

LUMINIȚA CHIOREAN
Petru Maior University of Targu-Mures

**'The Political Bestiary'.
*The Level of Discursive Practices in the Opinion Editorial***

The contribution of our article entitled 'The Political Bestiary' consists in applying rhetoric notions to journalistic discourse – a controversial domain, especially in Romania, and mainly focused on the production of journalistic text rather than on deep analysis. The considerations regarding the discursive architecture as developed from Classical Rhetoric and discursive Ethos (applied to opinion-based journalistic discourse) - are all focused on the writing of Cristian Tudor Popescu and aim to maintain the interest for reading among the everyday individual. The extra-discursive Ethos gives value to the fame and authority of this critical voice of Romanian media. As a leader of opinion, he influences the reading and offers an ideatic plan to his own opinion on the events.

Preliminaries

Included in the paradigm of communication sciences as the science of managing the word, a specialized annex of literature, journalism is defined as the "creative activity in the written, spoken and audio-visual press, through which professional pressmen, correspondents and contributors make possible the act of communicating with the public in different styles and manners, messengers of the immediate present (reality)." (Vișinescu, 2002:152-154) The pragmatism of the publicistic styles (Vișinescu, 2002:132) is verified through the concrete communication of the event, defined both as immediate present (reality) and as interest for reading (Preda, 2006:27-29).

The taxonomy of the journalistic discourse inventories various discourse types (Jean-Michel Adam in Preda, 2002:62-83) like: the narrative discourse, focused on the story, the narration, the fabulation, epic constructed sequentially; descriptive acts (topographic, chronographic, posographic, portraistic, ethopic, variants of description, apud Fontanier); the explanation, manifested through analytic and/or synthetic acts; the argumentation reflected through persuasive acts with the characteristic persuasion techniques (discursive anaphor, metaphor, symbol, irony etc.); the injunction – discourse focused on the elocutive act (imperative discourse which contains warnings, recipes etc.); prediction – anticipative and prospective act; commissive acts (promises, threats) specific to orality, discourse which uses dialogue, monologue or soliloquy – a polyphonic construction; polemic discourse conserved at the level of the reactive act or of the sophisms – dissent, ascertainment.

Without being a caprice, setting as a goal to establish a friendship with the readers, the serious journalist convinces us that he constructs his discourse applying the strategy of reading the publicistic text in three steps: the attraction, the allurements and/or the lectorial stimulation (through the title, images, pagination, holding etc); the provocation or the maintenance of the interest for reading (through lead, attack, subheads etc.); and the reception of the discourse or the total reading. Starting from the current reading, we have observed that the journalistic discourse which convinces reflects the creative spirit of the journalist. In journalistic writing the one who gains respect and is recognized as an opinion

leader is the one who proves to be a spirit that cumulates as many communication virtues as possible, like: being a great narrator, but also a descriptive, analytic and/ or synthetic spirit; using a persuasive discourse; giving value judgements about the society he represents and having a discourse which also contains predictive acts; being a critical spirit that manifests through a natural behavior, oscillating between conviction, irony and aporia, excluding sophisms through viable and valid arguments in the socio-politic present reality of a collectivity. And last but not least, the polyphonic configuration of his contemporaries must be found in the journalist's Ethos.

1. *Why the political editorial signed by CTP?*

The editorial is the pillar and the conscience of the journal where it is published. The fields which are privileged in the editorial are interesting and actual: politics, society, economy, education, criminality. Editorials are samples of the journalistic idiosyncrasy: between humor, sarcasm and satire, parable and parody. The editorial is written by an experienced journalist or a recognized leader of opinion, who insists that, through his discourse, he can change the world. It conserves the opinion and the official attitude of the magazine where it is published, has socio-cultural functions, specific to the publicistic style (informative, persuasive or critical, educational-instructive functions). Finally, the definition is completed with Daniela Roventă-Frumușani's affirmation: "The mediatic discourse can be understood as a general discourse which mixes and focalizes the beliefs and knowledge about what was, is and should be, of course with stressing the present ("news", "now", "hic et nunc"), without the exclusion of memory and prospective. [...] Defined largely as 'enunciation' about the social reality (mediatic discourse) it is unmistakably a plural concept, characterized by diversity, polymorphism and ubiquity." (Roventă-Frumușani, 2005:120-121)

Preferring the 'inverted pyramid' technique, which consists in the summarized presentation of the information right in the introduction, followed by explanation, comments etc., the editorial is text organized in three parts: the introduction (*causa scribendi*) and/or the expository part or *naratio*; the explicative-argumentative part (narrative models propose either the gradual ascending order or the 'homerian' one) and the final-conclusive part (ending formulas: 'cliche' ending; figurative, emphatic ending; reformulated argumentative ending).

Why the political editorial? During an electoral campaign or the debate of an inflammatory subject, the opinion leaders are the 'critical voices' with the greatest resonance together with the ones of the political actors. Cristian Tudor Popescu (CTP), the author of the editorial group proposed for analysis, is an important opinion leader in the contemporary Romanian press, with a considerable experience in the field of political journalism. The option for such editorials, born in tense moments for the Romanian society – stage marked by the second round of the presidential elections between December 2009 and September 2010, the economic crisis – represents the optimal application in the rhetoric of the Romanian journalistic discourse. The variety and the signification of the metaphors represented an additional challenge for the interpretation of the article from a rhetorical perspective. More than this, the editorial analyzed offers an interesting reading on all levels: textual, discursive and socio-cultural, the influence of the Ethos in the orator-public relationship being obvious. The editorials analyzed carry a well-defined 'CTP' style included in the tendencies of the opinion journalism of the contemporary Romanian press.

