

# From Madhavi to Modernity: Literary Memory and the Evolution of Bharatanatyam

Swarnika Singh

Assistant Professor

Department of English

Zakir Husain Delhi College

University of Delhi

Delhi, India

swarnikasingsh13@gmail.com

## Abstract

This research examines the literary, aesthetic, and performative genealogies that contribute to the evolution of Bharatanatyam from early classical traditions to its modern reconstruction as a codified Indian classical dance form. Rather than approaching Bharatanatyam solely as a performative practice, the study investigates the form as an embodied cultural archive shaped through literary memory, dramaturgical theory, Tamil poetics, and historical transformation. The research particularly focuses on the relationship between Bharata Muni's *Natyashastra*, the Tamil treatise *Tolkappiyam*, and the epic *Silappattikaram* in order to understand how textual traditions participate in shaping the conceptual and aesthetic foundations of dance.

The study adopts an interdisciplinary methodological framework combining literary analysis, performance studies, cultural historiography, aesthetic theory, and textual interpretation. Through close reading of primary texts alongside historical and theoretical scholarship on Bharatanatyam, the paper examines how concepts such as *rasa*, *bhava*, *abhinaya*, gesture, emotional representation, and performative narration move from textual codification into embodied artistic practice. Particular attention is given to the figure of Madhavi in *Silappattikaram*, whose presence as a trained dancer and performer provides insight into early

Tamil performance cultures and the literary imagination surrounding dance traditions that later transcend towards Sadir and Bharatanatyam. The paper does not attempt to establish a direct equivalence between ancient performance forms and contemporary Bharatanatyam. Rather, it traces the continuities, aesthetic echoes, and cultural inheritances that contribute to the broader genealogy of the dance form.

The research further explores the transformation of Bharatanatyam during the colonial and postcolonial periods, including the decline of Sadir under anti-nautch discourse and its subsequent revival and institutionalization in the twentieth century. In doing so, the study engages with questions of gender, cultural legitimacy, nationalism, embodiment, and the politics of “classical” identity. Ultimately, the paper argues that Bharatanatyam emerges through the convergence of literary traditions, aesthetic philosophies, and embodied practices, functioning not merely as dance but as a continuing site of cultural narration, preservation, and reinterpretation. Through its relationship with classical texts and performative memory, Bharatanatyam sustains a dialogue between body, literature, history, and identity across shifting historical contexts.

**Keywords:** Bharatanatyam, sadir, Natyashastra, Tolkappiyam, Silappattikaram, Madhavi, performance studies, classical Indian aesthetics, literary memory, abhinaya, rasa theory, Tamil poetics, embodiment, dance and literature, devadasi tradition, cultural historiography, Indian classical dance, performance aesthetics, body and text, cultural memory, gender and performance, Indian literary traditions

## **Introduction**

Bharatanatyam occupies a distinctive position within the cultural and artistic history of India, not merely as a classical dance form but as a layered aesthetic tradition shaped through literature, performance, ritual, memory, and historical transformation. Over centuries, the form has evolved through multiple cultural spaces including temples, courts, devotional practices,

literary traditions, and modern institutional frameworks. While Bharatanatyam is often discussed through the language of movement and choreography, its foundations extend far beyond physical performance alone. Embedded within its structure are systems of narration, emotional expression, symbolic representation, musicality, and dramaturgical discipline that emerge from a long continuum of literary and aesthetic traditions. The relationship between text and performance therefore becomes central to understanding the evolution of Bharatanatyam, particularly when examined through classical works such as *Natyashastra*, *Tolkappiyam*, and *Silappattikaram*.

This research examines the literary memory and aesthetic genealogies that contribute to the making and evolution of Bharatanatyam from early textual traditions to its reconstruction within modern cultural discourse. Rather than approaching Bharatanatyam solely as a codified dance practice, the study positions it as an embodied cultural archive in which literary imagination, performative traditions, emotional aesthetics, and historical continuities intersect. In doing so, the paper explores how dance emerges not simply through choreography or technical discipline, but through centuries of textual codification, poetic representation, dramaturgical theory, ritual practice, and cultural reinterpretation. The study particularly focuses on the ways in which literary texts preserve traces of performative cultures and aesthetic systems that later contribute to the conceptual and artistic foundations of Bharatanatyam.

One of the central concerns of this paper lies in understanding how classical literary traditions shape performative identity. Within Indian aesthetic discourse, performance has historically not been treated as separate from literature, philosophy, spirituality, or emotional experience. The body itself functions as a medium of narration and symbolic communication. Gesture, expression, rhythm, and movement become forms of language through which emotional and philosophical states are communicated to an audience. This interrelationship

between embodiment and textuality is particularly visible within Bharatanatyam, where performance is deeply rooted in narrative interpretation, emotional suggestion, and codified systems of expression. As Kapila Vatsyayan observes in her discussion of Indian classical arts, the traditions of dance, theatre, sculpture, and literature often exist within interconnected aesthetic frameworks rather than isolated artistic categories. The dancer therefore does not merely perform movement; the performer interprets, translates, and reanimates literary and emotional worlds through the body.

The theoretical foundations of Bharatanatyam are significantly shaped by the aesthetic principles outlined in the *Natyashastra*, traditionally attributed to Bharata Muni. Often regarded as one of the foundational texts of Indian dramaturgy and performance theory, the *Natyashastra* provides detailed discussions of rasa, bhava, abhinaya, gesture, movement, dramatic structure, music, and spectatorship. The text conceptualizes performance as a deeply affective experience in which emotional states are transformed into aesthetic experience through artistic mediation. The theory of rasa, in particular, remains central to Indian performance traditions and continues to influence the expressive dimensions of Bharatanatyam. According to Bharata Muni, “No meaning can blossom forth without rasa” (Bharata 119). This statement highlights the importance of emotional realization within performance traditions and establishes aesthetic experience as one of the defining aims of artistic expression. Within Bharatanatyam, rasa is not simply represented but embodied through facial expression, gesture, rhythm, and choreographic interpretation.

At the same time, the literary and cultural foundations of Bharatanatyam cannot be understood exclusively through Sanskrit dramaturgical traditions alone. Tamil literary culture and regional aesthetic systems also contribute significantly to the historical imagination surrounding dance and performance. The *Tolkappiyam*, though primarily recognized as a grammatical and poetic treatise, contains important insights into emotional classification,

symbolic landscapes, and the relationship between human experience and artistic representation. Its discussions of Akam and Puram traditions, emotional environments, and aesthetic organization reveal sophisticated approaches to representation and performative sensibility within early Tamil culture. These frameworks become especially important when examining the emotional and expressive dimensions of Bharatanatyam, where interior states, emotional suggestion, and symbolic communication occupy a central position within performance.

The inclusion of *Silappattikaram* within this study further expands the discussion of literary memory and performance traditions. The text occupies a crucial position within Tamil literary history and provides valuable insight into early cultural representations of dance and artistic performance. The character of Madhavi, a trained dancer and performer within the epic, becomes particularly significant in this regard. Her artistic training, performance repertoire, and cultural positioning reveal the complexity and sophistication of performance traditions within Tamil society. The Arangetru Kathai sections of the epic offer elaborate descriptions of performance spaces, musical systems, audience response, and artistic discipline, thereby preserving traces of aesthetic cultures that later resonate within traditions associated with Sadir and Bharatanatyam. The present study does not attempt to establish a simplistic or uninterrupted historical continuity between Madhavi's performances and modern Bharatanatyam. Instead, it explores how literary texts preserve aesthetic memories and performative structures that contribute to broader genealogies of dance traditions across time.

The paper also engages with the historical transformation of Bharatanatyam during the colonial and postcolonial periods. The transition from Sadir to Bharatanatyam was not merely a change in nomenclature but a deeply political and cultural reconstruction shaped by colonial morality, anti-nautch discourse, nationalism, gender politics, and institutional reform. During the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, hereditary performance traditions associated with

Devadasi communities faced severe social stigmatization under colonial frameworks that reinterpreted indigenous artistic practices through Victorian moral standards. The subsequent revival and institutionalization of Bharatanatyam by figures such as Rukmini Devi Arundale transformed the dance form into a symbol of national culture and classical legitimacy. However, this process also generated important debates concerning authenticity, caste, gender, erasure, and cultural ownership. Scholars such as Avanthi Meduri and Amrit Srinivasan have critically examined how the reconstruction of Bharatanatyam involved both preservation and selective reinvention.

