*Mariana Tocia*[1]

# RHETORICAL PRACTICE IN MEDIA, INFLUENCES AND POLITICAL STRATEGIES IN THE ARCHITECTURE OF JOURNALISTIC DISCOURSE

Abstract: *The journalistic discourse is a rhetorical practice in which we observe elements of classic rhetoric, according to the thinking of Plato, Aristotle, Cicero, Quintilian, as well as modern elements of the 19th and 20th century, according to the thinking of the new language philosophers: Jacques Moeschler, Anne Reboul, M. Meyer, M. Foulcault, Umberto Eco, A. Jaworski and N. Coupland, etc. In the journalistic discourse, we assist to a rhetorical construction*[2] *by means of language, due to the descriptive technique. The resort to ration is focused upon the mass-media product*[3] *and upon the atmosphere technique: the resort to emotion, pathos, the construction of political symbolics in order to obtain non-rationed reactions. The journalistic rhetoric dominates the reader by conveying emotions as well as arguments across several types of discourse, sometimes even opposed in colloquial, informative terms – official, pamphleteer (of opinion, with the related stylistic procedures: irony, sarcasm).Our theoretical demonstration is accompanied by applications in Constanta's local media, through examples from publications on different political perspectives: Cuget Liber, Ziua de Constanţa, Independentul and Telegraf.*

Key words: *journalistic discourse, rhetoric, pathos, logos, ethos, technical and extra-technical arguments.*

## Discourse power through *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos*

The selected times, 1996-2000-2004-2007, mark the process in which the state property, the subordination of social and political life in the post-communist age are gradually replaced by liberal democracy and market economy. The transition from post-communism to democracy is most striking between 1996 and 2000, when the media targets the political values of liberal democracy, while simultaneously publishing according to their own political agenda, as bad publicity towards opposing political parties.

In 1996, PDSR loses both parliamentary and presidential elections to CDR and E. Constantinescu. Selections from Cuget Liber (October 1996) reflect positively on the speech of candidate E. Constantinescu.

In 2000, PSD (former PDSR) wins the elections in Romania, and Ion Iliescu returns as president due to a political alliance between PSD and PUR. *The Independent* paints a rhetorical picture of the social-democrats election victory (December 2000).

In the election year 2004, Traian Basescu wins the presidential poll with the support of D.A. alliance (PD and PNL), against PSD. *Ziua de Constanța* supports the new political class` campaign and takes an offensive speech against social-democrats and the Nastase government.

Selected articles from the 19th of May 2007 make reference to an intense conflict between PSD and PD, the dismissal of president Traian Basescu. Over 70% of the voters voted against the

[1] Ovidius Univesity of Constanţa, Romania.
[2] Political rhetoric, through the power of assurance, excitement and training.
[3] The political character is a mass-media product.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

president`s dismissal, and *Cuget Liber* defends PD`s policy by stating : "The Romanians have said NO to high corruption", the fight against corruption being the tool that won the 2004 elections for PD.

Any pragmatic analysis, such as the one that we present herein, also involves the analysis of rhetorical procedures, since pragmatics, as well as rhetoric, stakes on the same language related approaches. Both approaches *"are based upon communicatively intended notions of the issuer and effect over the receiver."*[4].

The perspective of researcher M. Meyer depicts the power of discourse, where the ethical disposition of the speaker has a persuasive power:

"*...when discourse is pronounced in such a manner that the speaker inspires trust: because we'd rather trust the good people….than those who lack precision…where doubt is embedded"*[5].

The trust in words (*logos*) must arise from the entire discourse. Thus, the context is the one offering trust in the "word's" power. On one side, the word must host arguments and grounded rations, so that the listener reacts or believes certain things. On the other side, the speakers choose a much wider vision when it comes to the word: the presence of figures of speech or the seduction of words through passage of the literal sense to the metaphoric sense. The figurative speech, seducing, although it opposes the argumentative rhetoric, can be much more persuasive.

M. Meyer, the best follower of Ch. Perelman, in the new direction of modern rhetoric, proposes a synoptic picture in which he synthesizes the instruments of rhetoric: *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos*, according to Plato's, Aristotle's and Cicero's perspective:

| | *Ethos* | *Logos* | *Pathos* |
|---|---|---|---|
| Plato | Intent | Sophistic (ambiguous) | Manipulation |
| Aristotle | Expertise | Ration | Passion |
| Cicero | Ration | Eloquence and figures | Conviction |

Plato accuses the rhetoricians (especially sophists) that they favor the *pathos*, Aristitle pays special attention to *logos*, and Cicero prefers the *ethos*. Plato's vision presents the rhetorician's intent to delude the audience, to create misunderstandings and ambiguities. Thus, *ethos* is intent, and *pathos* manipulation. According to Plato's perspective, the rhetoric is a wordplay in which truth is manipulated, the same as in propagandistic or advertising speech.

