



Structures, Techniques, and Strategies of Advertising Discourse

Bianca-Georgiana Munteanu

Vasile Alecsandri University of Bacău

8 Spiru Haret, Bacău 600114

Letters Faculty

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-7664-6993>

Abstract: The contemporary advertising discourse represents a highly fertile ground for pragmalinguistic, rhetorical, and stylistic analyses due to its efficient exploitation of persuasion strategies, lexical creativity, verbal/non-verbal opposition, and stylistic contrast. This paper provides an analysis of the advertising phenomenon by referencing three key aspects of language (semanticity, creativity, and alterity), each serving distinct roles. Semanticity is articulated at the idiomatic level and serves as the foundation upon which subsequent pragmatic determination is built. Advertising creativity explores text construction by exploring linguistic resources that engage both the speaker and the recipient's idiomatic and expressive competence. The third aspect, alterity, guarantees objectivity, as the only existing reality is the one that unfolds within the space of intersubjectivity, where the sign emerges.

Keywords: advertising discourse; argumentative structures; rhetorical figures; semanticity; creativity; alterity.

How to cite: Munteanu, Bianca-Georgiana. "Structures, Techniques, and Strategies of Advertising Discourse". *LiBRI: Linguistic and Literary Broad Research and Innovation*, vol. 12, no. 1, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.70594/libri/12.1/1>



1. Argumentative Structures in Advertising Discourse

From a pragmatic perspective, argumentation regarding advertising discourse aligns with the language's functional levels through models proposed by argumentation theory and rhetorical argumentation.

In advertising, argumentation often uses schemes that deviate from the principles of logical deduction. Advertising can be characterised as a domain where arguments lead rapidly to conclusions that do not necessarily reflect reality.

This form of advertising argumentation can be clarified through the concept of "argumentative orientation", meaning the direction of statements aimed at reaching specific types of conclusions. The connection between argumentative orientation and the argumentative strength of a discourse is essential, as it is evaluated in relation to different argumentative classes or scales. Advertisers employ various argumentative structures and strategies to capture and maintain the audience's attention, utilising argumentative orientation to maximise the effectiveness of their messages. Syllogism and enthymeme are two of the classic forms of argumentative structures frequently used in advertising.

The syllogism was defined by Aristotle as: "a reasoning from which, after establishing certain premises, a new proposition necessarily follows simply by virtue of these given facts."¹. Syllogisms are constructed based on inferences or abstract forms of reasoning, structured as a major premise, a minor premise, and a conclusion. Therefore, the syllogism is based on the next model:

The major premise establishes a general rule or a universal statement (e.g., All products of brand X are of high quality); the minor premise introduces a specific statement or a particular case that falls under the general rule (e.g., This product is of brand X); the conclusion results from applying the general rule to the particular case, leading to a necessary inference (e.g., This product is of high quality). This structure is rarely used in its complete form in advertising because it requires detailed explanations that do not always fit the concise format of advertisements.

An incomplete syllogism is considered an enthymeme, as it involves omitting a premise that is already known in order to emphasise the conclusion. If one of the premises is already familiar or implicit, it does not need to be explicitly stated because the audience is expected to recognise it automatically as a self-evident truth.

Vistian Goia highlights the subtypes of syllogisms:

An elliptical syllogism, missing one of its component propositions, is called an enthymeme. A syllogism in which one of the premises is justified through an enthymeme is called an epicheirema. A chain of at least two

¹ Aristotel, *Analitica primă*, Cartea I, 24b, p. 18-22, apud Adam, Jean-Michel, Bonhomme, Marc, *Argumentarea publicitară. Retorica elogiului și a persuasiunii*, 1997, traducere de Mihai-Eugen Avădanei, Iași, Institutul European, 2005, p. 166.

sylogisms, where the conclusion of one becomes a premise in the next, is called a polysyllogism. An elliptical polysyllogism, missing its intermediate conclusions, is called a sorites.²

The connection between the syllogism and the enthymeme can be explained by the rigour with which both structures are built. However, in reality, advertising texts use structural schemes of the syllogism or enthymeme without necessarily maintaining the logical connection that should first exist between the premises and then between them and the conclusion. To illustrate this theory, I have chosen the following example:

If cooking is an art, then the oven must be a masterpiece. With the new Ariston oven, you can prepare the most extravagant or traditional dishes, or you can simply admire its design without doing anything else. Because the new Ariston oven takes care of the cooking for you.³

At a structural level, the text follows a syllogistic pattern through its overall progression and the combination of terms. In the first statement, an enthymeme is used based on the argumentative scheme "*if...then*", requiring the audience to reconstruct the omitted premise. At the same time, it assumes that this unexpressed premise is a generally accepted truth. Additionally, the text engages in playful reasoning, giving the audience the pleasure of logically completing the argument. However, when examining the premises and the conclusion as a whole, it becomes evident that the logical scheme is not entirely followed, as the conclusion should have been formulated differently based on the established premises.

