride for which there was no audience. It can be contextualized here, that those lost opportunities of romance, represented through the family dramas in films in the latter half of the twentieth century, starred by the gifted duo Uttam Kumar and Suchitra Sen surely had an appeal for people who compromised in their youth and silently learned to find happiness with the negotiated partner.

In this paper I have tried to address how the genders of Bengali man and woman are constructed, with references to the expectations and challenges of negotiated marriage in middle class standards perceived in the middle and the latter half of the twentieth century, in two specific texts and films 'adapted' from those.¹ The primary texts include: Ashapura Devi's short story '*Chhayasurya*' (1988[?]: 130–139) and Partha Pratim Chowdhury's *Chhaya Surya* [*Chhayasurya*] (1963) (film 'adaptation' of Devi's story), and Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay's *Dadar Kirti* ([1982] 2011: 259–289) and Tarun Majumdar's 'adaptation' of the same, *Dadar Kirti* (1980).² The paper attempts to carry forward the texts/movies to the international audience stressing their visions which certainly were ahead of their times (and/or may have escaped the perceptive, and accepting potential of the readers/audience) rendering them relevant for critical studies for our times.

II. The Primary Texts and Movies

II. a. Comparative Summaries of Ashapura Devi's '*Chhayasurya*' and Partha Pratim Chowdhury's *Chhaya Surya* [*Chhayasurya*]

Devi's story is an exploration of gendered differences between the two sisters Ghentu (younger) and Mallika (elder), and under the convenient projection of the male persona (the sisters' younger uncle who is the story's narrator), does include criticisms of Ghentu's temperament primarily from the women's point of view since the elderly female members of the family cannot comprehend and endorse her un-womanish nature (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139). Instead of a progression of a plot, the story appears like fictive anecdotal recollections of the narrator whom Ghentu approaches in the film 'adaptation' by Chowdhury (1963) with a request for authorial justice through a fictional representation of her by him, thereby including her in the map of possibilities, and index of gender-acceptances. Ghentu develops a relationship with a low-class worker but fails to provide him treatment in dearth of which he expires (Devi 1988[?]: 135–139; Chowdhury 1963). Mallika receives a very prospective husband and Ghentu's 'theft' of 'one hundred rupees' (translation mine) (to arrange cure for her lover's 'illness' [translation mine]) brings her verbal curses from everyone, for being the cause of ultimate 'shame' (translation mine) in her prestigious family (Devi 1988[?]: 135–139).

Chowdhury's film (1963) provides visual scope for Mallika's negotiation to develop in which her future husband and Ghentu's (played by Sharmila Tagore) romantic interest are both shown as full-fledged individuals. Simultaneously the narrator-uncle (played by *Nirmal Kumar*) is provided fullest scope to act as a confidante of Ghentu, acting as a port of entry and exit between patriarchal expectations internalized by dependent women, and the (female) rebellious, emancipated possibilities which delight his (male) authorial self – since as a writer his eyes are keen in detecting anomalies and exceptions (as expressed by him to Ghentu's mother in Devi's story [1988(?): 132] and in Chowdhury's film [1963]). At the same time, the uncle-writer/narrator is also a career of those patriarchal injunctions with which he regulates and interprets Ghentu's movements; however, he certainly is neither traditional nor conservative Bengali man (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139; Chowdhury 1963). In fact, his own masculinity may be questioned: in Chowdhury's film (1963) he clearly expresses his discomfort with the marriage-system, and his desire to remain free from such ties also considerably frees him from practicing the expected gender trends/traits that distinguish between men and women, through marriage. This leads us to consider: should we not consider the sensibility of a male thoughtful person (a domestic loner) as a separate trait from the heterosexual married man, whose masculinity is judged through his decision-making which at

times may lack gender-sensibility towards the needs of his wife and the female sex in general?

II. b. Comparative Summaries of Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay's *Dadar Kirti* and Tarun Majumdar's *Dadar Kirti*

Kedarnath Chattopadhyay, a man fond of learning yet unable to qualify the examination-based assessment of merit, is sent to pursue bachelor's course away from Calcutta and is welcomed in his uncle's household where he is regarded warmly by Santosh (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 261–289), his junior cousin, who is a man of adrenalin charm but with decent control of testosterone and machismo (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 261–263, 266, 268). Santosh's engagement with Beena, the younger daughter of Kshitin Babu, is initiated by Santosh's mother whose decision/choice, as the text implies, is based on close proximity, identical professional status, and simultaneously a complementary pairing of appearances and temperaments of her boy and Beena (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 268). Kedar develops a passion for Saraswati (Beena's elder sister) – a girl of 'obstinate' (translation mine) temperament (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 263) and Santosh, along with Amulya play a 'prank' on Kedar and Saraswati, by 'forging' a letter from Saraswati to Kedar (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 261–278). Saraswati discovers the 'mischief,' and is later engaged to *Sharat Chandra* Ghoshal, (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 271–287); in the film her 'negotiation' was being pursued with Amarnath Chakraborty, son of Nibaran Chakraborty (Majumdar 1980). However, she turns against the 'negotiation' having received the visual (self-representation) and amorous addresses from Sharat (visual intrusion is thereby considered more intense encroachment upon her territory than the previously 'forged' letter by Amulya and Santosh) (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 284–286). Kshitin Babu agrees to discontinue the 'negotiation' (translation mine) between Saraswati and Sharat, and his appreciation for Kedar in considerable degrees had been meanwhile enhanced by Kedar's interest in Vedic scholarship, leading the reader to expect Kedar as his future son-in-law (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 277, 283–289).

