CURRENT RESEARCH JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES (ISSN: 2767-3758)

VOLUME: Vol.07 Issue01 2026
Page: - 15-22
DOI: - 10.37547/philological-crjps-07-01-04

RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

The Interpretation of Central Archetypes and Symbols in The Hobbit and The Lord of The Rings

Muzaffarov Javlon Kodirjonovich

Basical doctoral student at the Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages named after Iskhokhon Ibrat, Uzbekistan

Received: 30 November 2025 **Accepted:** 25 December 2025 **Published:** 11 January 2026

ABSTRACT

This article examines the central archetypes and symbols that structure J. R. R. Tolkien's The Hobbit (1937) and The Lord of the Rings (1954–1955) and argues that Tolkien's mythopoetic method does not merely "decorate" narrative with traditional motifs, but uses archetypal figures and symbolic objects to stage an ethical anthropology: a theory of personhood tested by power, loss, mercy, and providence. Drawing on archetypal criticism, Jungian-informed myth analysis, and narratological comparison, the study interprets how Tolkien reconfigures inherited patterns—hero, mentor, shadow, king, trickster, and the loyal companion—within a specifically modern crisis of agency, in which temptation operates less through overt coercion than through interior consent. The article shows that Tolkien develops a symbolic grammar across both works, anchored by the road, the ring, light, the tree, and the wounds of industrialized domination, and that this grammar intensifies from the relatively comic, episodic structure of The Hobbit into the tragic-epic architecture of The Lord of the Rings. The analysis emphasizes the symbolic conversion of "smallness" into moral force: the humble hero becomes the privileged site where cosmic conflict is decided without erasing ordinary life. Ultimately, Tolkien's archetypes function not as fixed psychological templates but as relational roles shaped by choice, community, and grace, while his symbols operate as ethically charged instruments that reveal what characters love, fear, and are willing to sacrifice.

Keywords: Tolkien, archetype, symbol, mythopoesis, Jungian criticism, quest narrative, the Ring, the Road, the Shadow, eucatastrophe, moral anthropology.

INTRODUCTION

The enduring interpretive power of J. R. R. Tolkien's The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings derives not only from their invented languages, detailed geography, and historiographic depth, but also from the way these works mobilize archetypes and symbols to generate meaning at multiple scales. Tolkien builds a secondary world that invites readerly immersion, yet the imaginative credibility of Middle-earth is sustained by structures that predate any single literary tradition: the recognizable shapes of the quest, the descent into darkness, the encounter with a numinous guide, the temptation of a forbidden object, the return with transformed vision. In a strict sense, these patterns are neither "universal" in a simplistic way nor detached from history. They are cultural forms transmitted, adapted, and contested. Nevertheless, their recurrence across mythic and literary corpora makes them analytically useful for understanding how Tolkien's narratives create the impression of antiquity and moral consequence while speaking to twentieth-century anxieties about power, mechanization, and moral fragmentation.

Archetypal interpretation is often criticized for reducing literary works to a checklist of roles and motifs. That risk is particularly acute in Tolkien studies because the popularity of Middle-earth has produced a secondary

culture of simplified labels: the hero, the wizard, the dark lord, the loyal friend. Such labels can flatten Tolkien's ethical complexity and his deliberate resistance to allegorical one-to-one correspondences. Yet archetypal criticism can be productive when it is treated not as a deterministic system, but as a method for tracing how narratives activate inherited forms and then reshape them through local texture, moral nuance, and theological imagination. Tolkien's protagonists are not heroic because they embody a static mythic type; they become heroic as they endure inner attrition, confront moral ambiguity, and persist in fidelity despite fear and diminishment. In this way, archetypes in Tolkien operate as relational positions that characters can enter, resist, or corrupt.

Symbols in Tolkien function similarly: not as ornamental emblems, but as dynamic nodes where psychology, ethics, and metaphysics converge. The ring, the road, light, and the tree are not merely recurring images. They are organizing principles that distribute value in the narrative world and test the integrity of those who encounter them. Tolkien's refusal of strict allegory does not entail the absence of meaning; rather, it produces what might be called polyvalent symbolism, where an object can be simultaneously historical (within the fiction), psychological (in its effect on desire), and metaphysical (in its relation to providence and corruption). The result is an interpretive field in which symbols are experienced, not decoded, and where repeated encounters with the same symbolic structure yield different moral outcomes.

