



## RESURGENCE AND TRANSFORMATION IN INDIA'S KATHAK DANCE

ORCID  
Connecting Researchers  
and Researchers

<https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2917-0644>

DR. SANJEEV KUMAR MISHRA

Kendriya Vidyalaya Sangathan  
Ministry of Education, Govt. of India  
[sanjevmishrasrs@gmail.com](mailto:sanjevmishrasrs@gmail.com)

Received: 08.05.2025

Reviewed :10.05.2025

Accepted: 14.05.2025

### ABSTRACT

*While musical revivals in Euro-American contexts are often associated with folk traditions, the postcolonial Indian revival emphasized “classical” music and dance as invaluable components of national heritage. However, India’s revival was not simply a matter of cultural restoration following colonial rule. Questions surrounding authority, authenticity, and appropriation were deeply embedded in the act of reclaiming tradition. By juxtaposing this historical phase of Indian dance with contemporary revival theory, this article aims to propose a model of “revival” as a global dynamic, offering a more expansive view of cultural persistence and transformation.*

**KEY WORDS:** Kathak, Historical, Reclamation, Resurgence, Revival

### Introduction

There is now little debate over the assertion that India experienced a cultural revival during the years surrounding its independence from British colonial rule in 1947. Discussions on Indian music and dance often explicitly reference a twentieth-century “renaissance” or “reclamation” of cultural traditions following centuries of foreign domination. Moreover, an expanding body of academic work—including studies on South Indian music (Subramaniam 2006; Allen 2008; Weidman 2006), North Indian music (Bakhle 2005; Kippen 2006; Qureshi 1997), and various classical dance forms (Chakravorty 2008; Lopez y Royo 2007; Meduri 2005 and 2008; O’Shea 2006 and 2007; Soneji 2004 and 2008; and Walker 2004)—has begun to provide significant critical engagement with the revival’s role in shaping reinterpreted histories and identities within the performing arts. However, within musicological discourse, revivals in the performing arts have been primarily studied in relation to Euro-American folk traditions, and existing revival theories, such as those proposed by Livingston (1999), Ronström (1996), and to a certain extent

Rosenberg (1993), focus almost entirely on folk contexts.

I am interested in exploring the possibility of bridging these bodies of scholarship, locating points of convergence and divergence, and initiating a movement toward conceptualizing “revival” as a phenomenon with global relevance. All of India’s so-called “classical” performing arts experienced some form of revival or transformation during the twentieth century. Over two centuries marked by socio-political upheaval, music and dance had already responded to numerous changes in patronage, as the feudal systems of the Mughal Imperial court in North India and various regional royal courts in South India were gradually displaced and absorbed by the expanding British colonial regime. In the nineteenth century, performance venues diversified even further. Private gatherings hosted by elite Indians and “Indianized” Britons regularly featured professional musicians and dancers, while the formal, state-sponsored “Darbars”—which bolstered princely authority and later British imperial dominance—showcased elaborate displays, including musical and dance

presentations alongside parades of elephants, troops, and marching bands. At the same time, smaller private salons led by hereditary female performers—now labeled courtesans—offered more intimate forms of expression such as poetic recitations and songs embellished with expressive movements and dance. However, the close ties between the performing arts and imperial structures (both Mughal and British), the perceived decadence of the courts, and particularly their association with courtesans and the sex trade, rendered these art forms problematic within the emerging Independence movement. A defining element of nationalist ideology at the time was the deliberate reclamation of a uniquely Indian cultural identity as a wellspring of national dignity; music, dance, architecture, and literature were to be embraced as treasured legacies of a civilization worthy of equality, independence, and self-rule. Thus, the revival of Indian music and dance entailed more than a shift in patronage—from royal courts and courtesans to urban institutions and middle-class practitioners—it also required a redefinition and upward social reclassification of these traditions, separating them from their morally suspect pasts and recasting them as vital expressions of both India’s timeless heritage and its modern nationhood. The narrative of revival and reclamation in Indian music and dance encompasses all the forms now recognized as “classical.” In fact, it can be argued that the very process of urbanization and institutionalization was instrumental in shaping the current canon of Indian classical music and dance. Hindustani Sangit, the classical tradition of North India; Karnataka Sangeeta, the classical music of South India; and the six or so classical dance forms—manipuri, kathakali, bharatanatyam, kathak, kuchipudi, and odissi—were each, to varying degrees, reinvented during the decades surrounding Independence in 1947. Any one of these traditions could serve as a valuable case study for analyzing the dynamics of revival, and significant research is underway, particularly in the areas of bharatanatyam (Meduri 2008; O’Shea

