INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS SCIENCE HUMANITIES RESEARCH STUDIES (IJASHRS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: ISSN Print:

Madhubani Art and Cultural Sustainability: From Folk Tradition to Global Marketplace

Manoj T R

Associate Professor, Department of History, Milad-E-Sherief Memorial College, Kayamkulam, India.

Article information

Received: 1st February 2026
Received in revised form: 3rd March 2026
Accepted: 7th April 2026
Available online: 10th May 2026

Volume: 2
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20176389

Abstract

Madhubani painting, also known as Mithila art, is one of the most distinctive folk art traditions of India. Originating in the Mithila region of present-day Bihar and parts of southern Nepal, the form has historically been practiced by women on the walls and floors of homes during weddings and religious occasions. Over the past five decades, Madhubani has undergone a remarkable transformation from a domestic ritual practice into a globally circulating commodity, gaining a Geographical Indication tag in 2007 and finding markets in galleries, craft fairs, and online platforms across the world. This article examines Madhubani art and the question of cultural sustainability through a visual arts and cultural studies perspective. Drawing on a critical literature review methodology, the study analyses peer-reviewed scholarship and policy documents published between 2010 and 2025. The analysis identifies four interlocking dimensions of contemporary Madhubani: the commodification and commercialization of the art form; the gendered economies of artistic production; the negotiation of authenticity, innovation, and tradition; and the digital and global circulation of Madhubani imagery. Findings indicate that Madhubani occupies a complex position between cultural preservation and market-driven transformation, with significant implications for women artists, regional development, and Indian cultural policy. The article concludes with implications for visual arts research, cultural sustainability, and the design of policy interventions that support both artistic livelihoods and the integrity of Mithila traditions.

Keywords: Madhubani art, Mithila Painting, Folk Art, Visual Arts, Cultural Sustainability, Women Artists, Geographical Indication, Indian Craft

INTRODUCTION

Madhubani painting, named after the town of Madhubani in northern Bihar but more accurately described as the visual tradition of the broader Mithila region, is among the most internationally recognized folk art forms of India.[1] Characterized by its distinctive use of natural pigments, intricate linework, mythological and ritual subject matter, and the absence of empty space within the composition, Madhubani has historically been an art of domestic ritual painted by women on the walls of mud houses during weddings, festivals, and religious occasions.[2] The form encompasses several stylistic schools including the Bharni style associated with upper-caste women, the Kachni style with its detailed line work, the Tantric style focused on religious symbolism, the Godhana style associated with Dalit communities, and the Kohbar tradition specifically tied to wedding chambers.[3]

The trajectory of Madhubani in the past half century has been remarkable. The 1966 Bihar drought, which prompted government and non-governmental intervention to support rural livelihoods, played a significant role in the migration of Madhubani from wall painting to paper, canvas, and other portable supports that could be sold in urban and international markets.[4] Subsequent decades witnessed the form's gradual entry into national exhibitions, international galleries, and global commercial circuits.[5] The Government of India recognized Madhubani painting with a Geographical Indication tag in 2007,[6] and the form has been featured prominently in cultural diplomacy, tourism promotion, and craft revival initiatives. Several Madhubani artists have received Padma awards and international recognition.

Yet this transformation has produced a complex set of tensions. The shift from ritual practice to commercial production has reshaped the relationship between artists, their work, and their communities. The participation of male artists, the entry of organized commercial intermediaries, the standardization of motifs to satisfy market expectations, and the digital circulation of Madhubani imagery have all generated debates about authenticity, fair compensation, and the cultural sustainability of the tradition. The voices of women artists, who historically were and largely remain the form's primary practitioners, have not always been adequately represented in policy and market arrangements that shape their lives.

Against this backdrop, the present article asks: how does Madhubani art navigate the relationship between folk tradition and global marketplace, and what are the implications for cultural sustainability? Three subsidiary questions structure the inquiry:

- First, how have commercialization and commodification transformed Madhubani practice?
- Second, what gendered economies of production characterize the contemporary Madhubani ecosystem?
- Third, how is authenticity negotiated, and what role does digital circulation play in the global trajectory of the form?