Methodologically, this research adopts an interdisciplinary approach combining literary analysis, performance studies, aesthetic theory, and cultural historiography. The study relies upon close textual reading of primary literary works alongside critical scholarship on dance history and performance traditions. Rather than treating literature and dance as separate domains, the paper examines how textuality and embodiment continually intersect within Indian aesthetic traditions. The analysis therefore moves between literary representation, theoretical codification, historical transformation, and performative interpretation in order to understand Bharatanatyam as both artistic practice and cultural discourse.

The scope of this paper is therefore situated within the larger question of how cultural traditions survive, transform, and rearticulate themselves across historical periods. Bharatanatyam emerges within this framework not as a static or singular tradition but as a layered aesthetic formation shaped through literary imagination, dramaturgical theory, ritual practice, historical rupture, and cultural reconstruction. The relationship between Madhavi's literary performances, Bharata Muni's dramaturgical formulations, Tamil poetic aesthetics, and modern Bharatanatyam reveals the complex ways in which Indian performance traditions negotiate continuity and change. Through this exploration, the study argues that Bharatanatyam

functions as an embodied form of literary memory in which texts, histories, emotions, and cultural identities continue to find expression through performance.

### **Literary and Historical Genealogies of Dance Traditions**

The history of Bharatanatyam cannot be understood solely through its modern codified structure or through the institutional frameworks within which it is presently performed. Its evolution emerges from a much older continuum of literary memory, ritual practice, musical traditions, temple culture, and performative aesthetics that developed across centuries within the Indian subcontinent, particularly in South India. Long before Bharatanatyam acquired its contemporary nomenclature and stage grammar, literary and cultural texts preserved traces of highly sophisticated dance traditions that reveal the importance of performance within social, religious, and artistic life. These traditions existed not as isolated spectacles but as integrated cultural practices closely connected to poetry, music, storytelling, devotion, kingship, and aesthetic expression. In this context, literary works become crucial archives through which the historical imagination surrounding dance may be reconstructed.

One of the challenges in studying the genealogy of Bharatanatyam lies in avoiding simplistic narratives of direct origin. The tendency to retroactively identify every early dance reference as “Bharatanatyam” risks flattening historical complexity and overlooking the transformations through which performance traditions evolved over time. The dance form known today as Bharatanatyam emerged through multiple historical transitions, including the earlier practice of Sadir performed by hereditary dancers attached to temples and courts. However, while modern Bharatanatyam cannot be projected unchanged into ancient literary worlds, classical texts nevertheless preserve aesthetic systems, emotional structures, and performative cultures that contribute significantly to its broader genealogy. The present discussion therefore approaches these literary references not as evidence of direct equivalence but as sites of cultural continuity and aesthetic inheritance.

Within early Tamil culture, music, poetry, and dance occupied an important position within both ritual and courtly life. Sangam literature repeatedly reveals a society deeply attentive to emotional nuance, artistic refinement, and performative expression. The artistic body was not merely decorative but communicative, functioning within larger systems of social and symbolic meaning. Dance appears in these literary traditions not simply as entertainment but as a cultivated art associated with training, emotional articulation, ceremonial spaces, and aesthetic sophistication. The interrelationship between poetry and performance becomes especially significant in this regard. Tamil literary traditions frequently situate artistic expression within embodied experience, suggesting that emotion, landscape, music, and gesture were perceived as interconnected forms of communication.

The emotional and symbolic dimensions of performance within Tamil culture are closely linked to the aesthetic structures later articulated in texts such as *Tolkappiyam*. The classification of emotional states, environments, and human experiences within Tamil poetics reflects an aesthetic consciousness deeply attentive to representation and affect. Such frameworks become important when examining the later expressive dimensions of dance traditions, particularly those involving abhinaya and emotional narration. Although *Tolkappiyam* itself is not a dance manual in the technical sense, its understanding of emotion, symbolism, and aesthetic communication contributes to the larger cultural atmosphere within which performance traditions developed.

Among the literary texts that preserve performative memory, *Silappattikaram* occupies a uniquely important position. Often regarded as one of the great Tamil epics, the text offers invaluable insight into the artistic and cultural life of early Tamil society. More significantly for this study, it contains elaborate representations of dance, music, theatricality, and spectatorship that reveal the sophistication of performance traditions within the period. The character of Madhavi emerges at the centre of this aesthetic world. She is not presented merely

as a dancer in a superficial sense, but as a rigorously trained and culturally respected performer whose artistic identity reflects the complexity of classical performance traditions.

The Arangetru Kathai sections of *Silappattikaram* are especially significant because they provide detailed descriptions of Madhavi's debut performance, artistic preparation, musical accompaniment, stage environment, and repertoire. These passages reveal a highly codified performance culture in which dance was inseparable from literary interpretation, musical structure, and emotional communication. Madhavi's training itself demonstrates the interdisciplinary nature of artistic practice. She is skilled not only in movement but also in rhythm, music, expression, and performance conventions. Her art is intellectual, emotional, and physical simultaneously.

The descriptions of Madhavi's performance also suggest a sophisticated understanding of audience reception and aesthetic experience. Performance is presented as an act of transformation capable of emotionally affecting spectators. This concern with affective response resonates strongly with later rasa-based performance theories associated with the *Natyashastra*. While the text does not function as a dramaturgical manual in the same manner as the *Natyashastra*, its literary representation of dance reveals a performative culture deeply invested in emotional and artistic communication. The performer becomes a mediator between narrative, emotion, and audience experience.

Another important aspect of Madhavi's characterization lies in the relationship between femininity, artistic labour, and cultural prestige. As a dancer, she occupies a socially visible and culturally influential position within the narrative world of *Silappattikaram*. Her artistry grants her admiration and status, yet her position also reflects the complicated intersections between gender, performance, patronage, and social expectations. This complexity later becomes significant when examining hereditary dance communities associated with Sadir traditions. The

historical memory of female performers within South Indian cultural history cannot be detached from questions of respectability, artistic legitimacy, and institutional power.

The relationship between Madhavi's performance traditions and later Bharatanatyam requires careful scholarly nuance. It would be historically inaccurate to claim that Madhavi "performed Bharatanatyam" in the modern codified sense of the term. However, such a conclusion does not diminish the importance of *Silappattikaram* within the genealogy of South Indian dance traditions. Instead, the text preserves evidence of artistic structures, performance cultures, aesthetic sensibilities, and embodied practices that later resonate within Sadir and eventually Bharatanatyam. The significance of literary texts therefore lies not in proving direct continuity but in preserving cultural memory across historical transitions.

The evolution from earlier temple and court performance traditions into Sadir represents another important stage within this genealogy. Sadir, historically associated with Devadasi communities in South India, functioned as a highly developed artistic tradition combining dance, music, storytelling, and devotional expression. Performers attached to temples and royal courts maintained intricate systems of training and repertoire that contributed substantially to the foundations of modern Bharatanatyam. These traditions were transmitted orally and performatively across generations, often outside the textual frameworks privileged within colonial historiography.

The Devadasi system itself occupied a complicated position within South Indian society. Devadasis were not simply entertainers but ritual performers attached to temple institutions, where dance formed part of ceremonial and devotional practices. Their artistic labour contributed significantly to the preservation of performance traditions, musical compositions, and expressive techniques that later became central to Bharatanatyam. At the same time, the social perception of Devadasi communities shifted dramatically under colonial modernity,

especially through Victorian moral frameworks that reinterpreted indigenous performance cultures through the lens of sexual regulation and social reform.

The anti-nautch movement of the nineteenth century profoundly altered the historical trajectory of South Indian dance traditions. Colonial discourse increasingly stigmatized hereditary female performers, framing temple dance traditions as morally degenerate rather than aesthetically sophisticated. This process contributed to the social marginalization of Devadasi communities and threatened the continuity of Sadir traditions. However, the early twentieth century also witnessed the reconstruction and reinvention of these dance forms within nationalist cultural movements. The transition from Sadir to Bharatanatyam was therefore not simply artistic but ideological, involving questions of class, caste, gender, spirituality, and cultural legitimacy.

Scholars such as Amrit Srinivasan have argued that the “revival” of Bharatanatyam simultaneously involved processes of erasure and preservation. In *Reform and Revival: The Devadasi and Her Dance*, Srinivasan notes how upper-caste nationalist reformers restructured the dance form in ways that distanced it from hereditary performers while simultaneously appropriating its artistic legitimacy. Similarly, Avanthi Meduri examines how Bharatanatyam was reconstructed as a symbol of Indian classical identity through selective reinterpretation and institutionalization. These historical transformations reveal that Bharatanatyam is not a static inheritance but a continually negotiated cultural form shaped by changing social and political contexts.

