ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

ARCHETYPAL IMAGES IN THE INTERPRETATION OF TOGAY MUROD'S AND JACK LONDON'S WORKS

Nazarova Lobar Maxmataminovna

Lobarnazarova195@icloud.com

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24529237

Abstract: The article offers a comparative analysis of archetypal images in the works of the Uzbek writer Togay Murod (1948–2003) and the American writer Jack London (1876–1916). Drawing on Carl Gustav Jung's theory of the collective unconscious and on the archetypal criticism of Northrop Frye, the study examines the animal, hero, mother (earth), wise old man and shadow archetypes. It is argued that both writers use animal and nature imagery as a bridge to universal human experience, but that London's archetypes are shaped by naturalism, evolutionary thought and the frontier myth, while Murod's are rooted in folklore, historical memory and the Uzbek national worldview. The functions of these images, aesthetic, philosophical and ethical, are also highlighted.

Keywords: archetypal image, Togay Murod, Jack London, comparative literary studies, Jung's theory, animal archetype.

1. Introduction

The concept of the archetype occupies a central place in modern literary studies because it explains why certain images, motifs and plots recur across cultures and historical periods. According to Carl Gustav Jung, archetypes are universal structures of the "collective unconscious" that preserve the shared experience of humankind and appear in myths, dreams and works of art [1]. In literary criticism the idea was developed further by Northrop Frye, who treated literature as a system built from recurring patterns and myths [3], and by Joseph Campbell, who described the hero's journey as a universal narrative model [4].

The comparison of Togay Murod and Jack London may seem unexpected at first glance, since the two writers belong to different continents, eras and literary systems. Yet both are authors for whom nature, the animal world and the struggle for survival are not mere background but a means of exploring the human soul. London, whose best-known works are *The Call of the Wild* (1903) and *White Fang* (1906), placed the dog and the wolf at the center of his narratives [5; 6]. Murod, in *Ot kishnagan oqshom* ("The Evening When a Horse Neighed") and *Otamdan qolgan dalalar* ("The Fields My Father Left Me"), turned the horse and the land into carriers of national memory and moral value. The aim of this article is to identify and compare the archetypal images in their works and to show how universal patterns are refracted through different national-cultural lenses.

2. Theoretical Framework and Method

The study relies on Jung's distinction between the personal unconscious and the collective unconscious, the latter containing inherited, impersonal images, among them the Hero, the Great Mother, the Wise Old Man, the Shadow and the Animal [1; 2]. Jung emphasized that an archetype is not a fixed image but a pattern that is filled with concrete content by a specific culture and individual. This is precisely why archetypal analysis suits comparative research: the same pattern can be traced in different literatures while its cultural "filling" is examined as the sign of national distinctiveness.

The methods used are comparative-typological analysis, close reading of key episodes and archetypal interpretation of images. The comparison is organized around four archetypal complexes:

the animal archetype, the hero and his initiation, the mother (earth) archetype, and the wise old man and the shadow.

3. The Animal Archetype

The animal is perhaps the most ancient archetypal image, standing for instinct, vitality and the link between humans and the natural order. In Jungian thought the animal represents the layer of the psyche that lies below consciousness [2].

In London's prose the animal archetype is closely tied to the idea of atavism. Buck, the domesticated dog of *The Call of the Wild*, is torn from a comfortable Californian home and thrown into the harsh world of the Klondike. As he adapts, "ancestral memories" awaken in him, and he gradually recovers a primordial identity [5]. The "call" of the title can be read as the voice of the collective unconscious itself: an inner summons to return to the primeval layer of life. In *White Fang* the movement is reversed: a wolf-dog born in the wild gradually enters human society and is domesticated by love [6]. Together the two novels form a mirrored pair, in which the animal passes between the poles of nature and culture, and this passage is the novels' central archetypal drama.

