CHAPTER II

Myths and Archetypes: A Reading of Frye and Jung

The word *mythology* comes from the Greek *mythología*, meaning "a story-telling, a legendary lore". It is derived from the word "*mythos*" meaning narrative, speech, word, fact, and story, "*logos*" meaning speech, oration, discourse, quote, study, reason and argument. In *Some Meanings of Myth* (1959), Harry Levin explains the original meaning of the word as a ‘word’ which means *mythos*. With the suffix logos one gets the word “*mythology*”. Thus, in a certain sense, the science of myth also means “the word or words”, which should be a caveat against excessive verbiage (1959, 223). An exploded example is the hypothesis of Max Muller that all myths were originally derived from words through a species of allegorical etymology. (1959, 223) *Mythos* is used for “word” or “speech” in Homer and in other Greek poets, as differentiated from *logos* that is ‘tale’ or ‘story’ (1959, 224).

The term mythology has been in use since at least the last 15th century, which means "the study or exposition of myths". The additional meaning of "body of myths" itself dates back to 1781. In extended use, the word can also refer to collective or personal ideological or socially constructed received wisdom. The adjective
mythical dates to 1678. The historical approach was set forth in 1725 by the monumental treatise of Giambattista Vico’s, *Principi di una Scienza Nuova intorno alla Natura della Nazioni*. Vico proposed that mythology be read as proto history. He discerned in myth not only the outlines of his spiral theory of progress, but a key to the so-called Homeric problem and a working model for the development of law.

*Myth*, in general use, is often interchangeable with *legend* or *allegory*, but some scholars strictly distinguish the terms. The term has been used in English since the 19th century. Myths are Cosmogonic Narratives, connected with the Foundation or Origin of the Universe, though often specifically in terms of a particular culture or region. Given the connection to origins, the setting is typically primordial and characters are proto-human or deific. Myths also often have cosmogonic overtones even when not fully cosmogonic, for instance the myth relating to the origins of important elements of culture like food, medicine, ceremonies, etc.

By contrast, legends are stories about the past, which generally include, or are based on, some historical events; generally focussed on human heroes and folktales/fairytales or *Märchen* (the German word for such tales). Legends are stories which lack any definite historical setting and often include such things as fairies, witches, a fairy guide and animal characters.
Myths are Narratives of a Sacred Nature, often connected with some ritual. Myths are often foundational. They are key narratives associated with religions as well. A myth is a narrative of events. It has a sacred quality and the sacred communication is made in symbolic form. At least some of the events and objects which occur in the myth actually neither occur nor exist in the world other than in the myth itself. The narrative quality distinguishes a myth from a general idea or a set of ideas, such as a cosmology. The sacred quality and the reference to origins and transformations distinguish myth from legend and other types of folk-tales. Campbell in *The Power of Myth* (1991) says, “A ritual is the enactment of a myth. By participating in a ritual, you are participating in a myth” (1991, 103). Within any given culture there may be sacred and secular myths coexisting. In his article, *The Necessity of Myth* (1959), Mark Schorer quotes Maslinowski who says that myth continually modified and renewed by the modifications of history, is in some form an “indispensable ingredient of all cultures” (1959, 361).

From the earlier work of Malinowski on myth we see the intimate relation of myths as sacred stories to social patterns of behaviour, to ritual, to religion and to practical ethics. His is a sociological theory, according to which myth performs indispensable in primitive societies.
Ihab Hassan writes “Myth is not poetic, not symbolic, and not explanatory. It is faith and emotion channelled to specific cultural purposes” (1952, 206-207).

According to William G. Doty, myths are narratives which are formative or reflective of social order or values within a culture. Myths are narratives representative of a particular epistemology or way of understanding nature and organizing thought. Myths are the narrative fictions whose plots are read first at the level of their own stories, and then as projections of imminent transcendent meanings. Such plots mirror human potentialities, experiences with natural and cultural phenomena, and recognition of regular interactions between them. Myths thus provide possible materializations for otherwise inchoate or unrecognized instantiations (1980, 538).

In A Comprehensive Definition of Myth (1980) Doty further confirms that, myths may mean differently at different stages of our lives (535). It may be regarded as a personal or a tribal possession, to be shared as a gift, and may be considered as a form of real property. Myths the primary stories of a culture, that shape and expose its most important framing images and self-conceptions and its “roots” (1980, 543).

Mythic narratives often involve heroic characters, possibly proto-humans, super humans, or gods who mediate inherent,
troubling dualities, and reconcile us to our realities, or establish the patterns for life as we know it. A structuralist anthropologist, Claude Levi-Strauss, saw myths as stemming from a human need to make sense of the world and to resolve cultural dilemmas. These dilemmas are embodied in the structure of myths, which is made up of opposites, such as good-bad, night-day etc. For Levi Strauss, myths are a kind of universal language. While the events of myths vary, the basic structures, like grammar, are similar in myths worldwide – because people are similar. On another level of ‘making sense’, myths explain the world, making it manageable. For example, the myths worldwide in which human beings are fashioned from clay by a divine potter, such as the Egyptian Ptah, fulfils our need to know how and why we came to be here. In *The Structural Study of Myth* (1955) Strauss says:

Myths are still widely interpreted in conflicting ways: collective dreams, the outcome of a kind of aesthetics play, the foundation of ritual …Mythological figures are considered as personified abstractions, divinized heroes or decayed gods. Whatever the hypothesis, the choice amounts to reducing mythology either to an idle play or to a coarse kind of speculation (1955, 428).

He further states that Myths are narratives that are "Counter-Factual in featuring actors and actions that confound the conventions of routine experience". Some claim that human societies merely express, through their mythology, fundamental feelings common to the whole of mankind, such as love, hate, revenge; or
that they try to provide some kind of explanations for phenomena which they cannot understand otherwise: astronomical, meteorological, and the like. On the other hand, psychoanalysts and many anthropologists have shifted the problems to be explained away from the natural or cosmological fields to the sociological and psychological fields (1955, 428-429).

Northrop Frye, on the other hand identifies myth with literature asserting that myth is a "structural organizing principle of literary form" and that an archetype is essentially an element of one's literary experiences (Geurin, et al, 1999, 166). In its archetypal aspect art is a part of civilization, whose major concerns, as it develops, are the city, the gardens, the farm, the sheepfold and human society. Therefore, an archetypal symbol is usually associated with a natural object with human meaning, and it forms part of the critical view of art as a civilized product, a vision of the goals of human work.