Despite these transformations, literary memory continues to function as an important site of continuity within Bharatanatyam. Texts such as *Silappattikaram*, aesthetic systems embedded within *Tolkappiyam*, and dramaturgical frameworks articulated in the *Natyashastra* collectively contribute to the cultural imagination through which Bharatanatyam is understood and performed. Even within contemporary performance spaces, dancers continue to engage

with narrative traditions, devotional literature, symbolic expression, and emotional embodiment in ways that echo older aesthetic worlds. The dance therefore becomes a site where literary pasts remain active within present performance.

The genealogy of Bharatanatyam must therefore be approached not as a linear or uninterrupted history but as a layered process of transmission, reinterpretation, and reconstruction. Literary texts preserve emotional and performative vocabularies; temple and court traditions sustain embodied practices; aesthetic treatises codify artistic principles; and modern institutions reshape performance within new cultural frameworks. Bharatanatyam emerges through the convergence of all these forces. The movement from Madhavi's literary performances in *Silappattikaram* to the contemporary Bharatanatyam stage is neither simple continuity nor complete rupture. Instead, it represents a long historical negotiation between memory and reinvention, text and body, preservation and transformation.

In this sense, dance traditions survive not only through choreography or institutional teaching but also through literary imagination and cultural remembrance. The body of the performer carries traces of older artistic worlds, while literature preserves the emotional and symbolic structures through which performance acquires meaning. Bharatanatyam therefore exists not merely as a classical dance form but as a living aesthetic archive shaped by centuries of literary memory, historical transition, and embodied cultural practice.

### ***Natyashastra* and the Codification of Performance Aesthetics**

The evolution of Bharatanatyam as a classical dance tradition cannot be separated from the aesthetic and dramaturgical foundations articulated in *Natyashastra*. Often regarded as one of the most influential texts in the history of Indian performance traditions, the *Natyashastra* occupies a foundational position within discussions of theatre, dance, music, gesture, aesthetics, and emotional representation. More than a technical manual, the text constructs an entire philosophy of performance in which artistic expression becomes a medium capable of

communicating emotional, ethical, spiritual, and cultural experience. Its significance within Bharatanatyam lies not merely in codifying movement, but in shaping the very conceptual grammar through which performance acquires meaning.

The *Natyashastra* is traditionally attributed to Bharata Muni and is believed to have evolved between approximately 200 BCE and 200 CE, though scholarly debates regarding its chronology continue. Regardless of precise dating, the text demonstrates a remarkably sophisticated understanding of performative structures and aesthetic communication. It conceptualizes performance as a total art form integrating dance, drama, music, poetry, costume, gesture, and emotional enactment. This integrated approach becomes especially important when examining Bharatanatyam, where movement and expression remain inseparable from literary narration and musical interpretation.

One of the most influential concepts introduced within the *Natyashastra* is the theory of *rasa*. *Rasa* may be understood as aesthetic experience or emotional essence generated through artistic performance. Bharata Muni identifies *rasa* not as ordinary emotion, but as refined aesthetic realization experienced by the spectator through artistic mediation. The famous sutra, “*Vibhava-anubhava-vyabhichari-samyogad rasa-nispattih*,” explains that *rasa* emerges through the interaction of determinants, consequents, and transitory emotional states (Bharata 119). In simpler terms, performance transforms emotional situations into aesthetic experience through representation and artistic interpretation.

Within Bharatanatyam, the concept of *rasa* remains central to expressive performance, particularly in forms involving *abhinaya*. The dancer does not merely imitate emotional states but transforms them into stylized artistic expression capable of evoking emotional resonance within the audience. The spectator is therefore not positioned as a passive observer but as an active participant in aesthetic realization. This relationship between performer and audience becomes one of the defining features of Indian classical aesthetics. Emotional communication

in Bharatanatyam depends not only on technical precision but also on the performer's ability to embody and transmit rasa through gesture, rhythm, facial expression, and movement.

The *Natyashastra* identifies multiple rasas, including sringara (love), hasya (humour), karuna (pathos), raudra (anger), vira (heroism), bhayanaka (fear), bibhatsa (disgust), and adbhuta (wonder), with later traditions incorporating santa (tranquility). These emotional states continue to shape the expressive repertoire of Bharatanatyam, especially within narrative compositions such as padams and varnams. The dancer's body becomes a site through which these emotions are stylized and aesthetically communicated. In this regard, Bharatanatyam operates not merely through physical choreography but through emotional architecture.

Closely connected to rasa is the concept of bhava, which refers to emotional states expressed by the performer. Bharata Muni distinguishes between stable emotions, transitory feelings, and involuntary physical responses, creating an elaborate system through which emotional expression may be codified within performance. Bharatanatyam draws extensively from these frameworks, particularly within abhinaya-centered performances where subtle emotional shifts become central to narrative communication. The performer must therefore cultivate not only technical discipline but also emotional precision and interpretive sensitivity.

The theory of abhinaya occupies another crucial position within the *Natyashastra* and continues to profoundly shape Bharatanatyam. Bharata Muni identifies four forms of abhinaya: Angika (physical expression through the body), Vachika (speech and vocal expression), Aharya (costume and visual ornamentation), and Sattvika (inner emotional realization).

Among these, Angika and Sattvika abhinaya remain especially significant within Bharatanatyam. Through controlled bodily movement, facial expression, and gesture, the dancer communicates emotional states and narrative developments. Eyes, eyebrows, neck movement, hand gestures, posture, and rhythmic footwork collectively function as expressive

language. The body becomes semiotic, capable of producing layered meaning through codified movement systems.

Sattvika abhinaya introduces an especially important dimension to Bharatanatyam because it emphasizes inner emotional realization rather than external imitation alone. Bharata Muni associates Sattvika expression with involuntary emotional manifestations such as tears, trembling, silence, or stillness. Within Bharatanatyam, this dimension often distinguishes technically competent performance from deeply affecting artistic interpretation. Emotional authenticity, though stylized, becomes central to the dancer's communicative power. The performer must internalize emotional experience sufficiently for aesthetic transformation to occur.

Gesture systems described within the *Natyashastra* further contribute to the codification of performance aesthetics. Mudras, or hand gestures, function as symbolic units capable of communicating objects, actions, emotions, relationships, and narrative details. These gestures create a visual vocabulary through which Bharatanatyam narrates stories and conveys symbolic meaning. The codification of gesture transforms movement into language, allowing the performer to communicate complex emotional and narrative structures without spoken dialogue.

Similarly, the concept of karanas occupies an important position within discussions of classical Indian dance traditions. Karanas refer to coordinated movement units combining posture, gesture, and rhythmic action. Though scholarly debates continue regarding their exact reconstruction and continuity, they remain significant for understanding the historical relationship between movement vocabulary and textual codification. Scholars such as Padma Subrahmanyam have argued for the importance of karanas in reconstructing historical continuities between ancient movement traditions and contemporary Bharatanatyam practice.

Her work attempts to bridge textual description, sculptural representation, and embodied performance in order to reconsider the historical foundations of Indian classical dance.

The distinctions between *nritta*, *nriya*, and *natya* outlined in the *Natyashastra* also remain central to Bharatanatyam. *Nritta* refers to pure dance emphasizing rhythm, movement, and formal structure without explicit narrative content. *Nriya* combines movement with expressive interpretation and emotional communication. *Natya* involves dramatic enactment and theatrical representation. Bharatanatyam incorporates all three dimensions, creating a layered performance structure where rhythm, expression, and narrative coexist simultaneously. A traditional Bharatanatyam recital often moves between abstract rhythmic compositions and emotionally charged interpretive segments, demonstrating the continued relevance of these categories.

Importantly, the *Natyashastra* conceptualizes performance not merely as entertainment but as an ethically and spiritually significant activity. According to the text, performance possesses the capacity to educate, emotionally refine, and culturally unify audiences. Bharata Muni describes *natya* as a form capable of representing “the actions of the world” while simultaneously offering instruction and pleasure (Bharata 14). This philosophical understanding of performance becomes particularly significant within Bharatanatyam, where devotional compositions, mythological narratives, and spiritual symbolism frequently shape performance content.

The sacred dimensions of performance also emerge through the ritualistic framing of dance traditions. Bharatanatyam historically developed within temple contexts where dance functioned as offering, devotion, and ceremonial enactment. The influence of the *Natyashastra* therefore extends beyond technical codification into larger understandings of performance as sacred communication. The performer becomes both artist and mediator, translating narrative, emotion, and spirituality into embodied form.

At the same time, it is important to recognize that the relationship between the *Natyashastra* and Bharatanatyam is neither mechanically direct nor historically uncomplicated. Modern Bharatanatyam emerged through multiple historical processes including colonial disruption, revivalist reconstruction, institutional codification, and nationalist reinterpretation. Consequently, the contemporary dance form cannot be understood as a pure preservation of ancient practice. Rather, the *Natyashastra* functions as an influential aesthetic and theoretical framework repeatedly reinterpreted across changing historical periods.

