

## **CONSIDERATIONS UPON THE METAPHOR AND THE ANALOGY IN THE ROMANIAN SYMBOLIST POETRY**

**Andreea-Iuliana DAMIAN\***

***Abstract:** The abundance of metaphors and analogies in the symbolistic poetry is closely related to the desire for intellectualization and idealization of the lyric, that the symbolistic movement was promoting. This new concept was adopted differently according to the will and the resources of each poet, making the usage of these figures of speech a factor of individualization.*

***Keywords:** symbolism, metaphor, analogy.*

A strict delimitation between the analogy and the metaphor was always a matter of debate. Many studies before came with the idea that the metaphor is an independent figure of speech, not being able to mix with the analogy because the modern rhetoric proved that most analogies can not be turned into metaphors, having their own meaning and style.

But this should not be seen as a break between the two figures of speech, mainly due to the fact that there have been observed many similarities: G. Genette describes the metaphor as a consequence of a process that happens while turning proper facts into figurative speech, so the metaphor is explained as being a result of many comparative transformations.

But rhetoric had already pointed out that the analogy is not a primitive metaphor, but that it should be seen a secondary process of the a syntagmatic development, because the analogy had developed along with the metaphor and not emerging one from the other, so being observed two different figures of speech: one semantically marked and the other one not marked.

In the symbolist writings can be observed an abundance of metaphors, many of them are part of the “in absentia” metaphors, in which the comparison is lacking leaving room for poetical interpretation according to the reader`s appreciation.

The symbolist metaphor is considered to be very complex considering that all possibilities of rendering the implied term are available: the term having a correspondence in the factual reality, or having a correspondence in the connotative speech, or both terms belong to the connotative sphere creating a more ambiguous atmosphere.

The pre-symbolist lyric emphasized the metaphor as following a strict pattern that was based on a logical deduction of assuming a compared term in an unity of two terms, lacking the comparative expressed relation. From a desire of improving the lyrical speech and going beyond the past limits, the Romanian symbolist poets use the analogy in order to create diversity and to avoid the fixed forms from the previous epoch.

The Romanian symbolist poetry is very rich in analogies and metaphors, because in many situations the analogies become the nucleus of the poetical idea, turning the lyrical speech into an intellectual poetry that can not be perceived by all types of readers.

---

\* University of Pitești, [damiandreea@yahoo.com](mailto:damiandreea@yahoo.com)

The analogy consisting in an association of two terms in which one of them is an abstract term and the other one is a tangible term is met in the poetry of Ion Minulescu, Ștefan Petică or Dimitrie Anghel: “În țara mea, tot cerul pare o pată/ De sânge, scurs din rana unui soare./ Ce-abia-și deschide ochii-n zări; și moare/ Ca cei mușcați de o gură-nveninată” (I. Minulescu- *Sonet*)

It is likely that the use of this kind of analogy should have been influenced by Baudelaire's poetry, which was admired and studied by Romanian symbolist poets: “It is not improbable that the relatively big frequency of this type of analogy it has been consolidated on Romanian ground by the prestige which the Baudelarian poetry had among our symbolists, some of them even being translators for his works” (DudaG., 2002, 77)

The association of the metaphorical terms taking part in the analogy is different for each poet, despite the fact that the analogy follows a pattern imposed by the semantic sphere of each element: the compared coming from a connotative semantic area, and the comparative emerging from a denotative area. The link between these terms of an analogy is a varied matter since each reader can find different possibilities to according their feelings and a previous knowledge of the matter.

According to the same kind of relation, the poetry is accepted different because of the metaphorical link between the terms of the analogy, so in the same way the semantic identification instead of clearing the meaning of the words it increases the metaphorical ambiguity that arises from the association of the terms: “E vocea ta/ E vocea tăcerii ce cuprinde/ Întreaga balustradă a naltului balcon./ Ca și o funerară făclie ce s-aprinde/ În mâna unui Rege/ Și-n preajma unui Tron.” (I. Minulescu *Romanta morții*).

The term “funerară făclie” has an odd position regarding the other two terms: “vocea” and “tăcerii”, and this situation creates a metaphorical ambiguity leaving the metaphor opened for interpretation and by this interpretation the metaphorical meaning is extended to the reappraisal of each lector, leading to the enhancement of the symbolic significance.

In Minulescu's poetry there is a preference for the metaphorical analogy, while in the poetry of Dimitrie Anghel and Ștefan Petică the elements of the analogies are more easily to spot by their denotative implication of meaning.

The main idea of the Romanian symbolism was based on the existence of symbols by investing the metaphors with a symbolical status and by creating musicality through the association of words: “Paznicul mi-a-nchis cavoul/ Și-am rămas afară-n ploaie.../ Paznicul mi-anchis cavoul/ Și-am rămas să-mi plimb scheletul/ Pe sub sălciile ude./ Ce mă cheamă și se-ndoaie/ Să-mi sărute golul negru ce-mi plutește în orbite./ Să-mi sărute alba frunte/ Fruntea ce-mi știa secretul/ Aiurărilor trăite/ Și să-mi șteragă de pe oase picăturile de ploaie.” (I. Minulescu *Romanta mortului*)

Another type of analogy is the analogy lacking a term, which was a feature of the French symbolism, but in the lyrical of our country these analogies are a clue of modernity, going beyond the limitation of the boundaries imposed by the traditional poetry.

