

# Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities ISSN: 2795-4846 Vol. 4 (2022)

https://mjssh.academicjournal.io/index.php/mjssh



#### THE APPEARANCE OF UNUSUAL IMAGES THE ROLE OF ARCHETYPES

## Allambergenov Hamza Kamalovich

Named after Ajiniyaz Nukus State Pedagogical Institute Associate Professor of Uzbek Literature, Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD)

**Annotation:** Although figurative images expressed in words are accepted as myths, in art and religious imagery, myth finds its expression through symbolic representations. Therefore, archetypal symbols are the source of mythology, religion and art. The stage of syncretism in artistic thinking is manifested in these three factors.

**Keywords:** Archetype, term, mythology, analogy, syncretism, image, archaic.

The word archetype means "first image" in Greek. The term was first introduced to science by the Swiss scientist K.G.Jung, who believed that mythology was the first method of processing archetypal images. He tried to establish a list of archetypes. In particular, he sees the origin of mythological images, their interaction and interdependence as a product of primitive consciousness, and evaluates these interrelationships as an analogy, sometimes as a new phenomenon that arises as a result of the influence of one.

Archetype is a concept that can be used in any case in the theoretical analysis of mythology. The process of creating a myth is nothing more than the transformation of archetypes into images. Therefore, when K.G.Jung put forward the idea that the archetype is not yet an image, but a scheme of images, he also paid attention to the role of myth in the process of formation of archetypes.

In Russian and European literature, even after K.G.Jung, some views on archetypes were put forward. For example, O.M.Freidenberg's approach to archetypal images is not significantly different from K. Jung's. According to him, archetypal images are always created as a result of man's involuntary attitude to existence. The result of this process is the creation of myths. Although figurative images expressed in words are accepted as myths, in art and religious imagery, myth finds its expression through symbolic representations. Therefore, archetypal symbols are the source of mythology, religion and art. The stage of syncretism in artistic thinking is manifested in these three factors. It is also a cultural phenomenon, in which there is a gradual process of confusion of confusing and terrifying images, which become symbolic, beautiful in form and common in content. In short, mythology is the first step in the development of archetypal images.

It is noteworthy that O. Freidenberg focuses on "terrifying images" when advancing his views on the emergence of archetypes or archetypal images and their source. After all, supernatural images are formed from terrifying images, and the source of the series of images, no doubt, goes back to the archetypal images.

Creating a myth means creating an image, which is why it is considered a part of folklore and art. Based on the theory of K.G.Jung and O.M.Freidenberg, we want to advance the view that both historical and mythological images in ancient Turkic written monuments are the product of archetypes. In other words, when we talk about archetypes in ancient Turkic monuments, the fact that the symbolic or metaphorical symbols preserved in these monuments are the basis of archetypes, in our opinion, can express the essence of the matter. In general, the ancient Turkic monuments rely on these artistic means, as well as some details, to talk about archetypes.

#### **Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities**

There is a commonality and interdependence between syncretism and archetypes or archetypal symbols. Syncretism, as a literary phenomenon, expresses archetypal images. The most vivid example of this is the works of ancient applied and fine arts with syncretic content, which is the product of mythopoetic creativity. In them we see artistic creation, religion, philosophical views and art. These include the Amu Darya Treasures, which we mentioned earlier, and items found in the Issyk Fortress. In general, in the works of ancient art, in the folklore, there are many archetypal symbols. Archetypes are events related to artistic thinking, and this or that event is a repetition of the content of images. This is the first. Second, archaic thinking, which differs from later thinking, is also syncretic, that is, it has an indivisible, unitary nature. Syncretism is not a mixture, but an inseparability, a lack of formation of holistic ideas.

In the archaic period, man received in an inseparable syncretic way the information he received through the organs of sensory cognition, nature with himself, "I" and "others", art and life, the word and the object it expresses, information based on myths and life activities. According to A.N.Veselovsky, a holistic view of the world is an expression of archaic consciousness. The same can be said of archetypes: those who speak through archetypes seem to make thousands of voices. This indicates the integrity of a literary event - the incarnation of several literary events or processes in one artistic image or image. Archetypes are the beginning of the whole literary process, and in the future the tendency to divide into literary types and genres is a post-archetypal event, that is, archetypes also lie in the formation of literary types and genres. From this it can be concluded that archetypes are closely related to the phenomenon of syncretism, and one does not occur without the other.

When archetypal symbols become symbolic, literary tours and genres begin to separate.

