



The poetic metaphor and its classification

Delfuza BALTABAEVA¹

Berdakh Karakalpak State University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received October 2025

Received in revised form 5
October 2025

Accepted 10 November 2025

Available online 25

November 2025

Keywords:

literary language,
metaphor,
linguistic metaphor,
poetic metaphor,
elements of metaphor,
types and classifications of
metaphor.

ABSTRACT

The article explores the structure and classification of poetic metaphors and analyses their functioning within the language of literary works. The study highlights various scholarly approaches to the division of metaphors based on their structure, stylistic function, and semantic features. It provides an overview of the main types of metaphors proposed in both linguistics and literary studies – from the classical theories of Cicero and I.A. Richards to the modern classifications developed by G.N. Sklyarevskaya, Yu.I. Levin, and G. Lakoff & M. Johnson. Special attention is given to the distinctions between linguistic and poetic metaphors, their expressive and cognitive functions.

2181-3701/© 2025 in Science LLC.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-3701-vol3-iss10/S-pp54-59>

This is an open-access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Poetik metafora va uning tasnifi

ANNOTATSIYA

Kalit so'zlar:

badiiy adabiyot tili,
metafora,
lingvistik metafora,
poetik metafora,
metafora elementlari,
metafora turlari va tasniflari.

Ushbu maqolada poetik metaforalarning tuzilishi va tasnifi o'rganilib, ularning badiiy asarlar tilidagi funksiyasi tahlil qilindi. Tadqiqotda metaforalarni tuzilishi, uslubiy vazifasi hamda semantik xususiyatlariga ko'ra toifalanishiga doir turli ilmiy yondashuvlar yoritilgan. Unda Siseron va I.A. Richardsning klassik qarashlaridan tortib, G.N. Sklyarevskaya, Yu.I. Levin, hamda G. Lakoff va M. Johnson tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan zamonaviy tasniflarga qadar bo'lgan asosiy metafora turlari umumlashtirib berilgan. Shuningdek, lingvistik va poetik metaforalar o'rtasidagi farqlar, ularning ifodaviy va kognitiv funksiyalariga alohida e'tibor qaratilgan.

¹ Doctoral Student, Berdakh Karakalpak State University. E-mail: baltabaevadelfuza@gmail.com

Поэтическая метафора и её классификация

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова:

язык художественной литературы, метафора, лингвистическая метафора, поэтическая метафора, элементы метафоры, типы и классификации метафоры.

В статье рассматриваются структура и классификация поэтических метафор, а также анализируется их функционирование в языке художественных произведений. В исследовании освещаются различные научные подходы к классификации метафор по их структуре, стилистической функции и семантическим особенностям. Дается обзор основных типов метафор – от классических теорий Цицерона и И.А. Ричардса до современных классификаций, разработанных Г.Н. Склярёвской, Ю.И. Левиным, Дж. Лакоффом и М. Джонсоном. Особое внимание уделяется различиям между лингвистическими и поэтическими метафорами, их экспрессивным и когнитивным функциям.

INTRODUCTION

Metaphor is a fundamental semantic phenomenon that plays an essential role in the artistic and aesthetic richness of language. In modern linguistics, scholars classify metaphors according to their structure, stylistic functions, and semantic features, each offering their own perspective on the phenomenon. Before analyzing the types of metaphors, it is necessary to consider their internal structure.

The British linguist and literary theorist I.A. Richards, in his influential work *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, proposed that a metaphor consists of two principal elements: **the tenor** (the subject or concept being described) and **the vehicle** (the image used for description) (Richards, I., 1936). For instance, in the expression *Life is a journey*, life represents the tenor, while journey represents the vehicle. The relationship between these two elements forms the basis of metaphorical meaning.

