

# FROM IBSEN TO RAY: TRANSCULTURAL ADAPTATION AND FILM AUTHORSHIP IN *GANASHATRU* (*AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE* 1989)

Shyam Sundar Pal & Ananya Ghoshal  
Indian Institute of Technology Indore, India

## ABSTRACT

Satyajit Ray's *Ganashatru* (*An Enemy of the People* 1989) marks the first part of the *final trilogy*, with the subsequent two parts being *Shakha Prashaka* (*Branches of the Tree* 1990), and *Agantuk* (*The Stranger* 1991). Ray's last three films are notable for their strong use of language against the prevailing state of corruption and decadence in society. *Ganashatru* shows how Dr. Ashoke Gupta, a medical practitioner in Chandipur, an imaginary town in West Bengal, fights against the town's corrupt officials to decontaminate the temple's holy water, spreading jaundice and other water-borne diseases. Enriching the oeuvre of Ray's filmic adaptations, *Ganashatru* is an adaptation of Henrik Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People* (1882). Since the source text is adapted from another culture, the paper identifies *Ganashatru* as a "transcultural adaptation," borrowing the term from Linda Hutcheon. A theoretical analysis of film authorship is presented in this paper. Ray's three critically important aspects of film authorship are explored next—his inclination to adapt classic texts, his casting of a familiar set of actors, and the establishing of his protagonist's resistance to corruption.

**KEYWORDS:** Satyajit Ray, Henrik Ibsen, *Ganashatru*, Transcultural Adaptation, Film Authorship, Resistance, Corruption.

DE IBSEN A RAY: ADAPTACIÓN TRANSCULTURAL Y AUTORÍA FÍLMICA  
EN *GANASHATRU* (*AN ENEMY OF THE PEOPLE* 1989)

## RESUMEN

La película *Ganashatru* (*Un enemigo del pueblo* 1989) de Satyajit Ray es la primera parte de la *trilogía final*, siendo las dos partes posteriores *Shakha Prashaka* (*Ramas del árbol* 1990) y *Agantuk* (*El desconocido* 1991). Los últimos tres filmes de Ray son destacables por su fuerte uso del lenguaje contra el estado prevalente de corrupción y decadencia en la sociedad. *Ganashatru* muestra cómo el Dr. Ashoke Gupta, un médico en Chandipur, una ciudad imaginaria en Bengala Occidental, lucha contra los corruptos funcionarios de la ciudad para descontaminar el agua sagrada del templo, que está propagando la ictericia y otras enfermedades transmitidas por el agua. Enriqueciendo el corpus de adaptaciones cinematográficas de Ray, *Ganashatru* es una adaptación de la obra de Henrik Ibsen, *Un enemigo del pueblo* (1882). Dado que el texto fuente es adaptado de otra cultura, el artículo identifica a *Ganashatru* como una «adaptación transcultural», tomando prestado el término de Linda Hutcheon. A continuación, se presenta un análisis teórico de su autoría fílmica, donde se exploran los tres aspectos más importantes de la autoría cinematográfica de Ray: su inclinación a adaptar textos clásicos, la selección de un conjunto familiar de actores y el establecimiento de la resistencia de su protagonista a la corrupción.

**PALABRAS CLAVE:** Satyajit Ray, Henrik Ibsen, *Ganashatru*, adaptación transcultural, autoría fílmica, resistencia, corrupción.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.recaesin.2024.89.10>

REVISTA CANARIA DE ESTUDIOS INGLESES, 89; octubre 2024, pp. 171-188; ISSN: e-2530-8335



## 1. INTRODUCTION

Following the release of *Ghare Baire* (*The Home and the World* 1984), Ray took a five-year-long gap from filmmaking, except for the short documentary on his father, *Sukumar Ray* (1987). He returned to filmmaking with *Ganashatru* (*An Enemy of the People* 1989), the first installment of *the final trilogy*, which was followed by *Shakha Prashaka* (*Branches of the Tree* 1990) and *Agantuk* (*The Stranger* 1991). These films constitute *the final trilogy*, as they are the last three films of an illustrious film career of one of the greatest filmmakers of India. However, the theme of the films ostensibly resonates with Ray's observations of the contemporary degraded state of society as he contemplates, "looking around me, I feel that the old values of personal integrity, loyalty, liberalism, rationalism, and fair play are all completely gone. People accept corruption as a way of life, as a method of getting along, as a necessary evil" (Robinson 2004, 340). In *Ganashatru*, a doctor fights against the corrupt authorities of a municipal town to decontaminate the temple's holy water. In *Shakha Prashaka*, an old, retired industrialist father is heartbroken learning about the corrupt and dishonest ways two of his sons adopt to make their fortune. In the final film, *Agantuk*, the protagonist, an anthropologist, renounces the humdrum of city life to explore the root of culture and civilization. As Andrew Robinson points out, Ray has thematized corruption in bureaucracies and politics as well as moral decay in his films on more than one occasion, as he did in his earlier films like *Pratidwandi* (*The Adversary* 1970), *Jana Aranya* (*The Middle Man* 1975), *Hirak Rajar Deshe* (*Kingdom of Diamonds* 1980), and *Ghare Baire* (*The Home and the World* 1984); but the final trilogy stands out for its 'defiant individualism,' 'sombreness of theme,' and 'directness of language' (2004, 339).

The diversity of themes that Ray explores in his filmic narratives owes much to the selection of their source texts. Therefore, adaptation proves to be an essential phenomenon in his filmmaking career. *Ganashatru*, the first film of *the final trilogy*, is also an adaptation of Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* (1882). Ray's adaptation of Ibsen's play is crucial, shedding light on various relevant aspects of Ray's filmmaking techniques. Firstly, it is an adaptation of a theatrical text, a novel experience for him. Secondly, and notably for the first time in his filmmaking journey, Ray extends his search for a source text amongst the Western classics. In this regard, it must be noted that Ray enjoyed enormous exposure to American and European literature and cinema even before his filmmaking career took off. Robinson writes, "Ibsen's play *An Enemy of the People*, written in 1882, had appealed to Ray ever since he read it. He was attracted to its central character, the idealistic Dr. Stockmann, that obstinate whistle-blower who destroys a comfortable life for the sake of a principle" (2004, 342).

This paper identifies Ray's adaptation of Ibsen's text as 'transcultural adaptation,' borrowing the theoretical term from Linda Hutcheon's book *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006). Referring to the adaptation theories of Hutcheon and Robert Stam, the article examines Ray's process of transculturation in transplanting Ibsen's 19<sup>th</sup>-century text in the 1980s social and cultural ambiance of West Bengal, India. The article further discusses the theoretical context of film authorship, referring to the



critical discourse of film authorship by John Caughie, David A. Gerstner, and Thomas Leitch. It is argued in this article that Ray effectively employs three significant features of his authorship to create the film *Ganashatru*, in which he adapts a classical text, casts a familiar cast, and establishes the protagonist's resistance to corruption. The essay further discusses Ray's authorship of adapting classical texts and working with a familiar set of actors, which begins right from the initial years of his filmmaking. However, the authorship of Ray's protagonists' resistance against corruption develops since his 1970s films, particularly with *the Calcutta trilogy*. Since the 1970s, Ray's films have started exposing the corrupt state of society in the modern city.