A comparative reading of The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings is particularly illuminating because Tolkien himself shifted from a relatively light, episodic tale shaped by the conventions of children's literature to an epic whose moral stakes are cosmological and whose emotional register includes grief, exile, and the irreversible. The archetypes and symbols do not disappear between these works; they mature. Bilbo's adventure establishes a pattern of "small" agency against large forces, and introduces a symbolic object that becomes the central moral engine of the later epic. Meanwhile, the later work amplifies the shadow archetype into an entire system of domination and develops symbolic counterforces—light, memory, song, the unbroken line of the tree—that articulate resistance not merely as military opposition but as preservation of the good.

This article approaches Tolkien's two central narratives as a single mythopoetic continuum. It treats archetypes and symbols as intertwined: archetypes are embodied roles through which meaning is enacted, while symbols are material or imagistic forms through which meaning is condensed and transmitted. The interpretive focus is on "central" archetypes and symbols, understood as those that structurally shape the protagonists' moral formation and the narrative's ethical horizon. Rather than enumerating motifs in isolation, the analysis follows the transformation of key archetypal relations—hero and guide, self and shadow, king and community—and interprets how the principal symbols coordinate those relations.

The aim of this study is to interpret how central archetypes and symbols operate across The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings as a coherent mythopoetic system, and to show how Tolkien reshapes traditional archetypal structures and symbolic objects to articulate an ethics of power, mercy, and communal fidelity that intensifies from the earlier work to the later epic.

The material for analysis consists of Tolkien's The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings (including the narrative proper and, where relevant, the Appendices), with interpretive support from Tolkien's essays and letters that clarify his aesthetic aims and his understanding of myth, fairy-story, and applicability. Secondary scholarship in Tolkien studies is used not as an authority to be reproduced, but as a contextual lens that identifies established interpretive problems and offers critical vocabulary for discussing symbolism, philology, and narrative structure. Because Tolkien's symbolism is deeply integrated with his invented history and languages, the method combines close reading of key scenes with a comparative approach that tracks how the same archetypal or symbolic structure changes function between the two works.

The interpretive framework is primarily mythopoetic and archetypal. Jungian archetypal theory is employed cautiously, as a heuristic for describing recurring roles such as the shadow-double, the wise guide, and the numinous feminine, without treating characters as mere projections of a single psyche. In parallel, narratological attention is given to focalization, scene structure, and the distribution of knowledge, because Tolkien often places symbolic pressure on what is seen, what is hidden, and what is remembered. The symbolic method is semiotic in the broad sense: symbols are interpreted through repetition, variation, and the ethical consequences attached to them, rather than through fixed allegorical equivalence.

The analysis proceeds by identifying a small set of central archetypal positions and symbols that anchor both narratives, then interpreting their interactions in representative episodes. This procedure is designed to avoid motif cataloguing and to emphasize the functional integration of archetypes and symbols within Tolkien's ethical imagination.

Tolkien's mythopoesis is frequently described as the creation of a "secondary world," yet this description can obscure a crucial point: the internal coherence of that world depends on a symbolic economy in which certain images carry disproportionate moral weight. Not every recurring object becomes symbolic in the same sense. A symbol in Tolkien becomes "central" when it mediates an axis of decision—when it reveals a character's orientation toward power, mercy, possession, or renunciation. Similarly, an archetype becomes central when it organizes a cluster of relational expectations and moral tests, as in the repeated pattern of the humble agent guided by a figure whose wisdom is inseparable from secrecy.

In The Hobbit, the narrative voice often frames events with comic distance, and Bilbo's movement from comfort into danger is punctuated by episodic encounters. The archetypal pattern is present—departure, trials, confrontation, return—but it is softened by the narrator's ironic commentary and by the fairy-tale atmosphere. Even so, the symbolic economy is already visible: the road draws Bilbo out of the Shire, darkness tests perception, riddles dramatize the relationship between language and survival, and the ring enters the story as an object that both saves and compromises. The "centrality" of the ring is not obvious at first because the work's surface tone is playful, but the object's ability to reorganize desire and agency already exceeds its immediate plot function.