For Aristotle, the speech is defined as the language of ration. The *ethos* represents the expertise of the speaker in a search of good or bad causes. "The passion" is the one that affects the audience related judgment.

For Cicero, the *ethos* is the most important aspect in the essence of a discourse since it represents the speaker's virtues (social or moral). In order to convince the audience, the speaker resorts to eloquence and figures of speech („*ars bine dicendi*"). *Pathos* is the definition of conviction, according to Ciceronian vision.

M. Meyer asserts that within a written or oral communication, the communicators have in common the interest for a certain issue or aspect, which stands for the grounds of discourse. The protagonists confront themselves, they are in complicity or they negotiate a certain issue. The researcher's perspective over rhetoric is represented by negotiation between participants:

"*...the advantage of such a pure definition renders equality between the speaker (ethos), audience (pathos) and language (logos) by means of which they convey questions and answers"*[6].

If we apply such theories in the corpus that we have selected, we shall observe that the point of view expressed by the speaker (politician or journalist) and his/hr values stand for *ethos*. The *pathos* reunites emotions, convictions, pleasures, and the *logos* is connected to ration and style.

[4] According to Liliana Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, 1999, p. 30.
[5] M. Meyer, 2008, p. 15.
[6] Iidem.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

If the rhetoric is the negotiation of distance between individuals, we must linger over the notion of "distance between communicators". When the distance is increased, the communicators are indifferent or not interested. It is the case of verbal automatisms, when the speaker is not interested by the other speaker. We notice in the media texts that the power of a political discourse increases when the distance between communicators decreases or when the speaker is interested in the discourse's effect over the other speaker:

*"A real problem of a rhetorical relation is the difference between individuals in terms of the issue they have to challenge*"[7].

When it comes to political rhetoric, researcher M. Meyer asserts that it is classified in the field of powerful social distances. The individuals do not know themselves and they are representatives of different communities negotiating their interests. We notice that in the media discourse, by means of political communication, the social and psychological distance between individuals is modified according to social and political interests. The hereinabove quoted theories describe a political space that drifts towards the *pathos* related space, where the propagandistic seduction of discourse is the one that prevails.

In the media texts we meet the applauding type, which is also familiar to journalists, as well as to politicians. The purposes of the issuer boasting or blaming are, according to Aristotle, the virtue (*"justice, courage, temperance, magnificence……generosity, kindness, wisdom)* or the vice *("immoderacy……stinginess……..pettiness")*, the high-spirit or everything that is *discreditable*[8].

Cicero says that *"everything in connection to virtue"* must be praised. The facts are exposed with the intent of striking a cord in the receivers and less with the intent of consolidating conviction. The ration of such a discourse is based on the audience's pleasure and delectation. The discourse uses *"the flamboyant style and certain words' brightness in order to enchant the receiver*"[9].

When he refers to laudatory discourse, Quintilian says that the issuer *"sometimes thinks that he/she proves"* and that *"certain laudatory discourses seem real means of defense"* or justifications.

The praise involves beauty and amplification of words through emphasis on respect, power, facts committed by doers. Thus, a new concept sees the light in the written media, which is the mythization of different political characters, who become heroes:

"*...nevertheless, we must retain that the auditors prefer those actions of which we can assert that the hero committed himself....or that he committed facts that exceeded our hopes or expectation; or that the fact was to others' interest and not to his own interest*"[10].

Obviously, noble words and facts, courageous attitudes, moral examples, etc, are eulogized.

The blame occurs in case of advantages, vices, malefaction related examples of unjustified luxury *("in the ancient Roman times, luxury would have meant a great crime").*

Through discourse, mass-media modern events *are capable to convert the representations' way of being itself*[11]. The political myths embed popular myths through which the political issuer resorts to human values, charged with emotions, such as: life, family, religion.[12] The political symbolics is rebuilt by means of the following:

- The religious myth of the wise: (1) *"...we do not have any money; thus, we have something that cannot be sold nor bought: the faith that we serve the Christian interests"* (C.L., 28.10.1996);

[7] M. Meyer, 2008, p. 23.

