BJPSH

AL-KINDI CENTER FOR RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

| **RESEARCH ARTICLE**

Traditions and Convergences of Archetypal Criticism: Jung's and Frye's Articulation and Application of the Concept of 'Archetype'

Yiwen Sha
Tang Wenzhi College, Soochow University, Suzhou
Corresponding Author: Yiwen Sha, **E-mail**: Sullivan.YW@outlook.comx

| **ABSTRACT**

The concept of archetypes and archetypal literary criticism are frequent topics in Western criticism, developed on the basis of the concept of 'archetype,' which originated in the Cambridge School of the United Kingdom at the beginning of the twentieth century and reached its peak in North America in the fifties and sixties. The Canadian scholar Northrop Frye, on the other hand, is recognised as an exponent of this critical theory. Frye's archetypal criticism is particularly influenced by the concept of 'archetype' in Jung's theory of analytical psychology, which is quite consistent in its interpretation of the nature and practical use of the concept of archetypes but inevitably carries with it certain limitations. The discussion explores the similarities and differences in the conceptualisation and use of Frye's and Jung's theories of 'archetypes' and to comment on the achievements of archetypal theory in both.

| **KEYWORDS**

Archetypes; Frye; Jung.

1. Introduction

The concept of archetype is originally derived from the Greek words arche (original) and typo (form). In Plato's philosophy, the word was defined as the concept of a priori primitive forms from which things are formed, and since then, Locke, Descartes, Berkeley, and even Kant have used the word 'archetype' in various philosophical senses in their theories. In this process, literary studies and criticism have also gradually become interested in the concept of 'archetype.' Around the 1960s, Northrop Frye further elaborated and shaped the concepts and theories related to 'archetypes' in the field of literature and criticism, laying the foundation for archetypal criticism. In his book 'Anatomy of Criticism,' Frye (2002) introduced a number of groundbreaking new ideas in criticism, such as 'literary archetypes' and 'mythic archetypes,' and brought the definition of archetypes from the category of ethics to the field of literature. Frye's definition of archetypes was brought from the realm of ethics to the realm of literature, and he made a structuralist interpretation of the development of archetypes in Western literature. It is worth noting that Frye incorporated Jung's psychoanalysis, especially the doctrine of the 'collective unconscious' and the theory of archetypes, into his criticism of archetypes. Although Frye himself did not agree to associate his theoretical system specifically with Jung, believing that it often leads to false and meaningless discourse(Frye, 1971), Jung's and Frye's critical concepts seem to be in the same vein in terms of the concept of 'archetypes,' which has been found to be valued by many scholars. (Zhang, 2003)This paper attempts to explore the similarities and differences between Jung and Frye in the concept of 'archetypes' on the basis of the explorations of the previous scholars and to explore the levels of similarities and differences between the theories of the two.

2. Literature Review

Archetypal Criticism is an important trend in Western criticism in the twentieth century, with great influence, not only spanning the fields of psychology, religion, anthropology, archaeology, etc., but also triggering significant repercussions in literary criticism.

American literary theorist Wellek (1975) pointed out that in terms of influence and popularity, archetypal criticism is the third major school of criticism after Marxist criticism and psychoanalytic criticism, while Scott (1962) listed archetypal criticism as one of the five most common modes of criticism (moral criticism, psychological criticism, social criticism, formal criticism, and archetypal criticism) in his book 'Five Approaches of Literacy Criticism: An Arrangement of Contemporary Critical Essay. ' As the 'bible' of archetypal criticism theory, Frye's 'Anatomy of Criticism' and the related archetypal theories expounded in the book have been studied by the world, and scholars have been connecting Jung's doctrine with Frye's. Professor Robert D. of Roanoke College, a major scholar of Frye's literary theory, has explored in detail the relationship between Frye's critical theory and approach and other critical methods, including a comparison between Frye's theory of archetypes and Jung's. In his contribution to the Northrop Frye Anthology of Literary Theory, he mentions that Frye took a 'centripetal perspective' on Jung's theories. In commenting on Jung's The Unconscious Mind, Frye developed a critical point of view which later - in places originally immovable - entered into the exposition of the symbolic archetypal stage in 'Anatomy of Criticism.' In addition, Hamilton's (1990) book 'Northrop Frye: An Anatomy of His Criticism' also provides a close reading of 'Anatomy of Criticism,' with a careful dissection of both the origins and application of its archetypal critical terminology. The Northrop Frye Centre at Victoria College in Canada has also contributed a great deal of literary criticism on Frye's Archetypal Criticism, and a number of scholars have undertaken theoretical analyses of Frye's Criticism. Professor Roseann Rondt, in contrast to the traditional Jungian influence, has attributed the concept of myth in Frye's literary theory to the political and cultural factors of his own country, and has attempted to trace the mythological archetypal thought in various directions.

