

Multicultural Education

Research Article

Homepage: www.MC-caddogap.com

INDIGENIZING SHAKESPEARE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF POWER POLITICS IN MACBETH AND MAQBOOL

Nosheen Jaffar

Ph.D English Scholar at Lincoln University College (LUC), Malaysia.

Lubna Ali Mohammed

Associate Professor, Faculty of Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, Lincoln University College (LUC), Malaysia.

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this article is to analyze Vishal Bhardwaj's *Maqbool*, a modern Indian adaptation of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*. In this paper, *Macbeth* role adapted as *Maqbool*, inhabits a literary world inspired by the religiously-motivated rage that ranges across the Indian subcontinent. The centrality/marginality dichotomy in *Maqbool* provides a perspective through which to examine our historical moment, one marked by incessant violence and hatred fueled by political differences. Bhardwaj suggests, in both *Maqbool* (based on *Macbeth*) and *Haider* (based on *Hamlet*), that Shakespeare may be intimately tied to the ongoing narrative of religious violence in several South Asian countries. Vishal Bhardwaj's *Maqbool* reimagines Shakespeare's *Macbeth* as a struggle for control inside the Mumbai mafia hierarchy. The film, on the other hand, can be considered as a glimpse inside a highly patriarchal Islamic set-up through the eyes of an equally fierce Hindu gaze. This Shakespeare story, set in the twenty-first century, creates a sense of all-consuming foreboding where the polarization of Hindus and Muslims becomes more than a power game; it becomes symptomatic of Indian society, where wily politicians and astute police officers turn a state's legal machinery into a den of horrific violence. The purpose of this research is to show that, despite their different narrative structures, the play and the film can be read in a politically similar way. The film begins with the illusion of the "other" being the "centre." But, the "other," initially projected as the "centre" in this film, is defeated not from outside, but from within, as we see numerous instances of illegitimacy, such as the mock-family structure, the half-caste protagonist, the illegitimate relationships, and, most importantly, the entire space of the film is made unlawful by consigning it to the mafia world.

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Adaptation; Indian Subcontinent; Religious Violence; Illegitimacy, Protagonist; Consigning

Article History:

Received: 19th Oct 2022
Accepted: 25th Nov 2022
Published: 7th Dec 2022

© 2020 The authors. Published by CADDO GAP Press USA. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial 4.0

Elizabeth I died in 1603, and her nephew, King James VI of Scotland, became James I of England. The failed assassination attempts on King James I of Scotland in 1605 (known as the Gunpowder Plot) and the subsequent public execution of its leader, Guy Fawkes, exposed the long-suppressed resentment of many English subjects toward James I of Scotland. There was no better time for Shakespeare to revisit his recurring theme of regicide than in 1606 when he wrote *Macbeth* (1606), a deadly combination of the political crisis arising from the assassination of a king and the interpersonal relations previously problematized in *Othello* (1603). Shakespeare's ability to reflect on the present by considering the past has proven effective multiple

times, and his observations on the present are always relevant. Kott: Shakespeare (1967). Our Contemporary contends that Shakespeare's plays are still relevant today because of the fluid but static historical conditions of time and place that afflict both a sixteenth-century audience and a 21st-century viewer. The same occurrence occurs at the beginning and end of each book. Essentially, every great Shakespearean act is a repeat of an earlier one (Kott, 1967:6). Since this is the case, many of Shakespeare's works have been adapted for the big screen.