[8] Aristotle, *Retorica*, I, 1366 b. Aristotle, who was born in Stagira, lays the foundation of "character" building, which is a rhetorical-literary species that shall make a long career in the universal culture. In the present case, we are interested in the fact that the author of the message, that is the journalist, gives the readers the impression of his probity, creating condescension and predisposition in order to manipulate them.

[9] Cicero, *Arta oratoriei*, IV, 2, 1, 72. The specialized treaties insist a lot over the *flamboyant style*, which affects the senses of receivers, rather than the ration, by lexical, morpho-syntactic and stylistic means. Nevertheless, from the principle point of view, this is not the case of local media.

[10] Quintilian, *Arta oratorică*, III, 7, 16.

[11] Michel Foucault, 1996, p. 278.

[12] Rodica Zafiu, 2001, p. 35.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

- The myth of the good leader: (2) *"....we have the power to rebuild a country and we shall bring the reconciliation of an entire nation"* (C.L., 28.10.1996);
- The myth of hero and warrior: (3) *"...we replied with our weapons to those that attacked us"*[13] (C.L., 28.10.1996).

These myths refer to values coming from the ancient rhetoric and they interweave around the modern eloquence[14]*, everybody use, more or less consciously, the models of Greek-Latin Antiquity*[15].

In the politician's discourse, we can observe, in the local media, *insinuatio*[16] from *exordium,* by which the rhetorician's sympathy is gained:

(4) *"I address to you, all friends of mine, who were supporting me for 4 years, not only by thanking you for your exemplary solidarity…."* (C.L., 28. 10.1996).

The style related valorization completes the opinion-based discourse, which transforms the political field into a virtual, figurative one. The seductive rhetoric reveals, through language, an unconscious type of persuasion. Thus, the rhetoric of journalistic discourse manipulates the truth.

Michel Meyer admits the following: "*there is a rhetoric of unconsciousness".* In addition, the researcher asserts that in a rational or emotional communication, the sub-text has a great role:

"*Everything that matters is the figurativeness, the suggested implicit, the codification, much more than eloquence or sensitive passion games that once formed the central part of rhetoric*"[17].

In terms of the subjectivity and affectivity in the journalistic language, we can notice the observations of researcher Rodica Zafiu:

"*It is not the subjectivity that has to be blamed in the contemporary journalistic discourse, but the affectivity – in forms varying from rudimentary extremisms up to obsessions, hopes and disillusions discretely formulated by means of the most subtle theatrical strategies*". [18]

The surplus of affectivity in media discourse, through eulogy or blame, is independent of the subjective discourse. The issuer may be subjective or personal in the opinion types (*"the re-emergence of an ego that speaks within well-determined communication conditions, in a given context and on a real recipient*"[19]), yet on non-emotional opinions that do not have to go off the real context. The excess of clichéd adjectives, which is specific to popular media, amplify and distort the real context, as we notice from the hereinafter-mentioned texts:

(5) "*This is the reason for which we must advise on a permanent basis with BNS representatives, because, most of the times,* ***the electors are much more intelligent than those elected***." (Z.C., 22.11.2004).

The reader may be delighted by the eulogy brought to electors by P.R.M. candidate to the Romanian Parliament. By means of the superior comparative of the adjective "intelligent" and by means of eulogy, politician Mocănescu adopts the strategy of attracting the electorate on P.R.M. side.

(6) "*In such position that I am now I shall do my best to remove this madness from the Romanian country because w****e don't have any right to mortgage the future of our grandchildren*** *just because any* ***dodger*** *from the Parliament wishes so."* (Z.C., 22.11.2004).

---

[13] It is about the electoral discourse of E. Constantinescu, made during the presidential elections in 2004.
[14] The art of speaking well, the science and art of speaking in public, of communicating.
[15] P. Gh. Bârlea, 2004, p. 12. Since the ancient Greeks, Demosthenes, Isocrates, Eschine, until nowadays, the discourse architecture is built according to the political doctrine adopted by each political group.
[16] Structures of Ciceronian discourse.
[17] Michel Meyer, 2008, p. 17.
[18] Rodica Zafiu, 2001, pp. 43-44.
[19] Iidem.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

The same candidate to the Romanian Parliament moves the reader, by resorting to politicians' responsibility in front of the electorate and in front of the future generations, as well as by blaming the members of parliament. The politician assigns to electors the role of victims, and to other politicians – opponents – the archetype of the astute, through the adjective "dodger".