In China, the development of the criticism of archetypal theory is a little late. Zhang (1980) first paid attention to Frye and his research on archetypal theory, and in his "Frye's Theory of Criticism," which was published in 1980, he objectively and deeply analysed Frye's system of literary criticism and the ideas shown in the 'Anatomy of Criticism,' and placed symbolism, imagery, and archetypal theory as one of the three most valuable and important parts of Frye's literary theory. In addition, Ye (1999) also identified symbolism and archetype theory as one of the three most valuable and important parts of Frye's literary theory. In addition, Ye Shuxian's Myth-archetypal Criticism, published in 1987, is also a classic of Frye's archetypal research material, which not only selects and translates a considerable number of myths and archetypal criticism, but also carries out the corresponding critical analyses of the selected essays and writings.

After the 1990s, with the gradual translation and import of Frye's literary theories, a large number of literary dissertations on Frye's studies and archetypal theories have appeared in the academic world, among which most attention has been paid to his mythological, archetypal theories, with in-depth discussions on the principles, methods, and features of his criticism, and at the same time efforts have been made to tap into local resources and express their own heterodox views in two-way dialogues and interactions. For example, Liang (2010), Mao and Zhong (2011), Xin (2013), Yang (2009).

After the turn of the millennium, the study of Frye's theoretical thought has become a hot topic in the academic world, and the research on archetypal criticism has shown diversity, richness, and openness, and the many sides of archetypal criticism have been continuously excavated, and scholars have begun to try to look at archetypal criticism literature from a new perspective. Ye (1999) combines Frye's literary theory with anthropology and tries to identify the possibility of the existence of a Chinese literary anthropological framework. Li and Zhou (2001) attempt to recover another side of Frye's 'meta-history' of the 'chain of survival,' which has been neglected in the past, by re-interpreting 'Anatomy of Criticism'. Also, Xia (2012); Xin (2013); Yang (2009); Yu (2011).

3. Basis: The Formal Notion of 'Prototype'
3.1 Carl Jung's Use of the Concept of Priori Archetypes
Carl Jung's definitional concept of 'archetypes' is based primarily on his discovery and use of the collective unconscious. As a student of Freud, Jung was also influenced by Freud's psychoanalytic theory of 'conscious and unconscious' [1] and absorbed parts of it, but Jung proposed a different understanding of the substance and structure of the unconscious.

Freud focused on the unconscious in the personal sphere, believing that the unconscious is the place where an individual's repressed and forgotten mental contents are collected and that the contents it hides are mainly from the repressed mental contents of an individual's early life(Jung, 2014), especially childhood, pointing to a person's primitive impulses, instincts or traumas. The activity of these ideas and desires often comes from the characteristics and experiences that people form in their later lives, and

---

[1] Freud's psychoanalytic psychology divides human mental activity into three levels: conscious, preconscious and unconscious. The conscious level is the phenomenal and logical world that human beings can be directly aware of and perceive; the preconscious (subconscious) is the unclear conscious world that lies below the individual's consciousness, which can enter the conscious mind but is not in a conscious state, and the contents of the preconscious (subconscious) can be revealed through special methods such as hypnosis, dream analysis, etc.; the unconscious is the unconscious, repressed world that is not conscious and can have a significant impact on human behaviour. The unconscious is the unconscious, repressed world that can have a significant impact on human behaviour, including instincts, primitive impulses, trauma, etc.

the content and state of the unconscious is different for each person because of the different experiences they have had, so for Freud 'the unconscious is as personal as it gets.'

