



Unraveling Cultural Code in Junoon: A Narrative through Costumes

Kumar Anketa^a, Rajantheran Muniandy^{b*}, Sillalee S.Kandasamy^c, Saravanan Sandaram^d, Sivagamy Kanniah^e, ^aResearch Scholar, Department of Indian Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Science, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. Assistant Professor, National Institute of Fashion Technology, Raebareli, Uttar Pradesh, India, ^bProfessor, Department of Indian Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, University of Malay, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, ^cAssistant Professor, Department of Modern Languages, Faculty of Creative Industries, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Sungai Long Campus, Bandar Sungai Long, Cheras 43000, Kajang, Selangor, ^dScholar, Department of Indian Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Science, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, ^eResearch Scholar, Department of Indian Studies, Faculty of Arts and Social Science, University of Malaya, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, Email: ^{b*}rajanmun@um.edu.my

In this paper, a materiality-based approach for analysing film narratives through costumes is examined. Indian film director Shyam Benegal's Hindi film *Junoon* (1979) is pursued crystallising costume as a significant feature for reading the movie. The article argues that costumes, on a symbolic level, work as agents. It thus focuses on the interdependence between costume and interpretations of the screenplay's main character. A theoretical notion of costumes and materiality are explored, and the idea is further developed in relation to stylistics constituted as emotions materialised in costume. As costumes are the main object for analysis, the discussion immediately centres on costumes made for the moment: for a specific narrative and aesthetic expression. In this study, we make a semiotic analysis of costumes and how they express the user's socio-cultural attributes. We demonstrate the phenomenal role that costume as a form of communication plays within the cultural and social society, specifically in period films. This paper makes use of semiotic theory and film analysis through qualitative methodology in order to analyse *Junoon* directed by Shyam Benegal. This form of analysis will allow costume a distinct voice in words dominated film. It reinforces costume as communication through motifs, lines, shape, colour, fabric and texture. This work has been able to create a semiotics distinction of costumes in films using the socio-cultural and conventional interpretations of colours, fabrics, styles and textures of clothes and accessories. It has attempted to understand how colours, fabrics and textures convey meaning in the film. We discover that costume aids us to form individual opinions

about characters and at the same time reconstruct their socio-cultural realities. In this study, Junoon is read through a theoretical framework deeply rooted in theatrical and film costumes, and a comprehensive methodology that focuses on the application of Roland Barthes 5th Code i.e Cultural Code is evaluated as the intervening mediations between interpretation and meaning of colours, lines, fabrics, textures, and styles of costumes in Junoon is unravelled with historical reference.

Key words: *Film, Costume, Semiotics, Cultural code, Hindi cinema*

Introduction

The Indian movie industry has been attracting immense interest from audience and critics. The Indian styles of clothes which are distinctly worn in India are now being transmitted as images around the globe through the Indian films. So the film medium has come to be indirectly associated with the cultural industry (Chakravarty, 2011).

Turner (2013) observes that the notion of identity is distinct from the notion of self, as "self is now viewed as a . . . series of identities that can be invoked individually." These are visibly expressed through costume, to direct others to verify each identity. Dress establishes expectations of certain behaviour: when an actor is in costume, audiences expect him to play the role to which he has been assigned. For any individual, "there is a continuous construction of self" (Schöpflin, 2010). All humans present a public face: acts of identity construction occur in every choice of garment, as wearers select their clothes to reflect the way they hope to be received by others. Much of this identity construction occurs subconsciously.

Any costume, as it is associated with a particular role, is accompanied by a set of unwritten rules dictating how the wearer must act. Through clothing, all humans communicate expectations about their actions and abilities (Troxell & Stone, 1981). "Dress is part of the expectations for behavior that define a person's role within the social structure. Thus, dress . . . helps to define an individual's role within society" (Miller et al., 1991). The relationship between dress and behaviour is so commonly understood that people will modify their behaviour to suit their clothes.

All humans play a number of different roles in their lifetime, and the transition from one role to another is marked by costume. A worker will change into casual clothing in the evening or at the weekend to signify that he or she no longer expects to engage in work. The two roles that this individual plays, marking home life apart from a professional role, are distinct, and the clothes that signify each role can never be exchanged without unwanted connotations. For



superheroes, the difference between the two roles is more marked. The appearance of a costumed character immediately prompts the expectation of spectacular action, and anything less would be a disappointment.

Conversely, civilian clothing establishes the expectation of civilian behaviour. "The characteristic of a costume that differentiates it from all other forms of apparel is its open proclamation of departures in behaviour . . . costume announces that the wearer is stepping out of character and into a new constellation of imagery or unusual social relationships" (Joseph & Houston, 1986).

Simultaneously, the costume permits behaviour that may otherwise be unacceptable, providing merit or justification for the wearer's actions. A man carrying a gun on the street may be assumed to be dangerous unless he is dressed in military or police uniform, in which case the weapon is excused. Two men engaged in a brawl on the street may both be assumed to be hooligans unless one wears the uniform of a security guard, in which case we assume that the uniformed man is on the right side of the law. Any human in uniform takes on the responsibilities associated with a role. A doctor, in his white coat, must come to the aid of a wounded man; a soldier in his military greens must run to the rescue of his injured ally. In both these cases, any man in civilian clothing would not be subject to such expectations.