Since ancient times, scholars have attempted to classify metaphors. The philosopher Cicero distinguished between linguistic and poetic metaphors. Later, researchers such as N.D. Arutyunova, M.V. Nikitin, G. Lakoff, V.P. Moskvina, G.N. Sklyarevskaya, and I.V. Arnold developed their own classifications based on linguistic and stylistic criteria. It should be noted here that such classification also occurs in literary studies. Thus, linguists' study linguistic metaphors, while literary scholars' study poetic metaphors. The question of the difference between linguistic and poetic metaphors is a matter of great concern. Because, in our opinion, there is a notion that metaphor only implies an allegorical description. We want to prove this with the opinions of scientists and this article aims to study the structure and classification of poetic metaphors and to distinguish them from linguistic metaphors.

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

According to J. Wardzelashvili, "a linguistic metaphor is an established element of the lexicon; such metaphors do not require creative effort, and speakers may use them unconsciously without perceiving their figurative meaning". (J. Wardzelashvili, 2002). In contrast, B. Larin defines a poetic metaphor as "a multifaceted and innovative phenomenon that departs from established patterns of thought and expression". (Larin, B., 1974).

Linguists hold various opinions concerning the classification of metaphors, largely due to their differing perspectives on the object of study. Nevertheless, most scholars agree to divide metaphors into two broad categories: **linguistic (language) metaphors** and **poetic (literary) metaphors**.

The Russian scholar G. N. Sklyarevskaya supports this dichotomy, stating that “a linguistic metaphor is conventional and universally recognized, whereas a poetic metaphor is the product of individual creativity”. (Sklyarevskaya.G, 1993). Both types rely on the resemblance between two objects or phenomena; however, they differ in stylistic, semantic, and communicative functions.

METHODS

The research is based on descriptive, comparative, and linguopoetic methods. So, descriptive analysis was applied to define structural and semantic properties of metaphors, comparative analysis was used to compare views of scholars such as Cicero, Richards, Lakoff, Johnson, and Levin and linguopoetic method was used to analyze metaphors in literary contexts and identify author-specific metaphorical styles.

The material of the study includes theoretical works by G.N. Sklyarevskaya, Yu.V. Tsinkovskaya, A. Khojamqulov, E. Allanazarov, and examples from Karakalpak and English literary texts.

RESULTS

In the field of literary studies, various classifications of metaphor have been proposed by prominent scholars. One of the most detailed typologies was developed by Yu.V. Tsinkovskaya in her article «Виды художественных метафор в современной русской прозе» ('Types of Artistic Metaphors in Modern Russian Prose'). She distinguishes the following principal types: Vital Metaphors, Mortal Metaphors, and Intertextual Metaphors.

1. Vital metaphor (from Latin *vita* – “life”) is a type of metaphor in which the semantics of life predominates, and the object is perceived as a living or animate being. Such metaphors serve to enhance emotional impact and intensify imagery. For example, *the sky is crying* (*osmon yig'layapti*), *the river of time* (*vaqt daryosi*), *the light of my life* (*hayotim nuri*).

2. Mortal metaphor (from Latin *mors* – “death”) is a type of metaphor in which the semantics of lifelessness predominates. This means that such words no longer carry any emotional or expressive meaning, and we do not even perceive them as metaphors anymore, since they have become fully integrated into the language: *the heart of the city* (*shahar yuragi*), *the foot of the mountain* (*tog' etagi*), *time ran out-* (*vaqt tugadi*).

3. Intertextual metaphor refers to the connection or relationship between two texts or between a text and other forms of art. Such metaphors are most often found in prose works, and they are based on images, myths, legends, historical events, or other literary sources (Tsinkovskaya.Yu, 2010): *mother is the gate to paradise* (*ona Jannat eshigi*), *between two doors* (*ikki eshik orasi*), *the earth is sated with blood* (*yer qon bilan to'yingan*).