## 2. TRANSCULTURAL ADAPTATION AND *GANASHATRU*

Linda Hutcheon coins the term 'transcultural adaptation' in her landmark book on adaptation studies, *A Theory of Adaptation* (2006). To borrow her words, in such adaptations, "a change of language is involved; almost always, there is a change of place or time period" (Hutcheon 2013, 145). Simply put, transcultural adaptation occurs when a source text travels to a new culture at a different time. Hutcheon also notices diverse facets when transcultural adaptations take place, including –an accompanying shift in the political valence from the source text to adaptation, transculturation or adapter's effort to right resetting, or recontextualizing, and changes in racial and gender politics from the source text to adaptation (146-147). Robert Stam (2017) later recognizes such adaptation, which involves a journey from one culture to another, as 'cross-cultural dialogism.' Although the practice of adaptations using sources from other cultures has been a phenomenon for a long time, Hutcheon and Stam have successfully framed them in the lexicon of adaptation studies.

There has been a thriving tradition of transcultural film adaptations in Indian cinema over the years. Although the number of transcultural adaptations in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Indian cinema (Bollywood and other regional cinema) is less, with the onset of the 21<sup>st</sup>-century, Indian cinema has seen promising growth in transcultural adaptation. There is no doubt that William Shakespeare's plays attract the interest of Indian filmmakers most within the sphere of world literature. A simple explanation may be that his plays are universally appealing on a thematic level, but Mukherjee rightly suspects something more fundamental, "it is quite difficult to understand the reasons behind Indian film directors' fascination with the Bard of Avon's plays" (2023, 2). Much before their cinematic rendition in India, Shakespeare's works came to be known in India through their literary and performative re-creations. According to Suddhaseel Sen, the reception of Shakespeare's works at a global level (including non-Anglophone regions) can be said to have truly begun in the 19<sup>th</sup>-century... In the same period in colonial India, Shakespeare came to be translated, performed, and commented on regularly, especially in the two cosmopolitan centers of those times, Calcutta (now Kolkata) and Bombay (now Mumbai) (2021, 1). Furthermore, he contests the views of the postcolonial critics, who believe that the reception of Shakespeare was a part of the British civilizing mission or English language education (4). Instead, Sen states, local-language theatres provided the primary site



for cross-cultural exchanges since, in cities like Calcutta and Bombay, where the British cultural influence was most pronounced, theatrical managers were keen to adapt Shakespeare's plays, along with Hindu, Arabic, and Persian stories, for local audiences (4). Moreover, he also points out how the early literary reworkings of Shakespeare's works, like Bankim Chandra Chatterjee's essay "Sakuntala Miranda, ebong Desdemona" ("Sakuntala, Miranda, and Desdemona," 1875) and Ishwar Chandra Vidyasagar's *Bhrantivilas (Comedy of Errors)* (1869), along with anticolonial and anti-misogynist lines, were pioneering in their scope by global standards (8).

In India, the Hindi film industry, often synonymous with Bollywood, based in Mumbai, dominates Shakespeare adaptations over regional cinemas. According to Dionne and Kapadia, the term Bollywood is often used as shorthand to describe stylistic gestures—the mix of dance, music, and melodramatic romance plots—that characterize popular Hindi cinema" (2014, 9). Quoting Mira Reym Binford, they further elaborate on Bollywood film as having "a distinctive aesthetic of its own... Realism, in the sense of visual or psychological authenticity, has not been valued. The mandatory song-and-dance sequences, like operatic arias, tend to serve as both narrative and emotional points of culmination and punctuation. Baroque and sometimes highly dramatic camera movement is complemented by flamboyant use of color and sound effects and flashy editing... Sound and visuals of song-and-dance sequences are often edited in blithe defiance of conventional laws of space and time" (10-11). However, the term Bollywood could be "a problematic category as it does not do justice to the tradition of Indian theatrical representation and cinema that make up its global content as a film form," but like the term Hollywood, the word Bollywood has "a useful pliancy as it defines the globalization of Indian filmmaking and its political and aesthetic vibrancy" (8). According to Rachel Dwyer, "Hindi cinema has itself been transformed since 1991, particularly with the formation of what is now known as 'Bollywood,' the high-profile, globalized mainstream cinema that lies at the heart of the growing entertainment industry" (2014, 8). To mention a few Bollywoodization of Shakespeare's texts, one is intrigued to recall critically acclaimed and commercially successful Vishal Bhardwaj's Shakespearean trilogy—*Maqbool* (2003), an adaptation of *Macbeth*; *Omkaara* (2006), an adaptation of *Othello*; and *Haider* (2014), an adaptation of *Hamlet*. A play like *Romeo and Juliet*, because of its theme of romantic tragicomedy, which is best suited for Bollywood movies, has been adapted many times viz. Raj Kapoor's *Bobby* (1973), Mansoor Khan's *Qayamat Se Qayamat Tak* (1982), K Balachander's *Ek Dujhe Ke Liye* (1981), Habib Faisal's *Ishaqzaade* (2012), Sanjay Leela Bhansali's *Goliyon Ki Raasleela Ram-Leela* (2013), and Manish Tiwari's *Issaq*, (2013). Debu Sen's *Do Dooni Chaar* (1968) and Gulzar's *Angoor* (1982) are inspired by *The Comedy of Errors*. Apart from them, other Hindi film directors like Sharat Katariya's *10ml Love* (2012), an adaptation of *The Midsummer Night's Dream*, and Bornila Chatterjee's *The Hungry* (2017), an adaptation of *Titus Andronicus* proliferate the number.