2. Editorials under "the magnifying glass"

The political editorials signed by CTP between 2009(Dec) - 2010(Sept), published in the newspaper *Gândul*, have been the fundamental document of the research which has as a goal the analysis, the imposition of a 'CTP' style and the recognition of an opinion leader. Two representative groups of three discourses each have been selected from these editorials. The first group presents events from the election campaign (the second round of the presidential election in Romania in Dec. 2009): *With the Fist on the Bible/ The Right of the Last Night*¹ (4th Dec. 2009), *Vote with disinfection*² and *Iz ză seim picceăr*³ (7th Dec. 2009). The second group refers to representative discourses on the theme of the economic crisis: *Summer Is Not Like Winter* (3rd Aug. 2010), *Death Is Not Like Life* (8th Aug. 2010) and *Upside Down* (23rd Sept. 2010) The interpretation of the rethoric of the opinion editorial refers only to two texts: *With the Fist on the Bible/ The Right of the Last Night* and *Upside Down*, which have the imaginary in common announced from December 2009: a political maladive, consumed by fear and hatred

2.1. The Textual Level: The Confrontation

CTP's editorials are either pamphlets, or samples of essayistic discourse – publicistic essays (especially film chronicles). The explanation lays in the writing talent of the author of SF literature, essay (discourse between prose and journalism). It is obvious that CTP prefers the ironic discourse. The affirmation is verified through the essayistic simulation of the architecture of the political editorial which respects the rethoric of the classic discourse: *exordium, presentatio, naratio, confirmatio, refutatio* and *peroratio*. (Chiorean, 2006)

After an inferential *exordium* (frag.0/I): the confrontation of the potential candidates (actors A and B), the discourse *With the Fist on the Bible...* (I) starts *ex abrupto* through the subjective topic of the attitudinal attribute "terrible", which proposes the forceful entry of the first actant: actor A – presidential candidate (*presentatio* - frag. 1/I). But the euphoria of the moment is blown to pieces on the shocking discovery of a sum of "political (terribil)-ism" announced through the repetition of the 'deaf' ignorance, expressed through the phraseology "to turn a deaf ear" (frag.2, 3/I), paradox in behavior, inexplicable attitude in the *avant*-electoral context. The aggressive actant tone of the *presentatio* structures the rethoric of the presumption of guilt and compromise. It is the moment when the objective voice of the CTP journalist-narrator can be sensed, which describes the events and characters implied using persuasive elements – verbal and nonverbal language, evocations either with the presidential candidates (in *naration, confirmatio*), or through the widening of the political spectrum: actor C – the politicians (*refutatio* – frag. 8/I), a symptomatology of the political maladive.

In *conformatio* a few attitudinal models can be visible, models which are representative for the 'political bestiary'. In conflict with these behavioral-political samples the narration hypostases are relevant (frag. 3/I: the historical conscience; frag. 5/I: the Self conscience; frag. 7/I: the indignant and dissapointed Self), states/manifestations comprised in

¹ <http://www.gandul.info/opinii/cu-pumnul-pe-biblie-dreptul-ultimei-nopti-5155088>

² <http://www.gandul.info/puterea-gandului/vot-cu-dezinfectie-5158031>

³ <http://www.gandul.info/puterea-gandului/iz-za-seim-piccear-5161781>

the ethic code marked by the civic conscience (*peroratio* – frag. 9/I). The decision of the omniscient narrator: "I will vote" (frag. 9/I) is the line of the citizen who is confident in the democratic values of the society, his word against the "political terrorism".

The same rhetoric pattern is also conserved at the textual level of the article *Upside Down*(II). In the *exordium* the rhetoric of the present state of things: the narrator's revolt, which comes as an answer to the question regarding the interhuman relationship, asked by curious people (frag. 0/II). In *presentatio*, the narrator develops the concept of "vulgarity" as opposed to "human nobles" and the derived "vulgar" (frag. 1/II) – label of actor B, which provokes his disdain and disapproval (frag. 2/II), reality supported through the axiological pseudo-samples (the narrator's irritation and revolt is triggered by the state of "being vulgar with oneself" – frag. 2/II).

In the *naratio*, the narrator uses the same imaginary of the 'political bestiary', this time the attitudinal model being conserved at a linguistic level: 'basescian' becomes the metaphor of a strange behavior which manifests its disdain and ignorance towards education and culture (frag. 3, 4, 7/II – narrations which have an axiological subject: *homo valens* in actor B's opinion).

It is already known that in *conformatio* the reader comes across the voice of the narrator, whose discursive Ethos takes form through axiological conscience (frag.1/II: "vulgarity, in its first meaning of vileness" vs. "human nobles"); ethical conscience (frag. 2/II: "being vulgar with oneself"); sarcasm (frag. 5/II: "doesn't understand the meaning of the word vulgarity not even when it creates it"); revolted self (frag. 8/II: "I am keeping the outer signs of respect, [...] but I do not have the inner ones anymore").

In *refutatio*, the omnipresent narrator warns the reader about the infestation of the political imaginary with vulgarity (frag. 9/II: "Which does not mean that vulgarity is produce only by" actor B). More than this, the narrator's deontological conscience is disappointed by actor B: "The journalistic profession includes the pamphlet, while the one of the head of state does not" (frag. 6/II)

Peroratio reaches the peak with the luxury of hating belonging to a revolted and disappointed Self (frag. 10/II: "Romania is getting every day more vulgar..."). The same symptomatology of a political malady can be sensed here. Just like time would have standed still, the period between 2009 and 2010 has nothing new to offer the citizen who believes in democracy.

