

Reframing Legong Keraton in Contemporary Scholarship: History, Embodiment, and Heritage Transformation

Liu Yang ^{1,*} and Lina Yi ²

¹ Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Universiti Malaya, Kuala Lumpur 50603, Malaysia

² Faculty of Languages and Communication, Universiti Pendidikan Sultan Idris (UPSI),
Tanjong Malim 35900, Malaysia

Abstract: This article examines how selected English-language scholarship explains continuity and change in Legong Keraton. It brings historical debates about origins into dialogue with research on embodied learning, tourism, and cultural heritage. The central argument is that continuity requires analysis at three connected levels: the retention of artistic forms, the reproduction of performance competence, and the authority to define valued practice. The disagreement over Legong's chronology shows that a shared name or courtly association does not establish an unchanged choreographic object. Studies of bodily knowledge and performance learning explain why recognizable forms depend on situated processes of acquisition and evaluation. Research on tourism and preservation, in turn, demonstrates that international visibility and institutional support must be assessed in relation to the practices they sustain. On this basis, the article interprets heritage transformation as a selective reorganization of relationships among repertoire, learning, and recognition. Its contribution is an analytical framework for comparing these relationships without assuming either inevitable cultural loss or assured resilience. The discussion is a selective narrative review; its propositions guide further historical and ethnographic inquiry rather than establish the present condition of every Legong tradition.

Keywords: Legong Keraton; Balinese dance; embodied learning; cultural heritage; tourism; artistic transmission

1. Introduction

Legong Keraton presents a problem central to the study of living artistic traditions: how can a recognizable performance form persist while the conditions of its production change? Bandem and deBoer's account places Legong within the historically changing organization of Balinese dance and theatre, including its courtly associations and relationships with other genres [1]. This wider setting matters because an account of continuity must explain both the recognizable dance and the social arrangements through which people continue to perform it.

This article argues that continuity becomes more intelligible when examined at three connected levels. Repertoire concerns the movements, musical arrangements, and performance structures retained or selected. Competence concerns the knowledge and capacities through which artists realize those forms. Authority concerns who can identify an acceptable performance, establish a historical account, or decide what merits support. We use these distinctions as an analytical framework developed in this review, rather than as categories presumed to govern all Balinese understandings of dance.

These levels need not change together. A named dance may remain available while access to its performance knowledge narrows; a new venue may alter presentation while supporting continued learning. Assessing transformation therefore requires identifying which dimension changes, through what process, and with what consequences for the others.

The review draws on selected English-language historical and ethnographic studies of Legong and related Balinese performance traditions, alongside work on embodiment, tourism, and heritage. Sources are included for their relevance to the argument rather than through a comprehensive database search. Direct accounts of Legong supply historically situated evidence; studies of other traditions provide contextual comparisons; general theories supply analytical concepts. These different evidential roles are maintained throughout the discussion. The article reports no new fieldwork and makes no claim to exhaustive coverage of the literature.

The argument proceeds from historical identification and aesthetic evaluation to embodied learning, then to tourism and heritage governance. This sequence connects the definition of the artistic object with the capacities required to perform it and the conditions that sustain those capacities.

2. Historical Claims and the Construction of Classical Form

2.1. *Origins and the Evidence for Continuity*

Historical descriptions make performances available for subsequent comparison. De Zoete and Spies's *Dance and Drama in Bali*, first published in 1938, documents dance and theatrical genres within the performance world its authors encountered [2]. Its value here is as a historical point of reference. Reading such an account as a record of particular practices allows change to become visible; treating it as a timeless definition would instead make later differences appear to be departures from an already complete tradition.

Holt's *Art in Indonesia* locates the arts within a broader account of continuity and change across Indonesian history [3]. This historical scale helps distinguish an artistic tradition's connections with earlier cultural materials from the persistence of a specific performance arrangement. Court sponsorship, narrative affiliation, and choreographic structure can have different histories. Our argument therefore separates the antiquity of the materials associated with Legong from the dating of arrangements subsequently recognized as characteristic of the genre.