The word ‘myth’ means different things in different fields opines Robert Denham in Northrop Frye on Culture and Literature (1978). In literary criticism it is gradually settling down to mean the formal or constructive principle of literature. In anonymous stories about gods they become legends and are part of folk tales in later ages; then they gradually become more ‘realistic’, that is, adapted to a popular demand for plausibility, though they
retain the same structural outlines. Profound or classic works of art are frequently, almost regularly, marked by a tendency to revert or allude to the archaic and explicit form of the myth in the god-story. When there is no story, or when a theme (Aristotle’s ‘dianoia’) is the centre of the action instead of a ‘mythos’, the formal principle is a charged idea or sense data. Myths in this sense are readily translatable: they are, in fact, the communicable ideogrammatic structures of literature (Denham 1978, 75).

The myth of concern comprises everything that a society is most concerned to know. It is the disposition which leads man to uphold communal, rather than individual values. Frye says:

A myth of concern has its roots in religion and only later branches out into politics, law and literature. It is inherently traditional and conservative, placing a strong emphasis on values of coherence and continuity. It originates in oral or preliterate culture and is associated with continuous verse conventions and discontinuous prose forms. And it is “deeply attached to ritual, to coronations, weddings, funerals, parades, demonstrations, where something is publicly done that expresses an inner social identity (Denham, 1978, 14).

According to C. G. Jung and C. Kerenyi, Myths are original revelations of the preconscious psyche, involuntary statements about unconscious psychic happenings and anything but allegories of physical processes. Myths have a vital meaning:

They are the psychic life of the primitive tribe, which immediately falls to pieces and decays when it loses its mythological heritage, like a man who has lost his soul (Jung, et al, 1978, 73).
Myths are the symbolic projections of people’s hopes, values, fears and aspirations (Guerin et al., 1999, 159). They are merely primitive fictions, illusions, or opinions based upon false reasoning according to the common misconceptions and misuse of the terms. Myth is, in the general sense, universal. As Guerin points it “Myths are by nature collective and communal, they bind a tribe or a nation together in common psychological and spiritual activities. It is the expression of a profound sense of togetherness of feeling and of action and of wholeness of living” (1999, 160). Myth and dream are the outside and inside of the human unconscious. Together they form the realm of the archetypes. And as myth is a codification of our unconscious archetypes, literature is the cultural realization of our mythologies. Myths and stories from our past have been used, interpreted, and reinterpreted for hundreds of years to create new stories. Through this process a number of ‘archetypes’ have been created. Myths are metaphorical representations of the content of the archetypes and used to provide us with information about life’s experiences.

According to Jung, “Myths are the means by which archetypes, essentially unconscious forms, become manifest and articulate to the conscious mind”. Jung indicated further that archetypes reveal themselves in the dreams of individuals, so that we might say that dreams are “personalized myths” and myths are ‘depersonalized dreams” (1999, 179).
Myths are the instruments by which we continually struggle to make our experience intelligible to ourselves opine Mark Schorer, in *The Necessity of Myth*:

A myth is a large, controlling image that gives philosophical meaning to the facts of ordinary life; that is, which has organizing value for experience. A mythology is a more or less articulated body of such images, a pantheon. Without such images, experience is chaotic, fragmentary and merely phenomenal (1959, 360).

He further says that Myth is fundamental, the dramatic representation of our deepest instinctual life, of a primary awareness of man in the universe, capable of many configurations, upon which all particular opinions and attitudes depend (1959, 361).

In *The Meanings of “Myth” in Modern Criticism* (1953) Wallace Douglas says that a society that possesses myths is a healthy human society... (But myths) will come into being, as they probably have in the past, only out of deep and long-continued passion, crystallized and given shape, perhaps, by some deeply passionate seer-artist, and slowly absorbed into a common culture because they reflect or create profound convictions and satisfy the impossible ideas of that culture (234).

Douglas points out that the mythic involves insights into the universal, or “commerce between the community and the mysteries”, and undertakes a part of the ordering of experience.
Myth deals with the "fundamentals of our existence", it is derived from "the word as the most ancient, the original account of the origins of the world"; it also imbeds a "complex of human problems" or carries "one of the archetypes from the collective unconscious of mankind" or "the timeless meaning" of an individual's psychic life. In what must be its widest senses, "myth in its union with logos, comprises the totality of human existence", or, as "the myth", it is "the totality of all visions of truth which are untestable, non-demonstrable, non-empirical, and non-logical" (1953, 236).

He further quotes Neitzsche, who assumes that a modern man is essentially different in his modes of thinking and feeling from primitive man: he is so broken up by the critico-historical spirit of our culture, that he can only make the former existence of myth credible to himself by learned means through intermediary abstractions. Without myth, any culture would lose its healthy creative power. Myth gives meaning to the foundations of the state and to the life of the individual.

Reviews of myths, legends, fairy tales, epic poems, novels and films reveal that the protagonist types who recur in these stories fall into sixteen distinctive categories, eight each for the heroes and heroines. At his or her core every well-defined hero or heroine is one of the respective archetypes. The archetype tells the
writer about the most basic instincts of the hero: how he thinks, how he feels, what drives him and why he chooses both his goals and his methods. The skilful writer, in turn, conveys these instincts to the readers or audience, who, knowing at a glance the character of this hero, settles down to watch the tale retold anew.


*Eugene Ionesco* says, "There is nothing truer than myth: history, in its attempt to realize myth, distorts it, stops halfway; when history claims to have succeeded, this is nothing but humbug and mystification. Everything we dream is realizable. Reality does not have to be: it is simply what it is." *Robert Graves* said of Greek myth: "True myth may be defined as the reduction to narrative shorthand of ritual mime performed on public festivals, and in many cases recorded pictorially." Moreover, myths or extended narratives are often acted out in dramatic rituals. As such,
myths become the scripts for the dramas of rituals, and rituals are performances and interpretations of myths (Power, 1986, 451).

Graves was deeply influenced by Sir James George Frazer’s mythography, *The Golden Bough*, and he would have agreed that myths are generated by many cultural needs. Myths authorize the cultural institutions of a tribe, a city, or a nation by connecting them with universal truths. Myths justify the current occupation of a territory by a people, for instance. All cultures have developed over time their own myths, consisting of narratives of their history, their religions, and their heroes. The great power of the symbolic meaning of these stories for the culture is a major reason why they survive as long as they do, sometimes for thousands of years.

