

Dream and Archetype: The Perpetuation of Rituals and Myth Enacted in *Sparsha*

Dipankar Senehang¹ 

¹Lecturer, Kathmandu BernHardt College, Nepal

Article History: *Submitted:* 8 February 2024; *Reviewed:* 19 February 2024; *Revised:* 18 March 2024 **Corresponding Author:** *senehanglims51@gmail.com*; *ORCID:* 0000-0003-2390-6967

Copyright 2024 © The Author(s). The publisher may reuse published articles with prior permission of the concerned author(s). The work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC4.0).



DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3126/spectrum.v2i1.64768>

Abstract

Myths, rituals, and dreams have been common traits of human beings; the underlying structure that underpins the interconnection between them and their inexplicable meanings coherently conjoined within has been a part of investigation. Accordingly, this paper analyzes dreams and archetypes for the formation of rituals in Nabin Chauhan-directed short movie *Sparsha* in the light of Carl Gustav Jung's notion of 'archetype' and 'collective unconsciousness' and Joseph Campbell's understanding of myth. *Sparsha* presents a contestatory story of father and son because of divergent opinions regarding performing rituals. However, Aarohang, the son, ultimately observes rituals reconciling the discrepancies and difficulties. Against this backdrop, this paper argues that archetype necessitates performing a recursive pattern of behavior that becomes a ritual of a particular group of people, which is an enactment of a myth. In other words, *Sparsha* represents the conglomeration of archetypes and myths that unconsciously function in dreams, paving the way for observing the myths in the form of rituals. The paper discloses ritual has a long psychological trial deeply rooted in human instinct, conditioned by unconscious force and dream manifestation, and grilled by mythological narratives. This connection is the primary source that fuels the mechanism that perpetuates the domain of rituals thereby clinging to mythology.

Keywords: Collective Unconscious, Dream Images, Contestation, The Good Mother, The Food, Nwagi

Introduction

From time immemorial, human beings have been dreaming either considering it as an imaginary concept of their surroundings or understanding it as a symbolic projection of futuristic events. In either case, the significance of the dream remains the projectile to understand human conditions in association with their lively atmosphere and the human instinct they resonate with. Dream, thus, is a common individual phenomenon with varying degrees of meaning, fundamentally based on the cultural location and the range of interpretation it observes. As an involuntary action, it, Carl Gustav Jung contends, “transmits unconscious reactions or spontaneous impulses to consciousness” (56). Since the unconscious involuntarily ingrains the dream, it “seems to be guided chiefly by instinctive trends, represented by corresponding thought forms — that is, by the archetypes” (67). In this sense, the linear connection of archetype, unconscious and dream demands conscious action or performance of specific patterns of behavior. However, inquisitively, what are those patterns of behavior? If they come to surface phenomena, what do we call them? Do they have substantial value in human existence? If yes, to what extent?

Focusing on these questions, this paper analyzes Nabin Chauhan directed short movie *Sparsha* in the light of Jung’s ‘archetype’ and Joseph Campbell’s understanding of myth. *Sparsha* is a Limbu cultural short movie featured by *Artmandu*, released in 2019, and nominated for the ‘Nepal Cultural International Film Festival’ in 2020. The movie narrates the story of the Limbu people, who are confronting cultural dysfunction because of the generation gap in the modern world. It stands as an acute instance of cultural practice thereby articulating the significance of dreams and archetypes for the continuation of rituals and mythological narratives. In the span of seven minutes and forty-six seconds, the movie succeeds in holding two major issues: repercussions of the generation gap and the significance of the ritual performance. However, apart from the dominant issues that persist in the movie, I strive to uncover how the movie, within the cultural sphere of the Limbus, unravels the overpowering ways of individual dreams and instinctual behavior, embedding to formulate the rites of its inhabitants. Although Lars Fogelin argues that, “the specific meaning of a symbol is less important than the manner in which it is deployed and the goals of the people who deploy” (59), I argue that the symbols either in the pragmatic life or manifested in their dreams, they determine the behavior