The arguments of the political character are coagulated under the sign of pathos and imperative:

(7) "*You have to convince the undecided that it is only us possessing the key that locks the poverty and humiliation gate, tell them about the extraordinary moments of solidarity, about the way we knew to share our bit of hope, like brothers. The same we shall also succeed in bringing Romania to the Promised Land, since we have the key that can make a better life for all."* (C.L., October 1996).

On one side, the political character embodies the liberator's myth, by the symbol element – the key, which raises the discourse in a mythic or virtual dimension, the one pertaining to the Promised Land. We have arguments based upon virtual facts (through the excess of stylistic procedures). On the other side, the political character has a discourse expressed by ethos, an authoritarian discourse[20], showing that it is only him that can lead the electorate to success.

The inter-speech relation of rhetoric is expressed by the three rhetorical dimensions: *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos*. Michel Meyer asserts that the pathos' role is inversely proportional to factual and logical arguments:

"*The more conflict there is, the more the discourse is affected by pathos. The more the discourse diminishes the questioning aspects, the more it expresses the solving of the norm through positive laws*"[21].

In our corpus, we identify example texts in which the conflictual political relation lays under the sign of *pathos*. We can also observe the presence of *ethos* when the politician resorts to moral authority:

(8) *"For 15 years, Romania was led by unscrupulous people, who don't' believe in God, becoming the mockery ground of all tramps. The time has come to send them away with a flea in their ear.*"(C.L., 6-7.11.2004);

(9) *"I shall be that politician who shall have no inhibition and who shall break this system. We are not entitled to tolerate anymore such a system that tries to consolidate itself. It must be cleaned without hatred, without revenge, but one thing is for sure: it must be cleaned."* (C.L., 6-7.11.2004).

The political discourse is an indirect call to the electors. Through evocation of "God", the politician resorts to the rulers' faith and morality. The political issuer makes use of *pathos* when he suggests conflict or insurgence as settlement of the problems identified during economic or politic crisis. The expressions such as "*to send them away with a flea in their ear", "break this system", "it must be cleaned,"* means verbal violence instigating to physical violence. We assist to an ideological political discourse aiming to touch the public up to extreme limit, the one of triggering violent breakaways.

According to Michel Meyer's theories, the political discourse encounters a reversed issue:

"*The more the problem is expressly specified, the more the political discourse is literally solved. The less open the problem is, the more it is subject to an ideological discourse pretending to solve everything. Eventually, politics represents the discourse of political people and the entire emphasis shall be put on ethos, personalization and the politic*"[22].

[20] The ethos: the rhetorician's authority by means of maturity and chance (technical evidence).
[21] M. Meyer, 2008, p. 262.
[22] M. Meyer, 2008, p. 263.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

M. Meyer asserts the following:

1. the ideological discourse has answers to all questions;
2. any problem or matter finds its answer in the ideological discourse;
3. any opposite answer would not do anything else but confirming the ideology, which is always right.

In the texts studied, we observe that the ideological discourse is completed by the *ethos* and that it asserts the moral authority of the political and administrative leader. Thus, through discourse, the politician indicates that he feels responsible in front of the electorate.

Modern theoreticians assert that the linguistic change, as a means of communication, is settled within a symbolic relation of power between a producer and a consumer[23]. The power related relation is being transformed into a negotiation subject, and the media consumer falls a prey to different influences of metadiscourse. Here are a few examples from our corpus:

(10) *The Romanians said NO to the great corruption*[24] (C.L. 21.05.2007).

(11) *Traian Băsescu shouted ...the indignation of all against the dirty games*[25] *from the Government and Parliament"* (C.L. 21.05.2007).

The text of the article is subjective by the verdictive, rhetorical, persuasive and deliberative adverb *NO*. It is about the political deliberation and about the action over the auditors' mind, which is also reminded by Aristotle:

"*The speaker must not only take care of the discourse, be demonstrative and compelling, but he must also present himself in a certain manner and also render the audience a certain disposition"*[26].

The issuer of the journalistic text accuses of corruption the political group that wanted to dismiss the president. The democratic political discourse is a discourse of his interest, of the *"scope": "the customs, laws and interests, because people, relating themselves to this purpose, make a choice*"[27].

Thus, by the stake of word, a single voice is recreated (discourse of complicity between the president and his electorate) against the Government and Parliament. An area of interference or complementarity occurs between the linguistic shape and the message conveyed through discourse, but also between the political field and the journalistic one. The discursive apparatus opens the apparatus that seizes *dirty games*, in the idea of transparency when it comes to the political and journalistic scene.

The following sequences were chosen as an illustrative text, including the fact of "proving".