The logical rigour of the syllogism in this example is lacking for two reasons. First, the syllogism is not based on a general rule; instead, it is a *paralogism* (a seemingly valid but actually flawed argument made in good faith), as it advances its own conjuncturally formulated rule within the enthymeme present in the first statement, as well as in the text's overall syllogism. Second, the large number of words in the second premise distracts the reader from the logical reasoning typical of a syllogism, instead guiding them toward a conclusion that emphasises the product's utility.

An example that aligns more closely with the classic form of the enthymeme, structured on the basis of coherent logic, can be found in the following slogan:

„*Dacă exigența cere impecabilul, exigența cere Ariel!*” (Ariel) [*If high standards demand perfection, high standards demand Ariel!*”]

In this formulation, we observe not only a combination of terms but also a syntactic parallelism achieved through repetition and a binary structure, which relies

² Vistian Goia, *Retorică și argumentare*, Cluj, Editura Dacia, 2007, p. 93.

³ <http://www.ariston.com.ro> accessed on 05.03.2024

on an elliptical premise (*perfection is represented by Ariel laundry detergent*), giving it an aphoristic effect. This structuring method facilitates the logical understanding of the slogan, thereby enhancing its memorability for the audience.

This enthymeme-based structure is further reinforced by linguistic and psychological components that support the slogan's subliminal impact. Linguistically, the phonetic parallelism between the suffixes "-ul" ⁴ and "-el" facilitates the association between "*impecabilul*" [*the impeccable*] and "*Ariel*", relying on the principle of equivalence. From a psychological perspective, there is a dual tendency to elevate the product's value, as it is presented as meeting the highest standards through its exceptional qualities. This slogan conveys reasoning that can be translated as follows: if you consider yourself a demanding person, then you must use a detergent that matches the level of exigency that defines you.

In conclusion, we can observe that advertising frequently employs argumentative structures such as syllogisms and enthymemes. This preference is not necessarily driven by the logical rigour of these structures but rather by their ability to generate varied and persuasive meanings, using argumentative frameworks that often verge on paralogisms. These techniques are leveraged for their persuasive effect and ability to appeal to the emotions and beliefs of the audience.

2. The Functionality of Argumentative Connectors

In argumentative discourse, structure is achieved through the use of argumentative markers. The argumentative approach of a discourse can be attributed to both discursive and linguistic factors. Linguistic factors are currently a primary subject of study in pragmatic research and are referred to as specialised linguistic markers, axiological markers, or argumentative markers. These markers are analysed in pragmatics and text linguistics studies alongside the class of discourse markers. In contemporary Hispanic research, the analysis of discourse markers follows an interdisciplinary approach that combines text linguistics and pragmatics, aligning with the study of discursive traditions and incorporating aspects of cognitively rooted linguistic theory.

The class of argumentative markers includes both argumentative operators and argumentative connectors, a subject explored by Daniela Roventă-Frumușani⁵ in her work *Analiza discursului. Ipoteze și ipostaze* (*Discourse Analysis. Hypotheses and Instances*). Terms such as "*decât*" (*than*), "*doar*" (*only*), "*totuși*" (*however*), and "*încă*" (*still*) serve as argumentative operators within a sentence, while terms like "*dacă*" (*if*), "*adică*" (*that is*), "*de fapt*" (*in fact*), and "*de aceea*" (*therefore*) are

⁴ In Romanian, the definite article is not a separate word as in English but it is attached as a suffix.