However, according to Jung, this 'individual unconscious' conceals a deeper spiritual level, the 'collective unconscious.' The collective unconscious is 'neither derived from personal experience nor acquired by the individual, but is innate'; it is not personal, but universal, and exists universally and similarly in each of us. In his article 'The Concept of the Collective Unconscious', he explains the 'collective unconscious' in a focused way: 'The content of the collective unconscious has never existed in consciousness. It has, therefore, never been acquired by the individual, but its existence has been attributed exclusively to heredity. The concept of the collective unconscious is further conceptualised, and it is claimed that this 'unconscious' is acquired through biological inheritance. It can be argued that the 'collective unconscious' is, by its very nature, a category of deep, hidden, completely unrecognisable spiritual beings and is more a conceptual hypothesis based on Jung's clinical research and academic readings than a real psychological structure. It is mechanically derived from the imprints accumulated by human beings since time immemorial and has no inherent reality. Therefore, the 'archetype,' which is the basic content of the collective unconscious, has a mystical and metaphysical tendency from the very beginning. Jung said: 'The archetype is not determined by content, but only by form ... The archetype itself is empty, purely formal, but only an innate capacity, a possibility of expression which is considered a priori'(Jung, 2014). It follows that Jung's archetype is not a concrete content but an abstract form that represents the possibility of 'archetypal' perception or behaviour, a formative and formal organising capacity that is itself unknowable and innate. It is similar to Kantian 'categories' but on an internal level, involving mental activities such as imagination, emotion, and intuition. Jung once attempted to imitate the 'formal' properties of the archetype through the innate crystalline structure of the crystal, stating that 'although the axial system of the crystal has no material existence of its own, it may be said to fulfil the role of a crystalline structure in the mother liquor ... the archetype is empty of form, a mere possibility of representation which has been given to it antecedently'. This also shows the metaphysical nature of the term 'archetype.'

3.2 The Jungian Colour of Frye's 'Literary' Archetypal Criticism

This preference for the a priori formal properties of Jung's 'archetypes' seems to have been inherited to some extent by Frye. This may seem difficult to understand on the surface since Frye's definition of 'archetypes' does not place them on the same level; by 'literary archetypes,' he meant to map out an institutional unit for literature, as in the case of pitch and rhythm in musicology(Ye, 1987), to realise a reflection on the regularity of literature. The idea of 'literary archetypes' is to plan an institutional unit for literature, like tones and rhythms in musicology, in order to think about the regularity of literature.

In the 'Anatomy of Criticism,' Frye first introduced the notion of 'symbol,' arguing that 'words, phrases, or images used with a particular mode of reference are symbols, and that they are elements that can be analysed by critical analysis.' If a 'symbol' is able to show 'a proportional resemblance between the poem and the nature it imitates,' then the symbol can be called 'imagery.' An archetype is 'a typical or recurring image' that 'links one poem to others and thus helps to unify and integrate our literary experience.' For Frye, the importance of 'archetype' does not lie in the search for deeper explanations of the mechanisms of production of recurring images in myth and literature but rather in the fact that 'archetype' itself, as a common human literary tradition and collective literary imagination, is important for exploring how human literature as a whole has developed and how literary works have been produced. Rather, it is the 'archetype' itself, as a common human literary tradition and collective literary imagination, that is of ontological significance in exploring how human literature as a whole has developed and how literary works are related. It is the intellectual structure of all literary criticism and makes literary criticism a discipline. Although Frye's discussion of the concept of 'archetype' is at the level of the literary text, his use of the concept of 'archetype' is still quite formal, which is mainly reflected in his systematic construction of 'archetype' and 'myth' and 'cycle.' On the one hand, this is mainly reflected in his systematic construction of 'archetypes' and 'myths' and 'cycles.'