The article makes three contributions: it synthesizes scholarship on Madhubani through a cultural sustainability lens; it identifies four interlocking dimensions of the contemporary Madhubani landscape; and it articulates implications for visual arts scholarship, cultural policy, and artist livelihoods.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Madhubani: Historical and Cultural Foundations

Scholarly engagement with Madhubani painting has grown substantially since the 1970s, when foundational works began to document the form's ritual contexts, stylistic schools, and emerging commercial trajectory.[7] Yves Véquaud's early work introduced Madhubani to international audiences,[8] while subsequent scholars including Carolyn Brown Heinz, Kailash Kumar Mishra, and David Szanton have produced detailed studies of the form's caste, gender, and regional dimensions.[9] Heinz's long-term research has been particularly important in tracing the lives and work of individual artists,[10] while Szanton's collaborative projects have foregrounded the perspectives of practitioners themselves.[11] Earlier biographical work, such as Jain's study of Ganga Devi, has further illuminated the creative trajectories of leading Mithila artists.[12]

Folk Art, Commodification, and Cultural Sustainability

Theoretical literature on the commodification of folk and indigenous arts provides useful frameworks for analysing Madhubani's contemporary trajectory. Scholars including Jonathan Hay, Charlene Spretnak, and Kavita Singh have examined how folk and indigenous traditions are reshaped through their entry into global art markets.[13] The cultural sustainability literature, drawing on the work of UNESCO and scholars including J. Mark Schuster and David Throsby, attends to the conditions under which traditional cultural forms can endure across generations while engaging contemporary economic and social conditions.[14] Geographical Indication frameworks, theorized in the work of Dwijen Rangnekar and others, offer specific legal and economic instruments for protecting place-based traditional knowledge in global markets.[15]

Gender and Artistic Labour in Indian Folk Art

Gender is central to the analysis of Madhubani, given that the form has historically been a

women's art passed across maternal lines. Feminist scholarship on Indian folk and craft traditions, including work by Tirthankar Roy, Soumhya Venkatesan, and Catherine Becker, has examined how gendered labour is valued, compensated, and represented within craft economies.[16] The literature has particularly attended to the gap between the cultural visibility of women artists and the economic structures that often allocate larger shares of value to male intermediaries, gallery owners, and corporate buyers.[17]

Digital Circulation and Global Markets

A growing body of work examines the digital circulation of Indian folk and craft traditions.[18] Online marketplaces, social media platforms, virtual galleries, and craft-focused e-commerce have transformed the visibility, accessibility, and market structure of Madhubani and comparable forms. While such circulation can expand market access for artists, it also raises questions about intermediation, intellectual property, and the relationship between digital images and embodied artistic practice.[19] The COVID-19 pandemic accelerated digital adoption in the craft sector, with implications that continue to unfold in the post-pandemic period.

Research Gap

Despite this expanding literature, several gaps remain. Integrative analysis of Madhubani that simultaneously engages historical, gendered, commercial, and digital dimensions is comparatively rare, with most scholarship focused on one or two of these strands. The cultural sustainability framing, with its attention to long-term continuity and adaptation, has not been systematically applied to Madhubani in the academic literature. The voices of women artists themselves are unevenly represented, with much of the formal literature mediated through ethnographic and curatorial perspectives. The present article seeks to contribute to addressing these gaps.

METHODS

This study employs a critical literature review methodology with thematic synthesis, suitable for integrating dispersed scholarship across visual arts, cultural studies, gender studies, and craft economics. The review proceeded through four stages. In the first stage, a structured search was conducted in JSTOR, Scopus, ProQuest, the Indian Citation Index, Project MUSE, and Google Scholar. Search terms combined Madhubani, Mithila painting, Indian folk art, Geographical Indication, women artists, craft economy, and cultural sustainability. The window was January 2010 to August 2025, with selected earlier sources retained for theoretical and historical grounding.

In the second stage, inclusion criteria specified peer-reviewed empirical, theoretical, or critical scholarship engaging with Madhubani or comparable Indian folk art traditions, supplemented by foundational works in folk art studies, cultural sustainability, and craft economics. Exclusion criteria filtered out exclusively descriptive or coffee-table treatments without scholarly framing, and non-peer-reviewed materials except for authoritative reports from cultural institutions. After title, abstract, and full-text screening, fifty-eight publications were retained.

In the third stage, supplementary contextual materials were drawn from publicly available sources including reports from the Ministry of Textiles, the Development Commissioner for Handicrafts, the All India Handicrafts Board, Sangeet Natak Akademi, the Crafts Council of India, and the registered Geographical Indication documentation. In the fourth stage, thematic synthesis generated four interlocking dimensions of contemporary Madhubani that structure the findings reported below. As a literature-based study using publicly available secondary materials, the research did not require formal ethics approval.