(12) "*President Traian Băsescu has already given a very clear signal regarding the promotion of a new political class made of young people who confirmed through their activity, and here I would remind the following persons: Emil Boc, Liviu Negoiţă, Anca Boagiu, Roberta Anastase, Liviu Nistoran, Cozmin Guşă, Lavinia Şandru*..." (Z.C., 25.11.2004).

The political discourse demonstrates, through the enumeration of young politicians, a new political perspective of the candidate to the presidency: the employment of a valuable generation in the political fight. The noun "signal", accompanied by the absolute superlative "very clear" are deictic for the new political perspectives. In addition, the relatively great number of names invoked increases the superlative value of the enouncement. The discursive argumentation is based on technical evidence. The adverb "already" fortifies and finalizes the political undertaking.

---

[23] A. Jaworski and N. Coupland, 2002, p. 502. It is about the economic exchange, reminded by Pierre Bourdieu, between an issuer and a receiver.

[24] The topic of the article is the referendum of 19.05.2007, when 79% of Constanta inhabitants said "no" to demission of the president.

[25] The metaphor, according to DŞL, is defined, starting from Aristotle (*Retorica*) and Quintilian, as a *shortened comparison* and it is included in the first treaties of modern rhetoric between the *tropes through resemblance*.

[26] Aristotle, *Retorica*, II, 1, 20-23 (1377 b).

[27] Ibidem, I, 9, 5-6.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

(13) "*The social-democrats conceived election posters that, instead of promoting their own candidates, intend to denigrate and calumniate the counter-candidates at the general elections. The main arteries of the city were packed by countless denigrating posters at the address of the liberals….CNA requested, in addition, the interdiction to broadcast two negative spots pertaining to PSD + PUR National Union…"* (Z.C., 6-7.11.2004).

The extra-technical evidence is expressed by the following nouns: "election posters" and "negative spots", since they were created by the social – democrats and not by the liberals, issuers of the political discourse. They are denigrating for the liberals, and they stand for signs of calumny and negative advertising. We appreciate the discursive argumentation from the realistic perspective to which the issuer refers. The arguments are based on real and genuine facts.

The journalistic type of opinion allows a free expression of the political perspective, but in accordance with the political orientation of the local newspaper. The insinuation that Adrian Nastase Government was a corrupt one is the opinion of the journalist, who mocks the left-wing politics by means of the relative superlative "the greatest success". According to the polyphonic theory of irony[28], the journalist creates an ironical announcement, in which the point of view belongs to the political character, from whom the journalist keeps the distance. The journalist is responsible for the announcement, but the politician is liable for the point of view expressed in the discourse.

Through the adverb "*indeed*", the intent is to convey the political truth, according to the editorial politics. Judging from the prism of the pragmatic analysis, the reader finds out that the editorial politics of the newspaper "*Ziua de Constanţa*" includes as favorite the right-wing politics. The argument supporting the opinion refers to the corrupt legislative system, where the laws *"apply according to the interests of certain individuals"*. The conclusion is typically electoral, persuasive, prospective and mystic: "*the law shall be the same for everyone, and its application shall be mandatory"*. Here we have a type of instigating peroration, in which we surprise elements of classic rhetoric[29] that we adapt to nowadays' rhetoric: the desire to make the auditor favorable for a certain political group and unfavorable for the other political group; the political actions are amplified, and the reader finds himself/herself in an emotional disposition.

Practically, the decomposition into component parts of the hereinabove mentioned fragment confirms the general application of Aristotle's theories. The entire construction from the opinion related article confirms the following ideas:

"*The method personal to rhetoric art is founded on proofs and the proof is a certain type of demonstration….The issuer's role is not to convince, but to see for each issue the means that we dispose in order to convince"*[30].

In speeches or discourses, we recognize signs of cognizance or deciphering, but also signs of authority, by means of which the issuer intends to be believed[31]. In the local media, the theory is materialized as follows:

(14) "*The action of the prefect, Mr. Dănuţ Culeţu, represents the greatest abuse that a prefect has ever made….Such an action can only be made to make baffles, to harm"* (T., 31.05.2006);

(15) "*The prefect's approach is absolutely legal…The final conclusion was that the prefect is entitled, according to Law 340, to attack such actions issued by the County Council……I would ask Mr. Constantinescu not to issue value judgment before the findings of the justice* (C.L., 31.05.2006).

