

***From Text to Screen:
The Writing and Re-writing of Hansa Wadkar's (1923–1971) Life Story***

Meghna Gangadharan, Indian Institute of Technology Indore, India
Ananya Ghoshal, Indian Institute of Technology Indore, India

The IAFOR International Conference on Arts & Humanities in Hawaii 2024
Official Conference Proceedings

Abstract

The autobiography of late Indian actor Hansa Wadkar (1923-1971), *Sangtye Aika* (1970) is a unique piece of writing that was ahead of its time. Initially, a collaborative project with the Marathi weekly *Manoos* (1961-1990) the process of which was documented, this book brought out Wadkar's story in her voice, as narrated by her. This autobiography was instrumental because, at the time, it gave Wadkar the agency to tailor her autobiographical self to the way she wanted to portray herself. Later, in 1977, inspired by Wadkar's book, noted Indian filmmaker Shyam Benegal made the film *Bhumika: The Role*, albeit with significant rewritings and departures from Wadkar's text. The paper examines both the writing of the text and its rewriting into the film to evaluate how the agency of the author got modified in the process of adaptation. It also argues that the film is partly a re-casting of Wadkar's image into the mold of the heroine from humble beginnings-turned-unsung-feminist-icon as Benegal saw her. In doing so, the paper questions the erasure of Wadkar's narrative authority by critically analyzing and comparing the film with the book. In pursuing these strands of inquiry, the paper addresses the research gap in the studies on autobiographical writings by South Asian women in cinema and the adaptations of such writings into film.

Keywords: Hansa Wadkar, *Sangtye Aika*, Shyam Benegal, *Bhumika*

iafor

The International Academic Forum
www.iafor.org

Introduction

Hansa Wadkar (1923-1971) was an actor most noted for her work in Marathi cinema and a few Hindi films. Her autobiography, *Sangtye Aika* (1966; 1970) was named after her most famous film, *Sangtye Aika* (1959). The film created an important milestone for Marathi Cinema as it was one of the first films that ran for almost 140 weeks continuously¹. It made Hansa Wadkar a household name synonymous with the *Lavani*² dance form that is a feature of *Tamasha*³ films like *Sangtye Aika*. Drawing from the title of this film, her autobiography was published in 1966 in *Manoos* (1961-1990) in a serialized format. This was an important publication as it was among the first of its kind in Maharashtra as the autobiography of a regional film actor.

The production process of the autobiography was also rather unique and this makes the text stand apart from the other texts within the genre. It was first published in Marathi in 1966 in *Manoos*, in a serialized format beginning with its Diwali edition and continued in installments across the three subsequent weekly issues. Later, in 1970, the team from *Manoos* conducted a second round of interviews to replenish the existing material and published the autobiography as a book through Rajhans Prakashan, who were also the publishers of *Manoos*. Like the articles, the book was also very well-received and was honored with the Maharashtra State award for the best autobiography in 1971. Unfortunately, Wadkar passed away shortly after its publication and could not witness the bestowing of this award on her autobiography.

In 1977, noted film director, Shyam Benegal (b.1934) made the film *Bhumika: The Role*, which was inspired by *Sangtye Aika*. Owing to the autobiography's unique narrative format, it could organically progress into the film, a potential Benegal was quick to realize. Though cited only as an inspiration, by using Wadkar's story for their film, Benegal, Satyadev Dubey (1936-2011), and Girish Karnad (1938-2019) validate Wadkar's vision and perception of her life as a cinematic panorama. Benegal also hints at this when he discusses the cinematic quality of *Sangtye Aika* in his interview with the British Film Institute. He mentions the significance of the text in the way it tells us about a very transient and exciting age in the Indian film industry.

As Wadkar was a seasoned film actor who was very well-versed with the cinematic medium, her autobiography reads differently. *Bhumika* validates Wadkar's reassessment and dismantling of the genre of autobiography through its own narrative format. However, the film features significant departures from the autobiography in its storyline and characterization. Through the discussions in the sections below, let us look into the writing and rewriting of Wadkar's autobiography more deeply and come up with an evaluation on how the text converses with the film and impacts the autonomy and agency of the author in telling her story.

¹ Hrishikesh Ingle in his book *Marathi Cinema, Cultural Space & Liminality: A History* (2022), mentions that the film ran continuously for 140 weeks.