Myths are often linked to the spiritual or religious life of a community, and endorsed by rulers or priests. Once this link to the spiritual leadership of society is broken, they often acquire traits that are characteristic of fairy tales. In folkloristic, which is concerned with the study of both secular and sacred narratives, a myth also derives some of its power from being more than a simple ‘tale’, by comprising an archetypical quality of ‘truth’.

Myths are often intended to explain the universal and local beginnings like ‘creation myths’ and ‘founding myths’, natural phenomena, otherwise inexplicable cultural conventions or rituals.
and anything else for which no simple explanation presents itself. Myth is not merely a story told, but a reality lived, a sanction for a way of life and a pattern for worship. The myth is simply the word itself, and it possesses divine power by its repetition.

Myths never remain static, as they are continually retold and re-written; and in this process they are modulated and transformed. Peter Munz in *History and Myth* (1956) elaborates this idea thus:

The myth which is thus distilled from or composed out of the original historical events can again be described as a concrete universal. It is a concrete story about certain people with definite names and about certain events in definite places. But it is a universal story in that it portrays the most universal patterns of human life, such as motherhood, fatherhood, elemental envy or devotion (1956, 8).

MacIver, in *Acculturation and Myth* (1973) opines “By myths we mean the value-impregnated beliefs and notions that men hold, that they live by or live for”. Every society is held together by a myth-system, a complex of dominating thought-forms that determines and sustains all its activities. All social relations, the very texture of human society, are myth-born and myth-sustained. It is through its myths that a society is able to trace its identity. It is through its myths that a social group is able to distinguish itself from other groups (Signorile, 1973, 119).
In *Myth, Memory, and the Oral Tradition* (1976) Frances Harwood says that an intimate connection exists between the world, the ‘mythos’, the sacred tales of a tribe, on the one hand, and their ritual acts, their moral deeds, their social organization, and even their practical activities on the other (1976, 784).

Bronislaw Malinowski justifies that Myth fulfils in primitive cultures an indispensable function: it expresses, enhances and codifies belief; it safeguards and enforces morality; it vouches for the efficacy of ritual and contains practical rules for the guidance of man. Myth is thus a vital ingredient of human civilization; it is not an ideal tale, but an active force; it is not an intellectual explanation or an artistic imagery, but a pragmatic charter of primitive faith and moral wisdom (1976, 785). For him myths are viewed as charters for social institutions. This formulation turns on two concepts – that of myth as a charter and that of an institution as an ethnographic category.

The similar view is highlighted by Jung *In Essays on a Science of Mythology*, (1993). He says thus:

The myth in a primitive society, i.e., in its original living form, is not a mere tale told but a reality lived. It is not in the nature of an invention such as we read in our novels today, but living reality, believed to have occurred in primordial times and to be influencing ever afterwards the world and the destinies of men… These stories are kept alive by vain curiosity, neither as tales that have been invented nor again as tales that are true. For the natives on the contrary they are the assertion of an original, greater, and more important reality through which the present life, fate, and work of mankind are governed, and the knowledge of which
provides men on the one hand with motives for ritual and moral acts, on the other with direction for their performance (1993, 5).

Functions of Myth

Campbell in *The Power of Myth*, (1991) identifies four functions of myth. According to him the first is the mythical function which makes one to realise the great mysteries of the universe, the human beings. Myth opens the world to the dimension of mystery, to the realisation of the mystery that underlies all forms. The second is a cosmological dimension, the dimension with which science is concerned – shows the shape of the universe. The third function is the sociological one – supporting and validating a certain social order (Campbell, *et al*, 1991, 38-39) and the fourth function is pedagogical that is how to live a human lifetime under any circumstance (Campbell, *et al*, 1991, 87).

Percy S. Cohen, in *Theories of Myth* (1969) quotes Levi Strauss who says that the main function of myth, the main cause promoting its existence as a mode of thought, is that it is a device for ‘mediating contradictions’ or ‘oppositions’ as experienced by men. According to him all myth performs a number of functions simultaneously. For whatever reasons myths were originally invented, they were subsequently used as a vehicle for communicating or just expressing a number of things for which
they may never have been intended. Let us say that myths were
originally explanations of the origins or transformations of things
or, as I would prefer to put it, let us say that they were originally

Handoo in *Folklore in Modern India* (1998) considers
the functions of myth as social authority, social control and cultural
continuity as enumerated by Bascom.

Myths are not the same as *fables, legends, folktales, fairy tales, anecdotes* or *fiction*, but the concepts may overlap.
Notably, during *Romanticism*, famously by the *Brothers Grimm* and
*Elias Lönnrot*, folktales and fairy tales were perceived as eroded
fragments of earlier mythology. Mythological themes are also very
often consciously employed in *literature*, beginning with *Homer*.

Comparative mythology is the systematic comparison
of myths from different cultures. It seeks to discover underlying
themes that are common to the myths of multiple cultures. In some
cases, comparative mythologists use the similarities between
different mythologies to argue that those mythologies have a
common source. This common source may be a common source of
inspiration or a common "proto mythology" that diverged into the
various mythologies. Nineteenth-century interpretations of myth
were often highly comparative. However, modern-day scholars tend
to be more suspicious of comparative approaches, avoiding overly general or universal statements about mythology.

In a scholarly setting, the word "myth" may mean "sacred story", "traditional story", or "story involving gods", but it does not mean "false story". Therefore, many scholars refer to a religion's stories as "myths" without intending to offend members of that religion. Religion begins with a sense of wonder and awe and the attempt to tell stories that will connect us to God. Then it becomes a set of theological works in which everything is reduced to a code, to a creed. Religion turns poetry to prose (Campbell, et al, 1991, 173-74). Nevertheless, this scholarly use of the word "myth" may cause misunderstanding and offend people who cherish those myths. This is because word "myth" is popularly used to mean "falsehood". Many myths, such as ritual myths, are clearly part of religion. However, unless we simply define myths as "sacred stories", not all myths are necessarily religious.