Apart from Bollywood, regional cinema in India demonstrates the enduring influence of Shakespeare. The Bengali cinema archives a significant number of Shakespearean rebirths among the regional cinemas. Based primarily on the eastern Indian state of West Bengal, Bengali cinema mainly caters to Bengali-speaking viewers



in that linguistic territory. Besides Bollywood, Bengali cinema, since its inception, according to Sharmistha Gooptu, has followed to establish a distinctive Bengaliness or Bengali culture which was driven by a certain kind of self-assertion and identity formation of the *bhadralok*<sup>1</sup> (educated Bengali gentlemen), who formed the main section of the moviegoers till 1960s and '70s (2018, 18). It was not until the 1980s that Bengali cinema began imbibing the influence of Bollywood 'masala' movies and created a new configuration of *another order of Bengaliness* (Gooptu 2018, 19; italics in the original). This transformation determined the contemporary character of Bengali cinema as since the '80s, it gradually transcended the circle of the *bhadralok* movie audience (19). However, Bengali cinema, too, significantly adds to the list of Shakespeare adaptations. Ajay Kar's *Saptapadi* (1961), based on *Othello*; Manu Sen's *Bhranti Bilas* (1963), an adaptation of *The Comedy of Errors*; Ranjan Ghosh's *Hrid Majharey* (2014), inspired by *Macbeth and Othello*; Aparna Sen's *Arshinagar* (2015), an adaptation of *Romeo and Juliet*; Anjan Dutt's *Hemanta* (2016), an adaptation of *Hamlet* are among a few. Rosa Maria García-Periago's (2021a and 2021b) studies have critically brought into notice Shakespeare's adaptation in other regional cinema – M Natesa's Tamil language film *Anbu* (1953), an adaptation of *Othello*; another Tamil language recreation of Shakespeare's tragedy is Dada Mirasi's *Ratha Thilagam* (1963); and Jayaraj's Malayalam language film *Veeram* (2017), an adaptation of *Macbeth*.

However, if Shakespearean adaptations are easy to locate, one must search patiently to find non-Shakespearean adaptations. The last century experienced transcultural adaptation of *The Thousand and One Nights* (Arabian Nights) stories in Bengali cinema (Mukherjee 2023), and, in Bollywood, novels of Thomas Hardy were adapted in films like *Dulhaan Ek Raat Ki* (1967), based on the novel *Tess of the d'Urbervilles* (1891), and *Daag* (1973), an adaptation of *The Mayor of Casterbridge* (1886). The number increased at the turn of the century as one finds Bollywoodization of non-Shakespearean texts, most notably, Rituporno Ghosh's *Raincoat* (2004), an adaptation of O' Henry's *The Gift of the Magi*; Vikramaditya Motwane's *Lootera* (2013), an adaptation of O' Henry's *The Last Leaf*; and Abhishek Kapoor's *Fitoor* (2016), based on Charles Dickens's *Great Expectations*. A perennial problem, however, with transcultural adaptation is that they are primarily unacknowledged and identifying them seems like an impossible puzzle (Mukherjee 2023, 2). In this context, it is crucial to critically analyze Robinson's comment on Ray's adaptation *Ganashatru*: "Had the film been given a different name ('Public Enemy' was considered at one point), and had Ray not credited it as an adaptation of Ibsen's play, I wonder whether most audiences would have been aware of any connection" (2004, 342). While Robinson's comment augments Ray's creative genius, it also poses a potential threat to discredit Ibsen's source text, which stimulates Ray's creativity. Therefore, unacknowledged

---

<sup>1</sup> The *bhadralok* are the social classes among the Bengali who, since the 19<sup>th</sup> century, had received some kind of English/western education. They were the chief connoisseur of Bengal's cultural art and literary practices in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century.



transcultural adaptation not only deprives the source text of its due credit but also disrupts the cross-cultural transmission of the arts.

The significance of Ray's *Ganashatru* is that it is one of the very few (non-Shakespearean) transcultural adaptations in 20<sup>th</sup>-century Bengali cinema. Before moving into Ray's mastery in the process of transculturation, we shall have a synoptic view of Ibsen's *An Enemy of the People* (1882). The plot is contextualized in a small coastal town in southern Norway called Bath. The town's main attraction is the Baths spa, which attracts thousands of visitors, becoming the town's significant source of income. Dr. Thomas Stockmann is the chief medical officer in the Bath. He suddenly discovers that the water of the Bath spa is polluted with industrial garbage. Peter Stockmann, the elder brother of Dr. Stockmann and the town's mayor, strongly opposes his brother's appeal to decontaminate water on the excuse of its reconstruction cost. No matter how hard Dr. Stockmann tries, the majority labels him an enemy of the people. Dr. Stockmann resolutely adheres to truth and principle when the majority corners him.

The process of transculturation that Ray communicates in his adaptation shows a Bengali recreation of the text in the celluloid. Robinson recalls how Ibsen's text was reproduced in "Bengal's theatre, especially by *Bobhurupee*, a well-known theatre group, a few times during the 1950s-1970s. But apart from translating it into Bengali, the group keeps the text largely unchanged. Ray, by contrast, transplants the play from Norway in the 1880s to West Bengal in 1989" (2004, 342). Ray's process of indigenization or transculturation begins by relocating the story to an imaginary flourishing town called Chandipur in West Bengal. The contaminated water in the Bath spa has been culturally transformed into a Hindu temple's *charanamrita* or holy water. The idea of the temple is 'Ray's masterstroke' because it brings a political-religious context and makes Ray's film truly 'Bengali in ethos and highly topical throughout India' (Robinson 2004, 342). About the origin of the idea of the temple, Robinson writes Ray was unable to recall, though he did admit to being intrigued by the long-running construction saga of a grandiose Orissan-style temple located not very far from his flat in Bishop Lefroy Road, funded by the Birla family (who are Marwaris) (343). In addition, Robinson cites the contemporary cases of polluted water supply in India, including a serious case in the famous south Indian temple of Tirupati in 1988 (343-344).

Accordingly, the film's central character becomes Dr. Ashoke K. Gupta from Ibsen's Dr. Stockmann, and Nisith Gupta, the mayor and the younger brother, is a recreation of Peter Stockmann. The surname Gupta is common in West Bengal and other eastern parts of the country; the word 'Gupta' originates from the Sanskrit word *goptr*, which means 'protector' or 'governor'. It is imaginative on Ray's part how the surname metaphorically enlightens different aspects of the two brothers. While Dr. Ashoke Gupta, by his profession, has the potential to be the protector, Nisith is literally the governor or mayor of Chandipur. Ray retained the name of *The People's Courier* with its nearest Bengali equivalent, *Janabarta*. The officials at *Janabarta* have taken their typical Bengali names with alliterative resemblances to Ibsen's characters. Thus, Mr. Hovstad, the editor of *The People's Courier*, becomes Haridas at *Janabarta*; Aslaksen, the printer and publisher, becomes Adhir Choudhuri; and Mr. Billing,



the sub-editor, is Bireswar at *Janabarta*. Like most of his adaptations, Ray does not crowd his plot with additional characters other than those in the source text, but he drops the characters and events that he feels are irrelevant in his narrative. Mr. Stockmann's two sons, Ejlif and Morten, are absent in Ray's adaptation. Thus, the character of Morten Kiil, a tanner and Mrs. Stockmann's adoptive father, whose fortune Stockmann's two sons will inherit, has also been dropped.