⁵ Daniela Roventă-Frumușani, *Analiza discursului. Ipoteze și ipostaze*, București, Editura Tritonic, 2005, p. 203.

argumentative connectors that link two or more sentences. An argumentative operator must be introduced to guide interpretation in a specific direction to provide an utterance with a certain argumentative potential. The following phrase has been selected to illustrate this point:

„*Folosiți Savana Unistrat! Doar Savana Unistrat!*” (Savana) [*Use Savana Unistrat! Only Savana Unistrat!*”]

In this slogan, the presence of the argumentative operator “only” (“doar”) plays an emphatic role, as it restricts interpretative possibilities by emphasising the uniqueness of the services offered by the paint company. The argumentative orientation of an utterance is much more clearly highlighted through the use of argumentative connectors, which is why they hold an important role in argumentation theory research.

Argumentative connectors are introduced through specific morphemes (conjunctions, coordinating or subordinating phrases, adverbs) that link two or more statements within the structure of an argumentative text. These connectors fulfill the functions of segmentation, enunciative assumption, and argumentative orientation of statements, ultimately triggering “*a recharacterisation of a propositional content either as an argument, a conclusion, or an argument aimed at substantiating or reinforcing an inference.*” [*“o recaracterizare a unui conținut propozițional fie ca argument, fie ca o concluzie, fie ca argument cu funcția de a fundamenta sau întări o inferență”*]⁶

In advertising discourse, the function of connectors is correlated with the attitude of the message sender or the potential reaction of the audience to the promoted product or service.

From an advertising perspective, various types of attitudes are promoted, such as justification, adherence, guarantee, confirmation, correction, and disagreement. These are incorporated into the argumentative strategies used by advertising discourse creators to emphasise the stance of the “actors” toward a particular product.

Justification is a frequently used argumentative strategy in advertising, representing a typical practice among advertising message creators due to the tendency to promote services by providing numerous explanations regarding their qualities. The connectors that typically indicate justification include “because” (*pentru că*), “in order to” (*ca să*), “since” (*fiindcă*), “therefore” (*de aceea*), and “as” (*deoarece*):

- “*L’Oréal, because you’re worth it!*” (L’Oréal) [*„L’Oreal, pentru că meriți!”*]
- “*For your family’s protection!*” (Dettol) [*„Pentru protecția familiei tale!”*]

⁶ Jean-Michel Adam, *Lingvistica textuală. Introducere în analiza textuală a discursurilor* [*Textual Linguistics. Introduction to the Textual Analysis of Discourses*], translated by Corina Iftimia, Iași, Editura Institutul European, 2008, p. 112.

This strategy can also be highlighted through illustration, introduced by connectors such as “*here is*” (*iată*), “*just as... so too*” (*așa cum... tot așa*), which sometimes take the form of an experiment. Another form of justification is *guaranteeing*, introduced using conclusive connectors such as “*therefore*” (*de aceea*). The presence of the connectors “*here is*” (*iată*) and “*therefore*” (*de aceea*) can be observed in the following advertisement:

"I am studying the issue of hard water in Romania. Let's see what people think. Did you know you have hard water? But how would I know? Here's the proof. Limescale deposits appear on the faucet and shower cabin. You clean them frequently, right? Of course. Imagine what happens inside the washing machine. Calgon neutralizes limescale particles, ensuring the machine's protection from the very first wash. That's why the most important washing machine manufacturers recommend Calgon. A washing machine lasts longer with Calgon!" (*Calgon*)

Adherence involves an individual's choice and agreement with a proposed idea. In mass media, adherence is marked by connectors such as “*yes*” (*da*), “*aha*”, “*very clear*” (*foarte clar*), “*very good*” (*foarte bine*), etc. The following example illustrates adherence introduced through a specific connector:

- “*Yes! Yes! The bites will disappear!*” (*Advantix Foresto*) [*Da! Da! Mușcăturile vor dispărea!*]

Confirmation is closely related to adherence and is expressed through connectors such as “*true*” (*adevarat*), “*absolutely*” (*absolut*), “*without a doubt*” (*fara indoiala*), “*exactly*” (*exact*), etc. The following slogan features confirmation connectors:

- “*Mega Image, incredible but true!*” (*Mega Image*) [*Mega Image, incredibil dar adevărat!*]

Another attitude marked by the use of connectors is rectification, introduced through adverbs such as “*that is*” (*adică*) and “*but*” (*dar*). This frequently appears in both monologic and dialogic forms of advertising discourse. An example is:

- “*Since 1718, many things have changed, but one thing has remained the same: people's joy of sharing a glass of Timișoreana.*” (*Timișoreana*) [*De la 1718 s-au schimbat multe, dar ceva a rămas la fel: bucuria oamenilor de a sta la un pahar de Timișoreana.*]