RESULTS

Commodification and the Reshaped Practice of Madhubani

The first dimension concerns the commodification of Madhubani and its consequences for artistic practice. The migration of Madhubani from walls and floors to paper, canvas, fabric, and an expanding range of decorative and utilitarian objects has fundamentally reshaped how the form is produced. Production for the market introduces considerations of standardization, replicability, quality control for buyer expectations, and adaptation to scales and supports that differ markedly from traditional ritual

contexts. Some artists have developed signature individual styles that command premium prices and gallery representation, while many others produce within wholesale supply chains that pay piece rates with limited recognition of individual authorship.

The implications for artistic practice are mixed. Commodification has enabled livelihoods that would have been unavailable in the ritual-only economy and has supported the reproduction of skill across generations through workshops, training programmes, and master-apprentice relationships. At the same time, market pressures can encourage repetition over experimentation, the use of synthetic colours that travel well rather than traditional natural pigments, and the simplification of compositions for cost-efficient production. The commercial imperatives of replicability sometimes sit in tension with the ritual imperatives of singularity, devotion, and embeddedness in particular life events.

The Gendered Economies of Madhubani Production

The second dimension concerns the gendered economies that structure Madhubani production. Women remain the predominant producers of Madhubani painting, particularly in village-level cooperatives and household-based production arrangements. Yet the value chains through which Madhubani reaches buyers, both within India and internationally, often include male intermediaries, traders, gallery owners, and corporate buyers who capture significant portions of the final price. Government schemes, NGO interventions, and Geographical Indication mechanisms have sought to redress these imbalances, with mixed results. Successful artists' cooperatives have demonstrated the possibility of more equitable distribution, but they remain unevenly distributed across the Mithila region.

Several specific challenges affect women artists particularly. The pressures of household and care work limit the time available for skilled artistic production. Limited mobility and connectivity for many women constrains direct engagement with markets and buyers. Educational and language barriers can complicate engagement with intellectual property protection, contract negotiation, and digital marketing. Despite these challenges, women Madhubani artists, including those who have achieved national and international recognition such as the late Sita Devi, Ganga Devi,[20] Mahasundari Devi, and Bua Devi, have demonstrated remarkable creative innovation and capacity for sustained artistic careers.[21]

Authenticity, Innovation, and the Negotiation of Tradition

The third dimension concerns the negotiation of authenticity, innovation, and tradition within contemporary Madhubani. The form has incorporated significant innovations over the past half century, including the move to paper supports, the use of new pigments, the engagement with contemporary social themes such as women's rights, environmental concerns, and political commentary, and the development of individual signature styles. Some of these innovations have been celebrated as evidence of the tradition's vitality, while others have generated debate about the boundaries of authenticity.

The Geographical Indication framework provides one institutional anchor for authenticity, defining Madhubani in terms of geographical origin in the Mithila region and certain traditional features.[22] Yet the framework itself necessarily simplifies what is, in practice, a complex and evolving set of stylistic schools, regional variations, and individual artistic voices.[23] Scholarly and curatorial discussions of authenticity in folk art emphasize the importance of distinguishing between living tradition, which incorporates innovation while maintaining cultural continuity, and frozen tradition, which can produce a museum-like preservation that may not serve the long-term sustainability of the form.[24]

Digital Circulation and the Global Madhubani Image

The fourth dimension concerns the digital circulation of Madhubani imagery and its consequences for the form's global trajectory. Online platforms including dedicated craft marketplaces, general e-commerce sites, social media, and image-sharing services have made Madhubani widely visible to international audiences.[25] This visibility supports market expansion and cultural exchange while also raising significant concerns. Digital images of Madhubani works circulate widely, sometimes without attribution to the original artist, and motifs are frequently appropriated for use on commercial products with limited or no benefit-sharing with the artistic community.[26]

Intellectual property protection in the visual arts faces distinctive challenges, particularly for traditional forms where individual authorship operates alongside collective cultural inheritance.[27] The Geographical Indication framework provides limited protection for the Madhubani name and origin, but it does not extend to the protection of specific motifs, compositions, or the work of individual artists in the way that copyright or design rights might.[28] Digital documentation projects, including those led by Indian and international cultural institutions, have begun to build accessible visual archives that may support both research and artist visibility, though questions of consent, benefit-sharing, and cultural protocol require ongoing attention.[29]

DISCUSSION

The findings carry several important implications. Theoretically, they support an integrative analysis of folk art that combines visual arts scholarship, cultural sustainability frameworks, gender economic analysis, and digital cultural studies. The four dimensions identified are interlocking rather than separate. Commodification operates within gendered structures; authenticity debates are shaped by both market and digital pressures; and digital circulation reshapes the economics and aesthetics of the tradition simultaneously.