Davies offers a specific reconstruction of that chronology. He places the emergence of Legong in the late nineteenth century and its consolidation into a definitive form in approximately 1916–1932. His analysis questions the familiar account connecting its invention to a royal vision and distinguishes Legong from related sacred and trance practices [4]. This argument makes the identification of a genre depend on the combination and organization of its features, rather than on the earliest appearance of a familiar name alone.

Vickers disputes aspects of this reconstruction by reconsidering nineteenth-century lexical, textual, and musical evidence. He gives greater weight to older courtly connections and cautions that accounts centered on particular regions can narrow the historical picture. His discussion also accepts the force of Davies's challenge to a straightforward derivation from sanghyang, while questioning other proposed relationships among forms [5]. The debate thus includes both disagreement and partial agreement; it cannot be reduced to a choice between accepting every origin narrative and rejecting historical continuity.

Taken together, these positions reveal a problem of historical identification. Evidence that a dance name was used establishes the circulation of that term. Evidence concerning an ensemble or narrative establishes another kind of relationship. A claim that the same choreographic object persisted requires additional demonstration. We consequently distinguish continuity of naming, continuity of artistic materials, and continuity of performance organization. This distinction preserves the relevance of older evidence while keeping the specific claims made from it open to scrutiny.

The same reasoning clarifies the status of oral accounts. A narrative can be important to how a community understands its artistic inheritance even when its chronology remains disputed. Its historical value includes both what it recalls and the circumstances in which it is transmitted. Examining these dimensions together makes it possible to acknowledge local historical knowledge while asking how an account acquired authority, whose experience it represents, and which alternative memories require consideration.

The significance of the origins debate therefore extends beyond dating. The criteria used to establish a genre's beginning also influence which later changes count as continuity or departure. A historical argument centered on one definitive arrangement will assess variation differently from an argument centered on relationships among repertoires. This is the first connection between artistic form and authority: historical explanation participates in defining the object that preservation later seeks to maintain.

2.2. Refinement as an Aesthetic and Social Judgment

Aesthetic description also helps constitute that object. Hobart challenges received representations of Balinese dance and asks how the circumstances, purposes, and audiences of scholarly accounts shape what they present as cultural knowledge. He calls for greater attention to performers' and audiences' own understandings [6]. His critique supports treating descriptions of classical refinement as situated judgments. Such descriptions need to identify who evaluates a performance and what qualities become visible through the vocabulary employed.

Musical analysis offers a way to give these judgments greater specificity. Tenzer's study of gamelan gong kebyar combines ethnographic inquiry with analysis of composition and musical structure [7]. Although its primary object is kebyar rather than Legong's pelegongan accompaniment, its methodological contribution is relevant: an aesthetic account can connect audible organization with the practices through which musicians produce it. Applying that principle to Legong requires identification of the actual ensemble, musical sequence, and dance passage under discussion.

Reed's review of dance scholarship situates structured movement within the formation of gender, ethnic and national identities, colonial relations, and representations of cultural difference [8]. This establishes a broader reason to examine aesthetic evaluation as a social process. Applied to Legong, the question is how judgments about skill, composure, or suitability become associated with particular performers and roles. These associations require evidence from the relevant setting; they cannot be inferred from the appearance of bodily control alone.

For the present analysis, refinement connects visible performance with an expectation. Its explanation requires attention to the movement evaluated, the standard invoked, and the person entitled to apply that standard. Technical success, audience admiration, and institutional endorsement can converge, but each indicates a different relationship to artistic value.

Formal analysis establishes what occurs and what differs among performances. Explaining the significance of those differences requires evidence about interpretation and evaluation. The explanation of a classical style must therefore connect its observable qualities with the conditions under which those qualities are recognized.

Standards become effective through choices, corrections, and judgments. This links aesthetic analysis to pedagogy: if a quality is regarded as characteristic of Legong, an account of its continuity must explain how performers learn to realize it and how others recognize its successful realization.