In The Lord of the Rings, the narrative tone and architecture shift toward what might be called tragic providential epic. Symbols operate under increased pressure because the conflict is no longer merely about treasure or homecoming; it concerns the possibility of domination over will itself. Tolkien's central symbols become instruments that distribute spiritual risk and spiritual consolation. The ring concentrates the logic of power, while light and living memory offer a counterlogic of gift, humility, and endurance. The archetypes likewise intensify: the shadow becomes systemic, the king becomes a problem of legitimacy and healing, the guide becomes more ambiguous, and the humble hero becomes the site where victory is possible precisely because he is not "fit" for domination.

The hero archetype in Tolkien is defined less by conquest than by capacity for moral persistence. Bilbo Baggins begins as a figure of bourgeois stability whose identity is bound to domestic order and predictable comfort. The departure from the Shire is therefore not only spatial but ontological: Bilbo must become someone for whom the unknown is thinkable. Tolkien renders this change through a narrative that repeatedly confronts Bilbo with thresholds—trolls, goblins, the forest, the mountain—and forces him to discover resources he did not know he possessed. Yet Bilbo's heroism remains distinct from the heroic violence of traditional epic. He survives through invisibility, wit, pity, and the willingness to act without grand self-conception. His decisive moral moment is not the killing of a monster but the sparing of an enemy and the refusal to reduce the world to possession, which culminates in his renunciation of the Arkenstone as a private claim.

Frodo inherits and transforms this humble hero pattern. The epic's magnitude might suggest the need for an archetypal warrior-hero at the center, yet Tolkien chooses a hobbit whose strengths are endurance, empathy, and the ability to carry a burden without fully understanding it. Frodo's heroism is interiorized. The ring makes the quest a prolonged experiment in temptation where victory cannot be secured by strength. In this context, the humble hero becomes an anti-imperial archetype: he resists the fantasy of mastery and embodies the possibility that moral agency does not require domination. The narrative repeatedly confirms this logic by showing how greater power correlates with greater vulnerability to corruption, while relative powerlessness can shelter a character from the immediate seductions of control. This is not a romanticization of weakness; hobbits suffer intensely. Rather, it is an ethical inversion in which the capacity to refuse power becomes a primary form of strength.

The continuity between Bilbo and Frodo also reveals Tolkien's symbolic method. The ring in The Hobbit appears as a curious aid that grants invisibility. In the later work, invisibility becomes a metaphysical sign: to use the ring is to step closer to the wraith-world, to diminish one's embodied presence, and to risk losing the self to the logic of the shadow. Bilbo's earlier use is therefore retrospectively reinterpreted, and the humble hero archetype becomes more tragic. Frodo's journey shows

that even humility does not immunize a person against corruption; it merely alters the form of temptation and the conditions of resistance.

Gandalf stands at the center of Tolkien's guide archetype. He is recognizable as the wise old man of mythic structure, yet Tolkien complicates this figure by making him neither omniscient nor unambiguously authoritative. Gandalf's guidance is inseparable from secrecy and risk: he withholds information, not as manipulation, but as a recognition that knowledge can burden or distort. In The Hobbit, he assembles the quest and then repeatedly disappears, leaving the protagonist to grow. This pattern can be read as a narrative technique for distributing agency, but it is also archetypal: the guide cannot complete the hero's journey because the journey is precisely the formation of the hero's capacity to choose. Gandalf's absences force Bilbo into situations where courage must be discovered rather than instructed.

In The Lord of the Rings, Gandalf's role becomes ethically and cosmologically weightier. He is a bearer of memory and a mediator between different moral communities, from hobbits to elves to kings. Yet his authority is constrained. He refuses the ring because he understands that the guide archetype is uniquely vulnerable to corruption: wisdom combined with power becomes the most dangerous form of domination because it can rationalize tyranny as benevolence. Gandalf's refusal demonstrates Tolkien's conviction that moral purity is not secured by intention alone; it requires structural humility, an acceptance of limits, and a willingness to act without ownership.

Gandalf's transformation from Grey to White can be interpreted as a symbolic enactment of death and renewal, a passage through the abyss that grants deeper authority while intensifying responsibility. Importantly, this transformation does not make him a ruler. The guide archetype in Tolkien is not meant to occupy the throne. Instead, Gandalf's role is to enable others to assume their proper vocations, whether that means kingship, stewardship, or simple fidelity. His archetypal function therefore aligns with Tolkien's anti-domination ethic: true guidance does not replace the will of others; it strengthens it against coercion and despair.

