



Article

Poetics of Image, Symbol and Emblem in Artistic Thinking: Semantic Interconnection and Functional Differences

Ergasheva Rayhon O'tkir qizi*¹

1. Department of Uzbek Language and Literature, Termiz University of Economics and Service
* Correspondence: ergashevarayhon1994@gmail.com

Abstract: This study explores the theoretical and methodological foundations of image, symbol, and emblem in artistic thinking, highlighting their semantic interconnections and functional differences. Together, the image, symbol, and emblem form a triadic system that conditions aesthetic imagination, each evoking a later stage of creativeness. The image is a visually stylized type of reality, the symbol is a codified net of denotation, and the emblem unites these denotations in a visible interpretation of their essence. Thus, this study fills a gap in our knowledge of the fraught interdependence of these poetic units, at least with respect to Uzbek literature. By means of a comparative-analytical, structural, semiotic, and cognitive approach, the paper shows their importance in enriching literary texts and shaping artistic consciousness. They conclude that the picture provides a basis for emotional and aesthetic responses; the symbol enhances the text with intellectual and cultural dimensions; and the emblem stabilizes the symbolic meanings, thereby anchoring them in culture. The results of the study show how these three aspects in a sense expand artistic meaning, with implications for how we think about literature aesthetics. The implications for our research will appeal to the field of literary and art studies, serving as a synthesis of artistic thought and its cultural expressions, and as a historical model for making generalizations in both national and global contexts. The examination of this evolution from image to symbol and motif further enriches the scholarship on literary and artistic expression.

Keywords: Scientific Significance, Literary Text, Semantic Layer, Aesthetic Device, Figurative Meaning, National Literature, World Literature, Aesthetic Perception, Philosophical Roots, Cultural Code, Allegory, Metaphor

Citation: O'tkir qizi, E. R. Poetics of Image, Symbol and Emblem in Artistic Thinking: Semantic Interconnection and Functional Differences. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2025, 6(4), 927-932.

Received: 13th Sept 2025
Revised: 20th Sept 2025
Accepted: 05th Oct 2025
Published: 18th Oct 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

1. Introduction

Exploring Artistic Thinking in Figurative, Symbolic, and Emblematic Terms is Critical Reading in itself, presenting the Aesthetic and Philosophical dimensions of Literature and Art. These three notions image, symbol, and emblem are the basic elements that allow us to analyze the ways meaning and feeling are infused in works of creative expression. The symbol introduces different, more abstract and generalised meanings as a contemporary image is almost like a sensory perception of the viewer of an aesthetic embodiment of reality [1], [2]. What the emblem, in turn, embodies are actual visual or narrative representations of these meanings. And form, together, a system that thickens the semantic layers of expression in art. This article investigates the relationship and functional differentiation between these components in literary and artistic works with the example of Uzbek literature.

This progression of image to symbol to emblem is demonstrated in the analysis of these poetic units. The image, despite being the first experiential representation of reality, quickly transforms into a sign with intellectual and emotional meanings. The emblem, on the other hand, embodies the end of this development, placing the intangible sense into tangible symbols. This unit relationship one part retaining upper significance possible since the layer as mentioned in block hierarchies is crucial to its aesthetic organization, whereby raw sensory events enter be having now transferred into high high quality cultural and philosophical signifiers [2]. This triadic arrangement of image-symbol-emblem has yet to be fully explored in its interrelationships and its workings within the sphere of modern literary theory. Earlier, scholars have discussed the significance of imagery in literature and art to get the symbolic meanings through visual and textual representations. Still, we have some gaps in knowledge when it comes to the interplay between these concepts, and how, together, they can lead to the overall aesthetic experience of the reader or viewer. While there is a range of qualitative literature around these concepts individually, the systematisation of the image, symbol and emblem as a single methodological unit has not been well-studied [3]. This study is a response to the above-mentioned gap in research an attempt to explore how these elements have evolved over time and what functional roles they play in artistic thought, and providing an account on one of the most illustrious Uzbek authors Alisher Navoi.

This study uses a comparative-analytical, structural, semiotic, and cognitive method to analyze the interaction Timage-symbol-emblem. This collect of Simon will hope reveal ways in which these devices in addition to structure natural content together with mill the constructive money together with logic rationale outward into novel lexicon. This research will help advance a more complex view of aesthetics in literature and their implications for literatures at both national and global levels.