The pleasure of dressing up comes partly in the pleasure of acting according to a different set of rules. For example, a child may enjoy dressing up as a robot because it changes the rules that govern his patterns of speech and movement. Consequently, "dressing-up" may be seen as both liberating and restricting. It liberates the wearer from the ordinary rules by which he lives but imposes another set in their place. This offers the wearer difference, and escape, but within restricted boundaries. Similarly, in Junoon, costumes of main characters would be evaluated with the application of Cultural code to see the costume relevance with the historical and cultural knowledge, as it a love story set in the historical period drama.

Literature Review

Semiotics is a theory developed in Linguistics for studying the structure and meaning of language. It is the study of signs and symbols and the way they generate meanings. Although semiotics was developed in the field of Linguistics to study the structure and signification of language, it has also been used to study various non-linguistic signs systems (Fawcett, 1984).

Semiotic is the study of signs, symbols and signification. It is the study of how meaning is created - not what it is but how it is evoked. The revolutionary nature of semiotic can be summarised by saying that, in general, it challenges the way Western civilisation has conceived the world since Plato. Barthes took over Saussure's concept of language as a sign

system, producing work that can be regarded as an appendix to his "Mythologies" (1957), he shows how the denotations in the signs of popular culture betray connotations which are themselves myths generated by the larger sign system that make up society. Adapting Saussure's model to the study of cultural phenomena other than language, Barthes developed his *Fashion System* (1967). In his *Fashion System*, Barthes shows how the adulteration of signs could easily be translated into words (Barthes, 2013). He explained how, in the fashion world, any word could be loaded with idealistic bourgeois emphasis. Thus, if popular fashion says that a 'skirt' is ideal for certain situation or ensemble, this idea is immediately naturalised and accepted as truth, even though actual style could just as easily be interchangeable with a 'wrapper', 'bubu' or 'trousers' or any number of combinations.

Whereas in the past, determinists like Aristotle saw things in terms of cause and effect, semiotics looks for signs and symbols. It challenges common sense, which believes that things have one meaning and that this meaning is pretty obvious. Semiotics tells us that meaning is constructed as a product of a shared system of signification (Chandler, 2007). For instance, the traditional Hindu society in Indian culture denotes the wearing of *mangalsutra*, which is a necklace made with a combination of black and golden beads signify that a woman is a wife and mother. Thus, the signification of a woman's marital status by this necklace worn around the neck is a constructed meaning which has over time become the Indian culture. Again, semiotics can be defined as the study of signs: how they work and how we use them. Berger defines semiotics as "The science that investigates the way meaning is produced and transmitted" (p.244). At the same time, a sign is anything that can be used to stand for something else—for instance, using a white robe with a cape and a cross pendant to signify a catholic priest.

Even within the context of the theatre arts, one can apply semiotic analysis to any theatrical arts, including dance, makeup, and costume and scene design). Semiotics involves the study not only of what we refer to as signs in costumes but of anything which stands for something else. In the semiotic sense, signs in costumes take the form of colours, insignia, images, textures and styles of clothes and accessories. Contemporary Semioticians study signs not only in isolation but as part of sign systems. They study how meanings are made and how reality is presented. According to Berger, "There is a science that is of great utility in helping us understand how visual phenomena communicate- a field of knowledge called semiotics, the science of signs" (p. 48). Semioticians believe that semiotic is the key to unlocking the meaning of all things.

It would be interesting research if made over the pattern, over time, that Bollywood movies have illustrated individuality and portrayed the relation of individual and society. Obviously, just like any other form of art, the movies also depict the appropriate nature and situation of the society of that era, but some art forms not only depicts the current situation of society, but



also succeeds in providing a new trend with a new idea for the society to be leaded and made practical, and such movies become the masterpiece (Viridi, 2003). Objectively speaking, Art is a careful re-creation of reality according to an artist's metaphysical value-judgments. That selective recreation is not meant to depict the things as they are, as Aristotle said that fiction is of greater philosophical importance than history, because "history represents things as they are, while fiction represents them as they might be and ought to be." Movies, being the indisputably strongest medium of art, if meant to show the things, situations, people and individuals as they ought to be, then they become the leading force of change in society and strengthens the values of individuality (Butcher et al., 1951).

The cultural code by Barthes designates any element in a narrative that refers "to a science or a body of knowledge" (Barthes, 1974). In other words, the cultural codes tend to point to our shared knowledge about the way the world works, including properties that we can designate as "physical, physiological, literary, historical, etc." (Barthes, 1974). The "gnomic" code is one of the cultural codes and refers to those cultural codes that are tied to cliché, proverb, or popular saying of various sorts.