In Majumdar's film (1980), the '*Dada*' (meaning a 'senior brother' in Bengali) in the story's title could be assigned to two male characters. Bhombol Bhattacharya (played by Anup Kumar), the good-for-nothing yet certainly the wittiest foil to Kedar (played by Tapas Paul), pursues the metamorphosis of the delicate, vulnerable Kedar to a well-groomed desirable

match for Saraswati (played by Mahua Roychoudhury), whom he had earlier heaped with fabricated information regarding Kedar's physical as well as cerebral successes (Majumdar 1980). There were not many Bengali films in the 1980s that projected masculine 'peer pressure' and addressed the problem we now identify as 'ragging'; although those issues had been projected under a coating of humor in Majumdar's film (1980). Boudidi (meaning 'elder sister-in-law' in Bengali and played by Sandhya Roy) (Santu's sister-in-law) is given an active role – by mock testing of Santu, she instils the degrees of conjugal responsibilities within Santu for Beena (played by Debashree Roy), so that the audience is not led to perceive Santu's right over Beena (backed by parental consent) as to be taken for granted (Majumdar 1980). In this regard, Majumdar's film (1980) not only gives precedence to parental supremacy in negotiations but also leaves room open for partners to turn that negotiation to a romantic attachment. Ultimately Bhombol forestalls bridal inspection of Saraswati (by Amarnath [played by Kaushik Banerjee]) and her subsequent marriage to Amarnath when he (Bhombol) produces a letter right before the inspection – in which he admits his faults, glorifying Kedar's unblemished nature, thereby instantly acquiring Saraswati's preference back for Kedar (Majumdar 1980). Audience, watching Majumdar's 'adaptation' (1980), but not having read Bandyopadhyay's novel ([1982] 2011: 259–289) would more decidedly identify Bhombol as the '*Dada*' and not Kedar.

III. Bengali Negotiated Marriage and Gendered Partnerships³

Before moving to theoretical review and application, let us briefly identify the issues of gender tied with tradition and conservative mentalities in Bengali negotiated marriage, which is not very different from all other racial arranged weddings in India. Marriage regulation, rituals, and the entire gamut of performance could be either traditional or conservative or both. It is traditional to go for horoscope consultation before arranged marriage, but it can lapse into a conservative endorsement to subject the prospective bride to corrective rituals. At times, even the people who consider themselves cultured may fall back upon selective doctrines (without any will to consider if these were sexist or misogynist). For example, no matter how fashion-conscious/fashion-trendy the bridegroom is, the '*topor*' (the bridegroom's decorated headgear: two provided from two households: the bridegroom's family and the bride's family) would form an essential part of the custom, costume, and code, and will be kept as a material memory even after the

marriage. But for the bride, her sari, and jewellery are also the material counterpart to the intangible blessings she earns, more crucially in case if she were the groom's parents' selection. To endorse a working bride (financially independent) to go through the '*bhaat-kaporer anushthan*' (the symbolic ceremony of the husband acquiring responsibilities for his wife's survival) is both traditional and conservative; often female members are the witnesses to it, not willing to realize how the ritual places the newly-wed wife (a member of their own sex) in a hierarchy lower than the men: the ceremony urges the symbolic (expected) dependence of the newly-wed wife on her husband to get accepted as mutually, conjugally beneficial. If asked regarding this ritual, an average family member (both male and female) may dismiss any critical inquiry into it, considering it as 'just another ritual' or an event of harmless photo shoots. Below are four, out of many, gendered perspectives of conservative negotiated Hindu (Bengali) marriage:

III. a. The bridegroom's living guardians are supreme; primary information regarding age, profession of the bridegroom should be exchanged between his parents and the bride's parents; the bridegroom may be expected to pay a visit for the bride-inspection following the primary inference regarding her suitability drawn by the bridegroom's parents. If the bridegroom wished to verbally settle with the bride's parents (when both his parents are in authority) then the bridegroom may be inferred as disrespectful and non-compliant even though the bridegroom's consent and comfort should be given priority. It is interesting that Majumdar (1980) does not feature Kedar's parents in the developing negotiation but discussions regarding the engagement between Kedar and Saraswati occur between Kshitin Babu and Kedar's uncle (Santu's father), and it is Boudidi, who subtly plays the significant role in negotiation through women's quarters, beneath the men's decisions: advising Saraswati to consider Kedar as her future husband, providing her scope to think independently about her happiness.

III. b. Between the confirmation of the negotiation and registry/blessings, the would-be bride (still in many households) is not expected/permitted to meet and travel to the groom's parental house.⁴ Occasionally, interviews of men precede inspections of women and clearly there is a difference between the two since the man's viability as the earning unit has to be justified to the would-be bride's parents/family. The uncomfortable yet necessary fact-collection is pursued by male members of the girl's family though it is made to look like a friendly conversation by appointing the girl's cousin-brother(s) and/or uncle(s) as the interviewers. In this regard, how can a second-generation scholar or an artist bridegroom/bride whose parents

still endorse the traditional and/or conservative exercise of marriage, be provided a justified image of the special attributes of his/her immediate future life-companion? Are the bride's cousins and uncles better judges of the bridegroom's artistic pursuits and vice versa? Obviously, the replies are negative: the bridegroom's talents are considered unnecessary before the marriage; what matters most is the bridegroom's financial position. This seems to subscribe to the publicly well-perceived view of marriage as an 'investment' itself; that a woman's economic settlement is more important than the recognition and fulfilment of her and her husband's other talents.⁵

III. c. Registry is the ultimate legal sanctioning of marriage; the complex rituals and/or exchange of rings are mere performances for social ratification, exhibition of status, and archiving of memories, all pursued to prove that it was a 'happy wedding ceremony.' As we hinted earlier, apparently the pre-(negotiated)-marriage erotic assessment of one's potential/performance is still frowned upon by traditional and/or conservative parents/families; many parents would actually pursue the registry on the marriage day fearing that the partners might initiate a sexual encounter following the registry and later change their minds having found that they two are sexually incompatible and thus are not mutually suitable.

III. d. The onus of financial handling usually falls on the husband. In circumstances when the husband has to take a risk in financial investment, it is considered demeaning on his part to ask for financial help from his in-laws; even this hesitated plea might be mistaken for asking for (belated) dowry in a disguised mode.⁶ Economy is thus severely gendered: the husband's masculinity being inflated, he is expected not to be dependent even on his wife in crisis. Gendering makes the husband masculine, at the cost of his humanity.