and the underlying structure of people's goal. To recall Silvana A. Rosenfeld and Stefanie L. Bautista, "The formal repetition of rituals can create patterns that materialize in the archaeological records . . ." (5), thus, what people consistently and continuously act as ritual is in fact a collage of historical evidence of human toil. In doing so, this research contributes to a sagacious comprehension of myth and its pervasiveness in association with dreams and archetypes, by uncovering the indispensable relationship between archetypes, dreams, and rituals and their profundity in human cultural continuation. It changes a pale comprehension of the dream, a common phenomenon, by signifying the dream as a fundamental requirement for forming rituals and its continuation.

Methodology

This research paper embodies a multidisciplinary approach, drawing upon the fields of psychology, and mythological studies in the Limbu cultural spectrum. To shed light upon the psychological domain, it undertakes Jung's definition of archetype as a "pattern of instinctual behavior" (61), and to unfold the mythological dimension of the movie, it incorporates Campbell's understanding of myth as an "experience of life" (5). Since archetypes are inherited and mythologies are the narration of human experiences, these two theoretical perspectives promise to succinctly point out the relationship between the myth, archetype, and ritual, contextualizing the visual significance of the movie. To this, this paper encompasses visual analysis as a research method and takes a constructivist approach to interpret the visuals and establish a new set of meanings in cultural discourse. These tools are purposively used to investigate the interplay between archetype, dream, ritual, and myth and its perpetuation across generations.

Dreams as the Wellspring of Archetypes

The most typical way to define a dream from a psychological perspective is, more than a physiological action, it is a psychic experience of human beings that serves the purpose of compensation. To recall Jung, dream brings the unconscious part of urges to the conscious act of visibility. In this sense, the dream has a specific function to discharge and has to construe a worthwhile message to the dreamer because "it [dream] does not mean

something it is not” (Jung 80). For Jung, a dream is “quite unlike a story told by the conscious mind” (27), which instead is a continuous process of bringing archetypal images and symbols into consciousness. Since archetypes are the “complexes of experience that come upon us like fate, and their effects are felt in our most personal life” (31), they appear in physical dominion through dream enactment enforced by unconscious impulses. These phenomena are a significant portion of the movie that shape the entire plot vivaciously imbued to structure the undeniable consequence of the urges. In other words, the dream stands as a primary mechanism to expose the seriousness of cultural practices and their continuation.

The movie begins with the dream of Aarohang’s father where he discerns his wife walking on the forehead of the rice field, following the movement of her voice from the ventriloquism. The sound reverberates: “Aarohang’s father! I roamed around our field on the hill today. The paddy is great. I want to eat rice from this very harvest. Will you give me? I am very hungry” (00:00:17-00:00:32). These lines, I argue, are the articulation of archetype through the unconscious mind of Aarohang’s father. To be more precise, the movie depicts the instinctual behavior of human beings and the structural demand of human necessity in dream manifestation. In this relevance, two imperative archetypes: ‘The Good Mother’ and ‘The Food,’ are requisite for the discussion because these two images hold the centrality of the dream.

Firstly, the woman is undoubtedly Aarohang's mother and she retains the good mother archetype. I should not be misunderstood that I am arguing she is an archetypal figure just because she is the mother of Aarohang, the protagonist; but instead, the point is that she is intensely a manifestation of nature, love, protection, care, and vehemently, an unseen force urging for her physical action. Mary Beth Spore, et al. argue, “The Good Mother offers protection and solace from the harshness and uncertainties of the world and is one of the oldest mythic figures. The Good Mother provides not only emotional support but also spiritual and physical sustenance as well. The connection to life-giving food pervades the literature on the Good Mother” (5). In this sense, since the good mother has nurturing and savior qualities, Aarohang’s mother symbolically resembles the needed qualities. She is in love

with her husband and shares her desire to have food with the harvest. Appraising the nourishment of the crops, she shows her pride and joyousness, which are emotional aspects of human nature. Her emotive reflection resonates with a sense of encouragement to her husband and the strength to sustain his life even in the hardship of old age. Moreover, her mesmerizing words are the energy, not merely caring, to her beloved to face the challenges in her absence. Additionally, natural elements like crops, mountains, and breeze, to name but a few, are simultaneously depicted with Aarahong's mother, thus, it also equates her association with nature.