A literary work is composed of a set of indications, both literal and figurative, that can be interpreted in an infinite number of ways and inspired by a plethora of variations. No single filmmaker can ever claim to have explored all possible interpretations of a literary work. In each movie adaptation, we can see a variety of critical readings at work, or "critical interpretations," to use Stam's term (2000:62). In the twenty-first century, there have been numerous "Bollywood" adaptations of Western literature. For example, Danny Boyle's 2008 film *Slumdog Millionaire* can be reviewed as a Dickensian bildungsroman with glimpses of Victorian England, while Gurinder Chadha's 2004 *Bride and Prejudice* (based on *Bias and Glory*) and Rajshri Ojha's 2010 *Aisha* (premised on *Emma*) deal with the difficult process of assimilating the customs of a once-colonized nation with those of the colonialist. There are hopeful undertones to Jamal's story that call to remind *Oliver Twist* and *David Copperfield*. English directors Gurinder Chadha (of Indian descent) and Danny Boyle (of English descent) would later utilize similar reimagining to build audiences in a more diverse society. Vishal Bhardwaj's *Maqbool* (2004), *Omkara* (2006), and *Haider* (2014) contrast a postcolonial global Indian backdrop with smaller, fundamentally indigenous places that speak of difficulties that are truly Indian. *Bride and Prejudice* and *Aisha* and *Slumdog Millionaire* show the mongrelized masses two faces of the exotic "other": the squalor and filth of Mumbai's slums and the glamour and splendour of Indian ceremonials. However, only an Indian can truly understand the complexities of issues like those presented in *Maqbool* (about the inner workings of Mumbai's underworld), *Omkara* (about the dark politics of rural Uttar Pradesh), and *Haider* (about Kashmir as a bone of contention between India and Pakistan). Thus, in contrast to Chadha, Ojha, and Boyle, Bhardwaj is successful in recentralizing Shakespeare (Stam, 2000:68). In explaining "indigenization," Linda Hutcheon (2006) explains:

The reception context of a work is just as crucial as the setting in which it was originally created. Perception, perspective, and the capacity for adaptation are all influenced by what we see and hear on the news and television these days. "Societies that make adaptations and also use them interact with the works they make and use" (2006, 149).

Adaptations change with time and location. The original text, the adapted text, and the "receivers" of both seem to be engaged in a continuous "conversation" with Kott and with each other since historic events repeat themselves through time, space, and cultures. The goal of this article is to show how Vishal Bhardwaj "creatively mistranslates" Shakespeare's *Macbeth* while keeping the story's main message the same across time, space, and cultures.

There is no surprise that Bhardwaj would turn to Shakespeare given his interest in societal chaos and his love of threatening characters, as seen in his depiction of the criminal underworld in *Maqbool* (2004), *Omkara* (2006), *Kaminey* (2009), and *Haider* (2014). Shakespeare's plays can be read as nothing less than powerful psychological crime thrillers due to their tightly plotted nature and focus on themes of lust, murder, and intrigue. So, Bhardwaj took his first tentative but a clear step toward making a Shakespeare movie with *Maqbool*.

Vishal Bhardwaj transforms *Macbeth* into *Maqbool* by adding multiple layers of allusions to *The Godfather* (1972). Shakespeare's *Macbeth* takes place in Scotland, a locale that would have been only slightly foreign to his English audience, including the "Three Weird Sisters" and the play's overall bizarre tone. In *Maqbool*, this otherness is evoked by the characters' deep devotion to Islam and the "other" in India. The film's entire set, and the "other" that defines this setting, are rendered illegitimate since Scotland, with a legal king (Duncan), is replaced by the mysterious Mumbai underworld. Tabu plays Lady Macbeth, now called Nimmi but was initially called Miyan *Maqbool*. Irfan Khan plays Macbeth, now called Miyan *Maqbool*, and Pankaj Kapoor plays Jahangir Khan, now called Abbaji.

According to Anthony Davies' character analysis (quoted by Brode, 2000: 191), while directors like Roman Polansk and Orson Welle have failed to successfully project this onscreen, Vishal Bhardwaj does it in *Maqbool*. Welles's *Macbeth* (1948) from the opening to the closing credits, while Polansk's *Macbeth* (1971) failed to present a storyline because *Macbeth* does not develop much depth as the story progresses. He merely appears as a duplicate of the statically evil Richard Three. However, in the first scenes of Justin Kurzel's adaptation, *Macbeth* is a tragic hero. Kurzel makes a significant departure from Shakespeare by starting his picture with Baby *Macbeth*'s funeral. It's clear from the beginning that they will forgive the parents' crimes, despite the fact that they caused their children's deaths. Kurzel's *Macbeth* never turns bad. The success of *Macbeth* and *Lady Macbeth* in Kurzel's *Macbeth* (2015) serves as a constant reminder of a loss that can never be made up for, and

the story becomes an allegory for the futility of seeking comfort in positions of power in the face of personal tragedy.