IV. Review of Selected Literature

Esha Dey notes that those women who did not receive adequate opportunity to express and represent themselves before a cultured, emancipated audience, came to regard Ashapura Devi as a source of inspiration (Dey 1996: 8-9). Dey observes that Devi could progress since in her own parental space there was no distinction drawn between male and female members/sibling in terms of studies, creative exercise with/before an understanding audience; following her marriage she was also equipped with economic stability, considerable emotional assistance from her husband, and received

convenient scope of publication (Dey 1996: 9–10). Phyllis Granoff has considered both the aspects of Devi's literary creations: Granoff draws reference to Manisha Roy's study ([1972] 1975), that considers the endorsement of women's compliance with 'traditional' perspectives set by men; Granoff also mentions Anima Bose (1976) who takes a reverse assessment of Devi as a spokesperson of upholding 'women's rights' possible only when such men-oriented 'traditional' expectations can be challenged (Granoff 1985: 195).⁷ Granoff also highly appreciated Devi's unique stance taken towards the equilibrium 'with men' in achieving independence not only in finance but also in learning, apart from inner enrichment (Granoff, 1985: 195). Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay is a very different author altogether: remembered primarily for his investigator-protagonist *Byomkesh* Bakshi for which he still remains an author potential for film 'adaptation' and audio performance; we do not however considerably look for nuances of gender and its implication in his fiction, which this paper attempts to pursue. His *Dadar Kirti* received a wide audience due to Tarun Majumdar's 'adaptation' (1980), but very few may feel it required to compare with the textual source and also see if western theories regarding the implementation of gender could be applied to Majumdar's 'adaptation' specially - which is often precluded from serious study due to lightness of having apparent humor of family drama. The paper takes an experimental approach to carefully select western theoretical insights and consider reworking of the same in these two Bengali texts and films from them.

Sara Heinämaa, in discussion of the construction of the subject's 'sexuality,' following Maurice Jean Jacques Merleau-Ponty ([1945] 1993), notes that like the constituent parts of an 'art' form, 'sexuality' and its patterns form the constituted aspects of a person's 'behaviour'; thus the patterns found in companionship, cerebral reasoning, and artistic considerations are modulated by 'sexuality' (Heinämaa [2004] 2005: 143).⁸ Heinämaa refers to the observation of Simone Lucie Ernestine Marie Bertrand de *Beauvoir* ([1949] 1993) who cited and followed Merleau-Ponty's view that womanly and manly features are subject to modifications and alterations: while woman does not constitute 'fixed reality,' man is built on 'a historical idea' (quoted in Heinämaa [2004] 2005: 144) and thus women undergo transformation (Heinämaa [2004] 2005: 144).⁹ Heinämaa thus establishes the truth that the male-female binary is indeed traced from the male perspective and that maleness is defined in opposition to the femaleness (Heinämaa [2004] 2005: 137–151).

Heinämaa's discussions on the difference between male and female '[s]exual identities' and 'behaviour' (Heinämaa [2004] 2005: 137–151) can be applied in the studies of the paper's primary texts, contextualized in the Indian scenario. In Chowdhury's *Chhaya Surya* [*Chhayasurya*] (1963) the child Ghentu indeed argues that sports should not be gendered and she is shown enjoying cricket with boys in the alleys (how they perceive her as a player is not given much insight in the film) but Chowdhury features the grown-up Ghentu (possibly in late teens or early twenties) fidgeting with a chain, enacting the *mastan* (the arrogant male) temperament. In contrast, in Majumdar's *Dadar Kirti* (1980) Santu while enjoying the date with Beena covers her head with a veil, projecting her as a bashful wife (Majumdar 1980). Beena's cerebral faculties are not questioned, they are not essentially considered important in comparison to Saraswati, but Amulya in Bandyopadhyay's novel explains to Santosh that the latter had been considered as a potential son-in-law combining his academic merits with his robust health (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 266). Majumdar (1980) also projects Saraswati performing the role of Rabindranath Tagore's Chitrangada from his dance-drama *Chitrangada* – the story of the mythical Manipuri princess who imbibed masculine valour rendering her undesirable for the hyper-male Arjuna (See Tagore [1905] 1954[?]), but it appeals to Kedar – who gets romantically vulnerable with her, perhaps because he himself lacks the masculine firmness (but not aggression) that is internalized by a woman like Saraswati (Majumdar 1980).

Based on Raewyn Connell's (R.W. Connell)(1995) observation, Mimi Schippers notes that one is provided the opportunity to be considered 'masculine' through pursuing habits associated with 'masculinity,' indicating that a person does not inherit 'masculinity' (Schippers, 2007: 86).¹⁰ Schippers refers to Connell (1987) who held the belief that 'hegemonic' 'femininity' does not exist as a counterpart to 'hegemonic masculinity' (conceptualized by Connell [1995])(quoted in Schippers 2007: 87) since men's positioning of women as lower than them is a global scenario (Schippers 2007: 87).¹¹ However, Schippers mentions following Connell (1995) that men also experience 'subordination' such as the straight men's domination of homosexual males, thereby forcing the latter to experience '*subordinate masculinities*' (mentioned and identified by Connell) considered 'feminine,' possessing degrees of passivity (Schippers 2007: 87–88).¹² Bhombol's coercion on the vulnerable Kedar to pursue the constructs of the 'hegemonic masculinity' (as discussed by Schippers [2007: 85–102] following Connell [1987, 1995]) and the demands of it can be observed in this regard (Majumdar 1980). Building upon Judith Butler's (1990) observation,

Schippers notes that the ‘hierarchical relationship’ between ‘femininity’ and ‘masculinity’ is based on ‘difference’ which initiates ‘erotic attachment,’ which acting as a ‘natural attraction’ draws men and women mutually leading to the constitution of ‘complementary opposites’ welcomed for coupling, considered ‘as natural’ (Schippers 2007: 89–90).¹³ Thus Schippers aptly sums up that a ‘masculine’ male is expected to have sexual attraction towards a ‘feminine object,’ while the ‘feminin[ity]’ of a female is perceived as ‘being the object of masculine’ ‘attraction’ (Schippers 2007: 90). Thus, Bhombol can dismiss Saraswati as ‘blotting paper’ because she cannot be held in attraction like other ‘feminine’ ‘object’ (Majumdar 1980).