From a cognitive perspective, G. Lakoff and M. Johnson proposed one of the most influential classifications in their Conceptual Metaphor Theory, the classification includes structural metaphors, orientational metaphors, and ontological metaphors. (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980). This classification, in fact, derives from the theory of cognitive metaphor and reflects its various types:

1. Structural metaphors – based on the comparison of two conceptual domains, where one domain is structured in terms of another. e.g., *argument is war*, *time is money*, *love is a game*.

2. Orientational metaphors – grounded in spatial orientation, reflecting human perception of space (up–down, in–out, front–back). e.g., *high spirits*, *falling into depression*, *I am feeling up*.

3. Ontological metaphors – associated with the conceptualization of abstract phenomena as tangible entities, granting them physical or human attributes. e.g., *inflation is an entity*, *the mind is a container*.

In Uzbek linguistics, M. Yuldoshev differentiates between linguistic metaphors and individual authorial metaphors. Similarly, B. Umarqulov, who studies the lexicon of poetic language, also distinguishes between language metaphors and poetic metaphors.

Furthermore, A. Khojamkulov proposes a detailed semantic classification according to the source domains of metaphorical transfer (Khojamkulov A., 2011):

1. Anthropomorphic metaphors – derived from human body parts, emotions, or actions (*the city is asleep*; *night has drawn its dark curtain*);

2. Zoomorphic metaphors – based on animal imagery (a greedy wolf who devours everything; a cunning fox);

3. Phytomorphic metaphors – drawn from the world of plants (a withered heart; roots spread through my soul);

4. Cosmomorphic metaphors – associated with celestial bodies (you are my sun; you are the light of my sky);

5. Theomorphic metaphors – related to divine or mythological concepts (fate punished him; lightning struck with divine wrath);

6. Abiomorphic metaphor – metaphors that arise from the transfer of meanings of words denoting inanimate objects in nature. Examples: heart of stone, soul of ice.

Thus, nowadays, Karakalpak linguists are also conducting research on this stylistic device. Among them, E. Berdimuratov, in his monographic work, noted that meanings formed through the process of metaphorization, that is, metaphors, can be divided into three groups according to their degree of possessing a universal (folk) character and their stylistic distinctiveness: **Metaphors of the common (folk) language, metaphors used in the common language but retaining figurative character, and metaphors that lack common linguistic recognition.** (Berdimuratov E., 1994)

In this case, first type, it is taken into account that metaphors of the common language have had their figurative meanings fade over time, becoming lexicalized and used in their direct, literal sense in everyday speech: *the eye of the needle* (*iynenin' kozi*), *the beat of the heart* (*jurektin uriwi*), *the light of the eye* (*koz nuri*): these have lost their original figurative meaning and are used in a mostly literal sense.

Second type (metaphors retaining figurativeness and expressiveness): the pearl of speech (*soz marjani*), delicate heart (*nazik kewil*), first love (*tungish muhabbat*), etc. – as the name suggests, these metaphors carry strong imagery and emotional-expressive force.

Third type (individual/authorial metaphors): these are created by the author to enhance the content or artistic impact of the work, reflecting original thought and personal creativity.

Өтти эсирлер қуўып арбасын,
Эл-Беруний туўылған жерде (Yusupov I., 1959)

Furthermore, G.R. Abdaliyeva, in her doctoral dissertation in philology, analyzed the metaphors in the works of the Karakalpak writer T. Kaipbergenov according to their structure, identifying simple, extended, and chain (linked) types present in his novels. She paid particular attention to the extended type, noting that this type of metaphor often consists of proverbs or folk sayings (Abdalieva G., 2024).

DISCUSSION

Poetic metaphors differ fundamentally from linguistic ones not only in their emotional and expressive nature but also in their cognitive and creative dimensions. While linguistic metaphors are often conventionalized and unconscious elements of everyday communication, poetic metaphors embody an author's individual worldview and unique creative thinking. They represent the transformation of ordinary linguistic meaning into a symbolic and imaginative form that intensifies the aesthetic and emotional impact of a literary text.

