# G. Aravindan: Myth, Metaphor, and Malayalam Cinema

Ashik M E, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India
Mriganka Madhukaillya, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India
Imon Shyam, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, India

The Asian Conference on Media, Communication & Film 2025
Official Conference Proceedings

## Abstract

This paper examines the cinematic artistic styles of G. Aravindan, a celebrated Malayalam filmmaker and cartoonist, focusing on his unique storytelling approach that blends myth, folklore, and social realism. Through an analysis of key films such as *Kummatty* (1979), which uses a bogeyman tale to explore themes of freedom, *Esthappan* (1980), which keen into human perception through a mystic figure, and *Kanchana Sita* (1977), a humanized retelling of the "Ramayana" with nature as metaphor and *Thampu* (1978) is discussed for its symbolic use of a circus tent as a miniature of this world. Aravindan's minimalist, visually driven narratives, marked by long takes, natural settings, the use of non-professional actors, and poetic silence, reveal his unique cinematic language and representation of existential and societal themes. This paper highlights his contribution to Malayalam cinema as a filmmaker who seamlessly merges myth and reality, creating works of philosophical and aesthetic depth.

*Keywords:* G. Aravindan, Malayalam cinema, mythopoeic cinema, contemplative cinema

## Introduction

G. Aravindan, born in 1935 in Kottayam, Kerala, began his artistic career as a cartoonist, then filmmaker. This paper examines four of Aravindan's most significant works: *Kanchana Sita* (1977), *Thampu* (1978), *Kummatty* (1979), and *Esthappan* (1980). These films, created during the most productive period of his career, exemplify his mature artistic vision and demonstrate the various ways in which he employed myth and metaphor to explore fundamental questions about human existence, society, and the nature of reality itself. Through close textual analysis of these films, this study seeks to illuminate the distinctive features of Aravindan's cinematic language and assess his contribution to world cinema.

## Literature Review

The scholarship on G. Aravindan's cinema has evolved considerably over the past four decades, reflecting growing recognition of his significance not only within Indian cinema but in the broader context of world art cinema. Early critical responses, primarily in Malayalam, focused on thematic interpretations and plot analysis. However, more recent scholarship has begun to engage seriously with the formal and aesthetic dimensions of his work, situating him within broader theoretical frameworks of film studies. In *Kummatty*, the mythical figure is intrinsically linked to the seasons, arriving in spring "when the rain is over and the plants are green in bloom. He is part of that nature" (Dungarpur, 2021). The narrative itself is framed by the natural world, unfolding between a sunrise and a sky full of birds, suggesting a cycle that is more ecological than merely narrative (Venkiteswaran, 2021). This is not a conscious stylistic choice but an organic expression of the director's own discomfort with urbanity; as Aravindan stated, "I love to be close to nature. I'm very uncomfortable in cities" (Aravindan G., The Ray the came in from the south, 1985).

*Kummatty* serves as a central case study in Aravindan's oeuvre. Critics like C.S. Venkiteswaran analyze it as a sequel to his earlier film *Thampu*, noting shared narrative structures where an outsider (a circus troupe in *Thampu*, the mythical Kummatty in *Kummatty*) arrives in a remote, self-contained village, creates ripples, and departs, leaving a transformed community behind (Venkiteswaran, 2021). The film is deeply ethnographic, portraying a village life where "all human activity... is controlled by nature" (Aravindan G. , A filmaker pitches his tent, 1984). The narrative is woven with folk songs that "tell stories and fantasise about Kummatty," creating a "magical folktale world" where the boundaries between "human and non-human, fantasy and reality... all merge and overlap" (Venkiteswaran, 2021). Aravindan himself explained that he constructed a functional, slightly unreal backdrop to make the arrival of the mythical Kummatty feel plausible, locating the character's personality "between myth and reality" (Aravindan, as cited in Venkiteswaran, 2021).

Scholars interpret Aravindan's work as creating what Gayatri Devi calls an "ethical community," both within the film and among its viewers. His films explore "the capacity of myth and faith" to forge this community by showing the simultaneous existence of the visible world and the invisible world of thought, myth, and faith (Devi, 2016).

The abundant presence of animals, birds, and natural phenomena in *Kummatty* (1979) fosters a "post-human aesthetics" and an "ecological vision" (Venkiteswaran, 2021). The film emphasizes that "the boundaries between the human and the animal are slender," presenting all life as part of an interconnected web and framing the responsibility of being human as a sentient part of this whole.