### 3. RAY'S AUTHORSHIP IN *GANASHATRU*

The term *auteur* has its origin in French film criticism, which referred to either “the author who wrote the script, or, in the more general sense of the term, the artist who created the film; gradually, the latter sense came to replace the former, and the *auteur* was the artist whose personality was ‘written’ in the film” (Caughie 1981, 9). John Caughie, in his book *Theories of Authorship: A Reader* (1981), identifies the significant traits of *auteurism*: “a film, though produced collectively, is most likely to be valuable when it is essentially the product of its director; that in the presence of a director who is genuinely an artist (an *auteur*) a film is more than likely to be the expression of his individual personality; and that this personality can be traced in a thematic and/or stylistic consistency over all (or almost all) the director's films” (9). However, in the history of film criticism, several theorists have questioned the relevance of studying film authorship on many occasions. David Gerstner favored the critical discussion of film authorship, pointing out that “authorship is always a way of looking at films, and obviously other ways exist as do other questions” (2003, 28).

According to adaptation scholar Thomas Leitch, “many directors whose films are based almost entirely on literary adaptations have nonetheless established a reputation as *auteurs*” (2007, 236). Leitch possibly points out that a filmmaker's repeated attempt to use literary sources contributes to the consistency of his filmmaking style and, thereby, establishes an aspect of authorship. In his entire film oeuvre, Satyajit Ray adapted twenty-six times from literary sources among his twenty-nine feature films. Not only literary sources, but Ray's inclination to literary source text could also be more specifically identified as classical works of the canonical writers, primarily from Bengali literature. From the very first film, *Pather Panchali* (1955), which is an adaptation of Bibhutibhusan Bandyopadhyay's classic Bengali novel *Pather Panchali* (1929), Ray successfully established his *auteurism* in selecting canonical writers and their classical texts for adapting them into film. Along with *Pather Panchali*, Ray adapted three more films from the Bengali literary classics of Bibhutibhusan Bandyopadhyay. Alongside Bandyopadhyay, Ray selected the canonical texts of stalwart Bengali literary masters like Rabindranath Tagore, Tarashankar Bandopadhyay, Narendranath Mitra, Sunil Gangopadhyay, et al. Ray adapted three short stories of Tagore into an anthological feature film *Teen Kanya* (*Three Daughters*) (1961), and further made two more Tagore adaptations, namely *Charulata* (*The Lonely Wife* 1964) and *Ghare Baire* (*The Home and the World* 1984). However, Ray sometimes received criticism, particularly following the release of



*Charulata*, for using cinematic liberty and breaking the fidelity in translating the canonical text onto the screen (Ray 2005, 142-143). Nevertheless, he has defended his artistic choices, delineating the differences in medium specificity between literature and cinema (143-175). Most importantly, his commercial and critical success in adapting the canonical texts into films cemented this prospect of authorship as a forte of Ray's filmmaking.

In art and literature, it is always a matter of great contention as to what contributes to the definition of a classic. In his seminal essay, "Why Read the Classics?" Italo Calvino interprets classics as texts that invoke rereading, not reading, because a classic text "has never finished saying what it has to say." (1986). To a generation of contemporary readers, the classics travel "bearing the traces of readings previous to ours and bringing in their wake the traces they themselves have left on the culture or cultures they have passed through" (Calvino 1986). Therefore, the classics champion the burden of time and the diversity of cultural forms by offering relevant meanings to their receivers. It also holds true that the classics account for the most number of adaptations across different ages and cultures. It is also observed that even a single classic text is retold multiple times in different medial forms. Therefore, in the scholarship of adaptation studies, "there is a special value in looking at adaptations of texts that have often, even continuously, been adapted... to consider how the story is changing and what this reveals about the society that made it" (Sullivan 2023, 110-111).

Towards the swansong period of filmmaking, the authorship of selecting the canonical text of classical writers led Ray to turn to the Western classical text *An Enemy of the People* (1882) by Ibsen. The classic status of Ibsen's play stems from the fact that it is still reread across different cultures and retold in different medial forms. Outside the Bengali literary corpus, Ray only considered the classical Indian Hindi writer Premchand's Hindi literary texts for two of his adaptations – *Shatranj Ke Khiladi* (*The Chess Player* 1977) and *Sadgati* (*Deliverance* 1981). Ibsen's play is Ray's only adaptation of non-Indian classical text. Although he adapted Ibsen's text in the late 1980s, according to Surabhi Banerjee, Ray's acquaintance with Ibsen's *An Enemy* took place many years earlier, around 1946 or 1947, and he considered a cinematic adaptation some ten or fifteen years later, which eventually didn't become possible (1996, 115). However, Ray's disenchantment with the quality of Bengali literature during the 1980s forced him to return to Ibsen's classic text for adaptation (Robinson 2004, 348). Ibsen's text also allowed Ray to explore the deterioration of social life and moral values in 1980s Bengal. Above all these concerns, it must be noted that Ray didn't compromise with the source text selection and chose a classical text, which has been an inherent feature of his auteurism.

Ray's preference towards classical texts may result from his growing up in a family of rich literary traditions and cultural practices. Satyajit Ray's grandfather, Upendrakishore Ray Chawdhury (1863-1915), was an eminent Bengali children's literature writer. He was also the founder of the famous Bengali Children's magazine *Sandesh* in 1913, and Satyajit also served as an editor of this prestigious journal. Satyajit Ray's father, Sukumar Ray (1887-1923), was an innovative Bengali poet who pioneered nonsense literature in Bengali, marked by his classic creations like





*HaJaBaRaLa* (*Mumbo-Jumbo*, 1921) and *Abol Tabol* (*The Weird and the Absurd*, 1923). Sukumar's own sisters, Shukhalata Rao (1886-1969), a writer and an artist, and Punyalata Chakrabarty (1890-1974), contributed to Bengali children's literature. The Ray family also shared a close bond with the Tagore family, whose contribution to Bengali art, culture, and literature was immensely enriching. Upon Rabindranath Tagore's recommendation, Satyajit Ray spent two years and pursued art education in Kala Bhavana (Institute of Fine Arts) at Tagore's university, Visva Bharati. This proximity and tutelage under great literary and artistic luminaries might have significantly contributed to Ray's enhanced intellectual comprehension of the literary classics.