Schippers notes that exhibition of rebellion by women or exhibiting excessive sexual drive or complete lack of it, feeling lesbian attraction or keeping multiple (male) partners are considered ‘threatening’ as they challenge ‘hegemonic masculinity’ (Schippers 2007: 95). Women who feature these traits, as Schippers observes, are considered as possessing ‘*pariah femininities*’ (as termed by Schippers [2007: 95]) but even then, these identities are thought of as ‘*not masculine*’ but ‘feminine’ and they are ‘undesirable’ to men (Schippers 2007: 95). We can argue that Ghentu imbibes the ‘*pariah femininities*’ (as termed and discussed by Schippers [2007: 95]) and because of her unruly nature and lack of discipline, is addressed in harsh terms like ‘*Rokkhe Kali*’ (Devi 1988[?]: 130, 134) and ‘*Smashan Kali*’ (Devi 1988[?]: 137). Curiously these terms are actually names of Kali’s fierce manifestations. The hypocrisy of the Bengali mindset is manifested here: Shakti worship is held in almost similar reverence like that of the cult of Vishnu: Kali is held in awe, but women having dark complexion, rough physical features, and unruly hair, are disliked, but we hardly have male counterparts to these terms in usage, that is arrogant boys/men are not identified with Shiva’s ferocity. Schippers’s observation can be cited here: the assumption is that ‘masculinity’ is inherently ‘superior’ and ‘legitimate’ conditioning of maleness, hence only ‘femininity’ can be seen ‘as contaminating’ but ‘masculinity’ is thought to be above such risk (Schippers 2007: 96).

Jyotirmaya Tripathy notes that though gender-awareness has initiated development in ‘femininity,’ simultaneously a hierarchy is generated between women of the ‘Third World’ requiring support and liberation, and the women of the ‘First World’ as progressive and emancipated (Tripathy 2010: 116). Perhaps Devi is wishing Mallika to come out of her shell in the West, following her marriage, while Ghentu is already self-emancipated (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139). Tripathy aptly observes that ‘masculinity’ is less complex,

easily discernible concept, which implies that one does not bear patience to distinguish different degrees of 'maleness'; the male human is thus conceived adding 'masculinity' with 'men' which is made to exercise its implications globally (Tripathy 2010: 119). Tripathy conjectures the reality of '[f]eminine universality' and considers the diverse influence of 'cultures' in shaping womanly features; men seem to benefit from a consolidated concept of masculinity but progression amidst women is suspected and their success is questioned (Tripathy 2010: 120). Conceptions of 'gender,' Tripathy derives, are thus classified under 'feminist' label and 'maleness' is believed to be beyond the purview of 'gender,' kept in the label of 'sex' as it resists 'change' (Tripathy 2010: 120). Thus, in both Bandyopadhyay's novel ([1982] 2011: 265–268, 271–277) and Majumdar's film (1980), the letter 'prank' (translation mine), as Saraswati and Boudidi both point out – could potentially harm Saraswati's 'reputation' (translation mine), though it is just a 'prank' for Amulya, Santosh [Santu], and Bhombol.

How relevant are the two texts and the 'adapted' films for our contemporary Indian scenario? Jennifer L. Bowman's and David C. Dollahite's article on approaches to negotiated and love marriages in India (Bowman and Dollahite 2013: 207–225) can be cited here. In the developing scenario, we seldom hear of coerced persuasion of young people by their parents to accept the negotiated partner/bride/bridegroom; the parents are also ready to hear their children's denial of the matches initiated (Bowman and Dollahite 2013: 208). Steve Derné (1994), referred to by Bowman and Dollahite, observes that a typical Hindu considers a married man leading a life of respect if his previous and following generations reside in the same house (Bowman and Dollahite 2013: 212).¹⁴ This is reflected in Saraswati's mother's wish to ensure her elder daughter's bliss of mind by getting Kedar as her son-in-law, since Kedar and Santosh [Santu] are blood related cousins, forming a greater family (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 286; Majumdar 1980). Bowman and Dollahite observe through a comparative survey that Indians, contrary to the citizens of United States prefer 'understanding' to 'love' in the tying of the knot and this emphasis on 'understanding' follows the initial absence of romantic attachment in negotiated marriage which does not provide much scope of acquaintance with the selected partner (Bowman and Dollahite 2013: 214). Bandyopadhyay projects that marital reality through the conversation between Amulya and Santosh – the former dismisses the pre-marital 'romance' as a western affair and plans to cure Kedar from his amorous fixation on Saraswati (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 265–266).

Unlike a straight man being calculative and actively involved in going on a date (generally implying that his ladylove accompanies in response and he fixes the date), Ghentu moves at ease between her house and her lover (Devi 1988[?]: 134–139; Chowdhury, 1963). Ghentu's Tabla-learning-aspiration may be a product of competitiveness with Mallika's Sitar-training (Devi 1988[?]: 133–134; Chowdhury 1963). It may be noticed that Sitar requires nimble fingers, slender ones, while much strength of the palm is required for Tabla; in fact, the hardness in the hands is an evident sign of physical labour but also a sign of masculine toughness. Bengalis have hypocrisies regarding gender coding of artists and gender associations with art. A prosperous parent may appoint an instrumental player (for example, Tabla) for his/her musician/dancer daughter, but there is a clear specification of task involved: the male Tabla player/trainer maybe seen as nothing more than a distinguished (paid) assistant, if not a paid servant. In that case any love-tryst between the Tabla player and the musician/dancer girl may be frowned upon (if both the families were not liberal and artists themselves), and as Devi's short story (1988[?]) and Chowdhury's film (1963) note, 'the daughter of a revered family' (translation mine) should not engage in Tabla-practice (Devi 1988[?]: 133–134; Chowdhury 1963) lest the physical exertion may reduce the delicacy of her hands and hinder her chance of getting married. Hand gestures and softness of a woman are still much in demand in negotiated marriages; in fact, inspection of the delicate hand of a woman occasionally transpires in negotiation.