Aravindan's work garnered significant international recognition, most notably in Japan, where preeminent critic Tadao Sato hailed *Kummatty* (1979) as "the most beautiful film he had ever seen" (Committee, 2022), inaugurating a lasting appreciation for the director's work in that country.

## Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design centred on auteur theory and close textual analysis to investigate the unique cinematic language of G. Aravindan. The research is structured as an auteur-led case study analysis of four key films, selected for their representation of his mature artistic vision and core thematic preoccupations. The analysis is guided by a synthesis of three primary theoretical frameworks. First, auteur theory positions the director as a distinct cinematic author whose coherent vision is expressed through a signature style. Second, mythopoeic analysis examines the active re-creation and re-contextualization of mythological and folkloric sources. Third, an ecocritical and post-humanist lens investigates the portrayal of nature as an active force and the interconnectedness of life. Primary data consists of the filmic texts themselves. Secondary sources include scholarly literature and the director's own statements, which provide critical context and insight into artistic intentions. The core analytical method is close textual and comparative analysis. This involves detailed examination of mise-en-scène, narrative structure, sound design, and metaphor/symbolism across the selected films to identify unifying techniques and themes, thereby substantiating the argument for a coherent auteur signature. The research is committed to a respectful engagement with the specific cultural context, grounding interpretations in textual evidence and established scholarly discourse while prioritizing the internal logic of the films and the director's stated intentions.

## *Kanchana Sita* (1977): Humanizing Myth Through Nature's Metaphor

In his 1978 film *Kanchana Sita*, G. Aravindan undertakes a radical reinterpretation of the Indian epic, the Ramayana. His primary method is the use of nature as a total symbolic reference for the character of Sita, who remains physically absent throughout the entire film. This approach is rooted in the folk tradition that identifies Sita with the spirit of the natural world.

Aravindan's central thematic device is the application of the Prakriti-Purusha principle, a core concept in Indian philosophy that distinguishes between the material, creative energy of nature (Prakriti) and the spiritual consciousness (Purusha). In the film, Sita is presented as Prakriti itself. During scenes of conflict and agitation among the male characters, her presence is felt through the rustling of leaves or the movement of tree branches. This sudden, audible intervention of nature consistently serves a moderating function, cooling tensions and steering the characters toward reconciliation. By making Sita an omnipresent but invisible force of nature, Aravindan humanizes the myth. He moves away from the mainstream, divine portrayals of the Ramayana to present a more earthly and philosophical narrative. This humanization is further emphasized by his casting choice; he enlisted tribal people from the banks of the Godavari River, who are believed to belong to Rama's clan, to play the characters, grounding the epic in a specific cultural and ethnic reality. Through this framework, Aravindan boldly interrogates conventional notions of "Dharma" and "Adharma" (righteousness and unrighteousness). The film suggests that true dharma may not reside solely in royal decrees or masculine codes of honour but is intrinsically linked to a harmonious relationship with the

natural world, which Sita embodies. Thus, *Kanchana Sita* uses its mythological source not for devotion but as a medium to explore profound ecological and ethical questions.

The film immediately establishes its unique aesthetic from the opening sequence. A slow zoom out from a river, revealing a mountain forest and two figures walking through the mud, grounds the myth in a tangible, primal reality. Rama and Lakshmana are depicted not as celestial beings, but as dark-skinned, bearded tribesmen clad in traditional attire, their humanity emphasised by their earthly surroundings. This visual strategy strips the epic of its celestial grandeur, repositioning it within an anthropological and realistic context. This earthly perspective is the lens through which all subsequent conflicts are viewed, making the gods and heroes relatable, flawed, and susceptible to profound anguish.

One of the most potent conflicts Aravindan explores is that of Varna, the caste system. The episode of Shambuka, a Shudra attempting penance, serves as a critical indictment of socially sanctioned violence. Rama's enforcement of the caste law, leading to Shambuka's death, is presented not as a glorious act of dharma but as a brutal necessity of his office. The film's critique is sharpened through powerful visual juxtaposition, the ritualistic sacrifice of the horse in the Ashvamedha Yaga is paralleled with the killing of Shambuka. This editing choices forces the audience to question the nature of true dharma. The climax of the narrative, the Ashvamedha Yaga, synthesises these conflicts. The use of a golden idol of Sita in the ritual, foregrounded by the sacrificial fire, is a potent symbol of the patriarchal substitution of a living woman with a hollow, man-made effigy. This act critiques a society that prioritizes ritualistic form over human essence.