At the end of Shakespeare's *Macbeth*, the protagonist undergoes a transformation that leaves him "sad but wiser," having come to terms with his own mortality. On the other hand, Maqbool begins his quest well aware of his peripheral and confined status in society. Both Maqbool and *Macbeth* are tormented by ambition and guilt. But Maqbool is also driven by his feelings for Nimmi and a desire to establish his own legitimacy, both of which he believes will help him succeed in his ambitions to steal power. The question of legitimacy is more central to Maqbool than it was to Shakespeare. When compared to other significant adaptations of the play, Maqbool includes a plot point about the protagonist's desire for "appropriate" social acceptance. In Akira Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood* (1957), the *Macbeth*-inspired character Washizu is an accepted member of the Japanese warrior's class and a better embodiment of the culture than in the films of Roman Polanski's or Justin Kurz'il, where time and environment are changed so that the characters no longer have to question their legitimate status in society. Shakespeare's *The Throne of Blood*, like Maqbool, does not provide an accurate adaptation of Shakespeare's universe in eleventh-century Scotland. Kurosawa's *Throne of Blood*, which has its origins in the Noh theatrical culture, presents Washizu as a prototypical mediaeval Japanese warrior who doesn't question his own validity because he is part of the norm. Nimmi's fixation on being married to Maqbool and assuring him over and over that their love is pure (or "paak") is just one manifestation of Maqbool's obsession with legitimacy. Another of Maqbool's wishes is to succeed Abbaji as the gang's leader. The main reason Maqbool's desire to replace Abbaji is dishonest is not the methods he will employ to make it a reality but rather the fact that Maqbool is not really tempted by power. His desire stems from two sources: his quest to transcend his own illegitimate status and his deadly affection for Abbaji's mistress. While *Macbeth* rises from thane to king, Maqbool goes from being Abbaji's devoted follower to a failed attempt at legitimate leadership inside the illicit hierarchy of Mumbai's criminal underworld. That Maqbool personifies "Muslim immorality" is a major factor in his downfall. As Sameera, Abbaji's legitimate daughter falls in love with Gudu, Kaka's son, the power of Hinduism and the question of validity make it hard for either actor to be in charge on-screen.

The film begins with a fundamentally patriarchal setup: In Bollywood, gangster heroes are more likely to be members of crime families, and loyalty to the family is often equated with devotion to the boss. The family in this movie is Muslim, as evidenced by how they look physically (language, visage, dresses), regular visits to the "dargha," the opening burial scene, the ritual sacrifice of a lamb, a henchman's rejection of alcohol, scenes of saying prayers, celebrations of "Eid," and Kaka and Guddu, two Hindu characters, which are not in power and not involved in much criminal activity. Because of this, the way the movie shows Maqbool's betrayal and the death race that follows may seem to be mostly caused by violence between Muslims, in which Muslims kill Muslims.

From a Hindu perspective, the Muslim community's pseudo-family structure, devoid of family values and has a history of killing their parents (done by Abbaji and later Maqbool), validates what is ultimately fake. The calmness of the shots depicting Gudu and Kaka's family serves as a counterweight to this betrayal of family values. Kaka's household is the only place where legitimacy has ever been seen to exist. It is worth noting that even though *The Godfather* (1972) is an inspiration for Maqbool's fake family, the genuine bonds of family in that film's criminal world, where kindness inside the family balances brutality without it, stand in stark contrast. (Leitch 116). "The *Godfather* was not so much a crime picture as a story of a family that happens to be in crime," writes Thomas Leitch, paraphrasing Mario Puzo in *Crime Films* (2002). (Leitch 116). The meaning of being a family member is a topic that gets some attention in *The Godfather* (Leitch, 2002:118). When it comes to the Corleone family, he and his boys never question who their real parents are. On the other hand, as the film's hero, Maqbool is perpetually troubled by his desire for legitimacy. Irfan Khan's performance as Maqbool is at the heart of the story in terms of time and his way of expressing emotions. Indeed, Om Puri and Naseeruddin Shah, both major names in the Bollywood industry, must be made comical to appear overshadowed by Irfan's existence in the film. While playing the lead role in the movie, Miyan Maqbool struggles with self-doubt. Maqbool is an illegitimate Muslim overreach who desperately wants to be accepted by mainstream society, as shown by his worries about Nimmi's unborn child and her frantic attempts to reassure him that their relationship is paak (pure). Standing outside of every so-called "center" category, his struggles could be interpreted as a desperate plea for survival throughout an entire generation. In this way, Bhardwaj's work reminds me of Shakespeare's idea that a loss isn't over until the people who lost realize they were wrong.