Junoon (The Obsession, 1978) is set during the chaotic times when Indian freedom fighters fought against British invaders in 1857, but Benegal reduces these "important" events to the background and explores the relationship between a cowardly Pathan noble and an English girl, and the film is subtly erotic, meticulously detailed and without any trace of melodrama (Rajadhyaksha & Willemen, 2014). This movie was built in partnership with Shashi Kapoor as a producer based on the story by Ruskin Bond called A Flight of the Pigeon. To get the sense of period the movie was built with certain kinds of schemes which make people feel that they have been transported into that century or a particular period within that century or decade. In Junoon, the emphasis was to create a certain kind of warmth in the colour schemes (Sachdeva, 2019). Junoon attempts to deal with the British period, which has been documented very well in Lithographs and Prints. The period has been identified with the same visual representations. An obsessive love of Pathan with an English girl has been set against the backdrop. In the understated, quiet tone of the film, Benegal avoids significant compromise to the popular cinema.

The background of the film is set during India's first Freedom movement in 1857. Shashi Kapoor played the lead role as Javed Khan Who aims judicious feudal chieftain with a Muslim Pathan inheritance. His world revolves around a passion of breeding pigeons which serves as a carrier. Sarfaraz Khan, his younger brother-in-law, played by Naseeruddin Shah is politically stimulated and actively engaged in the freedom movement. He strategies the fight against British rulers. In the film, the freedom fighters attack the local British administrators on Sunday when they are at Church and exterminating them all. Miriam Labadoor played by Jennifer Kendal the real-life wife of Shashi Kapoor manages to escape with her daughter,



Ruth, played by Nafisa Ali and mother played by Ismat Chughtai, a Muslim lady. She belonged to the royal Nawab family of Rampur and was married to an Englishman. The three women request shelter from a wealthy Hindu family of Lala Ramjimal played by Kulbhushan Kharbanda. Lala Ramjimal is uncertain between his devotion for Indian independence and his advantaged position under the British. His silent love towards Miriam, who also seems to reciprocate it silently motivates him to help. However, matters are taken out of his hand when Javed Khan barges into Lala's house and forcibly takes Ruth and her family to his own house. This leads to jealousy on the part of his wife, Firdaus played by Shabana Azmi and anger on the part of his brother, who ultimately provides into the Pathan tradition of giving welcome and sanctuary even to uninvited guests. Numerous things turn out thanks to cultural misunderstandings within the domestic routine of the Muslim practices with its new English guests. Javed falls loving with Ruth, and needs to marry her however is opposed bitterly by her mother. Noticing intense feelings of Javed for her girl Ruth, Miriam Labadoor smartly makes an arrangement with Javed that she would solely provide her daughter's hand to Javed if British were defeated. Initially, Javed is hesitant; however, he accepts the proposal once more Miriam asks him if he has misgivings in his war against the British. There are simmering of a relationship underneath the watchful, suspicious eyes of Firdaus (Lokapally, 2014).

Meanwhile, the rebellion or freedom fighters run into issues, and also the British forces manage to defeat the poorly organised Indian forces. In an exceedingly stormy scene, Sarfaraz destroys Javed's Columbia form bird coops and sets his pigeon pets free once he finds out that Indian forces have lost the battle for freedom. Sarfaraz dies in an exceedingly battle against the British. The Labadoors come to the protection of the re-deployed British contingent, bootleg by Firdaus, who solely needs to avoid wasting her wedding. Javed finds out that the Labadoors have wanted a sanctuary within the church and rushes there to see Ruth one last time. Astonishingly, Ruth comes out and expresses her feelings for Javed against her mother's wish. However, Javed honourably keeps his word and also the promise he had agreed with Miriam Labadoor and left the Church leaving Ruth. The film concludes here with the voiceover that Javed was martyred fighting British forces whereas Ruth and her mother return to their home in England. Ruth dies fifty-five years later, without getting married (Sharma, 2017).

With the approaching in of Muslim rule from eighth Century AD, Medieval India saw a great deal of modification in costume and culture. This variation is often seen within the characteristic design and painting depiction up to date costumes. With the institution of Mughal rule, a mix of Persian and ancient Indian creative sensibilities are often seen in art, design and article of clothing. With the Persian influence, the bulk of seamed clothes entered India, and the *antariya* was replaced by the Pyjamas or costumes for the legs, which were of a numerous varieties, starting from terribly loose to terribly tight; there have been different

types of Pyjamas for men and ladies, the cut, vogue and ornamentation additionally varied. The *uttariya* still remained although numerous tunics like *kurtas* and *anrakhas* were additional. The Persian men and ladies wore themselves from Head to Toe in numerous layers of seamed clothes. It is attention-grabbing to notice that despite such major influences, most of Indians continued to wear their ancient unstitched clothes. A great deal of fusion wear came in, like carrying kurta with breechclout as popularly known *dhoti*. This traditional ancient Indian clothing of kurta with numerous kinds of pyjamas is still in use (Bhatnagar, 2004).