Archetypes are a common process and can be applied to mythology, which is common to most peoples of the world. Given the universality of the mythology of the peoples of the world, archetypes are applied to the same mythological motif. This is also marked by the inseparability of human art in the primitive period.

Cultural and written monuments of the ancient Turkic period are the most reliable factors for talking about archetypes. Examples include the winged animals found in ancient Turkic monuments, half-human and half-animal creatures, and the mythology of the peoples of the world, such as the tree of the universe, the earth, and the sky. In particular, the "Race Book" (VIII century) is an important monument that shows the existence of archetypal symbols in ancient Turkish literature.

It should be noted that archetypes are part of the mythopoetic model of the world in ancient Turkic monuments. Let us pay attention to the images of Bumin and Istami, the rulers of the First Turkic Khanate in Kultigin. The first line of Kultigin's inscription represents a mythological poetic model of the universe: Kisi oghlinta uza achum apam Bomin qaghan Istami qaghan olurmis, oluripan turk bodunin alin torusin tuta birmis itu birmis - When the blue sky above and the brown earth below were created, human children were created between the two. My ancestors, Bumin Haqqan and Istami Haqqan, sat on human children and held the state and laws of the Turkish people.

In the process of mythological thinking, as archetypes grow into an image, along with symbols of god and earth, Bomin and Istami evoke images as archetypal images. Because in Kultigin's inscription they were interpreted as the image of the representatives of the first humanity. While Bomin and Istami are historical figures, they should be considered as immutable images. Even when they were part of the monuments describing the history of the ancient Turks, they had a mythological meaning, that is, they preserved the concept of "early humanity", mythized real historical figures. Furthermore, the presence in this passage of anthropogenic myth, the oldest religion of Central Asia, which is a manifestation of the cosmogonic myth influencing the historical period, further clarifies the imagining of both images as archetypes.

With this in mind, it is worth acknowledging that in most Turkic epics, including Oguznoma, in the ruby "Mighty Land Sogotox" and in a number of other Turkic epics, there is a mythopoetic model of the world in Kultigin's inscription, and the heroes in these models are archetypal images. As an

## **Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities**

example, we would like to share our thoughts on the interrelationships and interactions at the beginning of the Kultigin inscription with the mythopoetic model of the universe preserved in Oguznoma.

According to our observations, Kultigin's inscription is close to "Oguznoma" in terms of content and structure. The Chronicle of Events, like the Kultigin inscription, contains archetypal images of the origin of the universe and the first human beings on earth, although the dates are not clearly indicated. Oguz, like Bomin and Istami, is the first ancestor of the Oghuz Turks and the first hero on earth. At the same time, it is noteworthy that the Oguznama, just like Kultigin's inscription, embodies the myth of the creation of the universe and the emergence of humanity. At the beginning of the epic we come across a brief account of the myth of the creation of mankind: Bolsunghil said. Anung angagusus oshbu turur. Then they found joy. One day, Kena's eyes widened. The boy gave birth to a son (I-IV). This is what he looks like. Again they rejoiced after that. One day, the Moon's eyes will tear. A son was born.

According to the content of the epic, the newborn baby - Oguz was the first man on earth, he was born abnormally. Given that the supernatural is a single sign of archetypes, we witness that mythological content lives on as an important part of the supernatural symbols. Not only in ancient Turkic monuments, but also in the myths and legends created in later periods, there are many examples of the first human being being born abnormally. In particular, S.P.Tolstov in his book "In Search of the culture of ancient Khorezm" writes that the legend of Kayumars was created in the Khorezm region, Kayumars was originally Gavomard and meant the Bull-Man. In general, since Qayumars was the first man on earth, he was half in the form of a bull, half in the form of a man, that is, he came into being as a supernatural symbol. Or in one of the legends about the Scythians in Herodotus' book History, it is said that the Scythians were born of a half-female, half-serpent-like creature.

The purpose of re-referring to this legend is that there is a harmony in the birth and activities of Oguz and Scythia. In general, in many myths about the emergence of humanity, the image of the first man has a supernatural character. In this case, it would be appropriate to link the emergence of supernatural symbols not only with mythology, but also with beliefs. After all, beliefs contain an ancient layer of emblems or certain events.

In Oguz's later supernatural activities, we also see traces of a cosmogonic or mythopoetic period based on beliefs. Here the struggle between the epic heroes - the Oghuz and the terrifying creature - is a mythological plot typical of the early epics. Such plots play an important role in the formation of the epic.