Macbeth, played by Shakespeare, struggles at first to accept the dreadful truth of what he finds is the dark side of his own. This is where Shakespeare runs into trouble. Despite his mental instability, Hamlet is a man who strives to do what is right. In spite of their tragic mistakes, Othello and Brutus cannot be called evil. Shakespeare faced his greatest task in making a man like Richard III, who acts as a villain, turn him into a tragic

hero of the same name. Shakespeare uses Macbeth to explore the inherent conflict between a person's good and evil sides. Shakespeare did an amazing job of making us feel sorry for a man who chooses evil even though he knows it will hurt him in the end.

On the other hand, Bhardwaj's Maqbool is an inevitable expansion of the dark underbelly of the Mumbai underworld. There is something intrinsically "bad" about where he was born. So being evil isn't something he can choose; it's something he has to do. Despite the pervasive evil around him, he attempts to maintain his loyalty to the mafia boss. But he never loses sight of his inferior status. Thus, Nimmi's unexpected act of hope causes him to go into a rage. Thus, Nimmi's sudden spark of optimism precipitates his abrupt fury.

As the play progresses, Macbeth, a once-loyal hero, ultimately gives in to his hidden passions, but not before engaging in some introspective soul-searching. Maqbool appears to be more of an acted-upon character, driven not just by Nimmi but by some other terrifying power structure. Nimmi's open sexuality and the way she mocks Maqbool's masculinity are what shake up Abbaji's fake family. On closer inspection, however, Under the guise of showing the rise and fall of these characters, it is revealed that the corrupt cop's Pandit and Purohit, who predict Maqbool's rise to power and Maqbool's death (by leaving Maqbool's old enemy RiyazBoti alive), are the real ones (Shakti kasantulan).

Notably, both of these police inspectors are portrayed as devout Hindus. Their devotion to astrology, their practice of wearing their hair in "shikhas," in-depth conversations about the impact of Mangal, Shukra, and Shani, and frequent references to the harmful effects of "grahan," give us the unpleasant feeling that we are relating to violence between communities instead of within a single community. Scenes in which red-turbaned Hindus confront Maqbool's Muslim supporters in front of Kaka's house and a close-up shot of a Hindu deity fades into a very prominent Muslim scene at Abbaji's funeral are disturbing reminders of the cyclical storms of religion-fueled violence that continue to hit India, perhaps now more than ever.

Even though the film mainly focuses on Muslim individuals and Islamic traditions, it opens with a foreboding close-up of a design on the window of the bus, a prominent symbol of Hinduism. The film's plot revolves around this symbol, appearing multiple times. The first sequence of Maqbool repeats itself. It opens with a glimpse of the horoscope that foretells Mumbai's future and closes with a similar shot, this time containing the blood of a Muslim henchman who worked for Abbaji's rival gang leader. Then Pandit's voice comes on, slightly irritated: "Saari Mumbai khon says bharTeya" (You've splattered Mumbai in blood.) The scene's cyclical structure reflects the police officers' primary goal: to maintain a "balance" of forces to ensure the perpetuation of the cycle of violence. In this passage, Vishal Bhardwaj diverges significantly from Shakespeare by arguing that Macbeth's supernatural soliciting of the Weird Sisters has no inherent power. The "Weird Sisters" influence stems entirely from Macbeth's character and aspirations. They are effective because they first put words to Macbeth's unspoken yearning. They see his answer as emblematic of whom or what they claim to be. The words "bad be thou mine good" take on new meaning in Macbeth's mind. Therefore, it is not the "Witches" who enslave Macbeth's mind to their words but Macbeth himself. Without Duncan's murder, he could have been King of Scotland without much effort other than continuing to be "noble Macbeth," as he states in the play.

If destiny wants me to be king, she can crown me without asking!