When the movie portrays Aarahong's mother, an image of the good mother is inoculated in connection with loving and caring emotions. This fits the criteria of the archetypal figures because as Jung claims, "They [archetypes] are, at the same time, both images and emotions. One can speak of an archetype only when these two aspects are simultaneous" (87). From this perspective, Aarahong's mother is an archetype that unconsciously comes into the psychic parameter of Aarahong's father to bring something into consciousness or conscious action. If so, what consciousness does her presence bestow? And what action does she effectuate? To answer these questions, I appropriate Jung's proposition to comprehend the deeper meaning of the symbol as he attests, "When we attempt to understand the symbol, we are not only confronted with the symbol itself but we are brought up against the wholeness of the symbol-producing individuals. This includes a study of cultural background, and in the process, one fills in many gaps in one's own education" (81-82). Jung clarifies that symbol incorporates layers of information hidden beneath interacting with diversified aspects of cultural and individual experiences. The good mother archetype, from the Limbu cultural perspective, resembles Yuma Sammang who, according to Iman Singh Chemjong, "is the only spirit God, who is omnipresent, supreme and eternal" (21). The capability of *Yuma* does not merely reside in itself but at the same time "An internalized and personal belief in *Yuma*," Linda Gustavsson argues, "changes the ritual specialist's role as a mediator between physical and supernatural realms" (137). In this sense, the good mother is a manifestation of *Yuma*, who wants to extort Aarahong's father to understand the relationship between the physical and nonphysical properties of living, revitalizing the

message disseminated in his dream. More importantly, to express her opinion regarding the crops and her desire to have food, informs Aarohang's father about the harvesting time, and summons him to perform *Nwagi*.

Secondly, food, although it is commonly associated with the mother archetype, slightly touches a different pattern of urges in the human psychic process. It is, in fact—in association with the movie, stimulation of the hunger and medium of exchange that consolidates the relationship between physical and nonphysical existence. Aarohang's mother is hungry, which is instinctual, and her desire to have food indicates the physical response to the archetype because as Jung claims, "The archetypes are the unconscious images of the instincts themselves" (61) and these images demand a responsive effort of human action. Moreover, the food as an image of crops and the emotion of sharing have come together to foreclose the archetypal images in the dream of Aarohang's father that significantly captures the essence of the archetype. As Jung claims, "They [archetypes] are, indeed, an instinctive *trend*, as marked as the impulse of birds to build nests, or ants to form organized colonies" (58). In relevance to human beings, food urges them to either consume or harvest. To this, the food archetype has been enunciated in the movie to stress the instinctual trend of an individual, formulating the collective unconscious.

According to Jung, "The collective unconscious is a part of the psyche which can be negatively distinguished from a personal unconscious by the fact that it does not, like the latter, owe its existence to personal experience and consequently is not a personal acquisition" (59-60). Jung clarifies that collective unconscious "does not develop individually but is inherited" (60) communally, consisting "essentially of archetypes" (60). If so, food and hunger are the instinctual behaviors of living beings and undoubtedly it is a shared value of human beings. Therefore, when portraying food, the movie is not merely striving to inculcate archetypes but also, meanwhile, reflecting upon the collective unconscious of human beings. In this sense, the depiction of food resembles the inheritance and continuation of the instinctual trend, developing the regime of the collective unconscious. It is not to say that the food archetype is the only responsible factor in the movie for contriving collective unconscious but rather, the archetypes whether food or mother, as long as they

are archetypes, are necessarily the salient components to rejuvenate and elongate its domain.