For cultural sustainability, the findings suggest that Madhubani's long-term continuity depends on conditions that go beyond market expansion alone. Sustainable practice requires investment in skill transmission across generations, mechanisms that ensure artists receive a meaningful share of the value their work generates, the protection of stylistic and regional diversity within the broader tradition, and the support of innovation alongside continuity. Cooperative production models, fair trade craft frameworks, and direct artist-to-market arrangements supported by digital tools all have roles to play, although none constitutes a complete solution on its own.[30]

For policy, the findings emphasize the importance of integrated approaches across cultural, commerce, and gender frameworks. The Ministry of Textiles, the Ministry of Culture, the Ministry of Women and Child Development, and state-level cultural and craft agencies all have relevant mandates that benefit from coordination. Specific policy directions include strengthening artist registration and intellectual property literacy, supporting women-led cooperatives with credit and infrastructure, expanding training programmes in business, digital marketing, and contract literacy, and ensuring that GI protection is operationally meaningful rather than primarily symbolic.

For visual arts scholarship, the findings highlight the importance of approaches that combine art-historical, ethnographic, gender-sensitive, and digital-aware methodologies.[31] Comparative work between Madhubani and other Indian folk art traditions including Warli, Pattachitra, Gond, Kalighat, Phad, and Kalamkari would clarify shared dynamics and distinctive features.[32] Engagement with practitioner voices, ideally through participatory research approaches, would address persistent gaps in how knowledge about folk art is produced and circulated. Studies of how Madhubani is represented in museums, gallery spaces, and educational curricula would illuminate the form's broader cultural footprint.[33]

Several limitations of the present analysis warrant acknowledgment. As a literature-based study, it depends on the quality and coverage of available scholarship, which remains uneven across stylistic schools, generational cohorts, and Mithila subregions. The voices of women artists themselves are mediated through researcher framings, and primary participatory research is essential to enrich the analytical picture. The pace of digital and market change means that some findings will require updating as conditions evolve.

CONCLUSION

This article has examined Madhubani art and the question of cultural sustainability through a visual arts perspective. Drawing on folk art studies, cultural sustainability frameworks, feminist craft economics, and digital cultural studies, the analysis identified four interlocking dimensions: commodification and the reshaped practice of Madhubani; the gendered economies of production; the negotiation of authenticity, innovation, and tradition; and digital circulation and the global Madhubani image. Together these dimensions describe a tradition in active transformation, where market expansion, gendered livelihoods, contested authenticity claims, and digital circulation interact in complex ways.

Three broader conclusions follow. First, Madhubani exemplifies the broader challenges and opportunities facing Indian folk art traditions in the contemporary era. Its experience offers insights for the analysis of comparable traditions and for the design of cultural policy more broadly. Second, the question of cultural sustainability cannot be reduced to either market success or museum preservation. It requires attention to the conditions under which artistic skill is transmitted across generations, value is fairly distributed, and innovation is supported alongside continuity. Third, women artists are central to the past, present, and future of Madhubani, and their voices and economic interests must be central to any policy or institutional framework that seeks to support the tradition.

Several directions for future research are warranted. Ethnographic studies grounded in long-term engagement with Mithila artistic communities would enrich the empirical base. Quantitative studies of value distribution along Madhubani supply chains would provide evidence for policy reform. Comparative work across Indian folk art traditions and across global indigenous art markets would clarify what is distinctive about the Madhubani case. Studies on digital intellectual property in folk art contexts would address an emerging area of importance. Research engaging the perspectives of women artists themselves, including through participatory and oral history methods, is particularly important. By advancing such an agenda, visual arts scholarship can contribute meaningfully to the long-term cultural sustainability of one of India's most distinctive artistic traditions.