Harry M. Buck makes a brilliant analysis. According to him, Myths that are based on a historical event over time become imbued with symbolic meaning, transformed, shifted in time or place, or even reversed. One way of conceptualizing this process is to view 'myths' as lying at the far end of a continuum ranging from a 'dispassionate account' to 'legendary occurrence' to 'mythical status'. As an event progresses towards the mythical end of this continuum,
what people think, feel and say about the event takes on progressively greater historical significance while the facts become less important. By the time one reaches the mythical end of the spectrum the story. Myth is not merely a story told, but a reality lived, a sanction for a way of life and a pattern for worship. The myth is simply the word itself, and it possesses divine power by its repetition (1961, 220). The narration of events and reference to objects unknown outside the world differentiates myth from history or Pseudo-history.

Myth, as mentioned earlier, has a history and a development. The old theory of euhemerism is an attempt to understand the genesis of myth. It is now generally accepted that the folktale preceded mythology in human history (Ihab H. Hassan, 1952, 213).

Myth is a fascinating and many-facetted subject. There are myths, sagas, and fairytales; there is folklore and superstition. There are ancient myths, modern myths, or urban myths, that supposedly have taken place in our own time. Collectively all of this can be labelled “traditions.”

The purpose of science is to find the truth, in a literal, physical sense. The role of fiction is to entertain. They have variously been interpreted as distorted history, as remnants from an obsolete religion, and as entertainment. There are several more
paradigms for how to interpret myth. Sigmund Freud, for instance, might have interpreted the troll as a manifestation of sexuality, while Jung might have sought the image of the troll in the common subconscious. Robert Graves often interpreted Greek myths as misunderstood symbols from an earlier religion. His Irish background with its own rich mythology may well have guided his interpretations, but if that is for the better or worse can be debated.

Claude Levi Strauss says that modern Science is not at all moving away from these things, but re it is attempting more to reintegrate them in the field of scientific explanation. At that time, with Bacon, Descartes, Newton, and the others, it was necessary for science to build itself up against the old generations of mythical and mystical thought, and it was thought that science could only exist by turning its back upon the world of the senses, the world we see, smell, taste, and perceive; the sensory was a delusive world, whereas the real world was a world of mathematical properties which could only be grasped by the intellect and which was entirely at odds with the false testimony of the senses. The contemporary science is tending to overcome this gap and the more sense data are being reintegrated into scientific explanation as something which has a meaning, a truth, and which can be explained (1979, 5-6).

Mircea Eliade, a philosopher in his appendix to *Myths, Dreams and Mysteries* (1967) and in *The Myth of the Eternal*
Return (2005), assumed the existence of “the sacred” as the object of religious worship, and saw myth as a physical revelation of the sacred. If the sacred interacts with our physical reality it can, at least in principle, be measured and determined to be either true or false. But if it does not interact, it can neither be falsified nor confirmed. However, if it does interact then it is perfectly natural. Thus, if God exists he is a natural phenomenon that has turned first into a myth, and then into religion, it would seem.

Science can make an historic myth intelligible again. On the contrary, they will find that their religion kept the myth alive, so that we today could regain knowledge that would otherwise have been lost forever. Science is then just the process to undo the damage so to say, and mythology has been the vehicle for saving the knowledge.

In History and Myth, Peter Munz says that in common usage the two words ‘myth’ and ‘history’ are used as if they denoted contradictories. Historians are inclined to call the version of an event which they consider untrue, a myth. Myth and history, in a very special sense, are interdependent. They fertilise each other; and it is doubtful whether the one could exist without the other (1956, 1).

He further states that one needs to make it clear at the outset that both the naïve conception of myth and history as
contradictories and the more subtle notion of their mutual interdependence, are due to the fact that myth and history are stories of concrete events, said to have taken place at a certain time and to have involved certain people. Both kinds of stories differ fundamentally from such general propositions as ‘all men are mortal’ or, ‘unless babies are weaned at a certain moment they are likely to get a mother fixation’ (1956, 1).

A myth, however, differs qualitatively from a historical account, in that it is vague in its specifications of time and space. But this is not necessarily so, for there are many myths that are by no means vague. A myth is a story of concrete events involving concrete persons. But it is lacking in any precise indication as to the time and place the events happened. We may conclude therefore that the myth, although a story of a concrete event, is not a story of any particular historical event. We can nevertheless speak of a true myth. A true myth is one that draws our attention to a more or less universally valid story. A myth, then, is a true story not because it relates to a particular historical event; but because it exhibits universally true features. And since it is a concrete story, one can call a myth a concrete universal. William L Power, in Myth, Truth and Justification in Religion (1986) justifies this:

Thus, a myth represents reality, if it truly does represent reality, by means of analogies and holistically so, and the truth value of a myth is
determined by the same canons of assessment found in critical inquiry; only those canons are implicit rather than explicit (1986, 456).

We may conclude therefore again that the formation of myth is subject to certain laws and not due to an arbitrary exercise of the imagination. When history is telescoped into myth, the myth-maker always has the objective of bringing out certain features deeply characteristic of human behaviour. The myth-maker feels free to select his facts from a wide sphere; he is not concerned with the literal truth of his story; but with linking facts chosen from a vast field of events into a significant whole, a concrete universal story.

We see, therefore, that the myth which is thus distilled from or composed out of the original historical events can again be described as a concrete universal. It is a concrete story about certain people with definite names and about certain events in definite places. But it is a universal story in that it portrays the most universal patterns of human life, such as motherhood, fatherhood, elemental envy or devotion.

There are many theories of myth, but they are not necessarily rival theories. According to Pre-modern theories, storytellers repeatedly elaborated upon historical accounts until the figures in those accounts gained the status of gods. This theory is named "euhemerism" after the novelist Euhemerus (320 BC) who
suggested that the Greek gods were developed from legends about human beings. This theory claims that myths are distorted accounts of real historical events. According to this theory, storytellers repeatedly elaborated upon historical accounts until the figures in those accounts gained the status of gods. It refers to the process of rationalization of myths, putting themes formerly imbued with mythological qualities into pragmatic contexts, for example following a cultural or religious paradigm shift (Jung, 1968, 60).

Some theories propose that myths began as allegories. Apollo represents fire; Poseidon represents water, and so on. According to another theory, myths began as allegories for philosophical or spiritual concepts: Athena represents wise judgment, Aphrodite represents desire, etc. The 19th century, Max Muller supported an allegorical theory of myth. He believed that myths began as allegorical descriptions of nature, but gradually came to be interpreted literally: for example, a poetic description of the sea as “raging” was eventually taken literally, and the sea was then thought of as a raging god.