Ray's first job at D.J. Keymar's Advertising Agency as an illustrator and cover designer of the books also familiarized him with many classical books—poetry anthologies by post-Tagore poets like Bisnu Dey and Jibanananda Das, Jim Corbett's adventure classic *Man-Eaters of Kumaon*, Jawaharlal Nehru's *Discovery of India*, to name a few (Robinson 2004, 58). It is surprisingly true that Ray first came across Bibhutibhusan Bandyopadhyay's book *Pather Panchali* at the Keymar's, which resulted in his adaptation of the landmark debut film *Pather Panchali* (*Song of the Little Road* 1955). In his recent visits to Ray's library, Barun Chanda enlightens how the bookshelves of the library accommodate separate sections of books on literary classics and different aspects of filmmaking—films and filming, scripts, plays, poetry, fiction, science fiction, and crime thrillers (2022, 293). He provides an exhausting list of books from each category, like John Gassner and Dudley Nichols's *20 Best Film Plays*, books by Arthur C. Clarke, autobiographies of Luis Bunuel and Akira Kurosawa, Woody Allen's screenplays, the screenplay of *Tom Jones* by John Osborne, Rob Roy by Walter Scott, *The Three Musketeers* by Alexander Dumas, *Great Expectations* by Charles Dickens (293-297). Although Ray's films are based on Bengali classics, Chanda's list, quite surprisingly, barely accounts for a Bengali book, given the reason that "right from his boyhood days Ray was more comfortable reading English, rather than Bengali" (302).

One consistent hallmark of Ray's cinematic authorship lies in his deliberate choice to collaborate with a recurring group of actors across a significant portion of his filmography. Regarding working with actors repeatedly in his films, Ray expressed that he "builds up a relationship that makes it easier to do another film. It becomes a quicker and easier process (Cardullo 2007, 109). In *Ganashatru*, the principal male and female characters feature from Ray's most familiar set of actors. Soumitra Chatterjee, the male lead who plays Dr. Ashoke Gupta, appears in as many as fourteen of Ray's films. Another male lead, Dritiman Chatterjee, a versatile actor from Bengal playing the crucial role of Nisith Gupta in *Ganasharu*, features as one of the central characters in three of Ray's films since *Pratidwandi* (*The Adversary* 1970). Ruma Guha Thakurta, who plays the female lead, Maya, has also previously been a part of Ray's filmmaking world. Dipankar Dey, portraying Haridas in Ray's adaptation, features in a total of five films since his appearance in Ray's film in *Seemabaddhha* (*Company Limited* 1971). Two other actors, Mamata Shankar and Bhisma Guhathakurta, who play the significant roles of Indrani and Ronen in the film, are cast in more than one film in Ray's *final trilogy*. Therefore, in *Ganashatru*, Ray consciously opts for the



familiar set of actors to get the intended result that the portrayal of the characters demands in the film.

Ray adeptly utilized these actors to embody diverse characters as per his films' requirements; concurrently, it holds true that the actors demonstrate mastery in portraying an array of characters effectively on screen. Consequently, they all continue to have long-standing careers in the realm of acting, particularly in Bengali cinema. In the case of Soumitra Chatterjee, he established himself as a versatile and feted actor in Bengali cinema, continuing to work until his demise in 2020. In the recent recoveries of Mr. Chatterjee's diaries, carried out by Amit Ranjan Biswas, the actor unravels the mystery of his profound acting skills by claiming, "I am a blotting paper. I absorbed life in it, which I successfully pour into my acting" (2023, 22).<sup>2</sup> Dhritiman Chatterjee has significantly contributed to Bengali cinema, along with his screen presence in Hindi cinema and different regional cinemas in India. Satyajit Ray once highly praised Dhritiman's screen presence by claiming that "a star is a person on the screen who continues to be expressive and interesting even after he or she has stopped doing anything. This definition does not exclude the rare and lucky breed that gets five or ten lakhs of rupees per film; and it includes anyone who keeps his calm before the camera, projects a personality and evokes empathy. This is a rare breed too, but one has met it in our films. Dhritiman Chatterjee of *Pratidwandi* is such a star" (1994, 98). Besides them, Ray's choice of actors like Dipankar Dey and Mamata Shankar plays a crucial role in Bengali cinema nowadays.

However, the most crucial aspect of Ray's authorship, which develops since his 1970s films, specifically with the first installment of *the Calcutta trilogy*, *Pratidwandi*, is the protagonist's refusal to succumb to bureaucratic as well as corporate corruption in Calcutta as a means to secure employment. While the filmmaker exposes how corruption creeps into all aspects of daily life, his protagonists tend to stay away from such vile means of life. In *Pratidwandi*, the protagonist Siddhartha turns down all the dishonest ways of life to fight against unemployment in 1970s Calcutta and ends up getting a job far away from the city. In the last part of the trilogy, *Jana Aranya* (*The Middle Man* 1975), the male lead, Somnath, an unemployed young man, decides to start his own business as a salesman and is caught up in the turmoil between choosing the moral or immoral way of life to prosper in the business. Finally, he surrenders to the dishonest practice in his job, where only grief and remorse constitute his means of resistance.

Nevertheless, in *the final trilogy*, the denial of corruption culminates in strong resistance from the protagonists, for which Robinson thinks Ray employs "sombreness of theme and a directness of language" against any form of corruption in social life (2004, 339). In *Shakha Proshakha*, the second installment of *the final trilogy*, the

---

<sup>2</sup> The recent retrieval of Mr. Soumitra Chatterjee's diaries, under the title "Chittir Mittir: Portrait of a Friend" ("Soumitra Chatterjee-Reflections from His Diary"), has been undergoing bimonthly publication in the *Robbar* (Sunday) pages of *Sanbad Pratidin* Bengali newspaper. This endeavor has been spearheaded by Amit Ranjan Biswas.



protagonist, Anandamohan Mojumder, a seventy-year-old industrialist, leads a corruption-free life. He garners honor and recognition for fostering humanitarian causes for society, and his greatness is celebrated by naming the township in his name. However, the film gradually reveals that all Anandamohan Majumder's sons, except Proshanto, adopted corrupt means in their professional lives to achieve success. The knowledge of his sons' dishonest way of life disheartens the father, who has already suffered a heart attack and lives under intense medical care.

Dr. Gupta in *Ganashatru* emerges as arguably the most resilient of Ray's protagonists. He displays steadfast resistance against the political and religious corruption prevalent in Chandipur. Dr. Gupta's opposition to corruption stems from his inherent qualities like—a deep-rooted commitment to his town, profound responsibility towards his medical profession, modernist rationality, and empathetic humanism. All these qualities of Dr. Gupta strengthen and motivate him at different stages of his persistent battle against the administrative corruption of the town in handling the health crisis.

Dr. Ashoke K Gupta serves as a medical practitioner in the municipal hospital in Chandipur. He has been practicing medical activities in Chandipur for over twenty-six years. Besides, in the film's opening, one learns from Maya, Dr. Gupta's wife, that Dr. Gupta was born in Chandipur. He moves to Calcutta to pursue a medical degree from Calcutta University. He gets married and practices there as a doctor. His attachment to his birthplace soon brings him back to Chandipur from Calcutta. Maya also informs us that they prefer small towns like Chandipur over Calcutta. In response to Nisith's question, whether Dr. Gupta prays for the well-being of Chandipur, the latter vociferously claims, "I care for the town a hundred times better than anybody else, and there is no competitor for me in this regard, not even you (Nisith)" (00:11:22). These initial revelations in the film about Dr. Gupta's love and attachment to his native place, Chandipur, serve as strategic means to ascertain Dr. Gupta's deep rootedness to Chandipur.