V. Female Sibling-pairings

V. a. Ghentu and Mallika

The author is at odds in exploring the masculinized femininity in Ghentu, which he infers, as both fascinating and undesirable, and is particularly difficult in attracting the opposite sex (male), as Ghentu's maleness precludes such amorous possibilities (Devi 1988[?]: 132–135). Ghentu's straightforward nature is complemented with her lover's inwardness, which she specifies as 'shyness' (translation mine), which any careful reader may discern as having degrees of vulnerability and delicate nature in a man (but not effeminate) which makes Ghentu feel concern and tenderness for him (Devi 1988[?]: 134–136, 138–139). Ghentu's negative assessment of Mallika is for her passivity in being a medium for exercise of patriarchal expectations which she has complied with (Devi 1988[?]: 135). Ghentu considers Mallika a 'wax doll' (translation mine) which is generated only

through conditions set by men, for fulfilment of conditions expected by men (Devi 1988[?]: 135). In other words, Mallika's gifts do not enrich her; rather those enhance her family's reputation (Devi 1988[?]: 131–135). The author-narrator too is indoctrinated in the condition that the family name may acquire 'blemish' (translation mine) due to Ghentu's affair but what is interesting is: he hopes that any such 'stain' (translation mine) could be purified by Mallika's character but does not say that Ghentu's nature would be of any hindrance for Mallika's chance of getting a prospective husband (Devi 1988[?]: 136). Female achievements are seen more in terms of being approved and sorted out by male family members, and prospective groom: Mallika has surpassed the females in the family by pursuing 'college' course, and her crossing India's boundary through marriage is certainly a path-breaking achievement (Devi 1988[?]: 136). One may question: whose achievement is it actually? Is it the groom's, charmed at Mallika's looks and qualities, or is it fate's own achievement that ensured Mallika's coincidental good fortune?

There is a slight patronizing tone in the description of Mallika's 'delicate' figure (translation mine) (yet considered beautiful in terms of negotiation) from the author-uncle-narrator, but there is certainly an intrigued look at Ghentu's 'strong physique' (translation mine) since she appears to be potential subject (not object) of observation for him (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139). The male persona of the narrator, inspecting a woman's looks before her qualities, is unsettled that a masculinized girl has found a male lover, rather than a conventionally pleasant-appearing girl like Mallika (Devi 1988[?]: 130–134). Instantly he corrects his thought process by referring to Mallika's penchant for norms even at the cost of letting another man – institutionally acknowledged, claim her unsoiled identity, which an illegitimate amorous investment, unsanctioned and unapproved, can never pursue (Devi 1988[?]: 134). Mallika is successful in deregistering the appeal displayed by her male domestic instructors, and the descriptions seem to rather lament the fact that there is a lack of spontaneous, visceral response in her character (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139). The degrees of appreciation stem from the narrator's success in 'comprehending' (translation mine) Mallika's character, which is not however conveniently simplified in case of Ghentu, since Ghentu is not a stereotype like Mallika (Devi 1988[?]: 134–135).

V. b. Saraswati and Beena

In Bandyopadhyay's text, the two families have been introduced through the perspective of women (Santosh's mother's pursuit of Beena as her daughter-in-law [Bandyopadhyay (1982) 2011: 268]), though the men execute the decisive actions in both the novel (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 259–289) and the film (Majumdar 1980). Santosh's father readily provides a comfortable space for his nephew Kedar in his house (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 261), and in the film Kedar is also affectionately accepted by his daughter-in-law (Santu's Boudidi) who considers the advent of a new brother-in-law to provide a friendly companion for her own brother-in-law Santu (Majumdar 1980). In Majumdar's (1980) film, Boudidi is shown to be almost in a sisterly bonding with Santu as both are shown enjoying friendly conflicts over pen for epistolary romance with her distant husband. It is through her that we learn of an engagement between Beena and Santu; however, Santu's mother shows doubts regarding Beena's parents' decision (Majumdar 1980). At the mention of Saraswati, Boudidi expresses the society's discomfort with Saraswati from both male and female perspectives: Saraswati's scholarly outlook and achievements (her brilliant performances in English as well as mathematics) are to be dreaded as well as appreciated in a woman, and it is evident that her primary conception of Saraswati is that of a girl with resolutions (Majumdar 1980). Saraswati applies her authority/custodianship on her mother and sister and enjoys the autonomy through representing the engagement as a regulating yardstick for Beena, thereby keeping herself outside the loop of marriage (Majumdar 1980). Saraswati's father communicates Nibaran's account of his son's visual delight at watching Saraswati, inviting her instant disapproval (Majumdar 1980). Saraswati does enjoy this autonomy as she refuses to provide information regarding Beena to Santu in one scene, thereby creating feminine, secured space where women are controllers of facts and are proficient interlocutors (Majumdar 1980). Saraswati is aware that Beena's allegiance is being divided between her elder sister and Santu, and Saraswati may have also known that her own ego might not fetch her a good husband; so, the only space she can keep control is over her mother and sister, and her sister's silent disobedience (in going out on a date with Santu) punctures her ego and makes her cry (Majumdar 1980).