2007) and odissi (Lopez y Royo 2007). Kathak, the classical dance form of North India and my specific area of expertise, not only serves as a compelling and representative instance of how the performing arts—especially dance—were transformed by the revival, but also presents distinctive non-Western insights into broader discussions around authenticity, hybridity, and cultural transformation.

### **Positioning Kathak Dance within the Indian Cultural Revival**

Kathak today is a highly skilled stage art performed by professionally trained dancers as a formal production for an audience. Its signature dance vocabulary features intricate rhythmic footwork—often improvised and accentuated by ankle bells known as *ghunguru*—alongside dazzling sequences of spins called *chakkars*.



**Figure 1:** Pandit Birju Maharaj, hereditary Kathak dancer and current authority of kathak dance (specifically the style from the city of Lucknow). source - The Times of India Group © BCCL. Used with permission.

This dynamic and vigorous aspect is balanced by graceful, sensual movements, predominantly expressed in the arms, hands, and upper torso, and commonly used in expressive or narrative segments. The gestures and facial expressions of Kathak dancers are typically subtle, offering a contrast to the more dramatic and overt theatricality seen in other Indian classical dances. In what is regarded as its most traditional presentation, this distinctive blend of vigorous and graceful movement is realized through a solo format composed of several brief pieces performed in a tempo that gradually increases. These individual items or “numbers” range from expressive or narrative sections that depict poetry or retell stories from Hindu mythology, to intricate, composed rhythmic passages that are closely tied to the traditions of North Indian percussion. The Kathak repertoire thus appears to reflect multiple dualities—rhythmic versus narrative, vigorous versus graceful, devotional versus secular, and improvised versus structured—which all point to its layered and syncretic evolution.

Kathak’s origins are complex and multifaceted. The most commonly circulated narrative is that kathak began in Hindu temples, where priestly storytellers known as *Kathaks* performed devotional music and dance. With the establishment of Muslim rule in North India, these performers are said to have transitioned into court entertainers, adapting the aesthetics of kathak from devotional expression to virtuosic display to appeal to their non-Hindu patrons (see, among others, Devi 1972, Banerji 1982, Khokar 1984, Natavar 2000, and Sinha 2000). I have explored this widely accepted theory of kathak’s supposed temple roots in depth (Walker 2004 and 2009/2010), and have discovered little concrete documentation to substantiate it. In fact, prior to the 1920s or 1930s, neither indigenous texts nor colonial travel records mention a dance form named kathak. While the 1800s census reports do reference performers called *Kathaks*,<sup>1</sup> no such references are found in sources from the 1700s. When we shift our focus from the name “kathak” to

its possible constituent elements, we do encounter evidence of various loosely connected performance traditions across North India—from Benares to Rajasthan—that form the historical basis of the modern dance. These include the artistic practices of hereditary female performers now identified as courtesans or *tavayafs*, the rhythmic dances of hereditary male performers known variously as *Kathaks*, *Bhands*, or *Bhagatiya*, and a diverse set of devotional and popular rural theatrical forms such as *Ras Lila*, *Ram Lila*, and *Nautanki* (Walker 2004). The transformations in patronage, setting, performance space, and cultural context that integrated these traditions into what is now called kathak are the very processes that define its revival, and warrant close and careful examination.