² According to Meera Kosambi, *lavanis* were "short and compact songs that dealt imaginatively with emotions — mainly romantic or erotic love — with great sophistication. The *lavanis* often commented on contemporary events, and some were set to classical raga tunes and made into a form of concert music. (p. 9)

³ *Tamasha* films are a genre of Marathi films which derive their structure from the Marathi theatre form *tamasha*.

The Writing: *Sangtye Aika* (1966 and 1970)

The editor of *Manoos*, G. Majgaokar mentions in his editorial, published along with the first installment of Wadkar's autobiography that:

The details of the interview were decided and two or three representatives of *Manoos* would write down what Hansabai was telling, word by word. She would eloquently tell us everything; we would write it down. Though we would feel tired while writing, Hansabai would go on tirelessly. Whatever she said, we wrote. All her memories were collected and connected sequentially. We would then read it back to her. After making the corrections and changes suggested by Hansabai, we would read it to her again. After three weeks of continuous toil, this autobiography was finally complete - as told by Hansabai – in her own original words.⁴ (p. 41)

Through Majgaokar's essay, we know that the autobiography was the initiative of the editorial team at *Manoos* and that they collected the material through an interview process. He also states that Wadkar's autobiography was, truly, an oral narrative and an outcome of a collaborative project. Being an oral narrative, there is an inherent dimension of performativity attached to the text. This is to say that the autobiography was a site of performance – for Wadkar's autobiographical self, who is also the subject of the narrative. Furthermore, upon reading the autobiography, we get the sense of an acute awareness of the readership on Wadkar's part, which is not uncommon for life writings like autobiographies. Her narration is intended to reorient the understanding her readership has about her. Also, being an oral narrative with significant interplays of memory on narrative progression, it is fragmented and non-linear in its flow. These aspects also make it an uneasy fit within the genre of autobiography, as Jasbir Jain, one of the scholars who translated Wadkar's book in to English also notes.

Yet, since the very beginning the text has had ambivalent subtitles. The Marathi version published in *Manoos* carried the subtitle "*Ek Navinyapura Atmakatha*," which loosely translates to "an innovative autobiography." When it reappeared as a book in Marathi in 1970, this subtitle was removed. As for the English translation, a modified version of the subtitle was added, and it reads: *You Ask, I Tell: An Autobiography*. These instances indicate the non-conformity of the text owing to its ambivalent association with the genre of autobiography. However, the editorial team and Wadkar were not too concerned about this ambivalence. Majgaokar's objective behind publishing such stories was to bring forth the life stories that will inform *Manoos*' readers about the lived experiences of actors from their regional industry, *in their own voice*.

Majgaokar's editorial note indicates that Wadkar was closely involved with the production of the autobiography and that she was the ultimate editorial authority in selecting and curating what went into the articles and the book. The text demonstrates Wadkar's control over her readers' gaze. On closer engagement, the autobiography reads like a planned and rehearsed performance of her autobiographical self. While it contains moments of improvisation in the form of suddenly recollected anecdotes, it is carefully constructed with a particular objective in mind and Wadkar decides what and how much should be told. In such texts, there is always an objective. This can also be seen through the way in which such autobiographies are

⁴ Translated by the authors

organized. In Wadkar's autobiography, we see that there are no images from her personal life, as if what the readers get is a continuing performance of her on-screen, public persona. It becomes clear that she desires to tell her version of the 'truth' about her life and re-orient her readers towards an image of her that she has curated through this autobiography. She informs the readers many times in the autobiography of her desires to quit films to be a homemaker – this reiteration is to suggest that she is not, in real life, the boisterous, flamboyant character that the audience sees in films. She talks about *Sant Sakhu* (1941), her favorite film in which she completely merged with her character. She goes back to this twice in the autobiography, telling her readers that she shares the values of chastity, homeliness, faith, and fidelity, represented through the character of Sakhu and that is how she wishes to be understood as a person, outside of cinema.

In orally narrating the autobiography, Wadkar plays the role of a storyteller, making the text progress in disconnected fragments, placing it within the long, continuous tradition of storytelling from the Indian subcontinent where the concept of space takes precedence over that of time. The author is more mindful and detail-oriented while describing the places, people, and emotions, but is not concerned with time frames. She does not give an exact timeline for any event or incident except for a few like her date of birth, date of marriage, and the time when Himanshu Rai (1892-1940), the owner of Bombay Talkies⁵ fell ill and died. The presence of these features in Wadkar's text affirms its position as a culturally rooted text.