Disagreement in advertising is often used to emphasise comparison or highlight the superiority of one idea over another. It is typically introduced through connectors like “*(on the) contrary*” (*din contră*), “*no*” (*nu*), “*not only*” (*nu doar*), “*not just*” (*nu numai*), etc. An example of this is:

- *"Breaking news: dear germs, Domestos has surprised us once again! Domestos Extended Power not only eliminates all known germs but also protects against limescale up to three times longer! The new Domestos Extended Power – 3X longer protection against limescale!" (Domestos) [Știri de ultimă oră: stimați microbi, Domestos ne-a surprins din nou! Domestos Extended Power nu numai că elimină toți microbii cunoscuți, ci și protejează împotriva calcarului de până la trei ori mai mult! Noul Domestos Extended Power, protecție de 3X mai îndelungată împotriva calcarului!]*

Argumentative connectors are particularly relevant in a pragmatic approach to advertising discourse, demonstrating their usefulness through the pragmatic functions they express at the idiomatic level.

In the analyses mentioned above, the necessity of linguistic analysis becomes evident when referring to text and discourse, as they go beyond the limitations of language as a system.

3. Argumentative Techniques Based on Rhetorical Figures

Advertising is an effective tool through which the sender presents arguments to persuade the audience that the promoted product or service can bring happiness, comfort, and pleasure. Through well-thought-out strategies, advertising aims to sell not just products but lifestyles, placing individuals in an engaging universe where a connection based on joy and complicity is cultivated.

The preference for using rhetorical figures in advertising is pragmatically motivated, as explained by Constantin Sălăvăstru⁷ in his work on rhetorical discourse. He analyses the pragmatics of this type of discourse through three types of performance: understanding, persuasion, and acceptability. Sălăvăstru identifies three essential mechanisms of rhetorical performativity: negation, interrogation, and the use of metaphorical language, all contributing to the effectiveness of advertising communication.

The differentiation of figurative language can be understood through the pragmatic functions of rhetorical figures in advertising:

Motivation is one of the primary functions, as the audience is invited to read or listen to the message in a way that does not feel forced.

The second function would be "the pleasure of the text". This one, as described by Roland Barthes, aims to produce a pleasurable reaction in the audience, generating a positive attitude and offering satisfaction as a reward for the time spent engaging with the advertisement.

⁷ Constantin Sălăvăstru, *Discursul puterii*, București, Tritonic, 2009, pp. 267- 307.

The third function of rhetorical figures in advertising is to provoke an emotional response from the consumer. These are designed to stimulate emotions, provoking reactions that can influence consumer decisions and preferences.

The fourth function brings out memory retention. Figurative language is often easier to remember due to its creative and distinctive characteristics, which help embed the message in the audience's long-term memory, depending on the context in which it is used.

The classification of rhetorical figures has been one of the main concerns of language studies since ancient times. A classification method is presented by C. Sălăvăstru, following Marc Bonhomme, who supports two possible typologies: a functional typology, based on the purposes fulfilled by figures within discourse, and a structural typology, which categorises rhetorical operations according to the discourse components they modify. The second typology is more comprehensive and rigorous, as it proposes both a complex systematisation of figures and traditional rhetorical classifications.

According to Marc Bonhomme⁸, four discourse units can be altered to create figurative language: the form of words, the combination of words in sentences, the meaning of words, and the reality to which the word refers. Based on these units, *M. Bonhomme* proposes four classes of rhetorical figures:

Phonological figures, or sound-based rhetorical figures, rely on the auditory characteristics of language. These include: pure sound figures (alliteration, assonance, rhyme, homophony, paronomasia), phonetic alterations (apocope, apheresis, metathesis, syncope, syneresis), and wordplay (anagram, palindrome)

This category of rhetorical figures focuses on phonetic or graphical modifications of words. In audiovisual advertising, these stylistic devices are essential for capturing the audience's attention through the auditory impact of words. Among the many rhetorical techniques that function at the sound level, only a few are commonly found in advertising discourse, as their creation requires significant cognitive effort, and perceiving these sound subtleties often demands a challenging interpretative exercise from the listener.