The historical and aesthetic arguments converge at this point. Both the dating of a form and the evaluation of its refinement depend on criteria of recognition. The next section examines the practical reproduction of those criteria, moving from how a performance is identified to how its knowledge is acquired and enacted.

3. Legong as Symbolic and Embodied Practice

3.1. Meaning and the Limits of Genre Classification

Interpretive anthropology explains why formal similarity alone cannot settle meaning. Geertz's account of cultural interpretation emphasizes the contextual work needed to make an action intelligible [9]. For the present argument, a gesture acquires analytical significance through its relationship to an occasion, a narrative, and participants' understandings. An interpretation must establish those connections instead of assigning a fixed symbolic content to movement simply because it belongs to a recognized dance genre.

The performance situation is therefore analytically important. Performers, organizers, and audiences may attribute different meanings to an event. A ceremonial setting, for example, does not establish that every performance within it has an identical ritual function. The relationship between setting and action needs explanation.

Talamantes's study of pelegongan andir in Banjar Carik, Tista, provides a concrete example of the importance

of local specification. Her historical and ethnographic discussion concerns performances during 1995–2001 and identifies possession, communal welfare, and local identity as central to this community's practice. She further argues that the practice may contest national projects of cultural identification [10]. These findings concern a named community and a related performance tradition; their specificity is precisely what makes them useful for comparison.

This case places an important limit on generalization. Related movement materials or genre names do not entail identical relationships among performance, possession, and communal obligation. Comparing them can reveal how similar artistic resources are organized for different purposes. The appropriate unit of explanation is therefore the documented configuration of practice, participants, and occasion. That unit permits a comparison with Legong Keraton while preserving distinctions that a broad description of Balinese spirituality would obscure.

Local explanations establish why a performance matters, while close description shows how that significance is enacted. Together they make meaning a relationship demonstrated through evidence. Differences among settings can then become findings that qualify broader classifications.

Interpretation nevertheless leaves a further question: how do performers acquire the capacities through which meaningful action becomes possible? Understanding what a movement signifies does not itself explain how someone learns to execute it. Embodied approaches address this practical dimension and connect the continuity of cultural meanings with the reproduction of artistic competence.

3.2. Learning as the Reproduction of Artistic Knowledge

Jackson's account of bodily knowledge challenges the reduction of practical experience to verbal or conceptual representations [11]. It provides a theoretical basis for examining knowledge expressed in action, including knowledge that an accomplished performer may not articulate as a sequence of rules. For dance research, this means that interviews and observation answer related but different questions: an explanation of a technique and its successful execution cannot be treated as interchangeable evidence.

Csordas develops this connection through the concept of somatic modes of attention, emphasizing culturally organized ways of attending with and to the body in relation to others [12]. Applied analytically to Legong learning, this perspective directs attention to what learners notice, how they recognize correction, and how their responses become coordinated with other performers. These are proposed applications of a general concept; the particular organization of attention must be established in the teaching setting itself.

Farnell's account of dynamic embodiment places moving persons and meaningful bodily action at the center of social analysis [13]. This supports an account of learning in which performers act, interpret, and respond within relationships. In the framework developed here, competence includes the capacity to make appropriate adjustments, not simply to reproduce a visible outline. The analytical task is to establish how such adjustments become intelligible and acceptable to those involved.

Herbst's study provides a Balinese performance context for this connection between experience and understanding. Drawing on his learning with Balinese masters, he examines vocal music and dance theatre through relationships among place, time, context, and aesthetic experience [14]. His work makes learning relevant to how an art is understood, as well as to how it is performed. It consequently supports examining pedagogy within the social and aesthetic world of a practice, while preserving the distinctions among the performance traditions discussed.

Historical research also supplies a basis for investigating transmission. Dunbar-Hall examines music and dance education in Bali during the 1930s by locating and coding references to teaching in accounts written by researchers of that period [15]. This is evidence that pedagogy can be investigated historically, although the descriptions remain mediated by their observers. Its methodological relevance is to connect accounts of training with identifiable periods and sources, allowing claims about pedagogical continuity to be compared rather than assumed.