VI. Women as Interlocutors

VI. a. Interaction between Ghentu and Her Uncle

In Chowdhury's (1963) 'adaptation' of Devi's '*Chhayasurya*' the two sisters' recitations (the topic, content, and style of recitation) before their younger uncle constitute a distinction between their own insights into their feminine natures. Mallika recites with melodious tone and certainly adjusting her mood (Chowdhury 1963). Ghentu's recitation comes out of her own volition, in a slightly competitive mood, eager for attention, while Mallika had to be requested by her younger uncle (Chowdhury 1963). Ghentu perceives her younger uncle as her confidante, and her younger uncle admits that his attachment is more towards Ghentu than towards Mallika (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139; Chowdhury 1963). Mallika recites from Rabindranath Tagore's poem '*Chirayomana*' (Chowdhury 1963) – in which the poet/speaker wishes spontaneity from his female lover, to approach in a tryst without any affectation and/or artificial beautification (Tagore [1987(?)] 1995(?): 253–255): it is ironic that Mallika recites it without considering the internalizing of the spirit of the poem: to break the polished look of a female lover, since love is not like a crafted jewel but a continuous process of realizations and modifications. Ghentu recites Tagore's '*Bor Esehhe Birer Chhande*' in a non-academic, casual, yet entertaining way and quite successfully brings out a comic effect (Chowdhury 1963). In fact, this poem by Tagore is a satire on how Bengali bridegrooms/men consider the fun, and separation (between father and daughter) in marriage (Tagore [1990(?)] 1995(?): 19–20). Weeping, crying (indeed out of sorrows of separation) are also considered expected performances before the invited, sanctioning guests, relatives, and neighbours, and are included within the complex, trailing rituals of marriage.

Devi's text stresses that Mallika's nimble fingers are adept in 'miniature' 'work' (translation mine) and her faithful reproductions preclude any detection of difference between the source and the reproduced: one can extend her penchant for painting in terms of her attention towards detailing which requires patience, but it also includes the temperament to 'imitate' (translation mine) (Devi 1988[?]: 131–132). If changes in artistic vision and exercise involve interpretation, careful selection and editing, then Mallika lacks ingenuity despite enormous skill. This also implies that she prefers to follow without embracing change, and she is shown producing a visual replica of Parvati and her husband Shiva where in Bengali and Hindu culture women are socially and ritually influenced and inspired to gain 'a husband like Shiva' (Knapp 2006: 95) (Devi 1988[?]: 131–132; Chowdhury 1963). Ghentu's visual composition of a buffalo is just the 'vehicle of Yama' (translation mine) for her father (Devi 1988[?]: 131–132; Chowdhury 1963) and the visual extension of her 'thought-process' (translation mine) as

interpreted by other family members (Devi 1988[?]: 131–132). The elders, even with their collected experience and wisdom, fail to realize Ghentu's ingenuity: that a female human artist had sketched a male beast raging, and completely out of her memory, without having the living subject in the front to make imitation of (Devi 1988[?]: 131–132; Chowdhury 1963). In Chowdhury's (1963) film Ghentu's younger uncle's face displayed an understanding smile because he alone finds Ghentu's art showing its subject in its true essence: an active animal in motion and without human hypocrisies.

As his authorial self admits, and the meeting with the publisher communicates in Chowdhury's (1963) film projects: the uncle-author/narrator's literary creations are economy-bound, and in both Devi's story (1988[?]: 130–139) and Chowdhury's (1963) film, the uncle-writer-figure considers the 'truth' - not the everyday 'truth,' but the author's 'truth,' (translation mine) that transcends the representations of characters encountered in the life of senses, and includes the unrepresented too, providing a room for an unusual girl (Ghentu). From her body language it is clear that Mallika sees her younger uncle as any other male elderly member, and maintains a reverential distance; Ghentu, as the narrator observes, is incapable of 'respecting' (translation mine) someone, but a strange form of 'love' (translation mine) is given to the author-narrator by her (Devi 1988[?]: 130–139; Chowdhury 1963). Chowdhury builds upon this intimate interaction in the film, thereby allowing Ghentu to tour with her younger uncle, where he is also permitted to read her 'love letter' (translation mine) and interpret her mind (Chowdhury 1963).

VI. b. Relation between Santosh [Santu] and His Boudidi

As Majumdar (1980) projects through his cinematic direction, the spaces in the Bengali locality are thoroughly gendered: Kedar learns that the 'Sharadiya Festival' is celebrated with cultural programs (drama), in which chronology of references is based on hierarchy of age and gender: firstly, the elderly men, secondly, the post-adolescent/youthful men, and thirdly, the women/girls, and the three groups participate separately (Majumdar 1980). In a very interesting scene, we see the elderly married women in a separate room, preparing refreshments for the men-folk who were rehearsing (Majumdar 1980). The girls' participation is seen more as entertainment rather than as a creative focus and attempt: Bhombol dismisses the perseverance in their rehearsal, uttering a blatant sexist remark that the girls' energies should be targeted at marriage rather than in investing

their mind and energy in performance (Majumdar 1980). This directs Saraswati's indignant glare at him and his friends, and in consequence she is branded in contempt as a 'blotting paper' (indicating that she lacks the feminine charm and delicacy) by Bhombol (Majumdar 1980). Even the sexes apparently sit separately in the public spaces - in the cultural event of the 'Spring Festival' (translation mine) (Holi) we see women sit together, which means that even husband and wife, complying with gender-division as endorsed by social etiquette (without realizing that such etiquette expects the society-driven difference between women and men to continue) may not sit side by side but take seats with other family members of the identical sexes (Majumdar 1980). The colloquial Bengali of the film also is given an emotional control - Boudidi, while referring to Kedar, asks Santu for confirmation if Kedar indeed have developed '*maya*' (the word '*Maya*' generally means 'delusion' [Pattanaik 2006: 167, 200] but here it implies softness towards someone) in thinking about Saraswati (Majumdar 1980); any sensible reader will understand that '*maya*' is not a suitable translation of 'love,' but in a culture where romance is rather cultured discreetly through parental consent and social management, '*maya*' is a rather disguised substitute for '*prem*' (meaning 'love'). We can argue: if a man projected '*maya*' instead of '*prem*' towards a woman, does it make him less masculine and less a lover? We cannot consider Kedar as effeminate as far as Bandyopadhyay's text ([1982] 2011: 259–289) and Majumdar's movie (1980) are concerned: he has tenderness in his approach towards both women and men, which also implies that like a masculinized straight male (viewing women as inferior by randomly deriving that women are always in need of protection), he does not distinguish between a man and a woman in terms of importance (Majumdar 1980).