In the closing decades of the 1800s, not long after the formal establishment of British Imperial rule in 1858, new political and cultural currents had already begun to emerge. Over a century of European dominance had seemingly drained India of its legendary prosperity, cultural confidence, and political sovereignty. Yet, a combination of increased access to education and employment, along with enduring indigenous intellectual traditions, helped to empower a rising and increasingly influential middle class. Alongside the growing Independence movement came a gradual reassertion of Indian identity and cultural pride, a process that had its roots in the Bengali literary renaissance of the 1800s and culminated in the founding of national institutions after 1947. Central to this cultural reclamation was the creation of national, “classical” music and dance forms. At the heart of the revival was a perceived need to connect modern cultural expression to a native past—one imagined, in Janet O’Shea’s words, as “pure, distinctive, and unaltered by colonial hybridity” (2008:169). This endeavor took many forms, including artistic reconstructions based on rediscovered Sanskrit treatises and interpretive frameworks that linked current performance practices to elite Hindu devotional traditions. However, in North India, the historical ties of music

and dance to the perceived decadence of Muslim royal courts and the sensual realm of the courtesans conflicted with this idealized vision of cultural authenticity. These associations also clashed with the Victorian moral codes of both the British rulers and the British-educated Indian middle class, resulting—by the late 1800s—in a broad social disdain for the performing arts. The most visible and widely recognized expression of this attitude was the “anti-Nautch” movement, which aimed to eliminate performances by hereditary women, both in temples (where girls were still ritually “married” to deities) and in the salons of courtesans. Public dance, particularly when performed by women from hereditary lineages, came to represent the very societal decay that many believed had enabled colonial subjugation (see Forbes 1996, Rao 1996, and Sundar 1995 among others). Thus, the cultural revival of Indian music could only proceed by purging or sidelining those elements deemed “impure” in the modern context, while simultaneously anchoring the arts in a reimagined and elevated ancient past.

In the case of the dance form that evolved into kathak, it was the hereditary male performers—known as *Kathaks*—who played a central role in its cultural revival. Within both the royal courts and the *kothas* (courtesans’ salons), these Kathaks served as the instructors and musical accompanists of the courtesans and, by virtue of this association, might have been expected to face the same degree of societal disapproval and marginalization as the women themselves. However, unlike many other professional musicians in North India, the Kathaks were (and continue to be) Hindus. Throughout the 1800s, they underwent what is referred to as a caste shift—a process in which a lower-status group attains some form of socioeconomic advancement (often financial), adopts a new group identity through a different name, engages in behaviours that reflect and reinforce their elevated status, and constructs a revised history that distances them from their earlier identity (Pandian 1995). While the exact name used by the Kathaks prior to 1800

remains uncertain, evidence of this transformation can be seen in British census records. For instance, the 1832 *Census of Population of the City of Benares* lists 118 individuals identified as Kathaks, described as “Music and Dancing Masters,” under the Shudra category—the lowest tier of the caste hierarchy, traditionally associated with servitude (Princeps 1832:495).

By 1885, however, in the *Tribes and Castes* volume interpreting the 1881 census of the Northwest Provinces and Oudh (the region that now forms the modern Indian state of Uttar Pradesh), the Kathaks were classified as Brahmins—the highest-ranking priestly caste—and described as descendants of ancient temple performers who had, by unfortunate circumstance, become relegated to accompanying dancing girls (Nesfield 1885:44–45). Later census reports (Risley 1981 [1891]; Crooke 1896) and early scholars such as Coomaraswamy (1913:124) likewise identified the Kathaks as Brahmins, though the census accounts made a point of noting that their social standing was considered “very low” within that designation (Risley 1981 [1891]:433).