The Maratha and Rajput men took to carrying the costumes influenced extremely by the Mughal rulers, whereas the female continued to wear their ancient clothes. A serious modification within the female costume that came was the veil. Before the Mughal rule, we never see Indian or Hindu female having covered their faces in veils. Solely when the approaching in of Islam and its influence in India, the female started covering their face, though they still wear their ancient *ghagra-choli*, *antariya-uttariya* mix – the sari. Mughal female wore layers of covering and additionally lined their faces with veils. It is going to be noted that suitability of the climate the article of clothing was cotton, loose and breathable (Kumar &Walia, 2017).

The wardrobes of local textiles assembled by Emperors Akbar and Jahangir marked a departure from garments worn by the first Mughal rulers, Babur (r. 1526–30) and Humayun (r. 1530–40; 1555–56), who continued to wear the heavy *postīn*, or leather coat, and the *chapān*, or long coat made from wool, silk, and leather, that were more suited to the cooler climates of Babur's original homeland in Central Asia. In Persianate and Central Asian dress, like that worn by Babur and Humayun as well as by the Mughals' contemporaries in Safavid Iran, cotton was used only for veils or for long-sleeved undershirts covered by heavier *qabā'* jackets. Akbar's adoption of cotton cloth reflected the fact that in India cotton clothing was both ubiquitous and more visible (Richards, 1995). It was worn as turbans and shawls, wrapped around the waist (as in a traditional South Asian dhoti or lungi), or used in the draped women's sari. In north India, under the preceding Afghan Lodi Dynasty (r. 1451–1526), a particular type of tailored cotton garment had come into widespread use. Adapted from the *jhaggā*, which was indigenous to the Rajput kingdom of Mewar in northwest India, this cotton garment of translucent material had a tight upper bodice that crossed diagonally at the chest with tassels; long, closely fitting sleeves; and a skirt that extended below the knees. The most recognisable variant of this garment, known as the *chakdarjāma*, had a four-pointed hem along the bottom edge. In South Asia, translucent cotton *jāmas* were often worn with only a thin undershirt or without anything underneath, allowing the glow of the skin, the wetness of perspiration, and the curls of body hair to show through. A painting from a late sixteenth-century manuscript from Mewar (in contemporary Rajasthan) depicts a prince or nobleman wearing the *chakdarjāma* (Houghteling, 2017). The artist has rendered three of

the *jāma*'s four-pointed ends and used heavier paint to capture the decorative fringes that run along the chest of the garment. As the prince arranges his turban in a mirror, with his arms above his head, we can see the faint outlines of his bare torso beneath the translucent white of his cotton *jāma*. His red trousers also show through as a pale pink. The cool white cloth seems to counteract both the intense yellow sun and the deep crimson walls of the pavilion in which the prince is resting. The two female attendants also wear translucent cotton in the form of *dupattās*, or shawls. The way that the cotton cloth lightly grazes the contours of their hair, backs, and hips, and clings to the torso of the prince, suggests a sensual mood and projects bodily comfort during a hot day (Das, 1992).

The fineness and transparency for which muslin cloth was known emerged from a confluence of factors: precise ecological conditions, inventive technical processes, and painstaking, virtuosic labour. These conditions, like the cloth that they produced, were held in a delicate balance that has been disrupted in numerous ways since the seventeenth century. The finest indigenous varieties of cotton have disappeared, replaced by New World cotton plants. Early industrial innovations, such as Eli Whitney's cotton gin, as well as machine spinning and weaving, led to a move away from specialised techniques that yielded the most elastic cotton fibres and the finest threads. Only a very small number of highly skilled craftspeople today retain the knowledge, tools, and expertise to produce hand-spun, handwoven muslin, and the fineness achieved by earlier craftspeople is now the stuff of legend (Cohn, 1985).

Impact of Mughal followed by British rulers on Indian Dressing

There was a stark distinction within the dressing sensibilities of the Mughals, British and Indians. For instance, headgear was vital to men of each the origins. The British men removed their hat before a king or someone of upper status, it absolutely was their method of showing respect, whereas the Indian men, irrespective of to any region or faith thought-about it insulting to get rid of their headgear (turbans or phetas) publicly. It absolutely was equivalent to being stripped off. In reality, the Indian men took off their shoes as a mark of respect, that was not a case with the British. The British men who came before the Raj were fast to adjust. They took to sporting loose turbans and loose costumes and learnt to figure and relax in Indian traditions. However, once the Raj was over, the practice was not the same. Now Indians were looked down upon as natives, who failed to shrewdness to decorate. As a result, the Indians started looking down upon themselves. Indians thought that their customs and costumes considered illiteracy. Most of them detested the fact that they were brown-skinned. They refused to talk in their native tongue and refused to wear their native garments (Trivedi, 2007).

In the 1850s, British women's skirts were domed and bell-shaped, supported by crinoline petticoats. They often featured deep flounces or tiers. Long bloomers and pantaloons trimmed

with lace were popular. Tiered cape-jackets were fashionable, as were paisley patterned shawls. Deep bonnets were worn, and hair was swept into buns or side coils from a centre parting (Cohn & Scott, 1996).