The twentieth-century reconstruction of Bharatanatyam frequently invoked the authority of the *Natyashastra* in order to legitimize the dance form as “classical.” Revivalists and cultural reformers often turned toward Sanskritic textual traditions to establish historical continuity and aesthetic legitimacy. This process contributed significantly to the institutionalization of Bharatanatyam within modern India. However, scholars such as Avanthi Meduri have argued that such reconstructions also involved selective reinterpretation shaped by nationalism, caste politics, and cultural purification.

Nevertheless, the continued presence of *Natyashastra*-based concepts within Bharatanatyam remains undeniable. Contemporary performers continue to rely upon *rasa* theory, *abhinaya* systems, gesture vocabulary, and aesthetic principles rooted within the text. Even when adapted or reinterpreted, these frameworks continue to shape the language through which Bharatanatyam communicates meaning. The text therefore survives not as static doctrine but as a living aesthetic inheritance repeatedly embodied within performance.

The significance of the *Natyashastra* within Bharatanatyam ultimately lies in its ability to transform movement into meaningful aesthetic communication. Through its codification of emotion, gesture, spectatorship, and dramatic structure, the text provides a framework through which performance acquires interpretive depth. Bharatanatyam emerges within this context not merely as choreography but as embodied dramaturgy. Every movement, expression, rhythmic

sequence, and narrative gesture participates within a larger aesthetic system where body, emotion, literature, and performance remain deeply interconnected.

Thus, the *Natyashastra* does not simply “influence” Bharatanatyam in a superficial or historical sense. Rather, it shapes the very conditions through which Bharatanatyam becomes legible as an aesthetic form. Its theories of rasa, bhava, abhinaya, and performative representation continue to structure how dancers embody emotion, how audiences experience performance, and how artistic meaning is generated within classical Indian dance traditions. Through this enduring relationship, Bharatanatyam continues to sustain a dialogue between ancient dramaturgical theory and contemporary embodied practice.

### ***Tolkappiyam* and Tamil Aesthetic Sensibilities**

While the *Natyashastra* provides one of the most influential dramaturgical frameworks for understanding Indian performance traditions, the evolution and expressive dimensions of Bharatanatyam cannot be fully understood through Sanskritic aesthetics alone. Tamil literary traditions contribute significantly to the emotional, symbolic, and cultural foundations of South Indian performance practices. Among these traditions, *Tolkappiyam* occupies a particularly important position. Although primarily recognized as an early work on Tamil grammar and poetics, the *Tolkappiyam* extends far beyond linguistic classification. Embedded within the text is an elaborate aesthetic worldview concerned with emotional experience, symbolic representation, human relationships, landscape imagery, and modes of expression. These frameworks become especially relevant when examining Bharatanatyam as an embodied form of emotional and narrative communication.

The *Tolkappiyam* is traditionally divided into three major sections: Ezhuttatikaram (phonology and orthography), Sollatikaram (morphology and syntax), and Porulatikaram (meaning, poetics, and social life). Of these, the Porulatikaram becomes particularly significant

for discussions of performance and aesthetics because it addresses emotional representation, literary conventions, human experience, and symbolic structures. Unlike technical manuals that isolate performance from broader cultural life, the *Tolkappiyam* situates artistic expression within lived emotional worlds. This integrated understanding of emotion, environment, and representation resonates strongly with Bharatanatyam, where narrative and emotional embodiment remain central to performance practice.

One of the most distinctive contributions of the *Tolkappiyam* lies in its conceptualization of Akam and Puram traditions. Akam refers to interior emotional worlds associated with love, longing, separation, waiting, and intimate human experience. Puram, by contrast, concerns public life, heroism, war, ethics, kingship, and collective action. This division is not merely thematic but aesthetic and symbolic, organizing emotional experience into codified literary structures. The Akam-Puram framework reveals an advanced understanding of how human emotions may be represented artistically through suggestion, symbolism, and contextual association rather than direct declaration.

The expressive dimensions of Bharatanatyam often operate through similar modes of emotional suggestion. In abhinaya-centered performance, emotions are rarely presented through realism alone; instead, they are stylized, layered, and symbolically communicated through gesture, facial expression, rhythm, and bodily movement. The dancer evokes emotional states indirectly, allowing audiences to participate interpretively within the aesthetic experience. This process bears important parallels to Tamil poetics, where emotional intensity frequently emerges through landscape symbolism, metaphorical association, and suggestive imagery.

The Thinaï system articulated within the *Tolkappiyam* further strengthens this relationship between emotion and representation. Thinaï refers to the classification of landscapes associated with specific emotional situations and modes of human experience. Each

landscape becomes symbolically linked to particular emotional states: Kurinji signifies union, Mullai represents waiting, Marutham concerns domestic conflict, Neithal evokes longing and separation, and Palai symbolizes hardship and emotional desolation.

The emotional world is therefore inseparable from geography, environment, and atmosphere. Landscape itself becomes performative, functioning as an extension of human emotion.

This symbolic relationship between environment and emotional experience holds particular relevance for Bharatanatyam because the dance frequently depends upon atmosphere and suggestive emotional worlds rather than literal narration alone. Through abhinaya, the performer creates emotional landscapes using the body as expressive medium. A single glance, pause, or shift in rhythm may communicate longing, anticipation, grief, devotion, or joy without explicit verbal explanation. Much like the Thinaï tradition, Bharatanatyam relies upon symbolic compression and aesthetic suggestion to generate emotional resonance.

The relationship between Tamil poetics and Bharatanatyam becomes especially visible in compositions rooted in Bhakti traditions and Tamil devotional literature. Many Bharatanatyam performances draw upon Tamil poetic works that foreground emotional intimacy between devotee and deity. These compositions frequently blur the boundaries between spiritual devotion and human longing, echoing the emotional structures associated with Akam poetics. The dancer therefore navigates multiple layers of meaning simultaneously: personal emotion, devotional expression, symbolic representation, and aesthetic enactment.

Importantly, the *Tolkappiyam* reveals that emotional expression within Tamil literary traditions was never understood as chaotic or uncontrolled sentiment. Instead, emotions were organized within culturally recognizable aesthetic systems. This codification of feeling parallels the structured emotional frameworks visible within Bharatanatyam and within rasa-based performance traditions more broadly. Emotional expression becomes disciplined through

artistic convention while still retaining affective power. In this sense, both Tamil poetics and Bharatanatyam transform private feeling into aesthetic communication.

The emphasis on suggestion within Tamil literary traditions also contributes significantly to understanding Bharatanatyam as an interpretive rather than purely representational art form. Classical Indian aesthetics frequently privilege implication over direct statement, allowing meaning to emerge gradually through layered symbolic structures. Bharatanatyam similarly depends upon interpretive participation from the audience. The dancer offers emotional and narrative cues through movement and expression, while the spectator completes the aesthetic experience through recognition and emotional engagement.

This interplay between performer and spectator recalls larger Indian aesthetic theories concerning *rasa* and emotional realization. However, Tamil literary traditions provide additional regional and cultural textures to these frameworks. While the *Natyashastra* offers a pan-Indian dramaturgical system, the *Tolkappiyam* contributes specifically Tamil modes of emotional organization and symbolic representation. Bharatanatyam, particularly in its South Indian contexts, emerges through the interaction of these Sanskritic and Tamil traditions rather than through a singular aesthetic lineage.

The significance of Tamil literary traditions becomes even more evident when examining *Silappattikaram* and the figure of Madhavi. The emotional and performative worlds represented in the epic reveal clear continuities with the aesthetic consciousness embedded within the *Tolkappiyam*. Madhavi's performances are not described merely as technical displays but as emotionally charged artistic enactments situated within elaborate cultural and aesthetic systems. The epic demonstrates how literary imagination, emotional representation, music, dance, and spectatorship were deeply interconnected within Tamil cultural traditions.

The body within Bharatanatyam therefore functions not only according to the codified gestures of dramaturgical theory but also within culturally embedded emotional systems shaped

by Tamil aesthetics. Facial expression, bodily posture, movement patterns, and narrative interpretation become carriers of layered emotional memory. The performer does not simply execute choreography but inhabits symbolic and affective worlds shaped by literary traditions extending across centuries.

