LITERARY ANALYSIS OF THE DISTINCTIVE FEATURES OF ARCHETYPES AND METAPHORS

Umarov Umidjon Akram o'g'li
English teacher of Alat Specialized school
umidjonumarov02121996@gmail.com
Xudoyqulov Nutfillo Sohib o'g'li
English teacher of Turon Zarmed University
nutfulloxudoyqulov6@gmail.com

Abstract: *This article interprets the meaning and functions of archetypes and metaphors as well as their peculiar features, reveals their similarities and differences, and analyzes their importance in the development of literary works. Metaphors should be taken into account in a structured context. The other epistemic tools—archetypes, symbols, models, and theories—are thus discussed in relation to metaphors in this paper. A proper explication and definition of metaphors are essential for a theory of metaphors, but this is not the main goal of this paper. Instead, it aims to incorporate metaphors into a comprehensible language-based theory of meaning (after some definitional work has been resolved). Because of this, we must enter what might be referred to as the unfolding theory of language after taking an exemplaric look at the types of metaphors we are going to examine. Metaphors are a common occurrence in daily life and serve as both a prescientific tool and a device of poetic imagination. They allow us to change the context and go beyond the expressive limitations of literal language.*

Key words: *Archetypes, metaphors, symbol,   figurative language, Jung's theory, image of instinc, symbolic figures*

INTRODUCTION

Symbolic figures can occasionally become widespread enough   to be referred to as "archetypal". Aspects (such as characters, circumstances, themes, symbols, settings, etc.) are referred to as "archetypes.".) that use universal patterns (in reference to human behavior/nature) to shape a written work. Given that a story develops certain patterns consistently, "archetypes" frequently have an impact on how a text is organized.

Establishing a meaningful structure and potential patterns requires looking closely at the format of paragraphs. The historical context must also be taken into account because seventeenth-century prose writers tended to write lengthy paragraphs, which we would today refer to as chapters. In poems, each section is purposefully developed in   order to advance the   poem   as   a whole. Readers can still detect how various sections or paragraphs of a text can relate to one another despite the variety of texts provided. Making connections

between these details and recognizing them supports a reader's interpretations or analyses of the text as a whole.

Metaphors frequently apply or compare two concepts implicitly. Extended metaphors are consistently used throughout a text as a result of the author's use of a number of writing techniques. To create a sense of style, writers manipulate imagery, diction, syntax, and figurative language. Although Charles Dickens's and John Steinbeck's writing styles may not be identical, both can be regarded as being effective in terms of achieving their desired message or goal. Analyzing the passage's rhetoric—the way words are used to persuade or influence the audience—is a necessary step in identifying style. However, simply analyzing a text does not ensure that readers will comprehend it. Readers should infer meanings in order to comprehend any metaphors that might be present or the symbolism of the writing style. With these interpretations, the potential impact and intent of these elements can thus become more apparent.

LITERATURE REVIEW

One of the first ideas we associate with C.G. Jung's work is undoubtedly the archetype. But it's not always clear what Jung meant by this idea. He used the term in various ways, at various times, and in various contexts, which contributes to the difficulty. The typical linear, logical way that many other serious thinkers had tended to think was not how Jung thought. Even Freud, whose writing is more narrative and logical, is occasionally simpler to understand than Jung. Like Freud occasionally did, Jung did not have a tendency to go back and correct his earlier theories. Simply put, Jung was not that type of thinker. We might discover that Jung's approach has made us richer in a variety of ways. In the current state of analytical psychology, we undoubtedly find ourselves in a field that is teeming with fresh perspectives. The most inclusive and practical interpretation of Jung's concept of the archetype as a whole is as a metaphor -- an "as-if," a possibility or potential -- which can be richly explored from numerous angles.

This metaphor does, however, also have a sort of undercarriage, which is not meant to imply anything rigid, preexisting, or fixed like Plato's forms. In contrast to Plato, Jung made it clear that he was not practicing philosophy. He claims that Jung was actually practicing psychology. He therefore meant by an archetype something empirical, alive, phenomenal, which only manifests itself in and through living processes. To describe these archetypal possibilities, Jung employs a variety of metaphors. Each illustration has a unique set of illustrative implications, and it is best to comment on each metaphor by making use of a different illustration or metaphor.

One of Jung's metaphors for the archetypal is the delicate three-dimensional structure of a crystal being revealed when it is submerged in a solution. Folklore, literary works, and productions all have motifs and themes that Jung believed to have

archetypal potential. An additional metaphor used by Jung to describe the archetype is that of a riverbed that has been deeply carved by experience. The archetype is compared to a psychic organ or an "instinct's perception of itself.". Other possible examples could be added, such as themes from daily life, common experiences, ways of thinking, etc. There are many options. The more overt way of describing archetypes is more typologically personified, for instance, the Great Mother, the Elderly Wise Man, the Warrior. This more typified approach to thinking about archetypes is symbolic and concrete but also useful in its own way. Depending on how and what one uses them for, such uses can be clarifying and helpful at times and less so at other times. Such personifications are useful for describing the different types of people or personalities that make up a group or business association. They may be overly generalized or simply typological in other cases, which can obscure or lose an individual's particularity, complexity, and particularity. Depending on the situation and the context, Jung would think one way and sometimes another.