[28] Jacques Moeschler, Anne Reboul, 1999, p. 309.
[29] Cf. Aristotle, *Retorica*, III, 19, 10-13, 1419 b: "*The peroration is made of four elements: the fact of disposing the auditor as favorable for himself and the opponent as unfavorable, then the fact of amplifying, respectively of diminishing, as well as the fact of convincing the auditor towards passions".*
[30] Ibidem, I, 1, 4-5, 1355 a; I, 1, 9-10, 1355 b.
[31] Conflict occurs, as informative value, regarding the demonstration of truth.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

The relative superlative "the greatest abuse", accompanied by the verbs "to make baffles" or "to harm" are signs of public fulmination, which convey from discursive-textual point of view the insinuation for the political activity of Mr. D. Culetu. "Telegraf" newspaper hosts controversy discourses or opposition discourses for the liberal political groups.

The following article, an extract from *Cuget Liber* newspaper, presents a logical and reasoned discourse: *"The prefect's demarche is absolutely legal…pursuant to Law 340*", which discharges the political referent accused in "Telegraf". *Cuget Liber* newspaper intercepts an approach angle that supports the liberals' politics. The expression "I would ask"[32] is a politeness formula operating in oral rhetorical language and constitutes an example of hyper-codification. The approach related diversity of the actions of political parties is a double sign: journalists' freedom to express themselves and politicization of local publications.

The politicians' judgments follow the expositive type (situation related analysis), the instructive type (it gives an impetus to action) and the argumentative type. Again, the theories of classic rhetoric hold firmly across millenniums:

*"The eulogy, on one side, and the reprehension, on the other side, both of them are specific to the demonstrative type"*[33].

We are dealing here with the deliberative type, based upon the audience's conviction or dissuasion, but we can also discover elements of the epideictic type identified by means of public reprehension. In all cases, we need premises that support the demonstrative discourses and the judicial actions (pursuant to Law 340).

Thus, the journalistic discourse from the opinion related media represents a synthesis of types and species pertaining to classical rhetoric. We must mention that the modern rhetoric itself, irrespective of its means of manifestation (parliamentary, diplomatic, electoral or written discourses), resorts to the mixture of types. In fact, even from ancient times, the deliberative (political) pleas made use of arguments extracted from legislation or tradition, which means that a purely deliberative, juridical, epidictic elocutionary type can never be possible. The articles published in the local media, as well as those published in the central media, operate more and more transparently with such a game of perspectives, given the ephemeral character of the journalistic production, the speed of events that needs to be reflected in mass-media.

The appellation justifies its primordial role, the one of capturing the speaker's attention, of preparing the speaker to get involved in the oral interaction, but in written media, it also represents an indirect form to present the person interviewed.

The deliberative type of discourse is issued from extra-technical evidence, by means of examples – induction, based on real facts, or technical evidence – by the opinions of the media communicator:

(16) "*The publication of CURS opinion related barometer has caused a shock on the media political market. The opinion leaders and analysts cannot believe that Steaua financer mounted the third position in the trust related top, by a percentage of 31%, after Traian Băsescu (52%), Mona Muscă (40%), but before C. Vadim Tudor (28%), while PNG, by 6% of the electors' preferences, endangers UDMR role of jolly-joker in the equation of power*". (C.L., 6.05.2006).

In the present text, the argumentative indices or the extra-technical evidence are the following: "*CURS opinion related barometer",* percentages "*31%*", "*52%*", "*40%*", "*28%*", "*6%*". The issuer communicates the reader a reasoned informative discourse and the results of an authorized opinion survey. The arguments based on examples sustain the thesis according to which "*Steaua financer mounted the third position in the trust related top"*. The metaphor "*role of jolly-joker"* is a rhetorical figure of argumentation and it resorts to the reader's emotional state. The metaphor is not only used as a stylistic decoration, but it also has an argumentative function.

[32] According to Umberto Eco, this type of ready-made expression belonged to *elocutio*. Cf. Umberto Eco, 2008, p. 392.

[33] "*Sometimes it is the support, other times the reprehension that characterizes the deliberation; for those people that deliberate for a particular purpose and those that address a speech for a common purpose, make use of one or another*". Cf. Aristotle, 2004, p. 103.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

In the following journalistic texts (legends), we shall identify a type of argumentation based on virtual facts and on the authority of the iconic sign[34] that the legend accompanies.

