

Review Form 1.7

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Asian Journal of Language, Literature and Culture Studies |
| Manuscript Number: | Ms_AJL2C_114207 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Tracing the Cultural Origin of Chinese Nationalism based on Ancient Chinese Myths: A Mythological Approach and Overview |
| Type of the Article | |

Review Form 1.7

PART 1: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|---|--|---|
| <p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript) 2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title) 3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? 4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate? 5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct? 6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form. <p><u>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</u></p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, the article could be important for the scientific community. The connection between modern Chinese cultural consciousness based on the Han tradition, their cultural identity and myths is a relevant and important area of research. Unfortunately, the set aim was not achieved. 2. The title does not reveal the essence of the article. Fortunately, the authors do not talk about nationalism. («In line with the narratives for the peaceful rise of China, Chinese people, claiming themselves to be the descendants of Loong, are not blinded by the possession of power; neither do they preach the ideas of doing harm to neighbors and winning non-cooperative games on the international stage. From this perspective, any China threat narrative quoting Loong as a cultural proof is built upon misunderstandings of the true mind of Loong.» (p. 14)) The article could potentially be about the cultural identity of the Chinese - and this should be reflected in the title. 3. The abstract does not reflect the structure of the article. Neither the article nor the abstract contain clear statements "Methodology", "Aim", "Conclusion". However, the present study tends to re-organize the fragments of ancient Chinese myths, logically developing them along with interpretations as valid as possible, which is supposed to be another unique and considerate contribution to the existing literature.) (The aim of this study is to approach China's ancient times from the mythological perspective to trace the cultural origin of Chinese Nationalism. - It would be better to say this: THE AIM OF THE ARTICLE IS TO IDENTIFY THE ROLE OF MYTHOLOGY IN THE FORMATION OF THE MODERN CULTURAL IDENTITY OF THE CHINESE.) 4. Subsections and structure of the manuscript do not comply with IMRAD requirements. 5. The manuscript is not scientifically correct, since the stated goal was not achieved. At the beginning of the article, game theory is mentioned. It could help connect myth and human behavior. Unfortunately, the authors no longer return to this idea. Bern is not even included in the list of references. 6. Levi-Strauss, Taylor, Berne and many other modern scholars of mythology should be included in the references. It contains few classics of science and modern articles. | |
| <p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The term "nationalism" should be abandoned. 2. «Folk literature» (page 3) - It is advisable to use the word "folklore". 3. I do not agree that mythological thinking is primitive (page 3: «Ancient Chinese myths, collectively, constitute the ideological source of China's traditional culture, passing down unique ideas from Chinese primitive mode of thinking to the current Chinese value system».) 4. «Author's conjectures» - This is an unacceptable statement for scientific articles (p. 6). | |

Review Form 1.7

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Optional/General comments</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. «... to use fire for cooking» - Here and further it is advisable to refer to Lévi-Strauss: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Raw_and_the_Cooked - to this and his other works. 2. Page 9 onwards: when retelling a myth, it is advisable to refer to the source. 3. Page 12/16: It is important to refer to Taylor. It is necessary to discuss the problem of the connection between the totem and the first ancestor. 4. When analyzing the image of Loong, references are needed 5. Scientific hypothesis (page 18) - a reference to this hypothesis is needed. 6. Yandi, son of Loong, was defeated. It is unclear why the son of the dragon lost (p. 18,19). 7. P. 20: «Yu raised his troops to fight against this God. He also managed to kill another God named Xiangliu. During the fight against floods, an officer under his command, named Fangfengshi(防风氏), appeared to be negligent and even caused a delay in the process. Yu killed Fangfeng-shi to warn the others». - Here we need to clarify the status of mortal gods. This motif can be compared with the Celtic tradition. 8. Discussion on Chinese Nationalism and Mythological Approach – «Nationalism» should be replaced with something like “national identity” 9. «Discussion» (pages 23-24): There should be significantly more references here. 10. «Conclusion»: «Looking beyond nationalism, the current discussion also highlights the need for further research to deepen our understanding of the relationship between a nation’s spirit and a nation’s myths, no matter in what channel they are being told. <...> In this sense, it is appropriate for us to understand myths as the sources of contemporary spirits, rather than the objects of interpretations with modern mindsets». - These hypotheses remained unproven. | |
|---|---|--|

PART 2:

| | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|---|---|
| <p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p> | <p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p> | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Name:</p> | <p>Svetlana Valentinovna Gerasimova</p> |
| <p>Department, University & Country</p> | <p>The Kosygin State University of Russia, Moscow Polytechnical University, Russia</p> |