As a conclusion, the journalist respect the same rhetoric which, generally, conserves the parts of the classic discourse, even though the discursive Ethos dominates the text through the alternation of *naratio* and *confirmatio*: the narrated event, triggered by one or two actors, is analyzed each time by the narrator who views reality through his own 'magnifying glass'. Hence, the different manifestation of the discursive Ethos which gives solutions and contours the socio-political model of reference in the editorial.

It is possible for CTP's writing to evolve towards the journalistic essay and the soliloquy, as the reader can notice the journalist's option for paradox, sophisms and formal and conceptual aporia characteristic both to the political model and the cultural and civic ones as answers to the astonishment, speculation and aporias referring to the human being's position in society (here, in the Romanian society). For this, the argumentation through the interpretation of the editorial *Upside Down* is necessary, editorial which has the rhetorical

question as its discursive mechanism. Questions trigger the aporetic potential which will generate the model of a political malady which has as a consequence the inevitable 'luxury of hating'.

2.2. *The level of discursive practices: 'the political bestiary'*

The readers are the nominal audience, where there is the certainty of a real and exigent audience of the citizen, who is either disoriented, drifting, either traumatized by the laws given by the government. The orator transfers the state of the confused citizen without offering an answer. Both the imperative of voting ("I will vote" - I), and the certainty of the society's infestation with 'vulgarity' (II) are adequate attitudes both for the historical moment, and the publishing of the articles (December 2009 and September 2010). Both articles express the voice of a collectivity that is exigent with 'the nation's chosen leaders'.

The framing into style and category allows the presentation of some specific information regarding the language used. Luminița Roșca's affirmation: "The structure of the journalistic language is conditioned by the *reader* and the *context* where the communication takes place, the journalist-receiver relationship determining a code specific to journalism" (Roșca, 2004) is complementary to the rethoric perspective, where the audience (*the reader*) and the rethoric situation (*the context*) influences the structure of the discourse, and the orator-audience relationship implies the creation of a language of its own. At this level, the resistance trope is the poetic or non-poetic metaphor, *sine qua non* element of human communication which has a double purpose: it codes the message and facilitates the understanding of the alegoric imaginary of the 'political bestiary' proposed and supported by Cristian Tudor Popescu.

The political scene of 2009 (I) is resumed to a compromised imaginary characterized by anemias and strategies in order to obtain "the mediatic execution of the opponent". Consequently, the political grid generates characters recognized in the CTP discourse through the actants: A, B and C. Manifesting through 'terribilism' and other behavioral '-isms', the political weakness determined by power are ridiculed through actor A. The ostrich policy, characteristic to actor A, triggers fear and disorientation because the symbol of the 'ostrich' is a sign of recognizing both the mocking, and the reiteration of the communist behavior described gradually from "turning a deaf ear" (frag.1/I) to the stage of "pretending not to hear" (frag. 2/I), and culminating with the image of "ostrich G" (frag. 4/I), "autoprotective" tactic, which has, in fact, negative results: "with its head buried deep in sand and its butt raised towards the neons of the room, it awaits for the wind to stop blowing" (frag. 4/I).

The polysemy of the word "wind" ("element", "storm", "hurricane"; "to give somebody the push"= "to abandon", "to cast out") brings into discussion the friendship with S.O.V., key character conserving the political malady, mediator that will also bring actor B to the stage, the one who is attributed the metaphor of "political beast" (frag. 7/I)

In contrast to the metaphor of the ostrich with a sarcastic effect created visually, which evolves in the symbol of weakness and ridicule, "the political beast" brings forward the symbol of cunningness and (social) danger, image which will have as an effect

dissapproval, anger and even "the luxury of hating". The epithet "hideous on the inside" (frag. 7/I) together with the *in absentia* metaphor completes the narrator's revolt. Also in this case, the metaphor generates an unreliable ethical code for actor B (frag. 5, 7/I comprise relevant mini-narrations: the episodes with SOV, GO or "the moment of maximum thrill" of the oath "with the fist" on the *Bible* - in an electoral battle, the invocation of "the case of the sick child")

The metaphor of the "serpent-like mating" (frag. 8/I) generates the alusive semantic of compromise: unpredictable alliances and collaborations dictated by a politic full of party principles.

Without the persuasive function of the metaphor both in the sequential and global creation and perception of the text (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980), the audience would lack the interpretation of a unitary perspective. By accessing the argumentative function of the metaphor in the distinction and the qualification of the political characters, CTP signs the conformity of the political avatar at the level of the stage of enunciation through real links between the metaphor and the event, and also the actor. The offer of the political dimension/2009 (I) is overshadowed by stupidity, a political malady consumed between "fear and hatred"⁴: between "the right of the last night" – frustration and "anemia" – and "with the fist on the Bible" – "strategy" and power – intertexts in linguistic decal.