This newly crafted identity, with its ties to Hindu devotion and ritual practice, enabled the Kathaks—roughly fifty years later—to effectively align themselves with the broader cultural revival. It was not mere coincidence that the very decades in which hereditary female performers were being socially marginalized also witnessed the rising momentum of the music and dance revival. In fact, one could argue that the resurgence of dance, in particular, was significantly facilitated by the exclusion of these women. As the hereditary female performers were gradually pushed to the fringes and ultimately barred from the stage through legal and social means, their former accompanists, the Kathaks, assumed the role of authoritative bearers of both male and female repertoire. As Hindu men whose formal identity was now associated not with the courtesans scorned by middle-class society, but with the sacred temple dance now held in esteem, the Kathaks gained the freedom to perform virtually any genre without reproach. In the early decades of

the twentieth century, they began moving into urban areas, where the emerging nationalist middle class—eager to construct an identity for an Independent India—offered new opportunities for patronage. Disassociating the dance from its historical links to both royal courts and courtesans while rooting it in devotional tradition helped reframe it as a legitimate cultural asset. Moreover, detaching dance from its association with sexuality helped make it an acceptable pursuit for “respectable” girls and women. This development, in turn, allowed women from middle- and upper-class backgrounds to study dance in newly established music institutions and later to perform publicly. Thus, as kathak was reimagined and elevated, it underwent a process of gentrification, and in doing so, non-hereditary women came to be its leading proponents, performers, and choreographers.

It was these educated, middle-class women who played a leading role in the classicization, gentrification, and partial Sanskritization of kathak. Beginning with the establishment of the earliest kathak institutions in the 1930s and 1940s, young women from socially respectable backgrounds began training under hereditary male Kathak instructors. The repertoire they were taught consisted of rhythmic footwork, devotional storytelling, and the dance songs traditionally performed by courtesans—though now stripped of their more inappropriate or suggestive gestures and movements. As these women progressed into accomplished dancers, choreographers, and educators in their own right, they advanced the transformation further by crafting original choreographies, designing structured curricula and standardized exams, and engaging in the search for the supposedly ancient roots of the dance they had been taught and were now disseminating (Joshi 1989; Khokar 2004; Walker 2010). While kathak, unlike Bharatanatyam or Odissi, was not reconstructed directly from ancient Sanskrit treatises, the revival had led to its reimagining as a sacred temple tradition, thought to have emerged

from the narrative practices of a group called the Kathakas. This origin story, in turn, required scholarly and cultural validation.

By the mid-twentieth century, the dance form practiced by the Kathaks—originally a hybrid amalgamation of several older performance traditions—had gained a formal name, a constructed history, a structured curriculum with examinations and certifications, and a socially acceptable identity as a classical art grounded in Hindu devotional roots. The hereditary male dancers, by linking their adopted caste designation with both the dance itself and the ancient storytellers, retained their status as authoritative figures during the processes of urbanization and institutional development, as well as the dance’s absorption into middle-class culture. As a result, this newly standardized performance tradition, despite its composite origins, could now be promoted as a unified and authentically Indian cultural heritage with deep historical foundations.

### **Kathak, India, and the Conceptual Frameworks of Revival**

Establishing a connection to an Indian past that predates not only colonial rule but also the Mughal era was essential to the nation-building process in which the revival of Indian music and dance took place. Nationalism, of course, was a defining element of the Euro-American folk revivals during the early twentieth century, and it is in this context that we must now consider the relevance of revival theories to the Indian case. As Neil Rosenberg observes, “the idea of national cultural rebirth...was at the very roots of folklore studies in their late-eighteenth-century nascence” (1993:17), when European nationalists began to view a people’s “ancient heritage [as a foundation] upon which a modern nation could grow” (1993:11; see also Ronström 1996:7). Tamara Livingstone also highlights the early revivalists’ preoccupation with identifying a nation’s “‘national essence’ or ‘purity’” and its “true music” (1999:75). In the Indian nationalist movement, the effort to locate and restore India’s “true” music and dance was, unsurprisingly, of central importance and had a

relatively direct link to European intellectual traditions, as many of the first “discoveries” of Sanskrit texts on ancient music were made by British Orientalists such as Sir William Jones (1882 [1784]). Moreover, it was the emerging Indian middle class, simultaneously active in the struggle for Independence, that played a pivotal role in the cultural revival.