Another important aspect of Tamil aesthetic traditions lies in their relationship with temporality and memory. Emotional states within Sangam and post-Sangam literature are often structured through recollection, anticipation, waiting, separation, and longing. These temporal experiences become central to many Bharatanatyam compositions, particularly within padams and expressive abhinaya sequences. The slow unfolding of emotional experience within dance mirrors the poetic pacing found in Tamil literary traditions. Silence, pause, stillness, and restrained movement frequently become as meaningful as elaborate choreography.

The concept of embodiment also acquires additional complexity when examined through Tamil aesthetics. In Bharatanatyam, emotion is not external to the body but emerges through bodily discipline and expressive transformation. Similarly, Tamil poetics often locates emotional experience within sensory and environmental imagery. Human feeling becomes inseparable from landscape, sound, season, rhythm, and physical presence. Bharatanatyam inherits this sensory richness through its integration of music, gesture, rhythm, costume, and emotional interpretation.

At the same time, the incorporation of Tamil literary aesthetics within Bharatanatyam also reflects larger questions of regional identity and cultural continuity. The reconstruction of Bharatanatyam during the twentieth century frequently emphasized Sanskritic classical legitimacy through appeals to texts such as the *Natyashastra*. While these frameworks remain undeniably important, excessive emphasis on Sanskritic origins can sometimes overshadow the equally significant contributions of Tamil literary and performative traditions. Recognizing the

influence of texts such as the *Tolkappiyam* and *Silappattikaram* therefore allows for a more regionally grounded and culturally layered understanding of Bharatanatyam's evolution.

Scholars such as Kapila Vatsyayan have emphasized the interconnected nature of Indian artistic traditions, arguing that dance, literature, sculpture, music, and ritual often evolve through shared aesthetic principles. Bharatanatyam exemplifies this interconnectedness. Its movements carry traces of dramaturgical codification, literary symbolism, devotional expression, and regional cultural memory simultaneously. Tamil aesthetics contribute significantly to this layered artistic identity by shaping the emotional textures through which performance acquires meaning.

Furthermore, the continued relevance of Tamil literary traditions within Bharatanatyam is evident in contemporary performance repertoires. Many dancers continue to perform compositions rooted in Tamil devotional poetry and classical literary traditions, sustaining the relationship between textuality and embodiment. The performance of such works involves more than preservation alone; it also involves reinterpretation. Each enactment renews older literary and emotional worlds within contemporary cultural contexts.

The relationship between *Tolkappiyam* and Bharatanatyam therefore extends beyond direct textual influence. Rather, the text contributes to a broader Tamil aesthetic consciousness that informs emotional representation, symbolic communication, performative expression, and sensory imagination within dance traditions. Bharatanatyam becomes a space where these literary sensibilities are repeatedly embodied and reanimated through performance.

Ultimately, the significance of *Tolkappiyam* within the genealogy of Bharatanatyam lies in its articulation of a deeply nuanced emotional and symbolic aesthetic system. Its understanding of human experience, emotional landscapes, and representational structures provides important insight into the expressive foundations of South Indian performance traditions. When read alongside the *Natyashastra* and *Silappattikaram*, the *Tolkappiyam*

reveals that Bharatanatyam emerges through multiple intersecting aesthetic worlds rather than through a singular textual lineage.

Thus, Bharatanatyam may be understood not only as a codified dance form but also as a living site of literary embodiment where Tamil poetics, dramaturgical theory, emotional symbolism, and performative memory converge. The dancer's body becomes a medium through which older aesthetic worlds continue to move, transform, and acquire new cultural meanings across time.

### **Bharatanatyam as Embodied Literary Memory**

Bharatanatyam exists not only as a classical dance tradition but also as a deeply layered mode of cultural remembrance in which literature, performance, history, spirituality, and embodiment converge. The form carries within it traces of older aesthetic worlds preserved through gesture, rhythm, narration, music, and emotional expression. Every performance becomes more than choreographed movement; it becomes an act of transmission through which literary traditions and cultural memories continue to survive within the living body of the performer. In this sense, Bharatanatyam may be understood as an embodied literary archive where texts are not merely recited or represented, but physically inhabited, interpreted, and reanimated through performance.

The relationship between body and text occupies a central position within Bharatanatyam. Unlike literary traditions dependent solely upon written language, Bharatanatyam translates narrative and emotional structures into corporeal expression. The dancer's body functions simultaneously as medium, language, and interpretive site. Gesture, posture, facial expression, rhythmic movement, and stillness collectively generate meaning in ways that resemble literary narration while also extending beyond it. The performer does not simply illustrate a pre-existing text. Rather, the body transforms textual memory into sensory and emotional experience.

This embodied relationship with literature becomes particularly visible in Bharatanatyam's engagement with devotional poetry, mythological narratives, and classical compositions. Many traditional repertoires draw upon Bhakti literature, Tamil devotional poetry, Sanskrit stotras, and epic narratives, creating performances in which textual worlds acquire visual and emotional presence. The dancer therefore becomes an interpreter of literature, translating poetic imagery and emotional nuance into movement and expression. This process reveals the extent to which Bharatanatyam depends upon literary consciousness as much as technical discipline.

The concept of abhinaya plays a crucial role within this transformation of text into performance. Rooted in the aesthetic frameworks of the *Natyashastra*, abhinaya refers to the expressive dimensions of performance through which emotional and narrative meaning are communicated. Within Bharatanatyam, abhinaya allows the performer to embody multiple emotional states, characters, and narrative perspectives using subtle physical expression. The face, eyes, hands, torso, and rhythmically controlled body together create a visual language capable of carrying emotional and symbolic meaning.

Importantly, Bharatanatyam does not rely upon literal realism in its narrative approach. Meaning often emerges through suggestion, stylization, and symbolic compression. A single hand gesture may signify an entire landscape; a glance may communicate longing, devotion, anger, or separation. This aesthetic economy closely resembles literary forms dependent upon metaphor, implication, and layered symbolism. The dancer therefore performs not merely movement but interpretation. The audience is invited to participate imaginatively within the narrative world being constructed through the body.

The semiotic nature of Bharatanatyam further strengthens its relationship with literary expression. Gesture systems, rhythmic structures, and codified movements function as signs capable of generating complex meaning. Mudras become visual vocabulary, while bodily

transitions create narrative progression. The performer continuously negotiates between abstraction and representation, allowing Bharatanatyam to operate simultaneously as dance and language. In this regard, the form may be understood as a performative text where meaning is produced kinetically rather than verbally alone.

This embodied textuality becomes especially significant when examining the role of memory within Bharatanatyam. Literary memory within the form is not preserved statically through written documentation alone but through repeated bodily practice. Choreographies, gestures, emotional patterns, and expressive conventions are transmitted across generations through pedagogy and performance. The body itself becomes an archive carrying traces of historical traditions and aesthetic systems. As performance theorists have often argued, embodied practices preserve forms of cultural knowledge that cannot be fully captured through textual records alone.

The relationship between memory and embodiment is particularly important within South Indian dance traditions because many artistic lineages historically depended upon oral and performative transmission. Before institutional codification and modern archival practices, dance traditions survived through guru-shishya relationships, hereditary performance communities, and ritual enactment. Knowledge existed within disciplined bodily practice rather than exclusively within written manuals. Bharatanatyam therefore preserves forms of cultural continuity that are simultaneously textual and corporeal.

The figure of Madhavi in *Silappattikaram* provides an important early literary example of this relationship between body, artistry, and cultural memory. Madhavi's performances are described not as isolated entertainment but as cultivated artistic enactments requiring emotional sophistication, musical understanding, and aesthetic discipline. Through her body, literary and performative traditions acquire visible form. The epic preserves traces of a cultural world in

which dance functioned as a respected artistic practice deeply integrated with poetry, music, and ritual expression.

This continuity between literary memory and embodied performance remains visible within contemporary Bharatanatyam repertoires. Traditional compositions such as varnams, padams, and javalis depend heavily upon narrative interpretation and emotional embodiment. The varnam, often regarded as one of the most demanding components of a Bharatanatyam recital, combines rigorous rhythmic sequences with expressive storytelling. The dancer must simultaneously sustain technical precision and emotional depth, demonstrating the inseparability of movement and meaning within the form.

Padams, in particular, foreground the emotional and literary dimensions of Bharatanatyam. These compositions often explore themes of devotion, longing, separation, love, and spiritual surrender through nuanced expressive performance. The dancer's interpretation becomes central to the audience's experience of the composition. Facial expression, controlled pauses, bodily stillness, and subtle gestural variation acquire profound significance. In such performances, emotional intensity frequently emerges through restraint rather than excess.