Although they are not taken into account as metaphors, there are two syntagmas which have a neological and sarcastic imprint: "illogical and grotesque jumble with shadows of horror" (frag. 4/I) and "sequence of political romance" (frag. 4/I). The neologisms of cinematographic art define the kinetic mechanism and the political cliché. The rhetoric of "terribilism", which focuses on the "political bestiary" (ostrich, beast, serpents), is supported through the metaphor of political pathology: money make the world go round, especially politics – allusion to the friendship with oligarchy, like "The Cruel Trinity" (decal), forgetting that "money is the root of all evil". Consequently, the meeting between actor A and the businessman S.O.V. is presented as film scenes, which mock the event described, transforming the audience into the public of a decaying film, in which the well-known actors act predictably and in a hilarious way: "an illogical and grotesque jumble" (frag. 4/ I), culminating with "the right of the last night" (frag. 6/I). The narration of "the sequence of political romance", where S.O.V. changes his discourse partner "into business", actor B, accentuates the contour of the metaphor of human decay (in "the pre-mogul phase of the basescian way of thinking" – frag. 5/I): "vileness, vulgarity opposed to the nobles of the human spirit".

The image of protagonists A and B is negatively influenced by the 'game' of interests, which disadvantages them both in front of the audience. As follows, the politics of the ostrich favours the interaction of the communist model ("everything we pretend doesn't exist does not exist" – frag. 3/I), and the politics of "the mediatic execution of the opponent" through elimination, the strategy of "the silver bullet" (frag. 4/I), is nothing but the new face of the 'guerrilla': the chasing of game (without taking into consideration that game can become hunter), action which is similar to the one of the community security. The dichotomy 'communists vs. security' will be mentioned again in the articles of 7th December 2009,

⁴ <http://www.gandul.info/puterea-gandului/iz-za-seim-piccear-5161781>

conclusioned through the equivoque of the states of "the fear of what tomorrow might bring" and 'the hatred' against the system. In order to support the 'tipsy' electorate, represented through the image of citizen Ionescu, allusion to I. L. Caragiale's characters, the narrator offers the solution in the end: "I will vote" (frag. 9/I) – the manifestation of the civic conscience.

The political scene of the year 2010 does not bring great surprises. Still, now the causes that have changed the mentality of a nation until it reached the level of "drunkenness of hatred" are explored. Mainly, the political system, which has an axiology leaves a lot to be desired, is accused: by using cataphora, the narrator takes into account the offer of vulgarity (actor A/ frag. 2/II) that comes from *homo valens* in 'the Basescian language' (frag. 3, 4, 5/II), language detested in a political leader (actor B).

That he is intrigued by the state reached by society, this world of paradox, this world 'turned upside down' (intertextual decal of the "world turned the other way round", used by I. Creangă), anger, disdain, unrest have also been expressed in the editorial "Summer is not like winter" (3rd Aug. 2010), proving that the reader is dealing with an authentic opinion leader that has credibility in front of the public opinion. This is how he presents the paradox of "the religious philosophy of the today's Romanian citizen", which has many followers: "Vulgar materialism in a nation who believes 95% in God? How this can be possible is explained by the French Blaise Pascal, who anticipated hundreds of years ago the religious philosophy of today's Romanian citizen: If I believe in God and God does not exist, I cannot lose much. If I do not believe in God and God exists, I am in trouble. So, I believe."

The editorial "Upside down" proposes another type of structure: it is a journalistic essay which has a subject that evolves based on reflection "To survive means to survive hatred" (Glucksmann, 2004, 2007). The aporetic potential strengthened through rhetorical questions develops 'hatred' as an effect of the political malady announced in 2009. Hatred is written in stages, gradually, from anger (frag. 1/II), as the first form of revolt, to despair, "*dolor* or self-mourning" (frag. 2/II), anger, "*furor* or mourning the others" (frag. 3, 4, 5, 6), to disdain (frag. 7, 8) and reaching to the aversion towards a system, „*nefas* or universal mourning" (Glucksmann, 2004, 2007)

2.3. *The level of socio-cultural practices:*

"The limits of my language mean the limits of my world" (Wittgenstein)

The journalistic style pleads for an imaginary based on metamorphosis, discursive strategy which persuades the public-reader. The journalistic metaphor is proposed and used as political semantics (specialized communication) by the narrative authority of an opinion leader, whose articles, pamphlets and essays impose a style, as in CTP's case.

All editorials signed by CTP impose a 'CTP style', recognized in Vişinescu's opinion as: "The stylistic individuality (which) appears with full reliefs when the talented journalist uses the methods of narrative art – portraits, for example – which he creates through *transfERIC stylistics*. Common words become word-play, epithets, comparisons and personification are subordinated to a logic which is ment to cancel appearances and bring the essence and the pure truth into light." (Vişinescu, 2002:141)

The journalistic discourse usually conserves superlative, hyperbolic metaphors, 'definition'- metaphors or paraphrases, which bring their contribution in argumentation, tropes generated by semantic spheres, like: the univers of today's life; the disagreeable and the ridicule. Journalists also use contrastive, oxymoronic (the association from different semantic fields) metaphors; negative, interrogative and euphemistic metaphors (Mancaş, 1991:237-249). From "the grammar of metaphor" there should also be mentioned the metaphors of expression: the nominal metaphor (explicit/implicit), frequently found in CTP's editorial; the verbal metaphor (which has a role in annihilating the differences between the semantic areas of the [Concrete] and the [Abstract]; the adjectival metaphor (or the metaphoric epithet); the metaphoric chain or the 'trailed' metaphor (Mancaş, 1991:206-214). Depending on their presence in context, metaphors can be explained, argued or discussed – *in praesentia* methapors – or only named, without receiving appositional constructs: *in absentia* metaphors; both types are successfully used in the Romanian editorial (also in CTP's case).