Thus, Hansa Wadkar's autobiography had an inherent cinematic quality which allowed it to be easily assimilated into the cinematic medium. This is not only due to the fragmented structure and movement of her autobiography resembling the components of a cinematic storyline, but also because of the nature of descriptions, visual cues, insertion of fragments of songs, undertones of melodrama and the acute awareness of the audience or readership to whom this story is being narrated.

The Rewriting: An Evaluation of Shyam Benegal's *Bhumika: The Role* (1977)

Through *Bhumika: The Role*, Shyam Benegal presents his reading of Wadkar's autobiography. Being unfamiliar with Marathi, Wadkar's autobiography was read out to him by a friend. Recalling his experience while getting to know the story, in an interview with the BFI, Benegal discusses his realization of the cinematic potential of the text and his perception of Wadkar as a feminist icon. He saw in Wadkar a guide to the dynamic past of the Indian film industry, which he sought to bring to life through his film. However, the making of *Bhumika* was not a smooth process. There were several hurdles including an acute shortage of color film stock that was customarily used for shooting films.

Benegal had to come up with a creative solution to the conundrum. He chose to shoot the film on a variety of available stocks and to organize the narrative of the film by stock. *Bhumika* is, therefore, shot on a combination tinted black and white, black, and white, ORWO⁶ and Kodak Monopak color⁷ stocks. Interestingly, in doing so, he was also able to connect the different parts of the film to the corresponding technical conventions of filmmaking in

⁵ Bombay Talkies was a major film studio owned by Himanshu Rai and his wife, Devika Rani (1908-1994), who was also an actor.

⁶ ORWO, short for Original Wolfen, was a German manufacturer of black-and-white film products, established in 1964.

⁷ Kodak Monopak Color is a type of color film stock manufactured by Kodak that was used for shooting films.

practice at the time. This improvisation by Benegal and his team allowed the text to converse better with the film format. It also imparted the characteristic fragmentary nature of the text to the film. However, though Benegal retained some characteristic features of the text, he made strong departures from several other crucial aspects of Wadkar's story.

In the autobiography are many instances where Wadkar distances her narrative self from her subjectivized self, representing her past. She evaluates her past actions, associations and thought processes, arriving at thoughtful conclusions and judgements on herself. In the film, Benegal re-creates these moments of deep introspection through mirror scenes. These are scenes where the main characters in the film are shown to be in deep thought while looking at their reflections in the mirror. There are nine such scenes in the film, all of which have been placed at critical junctures in the plot. Usha, Benegal's protagonist based on Hansa Wadkar, has mirror scenes which mark moments of change and resolution, where, after reflecting on her actions thus far, she resolves to act in certain ways. For instance, in the autobiography, the moment when Wadkar leaves her husband, Jagannath Bandarkar and goes away with Joshi, the man she meets at a hotel, is a critical one.

In the cinematic recreation of this scenario, Usha stands in front of the mirror for a very profound moment. In the autobiography, at this point in the narrative, Wadkar expresses her dilemma – the difficulty in going home and the moral conundrum of leaving her husband and child, both of which weigh heavily on her mind. The scene from *Bhumika* conveys this very well through close-up shots and mirror scenes. Even in the absence of dialogues, the audience can sense what is going through Usha's mind. Wadkar highlights the irony of her leaving home in the autobiography through a confession that she used to be critical of women who left their husbands or opted to divorce them. Smita Patil presents a nuanced portrayal of the protagonist Usha, retaining the essence of Wadkar's autobiographical self without compromising with Benegal's vision of Usha as the feminist icon that he wanted to project through the film. The text in this manner converses with the film, with each filling in the gaps of the other, making Wadkar's autobiographical narrative clearer and more detailed to the reader/viewer.

However, the film does not call itself a direct adaptation and neither does it go beyond a certain point in Wadkar's narrative. Benegal also does not build a meta-narrative based on the para-text of *Sangtye Aika*, i.e., Majgaokar's editorial essay detailing the process behind the production of the autobiography. This leads to differences in the treatment of the narrative of the film from the autobiography. Yet, like the text, the film also progresses through a network of memories through flashbacks and flash-forwards. The time-leaps in Wadkar's narrative occur because of its orality. Benegal was able to enhance this effect by using different film stocks and editing. Usha recalls past events from her life without essentially narrating them. Thus, Benegal shows what Wadkar tells, which marks the distinction between the performance of narrative storytelling and cinema. Eventually the film, much like the autobiography, succeeds in conveying the complete narrative, despite its fragmentary narrative flow.