Men wore matching coats, waistcoats and trousers, with hairstyles characterised by large mutton-chop side-burns and moustaches, after the style set by Prince Albert. Shirts had high upstanding collars and were tied at the neck with large bow-ties. High fastening and tight-fitting frock coats were also very fashionable; though a new style called the sack coat (a thigh-length, loosely fitted jacket) became popular. The bowler hat was invented around 1850 but was generally seen as a working-class hat, while top-hats were favoured by the upper classes (Paranthaman et al., 2019).

A miniature photographic portrait such as this example is called a 'carte de visite' (the French for 'visiting card'). This was a photographic format, originating from the visiting card, which was introduced in France in 1854. Cartes were mass-produced, and those like Mayall's pictures of the royal couple were ordered by the hundreds of thousands. It was fashionable to collect 'cartes de visite' and compile them in albums.



Figure 1. Ruth entering a church for mass praying with her father (picture left), Prince Albert and Queen Victoria (picture right) the pictures updated by 'Carte de visite' (visiting card) photograph of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, John J.E. Mayall, 1861, London, Bequeathed by Guy Little Museum no. 3504-1953).



Figure 2. Attributed to Sur Das, *A Royal Entertainment*, India, Mughal dynasty, ca. 1600. Opaque watercolour and gold on paper, 17 x 11.4 cm. Freer Gallery of Art and Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, DC: Purchase—Charles Lang Freer Endowment, F1960.27

In the picture of Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, the Queen's skirt is tiered for fullness, which was fashionable in the 1850s and very early 1860s. It is held out in a pronounced bell shape by layers of petticoats or a steel cage crinoline. Her bodice is buttoned high at the neck and trimmed with a lace collar, with low-set and sloping shoulders. Her hair is parted in the middle and scraped back into loops and buns at the nape of the neck. Prince Albert wears a high starched collar with a neck-tie tied in a knot around it. His hair and moustache were copied by many men at this time.

A volunteer corps of Muslims who joined the non-corporation movement in India during Freedom struggle sorted either Khaki uniforms with the Turkish Fez and crescent armbands or else the long green Arab styles robes popularised by Ali Brothers (Minault, 1982).



Although semiotics is closely related to the field of Linguistics which for its parts studies the structure and meaning of language more specifically, it also studies non-linguistic sign systems. Semiotics can be applied to all sorts of human endeavours, including dance, costumes, makeup and architecture. Film costumes generate their meanings through elements of costume which can stand for signs. So film costume can adequately be studied in the semiotic mode. Within the Saussurean tradition, the task of the Semiotician is to look beyond the specific elements of costume (colour, fabric, texture, lines, space and motifs). Semiotics can be applied to anything which can be seen as signifying something –in other words, to everything which has meaning within a culture (Aston & Savona, 2013).

Methodology

The inferences have been drawn from various memoirs of the period such as Mughal and British period in India and the costume influences have been compared to the main characters in the movie Junoon which is a period film based on Ruskin Bond's novella of that era. Period films like Junoon is interesting and helpful in researching and arranging before us enormous pictorial evidence with reference to costumes. A lot of studies has been done on Mughal Influence on our culture, but not much specifically in terms of clothing. The attention is drawn towards the information that the approach towards dress today by Indians is largely a reflection of the Mughal followed by British influence. The Muslim influence was in terms of Persian Pyjamas, which were loose. It was the arrival of the Mughal rule that headed to the wearing of long loose shirt called Kurtas. "However, in time, all these garments were eventually outdated one by one by the Western-style jackets, trousers and blouses" (Paranthaman et al., 2019).

Indian is known for producing a large number of films compared to the rest of the world. And Cinema at large is a major source of the study of any culture. During early twentieth-century Indian Fashion mirrored the sentiments of modern society. The was when an attempt was to gain independence and self-governance and getting away from a manner set up by the British. Fabrics used for dress in early modern South Asia were valued for softness, warmth, a saturation of the colour, and coolness on the skin, qualities that went beyond the cost of the materials or the sophistication of the technology used to produce them (Rajadhyaksha & Willemen, 2014).

Analysis

In the shot where Firdaus played by Shabana Azmi is sewing a hair garland and is wearing a tinted pink muslin kurta with a blue coloured dupatta covering her head depicting the essence of Mughal costumes carried forward by the Muslim Pathans of India during the non-cooperation movement of 1857. Clothes worn by women in the movie is a reflection of

royalty and inheritance of wealth from their ancestors. Colours such as red, pink, blue depict the upper hierarchy amongst Muslim culture in the social system in India. Dupatta covering the head and the chest is delicately embroidered with border stitched with golden lace.



Figure 3. Dupatta

Ladies wore multiple layers of clothing, with a tightly fitted bodice that stopped short of the navel. The length hit the knees or lower. The waist fastened closely, and the neckline was in 'V' shape. *Pai-jama* is an amalgam of two Persian words, *Pai* meaning legs or feet and *Jama* meaning cover. The tighter version of *Paijama* is *Churidar*, and it is cut with much longer than the leg so that the many folds fall at the ankle. It is worn by men and women both. The *Shalwar* is a triangularly cut *Paijama* with a quilted band at the ankle and loose at the upper leg is worn by men and women. Other versions of *paijama* are *Dhilja*, made of silk, cut wide and straight; *Garara*: cut loose to the knees adding gathers; *Farshi*, cut without folds to the knees, and then gathered into pleats to the floor all are worn by women (Maraya & Maniam, 2018).