In the above discussion, I have shed light on the archetypes and the mode of collective unconscious compounded by archetypal images. Moreover, I have also considered how these elements are portrayed in the movie, disseminating their significance and purpose. Now, since the archetype and the collective unconscious, both are roughed by the unconscious, a very significant question remains unanswered. That is, how are these forms released? To this, Jung maintains, “The main source then, is *dreams*, which have the advantage of being involuntary, spontaneous products of the unconscious psyche and are therefore pure products of nature not falsified by any conscious purpose” (67). For Jung, a dream maintains transcendental distance from consciousness, and it does not allow consciousness to exacerbate the potential ground in which it is residing. In this regard, the movie delineates the archetype and the collective unconscious of the Limbu people through the dream of Aarohang's father.

The Contestation of Dream Interpretation

The dream, paving the way for the narratives of the story, occupies the most significant exposition of the movie; however, how it comes to the surface phenomena and what consequence it retains, becomes palpable after the father asks Aarohang to observe *Nwagi*. Aarohang's father recuperates his dream conveying the message to his son and asserting the promises he contrived to his wife. He also mentions his son about the assertion he made to his wife thereby justifying his proposition to acclaim there is a compulsion to do *Nwagi* sooner. When his wife expressed her wish to eat rice pudding, he says, “I said ‘We have not done *Nwagi* this year yet.’ Her face deemed. So, I asked her to come after five days. It was only then that she laughed shaking her *Bulaki*¹” (0:01:25-0:01:34). Aarohang does not deny doing the *Nwagi*; nevertheless, he rationalizes his idea by telling his father's request to be illogical. In response to his father, for example, he says, “I know *Nwagi* is a must. However, demanding it to be done within 5-6 days is irrational” (0:00:46-0:00:53). The

¹ A traditional ornament that women wear or typically hang on the nose in different parts of Nepal as a cultural attire or symbol.

dialogue between father and son resonates with a contestation where the father is motivated by dream images and the son with his rational conception. But why does the movie portray such an atmosphere where tension rises because of antithetical opinions?

In fact, deploying the conflicting situation when the ideas collide between father and son, I argue, that the movie immaculates the difference in understanding the meaning of the dream and the ability to interpret it justifiably. In doing so, it depicts the difficulties of the process of materializing and perpetuating the rituals of a particular cultural group. The collision of the thoughts is an emblematic articulation of the ability and inability to define the symbolic images embedded in the dream. Aarohang's father understands the images of his dream and is capable of magnifying its significance; however, there remain tremendous cleavages in an understanding of the dream between son and father. The contestation between father and son might be because of the generation gap in a literal sense; but in fact, if analyzed from the Jungian perspective, the son lacks the intellectual ability and intuition to interpret the dream. Since, "The unconscious aspect of any event is revealed to us in dreams, where it appears not as a rational thought but as a symbolic image" (Jung 5), it demands mental gymnastics and a curious outlook to define them. For Jung, "Intuition is almost indispensable in the interpretation of symbols, and it can often ensure that they are immediately understood by the dreamer" (82). But in the movie, Aarohang is neither a dreamer nor he is inquisitive to perceive things embedded in his father's dreams. Instead of acknowledging the imperatives and the pragmatic value that the dream possesses, he says, "OK! Mother might have asked us to do *Nwagi*. But may not be within five days! (0:01:02-0:01:05). This dialogue reveals Aarohang's fallacy to justify the purpose of the dream, as not merely asking for validation but also questioning the reliability of the dream symbols. He interprets his father's dream from scientific criteria, maintaining a reasonable distance between his subjective thoughts regarding the dream and the cognitive ability he attains.