Through its trichotomous structure, the metaphor is: a trope, a discursive-referential strategy and a suggestive and argumentative method, persuasive in the understanding of the textual meaning, no matter its nature (artistic, scientific, journalistic etc.). More than this, the metaphor is a component of daily language, characteristic confirmed by the theory of discourse. (Roventă-Frumușani, 2000:118)

In journalism, metaphors are all the more important so as the editorial is the reference object of a mass communication⁵. More than this, the editorial belongs to the opinion, formative-interpretative publicistic genre, which may use figures of speech, unlike the informative genre. This is why the use of metaphors in sending a message of general interest to an appreciable audience, which thinks in metaphors, without being aware of this, can favour the its receipt and internalisation. Also, the metaphor can contribute to creating a contextual understanding, the orator having the possibility to (re)formulate the context through this rethorical figure. The journalistic style also signals the use of metonymy, created either based on a rapport of contiguity (of substitution of a name with another, with which it has in common some particularities), either by manifesting itself as a whole-part relationship (as synecdoche). In the case of these tropes (metaphor and metonymy), the poetic language is characterized by parallel series: the metaphoric serie and the metonymic serie. The serie of metonymic figures consists in: the synecdoche, the antonomasia, the catachresis, the synecdochic comparison, tropes which function based on the same technical principle: the motivated semantically substitution.

In the sphere of figures of reasoning, the metaphoric series generate the symbol and/or the allegory (Corbett and Connors, 1991:396). For example: for the allegory of the political 'bestiary', CTP prefers the metaphors: ostrich, beast, serpents. Depending on the feedback of the receiver-reader, metaphors can create symbols (the ostrich; fear vs. hatred), the metonymic symbol (for example: the political maladive). It should be remebered that CTP frequently uses cultural symbols (biblical and christian; mythological and bookish) which he inserts in the discourse through a 'disparaging' decal ("The Cruel Trinity" from "The Holy Trinity"; decal and antithesis with connotations for "the first night" through the feudal code or "the last night of love" from Camil Petrescu's prose etc.), but also inovations in the sphere

⁵ <http://ebooks.unibuc.ro/filologie/dindelegan/36.pdf>

of the symbols of 'adversity', of 'deceiving appearances', of repression (n.n.), figurative language created by the apories which flood the text (symbols of hatred and revolt, in other editorials signed by CTP).

But beyond the stylistic purpose of the metaphors specific to the 'CTP style' and the contribution to the contextual understanding, it is important that they also have a phatic function, in the sense that: "the message mostly intends to fix, to extend communication or to suspend it, in order to verify the circuit and the quality of the receipt." (Panaitescu, 1994:79) Consequently, in the phatic function, the accent is on the channel. In this case the focus is on an article, published in a newspaper which is both printed and online, so that the shape and content of the discourse cannot be distorted or jammed. More than this, being a written communication, available for large numbers of people thanks to the internet, persons from the audience who are interested to read it again can do it easily. Still, it can be said that metaphors also have the purpose of keeping the audience excited, which, in damage to argumentation, is frequently fascinated by the stylistic register.

Having a persuasive discourse, CTP stresses a few defining characteristics for the two political actors, which aim at the human dimension, just as the orator himself says: "there will be made a choice, first of all, between the characters of two people, between their ways of being, between their moral cores" (frag. 8), the political dimension being overshadowed. The orator's intention is to determine a change in the election behavior of the audience, encouraged to participate to the presidential elections even if it lack a viable candidature, in order to demonstrate that the civic and democratic spirits are superior to the 'political bestiary'.

The implicit discursive Ethos finds its resource in the rethorical person, constructed, in this case, by style (ample sentences, figures of reasoning like the metaphor or the symbol, the allegory, the oxymoron etc. which define the 'CTP style'). As it has been observed, the description of actors A and B, in the first article, without being favorable to any of them, supports the final affirmation, which represents the goal of the persuasive effort. The use of the Ethos works as a persuasive technique of the discourse (Aristotle, 2004), the author adapting the discourse depending on the audience and the occasion (Aristotle, 2004:263) – which implies a previous knowledge of the latter two, but also of what was communicated before, as Bahtin points out (Aristotle, 2004:274). The expressed discursive Ethos consists in reminding the audience of the past moments when the orator had an edifying role in the political conflict ("Until when can I say I, because I have not forgotten about the time when I was the only voice criticizing Mr. B.(...)" – frag. 5/I) and has the purpose of making the orator more legitimate. The red wire of the discourse structured mainly on the rethoric function of metaphors is monopolized by the orator, who manifests his historical conscience ("I cannot stop remembering" – frag. 3/I), his self conscience ("can I say I" – frag. 5/I), and the right to decide his own fate ("I will vote" – frag. 9/I) – the civic conscience. The editorial "Upside Down" (II) comes with new meanings of the journalistic conscience: axiological (frag.1/II), ethical (frag. 2/II), sarcastic (frag. 5/II), of revolt, "the luxury of hating" (frag. 8, 10/II), the deontological conscience (frag. 6/II).

The extra-discursive Ethos fructifies Cristian Tudor Popescu's journalistic notoriety and experience. The audience has previous knowledge about the orator, whom they

recognize as an important critical voice on political subjects in the Romanian media and as a notable presence in the electoral campaigns of the last 20 years. Ethos, as image of the auctorial self, consists in the use of credibility by the author of the discourse, achieved in time, for achieving the goals of the discourse. If the situation is favorable for the author, the audience will believe his words. But how can the author of discourse become credible? The answer is given by Aristotle: credibility consists in displaying a practical intelligence (*phronesis*), good faith and virtue. In fact, the aristotelic Ethos consist in the trichotomy: *phronesis* or prudence; *arete* or virtue; *eunoia* or goodwill.