DISCUSSION

In any case, the archetype was important to Jung because it was always bi-polar and not just a straightforward image in motion. Jung held opposing viewpoints. It was essential to his strategy and a pillar of his power. Thinking in opposites, psychologically speaking, created the foundation for ongoing awareness of ambivalence and ambiguity within the very idea of archetype itself. This is helpful to us as a precursor to a growing awareness of psychological differentiation and complexity. Jung was never interested in simple reduction. He believed that causality could come from the past, more scientific or developmental thinking, as well as from more teleological or finalistic ideas about the future or purpose. For Jung, there was a place and a time for every kind of thinking, even though his area of expertise and the primary way he saw himself as different from Freud was undoubtedly toward the more purposeful and finalistic. The area of instinct is yet another place in thinking where there is frequently confusion. According to Jung, instinctive behaviors occasionally play a notable role but are never the only reason for archetypal phenomena. The archetype is spiritual in Jung's view. The archetypal levels of whatever phenomenon is being considered can be kept in focus by considering it primarily as a metaphor. According to Jung, an archetype is an "image of instinct" that represents "a spiritual goal toward which the entire nature of man strives" (Jung 1960). This eliminates the concern over exaggerating or making excessive claims. Additionally, the practice might offer the greatest scope and number of options. To only see things on a single, or literal, level is not what metaphor is intended to convey. The idea of an archetype will continue to be useful to us in the field of analytical psychology if we bear this in mind.

On the other hand, in order to understand clearly it is essential to state that Rahul briefly mentions the distinctions between archetypes and metaphors, but he confuses rather than clarifies. The entire archetype argument is undermined by this

single instance of slippage, but everything makes perfect sense if you change the word "archetype" in the piece to "metaphor". There are very few, if any, archetypes, which is precisely why metaphors are crucial to comprehend in interaction design. We as savvy users and interaction designers tend to believe that there are original concepts or symbols that are understood by everyone, but this is simply not the case. It explains why so many people fail to get interfaces that ought to be crystal clear. It's not an archetype because they don't comprehend the underlying mental model.

Since metaphors fill in this gap, they are helpful. One thing to keep in mind is that, contrary to what Rahul claims, metaphors are not "analogies between two objects or ideas, conveyed by the use of one word instead of another". Those are similes. I'm not saying this to be grammatically correct, but rather because there is a crucial difference. A metaphor states "it is," rather than "it is like.". By expressing a concept you do not understand in the form of one you do, rather than merely stating that it is similar to another concept, it aids in understanding. Life is a journey, not that life resembles one. This desktop file is comparable to a real paper document on your desk, according to an interaction design simile. This desktop file (actually, the icon of it) is a real file, a metaphor is saying. It matters because it affects both how we interact with those things and the mental models we develop. How far we can stretch and/or break those metaphors depends on the situation. Decide whether it was a file or just a file by deleting your most valuable file.

It is important to discuss Lakoff and Johnson's work on metaphors because they show how embodied metaphors underlie all of our language and how we understand the world. When you start to dissect language, you realize it's all metaphors (for example, "pick apart" is a metaphor for language being a thing made up of other things that you can pull apart).

They also discuss how metaphors become part of everyday speech without our awareness of them, but they still function as metaphors. We acquire this metaphor from being physically close to someone—typically our mothers—when we refer to someone as being close to us. At that point, closeness on a physical and emotional level are synonymous. Later, we use the metaphor of being close to someone to express emotional closeness, but it has become so widespread and well-known (in most languages), that we no longer recognize the metaphor.

Poetic metaphors, on the other hand, like "the sun was a fiery eye in the sky," aim to make us understand the metaphor and appreciate its dissonance or imagery. They are far from archetypes because most interface design is still based in poetry and screams out metaphors.

With multitouch technology, the interface almost seems to vanish, which is intriguing. When you scale or move digital photos that have never had a physical form, for example, it can feel like you are just interacting with the content in many cases. Of course, the interface remains. Although you are merely stretching or pinching a piece

of glass with your fingers, the illusion of direct manipulation provided by this tricked us into believing that we were actually manipulating something. In desktop metaphors, this still occurs, albeit to a lesser extent. When a file is accidentally deleted, it truly feels like you've lost it, but in reality, all you've really lost is a collection of pixels on the screen that serve as a visual representation of a dispersed collection of magnetic impulses on the drive. Because it's simpler that way, just like in theater, we willingly suspend our disbelief in order to accept the metaphor.