But even though he has doubts, he gives in to the Weird Sisters' temptation, even though he knows he is going into darkness:

"Stars put out your fires!"

Shakespeare (2008), 4, 50-53.

For Maqbool, this is not the case. Until Pandit's first prediction came true, Maqbool would control the Mumbai film business. When the first prediction came true, Maqbool didn't think twice before ignoring Pandit's advice. But despite this, he is destroyed. Therefore, the two police officers' authority is not tied to Maqbool's decisions. On the contrary, Maqbool plays the role of a passive observer throughout the film. In this scene, we see an inversion of Macbeth's tragedy, as Maqbool becomes a puppet of politicians, including political figures like "Palekar" and "Bhonsle" and law enforcers like "Purohit" and "Pandit."

In Macbeth, the three Weird Sisters play the agents of sinister Fate. Shakespeare says that they are controlled by spirits familiar to people on earth and that they get power by selling their souls to Satan. They can see into the future and make predictions, but they are not Fate. Maqbool's Hindu officers, in contrast to the Weird Sisters, not only anticipate the workings of Fate but also identify with it by invoking "balance" and supporting it through their nefarious activities. At the peak of this narrative of passion and murder, slaughter and

deceit, when one of the policemen (Pandit) sees another (Purohit) taking up a piece of sweet that has been used as a figure in the astrological sign constructed of candies, he warns his colleague not to eat Saturn on the grounds that Saturn eats people. Purohit chews on another piece of the chart and wonders, "Whom shall it swallow?" His friend smiles and asks, "Who do you want to eat?" This makes them more than just Fate's helpers who try to balance out the world's bad.

As a result, two police officers, the "Purohit" and "Pandit," are the king-makers. A purohit is a religious leader who has been recognized by the state and possesses significant influence in society. The purohit delegates the responsibility of legitimizing the authority he exercises to a "pandit." In the beginning, there was Mumbai's astronomical chart. Covered in a Muslim's blood, it takes on new significance in light of this information. "Purohit" is responsible for sealing the city's Fate with a Muslim gangster's blood. As expected, "Pandit" does the prophecy, while "Purohit" carries out the plan. The Hindu rulers use the tried-and-true ideological weapons of caste, knowledge, and official power to turn what looks like an unstoppable Islamic power structure into a Muslim community that is limited and controlled.

Maqbool focuses on minor personal grudges, extortion, alcoholism, unpleasant conspiracies, and illegal sex in an Islamic family. Abbaji's house is a place of reversed values where the father-son bond is mercilessly neglected. Gudu, who becomes a gang leader, marries Sameera, adopts Nimmi and Maqbool's child, and raises them as their own, all of which reeks of a work that presents the Muslim community as an object of a biased Hindu gaze. Due to her position on the illegitimate and patriarchal peripheries, Sameera needs to marry into a Hindu family in order to gain full legitimacy. As such, Guddu's deportation of Maqbool and his "marriage" to Sameera is a nuanced illustration of the archetypal domination of one community over another in a patriarchal society, with marriage's validity serving as the final stamp of approval. The fact that Guddu and Sameera adopted Nimmi and Maqbool's child serves as a symbol of and a check on their ascent to power.

Nimmi has all the qualities of a marginal figure, but Sameera is twice as far from the centre. A Muslim woman from Lucknow with a dark past has been living with Abbaji outside of marriage and having an affair with Maqbool, Abbaji's most loyal follower. She completely deviates from any and all conventional norms. Nimmi is the Hindi film industry's persistent use of tired stereotypes about women who have "fallen." Shakespeare and Vishal Bhardwaj both feature attempts to control women's sexuality deemed dangerous or deviant. Therefore, it comes as no surprise that these attempts have changed little through the centuries. Here, Bhardwaj closely follows Shakespeare in that both authors include female characters who create friction in the world of mental representation by displaying traditionally masculine traits like being abnormal, uncontrollable, having their own will, and forcing their partner to submit to them. Therefore, they disturb the object world because they threaten the patriarchal order. So, people with these kinds of unusual personalities need to be locked up so that the comfort of an object world can be restored.