Similarly, myths are also resulted from the personification of inanimate objects and forces. According to these thinkers, the ancients worshipped natural phenomena such as fire and air, gradually coming to describe them as gods. According to Jung ‘the Deity appears in the garb of Nature (Jung, 1968, 118).
According to the ‘myth-ritual theory’, the existence of myth is tied to ritual. In its most extreme form, this theory claims that myths arose to explain rituals. This claim was first put forward by the biblical scholar William Robertson Smith. According to Smith, people begin performing rituals for some reason that is not related to myth; later, after they have forgotten the original reason for a ritual, they try to account for the ritual by inventing a myth and claiming that the ritual commemorates the events described in that myth. The anthropologist James Frazer had a similar theory.

The first scholarly theories of myth appeared during the second half of the nineteenth century. In general, these nineteenth-century theories framed myth as a failed or obsolete mode of thought, often by interpreting myth as the primitive counterpart of modern science.

For example, E. B. Tylor interpreted myth as an attempt at a literal explanation for natural phenomena in which early man tried to explain natural phenomena by attributing souls to inanimate objects, giving rise to animism. Max Muller called myth a "disease of language". The anthropologist James Frazer saw myths as a misinterpretation of magical rituals, which were themselves based on a mistaken idea of natural law.

Many twentieth-century theories of myth rejected the nineteenth-century theories' opposition of myth and science. In
general, twentieth-century theories have tended to see myth as almost anything but an outdated counterpart to science; consequently, moderns are not obliged to abandon myth for science.

Swiss psychologist Carl Jung (1873-1961) and his followers also tried to understand the psychology behind world myths. Jung argued that the gods of mythology are not material beings, but archetypes or mental states and moods that all humans can feel, share, and experience. He and his adherents believe archetypes directly affect our subconscious perceptions and way of understanding. Following Jung, Joseph Campbell believed that insights about one’s psychology, gained from reading myths, can be beneficially applied to one’s own life.

Like the psychoanalysts, Claude Levi-Strauss believed that myths reflect patterns in the mind. However, he saw those patterns more as fixed mental structures specifically, pairs of oppositions than as unconscious feelings or urges.

According to Percy S. Cohen, a major critic there is several types of theory of myth which treats myth as a form of explanation. Sir Edward Burnett Taylor also treats myths as explanation, but considers that they are peculiar explanations; for him, the chief peculiarities are that myths make use of the language of metaphor and that metaphor is used by primitive man to
personalize the forces of the natural world which he seeks to understand and control.

Cohen opines that the chief weaknesses of these theories are that they do not explain why myth is social in character, and why the possession of certain myths is not only collective but is significant in marking the identity of a particular social group; and they provide poor accounts of the symbolic content of myth. He also points out that the chief merit of the intellectualist doctrine is that it does recognize that men, including savages, have intellects and, moreover, that they might also have intellectual curiosity (Percy S. Cohen, 1969, 339).

He further illustrates that the Freudian theorists seek to explain, not apart from this forms myths take, the source of mythical expression is. In this view, myths are like day-dreams which occur in full sleep involving a process known as the dream-work, of symbolically reconstructing messages which emit from the unconscious. In this process two main things occur: the message is disguised; and the body of messages is condensed (1969, 340).

Since myth is a type of day-dream it makes use of the symbolism of dreams, expressing unconscious wishes and conflicts. But since it is only a day-dream the conscious element is strong, it is more readily communicable than a dream (1969, 341).
For Durkheim, myth is part of the religious system, and expresses in words what ritual expresses in actions: both have a social function of maintaining and expressing solidarity. The content of the myth, in the first place represents certain values which are embodied in social life; secondly, it reflects certain features of social structure. He also points out that myth, along with other religious beliefs, provides the basis of all cultural means of categorizing the world: and this forms the basis of philosophy and science (1969, 343).

Since the beginning of modern philosophy and science in the 16th century, many Western intellectuals have seen myth as outdated. In fact, some argued that the Christian religion would be better off without mythology, or even that Christianity would be better off without religion.

In the 20th century, many scholars have resisted this trend, defending myth from modern criticism. Mircea Eliade, the religious scholar, declared that myth did not hold religion back, that myth was an essential foundation of religion, and that eliminating myth would eliminate a piece of the human psyche. Eliade approached myth sympathetically at a time when religious thinkers were trying to purge religion of its mythological elements.

Similarly, Joseph Campbell believed that people could not understand their individual lives without mythology to aid
them. By recalling the significance of old myths, he encouraged awareness of them and the creation of myths for the contemporary age.

Although there is no specific universal myth, there are many themes and motifs that recur in the myths of various cultures and ages. Some cultures have myths of the creation of the world; these range from a god fashioning the earth from abstract chaos to a specific animal creating it from a handful of mud. Other myths of cyclical destruction and creation are paralleled by myths of seasonal death and rebirth. Certain other cultures were concerned with longer periods of vegetative death through prolonged drought. The flood motif is extremely widespread and is one element of a group of myths that concern the destruction and re-creation of the world or a particular society. Myths treating the origin of fire, or its retrieval from some being who has stolen it or refused to share it; the millennium to come; and the dead or the relation between the living and the dead, are common.

There have been many theories as to the reasons for similarities among myths. Many have viewed myths merely as poor versions of history, and have attempted to analyze and explicate them in non sacred ways to account for their apparent absurdity. Some ancient Greeks explained myths as allegories, and looked for a reality concealed in poetic images Another interpretation sees myths
as developing from an improper separation between the human and nonhuman; animals, rocks, and stars are considered to be on a level of intelligence with people, and the dead are thought to inhabit the world of the living in spiritual form.

II

Archetypes are elementary ideas, what could be called “ground” ideas. These ideas Jung spoke of as archetype of the unconscious. Archetype of the unconscious means it comes from below and is biologically grounded (Campbell, et al, 1991, 60-61). The word ‘archetype’ is derived from the Greek term ‘archetypos’. ‘Arche’ meaning the original, and ‘typos’ meaning form or model. Thus the term denotes ‘original model’. Jung called the recurring personalities as archetypes. It also means the first of its kind.