Although the legend does not belong to the political authority, but to the journalist's authority, the rhetorical strategy is often used in electioneering. At first sight, the reader does not know that the legend's text belong to the journalist (it appears in the newspaper in Italics and it induces the illusion of a quotation given by the politician), and in consequence, he/she is influenced by the political message. The technique is usual in the political publicity and the effect is to confirm:

(17) "*Give me Yorik's head and I shall change the status!"*(I., 15.12.2000);

(18) "*I shall throw the skin for four years, but when I shall come back, you shall feel my nooks!"* (I.,18.12.2000);

(19) "*And now do I really have to accomplish everything that I had proposed to you?*" (I., 15.12.2000);

(20) "*I have filled the internals with people as Garcea, so I can convert the supporters of the Peasant's Party, Christians into democrats*" (I., 4.12.2000);

(21) "*Look, Emil, so that you cannot blame that Santa Claus did not come this year! Take your slippers and run so that I shall not be obliged to call the SPP to follow you!*" (I., 23-24.12.2000);

(22) "*I am telling to you! The Democrat Party celebrates Christmas the entire year!*" (I., 23-24.12.2000).

In general, such kind of announcement is enough for the newspaper readers to realize the deciphering of caricatures, of the graphic images present on the pages of the related publications. Thus, the argument is based on a first level of coordination between the political image and the verbal enouncements. However, the verbal enouncements embed, in certain cases, a second system of significance. Thus, in the second part of the example (18), he/she uses a paraphrase from the notorious threat extracted from "Alexandru Lăpuşneanu" novel written by Costache Negruzzi:

"If I wake up, I shall also ordain many of you!"

*Versus*

"...but when I come back, you shall feel my nooks!"

Obviously, the journalist recedes from the high style in favor of the quotidian style, even suburban, by resorting to expressions of powerful influence. The other angles that compose the legends of the images from daily magazines quoted by us use in abundance both expressions from this field of Romanian language, as well as allusions to characters from the older or recent folklore: "*people as Garcea", "Santa Claus came to you", "celebrates Christmas the entire year"*, etc. By the allusive information they contain, such collocations form implicit arguments, operating with arguments of the subtext, insinuation and persuasion.

Conclusion:

Research, from the rhetorical perspective of the political language, follows its influential power over the public, by intermediation of media. The result of the political influence or manipulation of truth triggers a confuse language, dominated by *pathos*. If we built a pyramid of rhetoric from the following elements: *logos*, *ethos* and *pathos*, we would choose *pathos* at the bottom of the pyramid or of the power of conviction, according to Cicero. The journalistic discourse is complementary to such a theory, in which *pathos* is the element dominating the reality. *Ethos*, according to Aristotle and Cicero, defines the ration of the journalist or politician, and it represents their virtues. As we have seen, virtues have a lot to suffer in the local media. Another convincing role, according to the classical approach applied in media discourse, is *logos*, by the persuasive power of the figures of speech. *Ethos* implies credibility, by the morality of the public communication pertaining to the point of views expressed by the journalist or politician, *logos* shows the intelligibility through the correctness of language, ration and style, and *pathos* indicates the political discourse's persuasion, through the emotional attributes connected to emotions and conviction.

According to researcher M. Meyer, we observe that the rhetoric means negotiation between participants: between the speaker, audience and language. We identify in the media text a relation of political negotiation, complicity or conflict between politicians and journalists. In addition, we observe

[34] The media photographs that accompany the texts, completing images and legends.

BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press
Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)

that the power of political discourse is greater when the distance between the communicators decreases or when the speaker is interested in the effect of his/her speech over the other speaker. The social and psychological distance between communicators is modified according to the interests of the editorial politics.

The effects of the journalistic discourse are connected to composition related strategies of the discourse: the first part of the discourse draws the attention by means of a demonstration (eulogy or reprehension from the exordium) and it incites the speaker, with the intent of gaining his/her support. According to classical typology, we observe that journalists and politicians often use the insinuating exordium. In addition, the political communicators use reprehension or eulogy in presenting the events in their narration, resorting to public sensibility.

The conflictual intent of attack pertaining to politicians and journalists is materialized in media discourse through public reprehension. Both politicians, as well as journalists adopt a polemic, negativist discourse, invective against political opponents, often resorting to metaphors in a depreciative sense. We observe that the issuers intend to obtain the performance of political facts, either emotional or passionate, on one side, credible or verisimilar, on the other side.

Regarding the argumentation of discourse, the modern media discourse is still marked by Aristotle's rhetoric, which requires demonstration of the facts presented to the public. We also identify Aristotle's argumentative technical and extra-technical persuasion in local written media. It is here that we find technical arguments creating an image favorable to the politician, meant to sensitize the public. At the same time, we can notice extra-technical, real arguments as well, indices that answer the following questions: who, what, where, how, when, as it is stipulated in Ciceronian and Quintilian rhetoric.