Still, the Indian middle class's role in the revival deserves close attention. Whether educated under British influence or not, it was the Indian bourgeoisie who established urban institutions for music and dance, systematized the orally transmitted repertoire by recording, collecting, and transcribing it, and then organized this material into structured curricula for instruction. After reclaiming the performing arts as a form of national heritage and the shared property of all Indians, the middle class became their primary audience—supporting concerts and festivals, enrolling their children in classes, and patronizing public performances. This process was more than a simple redirection of patronage after the decline of traditional feudal sponsorship; it was an intentional disruption of the longstanding artist-aristocrat relationship, devaluing its historical context and continuity in order to “reclaim” both the performers and their art as national assets. These reformers can be aptly described as the “mediators, agents, and entrepreneurs” discussed by Ronström, whose list of “researchers and intellectuals; museums and universities; schools, seminars and workshops; festivals, competitions and the media ... [that] produce traditions by identifying them” finds a direct counterpart in the Indian case (Ronström 1996:10). Livingstone likewise frames musical revivals as “middle class phenomena” that involve, among other processes, the commodification of both culture and national identity (1999:66; see also Rosenberg 1993:5). A key aspect of this commodification is what Rosenberg terms the movement of musical traditions “from the margins to the centre” (1993:5)—a pattern clearly visible in India. Similar to the urban and suburban middle-

class collectors of Euro-American folk music, Indian revivalists such as musicologist Vishnu Narayan Bhatkhande (see Bakhle 2005) and bharatanatyam pioneer Rukmini Devi (see Allen 1997) appropriated music and dance traditions from hereditary practitioners. Significantly, part of both Bhatkhande and Devi’s agendas was to render these traditional artists unnecessary as the newly trained graduates of modern institutions rose to become expert performers and instructors themselves. If music and dance were to become part of the shared cultural legacy of all Indians, they needed to be viewed not as the exclusive domain of isolated hereditary communities, but as public heritage—akin to treatises, sculptures, and architectural monuments. However, as previously discussed, kathak was not reconstructed from ancient treatises or temple sculptures. Instead, one of kathak’s distinguishing characteristics is that the hereditary male performers—the Kathaks—retained their position as authoritative figures in the tradition, thanks to the alignment of their adopted caste name with the dance form and with the ancient narrative storytellers. This stands in contrast to other classical dances like Bharatanatyam, where hereditary artists were largely replaced. When cultural reformer Nirmala Joshi began establishing music and dance institutions in Delhi in the mid-1930s, she depended on the hereditary experts themselves to serve as instructors. Thus, the Kathaks—recognized as the authentic bearers of the tradition—were, in a sense, “collected” much like ancient songs, dances, or manuscripts, and relocated from regional hubs like Lucknow and Jaipur to the newly emerging cultural epicentre of the nation: **Delhi**.

This notion of *embodied* rather than *textual* authority—though well recognized within North Indian musical traditions (Neuman 1977)—adds a compelling dimension to the discourse around tradition and historical continuity in revived art forms, especially outside the Western context. In kathak, what qualifies as “authentic” is ultimately determined by the senior members of hereditary families, and their definitions often appear to shift

to ensure that control and influence remain within the lineage. Theoretically, this destabilizes any fixed understanding of “authentic” performance practice. If the authority of an ancient tradition resides in a living individual rather than a written text or treatise, then that individual’s claims to authenticity must be accepted unquestioningly. In this light, the revival becomes more about affirming a right to innovate than about recovering lost choreographies or reclaiming a colonially suppressed cultural heritage. The situation is made even more complex in kathak because the reimagined history reinforces the embodied authority, even as that authority was initially justified by the assumed authenticity embedded in that revised history. This circular logic complicates the otherwise straightforward narrative of marginalized traditions being codified and elevated by the middle class.