In conclusion, *Kanchana Sita* (1977) concludes not with royal triumph but with catharsis and tragic ambiguity. The final scenes of the Yaga venue burning, while Rama and his sons call out for Sita, symbolize the collapse of the rigid structures upon which his reign was built. Aravindan's film is a subversive work that dares to humanize a god, presenting a Rama who is a victim of his own duty, haunted by guilt over the murder of Shambuka and the exile of Sita. By making Sita an invisible yet omnipresent force of Nature, the film ultimately affirms her moral and spiritual victory. Through its serene pacing and philosophical depth, Kanchana Sita compels its audience to move beyond simplistic notions of right and wrong, inviting them instead to contemplate the heavy, often contradictory, burdens of authority, justice, and the eternal human search for reconciliation with the natural world.

### *Thampu* (1978): The Circus as Microcosm of Society

*Thampu* (1978), G. Aravindan's third feature film, uses the setting of a travelling circus to create a metaphorical exploration of society, community, and human dignity. The title, meaning "tent" in Malayalam, points to the film's central organising image. *Thampu* (1978) unfolds through a series of nineteen distinct spectacles, tracing the arrival, integration, and departure of a circus troupe within a village, while contrasting transient entertainment with enduring social structures.

The film establishes the circus's entrance as the first spectacle. The arrival of the troupe and the setting up of the large tent on the riverbank serves as a free, preliminary show for the villagers, demonstrating that the very act of creating the spectacle is a performance. This transient world is contrasted with the village's own daily performance of cyclical life and the spectacle of modernity brought by the construction of a new factory. The circus integrates itself by promoting its show through a vibrant announcement rally, marketing its fantasy to every

social stratum. The early shows emphasize the shared experience of the audience, who watch the performance with awe, laughter, shock, and delight. However, the sources emphasize spectacles that deliberately break this illusion to reveal human suffering. The clown, or buffoon, provides the first crack when he responds to teasing children not with laughter but with a deeply sad and silent gaze. This internal reality culminates when the clown is slapped by the manager; he breaks character, identifying himself as Krishnan and revealing a life of forced performance and internal death for survival, marking the climax where the spectacle collapses. Another spectacle of suffering is Lakshmi, the old tightrope walker, who shares her story of being sold at age six and enduring 44 years of lifelong captivity and exhaustion behind her performance. The circus's appeal is eventually overshadowed by competing spectacles. The annual temple festival, announced by the Temple Committee, proves to be a religious spectacle rooted in community and tradition, drawing massive crowds with powerful Chenda drums and rituals. The circus performers, still in their makeup, ultimately become outsiders, standing outside their tent and watching the temple festival fireworks. With their temporary world dissolved, the final spectacle is the troupe's departure, continuing their eternal journey.

The film *Thampu* (1978) masterfully presents the idea that life itself is a series of interconnected spectacles, and we are all performers and audience members within it. The circus is the most literal spectacle, a world of intentional illusion and performance. However, the film shows that the village has its own spectacles: the daily ritual of the pump operator, the construction of the factory, the rich man's display of wealth, and the overpowering religious festival. Each of these is a 'show' that commands attention, conveys a certain narrative, and demands a role from its participants. Humans, like the characters, are part of this endless show. They perform roles dictated by our social status (the Master, the worker, the clown), our economic circumstances (the rich family, the struggling circus), and our traditions. All characters feel trapped by their parts. The most profound truth the film reveals is that the spectacle is often a mask for pain, exploitation, and survival. Krishnan and Lakshmedathi are not just performers; they are prisoners of the spectacle, their personal tragedies hidden behind greasepaint and daring feats. The moment the mask slips, it reveals that the "show" is a mechanism for coping with a harsh world. Ultimately, *Thampu* (1978) suggests that life is a constant cycle of spectacles rising and falling. The circus arrives and departs, the temple festival concludes, the factory is built, and individuals move from one stage to another, like the rich man's son joining the circus.