Lacking the medium term of an analogy is making it hard to be assimilated as an analogy and not as a metaphor, but it is used by many Romanian symbolist poets: “Și sărutările-ți aprinse înseamnă-le pe obrazu-mi pal./ Înseamnă-le la rând, să-mi steie pe veci de pază./ Neclintite./ Ca păsările legendare pe malul lacului Stymfal!...” (I. Minulescu)

*Romanșă fără muzică*); “Serbare zgomotoasă/ Ca-n bălci. Decor banal/ O boltă luminoasă/ Scăldată-n aur pal” (Șt. Petică *Cântecul toamnei*); “Ca o biserică miroasă seninul cucerit o clipă,/ Dar de se trezesc în umbră crinii, vărsându-și boarea lor profană/ Văzduhu-i greu cât n-ar fi în stare vâslind să-l taie o aripă,/ Un trandafir murind se farmă pătând curpînsul ca o rană” (D. Anghel *După ploaie*).

The relationship between the terms of the analogy can sometimes be assumed by the frequent association of their semantic values. These situations are firstly related to the romantic lyric, that has created bonds in the metaphors.

The modernity of the symbolism also comes to light by the innovative poetic techniques having in the centre the metaphor and the analogy. Leaving aside the traditional way, the symbolists believe in creating an analogy even without the existence of a factual inter-semantic relation.

In Minulescu’s poetry, most of the poet’s concern is focused on the verbal flow of the lyrical speech, not on the emphasize of each metaphor or analogy: “Ți-aduci aminte cum suna/ Ca-ntr-un ajun de sărbătoare?/ Suna ca-n zilele când moare/ Cineva!.../ Suna ca și-azi nencrezător/ În viitorul morților” (I. Minulescu *Celei învinse*)

While other symbolist poets take the analogy to the core of the poetry, recreating each of the poetic images portrayed by these figures of speech: “Afară plouă ca și toamna și-i urât/ Mă uit pe geam ca după tine. și atât/ În mine toate amintirile te-așteaptă/ De aceea mi-i privirea stranie și dreaptă/ Ca-ntr-un copil ce-a adormit plângând/ În mine nu mai este niciun gând” (D. Botez *Singurătate*)

Another element of modernity are the non-metaphorical analogies, in this way the analogies are sustained by supplementary explications, by the relations created among other textual elements that recreate the context: „A coalescent metaphor is reinforced, justified by the analogies that follow, and in this insistence of explanations, of contextual motivation, can be observed one of the features that distinguishes the romantic poetry from the modern poetry: elliptic, allusive expression...” ( Duda G., 2002, 83-84).

This analogy is a stage that precedes the modern metaphor and the metaphorical analogy, turning this figure of speech into a quite isolated type of analogy, but it has to be mentioned the fact that an abundance of these is mainly encountered in the Romanian poetry of XVII- century: “The absence of the metaphorical analogy is not an aesthetic mistake, but the symptom of a mentality belonging to an entire generation” (Zamfir M, 1976, 163).

Despite this approach to a poetry coming from the past, the symbolist non-metaphorical analogy is linked to the semantic relation of the terms, in a very different way than it happened in the pre-romantic poetry.

The step forward to modernism comes more from the structure of the analogy, and from the modern poetical techniques in creating it, than from the resemblance to a metaphor or the lyrical means of dissimulating an analogy into a metaphor.

Following the same pattern Minulescu’s poetry is full of analogies that do not seek to resemble to a metaphor or to become a complex figure of speech, for Minulescu the analogy is an instrument used in order to emphasize his poetical style.

Minulescu’s lyric makes use of oral discourse, it is always concerned of his tone and he tries to create a communication between the ideas of the poem and the reader, using the analogy as a form of dialogue: “Unde-i sfântul?/ Unde-i sfânta fără nume?/ Să ne spună,/

Pentru cine sună-ntr-una clopotele de trei ani?/ Cui trimitem noi atâtea lumânari/ Și-atâția bani?/ Unde-i sfânta iertătoare de păcate?/ Să ne spună.../ Și-nțreburile mulțimii răzvrătite/ Se ridică/ ca și valurile mării frământate de furtună,/ Și-n orașul cu trei sute de biserici/ Parcă pică din văzduh amenințarea:/ -Să ne spună...să ne spună” (I. Minulescu *În orașul cu trei sute de biserici*).

The analogies that can be seen in Minulescu’s poetry most of the time are very stupendous due to the association of terms that sometimes goes beyond the normal sphere of semantic relation which is a result of poet’s lyrical loquacious.