By repeatedly intruding into the realm of heterosexual male bonding, the women in the texts, at their most powerful, manage to disturb the easily recognizable and categorizable patriarchal picture of womanhood. Strong patriarchal structures rule both Macbeth's court and Maqbool's criminal underworld. Here, women are objects for men to use, whether as consorts, mistresses, or daughters. As they urge their partners to take action, Nimmi and Lady Macbeth invade the male-dominated world and steal a sexified version of the masculine language. Women are free to keep all the snarky comments, nasty retorts, and blatant displays of power that have made them so successful in business. When Lady Macbeth says, "Come, you spirits/that tend on mortal thoughts, unsex me here," she takes a bold step away from the submissive/aggressive stance of Nimmi. Shakespeare's I. 5: 40-41) Unlike Lady Macbeth, Nimmi does not have the social legitimacy that comes from belonging to a family. While both the wives of Abbaji and Macbeth fall outside of the accepted conventional criteria of a "good lady," it is ironic that they both rely on deception and manipulation to attain their goals. Lady Macbeth doesn't appear to be doing any better than her Indian analogue in this regard. Even if a woman never leaves a "legitimate" structure, going into the "illegitimate" domain of men is seen as a violation of her "legitimate" status and can lead to harsh punishments.

Lady Macbeth and Nimmi, though distinct from one another by a vast historical and spatial chasm, share the same madness. Women who purposefully seduce and coerce their men into murdering them challenge the socially sanctioned image of a passive woman; they come perilously close to choosing their Fate; they pose a threat to controlling the story, so it's essential to put them in their place. Only when these women become willing victims of their own unrestrained passions will patriarchy be able to return to its comfort zone. The two weapons that women employ to invade and abuse the masculine world of mind and body must be annihilated. Nimmi is a fat lady locked within the house's four walls, while Lady Macbeth walks into a white-walled castle, her body open to the stark gaze of the Doctor and the Gentlewoman (Polanski shows her completely naked). Instead of becoming the symbol of fertility, Guddu and Sameera treat her as a pitiful object that they can use to

hurt her. Women's tools to control the story are the targets of their hateful and unpleasant feelings. They have nothing left to add to the story as a sterile, empty shell of a body and a broken mind that can't live with sanity.

Patriarchy closes ranks by marginalizing these terrible femme Fatales and driving them insane, which is sometimes framed as a "female malady." Elizabethan conceptions of insanity were overwhelmingly masculinized, so this change indicates a change in how we see mental illness in terms of gender. Any competent Shakespearean scholar will tell you that in both *King Lear* and *Hamlet*, lunacy is a privileged male's way of coping with an otherwise unmanageable situation. It's always portrayed in women as a disgusting disease, a way to turn them into objects for a hypercritical male gaze to look at.

Neither Nimmi's descent into madness nor Lady Macbeth's sleepwalking are portrayed as clinical conditions or higher levels of existence in which they attain heightened consciousness, but rather as moral states. Bhardwaj's definition of madness is still based on the Elizabethan model. Nimmi's insanity may inspire sympathy or revulsion. Nimmi breaks her pattern by having a son. This son is a boy, and Guddu and Sameera use him as a trophy to show that the mainstream has won. The woman is physically and mentally confined throughout the pregnancy and afterwards as she struggles to regain her sanity. When she returns to work after giving birth, the confident woman who could hold her own with innuendos among her male coworkers will be replaced by a miserable creature afflicted with obsessive-compulsive postpartum madness. Before she completely loses her mind, Nimmi makes one last desperate attempt to wash the blood stains off her bedroom wall. Vishal Bhardwaj uses two perspectives to build this scene. In the closet mirror, we can see Nimmi washing those "blood spots" while Maqbool watches from a distance.

Consequently, the insanity caused by being watched and sculpted by so many people can serve as a model for the inevitable outcome that awaits any Indian woman who steps outside of the social norms that have been established for her. This woman raises questions about the difference between men and women. The last time we see her, she is wrapped in her dupatta, a sign of modesty and honour for Indian women, but has been turned into a "kafn" (shroud).