The tent itself becomes a powerful metaphor throughout the film. The act of erecting the tent, shown in careful detail early in the film, represents community creation, the collaborative work of transforming empty space into a structured environment where performance and community can occur. The film demonstrates Aravindan's ability to find universal themes in specific subjects, creating a work that is simultaneously a document of a particular place and time and a metaphorical exploration of fundamental human experiences. Like the circus tent it depicts, the film creates a temporary world that offers insights into larger realities, inviting viewers to see the extraordinary in the everyday and the universal in the particular.

### *Kummatty* (1979): Folklore, Freedom, and the Transformation of Childhood

*Kummatty* (1979) represents one of G. Aravindan's most accessible yet profoundly layered works, employing the framework of a traditional Kerala folklore tale to explore themes of childhood innocence, imagination, and the transformative power of freedom. The film's narrative centres on the titular character, Kummatty, a bogeyman figure from Kerala folklore who possesses magical powers to transform children into animals. Through this fantastical

premise, Aravindan creates a meditation on the nature of childhood, the relationship between humanity and nature, and the constraints imposed by social structures.

The character of Kummatty himself is crucial to the film's meaning. Neither fully benevolent nor malevolent, Kummatty represents the ambiguity of nature and the unknown. His magical powers can be read as metaphors for imagination and transformation, the capacity to see beyond the mundane reality of everyday existence. When the children are transformed into animals, they experience a kind of liberation from human constraints, able to move and perceive the world differently. This transformation can be understood as representing the imaginative freedom of childhood, the ability to inhabit other identities and perspectives that adults gradually lose.

## Classification 1: The Two Realms of Existence – The Mythical and the Material

The film meticulously constructs two parallel worlds that constantly interact, the world of myth and imagination, and the world of material reality and routine.

The Mythical Realm: This is introduced through sound and suggestion. The film begins not with an image, but with a folk song about "the beginning of everything," immediately grounding us in a timeless, oral tradition. Kummatty himself is first a whisper, a name children use to scare each other, a story told by the old granny. This realm is associated with nature, the vast skies, the open fields, the ancient temple pond, and the mysterious forest. It is a world where magic is possible, where songs can control the weather, and a wandering stranger can transform children into animals.

The Material Realm: This is the world of daily routine and modern education. We see Chindan brushing his teeth, his mother peeling vegetables, and the children going to school. In school, they learn about democracy, elections, and science (microbes and bacteria). This represents the structured, rational, and modern world that is slowly imposing itself on the village. Aravindan does not present these two realms as enemies. Instead, they overlap and inform each other. The lesson on bacteria connects to the shaman's exorcism and Kummatty's songs about disease spreading spirits, showing different cultural narratives explaining the same phenomena. The climax, where children are transformed into animals, is the ultimate fusion of these realms, where the mythical directly invades the material.

## Classification 2: Kummatty as a Personification of Nature and Cycle

Kummatty is not a conventional villain or a saint, he is a symbolic force, closely aligned with the natural world and its cycles. The Arrival and Departure: His entrance into the village is like a seasonal change. He arrives with the dawn, singing an invocation to the primal forests, and his songs about the "Lord who arrives riding the elephant of dark clouds" directly reference the monsoon. His departure, walking into the darkening horizon, signifies the end of a season.

The Giver and The Taker: He brings joy, magic, and biscuits to the children, representing the abundance and creativity of nature. However, his magic also leads to Chindan's suffering, symbolizing how nature can be unpredictable and harsh. His eventual return after a year completes the cycle, bringing redemption and restoration, much like the return of spring or the rains after a long drought. The film grounds its fantasy in an agricultural society's worldview, where life is inherently cyclical. The post-harvest ritual of Kothamooriyattam that occurs in

the middle of the film reinforces this, connecting human celebration to the rhythms of the land. Kummatty is the embodiment of this cyclical rhythm,both benevolent and detached.

## Classification 3: The Loss of Innocence and the Metaphor of Caging

The central narrative arc follows Chindan's journey, which serves as a metaphor for the loss of childhood innocence and the constraints of adulthood. Innocence as Freedom: The first half of the film is filled with images of freedom, children running through fields, Chindan releasing a caught fish back into the water, and the boundless sky. The children's lives, while simple, are unrestricted.