Analysis of Literature

Image, symbol and emblem, the cornerstones of artistic thought, disclose the aesthetic, spiritual and symbolic aspects of reality. An artistic-practical manifestation of reality, perceived emotionally and a piece of lyrics, which crowded with colours alive—a reflection of what only were and would be from creativity and imagination of the artist wash by time. A Gallery in Amerika It is the most significant poetic device which connects you to the audience feelings and their senses [4]. The symbol penetrates directly into the image, disclosing its spiritual and figurative dimensions, possessing an extrinsic (descriptive) and an intrinsic (semantic) meanings. The emblem also unifies its sign, usually in the form of a tangible reality person, event or object that fossilizes the meaning and grounds it in cultural and national values.

Prominent scholars have examined these concepts in various ways. G. W. F. Hegel and Hippolyte Taine provide insights into the philosophical and socio-aesthetic aspects of these poetic units, linking the image with the symbol and emblem. In Uzbek literary studies, B. Akramov, G. Bobobekova, and others have analyzed the role of the image and emblem in creating emotional depth and expressing spiritual integrity [5][6]. Researchers like Kh. Karim and N. Yuldoshev have further explored how symbols and emblems reflect historical and philosophical ideas. This body of work reveals the intricate roles that image, symbol, and emblem play in shaping both the form and meaning of artistic expressions [7].

2. Materials and Methods

This study adopts several complementary methodologies to explore the relationship between image, symbol, and emblem in artistic thought. The following applies a poetic-structural method, respectively, to examine the systemic relation between visual, sound, and text within literary texts as means for art-formal synthesis. In this approach, image, symbol and emblem are interwoven into the fabric of artful composition, each fulfilling a

different purpose in generating significance. In the second, using philosophical-aesthetic principle, based on the works of Hegel and Taine, the ideological and aesthetic content of symbol and emblem has been examined. Grounded in the methodology of Karim, Karimov and Yuldoshev, the historical-cultural principle makes it possible to consider the tokens and insignia through the prism of national cultural codes and historical backgrounds 8. Similarly, the functional-semiotic principle is used to explore the way the symbolism and emblematic encoded latent meanings and cultural markers. Lastly, the aesthetic-artistic principle, on the basis of Rasulov and Quronov, highlights that the symbolism and emblematic approach helps bringing extra artistic layer and aesthetic depth to the literary work. Through these methodologies, the study aims to reveal the complex interrelations and evolving functions of image, symbol, and emblem in artistic thinking.

3. Results and Discussion

In the early stages of artistic thought, the image was regarded as a representational means that directly reflected reality its external form and condition. Its primary function was to recreate life through art and to cultivate aesthetic perception. However, as the spiritual and psychological world of the human being gradually became more complex and reflective thinking deepened, the semantic potential of the image broadened [10]. As a basic category of literature and art, the image appears as an improved aesthetically elaborated reflection of reality, processed by the artistic consciousness. More than a mere copy, its roots lie in the artist's concept of aesthetics and its purpose and feelings when creating, and in doing so, it converts the representation of reality into an artistic creation with meaning and emotion. An image is a new reality—reimagined by an artist, populated by a stylistically-Calibrated emotional & aesthetic Continuum, and a vocabulary of art whether it be written word, hue of color, melody of sound or harmony of form. Accordingly, it embodies a dual essence: on one level, it is a visual model perceptible to the senses; on another, it is a spiritual-aesthetic phenomenon that evokes vivid imagination and emotional resonance in the mind of the reader or viewer [11]. The nature of the image initially relies primarily on depiction that is, it presents reality in a direct, lifelike manner. At this stage, the image does not yet require the complexity of multilayered symbolic meaning. Of course, its main purpose is to suggest an aesthetic assessment of reality, giving it a certain emotional colour and point of view through the prism of the artist. An image is a generalized, but at the same time, concrete image of human life, constituted by artistic imagination and possessing aesthetic value (L. Therefore, an image is a primary and essential element of artistic realization, that reflects reality, as well as the artist's perception, ideal of beauty and manner of creativity. Up until the early twentieth century, within Uzbek literary and scholarly traditions, the concept now referred to as "image" was expressed through terms such as "timsol" (emblem), "tasvir" (depiction), and "nusxa" (representation). For example, in old tazkiras and literary-critical texts, expressions such as "the poet created a symbol" or "depicted" were commonly used. The term nusxa, on the other hand, was mostly used in the sense of a "copy" or "imitation." During the 1920s–1930s, however, in the process of renewing literary terminology and under the influence of Russian and European literary studies, the term obraz was directly introduced into Uzbek scholarly discourse. Since then, obraz has become established as the main term, while timsol ("symbol") and tasvir ("depiction") have remained secondary concepts [12]. Thus, the adoption of the word obraz into Uzbek literary scholarship represents a gradual stage in the history of national terminology, reflecting a period of renewal and the systematization of literary science. The philosophical roots of the symbol were formed in ancient thought: Plato interpreted it as a sign between the world of ideas and the world of sensory perception, while Aristotle viewed it, within the framework of his theory of mimesis, as an artistic device that conveys indirect meaning. It would not be mistaken to say that Plato's conception paved the way for the transition from imitation (mimesis) to symbolization in the Middle Ages. Indeed, in a broader sense,