In addition, the ancient and new rhetoric adopts a rich, argumentative, persuasive discourse, by means of which the receiver is driven to agree with the issuer. In media discourse, the issuer aims to compare the opponent's arguments, to make himself/herself favorable and to discredit the opponent. The politician is usually self-eulogizing in the media discourse.

It is known that seductive rhetoric pertains to an emotional rhetoric discourse: both journalists as well as politicians resort to mythization or self-mythization, especially through the eulogistic type. The issuers' intentions are to persuade the receiver by emphasizing certain qualities: sincerity, courage, justice, wisdom. Aristotle calls them "purposes of the rhetorician". The articles that we selected make the proof of a transformation of the political characters, through mythization, into heroes.

We notice in the media texts a "rhetoric of the unconsciousness", as it is called by researcher M. Meyer, where theatrical acts, figurativeness or implicit actions and vague suggestions are essential in the activity of persuading. The emotion is conveyed through *pathos,* and the most persuasive journalistic texts are those that give place to conflicts.

The journalistic texts also render less frequent cases in which the discursive argumentation is based on extra-technical evidence or real evidence. At the same time, the media materials studied represent the issuers' intent to amplify the political actions, aiming to convince and incite the other speaker. In the advertising political discourse, the issuers adopt discursive strategies to attract the public, about such cases in which the politicians cooperate or they are in conflict: representational strategy on real effect (simulated or not) of figurative strategy, where the issuer resorts to myths, figures of speech, and symbols. We observe a commercial speech act, of marketing strategies, directed towards the apparent resolution of the problems that the public faces.

**References:**


Aristotel. *Retorica*, Traducere: Maria-Cristina Andrieş. Bucureşti: Editura IRI, 2004.

Bidu-Vrănceanu, Angela; Călăraşu, Cristina; Ionescu, Ruxăndoiu, Liliana; Mancaş, Mihaela; Pană Dindelegan, Gabriela. *Dicţionar de Ştiinţe ale Limbii*, (DŞL), Bucureşti: Editura Nemira, 2005.

Bârlea, Gheorghe. *Peithous Demiourgos – Ştiinţa şi arta convingerii în antichitatea greco-latin.* Târgovişte: Editura Bibliotheca, 2004.

Cicero. *Arta oratoriei*. Traducere: Traian Diaconescu. Bucureşti: Editura Saeculum Vizual, 2007.

Eco, Umberto. *O teorie a semioticii.* Traducere: Cezar Radu şi Costin Popescu. Bucureşti: Editura Trei, 2008.



**BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press**

**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)**

Foucault, Michel. *Cuvintele şi lucrurile*. Traducere: Bogdan Ghiu şi Mircea Vasilescu. Bucureşti: Editura Univers, 1996
Ionescu-Ruxăndoiu, Liliana. *Conversaţia. Structuri şi strategii*. Bucureşti: Editura All Educational, 1999.
Jaworski, Adam (ed.); Couplan, Nikolas (ed.). *Perspectives on discourse analysis*. Routledge-Taylor & Francis Group. London and New York, 2002
Meyer, Michel. *Principia Retorica, Une théorie générale de l'argumentation*. Paris : Editura Fayard. 2008.
Moeschler, Jacques; Reboul, Anne. *Dicţionar enciclopedic de pragmatică.* Traducere: Carmen Vlad şi Liliana Pop. Cluj : Editura Echinox, 1999.
Quintilian. *Arta oratorică.* Vol. I-II. Bucureşti: Editura Minerva, 1974.
Zafiu, Rodica. *Diversitate stilistică în româna actuală*. Bucureşti: Editura Universităţii din Bucureşti, (www.elibrarie.ro/carti/rodicazafiu.pdf), 2001.

*Cuget Liber* magazine (28.10.1996 ; 6-7.11.2004 ; 6.05.2006 ; 31.05.2006 ; 21.05.2007);
*Independentul* magazine (4.12.2000 ; 15.12.2000 ; 18.12.2000 ; 23-24.12.2000) ;
*Telegraf* magazine (31.05.2006);
*Ziua de Constanta* magazine (6-7.11.2004 ; 22.11.2004 ; 25.11.2004).

**BDD-A3747 © 2013 Ovidius University Press**
**Provided by Diacronia.ro for IP 216.73.217.142 (2026-11-14 13:00:02 UTC)**