Brinner's study of Javanese gamelan adds a comparative account of musical competence and interaction. He connects differences in what musicians know with ensemble roles, communication, and the negotiation of performance [16]. Its relevance to Legong is conceptual: artistic competence may be distributed across participants rather than contained entirely in an individual dancer. A study of dance transmission therefore gains explanatory reach when it also examines the relationships through which dancers and musicians coordinate their work.

These perspectives support a specific inference. Repertoire remains performable through the continuing acquisition and evaluation of knowledge. A recording or written description can preserve aspects of a work, but its realization requires people capable of interpreting and coordinating what is recorded. Assessing continuity consequently requires evidence about access to learning, opportunities to practice, and the exercise of judgment. These conditions connect the retention of form to the social reproduction of competence.

This connection also clarifies the next stage of the argument. A change in performance opportunities may affect learning even when recognizable choreography remains on stage. Conversely, new audiences may support teaching without determining all artistic decisions. Tourism and heritage institutions therefore need to be examined through the relationships they sustain or reorganize, as well as through the images of tradition they circulate.

4. Tourism, Modernity, and Cultural Reframing

4.1. Tourism and the Mediation of Cultural Value

Picard's analysis of cultural tourism in Bali shows how representations of Balinese culture become intertwined with tourism policy and Indonesian national development. His discussion of the discourse of Cultural Tourism examines the shifting positions from which authorities speak on behalf of Bali and the state [17]. Tourism thus enters the production of cultural categories and public authority. For the present review, its effects cannot be confined to changes made to a dance after it reaches the tourist stage.

Noszlopy's account of the 1952 Dancers of Bali tour gives this mediation a concrete historical form. She describes how young performers from Peliatan, particularly Raka Rasmini, became the focus of attention during performances associated with Broadway and the West End. Although the tour involved a large gamelan ensemble, reviewers concentrated on the girls' charisma, skill, and professionalism [18]. The example shows how international presentation can distribute attention unevenly across the participants in a collective performance.

We interpret this uneven attention as a problem of representation rather than as a direct measure of artistic change. What becomes prominent in publicity may differ from what makes a performance possible. The distinction matters because the circulation of a dancer's image can expand recognition while leaving the organization of music, rehearsal, and teaching less visible. A history of reception and a history of transmission therefore require connected but distinct evidence.

Cohen's analysis of authenticity and commoditization provides a further distinction. He questions the assumption that commercial exchange necessarily destroys cultural meaning and treats authenticity as something open to negotiation [19]. This general argument establishes why payment, altered presentation, or tourist interest cannot by themselves prove cultural loss. It also leaves the effects of any particular adaptation open to investigation: the relevant issue is how participants interpret and organize the change.

For Legong, this reasoning separates several possible consequences of tourism. A presentation may change in length, setting, or intended audience; a teaching relationship may change in access or remuneration; public recognition may change in scale. These dimensions can influence one another, but the direction of influence must be demonstrated. Treating them separately makes it possible to assess an adaptation without defining it as either successful preservation or degradation in advance.

Harnish places Balinese musical change within the interacting contexts of tourism, Indonesianisation, and modernization [20]. The importance of this broader musical perspective is that tourism need not be the sole explanation for every change observed in performance. In our analysis, attribution requires comparison with other relevant processes, including institutional education and changing artistic preferences. A transformation associated with tourist presentation may have several causes, and identifying them changes how responsibility and possible responses are understood.

The argument so far establishes that visibility is an outcome requiring interpretation. It can indicate expanded circulation without specifying what happens to the knowledge and relationships supporting a performance. The evaluation of preservation must therefore move from the prominence of the genre to the conditions under which its constituent practices remain viable.

4.2. *Preservation and the Social Base of Transmission*

Davies's 2006 assessment makes this distinction explicit. Despite acknowledging local efforts at revitalization, he argues that Legong was in decline and that centralized dance education could preserve representative dances while weakening their connection with the grassroots public that had sustained them [21]. The claim concerns a historically situated assessment, not a measurement of every present-day locality. Its analytical force is that the retention of selected works and the strength of a tradition's social base can move in different directions.