The influence of Bhakti traditions further deepens Bharatanatyam's relationship with literary memory. Devotional poetry composed by Alvars, Nayanmars, Andal, Jayadeva, Annamacharya, and numerous other poet-saints continues to shape the thematic and emotional structure of Bharatanatyam performances. These poetic traditions blur distinctions between sacred and personal emotion, allowing spiritual longing to be expressed through intimate human imagery. Bharatanatyam inherits this emotional complexity through abhinaya, where devotion becomes embodied through gesture and expression.

The body within Bharatanatyam therefore functions simultaneously as artistic instrument, emotional medium, and cultural repository. The performer carries inherited

vocabularies of movement while also reinterpreting them within contemporary contexts. Every enactment becomes both preservation and recreation. This dynamic relationship between continuity and reinterpretation prevents Bharatanatyam from becoming static repetition. Instead, the form remains culturally alive precisely because each performance renews older traditions through present embodiment.

At the same time, embodiment within Bharatanatyam is never entirely free from questions of discipline and control. Classical dance requires years of rigorous training involving bodily conditioning, rhythmic precision, emotional regulation, and aesthetic refinement. The dancer's body is carefully shaped according to codified artistic expectations. This disciplined embodiment contributes to Bharatanatyam's classical identity while also revealing the complex relationship between artistic freedom and formal structure.

The idea of the "classical body" becomes particularly significant within discussions of Bharatanatyam because the form's twentieth-century reconstruction frequently emphasized purity, discipline, and aesthetic refinement. Revivalist discourses often presented Bharatanatyam as spiritually elevated and culturally respectable, distancing it from hereditary performance traditions associated with Devadasi communities. Consequently, the performing body became a site where questions of gender, caste, morality, and cultural legitimacy were negotiated.

Despite these transformations, the embodied nature of Bharatanatyam continues to preserve traces of older artistic worlds. The body remembers through repetition. Rhythmic patterns, gestural vocabularies, emotional conventions, and narrative structures carry historical memory even when contexts shift. Performance therefore becomes a form of cultural continuity capable of surviving historical rupture. Literary traditions remain active not only within written texts but within bodily enactment itself.

The relationship between Bharatanatyam and time also contributes to its function as embodied literary memory. Performance unfolds temporally, allowing emotions and narratives to emerge gradually through rhythm and movement. Unlike static textual reading, dance requires the audience to experience narrative progression through duration, repetition, anticipation, and pause. This temporal quality intensifies the emotional experience of performance and strengthens the connection between memory and embodiment.

Stillness occupies an equally important place within Bharatanatyam's expressive vocabulary. Moments of pause often carry emotional significance equal to elaborate movement. Silence, restraint, and suspended gesture create spaces where emotional meaning deepens beyond immediate narration. Such moments reveal the extent to which Bharatanatyam depends upon affective atmosphere rather than mere visual spectacle. The performance invites contemplation as much as observation.

The role of music and sahitya further reinforces Bharatanatyam's literary foundations. Dance compositions rely upon poetic texts that shape emotional tone, narrative direction, and expressive interpretation. Rhythm and melody function alongside gesture and movement to create multisensory aesthetic experience. The dancer responds not only to narrative content but also to linguistic texture, musical phrasing, and emotional cadence. Literature within Bharatanatyam is therefore not external accompaniment but integral structural presence.

This interdependence between literature, music, and embodiment demonstrates why Bharatanatyam cannot be reduced to choreography alone. The form emerges through collaboration between textual tradition, musical interpretation, rhythmic structure, and bodily expression. Each performance becomes an act of translation in which written and oral traditions acquire renewed life through movement.

Theoretical discussions of embodiment within performance studies help illuminate this relationship further. Scholars such as Richard Schechner argue that performance functions as

restored behaviour, meaning that enacted practices carry cultural memory across generations through repetition and recontextualization. Bharatanatyam exemplifies this process. Traditional gestures and choreographies survive not because they remain historically unchanged, but because they are continually re-performed and reinterpreted within new cultural circumstances.

Similarly, Kapila Vatsyayan emphasizes the interconnectedness of Indian artistic traditions, noting that dance frequently absorbs influences from literature, sculpture, ritual, and philosophy simultaneously. Bharatanatyam demonstrates this interconnectedness vividly. A single performance may contain traces of Tamil poetics, Sanskrit dramaturgy, Bhakti devotion, temple ritual, musical tradition, and modern theatrical staging all at once.

The embodied nature of Bharatanatyam also challenges simplistic distinctions between archive and repertoire. Conventional archives depend upon written documents, inscriptions, and material preservation. Bharatanatyam, however, preserves cultural memory through bodily enactment. The repertoire itself becomes archive. Gesture and movement carry historical traces unavailable through textual documentation alone. The performer's body becomes both site of preservation and medium of transformation.

Ultimately, Bharatanatyam survives because it continually negotiates between memory and reinvention. Literary traditions remain alive through bodily practice, while performance reinterprets inherited narratives within changing historical and cultural contexts. The dance form therefore functions neither as static preservation nor as unrestricted innovation. Instead, it occupies a dynamic space where textual memory, emotional experience, historical continuity, and embodied creativity intersect.

Bharatanatyam may thus be understood as a living aesthetic archive in which literature continues to move through the body. Its gestures carry traces of older poetic worlds; its rhythms preserve ceremonial memory; its expressions sustain emotional traditions articulated across centuries of literary and performative culture. Through this ongoing relationship between text

and embodiment, Bharatanatyam transforms literary memory into lived aesthetic experience, ensuring that cultural histories remain not only remembered, but continually performed.

### **Revival, Modernity, and Cultural Reconstruction**

The modern history of Bharatanatyam is inseparable from processes of revival, reconstruction, institutionalization, and cultural negotiation that unfolded during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. While the dance form today is widely celebrated as one of the major classical traditions of India, its transformation into a nationally recognized “classical” art was neither linear nor culturally neutral. The journey from Sadir, historically associated with hereditary Devadasi performers, to modern Bharatanatyam involved colonial intervention, nationalist reform, changing ideas of morality, caste and gender politics, institutional codification, and the selective reinterpretation of tradition. Consequently, the evolution of Bharatanatyam during this period reveals not only artistic continuity but also profound social and ideological restructuring.

Before its reconstruction within modern cultural discourse, Sadir occupied an important position within temple and court performance traditions in South India. Hereditary dancers, particularly Devadasi communities attached to temples, preserved intricate repertoires of dance, music, ritual performance, and expressive interpretation across generations. These performers were highly trained artists whose knowledge extended beyond dance technique into literature, rhythm, devotional traditions, and musical systems. Performance within temple contexts was deeply integrated with ceremonial and religious life, while court patronage allowed for artistic refinement and experimentation.

However, colonial modernity dramatically altered the perception of these traditions. British colonial administrators and Christian missionaries increasingly interpreted indigenous performance cultures through Victorian moral frameworks that viewed hereditary female

performers with suspicion and social anxiety. Temple dance traditions were gradually recast as morally corrupt rather than aesthetically sophisticated. This shift formed part of a broader colonial attempt to regulate and redefine Indian social practices according to European standards of respectability and sexual morality.

The anti-nautch movement of the late nineteenth century became one of the most significant moments in this transformation. Reformers, missionaries, and colonial officials criticized Devadasi traditions and public dance performances, arguing that they represented social degeneracy. As a result, hereditary performers increasingly faced social stigmatization, institutional marginalization, and legal restrictions. The artistic labour of Devadasi communities was overshadowed by colonial narratives that reduced complex performance traditions to questions of morality and sexuality.

This period created a profound rupture within the historical continuity of South Indian dance traditions. The decline of temple patronage, changing social structures, and colonial legislation threatened the survival of Sadir itself. Yet paradoxically, the same historical moment also generated conditions for the later reconstruction of the dance form within nationalist cultural discourse. As Indian intellectuals and reformers began responding to colonial critiques, classical arts increasingly became symbols of cultural heritage and national identity.

The reconstruction of Bharatanatyam during the early twentieth century must therefore be understood within the context of Indian nationalism and cultural revival. Nationalist thinkers sought to reclaim Indian artistic traditions by emphasizing their antiquity, spiritual value, and aesthetic sophistication. Dance, music, literature, and philosophy became important sites through which Indian identity could be articulated against colonial assumptions of cultural inferiority.

Within this process, Sadir underwent significant transformation and was gradually reintroduced under the name Bharatanatyam. The renaming itself carried symbolic importance.

By associating the dance form with Bharata Muni and the *Natyashastra*, revivalists attempted to establish classical legitimacy through connection with Sanskritic aesthetic traditions. This association helped reposition the dance as spiritually elevated and culturally respectable rather than socially stigmatized.