The shadow archetype in Tolkien is distributed across characters and entities that represent different modalities of corruption. Smaug in The Hobbit embodies a classical hoard-dragon symbolism: greed, possessiveness, and the distortion of value into accumulation. The dragon's lair is a symbolic space where wealth becomes sterile, severed from communal circulation and reduced to a glittering instrument of self-glorification. Smaug's speech is as significant as his fire, because his rhetoric aims to seduce Bilbo into fear and vanity, revealing that corruption works by reorienting desire and identity.

Gollum introduces a different and more intimate form of shadow. He is not simply an antagonist but a double, a possible future for the protagonist. In The Hobbit, the riddle contest frames him as uncanny and pitiable, a creature whose language and logic have been warped by isolation. The ring appears here as a symbolic catalyst that both empowers and deforms. Gollum's obsession is not only with the object but with what the object has done to his sense of self; his identity collapses into possessive speech. The archetypal significance of Gollum lies in his proximity to the hero's path. Bilbo's pity becomes a decisive moral act because it disrupts the usual heroic logic of elimination and instead introduces mercy as a force that can outlast violence.

In The Lord of the Rings, Gollum's shadow function deepens. He becomes both guide and threat, a figure whose brokenness mirrors what the ring can do to Frodo. The narrative's ethical complexity emerges in the way Gollum is treated not merely as an enemy but as a moral problem: what does it mean to pursue a righteous goal while carrying hatred? Frodo's increasing identification with Gollum signals the psychological and spiritual cost of bearing evil even for the sake of destroying it. The shadow is not external; it is internalized through exposure, exhaustion, and the gradual narrowing of desire.

Sauron represents the systemic shadow, a disembodied will oriented toward domination. Unlike Smaug's personal greed or Gollum's addicted obsession, Sauron's shadow is political-metaphysical. He seeks not simply possession but the reconfiguration of reality into an order of control. The Eye becomes a symbol of surveillance and objectification: to be seen by Sauron is to risk being reduced to a function within his system. This logic resonates with modern anxieties about mechanized power, where domination operates through administration, categorization, and the absorption of individuality into utility. Tolkien's shadow archetype thus ranges from personal vice to totalizing domination, and the ring serves as the hinge that connects these scales.

Aragorn embodies the king archetype, but Tolkien frames kingship not primarily as conquest but as restoration and healing. The legitimacy of the king is tested by humility, patience, and service rather than by sheer victory. This archetype interacts with symbolism in distinctive ways. The reforging of the sword, the reclamation of the name, and the return of the king are not merely political events; they are symbolic acts through which identity is gathered from fragments. The sword that is broken and remade condenses a logic of continuity across loss: history can be wounded, yet not annihilated, and restoration requires both memory and transformation.

Aragorn's path is also defined by refusal. Like Gandalf, he resists premature seizure of power. His movement through the world is marked by hiddenness and self-discipline, suggesting that true kingship is incompatible with the ring's logic. The ring promises the ability to impose order directly upon will, while Aragorn's kingship is validated through the capacity to heal, to reconcile communities, and to accept burdens without coercion. Tolkien therefore recasts the king archetype as a moral counterimage to domination: the rightful ruler is the one who does not need the instrument of absolute power.

This restoration archetype has a symbolic counterpart in the White Tree and the renewal of the land. The king's return is not simply the arrival of a person; it is the reactivation of a living order that has been endangered. When Tolkien links political restoration to vegetal symbolism, he signals that good governance is organic rather than mechanical. It respects growth, limits, and the integrity of living things. In this sense, kingship becomes a symbolic affirmation of stewardship.

The road is arguably Tolkien's most pervasive symbol, appearing explicitly in poems and implicitly in the narrative structure of both works. As a symbol, the road represents more than travel; it is the form of moral becoming. To step onto the road is to accept exposure to contingency, to encounter difference, and to risk transformation. In The Hobbit, the road draws Bilbo out of the Shire and forces him to negotiate unfamiliar social worlds, from dwarven honor-culture to elvish detachment to the predatory logic of trolls and goblins. The road is comedic at times, yet it functions as a ritual passage that breaks and remakes identity.