In his 2011 discussion of Western involvement, Davies identifies touring, expatriate support, scholarship, and international teaching as contributors to Legong's circulation and conservation. He also argues that the genre has retained artistic autonomy and integrity despite these external connections [22]. This assessment brings support and artistic control into the same discussion. It demonstrates why the geographical origin of a resource is insufficient to determine its cultural consequences.

The two assessments can be read together because they address distinguishable relationships. A tradition may retain recognizable artistic standards while the distribution of participation changes. External support may assist particular groups without resolving a wider decline in access to learning. Our synthesis therefore treats artistic integrity, participation, and financial support as separate questions whose relationships require evidence. This approach accommodates tensions within preservation instead of resolving them through a single verdict on resilience.

The object of preservation also needs specification. Maintaining a representative repertoire, sustaining stylistic alternatives, and enabling new participants to become competent are different achievements. Evaluation should identify the intended achievement and examine the practices through which it is pursued.

This distinction provides a basis for evaluating institutional selection. Selection is unavoidable when teaching time, performance opportunities, or support are limited. The question is how its consequences are distributed. A selected work might gain a stable place in a curriculum while other works become harder to learn. Such an outcome would need to be documented, but its possibility explains why a preservation program cannot be evaluated solely through the survival of its most visible examples.

The relationship between payment and commitment likewise requires analysis at the level of practice. Remuneration can make time for teaching possible, while cultural responsibility can influence what a teacher agrees to teach. Neither relationship can be inferred from the existence of a commercial exchange alone. A study needs to connect artists' explanations with the organization of their work and the opportunities available to learners.

The evidence required depends on the conclusion being assessed. Observation may establish how a work is presented at an event. A claim about its future transmission additionally requires evidence about learning and participation. This distinction follows directly from the difference between presenting a repertoire and reproducing the capacities to perform it.

Tourism and preservation emerge from this discussion as processes that reorganize relationships among artistic forms, knowledge, and support. Their consequences are best assessed through those relationships. This conclusion leads to heritage governance, where decisions about recognition and resources give institutional force to particular definitions of valued practice.

5. **Heritage Recognition and the Conditions of Continuity**

Heritage recognition introduces another level of authority into the relationships examined above. An official description identifies what is valued, while subsequent arrangements may affect how that value is supported and presented. The contribution of heritage analysis is to connect these acts of identification with their practical consequences for artists and learning environments.

The following discussion distinguishes heritage designation, implementation, and practical effects. Institutional documents establish what has been recognized; evidence from teaching and performance settings is needed to explain what that recognition enables.

5.1. *Recognition and Institutional Selection*

Smith treats heritage as a cultural process and examines how authorized accounts privilege particular understandings of the past [23]. This perspective makes recognition an activity that distributes legitimacy. Applied to Legong, it suggests examining how an official description relates to performers' classifications and how different kinds of knowledge enter decisions about presentation or support. This is a theoretical application; it does not establish the conduct of a particular Balinese institution in advance.

The 2015 inscription of Three Genres of Traditional Dance in Bali on UNESCO's Representative List provides a specific institutional context. UNESCO's presentation distinguishes sacred, semi-sacred, and community entertainment categories and describes informal transmission to groups of children [24]. The recognized element encompasses several traditions. Its grouped description is therefore useful evidence of institutional framing, while a judgment about any particular Legong teaching environment requires a finer scale of observation.

This difference in scale is central to evaluation. Connecting the designation with decisions and resources in specific settings would show whether recognition assists existing teaching relationships, introduces new requirements, or has little direct effect on everyday practice.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett describes intangible heritage as metacultural production: the identification and safeguarding of a practice add another layer of cultural activity to it [25]. This explains why heritage presentation is analytically consequential. Documentation, designation, and display involve choices about how a practice will be represented. In the framework proposed here, these choices connect institutional authority with the selection of artistic forms that become publicly recognizable.

