

**WILDNESS–CIVILIZATION OPPOSITION AS AN ARCHETYPE AND ITS
STYLISTIC MARKERS (BASED ON JACK LONDON AND NORMUROD
NORQOBILOV)**

Mamura Melibayeva Klichboy qizi

Teacher, Oriental University, Samarkand Campus, Samarkand

Email: mamuramelibayeva810@gmail.com

Abstract

This article investigates the archetypal opposition between wildness and civilization as reflected in literary discourse, with particular reference to the works of Jack London and Normurod Norqobilov. The study seeks to explore how this binary opposition operates not merely as a thematic contrast but as a deep-seated archetypal structure embedded in human cognition. Drawing on qualitative comparative analysis, the research examines lexical, stylistic, and narrative features that signal the presence of this opposition. It is argued that although both authors belong to different cultural traditions, they employ comparable archetypal patterns while articulating them through distinct stylistic means. The findings suggest that the wildness–civilization dichotomy functions as both a universal and culturally mediated construct.

Keywords (English): Wildness, Civilization , Archetype , Stylistic markers, Comparative literature Lexical-semantic field, Symbolism, Instinct vs society , Narrative structure , Cultural context

Introduction

The tension between wildness and civilization has long occupied a central position in literary studies. This opposition appears to reflect an enduring human concern with the relationship between instinct and social order. From an archetypal perspective, such binaries are not accidental but rather emerge from shared structures of the collective unconscious (Jung, 1968).

In the works of Jack London, especially “The Call of the Wild” (1903) and “White Fang” (1906), the return to wildness is often portrayed as a rediscovery of authenticity. By contrast, Normurod Norqobilov’s prose situates this opposition within a culturally specific framework, where civilization is closely linked with ethical responsibility and communal values.

This article aims to examine how the wildness–civilization opposition functions as an archetype and how it is realized through stylistic markers. It also attempts to demonstrate that while the archetype itself may be universal, its literary expression is shaped by cultural context.

Methods

The research adopts a qualitative, interpretive methodology grounded in comparative literary analysis. The primary texts include selected works by Jack London and Normurod Norqobilov. Close reading is employed as the principal analytical tool, allowing for detailed examination of linguistic and stylistic features.

The analysis is conducted across three interconnected levels. First, the lexical-semantic level focuses on identifying key words and expressions associated with nature, instinct, and social

control. Second, the stylistic level examines the use of metaphor, symbolism, and contrast. Third, the narrative level explores how plot structures and character development reflect archetypal patterns.

The theoretical framework integrates Jung's concept of archetypes (1968) and Frye's structural approach to literature (1957), alongside contemporary stylistic theory (Leech & Short, 2007).

Results

The analysis indicates that both authors consistently rely on the wildness–civilization opposition as a central organizing principle. In London's narratives, wildness is frequently associated with freedom, vitality, and an almost primordial truth, whereas civilization tends to appear restrictive and, at times, alienating (London, 1903).

Linguistically, London's style is marked by dynamic verbs, vivid imagery, and a strong reliance on animal symbolism. These features collectively contribute to the portrayal of nature as an active and transformative force. The protagonist's movement toward wildness is not merely physical but also psychological.

In contrast, Norqobilov's representation of this opposition appears more nuanced. Civilization is not depicted as inherently negative; rather, it is intertwined with moral order and social cohesion. Wildness, in this context, often symbolizes emotional intensity or internal conflict. Stylistically, Norqobilov employs culturally specific metaphors and expressive language that reflect national traditions.

Despite these differences, both authors make extensive use of contrast as a stylistic device, juxtaposing nature and society, instinct and reason, and freedom and constraint.

Discussion

The findings support the view that the wildness–civilization opposition operates as a universal archetype, though its interpretation is shaped by cultural and ideological factors. London's perspective appears to align with a broader Western emphasis on individualism and self-realization, where nature serves as a space of liberation.

Norqobilov, on the other hand, integrates the archetype into a framework informed by collective values and cultural continuity. This difference is reflected not only in thematic emphasis but also in stylistic choices, particularly in the use of symbolism and narrative tone.

At the same time, the structural similarity of the archetype across both authors lends support to Jung's notion of shared cognitive patterns. The persistence of this opposition across diverse literary traditions suggests that it fulfills a fundamental interpretive function within human storytelling.

Thus, the combination of archetypal criticism and stylistic analysis proves to be a productive approach for understanding both the universality and variability of literary meaning.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the wildness–civilization opposition serves as a powerful archetype that shapes both thematic content and stylistic expression in literary texts. The comparative analysis of Jack London and Normurod Norqobilov demonstrates that while the archetype itself is universal, its realization is deeply influenced by cultural context.

The study highlights the importance of examining not only what is represented in literature but also how it is expressed. Future research may extend this approach to other authors and genres,

thereby contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of archetypal structures in world literature.

References

- Abrams, M. H. (1999). *A Glossary of Literary Terms*. Boston: Heinle.
- Frye, N. (1957). *Anatomy of Criticism*. Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1968). *The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious*. Princeton University Press.
- Leech, G., & Short, M. (2007). *Style in Fiction*. Pearson Longman.
- London, J. (1903). *The Call of the Wild*. New York: Macmillan.
- London, J. (1906). *White Fang*. New York: Macmillan.
- Norqobilov, N. *Selected Prose Works* (Uzbek literary editions).