In 'Historical Criticism: A Theory of Patterns,' Frye distinguishes between two main categories of literary works, 'thematic,' which are concerned with the narration of characters and their stories, and 'fictional,' which convey allegory. Thematic' mainly tells characters and their stories, while 'fictional' conveys allegory. At the same time, Frye classifies fictional literature into five modes according to the criteria for classifying works proposed by Aristotle in Poetics: myth, romance, high parody, low parody, and satire. In the following chapters, he examines these five modes in tragedy and comedy, arguing that in the long historical evolution of literature, 'myth' is the initial stage of its development. In the long historical evolution of literature, 'myth' was the initial source of its development: 'Before the Middle Ages, literature was closely linked to Christian, late Greco-Roman, Celtic or Germanic myths. Then, there was a gradual progression from 'myth' to 'satire,' and 'the same process' was observed in post-medieval Western literature and even in classical literature such as Greco-Roman. After that, the same process is developed again and again, realising the cycle from myth to irony and from the ironic mode back to myth. In the cycle of literary modes, myth is always the starting point; whether it is Romantic, high imitation, or low imitation mode can be regarded as "a series of displaced myths." Here, myth is not a specific content or story but the basic principle of literary structure and the prototype of pattern, like a geometric figure, and "myth" is a "prototype."

It can be seen that although Frye has modified Jung's archetypes to some extent, 'mythic archetypes' still have both form and content. Although Frye's archetypal criticism does not directly define 'archetypes' in terms of a priori, metaphysical assumptions as Jung did, he still identifies 'mythic archetypes' as an abstract framework (Xia, 2002)and determines the development of literature through the use of 'myth.' Through the use of 'myth,' he determines an initial logical starting point for the development of literature, and the same starting point is the 'end point' of literature, from which everything begins and to which it ultimately returns. Although Frye seems to have arrived at this view through an ephemeral investigation, nevertheless, the 'myth' is supreme, and everything is its return and repetition, with the result that the 'myth' ends up being a conceptual theory that seems to be derived from phenomenal experience, but with an implicit metaphysical or even religious deductivism. It seems to come from phenomenal experience but with a certain metaphysical and even religious deductivism. Indeed, Frye's study of myths and archetypes has been described as 'apocalyptic humanism'(Gill, 2006), which at some level seems to reflect his theoretical orientation.

4. The Phenomenological Path: An Exploration of the Representation of 'Archetypes'
4.1 Jungian Phenomenology: 'Archetypes' and 'Archetypal Image'
As noted above, Jung's understanding of the concept of 'archetype' is a priori, formally and metaphysically grounded in the theory of the collective unconscious, and the emergence of 'archetypes' is not a matter of 'hereditary thought' but merely a potential existence constituted by 'the possibility of hereditary thought.' The emergence of 'archetypes' is not a 'genetic idea' but merely a potential existence constituted by 'genetic possibilities of ideas.' Therefore, the perception of the collective unconscious and archetypes can only be grasped through the manifestations that they externalise, i.e., the archetypal image that recurs in dreams, literature, and religious works. The so-called archetypal image here refers to concrete, tangible images or behaviours that are symbolic portraits of the 'archetypes,' objects that can be perceived and studied.

In the early days, archetypal image was often confused with, or even equated with, archetypes, as Jung explains when he says: 'Archetypal image, sometimes called archetypes … is common to all peoples and all times.''(Jung, 2014)Although Jung later explicitly distinguished between the two concepts, it can still be seen that Jung's understanding of the abstract concept of 'archetype' does not leave the concrete external images of observation and induction. Jung once emphasised that 'I am an empiricist, not a philosopher,' suggesting that he admired the abstract or metaphysical nature of the archetypes but did not focus on purely metaphysical discourse and wished to maintain the same importance of the archetypes in terms of both material evidence and form. Although this endeavour appears vague within the framework of Jung's macro-theory, in the course of the actual analysis, we can still see that his search for the primordial imagery of the archetypes has returned to the realm of phenomenology and has turned to the question of perceptible reality in the clinical analysis.