### Conclusions

There are many other fascinating and insightful comparisons that could be explored, but I will now turn to one final characteristic identified by Livingstone and consider how it might be extended into postcolonial—and even post-revival—contexts. According to Livingstone’s framework, the goals of a revival are twofold: first, to act as a form of cultural resistance and offer an alternative to dominant or mainstream culture; and second, to elevate or improve existing culture by reasserting historical values and a sense of authenticity as articulated by the revivalists (1999:68). The second goal aligns particularly well with the Indian cultural revival—especially if we interpret “existing culture” as the culture imposed by colonial rule. From this perspective, independence and self-governance represent not just political liberation but a cultural advancement. The revival thus aimed to construct a new national identity rooted in a perceived set of historical values and an imagined, ancient Indian authenticity.

The first characteristic—“cultural opposition”—merits closer scrutiny. At first glance, it is tempting to interpret this in much the same way as the second

goal: as a response to colonial rule. In this reading, the Indian cultural revival acted as a form of resistance to the British Raj, providing a means to reclaim national pride while pursuing political and territorial independence. However, the simple binary of mainstream versus authentic as colonial versus indigenous quickly becomes inadequate in the Indian context. This is because the revival itself rapidly assumed the status of the mainstream, a status it actively sought from the outset. Classical kathak, particularly as shaped and propagated by the hereditary families and their close disciples, has now become hegemonic—occupying a position of seemingly unquestionable authenticity and authority.

Yet, the dynamics at play are far more complex than a straightforward exchange of marginal and mainstream positions. The revival, once a marginalized counter current during colonial rule, ultimately emerged as the dominant cultural force. Ironically, the middle-class women who were instrumental in reviving and legitimizing kathak have, in some respects, found themselves pushed to the periphery as hereditary male performers reclaimed central authority. In today’s post-revival landscape, those who seek to evolve kathak beyond what these established authorities deem “authentic” are now positioned at the margins.

These shifts in authority and cultural power, however, are not new. They reflect a longer history within North Indian dance traditions—one characterized by continual transformations in identity, social status, and ownership. The complex interplay between male and female performance practices, rhythmic and narrative forms, and sacred versus secular expressions suggests that change, rather than stability, has been the most enduring feature of kathak’s development.

One possible way forward lies in moving beyond the framework of cultural opposition, and it is here that postcolonial theory offers valuable insight. While the paradigm of resistance—structured around binaries such as colonizer versus colonized—remains central to much postcolonial

criticism, scholars like Jefferess (2008), Roy (2007), and Gandhi (1998) emphasize the inescapable hybridity born from both enforced and ongoing cultural encounters. To embrace hybridity as an essential consequence of cultural exchange is to move beyond the simplistic celebration of diversity or multiculturalism, which often reinforce notions of exoticism and otherness. It also challenges entrenched ideas of cultural purity or authenticity, and with them, the hierarchical claims of cultural superiority.

While it remains uncertain whether embracing an “ethics of hybridity” can truly foster the kind of global human understanding that thinkers such as Bhabha (1994) and Gandhi (1998) cautiously envision, the concept itself offers a compelling alternative to the “totalizing binaries” that reduce cultural dynamics to pure opposition and difference. A postcolonial theory of revival, therefore, must reconceptualize both revival and post-revival contexts as part of an ongoing, hybrid socio-political process—one that is not merely oppositional but deeply interwoven with and continually reshaped by the mainstream. This mirrors what Gandhi (1998:40) describes as the “mutual transformation of colonizer and colonized.”

Such a reading is particularly apt for the Indian cultural revival, which was never a simple reclamation of a lost tradition, but rather a process deeply embedded in the politics, aesthetics, and social shifts of its time. Indeed, this framework may prove valuable not only for understanding other cultural revivals, but also for interpreting the broader, continuing processes of global cultural transformation and exchange.