The discrepancies of thought between Aarohang and his father inscribe plenty of elements that hint at Aarohang's passivity and his separation from the ego consciousness. For example, when his wife suggests to him, that instead of being aware of the collective behavior that he had to adhere to, he subjectively

indicates his father's misdoing and accuses him of being obstinate and mulish. Negating his wife's suggestion, Aarohang says, "Don't talk rubbish. There is no compulsion to do *Nwagi* in five days! Father is only behaving so stubbornly" (0:09:38-0:09:46). Aarohang, emphasizing his thought, instead becomes obdurate in rejecting his father's request. More importantly, he consciously spurns the unconscious phenomena of the dream and constantly holds his opinion, predominantly defining him as true. In doing so, what he forgets is dreams are preponderated by the unconscious and as Sigmund Freud claims, "The unconscious is the larger sphere, which includes within it the smaller sphere of the conscious. Everything conscious has an unconscious preliminary stage; whereas what is unconscious may remain at that stage and nevertheless claim to be regarded as having the full value of a psychical process" (607). From this perspective, Aarohang's conscious refutation cannot efface the significance of the dream and significantly, he might reject the conscious thoughts he acquires but cannot omit the unconscious manifestation because it is the fundamental ground of his perceptions. The point is that Aarohang since he misreads the dream and objects to his father, fails to understand the significance of his father's motif and the essence of the dream that incorporates different meanings than it superficially encompasses.

When Aarohang's father was demanding to do *Nwagi*, he was coaxing Aarohang to participate in the ritual thereby employing the instinctual urges of the archetype—following the unconscious root of the psychic forces divulged through the dream. One might argue that Aarohang was not abjuring to participate in the ritual, only acclaiming it to be groundless if observed earlier merely because his father had a dream where his mother requested the food. To this, I would suggest, Aarohang's father had visited the field and had observed the crops thus it had instinctually mechanized him to foresee the reality through the dream manifestation. As Jung argues, "The sources of dreams are often repressed instincts which have a natural tendency to influence the conscious mind" (68), the dream of Aarohang's father resembles the instinctual trend of rituals that provoke him to force Aarohang to do *Nwagi*. In this sense, Aarohang's confutation to accept the very fact of his father's proposition was also an implicit denial of the rituals. Thus, the movie is also a vehement

prognostication of the impact of the inability to interpret the dream and its possible impact on the perpetuation of the rituals.

Rituals: Enacting Mythic Narratives

I have so far discussed the archetypal images, driven by instinctual trends, in the dream as dream symbols, and the contestatory interpretation of the dream impacting the performance of the rituals. Now, I focus on the climax of the movie to explore how mythic narratives revitalize the necessity of ritual continuation, or how despite contestation mythology recuperates the wound of cleavages, assisting in the perpetuation of the rituals. In doing so, although ‘rituals’ incorporate varieties of collective behavioral practices of human beings, I use the term to address such trends holistically. Holistically, I mean, rather than distinguishing them in terms of types, death rituals, and marriage rituals, to name but a few, I address the term in totality regardless of its different forms, encapsulating all the collective behavior human beings adhere to and accepting the definition by Rosenfeld and Bautista as they claim, “ritual can be seen as an enactment of relationships tying humans to spirits, gods, ancestors, animals, and objects” (6). Thus, I take *Nwagi* as a Limbu cultural ritual to tether their relationship with the spirits and gods, revamping the necessity of its prolongation and essentializing the significance of myth and its impact on human behavior.

The movie discloses the dissension between the father and son which is conditioned by the circumstances and the external force that prolongs the reign of peculiarity between them. Following the request of his father, however, Aarohang attempts to call *Phedangwa*, the Limbu priest, but he fails to fetch him because he believes that the *Phedangwa* is an egoist. Nevertheless, when he finds his father visiting the *Chihhanghar*, cemetery, of his wife with flowers, he bursts into tears and acknowledges his blunder. With this, we come now to crucial questions; Why does the movie, in its climax, essentialize death and the graveyard to make Aarohang realize his mistake? Is there only love and motherhood or does it mean something else? The purpose of the shot cannot be justified merely from a cinematic perspective as it resolves the story into a new state of equilibrium, and for this purpose, to give a broader perspective, I turn to Joseph Cambell.