Homophones are words that sound the same but have different meanings, often used to create memorable slogans:

"Ia aminte să ții minte!" (Pay attention to remember!) – Bilomag Forte

This example not only features phonetic parallelism but also employs antanaclasis, a rhetorical device involving the repetition of a word with a different meaning.

"Have an Ice Day!" (Ice Tea)

⁸ Marc Bonhomme, *Pragmatique des figures du discours*, Honoré Champion Éditeur, Paris, 2005.

This slogan plays on the similarity between *"Ice"* and *"Nice"*, mimicking the English greeting *"Have a nice day!"* through dislocation, a rhetorical technique that alters a well-known phrase for a new effect. Advertisements often use assonance, a technique that involves the repetition of vowel sounds to capture attention. This is clearly illustrated in the following example, where the repetition of vowel sounds emphasises the advertising message:

"Transpirația strică reputația!" (Sweat ruins reputation!) – Rexona

The repeated vowel sounds emphasise the message, reinforcing the connection between perspiration and its negative social effects.

Alliteration is the repetition of the same consonant sound or syllable at the beginning of consecutive words in a phrase. In the following example, the rhyme enhances the alliteration's effect.

- *"Delicios de pufos!" (Deliciously fluffy!) – Eti Puf*

When rhyme is combined with rhythm, it produces a captivating sound effect that helps with message retention, as seen in the following advertisement:

„Bebe nu mai vrea să doarmă/ Suntem în stare de alarmă/ Griji ne facem amândoi/ Cred că ne culcă el pe noi/ Noapte bună grijilor/ Și vouă întrebărilor/ Bebelușii noștri dorm/ Toată noaptea-un dulce somn/ Am sta chiar și-ntr-un picior/ Să-l adormim pe puișor/ Nu vorbiți, nu respirați/ Somnul să nu-i deranjați!” (Pampers)

[Baby doesn't want to sleep anymore / We're on high alert for sure / We both worry, night and day / I think he'll put us to bed this way / Good night to worries, time to rest / And to your questions, all the best / Our little babies sleep so tight / A sweet slumber all through the night / We'd stand on one foot if we must / Just to help our baby rest / Don't speak, don't make a peep / Let's not disturb the baby's sleep!]

This example illustrates how the sound qualities of the text, combined with visuals and music, can amplify the impact of a television commercial. In radio advertising, paraverbal techniques are frequently used to influence the audience.

The use of rhyme, especially in slogans, is a common practice, having a strong effect on the receiver:

„Combate cu cap, durerea de cap!” (Antinevralgic) ("Fight smart, the headache!")

„O gură de natură!” (Azuga) ("A sip of nature!")

„For every cigarette, there's Nicorette!” (Nicorette)

„Pentru un sistem osos sănătos!” (Cal-C-Vita) ("For a healthy bone system!")

To conclude, we can say that figures of sound represent an inexhaustible source of techniques through which advertisers fill the text with sonic potential, whose discursive value contributes to capturing the attention of the message recipient, making it much easier to perceive.

Figures of construction stand out through modifications made at the level of sentence or phrase structure, mainly by changing the order of words in a sentence.

From the perspective of figures of construction, S. Dumistrăcel conducted the first and most extensive study in Romanian linguistics on repeated discourse in advertising, referring to „*destructurarea și restructurarea enunțului*” (*the deconstruction and reconstruction of the statement*).⁹

Additionally, Eugen Coșeriu theorized this concept of repeated discourse, defining it as follows:

„tot ceea ce în vorbirea unei comunități se repetă într-o formă mai mult sau mai puțin identică sub formă de discurs deja făcut sau combinare mai mult sau mai puțin fixă, ca fragment lung sau scurt, a ceea ce s-a spus deja”

*(everything that, in the speech of a community, is repeated in a more or less identical form as pre-established discourse or as a more or less fixed combination, whether as a long or short fragment, of what has already been said).*¹⁰

Coșeriu enumerated various forms of repeated discourse, including quotes, proverbs, comparative formulas, fixed expressions, and previously used speech fragments, all of which form the class of discursive traditions. In advertising texts, the presence of these discursive traditions is evident through the repeated use of such forms, adding stylistic value to the message.

A stylistic intention involves transitioning from a declarative form to an affective form, achieved through figures of construction. Romanian advertising frequently relies on repetitive discourse patterns, based on various figures of construction, especially in advertising slogans, to enhance their recognition and retention. Most often, this construction technique emphasises one of the components of the "5 W rule": who? (cine?), what? (ce?), when? (când?), where? (unde?), why? (de ce?), to which an additional H has been added later: how? (cum?).