In Dominique Maingueneau's opinion, Ethos is implied in the enunciation stage which represents and supports the image of the auctorial self, an Ethos, in the sense of the enunciator's positive image (Maingueneau, 2007). From here: the Ethos consists in the socio-discursive notion implied in an interactive process of influencing the other and is perceived as a secondary plan of enunciation, being complementary of an prediscursive Ethos. The prediscursive Ethos refers to the image given by the receiver about the sender before the latter manifests, taking into consideration the fact that any writer (essayist, journalist) is a public character and that the belonging to a certain discourse implies a certain horizon of expectation. The extradiscursive Ethos includes everything that refers to the journalistic self, and the implications should be rational and not emotional.

A completion of the prediscursive Ethos is brought by 'incorporation', that is the reader's (addressee) way of adopting the Ethos, as it is known that the *Ethos* is linked to a *habitus*. Through Ethos, the reader takes on an identity that is somewhat 'embodied' and filled with historical values (Maingueneau, 2007:235-257). Referring to identity folding, the spectacular is represented by the receiving part: the reader.

The receiver-lector's halving can become unique through consecutive halvings which can happen from a virtual reader to a reader – model belonging to the dramatic genre, doubled by a virtual spectator liable to cross over into an authentic (advised) spectator; from here, he may be found in a director that can often easily become a dramatic author, isolated in his character played by an actor on the stage. This is a process for what will be called hiperprotection. The duplicitous path is not always linear, as it can also be characterized by 'leaps', by ignoring some of the masks. Halving as a result of duplicity is nothing but a "play of masks" (Zumthor), and the reiteration of the enunciation scenes represent hiperprotection itself or the temporal legitimacy of the piece of work. In the study of political discourse, the Ethos refers to the power of conviction of a discourse based on the orator's status, on his recognized qualities, on his image, recongnized by public opinion.

Conclusions

The observations regarding the discursive architecture tributary to classic rethoric and regarding the discursive Ethos (with a case study on the opinion journalistic discourse – the editorial) have had as a main goal keeping up the interest for reading of the reader active in everyday life: possible introduction for a poetics of the journalistic reading.

Even if it may be thought that the present study is focused more on the journalistic dimension of the political editorial, the author's intention has been to keep a balance between the two fields and to underline the rethoric dimension, which could not be valued without being linked to the stylistic register specific to the journalistic discourse.

Although the number of rhetorical figures is narrow, the option has been to stress the metaphors that have an essential role in the discursive construction and their correlation with the other figures of reasoning.

This article's contribution consists in applying the notions of rhetorics to the journalistic discourse – a controversial field, mostly in Romania, focused more on the production of the journalistic text than on a profound analysis. If during electoral campaigns, both the electors and the journalists' attention is focused on the candidates' discourses, through this process, the present study has tried to underline the more profound layers of the discourse which accompanies the political.

The editorial represents the journalistic discourse characterized by the dominance of free indirect style, not only reproductive, but also reflexive, the crossing to essay and soliloquy being natural. The latter is a discourse of the orator's solitude who, using ethical irony, reports reality, the event, to his own behavioral models, situation that explains the themes chosen by the journalist: revolt; delirium of existence; disgust and ridiculous; even the crossing from trauma to drama, isolation (soliloquy). The study has proved that the persuasive potential of the metaphor expressed through intertext, under the sign of irony and sarcasm or through linguistic decal, processes the sociopolitical realities into a critical imaginary.

The extradiscursive Ethos develops the notoriety and authority of the critical voice in the media (e.g. in Romanian media: Cristian Tudor Popescu, Lelia Munteanu – *Gândul*; Cornel Nistorescu - *Cotidianul*; Mircea Toma - *Academia Cațavencu* etc.). In CTP's case, it can be noticed the holding and the insertion of the essay in the media discourse, the obsession of the characterological metaphor which implies human typology, but also the noomorphic metaphor – the one of structuring the poetic thought (*Poeziar*): "I've always been a man of his word. And of imaginary, but image always comes afterwards, it is born out of the word. I say death and only then I see in black and white..." (CTP – *Cuvinte rare. Poeziar*); the affective implication in the orator-reader relationship.

The opinion leader influences the receiver's reading and/or offers an ideatic plan to the launch of his own opinions regarding the events he evokes and interprets. The opinion journalistic discourse verifies its value through the reader's critical voice (comments, interpellations – on CTP's editorials in *Gândul* - printed and online daily paper).

ANNEX

<p>I. <i>With the fist on the Bible/ The Right of the Last Night</i> by Cristian Tudor Popescu, 4th Dec. 2009⁶</p>	<p>II. <i>Upside Down</i> by Cristian Tudor Popescu, 23rd Sept. 2010⁷</p>
<p>0. Inferences in confrontation ... (Exordium)</p>	<p>0. "After all, why can you get along with B.?" I was asked this question by presidential intellectuals, when we still used to talk. It is the type of question that, if the interlocutor doesn't know how to answer, doesn't deserve to be answered, mostly when we are talking about someone who sees himself as an intellectual. (Exordium)</p>
<p>A Ss 1. Terrible in MG was the method which can be named, using an old Romanian idiom, of 'turning a deaf ear' (Presentatio A)</p>	<p>A 1. Vulgarity, in the primary sense of vileness, is the main factor of blockage in the undersigned's relationship with people. I've talked to stupid, intelligent, crazy, poor and wealthy people, to geniuses, whores and thieves. I can say that vulgarity can be found in every social and human category. There are people who can curse, talk illiterately, who frequently prove their inculture and, still, without being vulgar. As there are also some people who even by saying a simple yes or a no or by being silent can be vulgar. Vulgarity means the strong accent on the lowest part of the human being, on what is linked to the guts, sex, instincts, brute force and cruelty. It also means disdain for the opposite of vileness, human nobless. (Presentatio G & Confirmatio)</p>
<p>2. Every time he was in difficulty – "What is the name of the institute?", "What markets have fallen in exports?" – Mr. G tried to ignore the questions repeatedly asked by Mr. B., pretending not to hear them, while millions of people could. (Presentatio B)</p>	<p>B. 2. Mr. B. is maybe the most vulgar person I have ever met on such a high level of the social scale. I have come to this conclusion not starting from obscene public statements "I have small years, but I have something else</p>