As an imaginary town, Chandipur is situated outside the metropolis of Calcutta in West Bengal. As a rapidly growing town that provides its people with basic amenities like hospitals, schools, banks, and printing houses, in addition to avenues of cultural practices like theatre in 1980s West Bengal, Chandipur has the status of a municipality town. The town is home to a large population, and a place like Bhubanpally, where the Tripureswar temple is located, is one of the densely populated parts of Chandipur. Because of all these facilities, Dr. Gupta is tempted to eulogize, "Chandipur has no shortcomings anymore. I believe our town ranks as incomparable amongst the smaller towns around" (00:09:05). The municipal status of Chandipur also indicates the economic rise of the town, a major portion of which comes from tourism generated by the temple. However, it is noteworthy that the corrupted state of affairs in 1970s Calcutta, as depicted in *The Calcutta trilogy*, also afflicts the lives of residents in a small town like Chandipur.

It is due to the urge to serve his people with a firm commitment that Dr. Gupta discovers the contaminated water of the Tripureswar temple, which has been rapidly spreading jaundice (Infective Hepatitis) among his patients and other visitors in Chandipur. He secretly sends the water of the suspected area for a lab



test in Calcutta and confirms the contamination of water only when he receives the test report from Calcutta. However, his efforts to decontaminate the water face challenges from the concerned authorities of the town. Nisith, Dr. Gupta's younger brother and the town's mayor, significantly thwarts Dr. Gupta's endeavors. Nisith is a three-time elected chairman of the Chandipur municipality. He is also the president of the Bharghav Trust, which is responsible for establishing the town's hospital and temple. Besides, he is a business partner of Mr. Bharghav, the rich and influential businessman in the town who also owns the Bharghav Trust. Moreover, Nisith is ambitious about the rapid growth of Chandipur and dreams of making the place one of the top tourist attractions in West Bengal.

When Dr. Gupta solicits Nisith's assistance in decontaminating the temple's holy water, Nisith disapproves of the former's appeal. Nisith confronts his elder brother to ask if the latter has any idea about "how long it may take to identify and repair the leakage of the underground pipe where the dirty water of the gutter pollutes the drinking water. The temple should be kept closed during the reconstruction period. Thousands of visitors will know the reason behind the sudden closure of the temple" (00:32:20). Inevitably, he is worried that the shutting of the temple might potentially induce panic among the visitors, thereby discouraging their uninterrupted visit. The event can shatter Nisith's dream of turning Chandipur into one of the top tourist attractions of West Bengal. Therefore, Nisith seems to take special care to stop spreading any sort of defamation about the town.

Nisith consistently exhibits cunning and opportunistic behavior. Maya shares the family's past and how Nisith overlooked the old debts and forced Dr. Gupta to repay them single-handedly. Haridas, the editor of *Janabarta*, smells foul play among the temple authorities in claiming the revenue shares. One suspects that Haridas takes a jibe at Nisith, who is also the temple committee chairman. Even as a town's mayor, Nisith, entitled to care for Chandipur, is only bothered about monetary loss due to the sudden closing of the temple above the colossal health crisis. An unhindered prosperity of Chandipur should secure Nisith's subsequent turn as the town's mayor. Likewise, all of Nisith's endeavors toward the upliftment of the town are hidden behind some personal gains. Unlike Dr. Gupta, Nisith could go to any extent not to invite any harm to his personal interests concerning Chandipur. Eventually, he threatens Dr. Gupta about potentially losing his job in the hospital upon further involvement in water decontamination.

Apart from the economic concern, Nisith's disagreement with his brother stems from an ideological hiatus. Regarding the treatment for his digestion problem, Nisith informs Maya, "since my brother's medicine doesn't work for me, I take recourse to *kobiraji*" (ayurvedic medicine) (00:06:20). Undoubtedly, building a temple in Chandipur was Nisith's brainchild. He believes that his disease of spondylosis is magically cured because of his continued one-week visit to the temple. Therefore, Nisith and his wife are regular visitors to the temple. Along with this personal belief and attachment to the temple, Nisith agrees with Mr. Bharghav that the temple's holy water can never be contaminated because of its properties, like holy basil, *bael* leaves, and the Ganges water. Thus, Maya shares with her husband that "his brother may dress attire like a sahib, but he maintains religious rituals and pujas piously" (00:38:25).



Unlike Nisith, Dr. Gupta's cultural and religious beliefs must pass through scientific scrutiny. Furthermore, he certainly disapproves of Nisith's belief as the latter believes "holy basil can remove all the impurities of the water" (00:32:35).

Disillusioned by his brother's perplexing decisions, Dr. Gupta seeks support from the only newspaper of Chandipur *Janabarta* to publish his article to spread awareness among the townspeople. It turns out that Haridas, the editor of *Janabarta*, proves to be a hypocrite. From the film's beginning, one observes that he maintains a cordial relationship with Dr. Gupta, frequently visiting his house. And so does Adhir Choudhury, the printer and publisher of *Janabarta*. Their 'progressive daily' turns their back on Dr. Gupta when he needs them to publish his article. Instead, they are easily manipulated by Nisith that Dr. Gupta's urge to decontaminate the temple's holy water is an attack on the temple and religious beliefs. Consequently, Haridas and Adhir believe that publishing such an article might spoil the reputation of their newspaper.

Dejected by the responsible authorities' denial to publish his article, Dr. Gupta decides to hold a public meeting to read his essay and make people aware of the impending danger. A shrewd intervention of Nisith, Haridas, and Adhir in the event is meant to mislead the majority against Dr. Gupta. They successfully interrupt Dr. Gupta from reading his article before the people. Instead, Nisith plots an opportunity to prove Dr. Gupta is anti-religious and agitate the mob against him. Nisith coerces Dr. Gupta to confess before the crowd that he has not visited the temple even once in the last ten years. Forcibly, Nisith proves Dr. Gupta does not believe in any temple rituals, hence attacking the temple's holy water.