In the following example, we can observe the use of figures of construction to highlight the quality of services provided by the HelpNet pharmacy. This example also answers two of the 5W questions: who? (pharmacy) and where? (where you feel good).

„Farmacia unde te simți bine!” (HelpNet) ("The pharmacy where you feel good!")

In advertising texts, we also find slogans that answer the how? (cum?) question, as seen in the following advertisement. The phraseologism „ca la carte” ("by the book") is complemented by the expression „o primăvară” ("a spring"), which answers the question what? (ce?).

„Vino să ai o primăvară ca la carte!” (Bookfest Timișoara) (Come and have a spring by the book!)

⁹ Stelian Dumistrăcel, *Limbaajul publicistic românesc din perspectiva stilurilor funcționale*, Editura Institutul European, Iași, 2006, pp.129-131.

¹⁰ Eugen Coșeriu, *Lecții de lingvistică generală*, Chișinău, Editura Arc, 2000, p. 258.

In this example, the canonical form „*ca la carte*” (*by the book*) is integrated into a free formula, making a clear allusion to the main object of the service offered by Bookfest Timișoara: books. To illustrate the deduction of questions from the "5W rule", we have selected a few advertising slogans:

„*Lovește alergia în plin!*” (*Claritine*) (*"It hits the allergy!"*)

[who? (cine?) – Claritine, what? (ce?) – the allergy (alergia)]

„*Evoluăm împreună!*” (*Alpha Bank*) (*"We evolve together!"*)

[how? (cum?) – together (împreună)]

„*Trăiește fiecare clipă!*” (*Vodafone*) (*"Live every moment!"*)

[what? (ce?) – every moment (fiecare clipă)]

Additionally, the construction technique allows for the replacement of one term with another in the structure of canonical statements. Such examples become easy to remember, sometimes even humorous, but still require maintaining a minimally relevant context.

„*Setea vine mâncând!*” (*Coca-Cola*) (*"Thirst comes with eating!"*)

After recognising the proverb „*Pofta vine mâncând*” (*"Appetite comes with eating"*), the receiver can easily notice the modification through substitution.

Omission is a technique rarely encountered in advertising texts. It is recognised when abbreviated contexts are used at the slogan level or within the text structure by partially omitting a canonical statement. In the following example, the phrase „*pe bune*” (*"for real"*) represents both an omission and a modernisation of the expression „*a spune pe cuvânt*” (*"to give one's word"*).

„*Sprite – pe bune!*” (*Sprite*) (*"Sprite – for real!"*)

Argumentative techniques that use figures of comparison also include a series of figures of repetition, which can be classified into three subtypes: proper figures, syntactic constructions, and syntactic figures with semantic implications.

The proper figures of repetition include: syntactic parallelism, climax, enumeration, anticlimax, and repetition, along with the following subtypes: anaphora, chiasmus, epiphora, and anadiplosis.

Syntactic parallelism is a rhetorical device that consists of repeating the same grammatical structure in consecutive sentences or clauses to create a rhythmic effect and emphasise the expressed idea. It contributes to the clarity and elegance of statements, making the message easier to memorise and understand. In the example below, the parallelism between the two clauses highlights the quality of the product:

„*Prea bun, prea ca la țară!*” (*Covalact*) (*"Too good, too countryside-like!"*)

Most often, in advertising texts, syntactic parallelism is constructed alongside enumeration, as seen in these examples:

„*Mai mult spațiu, mai multă libertate!*” (*Skoda*) (*"More space, more freedom!"*)

„*Aromele tale, regulile tale!*” (*Hugo Boss*) (*"Your scents, your rules!"*)

Climax is a rhetorical device that involves an enumeration arranged in ascending order, progressively increasing the intensity and impact of the message.

An example of this rhetorical technique is found in the following advertisement:

„Pentru o viață sănătoasă, consumați doi litri de apă pe zi! Pentru o viață și mai sănătoasă, faceți mișcare treizeci de minute pe zi!” (ProTv) ("For a healthy life, drink two liters of water per day! For an even healthier life, exercise for thirty minutes a day!")