In his article, "The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious," the author examines the origin of "archetypes" through an analysis of specific Archetypal image. He recognizes the manifestation of "archetypal" forms by consciousness in universal images that have existed since ancient times and have been passed on continuously. The author argues that "archetypes" have existed since ancient times and have been passed on continuously. He acknowledges the existence of 'archetypes' as a manifestation of consciousness in the form of universal images that have persisted since ancient times. It is valuable to note that Jung not only observed the recurrence of images and behaviours in diverse mythological structures, but he also posited that such mythological symbols are analogous to the archetypes and the collective unconscious (Jung, 2011). He famously attributed the use of the image of the 'round wheel' in various mythological cultures to the 'mandala style,' arguing that this 'archetypal' form of manifestation by consciousness has existed since ancient times and has been passed on continuously. Jung famously attributed the use of the 'round wheel' image in various mythological cultures to the 'mandala pattern,' arguing that this common archetypal image reflects a collective unconscious that is a common psychological ground of humanity.

4.2 Frye's Phenomenology of 'Myth': 'Mythic Structure'
 Similarly, in Frye's use and examination of 'archetypes,' he also takes a phenomenological approach to 'literary archetypes' and, like Jung, chooses imagery that has existed since the age of myth as his main object of investigation. This includes the convention of associating the dead with a red or purple flower, as seen in poems about individuals who have died young. The historical origins of this convention in literature can be traced back to ancient rituals(Frye, 2018). In 'Archetypal Criticism: A Theory of Myth,' Frye dedicates a significant portion of the text to summarising three major groups of imagery from archetypes in Western literature: the divinely inspired, the magical and the monstrous, and the analogical. On this basis, Frye proceeds to analyse the imagery archetypes present in the Bible and other mythological stories. He identifies five categories of archetypal imagery: the world of God, the world of man, the world of animals, the world of plants, and the world of minerals. He then argues that the combinations between these categories form the model for the mythological and fairy tale worlds that we now know. He posits that the concept of the "imaginary background" can be likened to an obscenely naked body that must be clothed in a literal garment before it can be seen by all. The objective of my research is to study the metaphorical or mythological structure, which I have defined as hidden nakedness. Frye's concept of the 'imaginative background,' or 'mythic structure,' bears a striking resemblance to Jung's notion of Archetypal image.

From this perspective, both authors examine recurring images in literary culture from a phenomenological perspective on 'myth.' However, Frye's 'mythological archetypes' are more focused on their significance as traditional literary criticism, attempting to distill the original archetypal concepts of literary works in the context of human spiritual practices, thereby providing a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of 'archetypes.' Frye's concept of 'mythological archetypes' is primarily concerned with their significance within the context of traditional literary criticism. This approach involves an attempt to distil the original archetypal concepts embedded within literary works, particularly in relation to their development and evolution within the context of human spiritual practices. Consequently, this endeavour aims to provide a more nuanced and comprehensive understanding of the concept of 'archetypes.' In Jung's case, although he also attempted to ascribe a specific phenomenological significance to 'archetypes' through practical interpretation and discussed how archetypes, as a crucial component of the collective unconscious and a form of bearing, give rise to typical artistic images in literature, the archetypal image is merely an instrumental 'intermediary,' and the archetypes are only a 'middle ground' for the evolution and development of human spiritual practice. Nevertheless, archetypal images serve merely as an indispensable 'intermediary'. Archetypes and the collective unconscious have always been inextricably linked. The investigation of analogous imagery and experiences is designed to address the question of how 'archetypes' can be preserved in the comprehensive experience of human beings and repeatedly manifested. It exists at a superior level of meaning to be interpreted.