The multiple oppositions embedded in contemporary kathak practice must be understood not only as historical evidence of the dance’s inherently syncretic nature, or as products of colonial and postcolonial hybridity, but as features that may be intrinsic to the very process of cultural revival itself. The Indian dance revival played a pivotal role in institutionalizing, legitimizing, and

gentrifying kathak, recasting it as a national cultural treasure and classical art form. One could reasonably argue that kathak, as it is recognized today, would not exist without the ideological and structural interventions of this revival. Yet, this process also generated a dominant narrative—one that privileged a Hindu, male, and devotional lineage—effectively obscuring the dance’s hybrid and heterogeneous past.

Such privileging of purity and authenticity is a hallmark of revivalist ideologies globally, raising critical questions: Is the dominance of revivalist discourse and its entrenchment in mainstream culture a phenomenon particular to postcolonial contexts, where cultural identity must be reclaimed and redefined? Or is the reintegration of revivalist values into the cultural mainstream a broader feature of post-revival processes across global contexts? In India’s case, the project of cultural reclamation and nationalist pride began over a century ago, and the revivalist vision was fully absorbed into national consciousness with the advent of Independence more than sixty years ago. Despite the persistence of a hegemonic narrative that seeks to stabilize and essentialize tradition, kathak—like much of Indian classical performing arts—has evolved into a dynamic, globalized practice. Today, it enjoys vibrant international engagement and artistic innovation. While the revival played an undeniable role in the nation-building process, its legacy has now transitioned into a phase of creative proliferation, one that promises to shape both the national and transnational futures of Indian dance.

The shared use of the term *kathak* to denote both a dance form and a group of hereditary performers can lead to confusion. For the sake of clarity, I will use “**Kathak**” (capitalized) to refer specifically to the hereditary performer community, and *kathak* (italicized) to designate the dance form itself. The term *kathaka* originates from Sanskrit, meaning “storyteller” or “narrator,” and may not directly correspond to the present-day community of hereditary performers who now identify as Kathak.

**References:**

1. Allen, Matthew Harp. 1997. "Rewriting the Script for South Indian Dance." *The Drama Review, Journal of Performance Studies* 41(3):63-100.
2. Bakhle, Janaki. 2005. *Two Men and Music: Nationalism in the Making of an Indian Classical Tradition*. New York: Oxford University Press.
3. Banerji, Projesh. 1982. *Kathak Dance Through Ages*. New Delhi: Cosmo Publications.
4. Bhabha, Homi K. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London: Routledge.
5. Chakravorty, Pallabi. 2008. *Bells of Change: Kathak Dance, Women and Modernity in India*. Calcutta: Seagull Books.
6. Devi, Ragini. 1972. *Dance Dialects of India*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd.
7. Gandhi, Leela. 1998. *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction*. St. Leonards, New South Wales: Allen and Unwin.
8. Joshi, Damayanti. 1989. *Madame Menaka*. New Delhi: Sangit Natak Akademi. Khokar, Mohan. 1984. *Tradition of Indian Classical Dance*. 1979. Revised Edition. New Delhi: Clarion Books.
9. Meduri, Avanti. ed. 2005. *Rukmini Devi Arundale (1904-1986): A Visionary Architect of Indian Culture and the Performing Arts*. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers Private Limited.
10. Rao, Vidya. 1996. "Thumri and Thumri Singers: Changes in Style and Life-Style." In *Cultural Reorientation in Modern India*, edited by Indu Banga Jaidev, 278-315. Simla: Indian Institute of Advanced Study.
11. Sinha, Manjari. 2000. "Kathak." In *Indian Dance: The Ultimate Metaphor*, edited by Shanta Serbjeet Singh, 59-83. New Delhi: Bookwise (India) Pvt. Ltd.
12. Soneji, Davesh. 2004. "Living History, Performing Memory: Devadasi Women in Telegu-Speaking South India." *Dance Research Journal* 36(2):30-49.