Accepting that death is the beginning of the mythology, Campbell says, “The earliest evidence of anything like mythological thinking is associated with the graves” (89). For Campbell, death does not necessarily mean the end of life because he suggests “. . . there was a person who was alive and warm before you who is now lying there, cold, and beginning to rot. Something was there that isn’t there. Where is it now?” (89). There is always an essence in human beings that keeps the human body mobile, and surely that does not stop vibrating when the body stops working but instead, since the body is merely a vehicle to materialize life, it consistently goes on, be it physically or spiritually. From this perspective, Aarohang’s mother is dead physically but her life, in the form of a spirit, is still alive. Her physical disappearance does not mean the end of her life; instead, she persists in different forms because nothing, including the essence of life, completely vanishes. In fact, “Burial always involves the idea of the continued life beyond the visible one, of a plane of being that is behind the visible plane, and that is somehow supportive of the visible one to which we have to relate” (90). In this relevance, the movie shows the cemetery to expound the spiritual liveliness of Aarohang’s mother, and the mythological root to connect Aarohang with his long-lost mother who has become invisible but always around him, connecting with everlasting energy.

The graveyard, in the movie, is, thus, what abridges Aarohang with the pervasiveness of the mythology. And, to its corollary, since the myth dissociates an individual from the regime of solitary and conjoins with the collective whole, the cemetery is used as an emblem to connect him with his social group. If so, how does he connect himself with his belongings? More practically, I stress the answer— through rituals because as Campbell contends, “The main theme in ritual is the linking of the individual to a larger morphological structure than that of his own physical body” (90). It means ritual is capable of rejoining the disassociated character of the society in a cumulative totality, consolidating the social force that it contains. Instead of creating a domain for a particular body, it unites structurally with its fundamentals. However, since, “Ritual is prescribed,” as Stephan Feuchtwang argues, “and it is, therefore, a deliberately learned discipline, not just a habit picked up with experience and mimicry. It does things to people who perform it. Its performance forms public emotions and virtues, whether ascetic or

ecstatic, whether through pain or through pleasure” (283). Thus, it is essential to note that it is not easy to understand the horizon of ritual. In the words of Ramesh Kumar Limbu, “Each ritual action, instrument and fetish or object may have several meanings and needs a long range of painstaking pursuit in order to get a comprehensive insight into it” (129). The ritual, in this sense, does not mean lousy behavioral practices without meaning but rather a bunch of rational accumulation involved for a particular purpose that demands comprehensive and subtle understanding to unearth its ethos.

Probably, that is why the cemetery shot is intentionally taken to make the climax of the movie. I mean, since the ritual is a matter of vehement cognizance, one has to go through profound discernment, full of empathy and tenderness, the movie portrays the protagonist in the mode of catharsis in the cemetery scene, which is to show his erudition for the rituals. Because, as a result, when Aarohang’s regret culminates in a deep reminiscence of his childhood, he, therefore, decides to persuade *Phedangwa* to do *Nwagi*. In doing so, he is involved in rituals that his ancestors, including his father, used to perform. This means he ties himself with the god *Yuma*, the spirit of his mother, and nature—dissolving his singularity into collective social and cultural practice. In other words, as Campbell mentions, ritual “is in accord with the way of nature, not simply with personal impulse” (92), Aarohang, ultimately, celebrating *Nwagi* resembles his confluence with his cultural and social belongings, liberating himself from the spur of selfhood and submerging him into the intensity of the nature. And interestingly, his involvement in the rituals means his association with the myth because as Joseph Campbell argues, “Ritual is simply myth enacted; by participating in a rite, you are participating directly in the myth” (xix). Therefore, whether he is following the tradition or is repealing himself to amalgam in the communal whole, undoubtedly, in either case, he is inheriting myth through these mediums. If it is so then the movie’s attempt to illustrate Aarohang’s entanglement with the myth is not merely to show his transmogrification but rather an ardent continuation of rituals across generations and this is what myth does. To recall Campbell, “By absorbing the myths of his social group and participating in its rites, the youngster is structured to accord with his social as well as natural environment, and turned from an amorphous nature product, prematurely born, into a defined and

competent member of some specific, efficiently functioning social order” (35). Myth works as a mechanism to shape the environment of an individual thereby connecting them to the grammar of social parameters through rituals. Thus, Aarohang’s act of performance mirrors the process of the perpetuation of the rituals and the myth enacted in doing so.