⁶ <http://www.gandul.info/puterea-gandului/cu-pumnul-pe-biblie-dreptul-ultimei-nopti-5155088>

⁷ <http://www.gandul.info/puterea-gandului/cu-susul-in-jos-7409994>

	<p>that is bigger”, "Năstase makes love with his butt”, "20% of the Romanians are gay”, not from outbreaks like 'stinky gipsy', 'assholes' and many others, which I won't mention, but from the ascertainment that Mr. B. is vulgar not only towards others, in the public space, but also with himself, in his very conscience. (Presentatio P & Confirmatio)</p>
<p>3. I cannot stop remembering the almost religious faith of Ceausescu's party "everything we pretend does not exist, does not exist." (Confirmatio)</p>	<p>3. Do you remember how Mr. B. defines value in politics? "He has a politician's stomach", he used to say about his former acolyte Mr. Gușă. Stomach. Not mind, not brain, not vocation, not qualities. What about the relationship with the U.S., based on the preferable organ of suction of the Big Fire Fly? These are the fundamental values in Mr. B.'s political way of thinking. But in his little soul, in his nature that he exhibits in "poetic moments", like the one of reciting his own poem dedicated to his deceased mother when she was more alive than ever, one of the most horrible kitsch created inside a human being. (Naratio)</p>
<p>4. This was also the core of the K.O. suffered by Mr. G. in the moment of the "silver bullet" (the way Mr. B. calls the hits ment to publicly terminate his opponent). For dozens of seconds, Mr. B. kept telling him "Did you like your last night's meeting with S.O.V.?", and the ostrich G., with his head deeply buried under the sand and with his butt raised towards the neons of the room, was waiting for the wind to stop blowing. The rest is just an illogical and grotesque jumble, with shadows of horror: the second man in the state, who could also be the first one in three days, goes to visit Mr. S.O.V. the night before a decisive political confrontation, to justify himself for calling S.O.V. "malicious and turbulent" in a newspaper! To this, citizen S.O.V. says that M. G., his secret friend in the last 4 years, visited him 'to relax'! This is followed by a scene that seems taken from a</p>	<p>4. When he tells students to search for herodot on Google or states that he is reading Cărtărescu's book <i>The Levant</i> and then, after 4 years, the same book, T. B. (who must have stopped reading Cărtărescu since the latter called him to be finished) expresses, in fact, his sincere disdain towards culture. "We need auto tinsmiths and waiters, not phylosophers" means, in basescian, that he could not care less for educated people, who know foreign languages, and even Romanian, who have common sense, good taste, tact, fineness and decency. For him, they are some jerk-offs, who have no cojones, another organ of the basescian phylosophy. Andrei Pleșu would be the most qualified to say a few things about this, but he will not do it because he has not a pinch of his former boss' vulgarity, who now claims that V. P. "licked the door mat in my office in 2008" and that he had once written</p>

<p>political romance: S.O.V. and B. meet in the parking lot in Tâncăbești, whispering hidden from Năstase's security - the beginning of another beautiful friendship which would have materialized into the discreet support of Mr. B. by S. O. V. in 2004 and which lasted up to "a certain point". (Naratio)</p>	<p>Crin A. on the parliamentary list in Bucharest. (Naratio)</p>
<p>5. I can say up to what point, as I have not forgotten the time when I was the only voice in Romania that criticized B. on Realitatea TV. Neither have I forgotten B.'s stubbornness when he refused on the same TV channel to call Mr. S.O.V. together with Mr. P. and Mr. Voic. 'oligarchs' (pre-mogul phase in the basescian way of thinking), so that he can make the Cruel Trinity today. At the undersigned's live insistence, he made an 'imperial' concession: "Ok, Mr. Popescu, for you, I will call him a financial oligarch, as he is not involved in politics!" (Confrontatio)</p>	<p>5. In fact, Mr. B. does not understand the meaning of vulgarity not even when he produces it. How could he otherwise say, in the same discourse, "I regret the Dinescu and the Cristian Tudor Popescu before they became vulgar" and, about V. P., "he has the figure of an immature person, he is impudent, behaves like a monkey"? (Confrontatio)</p>
<p>6. After this bewildering scenes, what else can citizen Ionescu understand but the fact that Romanian presidents get to Cotroceni only by respecting the condition of a beautiful friendship with Mr. S.O.V.? That in the Middle Age the lord had the 'right of the first night', meaning that he had the right to take the virginity of his serf's wife, and that now, Mr. S.O.V. has used on Mr. G. 'the right of the last night'? (Refutatio)</p>	<p>6. Some will criticise the fact that I also use vulgar expressions in the texts referring to Mr. B. and other politicians. It is not the same thing. I only use strong words when the subject needs that. I will not find this kind of things in my texts about cinema and tennis. In particular, I will say it again, I profoundly loath vulgarity. Among my feminine preferences there have never been goddesses of vulgarity like E. Udrea and R. Anastase. The journalistic profession includes the pamphlet, while the one of head of state does not. The prestige of the presidential function is affected in a negative way with each of Mr. B.'s 'outburst' – he will never understand this. (Refutatio)</p>
<p>B 7. In T.B.'s case, the moment of maximum thrill was not determined, in my case, by the qualities attributed without batting an eyelash by Mr. President to Gen. Gabriel Oprea - in 2004, "the thief of thieves", "the head of the Năstase mafia", in</p>	<p>7. Once, Mr. B. publicly declared me his favourite newsman. Back then, I wrote in favour of his position, which I considered to be correct, in the conflict from the Democratic Convention and I declared him, when almost everyone stopped believing, the winner in his</p>