5. 'Archetypes' and the Creation and Reception of Literature: The Meaning of Literature

By analysing the concepts of 'myth' and archetypal image, Jung further developed his theory of archetypes in the context of literary creation. In Jung's view, the archetype represents a collective unconscious imprint accumulated by human beings over the course of reproduction and heredity. It manifested itself as a mythological image in ancient times and subsequently entered into the literary creations of all periods, manifesting itself in a range of literary works. Unlike Freud, Jung did not see literary creation as a kind of consolation or fantasy but rather as an adjunct to the 'collective unconscious', where the writer's inspiration and passion for creation come from inherent programmes and commands in the depths of the unconscious, and the archetypes are 'like a deeply cut riverbed in the psyche, in which the stream of life suddenly rushes into a great river, instead of flowing in a wide and shallow stream as before. The archetype is 'like a deeply cut riverbed in the psyche, in which the stream of life suddenly rushes into a big river, instead of flowing in a wide and shallow stream as it did before. This happens whenever one is confronted anew with that particular situation, which, over a long period of time, has helped to build up the original imagery.' (Jung,2014)This suggests that the creation of artists and authors is not entirely under their conscious control. Rather, it is influenced by the collective unconscious and archetypes. This implies that the work of art can be re-examined at the level of human spirituality. However, this arbitrary definition of art leads to the denial of the existence of culture. If culture and aesthetic forms are an involuntary process, similar to the projection of archetypes, then there has been no valuable art or culture produced by human beings over the millennia. Consequently, our understanding of art and culture is a posteriori and deterministic.

This is an untenable position for all parties involved. While the theory may offer an explanation as to why humans create products that align with popular culture and aesthetic norms, it is at odds with our general perception of human nature and is, therefore, unacceptable in the broader social context. A similar issue arises with Frye's theory of 'archetypes.' Here, myth is posited as the original and final archetype, effectively defining literature and establishing a 'living god' of literature. The existence of this intrinsic conceptual framework has constrained the model of literature to a limited and somewhat constrained scope. The existence of such a built-in conceptual world, which allows literary models to move and change only within a closed and relatively narrow range, is an underestimation of the power of human consciousness and a limitation on the significance of what is possible for literature to exist and develop. Although Frye's system of 'mythic archetypes' continues to primarily prescribe the form of literature and does not address the content of literature in great detail, it does facilitate innovation in literary content through the combination of imagery and the substitution of literary modes. However, this singular mythic framework structure ultimately constrains the scope of works and authors within a limited range.

6. Conclusion

Through a comparative analysis of Jung's and Frye's concept of 'archetypes,' we can see that their respective theories show a similar yet unique appearance in different disciplinary contexts. Jung's theory of 'archetypes' is based on psychology, emphasises the universal spiritual structure of the collective unconscious, and demonstrates its metaphysical qualities in culture and art, considering it not only the source of literature but also the essence of literature. Literature is not merely a reflection of the external material world; it also arises from the simple psychological memories of the heart. In contrast, Frye endeavours to abstract, generalise and construct a novel concept of the literary archetype from concrete literary works through the lens of literary criticism. This concept subsequently informs Frye's systematic 'myth-archetype' framework, which demonstrates that Frye's approach to criticism is not to establish an a priori framework as in the Kantian pattern, nor to continuously measure and compare concrete works in literary history as in the case of traditional subjective appreciative criticism. Rather, Frye's perspective is that criticism should be more of an a priori framework. This demonstrates Frye's conviction that criticism should not construct an a priori framework as Kant proposed, nor should it evaluate specific works within the context of literary history as traditional subjective

appreciation criticism does. Instead, it should focus on the works themselves and the literary whole they comprise. His true value lies in his authentic independence from the academic tradition and in his endeavour to establish criteria for an objective discipline of humanistic criticism. While their theories have disparate fields of application and academic purposes, they both examine analogous structures in human culture and the spiritual realm. Moreover, they have contributed to the refinement and development of criticism itself, significantly altering perceptions of archetypal criticism. However, these theories inevitably encounter metaphysical limitations, particularly in regard to overly structured interpretations of literary creation and cultural reception. This simultaneously calls for a cautious approach towards ideological theories characterised by universalism and essentialism and for an acknowledgement of the diversity and complexity of literature and culture.