Indeed, the movie starts with a dream of Aarohang’s father and ends with Aarohang’s ritual performance. The entire story revolves around the conditions of the protagonist that take him apart from the dream and myth that drags him to the rituals. In such a scenario, a susceptible part of a question can be like since it was the father who dreamt, then, does an individual’s dream pave the way for the continuation of rituals and myth enactment? Well, might it be more abstract and nonsensical in an empirical world where science and pragmatic studies may offer a more rational answer to the question because as Ernest Sosa claims, “Dreams seem more like imaginings, or stories, or even daydreams, all fictions of a sort, or quasi-fictions. Even when in a dream conscious choice, one need not do so in actuality. Nor does one necessarily affirm in reality whatever one consciously affirms in a dream” (10); however, I believe, an individual’s dream is a route to the collective dream. And I also agree, “The myth is the public dream and the dream is the private myth” (Campbell 48), because if an individual’s dream can accord with the public dream that can, in fact, change the dimension of mythological function. A collective dream cannot sustain its existence without the dream of an individual. Therefore, as Clyde Kluckhohn argues, “There are always individuals in every society who have their private rituals; there are always individuals who dream and who have compensatory phantasies” (52). These fantasies, in fact, do not merely confirm their limitation within individual consciousness but rather as Marie Bonaparte claims, “The fantasies of the Unconscious assert their claims to implicit belief” (116), relating individuals with the society. This is to say an individual’s dream becomes the myth of society through rituals. That is why “Ritual has been,” as Lord Raglan states, “at most times and for most people, the most important thing in the world” (461).

Conclusion

In this research paper, I have discussed the indispensable relationship between archetypes, dreams, rituals, and myths in the short movie *Sparsha*. I have shown that archetype, an instinctual behavior, through the route of the unconscious, appears in the dream and when dream images are hammered by the mythological symbol it perpetuates the regime of ritual. In this short movie, the instinctual trend symbolically hints at Aarohang's father through the dream that necessitates him to force his son to do *Nwagi*, but Aarohang's incapability to interpret the dream symbol leads to the contestation between father and son. However, when the mythological force strikes his consciousness, he participates in the ritual. Analytically, I have reflected upon the process of the perpetuation of rituals, with the help of instinctual trends. To be more specific, I have disclosed how rituals are not a random continuation of human behavior but rather a selective practice—motivated by instinctual urges and powered by mythology. As I have argued the archetype unconsciously emerges in the dream that demands a conscious action and this conscious action becomes the ritual practice signifying the cultural and social wholeness, when instigated by the myths.

I have also reflected on the vastness and the difficulties of the propagation of the rituals, reflecting upon the conflict between Aarohang and his father. In doing so, I have argued how an individual departed from the root still can intertwine with the rituals if triggered by the mythological functions. In these backdrops, I have shown that the movie is the articulation of ritual or myth, since the ritual is myth enacted, pervasiveness and the secret behind their existence so far, despite the world having been modernized. I have put forth that until and unless human beings embody instinctual trends they consistently evaporate them with the unconscious impacts in the dream—compelling them to participate in social practices. In this relevance, thus, the research concludes that *Sparsha* is an exemplary movie that depicts the root of ritual and mythological perpetuation, vehemently portraying the interplay between archetype, unconscious, dream, rituals, and myths. It, moreover, reflects that as long as human beings dream, they continue performing ritual behavior and mythological action.

This research has shown the indispensable relationship between human instinctual behavior and the rituals they perform; however, what is left behind is the dimension of love, affection, and compassion or the triangulation of father, mother, and son which enables to substantiate the archetypal significance and mythological pervasiveness against the backdrops of dream world and the world of reality that Aarohang's family exist. Thus, a broader spectrum to investigate the multifaceted avenues embedded in the triangulation could be a significant way to answer the question of how these archetypal images, mythologies, and dreams help to create family ties or how an unseen force is the foundational blocks to construct a repository of love and memories that persist even the somatic body collapses.