In The Lord of the Rings, the road becomes liminal in a more tragic sense. The quest is not merely the means to an end; it consumes those who undertake it. The road exposes the fragility of the self under prolonged fear and deprivation. It also creates temporary communities whose bonds are forged through shared vulnerability. Tolkien's symbolic road thus includes a social dimension: it is the space where fellowship becomes possible across historical fractures, and where ordinary persons are compelled to act with extraordinary fidelity.

The liminal quality of the road is intensified by threshold spaces such as the Old Forest, Moria, and Shelob's lair. These spaces are not neutral settings; they are symbolic zones where normal categories fail and where characters confront versions of the shadow. Passage through such spaces is narratively necessary, but it is also archetypal: descent precedes renewal. Yet Tolkien refuses a simplistic initiation pattern where the hero emerges strengthened without remainder. The road leaves scars. Frodo returns not as a triumphant conqueror but as a wounded bearer of memory, suggesting that moral formation can entail irreversible loss.

The ring is Tolkien's central symbol because it condenses the moral logic of domination into a portable object. Its power is not primarily destructive force but the capacity to reorder desire. Those who encounter it begin to imagine themselves as agents of a higher necessity, justified in overriding others for the sake of "good." This is the ring's most subtle temptation: it weaponizes virtue by offering efficacy. Tolkien's symbolism here is ethically acute. Corruption often enters through the longing to fix the world quickly, to remove ambiguity, and to impose unity. The ring offers the fantasy that moral ends can be achieved through coercive means without moral cost.

In The Hobbit, the ring's gift of invisibility is already symbolically charged. Invisibility can be read as liberation from danger, but it also introduces secrecy, evasion, and the possibility of living without accountability. Tolkien does not moralize this immediately; instead, he allows the object's ambiguity to develop. Bilbo's use of the ring is often pragmatic, yet the narrative seeds discomfort by associating the object with Gollum's degradation. The ring thus enters Tolkien's world as a symbol that tests the boundary between necessity and temptation.

In The Lord of the Rings, the ring's metaphysical function is clarified. It draws the bearer toward the wraith-world, suggesting that domination entails a reduction of embodied relational life. To dominate is to become less human in

Tolkien's anthropology: less capable of reciprocity, more enclosed within will. The ring also externalizes the paradox of agency. Frodo chooses to bear it, yet his freedom is gradually constrained by the very act of bearing. The symbol therefore enacts a tragedy of consent: one can freely accept a burden that later diminishes freedom.

The ring's culmination at Mount Doom reveals Tolkien's refusal to romanticize willpower. Frodo does not "win" by heroic self-mastery at the final moment. The destruction of the ring occurs through a convergence of mercy, providence, and the shadow's self-defeat, mediated by Gollum. This narrative choice reinforces the symbol's meaning: domination cannot be defeated by becoming a stronger dominator. Instead, the ring is undone by a moral economy where pity has consequences beyond calculation. Tolkien's symbol thus insists that the deepest battles are not tactical but spiritual, and that victory may depend on grace that exceeds intention.

If the ring concentrates the logic of domination, light in Tolkien frequently symbolizes the counterlogic of gift, memory, and hope. Light is not merely illumination; it is often a materialization of the good's presence in a world threatened by shadow. Tolkien's light is also historical: it carries the weight of lost beauty and the persistence of ancient goodness. This is visible in objects such as the Phial of Galadriel, which functions not as a weapon of conquest but as a sustaining presence in extreme darkness.

Galadriel occupies a complex archetypal position that can be approached through the notion of the numinous feminine, though Tolkien's Catholic imagination differentiates his portrayal from purely psychological archetypes. Galadriel is both perilous and benevolent, a figure whose beauty contains temptation and whose authority requires refusal. Her testing scene, in which she imagines taking the ring and then renounces it, dramatizes the same ethical structure that shapes Gandalf's refusal. The difference is that Galadriel's temptation is framed as an aesthetic-political fantasy of radiant domination. Her refusal therefore clarifies Tolkien's thesis that even the most "beautiful" form of power can be a mask for coercion.