Bendix examines heritage at the intersection of economic and political processes [26]. This perspective connects questions of cultural value with the interests and arrangements through which recognition operates. For Legong research, the implication is to examine support and authority together: who sets priorities, who carries out the work, and who benefits from the resulting opportunities. These questions concern the organization of safeguarding, not an assumption that all institutional involvement has the same effect.

Recognition becomes relevant to continuity through implementation. Establishing how institutional decisions reach teaching and performance would show how heritage authority interacts with the reproduction of competence. Public celebration and practical sustainability otherwise remain separate observations.

5.2. *Circulation and the Conditions of Sustainability*

Appadurai's account of cultural globalization connects the movement of people and mediated images with the social work of imagination [27]. This offers a way to analyze how a tradition can be encountered through representations that travel beyond its immediate performance setting. Applied to Legong, it supports tracing particular routes of teaching, performance, and publicity, while examining how participants use those encounters to imagine the dance and their relationship to it.

Circulation can connect representation with participation in different ways. Encountering an image and entering a teaching relationship involve different kinds of engagement. Comparing them would clarify when wider recognition creates access to performance knowledge and when it remains primarily an experience of representation.

Adaptation likewise acquires significance through the relationships it enables or restricts. Comparing its stated purposes, artistic decisions, and consequences for subsequent practice would establish a sequence of effects. The occurrence of change alone cannot explain whether transmission has been sustained.

Throsby's analysis of cultural policy distinguishes economic and cultural value and examines how both enter decisions about support [28]. This distinction strengthens the evaluation proposed here. Revenue may contribute to the conditions of artistic work, but it does not describe all the qualities that participants seek to maintain. Conversely, a culturally valued practice still depends on the resources needed to continue. Sustainability therefore requires examination of how economic arrangements support the capabilities and judgments on which performance depends.

The implication is a conditional account of continuity. Circulation contributes to transmission when the opportunities it creates remain connected to learning and practice. Recognition contributes when its

implementation sustains valued capacities. These are propositions developed from the review, to be assessed through comparative evidence; they do not imply that every institution, tourist encounter, or international exchange produces the same result.

5.3. *Performer Agency and Research Design*

Performer agency provides the practical link among these processes. In this article, agency refers to the situated capacity to make and negotiate choices about learning, performance, and transmission. It includes the ability to accept, adapt, or refuse particular demands. Its analysis must consider available options, because the same visible decision can reflect preference, obligation, or a limited range of opportunities.

A published comparative ethnography of Xiangxi Miao Drum Dance and Balinese Legong examines how ritual meanings are reconfigured through embodied memory, performer agency, and negotiation within tourism and heritage institutions. It interprets the cases as different pathways of ritual reconfiguration, shaped by their respective political and religious settings [29]. This account supports examining agency through how performers engage with inherited practices under changing conditions. For the present review, its contribution is to connect institutional pressures with embodied responses; its findings remain specific to the communities and performance settings studied.

A research design following this framework would connect accounts of artistic decisions with observation of their implementation. Interviews could establish how performers explain a choice, while rehearsal and performance records could show how it is enacted. Comparing these materials would clarify whether an institutional requirement changes artistic practice and how performers respond to that requirement. The purpose would be to document a relationship, not to assign a predetermined motive to an artist.

The comparison would benefit from variation across settings and over time. Following a work through teaching, rehearsal, and different performance occasions could identify which features remain stable and which are adjusted. Following participation over a longer period could establish whether opportunities lead to sustained learning. These designs address the framework's central concern: how changes in recognition or support become connected to the continuing reproduction of competence.

This agenda also requires linguistic and evidential breadth. Indonesian- and Balinese-language scholarship, local records, and performers' explanations can challenge the categories privileged in an English-language review. Historical sources and present-day observation answer different temporal questions. Bringing them together would strengthen the assessment of continuity while making clear which claims concern remembered histories, documented earlier practices, or current conditions.