Anaphora is a rhetorical device that consists of repeating a word or group of words at the beginning of multiple sentences or clauses, emphasising an idea and creating symmetry. A clear example of anaphora can be found in the following advertisement:

„Prea târziu/ Prea subțire/ Prea gros/ Prea gras/ Prea dulce/ Prea acru/ Prea bun/ Prea ca la țară!” (Covalact) [Too late/ Too thin/ Too thick/ Too fat/ Too sweet/ Too sour/ Too good/ Too countryside-like!]

Epiphora is a rhetorical device characterised by repeating the same word or phrase at the end of successive sentences. An illustrative example of epiphora is:

„De la jucători, pentru jucători!” (Unibet) [From players, for players!]

Anadiplosis is a rhetorical device in which a phrase begins with the same word or phrase that ended the previous sentence. A clear example of anadiplosis in advertising is:

„Frumusețea începe cu o piele frumoasă. O piele frumoasă începe cu Lux.” (Lux) [Beauty starts with beautiful skin. Beautiful skin starts with Lux.]

Also falling under figures of repetition are certain syntactic constructions such as ellipsis, dislocation, and zeugma.

Ellipsis represents the omission of one or more words, with the context making their meaning implicit. This technique is used to synthesise the text for stylistic reasons, as seen in the following example:

„Suntem zece mii de oameni în Brazilia. Cu respirația tăiată. Fiecare e singur. Punem totul în joc. Noi suntem Poker Stars!” (Poker Stars) [We are ten thousand people in Brazil. Holding our breath. Each one alone. We put everything on the line. We are Poker Stars!]

Dislocation is a rhetorical device that separates certain words or syntactic structures to create new associations within a sentence. An example of dislocation, which also falls under figures of sound, is:

„Drink positive!” (Lipton) [Drink positive!]

In this advertisement, the word „drink” is used instead of the word „think” from the original expression „Think positive!” ("Gândește pozitiv!"), creating a new meaning related to the consumption of the product.

Zeugma is a rhetorical figure that brings together contrasting elements within the same syntactic structure, formally associated. An example of the use of zeugma is:

„Dreaptă este calea către creditul Domo!” (Domo) (*"Straight is the path to the Domo credit!"*)

This example paraphrases a biblical quote, combining spiritual and material elements to emphasise the importance of the company.

Silepsis is a syntactic construction with a semantic implication, where the agreement is made according to the idea predominant in the speaker's mind, as in the following advertisement:

„Energie pură.” (Lukoil) (*"Pure energy."*)

Antanacsis is a rhetorical technique in which a word is used in the same context but with different meanings, often creating wordplay that highlights key terms in the advertisement. Here are some examples:

„Ficat fortificat, cu Fortifikat Forte!” (Fortifikat Forte) (*"Fortified liver, with Fortifikat Forte!"*)

„Farmec – Bucură-te de farmecul tău natural!” (Farmec) [*Farmec – Enjoy your natural charm!*]

From the numerous examples mentioned above, it can be observed that figures of repetition emphasise certain elements of the text, built upon a rich source of topical forms such as happiness, security, beauty, quality, prosperity, etc.

Semantic figures, known as tropes, are rhetorical techniques that involve the figurative use of words to create meaningful effects. Most authors include the following types of figures in this category: metaphor, personification, allegory, allusion, litotes, metonymy, synecdoche, oxymoron, comparison, symbol, and epithet. These are essential in structuring figurative language and play a crucial role in the artistic and persuasive expression of language.

In advertising discourse, metaphor is defined as „the trope of similarity, substitution, invention, and strategy.” Metaphor transforms the way we interpret a text, allowing for the deduction of truths by relating statements to their contexts. It is an essential characteristic of human language, manifesting both in pre-existing texts and unique linguistic innovations. The following advertising slogans illustrate how metaphors can suggest a connection between the promoted product and a specific quality or value:

„Borș Magic – borșul de încredere!” (Borș Magic) [*Magic Borș – the borș you can trust!*]

„Gerovital plant – regina cremelor!” (Gerovital) [*Gerovital Plant – the queen of creams!*]

„Ursus – Regele berii în România!” (Ursus) [*Ursus – The king of beer in Romania!*]

Metonymy is a rhetorical figure based on the principle of substitution, involving the replacement of one term with another. In advertising texts, metonymy is used when an element is conceptually associated with an idea or object. Metonymy is illustrated in the following example:

„Nu port bijuterii, le conduc!” (Automobile Alfa Romeo) (“I don’t wear jewelry, I drive it!”)