But, while Benegal honored certain aspects of Wadkar's autobiography, he also made significant departures from several aspects of it. Particularly, his rewriting of Wadkar through the protagonist Usha and casting her into the mold of a 'feminist icon' is noteworthy. Additionally, he has made extensive changes to characters and subplots; for example, Wadkar mentions a motorcycle accident when she went on a ride with director-actor Raja Paranjpe

(1910-1979) during the time she was shooting for *Sant Janabai* (1949). Both were under the influence of alcohol.

When our drinking session was over, Rajabhau took out his motorbike, I got on behind him and Rajabhau started to drive at a terrific speed... I egged him on, 'Drive faster, drive faster.' Rajabhau pressed the accelerator... Moving at such a high speed, the motorbike suddenly skidded. We were both thrown off. Rajabhau was badly injured. I, however, got away unscathed. (p. 65)

Wadkar is ambiguous in her autobiography about her friendship with Raja Paranjpe since working on *Pudhcha Paool* (1950). She says that she had only worked with him on two films – *Pudhcha Paool* and *Parijatak* (1951), and that she had a lot of trust and respect in him as a director and that that was all there was to it (Wadkar, 2013, p. 63). Benegal rewrites their relationship for the film and portrays Sunil, the character based on Paranjpe, and Usha in an extramarital affair. Sunil is essayed by Naseeruddin Shah (b. 1950). Furthermore, he completely changes the motorbike accident and instead adds a failed suicide pact between Usha and Sunil, wherein they book a hotel room to attempt to overdose on sedatives. This is a significant departure from the autobiography as it alters Hansa Wadkar's persona by arriving at conjectures on her state of mental well-being. This rewriting indicates that Usha succumbed to the psychological impact of the unfortunate circumstances and hardships she was going through in her life. But, in the autobiography, Wadkar refuses to show herself defeated by her circumstances and instead chooses to portray herself as a survivor rather than the victim. Thus, this aspect of the film appears jarring to the audience familiar with the autobiography.

In the film, Usha takes the sedatives and follows through with their decision, but Sunil changes his mind and does not take them. When the attempt fails and Usha wakes up, she finds an apologetic note from Sunil, bringing their relationship to its end, as also happens with Hansa Wadkar's relationship with Paranjpe after the motorcycle accident. Another significant departure from Wadkar's narrative happens in the part where she writes to her husband, Jagannath Bandarkar asking him to rescue her from Joshi's house in Marathwada⁸. In the autobiography, Wadkar shares the disturbing account of being raped by a magistrate while leaving Marathwada. Benegal rewrites this part and writes the sexual assault into a scene depicting a forced abortion procedure that Usha had to undergo. Wadkar also had to undergo forced abortions but does not mention any instance of sexual assault during the process. Furthermore, Benegal also rewrites the character of Joshi/Kale. In the autobiography, Joshi is a man with two surviving wives and a few children. In the film, Kale, essayed by Amrish Puri (1932-2005) is shown to have a bedridden wife, a mother and one child. These departures from the text can be taken as Benegal's creative liberty, but they also point towards a compromise of Wadkar's authorial integrity.

His rewriting of Wadkar's autobiography is particularly severe when it comes to the identity and lineage of the character inspired by Wadkar. In the autobiography, Wadkar mentions that she draws her lineage from the hereditary practitioners of performing arts; her father hails from the *kalavantin*⁹ community and her mother was the daughter of a *devadasi*¹⁰. In the film,

⁸ Marathwada is a region that approximately coincides with the Aurangabad region of present-day Maharashtra.

⁹ Kalavantin is the name of a community of hereditary practitioners of performing arts like music and dance.

¹⁰ Devadasi is a Sanskrit umbrella term that is used to define women with associations to temples, in parts of India. The usage of the term has been problematized and for further detailed insights, see Soneji 2004.