The symbolism of gifts given by the Elves is crucial here. Gifts in Tolkien are not transactions that create debt; they are instruments that enable endurance without owning the recipient. This contrasts sharply with the ring's economy, where every use deepens possession. The gift-symbolism articulates a social ethic: community is sustained by generosity that respects freedom. Light, as gift, becomes a symbolic pedagogy teaching characters to persist without becoming what they oppose.

Vegetal symbolism in Tolkien is not decorative pastoralism; it is a moral ontology. Trees, gardens, and cultivated land represent a mode of being in which life is received, tended, and allowed to grow according to its nature. The Shire embodies this symbolism in social form. It is not idealized as perfect; it is narrow, sometimes complacent, and resistant to change. Yet it represents a space where ordinary goods—meals, friendship, work, local memory—are valued without being subordinated to imperial ambition. As such, it functions as an archetypal "home" that gives meaning to the quest by providing a concrete picture of what must be preserved.

In The Lord of the Rings, the White Tree becomes a symbol of rightful continuity and the fragility of the good under neglect. Its withering reflects a political and spiritual diminishment, while its renewal signals not the return of a lost past unchanged, but the possibility of continuity through transformation. The tree's symbolism differs from the ring's in a decisive respect: it cannot be possessed in the same way. One can guard it, care for it, or destroy it, but one cannot make it an instrument of domination without violating its nature. This makes the tree a structural counter-symbol to the ring.

The Scouring of the Shire reveals Tolkien's insistence that the good is not preserved by distance from evil. Even the archetypal home can be invaded by the logic of domination, especially through industrialization and bureaucratic control. The damage to the Shire is therefore symbolic: it shows that modern forms of power can penetrate local life and degrade it. Yet the restoration of the Shire, aided by Sam's planting and renewal, suggests that stewardship can heal, though not without memory of loss. Sam's role here brings the loyal companion archetype into direct symbolic action: fidelity is not only supportive; it becomes creative, rebuilding the conditions for ordinary goodness.

The loyal companion archetype is central to Tolkien's moral vision because it resists the romantic isolation of the hero. Samwise Gamgee exemplifies this archetype, but Tolkien's fellowship includes multiple forms of companionship that collectively illustrate the social nature of moral endurance. The quest is sustained not by solitary greatness but by the capacity to remain faithful when hope

becomes abstract. Sam's loyalty is not blind obedience; it is a discerning commitment that sometimes involves resistance to Frodo's distorted perception under the ring's pressure. This complicates the companion archetype by introducing moral agency within loyalty.

Symbolically, fellowship represents an alternative to domination because it is based on voluntary mutuality. The ring isolates; fellowship connects. Tolkien repeatedly stages this contrast by showing how proximity to the ring can fragment community through suspicion, possessiveness, and fear. Conversely, acts of shared burden—carrying, feeding, guarding, speaking courage—create a countereconomy where power is not accumulated but distributed as care.

This social ethic has theological and anthropological resonance. Tolkien's world is not redeemed through the triumph of a single exceptional will. It is preserved through a network of fidelities, including those of characters who never approach the central battlefield. In archetypal terms, Tolkien decentralizes the hero narrative by insisting that the "small" are not merely helpers of the great; they are the primary agents through whom history turns.

A final interpretive result emerges when the two works are read as a continuum: Tolkien intensifies archetypes and symbols by shifting their narrative environment. In The Hobbit, archetypal functions often appear in relatively stable, bounded episodes. The dragon is slain, the treasure disputed, the hero returns. In The Lord of the Rings, archetypes persist but are placed under conditions of attrition. The shadow is no longer localized; it is ecological and political. The ring is no longer a clever tool; it is a metaphysical engine. The road is no longer a series of adventures; it is an ordeal that wounds the bearer. The guide is no longer a quirky wizard; he is a figure marked by death and return. The king is no longer a distant background; he is a contested hope whose legitimacy must be enacted as healing.

This intensification does not negate the earlier work's symbolic seriousness; rather, it reveals that The Hobbit contains in seed form the moral logic that will dominate the later epic. The ring's introduction, Bilbo's pity, the theme of greed and possession, and the valorization of humble agency all anticipate the later structure. Tolkien's mythopoetic achievement lies in transforming what could have remained a charming fairy-tale adventure into a mythic history in which symbols accrue depth through recurrence, reinterpretation, and the cost paid by those who carry them.