Such research would explain how particular artistic relationships persist or change and where performers influence those conditions. These priorities arise from the present synthesis; the selective scope of the review does not establish their absence from all previous scholarship.

6. Conclusions

Legong Keraton's continuity is best assessed through the relationship among retained forms, acquired competence, and the authority to define valued practice. The historical debate shows why a shared name or courtly association is insufficient to establish an unchanged choreographic object. Aesthetic analysis extends this problem by showing that recognition depends on standards of evaluation. Together, these arguments make the definition of the tradition part of the explanation of its continuity.

The discussion of embodied learning then identifies the practical relationship through which artistic forms remain performable. Knowledge must be acquired, coordinated, and evaluated by participants. This makes pedagogy central to an assessment of transmission and explains why records of a repertoire cannot alone establish its continuing realization. Interpretation and embodiment contribute complementary evidence about what a performance means and how it becomes possible.

Tourism and heritage recognition affect this relationship through the organization of visibility, support, and selection. Their effects cannot be determined from the fact of commercialization or designation alone. An adequate account identifies what is sustained, whose participation is enabled, and how artistic decisions are

made. Preservation may involve achievements and losses at different levels, which a single judgment of either decline or resilience would conceal.

The review's contribution is therefore an analytical connection among debates often discussed separately. Historical identification shapes the object of preservation; learning makes that object performable; recognition and resources influence the conditions under which learning continues. The framework offers a way to investigate those connections through particular cases while keeping the claims proportional to the evidence.

The scope of the article limits its conclusions. It is a selective narrative review of English-language sources, supported by an official heritage record, rather than an exhaustive survey or an assessment based on new fieldwork. Historical studies cannot determine the current condition of all Legong traditions. Further inquiry needs multilingual sources, attention to differences among communities, and evidence that follows changes in support through to their practical effects.

A stronger account of living heritage consequently asks how people remain able to realize, evaluate, and transmit the practices they value. For Legong, this means connecting the history of artistic forms with the relationships that sustain their performance. That connection makes cultural transformation open to explanation without presuming either the disappearance of tradition or its guaranteed survival.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Author Contributions

Writing—original draft, L.Y. (Liu Yang) and L.Y. (Lina Yi); writing—review and editing, L.Y. (Liu Yang) and L.Y. (Lina Yi). All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Institutional Review Board Statement

Not applicable. This article is a review of published literature and does not report research involving human participants or animals.

Informed Consent Statement

Not applicable. This article does not report research involving human participants.

Data Availability Statement

No new datasets were generated or analyzed for this narrative review. The published sources discussed are identified in the reference list.

Conflicts of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

- 1 Bandem IM, deBoer FE. *Balinese Dance in Transition: Kaja and Kelod*, 2nd ed.; Oxford University Press: Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, 1995. Available online: <https://archive.org/details/balinesedanceint0000band> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 2 de Zoete B, Spies W. *Dance and Drama in Bali*; Faber and Faber: London, UK, 1938. Available online: <https://books.google.com/books?id=mXXe0AEACAAJ> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 3 Holt C. *Art in Indonesia: Continuities and Change*; Cornell University Press: Ithaca, NY, USA, 1967. Available online: <https://archive.org/details/artinindonesiac00holt> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 4 Davies S. The Origins of Balinese Legong. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde* 2008; **164**(2/3): 194–211. Available online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27868481> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 5 Vickers A. When Did Legong Start? *A Reply to Stephen Davies*. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*