In the scene where Ruth is shown wearing a Pink Kurta and Churidar *Paijama* depicts her liking towards Javed Khan and willingness to accept and bridge the cultural differences amongst them. She enthusiastically gets dressed in the Indian attire with Dupatta worn over her head completing the look.



Sarfraz Khan played by Nasseruddin Shah wearing a long Khakhi coloured Kurta with a Turban over his head. In one of the interviews, Nasseruddin has quoted his dress influences in the movie based on his great grandfather's portrait at his home that had travelled from Afghanistan to India and participated in the freedom struggle of India. In this particular scene where he is explaining the motives of British invaders and his intentions of fighting against them is depicting his retaliation towards the British rulers which can be understood with mannerism and Khaki colour symbolising Mutiny as it was popularised during Non-corporation movement in India at the times of struggle of Independence. The cut opening of long cotton Kurta from his neck towards his chest is a popular style again adopted from Mughal costumes which were popular during the Mughal era before the British Invasion in India. Green was the favourite colour of the Prophet and is worn by those who mourn his death (Pastoureau, 2014).

Period costume need not necessarily entail richness and splendour as there is more to Indian history than the Mughal Empire, after all. Even so, the costume still manages to proclaim its own distinct value through other means, for example, its ability to conjure up a well-known historical figure via a set of distinct visual signs or, more importantly perhaps, its capacity to persuade the viewer of the action's "pastness." Notwithstanding that it is merely one among many persuasive devices, costume, with its unique power to stabilise conceptions of time as well as notions of character, is indispensable to the illusion of pastness in period films Thasarathan and Muniisvaran (2019).

Period costumes in several film industries frequently derive their fascination from attention to detail, as well as from the manifest value in the amount of skilled labour and special materials needed to make them. When Gilligan (2011), writing about the English-language period films *Elizabeth* (1998) and *Marie Antoinette* (2006), remarks that "costume is placed at the forefront through an endless stream of costume changes and spectacular set pieces," she could as well be writing about a Hindi-language period film such as *Jodhaa Akbar* (2007) or *Devdas* (2002).

The appeal to period correctness is part of a larger strategy of legitimising and authorising a film that recreates a historical context in its apparent entirety. In the realm of material culture, authenticating strategies take on enhanced significance in a world replete with copies, not so much to uncover an original as to offer reassurance that an object or performance issues directly and unaffectedly from what is, in essence, an idealised productive context (see, for example, Handler, 1986; Spooner 1986).

With film, audiences are willing to accept that appearances are contrived, but may expect a level of integrity in arriving at those appearances instead. All in all, however, disputes over what is authentic or how authenticity is to be gauged are, in effect, conflicts over present-day



authority to interpret and control the past; the significance of the authenticated item resides in how it embodies the evaluative criteria and discerning faculties of the person whose claims win out. Needless to say, some of the conflicts described in previous chapters in connection with films set in the present-day come to the fore in the production of costume for historical films as well. This time, though, the differences revolve around the sources of knowledge of India's past or, more specifically, the terms upon which compelling visual images of the past are created. The demands of costuming for period films are, in some ways, comparable to those for contemporary films. At the same time, they are distinctly different, since the clothes must evoke in viewers a sense of a past of which they typically have little or no direct experience. Character is thus elaborated within a narrow range of sartorial possibilities, subject to the consent of the viewer that this is, first and foremost, an acceptable version of a past reality (Wilkinson-Weber, 2010).

At the same time, there is an apparent paradox at the core of historical costume design, since an exact replication of past styles, silhouettes, and fabrics is neither the intention nor the outcome of costume design for period films Vasantakumaran (2020). The audience's agreement that the film is true to the period does not rest on any particular expertise regarding the past; instead, it comes from recognising critical signs and visual renderings of materials and movements that are deemed plausible. The most dramatic examples of this phenomenon come from portrayals of iconic historical figures, in which it is necessary to include certain irreplaceable signs to convince the audience that it is the life and times of this figure, in particular, that are being portrayed.

Films that include figures from the Independence struggle take place at a time just barely within the memory of film viewers. Many of the most famous persons from this and more recent history entered the public visual imagination via iconic images and also caricature—a form of art that, via exaggeration, draws attention to and underscores certain notable facial and bodily features. Mohandas Gandhi, Bhagat Singh, and Subhas Chandra Bose are recognisable to audiences, before they even speak or act, via these compelling appearances. To craft a Gandhi, one needs the round-framed spectacles, shaved head, and dhoti; for Bhagat Singh, the trilby or turban and the carefully groomed moustache; for Subhas Chandra Bose, the eyeglasses and the military uniform and hat. The effectiveness of these simple ensembles allows a far wider range of actors to take on roles, concealed as they are behind over-determining signs. This explains how the role of Bhagat Singh could be taken on by actors as physically distinct as Bobby Deol and Ajay Devgan in two films made about his life in 2002 (Wilkinson & Weber, 2013).