The conclusion of *Kummatty* (1979) offers a powerful and resonant resolution. When Kummatty returns, and Chindan is restored to his human form, it is not just a reversal of a spell. It is a moment of healing and reconciliation between the human and the natural, the imaginative and the real. The final act of the film is its most profound. Chindan, having experienced both the boundless freedom of childhood and the painful caging of his transformation, returns home and frees his parrot. This single action signifies a deep understanding. He has learned the value of freedom through its loss. The subsequent montage of numerous birds flying in different directions across the limitless sky is a final, poetic statement. The film argues that true maturity is not about abandoning imagination for the material world but about integrating the lessons of both. It is about understanding that life is a cycle of freedom and constraint, enchantment and disillusionment, and that the goal is to find one's own sky and soar, having known what it means to be caged. *Kummatty* (1979) remains a timeless masterpiece because it captures this universal human dilemma with unparalleled gentleness and poetic grace.

## *Esthappan* (1980): Mysticism, Perception, and the Transcendence of Reality

G. Aravindan's film *Esthappan*(1980) constructs its protagonist not through a linear plot, but through a mosaic of fragmented and often contradictory perspectives. These vignettes, presented by various members of a coastal Christian community, collectively build the enigmatic figure of Esthappan as a saint, a madman, a criminal, and a messianic figure.

The Mythic and Supernatural Figure Esthappan's mythic stature is established immediately, beginning with the almost miraculous image of him walking across the waves at twilight, described by fishermen as "the sun risen in the west". This supernatural identity is reinforced by later sightings, where he disappears after climbing a fort, only to reappear walking across the water. He is portrayed as a mystical trickster, famously fooling a policeman by transforming into a senior police officer to evade arrest, thus transcending earthly authority. Further emphasizing his divine or supernatural nature, he is depicted as a provider who conjures cookies from the emptiness of the sky for children, and he demonstrates invulnerability by drinking whiskey without becoming corrupted or drunk. The film also features a blatant allusion to Christ's resurrection when villagers find him hanging, apparently dead, only for him to resurrect, complaining that they disturbed his sleep. He ultimately serves as a guardian spirit of the sea, guiding fishermen past dangerous boundaries during storms. Challenging Societal and Economic Norms Esthappan functions as a spiritual guide, responding to inquiries with poetic, sermon-like verses, such as "He who has nothing has neither end nor beginning," echoing religious teachings. He actively rejects societal norms and institutional requirements. His idle, non-productive presence visibly irritates the factory owner, signifying his disruptive role within the modern economic structure. He also challenges conventional piety by

transgressing sacred taboos, such as when he was caught digging up a cemetery and playing with bones.

The Savior and the Transgressor Esthappan's character is defined by contradictions. He is accused by a lorry driver of being a criminal who stole bananas; however, he is also revealed to be a self-sacrificing figure who took the blame for a theft committed by a poor man, aligning him with Christ-like virtue. His acts of grace contrast sharply with community judgment, as seen when he was accused of visiting a sex worker but was actually there to heal her sick child. Other saving acts include rescuing the landlord's drowning child. Furthermore, he acts as a redistributor of wealth by giving money to the landlord's helpers, preventing a family's eviction, and demonstrating a critique of the economic system before his mysterious disappearance.

The film concludes by emphasizing its central theme, Esthappan is seen in multiple places simultaneously, an impossible phenomenon that defies rational explanation. The last shot is a panoramic view of the village that ends on Esthappan sleeping on a rock, parallel to the sea, creating the visual illusion that he is sleeping above the water, a final, serene image that encapsulates his enduring and enigmatic nature, suspended between the earthly and the divine. The narrative structure of *Esthappan* (1980) is deliberately fragmented and non-linear, reflecting the film's thematic concern with multiple perspectives and the impossibility of definitive knowledge. Rather than presenting a chronological life story, Aravindan constructs the film as a series of encounters, testimonies, and observations, approaching his protagonist from multiple angles without ever claiming complete understanding. This structural choice mirrors the film's philosophical stance: that reality, particularly the reality of exceptional individuals, cannot be reduced to a simple explanation or single perspective. These testimonies often contradict each other, some seeing him as a genuine mystic with divine powers, others as mentally disturbed, still others as a cunning charlatan. Aravindan refuses to adjudicate between these competing interpretations, instead presenting them as equally valid perspectives shaped by the observers' own beliefs, expectations, and limitations.