- 2009; **165**(1): 1–7. Available online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43817798> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 6 Hobart M. Rethinking Balinese Dance. *Indonesia and the Malay World* 2007; **35**(101): 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639810701233979>.
- 7 Tenzer M. *Gamelan Gong Kebyar: The Art of Twentieth-Century Balinese Music*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 2000. Available online: <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/G/bo3630827.html> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 8 Reed SA. The Politics and Poetics of Dance. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 1998; **27**: 503–532. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.anthro.27.1.503>.
- 9 Geertz C. *The Interpretation of Cultures; Selected Essays*; Basic Books: New York, NY, USA, 1973. Available online: <https://archive.org/details/interpretationof00geer> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 10 Talamantes M. Performance of Identity: The Pelegongan Andir of Tista, Bali. *Asian Theatre Journal* 2006; **23**(2): 356–373. <https://doi.org/10.1353/atj.2006.0031>.
- 11 Jackson M. Knowledge of the Body. *Man* 1983; **18**(2): 327–345. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2801438>.
- 12 Csordas TJ. Somatic Modes of Attention. *Cultural Anthropology* 1993; **8**(2): 135–156. <https://doi.org/10.1525/can.1993.8.2.02a00010>.
- 13 Farnell B. *Dynamic Embodiment for Social Theory: I Move Therefore I Am*; Routledge: Abingdon, UK, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203805039>.
- 14 Herbst E. *Voices in Bali: Energies and Perceptions in Vocal Music and Dance Theater*; Wesleyan University Press: Hanover, NH, USA, 1998. Available online: <https://www.wespress.org/9780819563194/voices-in-bali/> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 15 Dunbar-Hall P. “Good Legong Dancers Were Given an Arduous Program of Training:” Music Education in Bali in the 1930s. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 2008; **30**(1): 50–63. <https://doi.org/10.1177/153660060803000106>.
- 16 Brinner B. *Knowing Music, Making Music: Javanese Gamelan and the Theory of Musical Competence and Interaction*; University of Chicago Press: Chicago, IL, USA, 1995. Available online: <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/K/bo3633809.html> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 17 Picard M. *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture*; Darling D, Trans.; Archipelago Press: Singapore, 1996.
- 18 Noszlopy L. The “Little Legong Dancers” of Bali: The Rise of a Child Star in Indonesian Dance Theater. In *Entertaining Children: The Participation of Youth in the Entertainment Industry*; Arrighi G, Emeljanow V, Eds.; Palgrave Macmillan: New York, NY, USA, 2014; pp. 167–184. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137305466_10.
- 19 Cohen E. Authenticity and Commoditization in Tourism. *Annals of Tourism Research* 1988; **15**(3): 371–386. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383\(88\)90028-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/0160-7383(88)90028-X).
- 20 Harnish D. Teletubbies in Paradise: Tourism, Indonesianisation and Modernisation in Balinese Music. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 2005; **37**: 103–123. Available online: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20464932> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 21 Davies S. Balinese Legong: Revival or Decline? *Asian Theatre Journal* 2006; **23**(2): 314–341. <https://doi.org/10.1353/atj.2006.0018>.
- 22 Davies S. The Role of Westerners in the Conservation of Legong Dance. *Contemporary Aesthetics* 2011; **3**: 5. Available online: https://digitalcommons.risd.edu/liberalarts_contempaesthetics/vol0/iss3/5/ (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 23 Smith L. *Uses of Heritage*; Routledge: London, UK, 2006. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203602263>.
- 24 UNESCO. Three Genres of Traditional Dance in Bali. Available online: <https://ich.unesco.org/en/RL/three-genres-of-traditional-dance-in-bali-00617> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 25 Kirshenblatt-Gimblett B. Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International* 2004; **56**(1–2): 52–65. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1350-0775.2004.00458.x>.
- 26 Bendix R. Heritage Between Economy and Politics: An Assessment from the Perspective of Cultural Anthropology. In *Intangible Heritage*; Smith L, Akagawa N, Eds.; Routledge: London, UK, 2008; pp. 253–269. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203884973-20>.
- 27 Appadurai A. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*; University of Minnesota Press:

- Minneapolis, MN, USA, 1996. Available online: <https://www.upress.umn.edu/9780816627936/modernity-at-large/> (accessed on 22 September 2026).
- 28 Throsby D. *The Economics of Cultural Policy*; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511845253>.
- 29 Yang L. Reframing Sacredness: Ritual Reconfiguration in Xiangxi Miao Drum Dance and Balinese Legong Dance. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications* 2026. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-026-08996-x>.