Historical periods before the advent of photography are accessed via museums, art books, and reproductions of portraits and other paintings. The resources for the Mughal era are among the most numerous and the most useful, particularly miniatures and other paintings of court



life commissioned by the emperors and their aristocratic contemporaries. The compelling realism of films about the Mughal period comes in part from their being so visually familiar to a substantial segment of the audiences, who have either seen previous films about the same historical era or imbibed their impressions of the period from the reproductions of Mughal art that have entered the public culture. For the dress designer, the naturalistic conventions the Mughal elite explored following their exposure to sixteenth-century European painting permits the treatment of art as an unmediated source of information about the costume. Miniatures and full-size paintings are assumed to provide unambiguous guidance on matters of silhouette, colour, jewellery, and decoration. Conveniently, bodies are usually shown with the head in profile (depicting the tie of the turban) and the torso comparatively straight with respect to the viewer (displaying the cut and decoration of the clothing). The faces and hands, as well as other uncovered parts of the body, are rendered with precision and naturalism that is not replicated in the clothing, whose design is stylised to the point that a print pattern is repeated like a tiny portion of the wallpaper. Strangely enough, this draws the source closer to the kind of illustrative sketch that designers make as they compose designs.

Conclusion

Costumes are the representation of cultural identity. The clothes, as a man himself, give the information on the age, gender and ethnicity of the individual, his place of residence, the social status, the occupation, etc. The costume could tell a lot about the epoch in which he was created. The analysis of the psychological and expression mechanisms of perception of the appearance through the appearance of the other person shows that the clothes are the extension of the individual's body. The ambiguity of the clothes is a broad research field, in which the costume ethnic and image signification is of special interest.

The sign system and the social meanings of the costume have developed gradually throughout its whole history. Initially, a few centuries B.C, there was no fashion itself. People used clothes to meet their basic biogenic needs, providing the individual and specific human existence, such as the protection against the adverse environmental conditions. But gradually, with a shift from the primitive societies towards the ones of the mixed economy, the forms and cut-out of clothes had been complicated, and the first signs of the social differentiation through the costume appeared. In the film *Junoon* directed by Shyam Benegal, costume became a visualisation of continuity as it presented itself in a permanent state of flux, with shapes rhythmically appearing and disappearing, momentarily 'solidifying' into movie characters. Cinema has embraced costume as a device that can mesmerise and hypnotise the spectator, a dramatic and radiant entity with the potential for engendering multiple forms and optical effects. Costume, movement and time appeared to form an indivisible unity in the *Junoon* as a period drama. Cinema has already anticipated its capacity to not only record and register but also generate imagery near to its original form.



As Barthes (1978) and Metz (1974) after him have noted, the 'having-been-there' of a photograph gives way to the 'being there of the thing' in film or, as Sobchack (2009) has it, the moment of the photograph is replaced with the momentum of the film. And because of the impossibility of fixing and owning film as a discreet, portable image/object, it also makes it less prone than a photograph to being had, to becoming fetishised (Metz, 1985).

Costume on the screen produces a unique, emotionally-charged overlapping (layering) of two materials, the sartorial and the cinematic, what Bruno (2011) has called 'the fashioning and wearing of the image' or, to extend the Deleuzian concept (1983), a kind of fashion-image-movement.



REFERENCES

- Aston, E., & Savona, G. (2013). *Theatre as sign system: A semiotics of text and performance*. Routledge.
- Barthes, R. (2013). *The language of fashion*. A&C Black.
- Barthes, R., & Miller, R. (1975). *S/Z. Translated by Richard Miller*.
- Barthes R. (1978). 'Rhetoric of the Image', in *Image, Music, Text*, New York: Hill and Wang.
- Barthes R. (1981), *Camera Lucida*, Camera Lucida.
- Barthes, R. (1983), *Fashion System*, Fashion System.
- Berger, A. (2010). *The objects of affection: Semiotics and consumer culture*. Springer.
- Bhatnagar, P. (2004). *Traditional Indian costumes and textiles*.
- Butcher, S. H., Aristotle, & Gassner, J. (1951). *Aristotle's theory of poetry and fine art: With a critical text and translation of the poetics. With a prefatory essay, aristotelian literary criticism*. Courier Corporation.
- Butcher, S. H., Aristotle, & Gassner, J. (1951). *Aristotle's theory of poetry and fine art: With a critical text and translation of the poetics. With a prefatory essay, aristotelian literary criticism*. Courier Corporation.
- Bruno, G. (2011). *Surface, fabric, weave: The fashioned world of Wong Kar-wai, Fashion in Film*. Indiana University Press.
- Chakravarty, S. S. (2011). *National identity in Indian popular cinema, 1947-1987*. University of Texas Press.
- Chandler, D. (2007). *Semiotics: The basics*. Routledge.
- Cohn, B. S. (1985). *Cloth, clothes and colonialism: India in the 19th century*.
- Cohn, B. S., & Scott, D. (1996). *Colonialism and its forms of knowledge: The British in India*. Princeton University Press.
- Das, S. (1992). *Fabric art: Heritage of India*. Abhinav Publications.
- Deleuze, G. (1983). *Nietzsche and Philosophy*, trans, Hugh Tomlinson, London: Athlone.