symbolization—although referred to by various names such as “absolute beauty,” “ideal beauty,” “absolute truth,” or “truth”—serves a single purpose: the comprehension of the Divine (Haq). At the same time, a symbol merely points or alludes it indicates rather than describes [13]. Eastern authors like al-Farabi, Ibn Sina (Avicenna) and Alisher Navoi read the symbol as a symbolic sign expressing the spiritual world of man and representing the cosmic harmony. The obraz thus moved beyond representation and into the register of the thing-in-itself. This gave a work of art its characteristic of layered meaning, hidden from the uninitiated. In this way an image, which in the real world could be some object or phenomenon, gained through the power of context an elevated meaning within the soul, full of human desires, human feelings, and human metaphysics. A symbol is a figurative sign-based visual, representing an abstract notion, concept, or phenomenon indirectly. There are always its two (visible / inner (hidden, semantic) levels of meaning.) In Persian it is called ramz (from Arabic ramz "gesture, sign, indication"), which indicates the symbol and is one of the types of figurative transfer (metaphorical expression). It refers to a word or phrase that only takes on a figurative meaning by the mere fact that it is contained in a particular text, and works as a kind of image. The primary function of the symbol is to awaken in the reader a desire to uncover its hidden idea, to transmit meaning through cultural codes, and to deepen the semantic layers of the literary text. Allegory (the construction of an entire narrative as a symbol), allusion (an indirect historical or literary reference), metaphor (a figurative, transferred image), and trope (a general category of figurative expression) all serve as crucial means in the formation of symbolic meaning [14]. Therefore, although all the symbols are an image, not all our images are a symbol. It uncovers the background image and lifts it to an ideal and artistic level.

A symbolic figure (timsol) is an idealized and personified image of an abstract idea, a value or a national memory, embodied in a human being, an occurrence or a thing (for example, Navoi as the symbol of literature). As such, it is an appropriate image in form and condensation of values of human, national and universal importance. In Eastern poetics, this semantic evolution of the image acquired a distinctive form. Specifically, the timsol a meaningful image linked to a particular person, event, or object became an integral element of Eastern artistic thought. Unlike a mere depiction, the timsol represents a generalized, multilayered, and enduring artistic unit, forming the core of traditional poetic structure. Thus, in the Eastern literary-aesthetic tradition, the progression image → symbol → timsol reflects the gradual complication of artistic form and meaning, as well as the deepening of spiritual and philosophical content [15]. The concept of timsol is intrinsically connected to both image and symbol: Timsol is a “symbol embodied through an image.” In the process of transformation image becoming symbol, and symbol becoming timsol it attains permanence as a marker of culture. Obraz — voqelikning badiiy tasviri.

- a. Symbol (Ramz) — a deeper form of the image, endowed with hidden and multilayered meaning.
- b. Symbolic figure (Timsol) — the embodied and enduring form of the symbol within a specific historical and cultural context, represented as a concrete image.

Throughout historical development, the concept of the symbolic figure (timsol) has evolved from the system of ancient mythological and religious signs, through the dominance of the symbol-emblem paradigm in medieval literature, to the modern and postmodern reinterpretations of the image-symbol-emblem sequence. For example, in Alisher Navoi's “Lison ut-Tayr”, the nightingale (bulbul) is portrayed as an ordinary bird; however, it functions as a symbol of love, devotion, and melodious beauty. The bird's vivid and concrete depiction elevates it to the level of a symbolic figure (timsol). This demonstrates that, for an image to become a timsol, the following conditions must be met:

1. The image must be concrete and perceptible (visually or descriptively represented).
2. It must convey a symbolic meaning.

Can every image become a symbol? No. An image is a depiction created in an artwork or speech — something that can be seen, imagined, or felt.