Publisher's Note: All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers.

References

[1]   Frye, N. (1971). *The critical path: An essay on the social context of literary criticism*. Indiana University Press.
[2]   Frye, N. (2002). *Anatomy of criticism*. Baihua Literary Publishing House.
[3]   Frye, N. (2018). *Selected essays of Northrop Frye* (J. Wu Trans.). China Social Science Publishing House.
[4]   Gill, G. R. (2006). *Northrop Frye and the phenomenology of myth*. University of Toronto Press.
[5]   Hamilton, A. C. (1990). *Northrop Frye: Anatomy of his criticism*. Univ of Toronto Press.
[6]   Jung, C. G. (2011). *Archetypes and the collective unconscious* (D. Xu Trans.). International Culture Publishing Company.
[7]   Jung, C. G. (2014). *Psychology and literature*. Yilin Publishing House.
[8]   Li, W. P., & Zhou, B. (2001). Washing away the gravel and returning it to gold: Discussing the neglected aspect in the study of Frye's archetypal criticism of literary history. *Foreign Literature,* (3), 46-51. https://doi.org/10.16430/j.cnki.fl.2001.03.012
[9]   Liang, G. (2010). The position of biblical literature studies in Frye's critical system. *Foreign Literature,* (2), 124-131+160. https://doi.org/10.16430/j.cnki.fl.2010.02.017
[10] Mao, G., & Zhong, L. (2011). Frye on the emergence and development of Canadian literature. *Journal of Lanzhou University (Social Science Edition),* (3), 79-85. https://doi.org/10.13885/j.issn.1000-2804.2011.03.002
[11] Scott, W. S. (1962). *Five approaches of literary criticism: An arrangement of contemporary critical essays*. Macmillan.
[12] Wellek, R. (1975). Criticism as evaluation. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 119*(5), 397-400.
[13] Xia, X. (2002). *An initial exploration of Jung's archetypal theory* [Master's thesis, Shandong Normal University]. CNKI. Jinan. https://kns.cnki.net/kcms2/article/abstract?v=7gnxONS3vkmJ3uav-sudnJHKhenRHrHGAeR7BHEJXugU-8fzTsdrkRed1omU9Iq778x9LVukBNuyFIekZMn9jAjzIRLS7lPNingpLE0GZs-yR1ieAnQe2zxu926z4UpBYPJJMbFJ_XUOS6USDcEN4ZlZPYNd8xptgP4pxfi1aln4a8FFeC1CCmNDk6MwksNVubucVZUjfQC6tBC33-sXRyMuSJyJ8bKVgRUzUmhO5mkpZIbRJj254g==&uniplatform=NZKPT&language=CHS
[14] Xia, X. (2012). *Archetype theory and literary activities*. China Social Sciences Press.
[15] Xin, Y. (2013). The reform and independence of literary criticism: From I. A. Richards to Northrop Frye. *Journal of Hunan University (Social Science Edition),* (2), 94-99.
[16] Yang, L. (2009). Archetype-cultural criticism 'after theory.' *Literary Contention,* (11), 38-42.
[17] Ye, S. (1999). The spread of myth-archetype criticism in China. *Social Science Research,* (1), 115-120.
[18] Ye, S. X. (1987). *Myth-archetype criticism*. Shaanxi Normal University Press.
[19] Yu, Q. (2011). *Metaphor, archetype, culture: A study of Northrop Frye's textual thoughts*. Jiangxi People's Publishing House.
[20] Zhang, L. (1980). Frye's critical theory. *Foreign Literature Studies,* (4), 122-131. https://doi.org/10.19915/j.cnki.fls.1980.04.027
[21] Zhang, Z. Z. (2003). Prototype criticism. *Foreign Literature, 2003*(1), 71.