One of the most influential figures within this reconstruction was Rukmini Devi Arundale, whose role in institutionalizing Bharatanatyam profoundly shaped its modern identity. Through the establishment of Kalakshetra in 1936, Rukmini Devi introduced new approaches to choreography, pedagogy, costume design, stage presentation, and repertory structure. Her work contributed significantly to presenting Bharatanatyam as a refined classical art suitable for urban middle-class audiences and international cultural representation.

Rukmini Devi's reconstruction emphasized spiritual dignity, visual elegance, and aesthetic restraint. Temple sculptures, Sanskritic themes, and carefully stylized choreography became central to her vision of Bharatanatyam. In many ways, her approach helped preserve and popularize the dance form during a period of immense cultural transition. At the same time, scholars have noted that this reconstruction also involved selective purification and restructuring.

The concept of "purification" becomes especially important within discussions of Bharatanatyam's modern evolution. Elements associated with eroticism, sensuality, or hereditary performance traditions were often minimized or reformulated in order to align the dance form with upper-caste nationalist respectability. The reconstructed "classical" body was expected to embody discipline, spirituality, and moral refinement. Consequently, the transformation of Bharatanatyam was not merely aesthetic but ideological.

Scholars such as Amrit Srinivasan have critically examined this process in relation to Devadasi communities. In *Reform and Revival: The Devadasi and Her Dance*, Srinivasan argues that the revival of Bharatanatyam often erased the contributions of hereditary performers

while appropriating the artistic legitimacy of their traditions. The dance survived, but many of the communities responsible for sustaining it historically remained socially marginalized.

Similarly, Avanthi Meduri examines how Bharatanatyam's reconstruction was deeply shaped by nationalism, caste privilege, and modernity. Meduri argues that the modern "classical" identity of Bharatanatyam emerged through selective reinterpretation rather than simple preservation. The dance form was reorganized to fit new cultural narratives concerning spirituality, femininity, nationhood, and elite respectability.

These debates reveal the complicated relationship between revival and reinvention. Bharatanatyam did not emerge unchanged from antiquity into modernity. Rather, it was reconstructed through historical negotiation involving both continuity and rupture. The modern form preserves important aesthetic and performative traditions while also reflecting twentieth-century cultural politics.

The role of gender within this transformation remains especially significant. Historically, hereditary female performers occupied complex social positions within South Indian cultural life. Colonial reform movements increasingly framed these women as symbols of moral decline, while nationalist revival movements often reimagined dance through more "respectable" upper-caste femininity. As a result, the performing female body became a site of intense cultural regulation and symbolic reconstruction.

The reconstructed Bharatanatyam dancer was expected to embody ideals of modesty, discipline, spirituality, and cultural refinement. Costuming, gesture, choreography, and stage presentation were reorganized accordingly. Yet despite these transformations, traces of older expressive traditions remained embedded within the dance form. Emotional intensity, sensual nuance, and devotional intimacy continued to shape performance, even when reframed through modern classical aesthetics.

This tension between continuity and control becomes visible within Bharatanatyam's expressive vocabulary itself. Abhinaya performances often continue to explore themes of longing, desire, separation, devotion, and emotional vulnerability derived from Bhakti poetry and classical compositions. Such emotional textures cannot be entirely separated from the hereditary performance traditions through which they were historically cultivated. Consequently, the modern classical form still carries embodied traces of the very histories it sometimes attempts to sanitize.

The institutionalization of Bharatanatyam also transformed modes of transmission and pedagogy. Traditionally, dance knowledge circulated through hereditary communities and guru-shishya lineages rooted in lived artistic practice. Modern institutions such as Kalakshetra reorganized training within formalized educational structures. Codified syllabi, standardized choreography, and staged recitals contributed to Bharatanatyam's accessibility and global circulation, but they also altered relationships between performer, tradition, and community.

The globalization of Bharatanatyam during the twentieth and twenty-first centuries further expanded these transformations. Today, Bharatanatyam is practiced internationally across diasporic communities, universities, performance institutions, and intercultural artistic collaborations. The dance has acquired new meanings within global contexts while continuing to engage with questions of heritage, authenticity, and identity.

Contemporary performers frequently reinterpret Bharatanatyam to address modern themes including gender violence, migration, ecology, caste discrimination, sexuality, and political resistance. Such experiments demonstrate that Bharatanatyam remains a living and adaptive art form rather than a frozen classical relic. At the same time, these reinterpretations often provoke debates concerning tradition and innovation. Questions persist regarding how far the dance form may evolve while still retaining its classical identity.

These tensions reveal that Bharatanatyam's relationship with modernity remains ongoing rather than historically resolved. The dance continuously negotiates between preservation and experimentation, textual authority and embodied creativity, inherited repertoire and contemporary relevance. Modernity within Bharatanatyam therefore does not signify complete departure from tradition but rather an evolving dialogue with it.

The role of literature and textual memory remains important even within these modern transformations. Performers continue to draw upon classical poetry, devotional compositions, mythological narratives, and aesthetic theories while simultaneously reinterpreting them for contemporary audiences. The body remains a site through which older literary and cultural traditions acquire renewed visibility. Bharatanatyam therefore sustains continuity not through static imitation but through repeated acts of reinterpretation.

Importantly, the reconstruction of Bharatanatyam also contributed to broader discussions concerning Indian cultural identity after colonialism. Classical arts became symbols through which India articulated civilizational continuity and aesthetic sophistication on national and international stages. Bharatanatyam performances often came to represent "Indian culture" itself within diplomatic, educational, and global contexts. This symbolic role further intensified debates regarding authenticity, ownership, and representation.

Yet despite institutionalization and globalization, Bharatanatyam continues to retain its intimate relationship with embodiment and emotional expression. The form survives because it remains capable of carrying memory through movement. Every performance contains traces of older literary traditions, ritual histories, devotional worlds, and aesthetic systems, even when situated within modern theatres and international festivals.

The movement from Sadir to Bharatanatyam therefore cannot be understood simply as decline followed by revival. Rather, it represents a far more complicated process involving loss, preservation, reinvention, appropriation, resistance, and cultural negotiation. Modern

Bharatanatyam emerges through these layered historical transformations, carrying within it both the memory of hereditary traditions and the marks of nationalist reconstruction.

Ultimately, the history of Bharatanatyam's revival reveals that classical traditions are never entirely fixed or timeless. They are continually shaped by political power, cultural ideology, historical disruption, and artistic reinterpretation. Bharatanatyam survives not because it remains unchanged, but because it repeatedly negotiates continuity through transformation. Its modern identity therefore emerges through an ongoing dialogue between literary memory, embodied practice, institutional reconstruction, and cultural modernity.

### **Conclusion**

The evolution of Bharatanatyam reveals a history far more layered and complex than the idea of a singular or uninterrupted classical tradition. This research has attempted to examine Bharatanatyam not merely as a codified dance form but as a living aesthetic archive shaped through literary memory, dramaturgical theory, performative practice, ritual history, and cultural reconstruction. By placing texts such as *Natyashastra*, *Tolkappiyam*, and *Silappattikaram* in dialogue with the historical evolution of Bharatanatyam, the study has explored how literature and performance continuously intersect within South Indian aesthetic traditions. The relationship between text and body emerges throughout this discussion not as metaphor alone, but as an actual cultural process through which artistic knowledge is preserved, embodied, transmitted, and transformed across generations.

One of the central arguments of this paper has been that Bharatanatyam cannot be understood solely through modern institutional frameworks or contemporary stage practices. Its foundations extend into older literary and performative worlds where dance existed within ritual, poetry, music, emotional expression, and embodied storytelling. The literary references to dance found in *Silappattikaram*, particularly through the figure of Madhavi, reveal the sophistication of early Tamil performance cultures and demonstrate that dance occupied an

important aesthetic and cultural position long before the modern codification of Bharatanatyam. Madhavi's performances are not presented merely as artistic display; they represent a highly disciplined performative system integrating music, gesture, emotional interpretation, and spectatorship. Through these literary depictions, the text preserves traces of artistic traditions that later resonate within Sadir and eventually Bharatanatyam.

At the same time, this research has also emphasized the importance of avoiding reductive historical continuity. Bharatanatyam as it exists today cannot simply be projected backward into ancient literary texts without acknowledging the historical transformations, ruptures, and reconstructions through which the form evolved. The significance of texts such as *Silappatikaram* lies not in proving direct equivalence with modern Bharatanatyam, but in preserving aesthetic memory and performative sensibilities that contribute to broader genealogies of South Indian dance traditions. The concept of genealogy therefore becomes more useful than simplistic notions of origin because it allows for continuity alongside change, reinterpretation, and historical negotiation.