As B. Larin emphasizes, the poetic metaphor is not merely a stylistic ornament but a reflection of the author's inner emotional experience and worldview. This idea resonates with G.N. Sklyarevskaya's statement that poetic metaphor serves as the highest form of linguistic creativity, transcending the boundaries of conventional semantics. In this sense, poetic metaphor bridges cognition and emotion, uniting the linguistic and artistic functions of language.

The classifications discussed in the study complement one another, revealing the multidimensional nature of metaphor. The typologies of Yu. Tsinkovskaya and A. Khojamkulov highlight how the semantic sources of metaphor – whether vital, cosmomorphic, or anthropomorphic – reflect not only linguistic mechanisms but also cultural perceptions of life, nature, and divinity. Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) conceptual metaphor theory, in turn, shifts attention from language to thought, suggesting that metaphor is a fundamental mechanism of human cognition, structuring the way people conceptualize the world. Thus, poetic metaphors can be viewed as the aesthetic realization of conceptual metaphors, transforming abstract ideas into emotionally charged artistic images.

Moreover, in Karakalpak and Uzbek literary contexts, metaphor often functions as a marker of national and cultural identity. As E. Berdimuratov and G. Abdaliyeva observe, the figurative expressions in local literary traditions frequently originate from folklore, mythology, and everyday life. These culturally specific metaphors not only enrich the artistic imagery but also preserve collective memory and worldview. Consequently, the study of poetic metaphors in English and Karakalpak literature reveals both universal and culture-specific tendencies in metaphorical thinking.

CONCLUSION

Thus, metaphor is a semantic phenomenon in language that occupies an important place in artistic and aesthetic expression. In classifying metaphors, scholars use various approaches, dividing them into several types. They are typically categorized based on their semantic, cognitive, structural, or functional origin. In turn, these metaphors contribute to enhancing the artistic, emotional, and expressive qualities of literary language. Metaphor serves as a core semantic and aesthetic phenomenon of language. Its classification helps uncover the richness of poetic expression. Through comparative linguistic and literary analysis, this study shows that poetic metaphors are a reflection of both linguistic creativity and cultural identity.

REFERENCES:

1. Richards I.A. M.A., Litt.D. The Philosophy of Rhetoric. Oxford University Press. London. 1936.-P. 152.
2. Вардзелашвили Ж. О двоякой сущности метафоры// Санкт-Петербургский государственный университет и Тбилисский государственный университет. Научные труды. Серия: филология. Выпуск IV.-СПб-Тб., С.9. //http://vjanetta.narod.ru/bakan4.html.
3. Ларин Б.А. О лирике как разновидности художественной речи. (Семантические этюды.1925). Эстетика слова и язык писателя: избранные статьи// Ларин Б.А.; вступ.ст. А.Федорова.-Ленинград: Худож.лит.,1974.-С.285.
4. Складская Г.Н. Метафора в системе языка. Санкт-Петербург «Наука».1993.-С.31.
5. Абдалиева Г.Р. Структурно-семантические и стилистические особенности языка произведений Т.Қайыпбергенова. Докт.дисс. Нукус 2024.-С.82.
6. Бердимуратов Е. Лексикология Нөкис, Билим, 1994.-Б.23.
7. Хўжамқулов А. Ўзбек тилида метафоранинг таснифланишига доир. Ўзбекистон Республикасининг мустақиллигининг 20 йиллигига бағишланган илмий мақолалар тўплами. Лингвист, 2-китоб.-Тошкент: 2011.
8. Цинковская Ю.В. Виды художественных метафор в современной русской прозе. Ученые записки Забайкальского государственного университета. 2010.-С.154-158.
9. Lakoff D., Johnson M. The University of Chicago Press. Chicago and London. -P.241.
10. Юсупов.И. Аль Беруний туўылган жер.Күн шығыс жолаўшысына. Нөкис, 1959.-Б.18.