The origins of the archetypal hypothesis date back as far as to Plato. Jung himself compared archetypes to Platonic ideas. Plato's ideas were pure mental forms that were imprinted in the soul before it was born into the world. They were collective in the sense that they embodied the fundamental characteristics of a thing rather than its specific peculiarities. In fact many of Jung's ideas were prevalent in Athenian philosophy. The archetype theory can be seen
as a psychological equivalent to the philosophical idea of forms and particulars.

Archetypes form a dynamic substratum common to all humanity, upon the foundation of which each individual builds his own experience of life, developing a unique array of psychological characteristics. Thus, while archetypes themselves may be conceived as innate nebulous forms, from these may arise innumerable images, symbols and patterns of behaviour. While the emerging images and forms are apprehended consciously, the archetypes, which inform them, are the elementary structures which are part of the unconscious and impossible to apprehend. Being part of the unconscious, the existence of archetypes can only be deduced indirectly by examining behaviour, images, art, myths, etc.

Archetype has its sources in anthropology and in Jungian theory. An archetype is the first real example or prototype of something. In this sense an archetype can be considered the ideal model, the supreme type or the perfect image of something. The term has been defined as a "primordial image" that transcends the individual experience. Jung first referred to these as "primordial images"—a term he borrowed from Jacob Burckhardt. Later in 1917 he called them "dominants of the collective unconscious." It was not until 1919 that he first used the term "archetypes" in an essay titled Instinct and the unconscious.
Archetypes determine the form of imagery, rather than content. They are inferred from the vast range of concrete images and symbols found in mythologies, religions, dreams and art across history and space. An archetype appears in myths, but can also be seen its thematic or figurative dimension in literature, involving exile, rebirth, earth, goddess etc.

According to Carl Jung, archetypes are structures, forming elements within the unconscious and give life to the images of both individual fantasies as well as to the mythologies of an entire culture. He also explains that archetypes are not inherited ideas or patterns of thought, but rather they are predisposed to respond in similar ways to certain stimuli. In reality “they belong to the realm of activities of the instincts and in that sense they represent inherited forms of psychic behaviour”. (in Wilfred Guerin, et al, 1999, 178) Jung also used the term to refer to a recurring universal image, pattern, or motif representing a typical human experience. It is this aspect that gives archetypes their power – the ability to evoke themes that a vast majority of people can relate to. Jung wrote:

There are as many archetypes as there are typical situations in life. Endless repetition has engraved these experiences into our psychic constitution, not in the forms of images filled with content, but at first only as forms of images filled with content, but at first only as forms without content, representing merely the possibility of a certain type of perception and action (Campbell).
Archetypes are, according to Carl Jung, innate universal psychic dispositions that form the basic themes of human life. Each stage is mediated through a new set of archetypal imperatives which seek fulfilment in action. These may include being parented, initiation, acts of courtship, rituals associated with marriage and preparation for death.

In The Power of Myth, Campbell defines archetypes as elementary ideas or ground ideas. He suggests that “Archetype” is a better term because “elementary idea” suggests headwork. Archetype of the unconscious means it comes from below. The difference between the Jungian archetypes of the unconscious and Freud’s complexes is that the archetypes of the unconscious are manifestations of the organs of the body and their powers. Archetypes are biologically grounded, whereas the Freudian unconscious is a collection of repressed traumatic experiences from an individual’s lifetime. The Freudian unconscious is a personal unconscious, it is biographical. The Jungian archetypes of the unconscious are biological. The biographical is secondary to that (Campbell, et al., 1991, 60-61).

According to Esther Lombardi, an archetype is a symbol that appears in literature, but there are also generalized patterns of archetypes that can be found through time and across cultures. When we study literature, these symbolic threads can be
seen in plot elements, the setting or background, and/or in character
development. The development of these characters in a work of
literature may be done on an unconscious level by the author; the
author may recognize a pattern in work and further build upon it – to
accomplish a desired dramatic effect.

For Northrop Frye the word ‘archetype’ means the
first, the major or the ruling example or the pattern. The original
patterns of myths are changed through ‘displacement’, a term coined
by the psycho analysists. It means that basic instinctual drives and
goals are disguised or changed so that whatever is being wanted or
said becomes more believable and more morally and aesthetically
acceptable.

Frye points out that an archetype should be not only a
unifying category of criticism, but itself a part of a total form and it
leads us at once to the question of what sort of total form criticism
can see in literature. Total literary history moves from the primitive
to the sophisticated, and here we glimpse the possibility of seeing
literature as a complication of a relatively restricted and simple
group of formulas that can be studied in primitive culture. If so,
then the search for archetypes is a kind of literary anthropology,
concerned with the way that literature is informed by pre-literary
categories such as ritual, myth and folk tale (Northrop Frye, 1951,
99).
In *Northrop Frye on Culture and Literature* (1978), Robert Denham points out that Archetypes are easily locatable in highly conventionalized literatures which mean, for the most part, naïve, primitive, or popular literatures. Frye on the other hand distinguishes two kinds of archetypes: 'structural' or 'narrative archetypes' with a ritual content, and 'modal' or 'emblematic archetypes' in the drama of the educated audience and the settled theatre, in naïve or spectacular drama folk plays, puppet shows, pantomimes, farces, pageants, and their descendants in masques, comic operas, and commercial movies. Modal archetypes are best studied in naïve romance, which includes the folktales and fairy tales that are so closely related to dreams of wonderful wishes coming true and to nightmares of ogres and witches (1978, 124-25).

The anthropological origins of archetypal criticism can pre-date its psychoanalytic origins by over thirty years. *The Golden Bough* (1922), written by the Scottish anthropologist James G. Frazer was the first influential text dealing with cultural mythologies. *The Golden Bough*¹ was widely accepted as the seminal text on myth that spawned numerous studies on the same subject.

While Frazer’s work deals with mythology and archetypes in material terms, the work of Carl Gustav Jung is, in contrast, immaterial in its focus. Jung’s work theorizes myths and archetypes in relation to the unconscious, an inaccessible part of the
mind. From a Jungian perspective, myths are the culturally elaborated representations of the contents of the deepest recess of the human psyche: the world of the archetypes.

The archetype to which Jung refers is represented through primordial images, a term he coined. Primordial images originate from the initial stages of humanity and have been part of the collective unconscious ever since. It is through primordial images that universal archetypes are experienced, and more importantly, that the unconscious is revealed.

Like the death-rebirth myth that Frazer sees as being representative of the growing seasons and agriculture as a point of comparison, Jungian analysis\textsuperscript{2} envisions the death-rebirth archetype as a symbolic expression of a process taking place not in the world but in the mind (Jung, 1968, 116).