The study has further demonstrated the foundational role of the *Natyashastra* in shaping the theoretical and aesthetic grammar of Bharatanatyam. Concepts such as *rasa*, *bhava*, *abhinaya*, gesture systems, spectatorship, and performative communication continue to inform the expressive dimensions of the dance form. The *Natyashastra* does not simply provide technical instructions for performance; it constructs an entire philosophy of aesthetic experience in which emotional realization becomes central to artistic communication. Bharatanatyam inherits this emphasis on affective embodiment through its intricate relationship between movement and emotion. The performer does not merely execute choreography but transforms emotional states into aesthetic experience capable of affecting the audience.

However, the paper has also argued that Bharatanatyam cannot be fully understood through Sanskritic dramaturgical traditions alone. Tamil literary and aesthetic frameworks contribute equally significant dimensions to the dance form's expressive structure. The *Tolkappiyam*, particularly through its discussions of Akam and Puram traditions and the Thinaï system, reveals a highly developed understanding of emotional representation and symbolic communication. These frameworks illuminate how emotion, environment, memory, and bodily expression become interconnected within Tamil aesthetic traditions. Bharatanatyam continues to reflect these sensibilities through its emphasis on suggestive expression, symbolic gesture, emotional atmosphere, and interpretive performance.

The intersection between Tamil poetics and Bharatanatyam becomes especially visible within abhinaya-centered performance traditions. Much like classical Tamil poetry, Bharatanatyam frequently depends upon implication, emotional layering, and symbolic compression rather than direct realism. The dancer evokes emotional worlds through gesture, stillness, rhythm, and facial expression, allowing audiences to participate interpretively within the aesthetic experience. In this sense, Bharatanatyam functions as a form of embodied poetics where literary structures are translated into corporeal performance.

Another important aspect explored throughout this research concerns the relationship between embodiment and cultural memory. Bharatanatyam survives not only through written texts or institutional documentation but through repeated bodily practice. Gesture, rhythm, expressive conventions, and choreographic structures are carried across generations through the disciplined body of the performer. The body itself becomes archive, preserving traces of literary traditions, ritual histories, aesthetic systems, and emotional vocabularies. This embodied mode of preservation challenges conventional understandings of archive and memory that privilege written documentation alone.

The role of hereditary performers and Devadasi communities also occupies a crucial position within this historical trajectory. Before Bharatanatyam acquired modern classical legitimacy, Sadir traditions preserved highly sophisticated forms of artistic knowledge through hereditary transmission. The decline of these traditions under colonial morality and anti-nautch discourse reveals the extent to which cultural practices become vulnerable to political and ideological restructuring. Colonial modernity transformed the social perception of hereditary performers, recasting them through Victorian frameworks of morality that obscured the artistic and ritual significance of their work.

The twentieth-century reconstruction of Bharatanatyam therefore emerges as both revival and reinvention. Figures such as Rukmini Devi Arundale played a major role in institutionalizing and popularizing the dance form, helping secure its survival within modern India and global cultural spaces. Yet this process also involved selective purification and restructuring shaped by nationalism, caste politics, gendered respectability, and the search for classical legitimacy. Scholars such as Amrit Srinivasan and Avanthi Meduri have demonstrated how Bharatanatyam's reconstruction often depended upon distancing the dance from hereditary communities even while preserving many of their artistic traditions.

The modern history of Bharatanatyam therefore reveals the complex relationship between preservation and erasure. The dance survived, but not unchanged. Its transformation into a nationally celebrated "classical" form involved aesthetic refinement, institutional codification, and cultural repositioning, while also producing new exclusions and silences. Yet despite these historical shifts, Bharatanatyam continues to retain traces of older artistic worlds within its movements, emotional structures, and narrative traditions.

This continuing relationship between continuity and transformation remains one of Bharatanatyam's defining characteristics. The form persists because it is capable of adapting to changing cultural contexts while still carrying inherited aesthetic memory. Contemporary

Bharatanatyam performers continue to reinterpret classical repertoires, devotional poetry, and literary narratives while also engaging with modern themes and global performance spaces. Such reinterpretations do not necessarily weaken the tradition; rather, they demonstrate the dance form's capacity for renewal and survival.

The study has therefore attempted to position Bharatanatyam as a site where literature, history, performance, embodiment, and identity remain deeply interconnected. Texts such as *Natyashastra*, *Tolkappiyam*, and *Silappatikaram* are not simply historical documents external to the dance form. They continue to shape the emotional, symbolic, and aesthetic vocabularies through which Bharatanatyam acquires meaning. The dancer's body becomes a space where these literary and cultural traditions are repeatedly reactivated through performance.

Ultimately, Bharatanatyam emerges through this research not as a static classical relic but as an evolving cultural practice shaped through centuries of literary imagination, aesthetic codification, ritual enactment, historical rupture, and embodied memory. The movement from Madhavi's performances in *Silappatikaram* to the modern Bharatanatyam stage reflects neither complete continuity nor absolute discontinuity, but a long process of cultural negotiation through which artistic traditions survive by transforming themselves across time.

In this sense, Bharatanatyam remains a living dialogue between past and present. Its gestures carry echoes of literary worlds; its rhythms preserve ceremonial memory; its emotional structures sustain aesthetic traditions articulated across centuries of Tamil and Sanskrit thought. Through performance, literature becomes embodied, memory becomes movement, and history acquires living form. Bharatanatyam therefore continues to exist not only as dance, but as an enduring act of cultural remembrance through which older artistic worlds remain capable of speaking within the present.

**Conflict of Interest:** The corresponding author, on behalf of second author, confirms that there are no conflicts of interest to disclose.

**Copyright:** © 2026 by Swarnika Singh Tripathi retain the copyright of their original work while granting publication rights to the journal.

**License:** This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, allowing others to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon it, even for commercial purposes, with proper attribution. Author(s) are also permitted to post their work in institutional repositories, social media, or other platforms

### Works Cited

- Arundale, Rukmini Devi. *Vision of the Past*. Saffronart Books, 2007.
- Bharata Muni. *The Nāṭyaśāstra*. Translated by Manomohan Ghosh, Asiatic Society, 1951.
- Balasaraswati. "Bharata Natyam." *The Journal of the Music Academy*, Madras, vol. 34, 1963, pp. 1–12.
- Coomaraswamy, Ananda K. *The Dance of Śiva: Essays on Indian Art and Culture*. Noonday Press, 1957.
- Graham, Martha. *Blood Memory*. Doubleday, 1991.
- Foster, Susan Leigh. *Reading Dancing: Bodies and Subjects in Contemporary American Dance*. University of California Press, 1986.
- Ilango Adigal. *Silappattikaram*. Translated by R. Parthasarathy, Penguin Books, 2004.
- Kersenboom, Saskia C. *Nityasumangali: Devadasi Tradition in South India*. Motilal Banarsidass, 1987.
- Krishnan, Hari. "From Gynemimesis to Hyper-Masculinity: The Shifting Orientations of Male Performers of South Indian Court Dance." *Dance Research Journal*, vol. 41, no. 2, 2009, pp. 378–397.
- Meduri, Avanthi. "Bharatanatyam as a Global Dance: Some Issues in Research, Teaching, and Practice." *Dance Research Journal*, vol. 36, no. 2, 2004, pp. 11–29.
- Meduri, Avanthi. "Nation, Woman, Representation: The Sutured History of the Devadasi and Her Dance." *Representing the Body: Gender Issues in Indian Art*, edited by Kamala Visweswaran, Routledge, 2004, pp. 151–177.
- O'Shea, Janet. *At Home in the World: Bharata Natyam on the Global Stage*. Wesleyan UP, 2007.
- Rajam, V. S., translator. *Tolkāppiyam: The Ancient Grammar of Tamil Poetry*. International Institute of Tamil Studies, 1992.

- Schechner, Richard. *Performance Studies: An Introduction*. 3rd ed., Routledge, 2013.
- Srinivasan, Amrit. "Reform and Revival: The Devadasi and Her Dance." *Economic and Political Weekly*, vol. 20, no. 44, 1985, pp. 1869–1876.
- Subrahmanyam, Padma. *Bharata's Art: Then and Now*. Bharata Ilango Foundation, 2003.
- Subrahmanyam, Padma. *Karanas: Common Dance Codes of India and Indonesia*. Nrithyodaya, 1979.
- Venkataraman, Leela. *Indian Classical Dance: Tradition in Transition*. Lustre Press, 2002.
- Vatsyayan, Kapila. *Classical Indian Dance in Literature and the Arts*. Sangeet Natak Akademi, 1968.
- Vatsyayan, Kapila. *The Square and the Circle of the Indian Arts*. Roli Books, 1997.