In Togay Murod's work the animal archetype is embodied above all in the horse. In *Ot kishnagan oqshom* the horse is not only the central subject of the story but rises to the level of a symbol that expresses national consciousness, historical memory and the deeper layers of the human spirit [7]. Studies of Murod's horse imagery stress its links with freedom, honor and pride, values that have long accompanied the horse in Turkic oral tradition [8]. The horseman Ziyodulla, who embodies honesty and courage, shows that in Murod's world the animal and the human form a single moral union: the horse is a partner and a mirror of the rider's character rather than a creature of mere instinct.

Here the first major difference appears. London's animal is primarily a biological and evolutionary being whose inner life is rendered with naturalistic precision, and its archetypal meaning arises from the tension between instinct and civilization. Murod's horse is primarily a cultural and moral symbol, whose archetypal meaning arises from its place in national tradition. In London the animal reveals the "wolf within" the human; in Murod it reveals the "honor within" the human.

4. The Hero Archetype and Initiation

Both writers shape their heroes through trials that resemble ritual initiation, the stage of separation, ordeal and transformation described by Campbell [4].

Buck's path follows this model closely. He is abducted from his home (separation), endures the club, the sled-team hierarchy and the rivalry with Spitz (ordeal), and finally leads a wolf pack, becoming a figure of legend among the Yeehat people (transformation) [5]. His victory over Spitz is not simply a fight between two dogs; it is the hero's confrontation with the shadow and his rise to the position of leader. The hero's reward is not social status but a return to the primal source of life, which reflects London's naturalist and individualist outlook.

In Murod's prose the hero's ordeal is usually connected with moral choice and historical circumstances rather than with survival alone. His heroes are tested by loyalty, honesty, attachment to the land and the pressure of an era that threatens traditional values. The hero is rarely a lone conqueror; he is part of a family, a community and a lineage. His heroism consists in preserving human dignity and continuity with his ancestors. Where London's hero breaks away from civilization to join the primal order, Murod's hero stays within the community and defends its moral foundations. Individual freedom in London is therefore largely freedom *from* society, whereas in Murod it is the freedom to remain faithful to one's roots.

5. The Mother Archetype and the Archetype of the Land

The Great Mother archetype in Jung's theory stands for origin, nurture and protection, and is often linked to the earth itself [1].

Murod's novel *Otamdan qolgan dalalar* shows the strength of this link. The "fields" of the title are an inheritance, a source of livelihood and a moral bond between generations; land is perceived almost as a living, maternal being that feeds and demands loyalty in return. The images of mothers and women in his prose likewise embody patience, endurance and the preservation of the family hearth, qualities that are treated in the Uzbek tradition as the foundation of national character. Researchers have noted that Murod's constant recourse to folklore and its reworking is one of the defining features of his creative style, and this folkloric base naturally supports the survival of the mother and earth archetypes in his texts [9]. In London the maternal archetype is less prominent but still present. In *White Fang*, Kiche, the she-wolf, is the cub's first source of protection and teaching, and her loss marks the first break in his connection with the safe world of childhood [6]. More broadly, the Northland wilderness itself functions as an ambivalent Great Mother: it both nourishes and destroys, offering life to those who adapt and death to those who do not. In the story "To Build a Fire" this destructive side of nature becomes absolute. Thus, in London the maternal archetype appears chiefly in its "terrible" aspect, as indifferent nature, while in Murod it appears mainly in its nurturing aspect, as the fertile and morally binding land.

6. The Wise Old Man and the Shadow

The Wise Old Man is the archetype of meaning, guidance and spiritual authority [2]. In Murod's prose this figure takes the form of the elder (*oqsoqol*, *chol*), a bearer of experience and moral memory who speaks with the voice of tradition. His authority rests on age, wisdom and respect for ancestors, and he often serves as the conscience of the community.