Consequently, *Maqbool* can be interpreted as a book with multiple hierarchical layers: the "marginal" striving to occupy the "centre" is at first rewarded with the illusion of power, but in the end is contained and destroyed, and the "marginal" are relegated to their proper place in society as determined by the dominant, heterosexual, Hindu males. The tragic hero Maqbool gives us room to consider Nimmi from a gendered perspective and to have an inquisitive, more secular and sceptical approach to human desire. Perhaps the weight of communal violence's history haunts our everyday life, inspiring Bhardwaj to draw parallels between the twenty-first century's *Maqbool* and Nimmi's twisted views about legitimacy, blood, evil, and revenge mad, violent acts of the lost Macbeths of the sixteenth century. Shakespeare and his audience are curious about how far such a system can go to eliminate distinctions. This interest led to the horror film *Maqbool*, which exploded onto the screen.

In the end, *Maqbool* and his sidekick Nimmi are killed, and Guddu, the rightful son of a Hindu Brahmin, becomes the gang's land leader. Starting with a minority group with authority to pick which politicians live and die, the film eventually shows that group having that control taken away from them. When we look away from the heart of *Maqbool* and toward its periphery, we can see a much darker power structure behind the brutality, shady dealings, and awful violence that define this Islamic society. The film serves as a sobering reminder of the police force's increasing politicization and their often overt or covert engagement in communal violence as they pursue the partisan goals of the In the same way, women who are strong enough to stand up to a patriarchal society are called "witch" or "whore." Both Shakespeare and Bhardwaj agree that any kind of transgression must be punished, whether it is a violation of gender norms, as in *Macbeth*, or a violation of religious norms, as in *Maqbool*. This reminds Shakespeare's warning that rebellion is a risky political choice, especially for those on the outside.

Notes

1. Filmmakers and critics alike have looked to Kenneth Rothwell's (2004) *History of Shakespeare on Screen* for insight into how Shakespeare's works have been adapted for the big screen.

2. According to Berger (1972), women are conditioned to perceive themselves as both the surveyor and the surveyed continually. "She has to inspect... whatever she does since... how she appears to men is of critical importance for what is commonly thought of as the success of her existence" (46). Their internal surveyors are rendered useless when Lady Macbeth is sleepwalking or when Nimmi is insane. If the surveyor doesn't pay attention to the subject, the subject becomes just another thing for the surveyor to look at.

References

1. Aisha. 2010. Directed by GurinderChadha [Blu-ray Disc]. Delhi: PVR Home Entertainment.
2. Berger J (1972) *Ways of Seeing*. British Broadcasting Corporation: London.
3. *Bride and Prejudice*. 2004. Directed by GurinderChadha [DVD]. California: Miramax Home Entertainment.
4. Brode D (2000) *Shakespeare in the Movies: From the Silent Era to Shakespeare in Love*. Oxford University Press: New York.
5. Hutcheon L (2006) *A Theory of Adaptation*. Routledge: New York and London.
6. Kott J (1967) *Shakespeare Our Contemporary*. Methuen: London.
7. Leitch T (2002) *Crime Films*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
8. *Macbeth*. 1948. Directed by Orson Wells [Blu-ray]. Chicago: Olive Films.
9. *Macbeth*. 1971. Directed by Roman Polanski [DVD]. United Kingdom: The Criterion Collection.
10. *Macbeth*. 2015. Directed by Justin Kurzel [DVD]. Mumbai: Reliance Entertainment
11. *Maqbool*. 2004. Directed by Vishal Bhardwaj [DVD]. New Delhi: Eagle Home Entertainment.
12. Rothwell K (2004) *A History of Shakespeare on Screen: A Century of Film and Television*. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK.
13. Shakespeare W (2008) Ed. Kenneth Muir. *Macbeth: The Arden Shakespeare*. Cengage Learning: New Delhi, India.
14. *Slumdog Millionaire*. 2008. Directed by Danny Boyle [DVD]. Mumbai: Shemaroo.
15. Stam R (2000) *Beyond Fidelity: The Dialogics of Adaptation*, <http://www.webpages.uidaho.edu4Stam2>, accessed 14 August 2015.
16. *The Godfather*. 1972. Directed by Francis Ford Coppola [DVD]. United Kingdom: Best Value Entertainment.
17. *Throne of Blood*. 1957. Directed by Akira Kurosawa [DVD]. Akira Kurosawa— Vol.2. Mumbai: Enlighten Home Library.