<p>2009, minister of Interuir in the Negoiaș government, nor the swindle uttered with the hand on the Bible, "Do you swear that you did not hit the child Bogdan Istrățoiu?" "I swear I did not punch him in the plexus, nor in his face" to cover the truth which comes to light on the spot: the candidate B. hit the child with the back of his hand, as it can be seen on the video that he said to be "edited on the computer", but the invocation made in a TV show of electoral confrontation, where there are given points just as in boxing, of the case of a child with leukemia that his mother, second name, first name, home town, cannot look after because they are poor. This kind of things are to be solved quietly if you are really a person, but if you are a hideous political beast on the inside you have to squeeze out electoral tears using a child's suffering. That's right, Mr. B. does not punch children. (Naratio & Confirmatio)</p>	<p>confrontation with his opponent from PSD, S. Oprescu, when they ran for Mayor of the capital city. (Narratio)</p> <p>8. I did not use to write differently than I do today, when Mr. B. has discovered me as being vulgar and has announced that he does not give me the outer signs of respect. I am keeping the outer signs of respect towards him for the very improbable case that we shall ever meet again, but I do not have the inner ones anymore. (Confirmatio)</p>
C	C
<p>8. The political, economic and social programmes of the two candidates have moved into a distant plan after the TV show on Thursday evening. On Sunday, there will be made a choice, first of all, between the characters of two people, their ways of being, their moral cores on the background of the coverlid raised of a corner of the Romanian politics, making visible the underground serpent-like mating. (Refutatio)</p>	<p>9. This does not mean that vulgarity is produced only by Mr. B. V. Ponta's reaction of announcing the launch of the T.B.'s suspension soon after he was called 'licker of door mats' and 'little monkey' is sordid. One should not answer these personal insults with such strong means that affect the entire state. (Refutatio)</p>
<p>9. <u>I will vote</u> (Peroratio)</p>	<p>10. No matter how alarming and degrading is what T. B. does, it is a comfortable illusion to think that he is the one who infests Romania with vulgarity. <u>The day by day more vulgar Romania</u> is the one that gave birth and raised Mr. president. (Peroratio)</p>

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Aristotel. *Retorica*. Bucharest: IRI, 2004.
- Chiorean, Lumiņa. *Arhitectura eseului poetic stănescian*. Târgu-Mureș: 'Petru Maior' University Publishing House, 2006.
- Corbett, Edward P.J., and J. Robert Connors. *Classical Rhetoric for the Modern Student*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Coșeriu, Eugen. "Omul și limbajul său". *Cronica*, XXVII, nr. 7, 1-5 IV, 1992, 6-7.
- Irimia, Dumitru. *Introducere în stilistică*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 1999.
- Foucault, Michel. *L'ordre du discours*. Paris: Editons Gallimard, 1971.
- Glucksmann, André. *Discursul urii*. Bucharest: Humanitas Publishing House, 2004, 2007.
- Kapferer, Jean-Noël. *Căile persuasiunii: modul de influențare a comportamentelor prin mass media și publicitate*. Bucharest: Comunicare.ro Publishing House, 1980, 2002.
- Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1980.
- Larson, Charles U. *Persuasiunea. Receptare și responsabilitate*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 2001, 2003.
- Maingueneau, Dominique. *Discursul literar*. Iași: Institutul European Publishing House, 2004, 2007.
- Maingueneau, Dominique. *Pragmatique pour le discours littéraire*. Paris: Edition Armand Colin, 2005.
- Mancaș, Mihaela. *Limbajul artistic românesc*. Bucharest: Ed. Științifică, 1991.
- Panaiteșcu, Valentin (coord.). *Terminologie poetică și retorică*. Iași: "Al.I. Cuza" University Publishing House, 1994.
- Preda, Sorin. *Tehnici de redactare în presa scrisă*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 2006.
- Randall, David. *Jurnalul Universal. Ghid practic pentru presa scrisă*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 2000, 2007.
- Roșca, Lumiņa. *Producția textului jurnalistic*. Iași: Polirom Publishing House, 2004.
- Rovența-Frumușani, Daniela. *Argumentarea – modele și strategii*. Bucharest: All Publishing House, 2000.
- Rovența-Frumușani, Daniela. *Analiza discursului. Ipoteze și ipostaze*. Bucharest: Tritonic Publishing House, 2005.
- Ricœur, Paul. *Metafora vie*. Bucharest: Univers Publishing House, 1975, 1984.
- Vișinescu, Victor. *Jurnalism contemporan*. Bucharest: Victor Publishing House, 2002.
- Zafiu, Rodica. *Diversitate stilistică în româna actuală*. Bucharest: University of Bucharest Publishing House, 2001.