Despite the public meeting's majoritarian verdict that Dr. Gupta is an 'enemy of the people,' the meeting presents Dr. Gupta as 'mild-mannered, even-tempered, and a specialist of his profession' (Robinson 2004, 343), who is starkly different from Ibsen's Dr. Stockman. Indeed, Dr. Gupta proves to be a rational person, and his rationality develops from his nurturing of the scientific truths. Dr. Gupta prioritizes what science teaches him over religious sentiments. Therefore, he differentiates between scientific truths and religious dogmatism. At the same time, he explains that the purifying of contaminated water is not entirely a religious discussion. He upholds his rational approach and appeals to the townspeople to pay heed to him 'about the scientific ideas of hygiene' (343). He promises that his efforts will rescue Chandipur from the prevailing danger and restore its glorious old days. Dr. Gupta retorts to Nisith's questions, "Are you a Hindu?" (01:19: 40) Dr. Gupta confirms that "there should not be any doubt that I am a Hindu" (01:20: 00). One may agree with Dr. Gupta's statement, given that he chooses to hold the meeting in the Nat Mandir, a religious place, as one sees the idol of Goddess Durga at the back of the stage where Dr. Gupta addresses the audience. Dr. Gupta may have preferred some other place than Nat Mandir if he is anti-religious. He even reaffirms, "I respect others' religious sentiments and cannot think of attacking their religious beliefs even in my dream" (01:20:42). Though, he confesses his reservations against some of the dogmatic religious practices.

Nevertheless, it appears that Dr. Gupta's rationalistic principles cannot convince the majority. In fact, Ray believes that 'there is a grain of truth in Dr.



Stockmann's statement' that "it's the fools who form the overwhelming majority" (Robinson 2004, 342). The film draws particular attention to the conversation of a bunch of people coming to attend Dr. Gupta's public meeting. Before Dr. Gupta begins, as those people exchange words among themselves, it is noticeable that a few of them attend the public lecture without having any idea of what Dr. Gupta will address in the meeting. One person confesses, "I only followed the audience and entered it" (01:08:08). The other person reveals, "I do not miss public meetings. But do not ask me about the topic" (01:08:10). Their ignorance can hardly be justified as the wall posters have already informed that Dr. Gupta will discuss the 'Health Crisis of Chandipur on 5<sup>th</sup> January 1989 at Nat Mandir' (01:07:40). Their ignorance and lack of judgment have been the focus of Ray's mise-en-scene. One may argue that this kind of majority can be an easy victim of manipulation, as exemplified by Nitish's actions in the meeting to drive them against Dr. Gupta.

Notwithstanding the constant setback from Nisith and the majority, Dr. Gupta receives persistent support from 'a beleaguered minority' (Robinson 2004, 343). The minority comprises Maya, his wife, and Indrani, his daughter. Unlike Catherine in Ibsen's text, Maya always stands with her husband through thin and thick. Maya, who is proud of her 'science-educated husband,' confesses that she no longer differentiates between her husband's and her desires when Dr. Gupta enquires if she ever feels like visiting the temple. Indrani, Dr. Gupta's only daughter and a schoolteacher by profession, is her father's biggest supporter. She, too, advocates a very scientific and rational approach in her professional and personal life. She complains about the education system and regrets the content she must teach her students. Above all, she turns down Haridas's proposal of translating an English story into Bengali for *Janabarta* because she does not believe in what the story offers on supernatural power and its control on earth. She highly appreciates her father when Dr. Gupta writes the essay for public awareness and encourages her father to publish the same.

Dr. Gupta's other persistent supporter is Ranen Halder, a part of the 'beleaguered minority,' an extended family member, betrothed to Indrani. He has established a theatre group along with the other educated young people of Chandipur. This group also runs a quarterly journal called *Mashal* (A Torch). As the name signifies, the journal looks forward to enlightening the readers from the darkness of ignorance. He encourages Dr. Gupta with all his efforts. When Dr. Gupta fails to book a hall for the public meeting in the town, Ranen helps him avail the Nat Mandir, where Ranen and his group perform theatre, to hold the meeting. In order to avoid any unnecessary interruption in Gupta's meeting, Ranen assures his team to take control of the situation, although Nisith outpowers them on that occasion.

Ranen's real engagement initiates after Dr. Gupta is labeled 'the enemy of the people.' When the mob attacks Dr. Gupta's house, and he loses his job in the hospital, Ranen informs Dr. Gupta that his theatre group and the educated youth of Chandipur stand in full support of Dr. Gupta. Ranen ascertains that his group will print Dr. Gupta's essay as a pamphlet and circulate it among the masses. They are determined to campaign for Dr. Gupta until the authority agrees to decontaminate the temple water. To their utmost astonishment, Maya and Dr. Gupta listen to the



chanting, “Long live Dr. Ashoke Gupta” (01:33:25) as it echoes on the streets of Chandipur and close to Dr. Gupta’s house.

In spite of the majority’s opposition to Dr. Gupta, his avowed ‘empathetic humanism’ never dies (Mukhopadhyay 2017, 39). Dr. Gupta empathizes with the majority, which forces him to leave Chandipur once he is labeled ‘an enemy of the people.’ In his conversation with Maya, Dr. Gupta regrets the situation of the town and the decision of the majority: “Should I leave? What about the contaminated water, then? What about my patients? Should I forsake Chandipur in these difficult days? Do they never understand what mistake they are committing?” (01:24:20). At this critical juncture, along with the support of ‘the beleaguered minority,’ Dr. Gupta’s empathetic humanism drives him to work for the majority again. Dr. Gupta keeps faith in humanism and solidarity and proudly proclaims, “I may be an enemy of the people, but I have many friends. I am not alone” (01:34:00).

In addition to his rational thinking about scientific truth, Dr. Gupta also embraces humanism. In this context, it is crucial to remember what Mukhopadhyay has to offer about Satyajit Ray being both a rationalist and a humanist – “as a rationalist, he has to defend reason at all costs. But he is also a humanist, and this humanism has a broader scope than his rationalism. It needs to be underlined that Ray’s humanism is not grounded in a mere celebration of human reason; rather, he foregrounds an empathetic humanism, a humanism centered on universal love for humanism, even when those human beings are innocently irrational” (2017, 39). It goes without saying that Dr. Gupta, too, shares Ray’s humanism as Ray identifies himself with Dr. Gupta, claiming that “the doctor in *Ganashatru*, that’s me, and what that doctor believes- that’s what I believe in” (Cardullo 2007, 210). Dr. Gupta shares Ray’s ideals of fighting against evil forces in society and advocating humanism as a crucial way of life. It is both Dr. Gupta’s dynamic fighting spirit and his humanism that prepare him to battle the odds of society.

#### 4. CONCLUSION

Film critic and writer Chidananda Dasgupta observes, “the simplistic weakness of *Ganashatru* is so obvious and so plentiful that it is difficult to admit into the body of his oeuvre” (2001, 134). Another film critic and writer, Bhaskar Chattopadhyay, writes, “there is a common belief among film enthusiasts, particularly among those who have watched Satyajit Ray’s films quite keenly, that *Ganashatru* is, by far, his worst film... The film suffers from some extremely poor technical treatment, a few things need to be said about some of the other criticisms against it” (2021, 169). Thus, critics and scholars often see *Ganashatru* as one of Ray’s lesser-accomplished works and tend to compare the merit of this film with his earlier films. This paper denies any rigid definition of a film’s merit. It conveys that our focus on the technical rigor of art might cause us to overlook several other aspects that may merit our attention. It is also sometimes overlooked that *Ganashatru* achieved a remarkable feat of transcultural adaptation. Ray’s recreation of Ibsen’s text, which was almost a century old when Ray adapted it, and its apt contextualization are undoubtedly



successful feats of a genius filmmaker. That is why one is tempted to agree with Robinson that ‘Ray has transformed Ibsen into Ray’ in *Ganashatru* (2004, 343).