Usha's father is shown as a Brahmin, so, by making his protagonist the daughter born to a Brahmin father and a mother descended from the family of hereditary practitioners, Benegal succumbs to the caste hierarchies that influenced the social order within film studios of that time. We can infer from the works of Hrishikesh Ingle, who wrote on the discourse of respectability in early Marathi cinema¹¹ and Sarah Niazi, who argues that reputed studios like Prabhat (1929-1953) were conscious in ensuring that they were recruiting actors, particularly female actors from 'respectable backgrounds' and that they were able to provide a family-like idyllic atmosphere for the said 'respectable women'. Meera Kosambi states:

The women who entered the entertainment industry belonged either to upper caste families with connections to the literary-cultural scene, or to families of traditional women entertainers. (p. 372)

While Prabhat was devoted to producing social films on topical issues like women's empowerment, the discourse of respectability indicates that the caste location and social background of the artists influenced their casting. As argued by Niazi, such studios also prided themselves in being facilitators of social mobility for women actors engaged with them. They actively mobilized the respectable public perception of the female actors they hired through their films and their marketing strategies.

But Benegal's film came out in the late 1970s and therefore, the rewriting of Wadkar's identity and social background through Usha is deeply problematic. More so, because in the autobiography, Wadkar embraces her identity and lineage and does not try to conceal it. There was no apparent reason for Benegal to rewrite the character's social background also because Wadkar came from a family of hereditary practitioners with connections in the film industry, which was one of the known and legitimate ways for people to enter a career in films at that time. Her paternal aunts, Sushilabai and Indirabai were already in the film industry. Sushilabai was married to Master Vinayak Rao (Wadkar, 2013, p. 1) and Indirabai had taken the stage name Wadkar (Wadkar, 2013, p. 6), which Hansa also took when she started as an actor.

However, despite Benegal's rewritings, characters and the situations can quite clearly be traced to the autobiography. Yet, he only cites Wadkar's text as a source of inspiration and does not credit her as a co-author, for re-writing any story forges a co-authorial relationship between the past and present authors. Denying the text its status as a source of adaptation endangers Wadkar's autonomy as the narrator-author of her autobiography. Furthermore, it also foils the purpose with which *Manoos* ventured to publish narratives such as these. Majgaokar mentions in his editorial that their initiative was aimed at bringing out the voices of such experienced artists from the regional film industry, so that their stories can be told to the larger audience. Therefore, the autonomy and editorial agency lay with the narrator/writer by design. Benegal's rewriting changes this very critical aspect of the autobiography.

Bhumika received a lot of accolades, including the prestigious National Award for Best Screenplay, which was shared by Benegal, Karnad, and Dubey for their work on this film. Smita Patil (1955-1986), who essayed the character inspired by Wadkar, Usha, was also honored with the national award for Best Actress. This earned the film and its story an important place in the history of Hindi cinema. But, because of the accolades received by the

¹¹ Ingle, Hrishikesh. (2017) "Prabhat Studios: Early Marathi Cinema and Respectability". *EPW*, 52 (28), 43-48.

film and the reputation of Benegal himself as one of the pillars of the Indian Parallel Cinema, the modern-day audience is likely to be misadvised on the story of Wadkar. The publication of Wadkar's autobiography led to renewed interest in her life and work in the years that followed.

In rewriting, Benegal may inadvertently have taken the story away from Wadkar, endangering her agency and her voice as the author of her own story. The poignant silences, candid confessions, and certain omissions that Wadkar introduced are all punctuated with inferences and Benegal's rewriting ultimately ends up re-reading and rewriting it significantly. Thus, though Benegal attempts to honour Wadkar as an artist and a feminist icon (in his perception), he inevitably takes away her agency and speaks on her behalf instead of letting her speak through her own story.

Conclusion

Hansa Wadkar begins her autobiography by mentioning her familial roots. She was a descendant of a family of hereditary performers and was raised in Sawantwadi and Mumbai. Her paternal grandmother was a renowned courtesan and her maternal grandmother was a *devadasi*. Her father was among those who broke tradition and chose to marry. Due to the alcoholism of both her parents, Wadkar grew up in financially strained circumstances, which forced her at the age of ten to begin working as a full-time actor. Though she wanted to complete her education, get married and live as a householder, her financial circumstances forced her to continue working. The many instances of domestic, and psychological violence and many miscarriages, as well as her addiction to alcohol and tobacco, repeatedly prevented her from quitting her career in films and realizing her dream of living as a householder. However, she found success and adulation as an actor, which caused, in her words, her addiction to working in cinema. She says,