The various examples of something-centric "archetypes" Rahul provides and the "what if?" questions he poses about them are the piece's main strengths. Despite being insightful, they do not fit the definition of an archetype that he provides. Ironically, given that he explicitly stated at the beginning of the article that he was not referring to Jungian archetypes, I believe Rahul's examples are much more closely related to Jung's understanding of archetypes than the other definitions he mentions.

RESULTS

Understanding symbolism is closely related to determining a literary work's meaning. Objects that can both represent and emphasize various meanings are referred to as symbols. It is up to the readers to extrapolate these meanings from the context of the text and their own experiences. Some symbols may appear repeatedly and frequently, allowing readers to draw associations or connections before reading the text in its entirety. Other symbols may be interpreted in light of their context and thus stand in for ideas or concepts that can only be comprehended through careful reading of the text. As a symbol for ideas or concepts, characters can also be used.

It's crucial to take a text's overall structure and grammatical style into account when figuring out a symbol's purpose. We have examined many deliberate choices that authors make in order to create a significant work of literature. This article will center on how symbolism—which can be represented through archetypes and metaphors—helps to develop meaningful works in literature.

It is possible for symbolic figures to occasionally become widespread enough to qualify as archetypes. Characters, circumstances, themes, symbols, settings, and other elements are all examples of archetypes. (in reference to human behavior/nature) that help a writing piece by illustrating universal patterns. Given that patterns emerge consistently throughout a story, archetypes frequently have an impact on how a text is organized.

CONCLUSION

Archetypes can also not be intentionally created, in contrast to metaphors and symbols. Not the conscious mind, but the unconscious produces the archetypes. This is why the archetypes appear in our dreams, our imaginations, and our art. No more than our dreams can be created, so too cannot archetypes. The archetypes are experiences rather than things we control, just like dreams.

Jung frequently used the image of water to represent the energizing forces of the unconscious. He claims that this "water" originates from the depths of the unconscious and travels through obscure pathways before emerging into the light of consciousness. The archetype is the tunnel that it travels through. Its origin is indicated by a symbol. But one should not confuse this symbol with the experience (drinking the water) or the archetype itself; it merely denotes the location of the archetypal experience.

REFERENCES:

1. Akram o'g'li, Umarov Umidjon, and Sobirova Zarnigor Raximovna. "THE SYMBOL OF MIRROR IN ENGLISH CHILDREN'S LITERATURE AND ITS FANTASTIC FEATURES." Eurasian Journal of Academic Research 2.2 (2022): 70-74.

2. Akram o'g'li, Umarov Umidjon, Xudoyqulov Nutfillo Sohib o'g'li, and Yusupova Hilola O'ktamovna. "THE IMPORTANCE OF RIDDLES, PROVERBS AND TONGUE TWISTERS IN UZBEK CHILDREN'S LITERATURE." Eurasian Journal of Academic Research 2.2 (2022): 75-77.

3. Carl Jung, "The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious", Princeton: Bollingen Foundation, 1959

4. Carolyn Marie Mamchur, "The Hero's Journey", 2009

5. Joseph Campbell, "The Power of Myth", New York: Doubleday, 1988

6. June Singer, "Boundaries of the Soul: The Practice of Jung's Psychology", New York: Random House, 1994

7. Karen Basquez, " Taking the archetypes to school," The Assisi Institute Journal: Vol.1, 2014

8. Karin Barnaby and Pellegrino D'Acerino, eds., C. G. Jung and the Humanities: Toward a Hermeneutics of Culture (1990)

9. Laughlin, C.D. & Tiberia, V.A. "Archetypes: Toward a Jungian anthropology of consciousness", Anthropology of Consciousness, 2012

10. Michael Conforti, "Field, Form, and Fate: Patterns in Mind, Nature, and Psyche", New Orleans, Spring Journal Books, 1999

11. Naomi Goldenberg, "Archetypal Theory after Jung," Spring (1975)

12. Rakhimovna, Sobirova Zarnigor, and Umarov Umidjon Akram o'g'li. "UDC: 82.091 THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH CHILDREN'S LITERATURE AND ITS REPRESENTATIVES." SCIENTIFIC REPORTS OF BUKHARA STATE UNIVERSITY: 29.

13. Raya A. Jones, Mixed Metaphors and Narrative Shifts, Theory & Psychology, 10.1177/09593543030135008, 13, 5, (651-672), (2016).

14. Sohib o'g'li, Xudoyqulov Nutfillo, and Umarov Umidjon Akram o'g'li. "HISTORY OF UZBEK FOLKLORE GAMES AND THEIR PLACE IN CHILDREN'S LIVES." Eurasian Journal of Social Sciences, Philosophy and Culture 2.2 (2022): 403-408.

15. Stevens, Anthony, "The archetype"' (Chapter 3)", The Handbook of Jungian Psychology, 2006

16. William K. Wimsatt, Jr., and Cleanth Brooks, Literary Criticism: A Short History, 1957