*Ganashatru* proves to be one of Ray’s finest films, where he achieves the signature aspects of his film authorship. Ray’s filmmaking was hindered until *Ganashatru* by a severe illness following the completion of *Ghare Baire* (*The Home and the World* 1984). Even at the time of shooting for *Ganashatru*, Ray was surrounded by nurses and doctors with an intensive care unit in an ambulance standing by at the door (Dasgupta 2001, 133). In such a challenging situation, Ray expressed that he had been under doctors’ orders not to work outside the studio; still, he was allowed to work because “getting behind the camera exhilarated him and made him feel much better than did his medicines” (133). Therefore, due to this unusual circumstance of filmmaking, Ray relied more on expressing his authorship to make a successful film. Moreover, the critical discussion in this current paper demonstrates that Ray effectively employs three aspects of his authorship –choosing to adapt a classical text, casting the familiar set of actors, and establishing his protagonist’s resistance to corruption. A combination of these elements not only establishes *Ganashatru* as one of Ray’s greatest creations, but also convinces scholars to acknowledge the film as a masterpiece of the director’s career.





## WORKS CITED

- BANERJEE, Surabhi. 1996. *Satyajit Ray: Beyond the Frame*. New Delhi: Allied Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
- BISWAS, Amit R. 2023. "Chittir Mittir: Portrait of a Friend" ("Soumitra Chatterjee—Reflections from His Diary"). *Sanbad Pratidin* (Robbar, 15<sup>th</sup> January), 18-22. Kolkata. <https://www.facebook.com/amitranjanbiswas/posts/>.
- CARDULLO, Bert (ed). 2007. *Satyajit Ray Interviews*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi.
- CALVINO, Italo. 1986. "Why Read the Classics?" Translated by Patrick Creagh *The New York Review of Books* 33/15. Why Read the Classics? | Italo Calvino | The New York Review of Books (nybooks.com).
- CAUGHIE, John. 1981. "Introduction." *Theories of Authorship: A Reader*. London: Routledge.
- CHATTOPADHYAY, Bhaskar. 2021. *The Cinema of Satyajit Ray*. Chennai: Westland Publications Private Limited.
- CHANDA, Barun. 2022. *Satyajit Ray: The Man Who Knew Too Much*. New Delhi, Om Books International.
- COOPER, Darius. 2000. *The Cinema of Satyajit Ray: Between Tradition and Modernity*. USA: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139173148>.
- DASGUPTA, Chidananda. 2001[1994]. *The Cinema of Satyajit Ray*. New Delhi: National Book Trust, India.
- DIONNE, Craig and Parmita Kapadia. 2014. "Shakespeare and Bollywood: The Difference a World Makes." In *Bollywood Shakespeares*, ed. Craig Dionne and Parmita Kapadia. 1-18. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- DWYER Rachel. 2014. *Bollywood's India: Hindi Cinema as a Guide to Contemporary India*. London: Reaktion Books Ltd.
- HUTCHEON, Linda. & Flynn, Siboma. 2013[2006]. *A Theory of Adaptation* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed). London & New York: Routledge Taylor and Francis.
- GARCÍA-PERIAGO, Rosa María. 2021a. "Sexuality and Evil: Lady Macbeth in the Indian Film Adaptations of *Macbeth Maqbool* and *Veeram*." *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses* 83: 105-115. <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.recaesin.2021.83.08>.
- GARCÍA-PERIAGO, Rosa María. 2021b. "*Othello* as a play-within-the-film in post-independence Indian cinema." *Indian Theatre Journal* 5: 43-58. [https://doi.org/10.1386/itj\\_00015\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/itj_00015_1).
- GERSTNER, David A. 2003. "The Practice of Authorship." In *Authorship and Film*, ed. David A. Gerstner and Janet Staiger. 3-26. New York: Routledge.
- GOOPTU, Sharmistha. 2018. *Bengali Cinema: An Other Nation*. New Delhi: Roli Books.
- IBSEN, Henrik. 1978. *An Enemy of the People*. *Ibsen: The Complete Major Prose Plays*. Trans. R Fjelde. New York: Plume.
- LEITCH, Thomas M. 2007. "The Adapter as Auteur." *Film Adaptation and its Discontents: From Gone with the Wind to The Passion of the Christ*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- MUKHERJEE, Akhaitab. 2023. "From O. Henry's "The Gift of the Magi" to Rituparno Ghosh's *Raincoat*: Transcultural Adaptation and Film Authorship." *Quarterly Review of Film and Video* 40/7: 897-921. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10509208.2023.2176115>.
- MUKHOPADHYAY, Anway. 2017. "Ray between Two Owls: Satyajit Ray and the Aporias of Enlightenment." *South Asian Review* 36/1: 37-54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02759527.2015.11933002>.



- SEN, Suddhaseel. 2021. *Shakespeare in the World Cross-Cultural Adaptation in Europe and Colonial India, 1850-1900*. New York: Routledge.
- STAM, Robert. 2017. "Revisionist Adaptation: Transtextuality, Cross-Cultural Dialogism, and Performative Infidelities." In *The Oxford Handbook of Adaptation Studies*, ed. Thomas Leitch, 239-250. Oxford: Oxford UP. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199331000.001.0001>.
- RAY, Satyajit. 2005. *Speaking of Films*. Trans. Gopa Majumdar. India: Penguin Books.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1994. *Our Films Their Films*. New York: Hyperion.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1970. *Pratidwandi (The Adversary)*. Calcutta: Priya Films.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1971. *Seemabadhha (Company Limited)*. Calcutta: Chitranjali.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1975. *Jana Aranya (The Middle Man)*. Calcutta: Indus Films.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1989. *Ganashatru (An Enemy of the People)*. India: National Film Development Corporation of India.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1990. *Shakha Prashakha (Branches of the Tree)*. Calcutta: Satyajit Ray Prod., Gérard Depardieu (D.D. Productions), Daniel Toscan Du Plantier (Erato Films) and Soprofilms.
- RAY, Satyajit. 1991. *Agantuk (The Stranger)*. Calcutta: Satyajit Ray Productions, Gérard Depardieu (D.D. Productions), Canal+.
- ROBINSON, Andrew. 2004. *Satyajit Ray: The Inner Eye*. London: I.B. Tauris.