The interpretation of central archetypes and symbols in The Hobbit and The Lord of the Rings demonstrates that Tolkien's mythopoesis depends on an integrated ethical system rather than on isolated motifs. His archetypes are not rigid character types but relational roles through which choice, temptation, mercy, and community are tested. Bilbo and Frodo embody a humble heroism that resists imperial fantasies of mastery; Gandalf exemplifies a guide whose authority is constrained by self-refusal; the shadow is distributed from the personal greed of Smaug to the intimate double of Gollum and the systemic domination of Sauron; Aragorn reframes kingship as restoration and healing rather than conquest; and Sam and the fellowship articulate a social anthropology in which moral endurance is fundamentally communal.

Tolkien's symbols function as ethically charged instruments that shape agency. The ring concentrates the logic of domination by distorting desire and reducing personhood to will, while the road symbolizes liminal moral formation that leaves lasting wounds. Light, gift, and the tree enact a counter-symbolism of grace, memory, and stewardship, affirming that the good persists not through coercive power but through generosity and faithful care for living continuity. Read together, the two works show a deliberate intensification: The Hobbit introduces archetypal and symbolic seeds that bloom into the tragic-epic moral architecture of The Lord of the Rings. Tolkien's central claim, enacted rather than asserted, is that the world is most decisively defended by those least inclined to dominate it, and that mercy can become a force whose consequences exceed calculation.

References

1. Tolkien J. R. R. The Hobbit, or There and Back Again. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1937. 310 p.

2. Tolkien J. R. R. The Fellowship of the Ring. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954. 423 p.

3. Tolkien J. R. R. The Two Towers. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1954. 352 p.

4. Tolkien J. R. R. The Return of the King. London: George Allen & Unwin, 1955. 416 p.

5. Tolkien J. R. R. The Silmarillion / Ed. by C. Tolkien. London: HarperCollins, 1999. 365 p.

6. Tolkien J. R. R. Unfinished Tales of Númenor and Middle-earth / Ed. by C. Tolkien. London: HarperCollins, 1998. 472 p.

7. Tolkien J. R. R. Tree and Leaf: Including "On Fairy-Stories". London: HarperCollins, 2001. 224 p.

8. Tolkien J. R. R. The Letters of J. R. R. Tolkien / Ed. by H. Carpenter; with C. Tolkien. London: HarperCollins, 2006. 463 p.

9. Carpenter H. J. R. R. Tolkien: A Biography. London: HarperCollins, 2002. 432 p.

10. Shippey T. A. The Road to Middle-earth: How J. R. R. Tolkien Created a New Mythology. London: HarperCollins, 2005. 432 p.

11. Flieger V. Splintered Light: Logos and Language in Tolkien's World. Kent, OH: Kent State University Press, 2002. 184 p.

12. Hammond W. G., Scull C. The Lord of the Rings: A Reader's Companion. London: HarperCollins, 2005. 912 p.

13. Chance J. Tolkien's Art: A Mythology for England. Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 2001. 272 p.

14. Garth J. Tolkien and the Great War: The Threshold of Middle-earth. London: HarperCollins, 2003. 320 p.

15. Jung C. G. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious / Trans. by R. F. C. Hull. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1981. 470 p.

16. Campbell J. The Hero with a Thousand Faces. Novato, CA: New World Library, 2008. 432 p.

17. Eliade M. The Sacred and the Profane: The Nature of Religion / Trans. by W. R. Trask. New York: Harcourt, 1959. 256 p.

18. Frye N. Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957. 383 p.

19. Turner V. The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-Structure. Chicago: Aldine, 1969. 213 p.

20. Ricoeur P. The Symbolism of Evil / Trans. by E. Buchanan. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967. 356 p.

21. Lewis C. S. An Experiment in Criticism. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961. 176 p.

22. Auden W. H. The Quest Hero // Tolkien and the Critics: Essays on J. R. R. Tolkien's The Lord of the Rings / Ed. by N. Isaacs, R. Zimbardo. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968. P. 40–61.

23. Manlove C. N. Modern Fantasy: Five Studies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1975. 224 p.

24. West R. Tolkien's Modern Middle Ages. Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2002. 312 p.