Cinematographer Shaji N Karun's camera work in *Esthappan* (1980) is distinctive for its observational quality and its use of natural light and settings. Many scenes are shot outdoors, in the village environments where Esthappan lived and moved. The camera maintains a respectful distance, observing rather than penetrating, acknowledging the mystery at the film's heart. Long takes allow viewers to observe Esthappan's movements and behaviours in real time, without the manipulation of editing that might suggest interpretation. This visual approach embodies the film's philosophical stance: we can observe and contemplate, but ultimate understanding may remain elusive.

## Conclusion

G. Aravindan's contribution to cinema extends far beyond his relatively small filmography. In the four films examined in this study *Kanchana Sita* (1977), *Thampu* (1978)*, Kummatty* (1979), and *Esthappan* (1980), we see a filmmaker who developed a distinctive cinematic language capable of addressing profound philosophical, social, and aesthetic questions while remaining accessible to audiences willing to engage with challenging material. His achievement lies not only in the individual quality of these films but in demonstrating the possibility of a cinema that is simultaneously modernist and traditional, locally rooted and universally relevant.

The unity in Aravindan's these four films stems from their profound alignment with prevailing circumstances and with nature. The essence of an Aravindan film lies in the way humans,

animals, the ocean, the forest, the sun, and all natural phenomena appear with an innate naturalness, without any theatricality or the ostentatious impression of constructing something new. Although the narrative milieu often represents a central myth, these myths are all grounded in the earth. In an era where anything and everything can become a myth, and myth itself becomes a commodity, a time when myths are exploited for political purposes. Aravindan's films reposition myth in relation to humanity and their natural environment.

Across these films, certain consistent features of Aravindan's cinematic language emerge. His commitment to minimalism in dialogue, narrative, and production design creates space for contemplation and active viewer engagement. Rather than providing elaborate exposition and explicit interpretation, his films offer images, sounds, and situations that viewers must actively interpret, constructing meaning through their own engagement with the material. This approach assumes an intelligent, patient audience willing to work with the film rather than passively consuming pre-digested content. The use of long takes and observational camera work represents another consistent feature. Aravindan's camera rarely imposes through dramatic framing, rapid editing, or manipulative camerawork. Instead, it observes patiently, allowing scenes to unfold in their own time and honoring the duration and integrity of the events being filmed. This approach has philosophical implications, suggesting a worldview that values patience, observation, and respect for the autonomous existence of things and people outside the filmmaker's control. Aravindan's use of non-professional actors constitutes another distinctive feature with both aesthetic and ethical dimensions. Non-professional actors bring authenticity and presence that trained actors might lack, resisting the artificiality and theatricality that can distance viewers from the material. This casting strategy also has democratic implications, giving voice and visibility to people who might otherwise remain invisible in mainstream cinema. It suggests that any life, any face, any story has dignity and interest worthy of cinematic attention. The relationship between myth and reality in Aravindan's work deserves particular emphasis. Rather than treating these as opposed categories, his films demonstrate how mythological and folkloric materials remain living resources for understanding contemporary experience. Whether adapting the Ramayana in *Kanchana Sita* (1977), drawing on bogeyman folklore in *Kummatty* (1979), or exploring Christian mysticism in *Esthappan* (1980), Aravindan shows how traditional cultural materials can be revitalized through cinema, offering fresh perspectives on perennial human concerns.

Nature occupies a privileged position throughout Aravindan's work. Unlike mainstream cinema that typically treats nature as mere backdrop or as resource to be exploited, Aravindan's films present nature as active presence, as living community with which humans exist in relationship. This ecological sensitivity, evident throughout the films examined in this study, has become increasingly relevant as environmental crises demand new ways of thinking about human relationships with the natural world.

Despite these achievements and continuing relevance, Aravindan's work remains relatively underknown outside Kerala and Indian art cinema circles. This limited recognition reflects broader patterns in world cinema, where non-Western art cinema often struggles for visibility and recognition in international contexts dominated by European and North American perspectives. Greater critical attention to Aravindan's work could contribute to more inclusive and diverse understandings of cinema's possibilities and histories.

Future research might explore several directions. Comparative studies examining Aravindan alongside international art cinema traditions could illuminate both his distinctive contributions and his affinities with broader movements. Systematic study of his influence on subsequent

generations of filmmakers could document his continuing impact. Technical studies examining his collaborations with cinematographers, sound designers, and composers could provide insight into the craft dimensions of his work. Theoretical analyses drawing on contemporary film theory, philosophy, and cultural studies could offer fresh perspectives on his enduring significance.