London has no direct counterpart, since his world is largely one of struggle in which age does not guarantee wisdom. The archetype is instead transformed: the wise guide appears as a figure who teaches the hero a new law of life. In *The Call of the Wild* it is John Thornton, whose love and loyalty give Buck a human bond that is stronger than any command; in *White Fang* it is Weedon Scott, who replaces violence with patience and thus completes the wolf-dog's transformation [5; 6]. Their authority is based not on age but on compassion, which suggests a more modern, individual form of the archetype.

The Shadow, the repressed or hostile side of the self, is equally important. In London it is personified in Spitz, the dominant rival who reflects the brutality that Buck must overcome and, at the same time, absorb, and in Beauty Smith, the cruel owner who turns White Fang into a fighting animal [5; 6]. In Murod's works the shadow is more often social and historical: injustice, betrayal, the destruction of traditional ways of life, and the moral weakness that tempts the characters to abandon their principles. The conflict is thus externalized in London as a physical struggle and internalized in Murod as a moral and historical one.

7. Comparative Discussion

The analysis reveals both similarities and differences.

Similarities. First, both writers use nature and animals to raise universal questions: life and death, freedom and captivity, loyalty and betrayal. Second, in both cases the archetypal images are not decorative devices but the ideological foundation of the work. Third, both show a deep interest in the inner life of their characters, human and animal alike, and treat the animal's "point of view" with seriousness and respect.

Differences. (1) *Source of the archetype:* in London it is Darwinian and Spencerian evolutionism, naturalism and the frontier myth; in Murod it is folklore, the oral epic tradition and the historical experience of the Uzbek people. (2) *Mode of representation:* London's style is realistic and dynamic, built on action and the biology of survival; Murod's is poetic, symbolic and reflective, with a strong lyrical and narrative voice. (3) *Value orientation:* London's archetypes emphasize individual strength, adaptation and the law of the strongest, although his later work also celebrates love and loyalty; Murod's emphasize community, honor, continuity and spiritual responsibility. (4) *Relation to civilization:* London's hero moves back toward nature or negotiates between nature and civilization; Murod's hero defends a national-moral order against the forces that threaten it.

These contrasts confirm Jung's thesis that the archetype is a form without fixed content. The "wolf" or "horse" is not the archetype itself; the archetype is the underlying pattern of the animal as the voice of life, which each culture fills with its own historical and moral meaning.

8. Conclusion

The comparative study of archetypal images in the works of Togay Murod and Jack London shows that these two writers, though separated by language, geography and literary tradition, address the same deep layers of human experience. The animal archetype, the hero's initiation, the mother and earth, the wise guide and the shadow appear in both, but their artistic realization differs: in London they are shaped by naturalism, evolutionary thought and the American frontier, and in Murod by folklore, national memory and the moral worldview of the Uzbek people. The universal function of these images, to reveal the essence of human nature, pose ethical and philosophical questions and heighten aesthetic impact, remains the same. The study suggests that archetypal analysis is an effective method for the intercultural reading of Uzbek and world literature, and it opens prospects for further comparison of other Uzbek authors with English-language writers.

References

1. Jung, C. G. *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious* (R. F. C. Hull, Trans.). Princeton University Press, 1959.
2. Jung, C. G. (Ed.). *Man and His Symbols*. Doubleday, 1964.
3. Frye, N. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays*. Princeton University Press, 1957.
4. Campbell, J. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. Pantheon Books, 1949.
5. London, J. *The Call of the Wild*. New York: Macmillan, 1903.
6. London, J. *White Fang*. New York: Macmillan, 1906.
7. Murod, T. *Ot kishnagan oqshom*. Toshkent. [Add publisher and year of the edition used.]
8. Bolikulova, M. A. qizi, & Pardayeva, I. M. Tog'ay Murod ijodida ot tasviri. *Ustozlar ilmiy jurnali*, 2025.
9. Muminova, F. J. Tog'ay Murod qissalarida folklor an'analari. *"Involta" Innovation Scientific Journal*, 2(3), 2023, pp. 90–93.
10. Murod, T. *Otamdan qolgan dalalar*. Toshkent. [Add publisher and year of the edition used.]