This distortion of the term to which it is compared it is a feature that comes from the baroque poetry, something that Ion Minulescu lifts to a level of awareness by involving the reader in his work and by assigning him the role of moderator: “a feature in which it can be seen the mark of an undeniable baroque character of Minulescu’s poetry” (Dimitriu D, 1984, 255).

The Minulescian analogy puts the compared and the compare into an odd relation by relating them to a derisory reality that takes the analogy to turning it into a mean of creating humour and along with this becoming a mundane figure of speech: „Mă-ntreb și nu pot să-mi răspund/ De ce-n credința mea m-afund/ Ca luna-n fundul unui lac,/ Când lacul nu-i decât minciuna/ Cu care ne-amăgește luna/ Și stelele, când se prefac/ În licurici/ Gângăanii mici/ Pe care noi/ Când încercăm, din lac, să-i prindem,/ Zadarnic mâinile ne-ntindem/ Că nu găsim în lac decât...noroi!...” (I. Minulescu *Rânduri pentru credința mea*).

The depreciation of the symbol „luna” by comparing it to the bottom of a lake full o mud, is an example of the Minulescian way of diminishing the compare, and associating it to a earthly element unlike other symbolist poets like D. Anghel or Șt. Petică, who seek to appreciate the compare term by placing it into valuable relations: “Furtună! Tu-mi întinzi o mână mică,/ Ți-e teamă și te ghemui lângă mine/ Sfioasă ca un pui de rândunică,/ Și ploaia, răpăind grăbită, vine./ Ți-e părul ud și fața toată udă,/ Alergi cu mâna caldă-n mâna mea./ Miroase câmpu-a grâu și-a iarbă crudă,/ Și tremuri și ești albă ca o stea.” (Șt. Petică *Furtuna*); “În orașu-n care plouă de trei ori pe săptămână/ Orășenii, pe trotuare,/ Merg ținându-se de mână,/ Și-n orașu-n care plouă de trei ori pe săptămână,/ De sub vechile umbrele, ce suspină/ Și se-ndoaie,/ Umede de-atâta ploaie,/ Orășenii pe trotuare/ Par păpuși automate, date jos din galantare.” (I. Minulescu *Acuarelă*).

Among his contemporaries Minulescu is the only one who takes great pleasure in altering the relation between the symbol and the correspondent by creating unexpected associations, by diminishing the impact of the figures of speech, by taking the metaphor to a level beyond the ordinary and by creating jocularity even in sad situations: “A murit dresorul de sticleți!.../ A murit dresorul, fericit/ Că sticleții lui/ Copiii nimănu/ L-au stimat și l-au iubit.../ Și că el a scos din ei/ O falangă minunată/ De maeștri cântăreți/ Nu țărcovnici mititei,/ Ca dresorii de-altădată!.../ Căci e drept că-n viață lucrul cel mai greu/ E să-și piardă omul vremea cu sticleții,/ Ca să pună la curent analfabeții/ Cu ce-a neglijat să-i pună Dumnezeu!...” (I. Minulescu *Moartea dresorului de sticleți*)

Considering all these distinctive features, Minulescu’s style is very modern one, taking the Romanian poetry one step forward to a next generation: “the Minulescian

poetical style leads to the baroque, by the common taste for ostentatious and for the surprise element” (Duda G, 2002, 91).

The adaptability of these two figures of speech: the metaphor and the analogy, makes them change their use and interpretation being able to become means of conveying feelings and emotions, but also being able to sustain and hold the center of gravity in each lyrical creation.

### ***Bibliography***

- Bote, L., *Simbolismul românesc*, Editura pentru Literatură, București, 1966.  
Călinescu, G., *Istoria literaturii române de la origini până în prezent*, Minerva, București, 1982.  
Coteanu, I., *Considerații asupra structurii stilistice a limbii*. în *Probleme de lingvistică generală, Vol. IV*, Editura Academiei, București, 1962.  
Davidescu, N., *Aspecte și direcții literare*, Minerva, București, 1975.  
Dănciulescu, S., *Poetica minulesciană*, Scrisul Românesc, Craiova, 1986.  
Densușianu, O., *Sufletul nou în poezie în Opere IV*, Minerva, București, 1981.  
Dimitriu, D., *Introducere în poezia lui Ion Minulescu*, Minerva, București, 1984.  
Duda, G., *Metafora în poezia românească simbolistă*, Eminescu, București, 2002.  
Henry, A., *Métonymie et métaphore*, Klincksiek, Paris, 1971.  
Lovinescu, E., *Istoria literaturii române contemporane*, Editura Minerva, București, 1981.  
Pop, I., *Avangarda în literatura română*, Minerva, București, 1990.  
Tomuș, M., *Cincisprezece poeți*, Editura pentru literatură, București, 1966  
Valerian, I., în interviurile *Chipuri din viața literară*, Minerva, București, 1970.  
Zamfir, M., *Retorica poeziei romantice românești*, în *Structuri tematice și retorico-stilistice în romantismul românesc. 1830-1870*, Editura Academiei RSR, București, 1976.