Jung described several archetypes based on the repeating patterns of thought and action that re-appear time and again across people, countries and continents.

The ‘Shadow’ is a very common archetype that reflects deeper elements of our psyche, where 'latent dispositions', which are common to us, all, arise. Our ‘shadow’ may appear in dreams, hallucinations and musings. It personifies everything that the subject refuses to acknowledge about himself and yet is always
thrusting itself upon him directly or indirectly – for instance inferior
traits of character and other incompatible tendencies (Jung, 1968,
284-85).

For Jung the second most prevalent pattern is that of
the Anima (male), Animus (female), or, more simply, the Soul. It is
the route to communication with the collective unconscious. The
anima/animus represents our true self considered to be as opposed to
the masks we wear every day and is the source of our creativity.
Turned towards the world, the anima is fickle, capricious, moody,
uncontrolled and emotional, sometimes gifted with daemonic
intuitions, ruthless, malicious, and obstinate, harping on principles,
laying down the law, dogmatic, world-reforming, theoretic, word-
mongering, argumentative, and domineering (1968, 124).

Anima and animus are male and female principles that
represent a deep difference. Whilst men have a fundamental anima
and women an animus, each may also have the other, just as men
have a feminine side and women a masculine. Jung saw men as
having one dominant anima, contributed by female members of his
family, whilst women have a more complex, variable animus,
perhaps made of several parts.

In combination, the anima and animus are known as
syzygy (Jung, 1968, 67) a word also used to denote alignment of
planets, representing wholeness and completion. This combining
brings great power and can be found in religious combinations such as the Christian Holy Trinity (Father, Son and the Holy Ghost). A perfect partnership between man and woman can take place when not only our physical forms are compatible but also the *anima* and *animus*.

For Jung, the self is not just 'me' but God. It is the spirit that connects and is part of the universe. It is the coherent whole that unifies both consciousness and unconsciousness. It may be found elsewhere in such principles as nirvana and ecstatic harmony. It is perhaps what Jaques Lacan called 'the real'.

Jung said that there are a large number of archetypes. These are often linked to the main archetypes and may represent aspects of them. They also overlap and many can appear in the same person. For example: A family archetype consists of the father, mother and the child. The father represents the dynamism of the archetype (Jung, 1968, 102); he also represents sternness and power. The qualities associated with it are maternal solicitude and sympathy; the magic authority of the female; the wisdom and spiritual exaltation that transcend reason; any helpful instinct or impulse; all that is benign, all that cherishes and sustains, that fosters growth and fertility (1968, 82). This archetype of “child god” is extremely widespread and intimately bound up with all the other mythological aspects of the child motif (1968, 158).
‘child’ symbolises the post-conscious essence which is the essence of man. His pre-conscious essence is the unconscious state of earliest childhood; his post-conscious essence is the anticipation by analogy of life after death (1968, 178).

Archetypes consists stories of the wise old man who appears when the hero is in distress. He is the superior master and teacher, the father of the soul, and yet the soul, in some miraculous manner, is also his virgin mother, for which reason he is called by the alchemist the “first son of the mother” (1968, 35). The Earth mother is always chthonic and is occasionally related to the moon, either through the blood-sacrifice or through a child- sacrifice, or else she is adorned with a sickle moon (1968, 185). The Earth Mother plays an important part in the woman’s unconscious, for all her manifestations are describes as “powerful” (1968, 186). The hero is the rescuer and the champion. The hunter or old magician and the witch correspond to the negative parental images in the magic world of the unconscious (1968, 235). The trickster is someone who is “fooled” or “cheated”. He is known for his sly jokes and malicious pranks, his powers as a shape-shifter, his dual nature, half animal and half divine (1968, 255).

In Animal archetypes we encounter animals that act like humans, speak a human language, and display sagacity and knowledge superior to men (Jung 1968, 231). The archetype of the
spirit is being expressed through an animal form. The three-legged and four-legged horses are in truth a recondite matter worthy of closer examination. Three-leggedness, as the attribute of some animal, denotes the unconscious masculinity immanent in a female creature (Jung, 1968, 244).

In earlier work, Jung linked the archetypes to heredity and considered them as instinctual. Yet wherever he looked across cultures, he found the same archetypes and thus came to conceptualize them as fundamental forces that somehow exist beyond us. They have existed in ancient myths as elemental spirits and Jung sought to link with this deep and old experience.

It was not until the work of the Canadian literary critic Northrop Frye that archetypal criticism was theorized in purely literary terms. The major work of Frye’s to deal with archetypes is Anatomy of Criticism but his essay “The Archetypes of Literature” is a precursor to the book. Frye’s thesis in The Archetypes of Literature remains largely unchanged in Anatomy of Criticism. Frye’s work helped displace New Criticism as the major mode of analyzing literary texts, before giving way to structuralism and semiotics.

Frye’s work breaks from both Frazer and Jung in such a way that it is distinct from its anthropological and psychoanalytical precursors. As for Jung, Frye was uninterested
about the collective unconscious on the grounds of feeling it was unnecessary: since the unconscious is unknowable it cannot be studied. How archetypes came to be was also of no concern to Frye; rather, the function and effect of archetypes is his interest. For Frye, literary archetypes play an essential role in refashioning the material universe into an alternative verbal universe that is humanly intelligible and viable, because it is adapted to essential human needs and concerns.

There are two basic categories in Frye’s framework, comedic and tragic. Each category is further subdivided into two categories that are comedy and romance for the comedic; tragedy and satire for the tragic. Though he is dismissive of Frazer, Frye uses the seasons in his archetypal schema. Each season is aligned with a literary genre: romance with spring, comedy with summer, tragedy with autumn, and satire with winter (Frye, 1951, 104).

Comedy is aligned with spring because the genre of comedy is characterized by the birth of the hero, revival and resurrection. Also, spring symbolizes the defeat of winter and darkness. Romance and summer are paired together because summer is the culmination of life in the seasonal calendar, and the romance genre culminates with some sort of triumph, usually a marriage. Autumn is the dying stage of the seasonal calendar, which parallels
the tragedy genre because it is, above all, known for the “fall” or demise of the protagonist. Satire is metonymized with winter on the grounds that satire is a “dark” genre; satire is a disillusioned and mocking form of the three other genres. It is noted for its darkness, dissolution, the return of chaos, and the defeat of the heroic figure.