Once the intoxication of working with paint on your face and the accompanying experience, the accompanying atmosphere, takes possession, it becomes an addiction. Life without it is an unbearable longing. (p.102)

Her work in cinema, particularly in *Tamasha* films, led her to become a household name synonymous with the folk-dance form *Lavani*. One such film of Wadkar, *Sangtye Aika* (1959) became one of the most commercially successful films in the history of Marathi cinema. A theatre in Pune, Maharashtra is said to have played the film continuously even after two years of its release.¹²

Reading *Sangtye Aika*, one realizes that Wadkar's long and successful career allowed her to be well-versed with the contours of cinema, and this gave her a unique cinematic vision. She orally narrated her autobiography as it came to her and a team of editors noted it down and read it back to her and finalized it only with her approval. Inspired by her autobiography, Shyam Benegal made his film *Bhumika: The Role*, with significant rewritings and departures from Wadkar's version of herself and the events. Benegal's film focuses more on the different kinds of roles that the protagonist plays, both in cinema and in life, in her search for a meaningful life of her choice. As Benegal saw in *Sangtye Aika* of Hansa Wadkar a feminist icon and a pathway into the past of Indian cinema, he was inspired to turn the autobiography

¹² Priyadarshi. (1961) "Chitrapat Pareekshan: Chetana Chitra 'Sangtye Aika'." *Manoos*, 35-37.

into a film. But he rewrote many aspects of Wadkar's story and autobiographical self to create Usha, who was the feminist protagonist relevant to his context as a filmmaker in the late 1970s. Benegal only credits the text as an inspiration and shies away from calling his film an adaptation. He rewrites scenarios from the text and presents to us a reinvented version of Wadkar through his character Usha, who in the pursuit of her individuality, understands the fruitlessness of her dependence on men.

As the film was made during a difficult period, wherein there was a scarcity and resultant difficulty in procuring film stock, Benegal had to reorient his approach to making the film. He went back to the text, and in getting to explore the dynamic past of Indian cinema through Wadkar's autobiography, he chose to re-orient the narrative of the film by using different varieties of film stock, each corresponding to the timeline of the narrative as well as the prevalent technological conventions in filmmaking in India. This helped Benegal create a dialogue between his film and Wadkar's autobiography by recreating the fragmented, non-linear narrative driven by memory.

However, in significantly rewriting the story and citing the text only as an inspiration, Benegal inadvertently endangers Wadkar's autonomy and studied reflection of herself. He rewrites not only Wadkar's character and her origins but also several situations that she has mentioned in her autobiography. Furthermore, Wadkar's autobiography features punctuated silences, wherein, she exerts her authority as the author/narrator and leaves out certain things. These situations have been reinterpreted and presented in *Bhumika*, which eventually gives the viewers a different version of Wadkar. Due to such severe departures from Wadkar's text, Benegal's *Bhumika* risks misadvising the modern viewers whose first point of contact with Wadkar's story is, in most cases, the film.

References

- Benegal, S. (Director). (1977). *Bhumika: The Role* [Film]. Blaze Film Enterprises Pvt. Ltd.
- BFI Events. (2012, June 18). *Bhumika: Masterclass with Shyam Benegal*. YouTube. www.youtube.com/watch?v=UeMpq7AVcVE
- Ingle, H. (2017). "Prabhat Studios: Early Marathi Cinema and Respectability". *EPW*, 52 (28), 43–48. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26695878>
- Majgaokar, G. (1966). "Atmakathechi Katha". *Manoos*, 40–41.
- Niazi, S. (2016). "Teen Deviyan: The Prabhat Star Triad and the Discourse of Respectability". *Sahapedia*. <https://www.sahapedia.org/teen-deviyan-the-prabhat-star-triad-and-the-discourse-of-%E2%80%98respectability%E2%80%99>
- Priyadarshi. (1961). "Chitrapat Pareekshan: Chetana Chitra 'Sangtye Aika'." *Manoos*, 35-37.
- Soneji, D. (2004). "Living History, Performing Memory: Devadāsī Women in Telugu-Speaking South India". *Dance Research Journal*, 36 (2), 30–49. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20444590>
- Wadkar, H. (1970). *Sangtye Aika*. Rajhans Publications
- Wadkar, H. (2013). *You Ask, I Tell: An Autobiography*. (J. Jain & S. Shinde, Trans.). Zubaan. (Original work published 1966).

Contact email: phd1901261010@iiti.ac.in