Funding details

I have not received any financial support or funding from anywhere for the study.

Disclosure statement

I do not have any conflicts of interest to disclose.

Works Cited

- Bonaparte, Marie. "The Myth of the Corpse in the Car." *American Imago*, vol. 2, no. 2, 1941, pp. 105–26. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26300897>. Accessed 19 June 2023.
- Campbell, Joseph and Bill Moyers. *The Power of Myth*. Anchor Books, 1991.
- Campbell, Joseph. *Myths to Live by*. Vintage Books, 1972.
- . *Pathways to Bliss: Mythology and Personal Transformation*, edited by David Kudler, Yogi Impressions LLB, 2018.
- Chauhan, Nabin. "Sparsha - Limbu Cultural Short Film || Official Selected On NCIFF || ArtMandu ||." *Youtube*, performed by Aangdhoj Chemjong, Dayalu Baje, Sunita Nembang, ArtMandu Nepal Pvt. Ltd. 25 June 2019, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7F7Gr9Xp29s>.
- Chemjong, Iman Singh. *History and Culture of Kirat People*. Kirat Yakthung Chumlung, 2003.

- Feuchtwang, Stephan. "Ritual and Memory." *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, edited by Susannah Radstone and Bill Schwarz, Fordham University Press, 2010, pp. 281–98. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1c999bq.23>. Accessed 17 May 2023.
- Fogelin, Lars. "The Archaeology of Religious Ritual." *Annual Review of Anthropology*, vol. 36, 2007, pp. 55–71. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25064944>. Accessed 16 Mar. 2024.
- Freud, Sigmund. *The Interpretation of Dream*, Translated and Edited by James Strachey, Basic Books, 2010.
- Gusravsson, Linda. "Yumaism: A New Syncretic Religion among the Sikkimese Limbus," *Buddhist Modernities Re-Inventing Tradition in the Globalizing Modern World*, edited by Hanna Havnevik et al., Routledge, 2017, pp. 133-148.
- Jung, Carl Gustav. *Four Archetypes Mother, Rebirth, Spirit, Trickster*, Translated by R.F.C. Hull, Routledge, 2004.
- . *Man and his Symbol*. Dell Publishing, 1968.
- . *The Portable Jung*. edited by Joseph Campbell, Penguin Books, 1976.
- Kluckhohn, Clyde. "Myths and Rituals: A General Theory." *The Harvard Theological Review*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1942, pp. 45–79. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1508351>. Accessed 19 June 2023.
- Limbu, R. K. "Language as Cultural Expression: The Case of Limbu Mundhum and Ritual." *JODEM: Journal of Language and Literature*, vol. 11, no. 1, Dec. 2020, pp. 125-41, doi:10.3126/jodem.v11i1.34813.
- Raglan, Lord. "Myth and Ritual." *The Journal of American Folklore*, vol. 68, no. 270, 1955, pp. 454–61. *JSTOR*, <https://doi.org/10.2307/536770>. Accessed 19 June 2023.
- Rosenfeld, Silvana A., and Stefanie L. Bautista. "An Archaeology of Rituals." *Rituals of the Past: Prehispanic and Colonial Case Studies in Andean Archaeology*, edited by Silvana A. Rosenfeld and Stefanie L. Bautista, University

Press of Colorado, 2017, pp. 3–20. *JSTOR*,
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1mtz7j7.5>. Accessed 17 June 2023.

Sosa, Ernest. “Dreams and Philosophy.” *Proceedings and Addresses of the American*

Philosophical Association, vol. 79, no. 2, 2005, pp. 7–18. *JSTOR*,
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/30046211>. Accessed 11 June 2023.

Spore, Mary Beth, et al. “Chapter One: The Good Mother Archetype in Myth: Substantive Characteristics of Mytho-Poetics.” *Counterpoints*, vol. 187, 2002, pp. 5–11. *JSTOR*, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42977917>. Accessed 12 June 2023.