In both Bandyopadhyay's text ([1982] 2011: 259–289) and Majumdar's film (1980), Boudidi is not a restricted wife in her in-law's place. She has generated a bond of femininity with Saraswati and Beena that involves both sibling-affection and female-female friendship (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 278–280, 282–283, 287–288; Majumdar 1980). Beena complies with Boudidi's instructions reverentially, not only out of senior-junior difference, but also out of fear of not disrupting the planned marital connection: Boudidi is Santosh's sister-in-law which indicates a power-equation separately between women (one married and another unmarried) which is however, pivoted on [heterosexual] married relations (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 279). Boudidi holds a respectful position as Beena's future sister-in-law, but the former employs it to strengthen female bonding with the latter instead. Boudidi is equally adept in conversation regarding marriage with Santosh

(Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 280, 282, 287–288). While Boudidi quite appropriately considers the justification of parental interference in marriage, Santosh quite sensibly advocates the room for Saraswati's individual 'opinion' (translation mine) in the denial of the parental imposition (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 280). He distinguishes this marriage from the doctrine and sanctities of '*gouridaan*' and despite being described as a hyper-male, a '*gunda*' (a roguish male) (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 266) definitely values the 'opinion' (translation mine) of the bride/woman (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 280). It is interesting that this sensible conversation is appropriately occurring between a woman in her late youth, within marital sphere (whose husband is away for professional requirements), committed to regulations, and a post-adolescent male youth yet to enter into it, fed with hopes of conjugality, which he has conveniently been able to develop into love (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 280). Yet Boudidi feels deeply for Kedar, almost empathizing with him and helping him with his pursuit of Saraswati (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 279–280, 282, 287–288; Majumdar, 1980). Bandyopadhyay's text itself stresses Santosh's planned dependence on Boudidi in indirectly conveying Kedar's love-interest to his (Santosh's) mother (Bandyopadhyay [1982] 2011: 263).

VII. Conclusion

In the twenty-first century, our engagements with traditions of marriage have certainly changed; however, in case of a second general male/female scholar, though financially aided by their (self-made) first generation learner-parents who pursued a different profession - it remains a challenge to have similar opinions on the ritual aspects of marriage. For example, it is not entirely uncommon for a female/male academician to feel that her/his years of cerebral engagement - which may or may not have received an empathetic understanding from his/her parents - does not receive adequate acknowledgement when it is just summed up in the midst of social gathering and conversation. Their achievements are solely attributed to their parental sacrifices, leaving no specific recognition of their independent efforts. This gets extended to the marriage negotiation and post-marriage crisis if the marriage happened between a college/university professor and a spouse who has received higher studies but does not have the inclination to pursue a job or rather is not advised to do the same (she may still very much love her husband and take care of the household). Such a spouse, in consequence, would mentally split the identity of her husband under two categories: (i) as

a college/university professor, the difficulties and successes of which she may hear about but remains unable to gauge and participate in, and (ii) her sexual partner and the everyday man she knows in managing the household chores with. To such a couple there may be still domestic peace but without mutual recognition of possibilities and potential. From that context, we can argue that Devi (1988[?]: 136) sends Mallika off with her husband to the West, where we can hope she gets her talents duly approved and acknowledged (in a professional sense) and not just appreciated as ornamental, suitable means for earning a polished bridegroom, as seen in the Indian scenario of negotiations. In a similar mode, Majumdar (1980) takes a future vision in projecting a gender-reversal: providing a scope for Saraswati to domestically train and cerebrally enrich Kedar as her husband. Such a closure is possible, thanks to Bandyopadhyay's calculated plot, in which both Kedar and Saraswati are from economically empowered families, so the sole dependence on a viable earning husband in supporting his wife can be temporally deferred (as perceived from the conversations between Kshitin Babu and his wife [Bandyopadhyay (1982) 2011: 286]). Both Devi's '*Chhayasurya*' (1988[?]: 130–139) and Chowdhury's '*Chhaya Surya*' [*Chhayasurya*] (1963), and Bandyopadhyay's '*Dadar Kirti*' ([1982] 2011: 259–289) and Majumdar's '*Dadar Kirti*' (1980) in terms of courtship thereby remain relevant in our times, and the author of the article feels it suitable to recommend the studies of these texts and the films 'adapted' from those in academic curricula having found within them the convenient loci of application of the gender theories developed in the West, validating the theories' worldwide scope of praxis.

Notes

¹ For detailed studies on the usage and application of the term 'adaptation' consult Julie Sanders, 2006, *Adaptation and Appropriation*, London and New York: Routledge.

² Ashapura Devi's '*Chhayasurya*' was written before Partha Pratim Chowdhury's film 'adaptation' '*Chhaya Surya*' [*Chhayasurya*]. For reference I have consulted a collection of Devi's short stories, collected and published later (1988[?]), hence the date provided in References and parenthetical citations is later than that of Chowdhury's film (1963). Also, the date of the published anthology provides the year of publication according to the Bengali calendar. I have tried to estimate and provide the

corresponding date in English calendar; however, a question mark has been used as sometimes calculations vary. This uncertainty is also visible in the cases of citations of Rabindranath Tagore's *Chitrangada* ([1905] 1954[?]), Tagore's '*Chirayomana*' ([1987(?)] 1995[?]), and Tagore's '*Bor Esehhe Birer Chhade*' ([1990(?)] 1995[?]). The Bengali titles, while being spelt in English, are kept in italics; the italicized titles within quotes indicate poems and short story. In case of two dates provided for citing a particular text/source, the first date is within square brackets and the date of republication follows it. See the References for details. Also, please note that in cases of references to the two films, the names of significant actors and actresses are provided in the article but not in the Reference list because the emphasis is more on the issues of gender in the films and not on individual performers. Hence the directors' names are provided along with dates in parenthetical citations of movies.