- Fawcett, R. P. (1984). *The semiotics of culture and language: Language and other semiotic systems of culture*. Pinter Pub.
- Gilligan, S. (2011). Performing Postfeminist Identities: Gender, Costume, and Transformation in Teen Cinema. In: Waters M. (eds) *Women on Screen*. Palgrave Macmillan, London, https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230301979_12.
- Hanssen, E. F. (2009). Symptoms of Desire: Color, Costume and Commodities in Fashion Newsreels of the 1910s and 1920s", *Film History*, 21/2: 107–21.
- Houghteling, S. W. (2017). The Emperor's Humbler Clothes: Textures of Courtly Dress in Seventeenth-Century South Asia. *Ars Orientalis*, 47, 91. 114-118. <https://doi.org/10.3998/ars.13441566.0047.005>.
- Joseph, N., & Houston, G. (1986). *Uniforms and nonuniforms: Communication through clothing*. Praeger.
- Kumar, M., & Walia, A. (2017). Elucidation of the Indian salwar kameez. *IJASOS-International E-journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, 753-753. <https://doi.org/10.18769/ijasos.285935>.
- Kumar, R. (2006). *Costumes and textiles of royal India*. Antique Collectors Club.
- Leese, E. (1976), *Costume Design in the Movies*, Costume Design in the Movies.
- Lokapally, V. (2014, July 10). *Blast from the past: Junoon (1978)*. The Hindu. <https://www.thehindu.com/features/friday-review/blast-from-the-past-junoon-1978/article6196818.ece>.
- Maraya , R., & Maniam, K. (2018). Women's imagery in R.Kartigesu's novel: 'Vahnathu Veligal' [Citra wanita dalam novel R.Kartigesu: 'Vahnathu Veligal']. *Muallim Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 2(4), 277-285.
- Metz, C. (1974), 'On the Impression of Reality in the Cinema', in *Film Language: A Semiotics of the Cinema*, New York: Oxford University Press, 3–15.
- Minault, G. (1982). *The Khilafat movement: Religious symbolism and political mobilization in India*. Columbia University Press.
- Paranthaman, G., Santhi, S., Radha, R., & Poornima Thilagam, G. (2019). Indian women status: a historical perspective. *Muallim Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(2), 258-266. <https://doi.org/10.33306/mjssh19>.



- Pastoureau, M. (2014). *Green: The history of a color*. Princeton University Press.
- Rajadhyaksha, A., & Willemen, P. (2014). *Encyclopedia of Indian cinema*. Routledge.
- Richards, J. F. (1995). *The Mughal Empire*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sachdeva, V. (2019). *ShyamBenegal's India: Alternative images*. Taylor & Francis.
- Schöpflin, G. (2010). *The dilemmas of identity*. Tallinn University Press.
- Sharma, D. (2017, August 12). *Millennials review classics: A gut wrenching love story in Junoon*. The Quint. <https://www.thequint.com/entertainment/millennial-review/junoon-love-story-review-shashi-kapoor-shyam-benegal-shabana-azmi>.
- Sobchack, V. (2009). Animation and automation, or, the incredible effortfulness of being. *Screen*, Vol 50(4), Winter 2009, p. 375–391, <https://doi.org/10.1093/screen/hjp032>.
- Thasarathan, C., & Muniisvaran, K. (2019). Analyzes the film criticism by using the theory of textualism [Pathi Karuthiyal Kodpaddin Vazhi Vimarsana Kaddurai]. *Muallim Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 3(4), 467-474. <https://doi.org/10.33306/mjssh/36>.
- Trivedi, L. N. (2007). *Clothing Gandhi's nation: Homespun and modern India*. Indiana University Press.
- Troxell, M. D., & Stone, E. (1981). *Fashion merchandising*. Glencoe/McGraw-Hill.
- Turner, J. H. (1988). *A theory of social interaction*. Stanford University Press.
- Uhlirova, M. (2011), 'Costume in Early Cinema: The Aesthetic of Opulence', in M. Uhlirova (ed.), *Fashion in Film: Birds of Paradise* [exhibition catalogue], New York: Fashion in Film and Museum of the Moving Image.
- Vasantakumaran, S. (2020). Improve learning of peyareccam by using film technique [Thiraipada Uthiyai Payanpaduthi Manavargalin Peyarecham Katralai Membaduthuthal]. *Muallim Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, 4(1), 73-78. <https://doi.org/10.33306/mjssh/57>
- Virdi, J. (2003). *The cinematic imagination [sic]: Indian popular films as social history*. Rutgers University Press.
- Wilkinson-Weber, C. M. (2013). *Fashioning Bollywood: The making and meaning of Hindi film costume*. A&C Black.