A symbol, on the other hand, is a form in which a particular image conveys a figurative or hidden meaning. Therefore, a simple descriptive image (for example, “the blue sky,” “the green tree”) is not a symbol, since it does not necessarily carry a deeper meaning. In literature, for an image to become symbolic, there must be an abstract or generalized idea behind it. An image becomes a symbol when it represents a defined, coded abstract concept. A symbol becomes an emblem when it takes on a visually concrete and culturally stable form. For instance, Navoi’s comparison of the heart to a garden and love to a nightingale expresses emotional states through imagery this is not a scientific concept, but a thought perceived through artistic visualization. In Cho’lpon’s poetry, images such as “cloud,” “darkness,” and “dawn” convey social and spiritual transformation — this represents thinking through imagery.

So imagine artistic thinking, which is different than scientific thinking, thinking through imagery, always in images. Therefore, the most concrete quality of the art is the imagination the quality that separates it from another type of understanding. Imagery is a combination of feeling and thought, idea and idea, into a single aesthetic whole. Within a literary image there are rational (intellectual) and emotional layers of meaning. This is the rational layer; the concept, the idea or the meaning embedded in the image. For example, the image of a “bird” may symbolize freedom or liberation. The emotional layer, however, means that the image not only conveys thought but also evokes feeling. When we imagine a bird, we do not merely understand freedom we feel it. Aesthetic imagery unites both layers: it compels us not only to think but also to feel. In Navoi’s poetry, the image of the “flower” expresses the idea of love and beauty (rational layer) while simultaneously awakening tender emotions (emotional layer) in the reader’s heart. For example, the image of the “dawn” in Cho’lpon’s works symbolizes social change (ratio) and expresses the joy of hope (pathos). And so the whole strength of the artistic image comes from its blending of thought and feeling, acting to both mind and heart at once.

4. Conclusion

This review focuses on the notion of image, symbol and emblem as key components of art thinking through its evolutionary history and its meanings as an aesthetic as well as philosophical concept in the context of literary arts and arts in general. Results indicate that the image is a basic building block for the artistic image as an emotional response and perception of reality; the symbol intensifies the interpretation of this image by supplying hidden meanings; and the emblem further fixes and stabilizes these meanings through concrete representations. This triadic progression adds semantic layers to a piece, illuminating the complex relationship between aesthetic perception and cultural codes. Written for literary and art studies, the implications of this study are wider in offering a more precise methodological framework for interpreting works of art in terms of image, symbol, and emblem. In future works, these premises could be applied to non-literature arts and, therefore, Expanded form/discipline could add a neutral understanding of universal relevance to art making and responding. Comparative works across cultural traditions would also help us from a different angle to gather our information on how these units function under different literary traditions.

REFERENCES

- [1] L. I. Timofeev, *Osnovy teorii literatury*, Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1971, pp. 62-63.
- [2] D. Qur'onov, Z. Mamajonov, and M. Sheraliyeva, *Adabiyotshunoslik lug'ati*, Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2010, p.161.
- [3] D. Kh. Hamroeva, "Obraz, timsol va ramz," *Uzbek tili va adabiyoti*, no. 4, pp. 72-75, 2008.

-
- [4] G. W. F. Hegel, "San'atning maqsadi," *Sharq yulduzi*, no. 2, pp. 119–126, 2011.
- [5] I. Ten, *Filosofiya iskusstva*, ed. A. M. Mikishi and P. S. Gurevich, Moscow: Respublika, 1996, p. 351.
- [6] B. Akramov, *Olamning butunligi. Lirikada obraz muammosi*, Tashkent: Adabiyot va san'at, 1989, p. 145.
- [7] G. Bobobekova, "Lirik kechinma va po'etik obraz munosabati," *Sharq yulduzi*, no. 4, pp. 157–160, 2014.
- [8] Kh. Karim, *Tarixiy shaxs va badiiy obraz*, Tashkent: Yangi asr avlodi, 2006, p. 105.
- [9] O. Karimov, *Abdulla Oripov she'riyatida metaforik obrazlar*, Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2014, p. 297.
- [10] N. Yuldoshev, *Cholpon she'riyatida inson va tabiat talqini*, Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2016, p. 95.
- [11] A. Rasulov, "Adabiy xarakter," in *Badiiylik – bezavol yangilik*, Tashkent: Sharq, 2007, pp. 6–27.
- [12] B. I. Sarimsokov, *Badiiylik asoslari va mezonlari*, Tashkent, 2004, pp. 4–78.
- [13] S. Quronov, *Egiz san'atlar*, Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2018, p. 114.
- [14] T. Boboev, *Adabiyotshunoslik asoslari*, Tashkent: Uzbekistan, 2002, p. 41.
- [15] D. Quronov, *Adabiyot nazariyasi asoslari*, Tashkent: Akademnashr, 2018, p. 440.