The worship of various natural objects by the ancient Turks, asking for their help, symbolizes the mythopoetic period. For example, when an ox begs Tangri (heaven) somewhere, a blue light comes from the sky. A girl was sitting in the blue light. Subsequent events are a reflection of the cosmogonic myth of the girl's description and the life of the girl. This myth is consistent with the motif in the Kultigin inscription that Bumin and Istamining were born from the marriage of Tangri (heaven) and earth.

Why Bumin and Istami were historical figures, and although their reigns are clear (their reign began in 551 AD), the question may arise as to whether the year was not used in relation to the khan's activities. The reason why the author of the inscription did not indicate the date of their enthronement was the creation of archetypal images based on mythological content. The archetypal images gave rise to the idea that Bumin and Istamin ruled not in the fifth century AD, but in an era bounded by human history. In this sense, the image of both historical figures embodies the singular heroes of the Oguz Khan or Maadai Kara epic. All the images in the Kultigin inscription and in the Turkish epics are the product of idealization. Idealization or ideal images are far from historical.

With the conception of the formation of the heavens and the earth, the enthronement of Bumin and Istami is understood as a sequential process, and the ancient Turkic ancestors are considered to be the

## **Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities**

oldest generation created after the appearance of the earth and the sky. That is why historical khans, epic heroes are singular, archetypal images.

We believe that ancient works of art are one of the reasons for the tradition of mythological thinking. After all, when human beings repeatedly look at unnatural images on the rocks or walls of the past, the earth has created a place so that unnatural images do not fade from memory. After all, the psychological basis of such a tradition is also important. It is appropriate to look at them as archetypal symbols. The archetypal images that are repeated in art, folklore and written literature, passed down from generation to generation, are not so irreversible, but a mythical attitude of mankind to unnatural images. "Archetypal images have always been with humanity, they are the source of mythology, religion and art. In these cultural creations, there is a gradual distortion of confusing and frightening images, which become symbols, and the form becomes more wonderful on the one hand, and the content on the other.

K.G.Jung has finally placed a broad task on archetypal images. After all, we can see from the above statement of K. Jung that the first roots of artistic thinking began with archetypes. An example of the "polishing of scary images" is the supernatural images in the rock painting of Zarathustra. Scattering occurs when the symbols disappear from their original appearance and function. Without changing the meaning and function of the images of people in the form of birds and tails, Tuvalu moved to folklore and written literature.

The question arises as to why supernatural images are embodied in the form of human beings. There used to be creatures that scared people, and there still are. But when man is portrayed in art and folklore, in the written literature, in an unnatural way, it is clear that this situation was introduced not only to frighten people, but also wild animals. In this way, unnatural images became symbolic images and entered the oral and written literature.

The distance between the descriptions in the rock paintings and the written and oral literature we have quoted above is very long. We have already mentioned when the historical paintings of Zaroutsay were created. The common mythological content of these supernatural images ensured their survival. On the contrary, the influence of written and oral literature on the fine and applied arts is a much later phenomenon, and the tradition of mythological content or symbolic images is not observed. Examples include miniatures in manuscripts or illustrations in lithographs. Since these miniatures and written literature are not relevant to our subject, we will not dwell on them.

#### **References:**

- 1. Jung K.G. Archetype and symbol. M.: Renaissance, 1991. B. 13.
- 2. Archetypes / Myths of the peoples of the world. Encyclopedia. Volume 1. M .: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1992. S. 110.
- 3. Freidenberg O.M. Myth and literature of antiquity. -M.: The main edition of Eastern literature. 1978. S. 28.
- 4. Allambergenov H. Gayritaby imagery of the mythological asoslari. Tashkent: Muharrir, 2013. B. 28-30.
- 5. Theory of literature in two volumes. Ed. N.D. Tamarchenko. Volume 2. M: ACADEMA, 2004. P. 14.
- 6. Veselovsky A.N. Historical poetics. M: Ed. Fiction, 1940. S. 125-126.
- 7. Archetypes. Myths of the peoples of the world. Encyclopedia. Volume 2. M .: Soviet Encyclopedia, 1992. S. 110.
- 8. Herodotus. Story. M.: Ladomir, 1993. S. 189-190; Yana karang: Uzbek mumtoz adabiyoti namunalari. 1- residential (eng qadimgi davrlardan XV asrning birinchi yarmigacha). Tuzuvchilar: philology fanlari doctorlari, professorlar Rakhmonov N., Boltaboev H. Tashkent: Fan, 2003. B. 16-17.