Aravindan's cinema acts as a mirror not only reflecting reality but also its illusions. He did not view cinema as a political weapon, nor did he believe that art should directly produce political awareness. Instead, his films speak of a deeper politics one rooted in human compassion and reverence for nature. "Kummatty comes like the seasons," he once said, "he represents spring." Likewise, Aravindan's films are like spring in our lives calling us back to our secrets, our irrational beliefs, and our place within the natural world. His question "Why can't we respect beauty in its purest form?" (Aravindan G., The Ray the came in from the south, 1985) remains a timeless invitation to see the world with wonder and humility.

In conclusion, G. Aravindan's cinema represents a significant achievement in world cinema, demonstrating the possibility of a filmmaking practice that is simultaneously traditional and modernist, local and universal, accessible and philosophically profound. The four films examined in this study *Kanchana Sita* (1977), *Thampu* (1978)*, Kummatty* (1979)*, and Esthappan* (1980) exemplify his mature vision and distinctive cinematic language. They remain vital works that continue to offer insights, provoke contemplation, and inspire filmmakers and audiences decades after their creation. In an era of accelerated change and increasing homogenization, Aravindan's patient, contemplative cinema offers an alternative rhythm and vision, inviting us to slow down, observe carefully, and engage deeply with the mysteries of human existence, society, and the natural world. His work stands as testament to cinema's capacity to be more than entertainment to be, instead, a form of philosophical inquiry, cultural preservation and innovation, and genuine artistic expression that honours both tradition and the possibilities of the cinematic medium.

## Acknowledgements

## Declaration of Generative AI and AI-Assisted Technologies in the Writing Process

In the preparation of this manuscript, the author utilised DeepSeek AI-assistive technology for support in drafting, textual improvement, and proofreading. Used Google Notebook LM for reducing the words. The author assumes full responsibility for the final content, analysis, and conclusions presented.

# References

Aravindan, G. (n.d.). The Poet of Revelations - Filmmaker as an Intuitive Artist : Interview with G.Aravindan. (C. A, Interviewer).

Aravindan, G. (Director). (1977). *Kanchana Sita* [Motion Picture]. General Pictures.

Aravindan, G. (Director). (1978). *Thampu* [Motion Picture]. General Pictures.

Aravindan, G. (Director). (1979). *Kummatty* [Motion Picture]. General Pictures.

Aravindan, G. (Director). (1980). *Esthappan* [Motion Picture]. General Pictures.

Aravindan, G. (1984). A filmaker pitches his tent. (K. Nagpal, Interviewer).

Aravindan, G. (1985, June 9). The Ray the came in from the south. (T. t. Lens eye, Interviewer).

Committee, F. C.-l. (2022, November 16). *In memory of Tadao Sato.* Fukuoka City Central Library, Video Hall/Cinera: Fukuoka City Public Library / Ciné-là Executive Committee (092-852-0608).

Devi, G. (2016, March 7). *Seeing is Believing: The Invisible through Aravindan's Eyes.* The Red Earth. https://redearth.home.blog/2020/01/21/seeing-is-believing-the-invisible-through-aravindans-eyes-2/

Dungarpur, S. (2021, August). *RESTORING 'KUMMATTY.* mint.

Fountation, F. H. (n.d.). *Film Heritage Foundation's restoration of Aravindan's "Thamp̄" (1978) premiered at the Cannes Film Festival 2022!* Film Heritage Fountation. http://filmheritagefoundation.co.in/film-heritage-foundations-restoration-of-aravindans-thamp-1978-premieres-at-the-cannes-film-festival-2022/

Gangar, A. (2003). G. Aravindan The Cinema of Svabhava, a Svabhava. And the Sublime. *International Film Festival of Kerala catalogue.*

Khanna, S. (1992). Obituary: Aravindan 1935-1991. *Framework: The Journal of Cinema and Media*, 173-181.

M, S. (2021). G. Aravindan's Cinematic Oeuvre: Alternate Aesthetics of the Third Cinema of Contemplation. *Littcrit.*

Venkiteswaran, C. (2021, June). Kummatty Re-enchanting the World. *Chalachitra Sameeksha*, 6-25.

**Contact emails:** amashik8@gmail.com
　　　　　　　m.ashik@iitg.ac.in