³ The reader will realize that these observations are quite common in our society. We may have all experienced these in degrees but we do not quite notice their implications. The author has tried to arrange the relevant ones keeping the scope of the paper in mind.

⁴ The author posted discussion about this common scenario in Bengali on the Timeline of his Facebook Profile on October 18, 2017.

⁵ The author posted a similar observation in Bengali on the Timeline of his Facebook Profile on April 20, 2017.

⁶ The author posted a similar observation in Bengali on the Timeline of his Facebook Profile on April 20, 2017.

⁷ Words within quotation marks are Granoff's (1985: 195). See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information. To avoid confusion with the secondary critics/scholars cited in parenthetical citations, the publication dates and details of the primary/original critics'/scholars' works (cited indirectly) are also provided in a separate list.

⁸ See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

⁹ See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

¹⁰ See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

¹¹ See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

¹² See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

¹³ See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

¹⁴ See 'Selected Indirect References' for bibliographic information.

References

Bandyopadhyay, Sharadindu, [1982] 2011. *Dadar Kirti*, in Sri Pratulchandra Gupta [Sri Pratul Chandra Gupta] (ed.), *Sharadindu Amanibas* (by Sharadindu Bandyopadhyay). Vol. 10: *Uponyas Natok*. 17th Printing. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Ananda Publishers Private Limited: 259–289.

Bowman, Jennifer L., and David C. Dollahite, 2013. "Why Would Such a Person Dream About Heaven?" Family, Faith, and Happiness in Arranged Marriages in India', *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 2: 207–225. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/43613089> (accessed on March 22, 2018).

Chowdhury, Partha Pratim (Dir.), 1963. *Chhaya Surya* [*Chhayasurya*]. Calcutta [Kolkata](?): Pics Studio; India Film Laboratory; R. D. B. and Co.(?). Film [VCD].

Devi, Ashapura, 1988(?). '*Chhayasurya*', in *Swa Nirbachita Shrestha Galpa* [*A Collection of Self-selected Stories*] (by Ashapura Devi). 1st Edition. Kolkata: Model Publishing House: 130–139.

Dey, Esha, 1996. 'An Authentic Voice Ashapura Devi (1909–1995)', *Indian Literature*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (171): 8–16. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23335711> (accessed on August 7, 2013).

Granoff, Phyllis, 1985. 'Traditional Goals for Modern Women: The Paradox of Ashapura Devi's Fiction', *Journal of South Asian Literature*, Vol. 20, No. 1, Part I: Essays on The Mahâbhârata: 195–204. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40872746> (accessed on August 7, 2013).

Heinämaa, Sara, [2004] 2005. 'The Soul-Body Union and Sexual Difference: From Descartes to Merleau-Ponty and Beauvoir', in Lilli Alanen and Charlotte Witt (eds.), *Feminist Reflections on the History of Philosophy*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers: 137–151.

Knapp, Stephen, 2006. *The Power of the Dharma: An Introduction to Hinduism and Vedic Culture*. Lincoln, NE: Universe, Inc.

Majumdar, Tarun, (Dir.), 1980. *Dadar Kirti*. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Ram Cine Arts. Film [VCD].

Pattanaik, Devdutt, 2006. *Myth = Mithya: Decoding Hindu Mythology*. New Delhi: Penguin Books India.

Tagore, Rabindranath, [1905] 1954(?). *Chitrangada*. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Visvabharati Granthalay. *State Central Library, Kolkata, Digital Library of India, Internet Archive*, September 2, 2015 [Uploaded by Jayanta Nath]. URL: <https://archive.org/details/Chitrangada1905> (accessed on April 28, 2018).

Tagore, Rabindranath, [1987(?)] 1995(?). 'Chirayomana', in Sri Ashok Mukhopadhyay (published), *Kshanika, Rabindra-Rachanabali* (by Rabindranath Tagore). Vol. 4. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Visvabharati Granthanavibhag: 253–255.

Tagore, Rabindranath, [1990(?)] 1995(?). 'Bor Esehhe Birer Chhande', in Sri Ashok Mukhopadhyay (published), *Khapchhara, Rabindra-Rachanabali* (by Rabindranath Tagore). Vol. 11. Calcutta [Kolkata]: Visvabharati Granthanavibhag: 19–20.

Tripathy, Jyotirmaya, 2010. 'How Gendered Is Gender and Development? Culture, Masculinity, and Gender Difference', *Development in Practice*, Vol. 20, No. 1: 113–121. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27752191> (accessed on March 21, 2018).

Sanders, Julie, 2006. *Adaptation and Appropriation*. London and New York: Routledge.

Schippers, Mimi, 2007. 'Recovering the Feminine Other: Masculinity, Femininity, and Gender Hegemony', *Theory and Society*, Vol. 36, No. 1: 85–102. Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4501776> (accessed on March 21, 2018).

Selected Indirect References

Beauvoir, Simone de, [1949] 1993. *Le deuxième sexe I: Les faits et les mythes*. Paris: Gallimard. For English translation, see Simone de Beauvoir, 1952, *The Second Sex*, translated by Howard Madison Parshley, New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Bose, Anima, 1976. 'Ashapura Devi: Perspective on a Bengali Novelist', *Indian Literature*, Vol. 19, No. 3: 80–95.

Butler, *Judith*. 1990. *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge.

Connell, R. W. [Raewyn *Connell*], 1987. *Gender and Power: Society, the Person and Sexual Politics*. Cambridge: Polity.

Connell, R. W. [Raewyn *Connell*], 1995. *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Derné, Steve, 1994. 'Hindu Men Talk about Controlling Women: Cultural Ideas as a Tool of The Powerful', *Sociological Perspectives*, Vol. 37, No. 2: 203–227.

Merleau-Ponty, *Maurice*, [1945] 1993. *Phénoménologie de la Perception*. Paris: Gallimard.

For English translation, see *Maurice Merleau-Ponty*, 1962, *Phenomenology of Perception*, translated by Colin Smith, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Roy, Manisha, [1972] 1975. *Bengali Women*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.