Frye outlines five different spheres in his schema: human, animal, vegetation, mineral, and water. The comedic human world is representative of wish-fulfilment and being community centred. In the tragic, human world is a tyranny or anarchy, or an individual or isolated man, the bullying giant of romance, the deserted or the betrayed hero. The animal world is a community of domesticated animals, usually a flock of sheep, or a lamb, or one of the gentler birds, usually a dove. In the tragic, animal world is seen in terms of beasts and birds of prey, wolves, vultures, serpents, dragons and the like. The vegetable world is a garden, grove or park, or a tree of life, or a rose or lotus. In the tragic it is sinister forest or heath or wilderness, or a tree of death. Cities with the “starlit dome” or building or temple, or one stone, normally a glowing precious stone represent the comedic images. In the tragic vision the mineral world is seen in terms of deserts, rocks and ruins, or of sinister geometrical images like the cross. Lastly the unformed world is a river, traditionally fourfold. This world usually becomes the sea, as the narrative myth of dissolution is so often a flood myth.
The combination of the sea and beast images gives us the leviathan and similar water monster (Frye, 1951, 108-110).

Archetypal literary criticism is a type of critical theory that interprets a text by focusing on recurring myths and archetypes (from Greek arche, or beginning, and typos, or imprint) in the narrative, symbols, images, and character types in a literary work. Archetypal literary criticism's origins are rooted in two other academic disciplines, social anthropology and psychoanalysis. Archetypal criticism was its most popular in the 1950’s and 1960’s, largely due to Northrop Frye.

Jung proposed that the archetype had a dual nature: it exists both in the psyche and in the world at large. He called this non-psychic aspect of the archetype the "psychoid" archetype. Jung used the ancient term of unus mundus; to describe the unitary reality which he believed underlay all manifest phenomena. He conceived archetypes to be the mediators of the unus mundus, organizing not only ideas in the psyche, but also the fundamental principles of matter and energy in the physical world. For the A·chiks, tradition, myth and religion are inseperably intermingled. The A·chiks believe that the soul of a person is not being perished at death but the soul remains and turns into a process of forming a new flesh and body through re-incarnation. For them the spirit and life after death is real, hence the rituals to bring back home, the surviving members
take upon themselves the responsibility of looking after the spirit and sending it off to live among other spirits. If this ritual is not performed, the spirit wanders about on earth and takes long time to reach its destination.

Archetypal pedagogy was developed by Clifford Mayes, which bears some similarities to the pedagogical approach proposed by the French Jungian psychologist Frederic Fappani. Frederic Fappani, as a neo-Jungian scholar, has produced the first book-length studies in French on the pedagogical implications and applications of Jungian and neo-Jungian psychology, which is based on the work of Carl Gustav Jung (1875 - 1961). Jungian psychology is also called analytical psychology. He has developed what he has termed jungienne education that envision a pedagogy which helps students explore those ultimate concerns in a way that is spiritually sensitive without being theologically dogmatic or denominationally partisan (Mayes, 2005, 40).

All the most powerful ideas in history go back to archetypes. This is particularly true of religious ideas, but the central concepts of science, philosophy, and ethics are no exception to this rule. In their present form they are variants of archetypal ideas created by consciously applying and adapting these ideas to reality. For it is the function of consciousness not only to recognize
and assimilate the external world through the gateway of the senses, but also to translate into visible reality the world within us.

Archetypal criticism argues that archetypes determine the form and function of literary works that a text's meaning is shaped by cultural and psychological myths. Archetypes are the unknowable basic forms personified or concretized in recurring images, symbols, or patterns which may include motifs such as the quest or the heavenly ascent, recognizable character types such as the trickster or the hero, symbols such as the apple or snake, or images such as crucifixion all laden with meaning already when employed in a particular work.

Archetypal critics find New Criticism to be too atomistic in ignoring inter to be textual elements and in approaching the text as if it existed in a vacuum. After all, we recognize story patterns and symbolic associations at least from other texts we have read; we know how to form assumptions and expectations from encounters with black hats, springtime settings, evil stepmothers, and so forth. Archetypal images and story patterns encourage readers and viewers of films and advertisements to participate ritualistically in basic beliefs, fears, and anxieties of their age. These archetypal features not only constitute the intelligibility of the text but also tap into a level of desires and anxieties of humankind.
The *A-chiks* have woven myths and archetypes around mystic and mysterious physical phenomena like that of the rivers, clouds, the thunder, lightning, the sun and stars, the hills and other natural formations to give plausible and imaginative explanations of their origin and existence, adding more mystery to them in the process.

**End Notes**

1. The *Golden Bough* is really a study of unconscious social symbolism as expressed in rituals and hence it is closely linked, as Freud immediately recognised, to Psychology, which studies unconscious individual symbolism of the unconscious as expressed in dreams. At the heart of the animistic symbolism is the theme of death and rebirth. The theme that is studies in *The Golden Bough* in terms of social ritual and in Jung’s *Symbols of Transformation* and elsewhere in terms of individual dream. (Frye, 1978, 100-01) The *Golden Bough* identifies shared practices and mythological beliefs between primitive religions and modern religions. He argues that the death-rebirth myth is present in almost all cultural mythologies, and is acted out in terms of growing seasons and vegetation. The myth is symbolized by the death (i.e. final harvest) and rebirth (i.e. spring) of the god of vegetation.

2. Jungian psychoanalysis distinguishes between the personal and collective unconscious, the latter being particularly relevant to archetypal criticism. The collective unconscious, or the objective psyche as it is less frequently known, is a number of innate thoughts, feelings, instincts, and memories that reside in the unconsciousness of all people. Jung’s definition of the term is inconsistent in his many writings. At one time he calls the collective unconscious the “a priori” inborn forms of intuition, while in another instance it is a series of experiences that come upon us like fate. It is quite impossible to conceive how “experience” could originate exclusively in the outside world. The psyche is part of the inmost mystery of life, and it has its own peculiar structure and form like every other organism (Jung, 1968, 101).

3. A notable characteristic of Jung’s archetypes is that we recognize them in image and emotion. This gives a profound effect on us and implies that they have deep and primitive origins. They thus have a particular potential for significance and may be feared or revered as mysterious signifiers of things beyond our complete understanding.
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