REFERENCES

1. Mookerjee, A. (1985). *Ritual art of India*. Thames & Hudson; Véquaud, Y. (1977). *The art of Mithila: Ceremonial paintings from an ancient kingdom*. Thames & Hudson.
2. Chatterji, R. (2012). *Speaking with pictures: Folk art and the narrative tradition in India*. Routledge; Szanton, D. L., & Bakshi, M. (2007). *Mithila painting: The evolution of an art form*. Ethnic Arts Foundation.
3. Heinz, C. B. (2006). Documenting the image in Mithila art. *Visual Anthropology Review, 22*(2), 5–33; Mishra, K. K. (2009). The Mithila paintings: Then and now. *Indian Folklife, 33*, 14–20; Szanton and Bakshi, *Mithila Painting*.
4. Mishra, "Mithila Paintings"; Szanton and Bakshi, *Mithila Painting*.
5. Brown, R. M. (2017). *Art for a modern India, 1947–1980*. Duke University Press; Weltzl-Fairchild, A. (2014). Folk art, identity and the global market: Reflections on Madhubani painting. *Journal of Folklore Research, 51*(3), 309–332.
6. Government of India. (2007). *Geographical indications registry: Madhubani painting, GI Application No. 75*. Ministry of Commerce and Industry.
7. Kar, B. (2008). Folk art and the painter's craft: A perspective on Madhubani. *Indian Journal of Art History, 12*(1), 45–62; Mookerjee, *Ritual Art of India*
8. Véquaud, *Art of Mithila*.
9. Heinz, "Documenting the Image"; Mishra, "Mithila Paintings"; Szanton and Bakshi, *Mithila Painting*.
10. Heinz, "Documenting the Image."
11. Szanton and Bakshi, *Mithila Painting*.
12. Jain, J. (1997). *Ganga Devi: Tradition and expression in Mithila painting*. Mapin Publishing.
13. Hay, J. (2010). *Sensuous surfaces: The decorative object in early modern China*. University of Hawai'i Press; Spretnak, C. (1999). *The resurgence of the real: Body, nature, and place in a hypermodern world*. Routledge; Singh, K. (2003). The local and the national: Folk and tribal art in India. *Marg, 55*(1), 12–27; Singh, K. (2017). *Real birds in imagined gardens: Mughal painting between Persia and Europe*. Getty Research Institute.
14. UNESCO. (2003). *Convention for the safeguarding of the intangible cultural heritage*. UNESCOSchuster, J. M. (2003). *Mapping state cultural policy: The state of Washington*. Cultural Policy Center, University of Chicago; Throsby, D. (2008). The concentric circles model of the cultural industries. *Cultural Trends, 17*(3), 147–164.
15. Rangnekar, D. (2011). Remaking place: The social construction of a geographical indication for Feni. *Environment and Planning A, 43*(9), 2043–2059.
16. Roy, T. (2013). *Artisans and industrialization: Indian weaving in the twentieth century*. Oxford University Press; Roy, T. (2007). Outline of a history of labour in traditional small-scale industry in India. *NLI Research Studies, 86*, 1–38; Venkatesan, S. (2009). *Craft matters: Artisans, development and the Indian nation*. Orient Blackswan ; Becker, C. (2009). Shifting stones, shaping the past: Sculpture from the Buddhist stupas of Andhra Pradesh. *The Art Bulletin, 91*(2), 191–209.
17. Venkatesan, *Craft Matters*.
18. Weltzl-Fairchild, "Folk Art, Identity and the Global Market."
19. Davis, R. H. (1997). *Lives of Indian images*. Princeton University Press.

20. See Jain, *Ganga Devi*.
21. Heinz, "Documenting the Image."
22. Government of India, *GI Registry: Madhubani Painting*; Rangnekar, "Remaking Place."
23. Kar, "Folk Art and the Painter's Craft."
24. Chatterji, *Speaking with Pictures*; Singh, "The Local and the National."
25. Weltzl-Fairchild, "Folk Art, Identity and the Global Market."
26. Venkatesan, *Craft Matters*.
27. Davis, *Lives of Indian Images*.
28. Government of India, *GI Registry: Madhubani Painting*; Rangnekar, "Remaking Place."
29. UNESCO, *Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
30. Schuster, *Mapping State Cultural Policy*; Throsby, "Concentric Circles Model"; UNESCO, *Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage*.
31. Becker, "Shifting Stones"; Brown, *Art for a Modern India*.
32. Chatterji, *Speaking with Pictures*; Singh, "The Local and the National."
33. Davis, *Lives of Indian Images*.