Another example demonstrates the process of replacing the general with the particular or vice versa:

„Penny Market – știe ce ne place!” (Penny Market) (“Penny Market – knows what we like!”)

This suggests that the store understands and responds to the individual needs of consumers.

Synecdoche is a rhetorical figure in which a term is used to represent another term through a part-whole or whole-part relationship. This can be observed in examples such as:

„Soțul tău suferă de palpitații? Protejează-l altfel. Aspacardin te poate feri de palpitații!” (Aspacardin) [Does your husband suffer from palpitations? Protect him differently. Aspacardin can keep him safe from palpitations!]

In this example, the word „palpitații” (“palpitations”) is used to represent both a specific symptom of a cardiac condition and a general state of worry or stress, thus adding a layer of complexity and figurative interpretation to the advertising message.

Personification, a rhetorical figure, is the process of attributing human traits to a concrete object or an abstract concept. This technique is frequently used in advertising discourse as it has the power to “animate” the promoted objects. Relevant examples include:

„Doncafe: cafea cu suflet.” (Doncafe) [Doncafe: coffee with a soul.]

„Granini, fructele iubesc natura!” (Granini) [Granini, the fruits love nature!]

Comparison is a rhetorical figure that establishes a relationship between two elements by highlighting common traits, using words like “ca” (like), “asemenea” (similar to), etc. This technique emphasises the similarities between the two elements, thereby enhancing the positive attributes of the main subject. A relevant example is:

„La fel de natural ca și grija.” (Milli) (“As natural as care.”)

The comparison associates the natural quality of the product with care, thus emphasising its authentic and positive attributes.

The diversity of rhetorical figures presented in the analysed examples indicates that advertising language relies on stylistic resources of the language to constantly reinvent itself and continually captivate the audience.

Figures of thought, also known as metalogisms, are logical figures that influence the extended structure of the text or even the entire discourse. Typologically, these rhetorical figures include: allegory, antiphrasis, antithesis, euphemism, hyperbole, irony, paradox, deliberation, pleonasm, parable, tautology,

etc. In the advertising discourse, the most relevant ones are: irony, hyperbole, tautology, and antithesis.

Irony, characteristic of figures of thought, consists of a simulated appreciation or praise that ironically implies a negative meaning instead of the expected positive one. Such an example is found in the following advertisement, which is structured as a dialogue between two elderly individuals:

„– Ce mă dor șalele! Ce aș mai merge la băi, cum mergeam altădată! – Ia cardul și du-te la Catena! / – Ce să caut la Catena? Am spus că aș vrea să mergem la băi! / – Nu știi? / – Nu! / – Cumperi cu cardul și Catena te trimite, ghici unde? La băi! / – Hopa! Farmacia inimii Catena!” (Farmacia Catena)

[– My back hurts! Oh, how I wish I could go to the spa, like in the old days! – Take the card and go to Catena! / – What would I do at Catena? I said I want to go to the spa! / – Don't you know? / – No! / – You buy with the card, and Catena sends you – guess where? To the spa! / – Oh wow! The pharmacy of the heart, Catena!]

The irony resides in the fact that, instead of a serious medical recommendation, the elderly person receives a solution that initially seems humorous but turns out to be actually useful. This contrast between expectations and reality creates an ironic effect.

Hyperbole is a rhetorical figure that intensely exaggerates the purpose of the statement, often by distorting reality visually and conceptually. In advertising, this rhetorical figure is frequently used to make the impossible seem possible, thereby emphasising the unique features of a product. For example, the following slogans illustrate the effective use of hyperbole:

„Noi înghețăm și Ecuatorul!” (Arctic) (“We can even freeze the Equator!”)

„Natura întâlnește orașul!” (Dorna) (“Nature meets the city!”)

„Redbull îți dă aripi!” (Redbull) (“Redbull gives you wings!”)

Tautology is a rhetorical technique based on the principle of identity, avoiding an in-depth analysis of an object. By explicitly or implicitly repeating a concept, tautology wraps reality in a redundant form. In an advertising context, tautology can have an intellectual sophistication effect, suggesting that, beyond the apparent repetition, there is a deeper meaning accessible only to the initiated audience. Here are some examples illustrating the use of this technique:

„Ciocolata ROM – senzații tari românești” (Ciocolata ROM) [ROM Chocolate – intense Romanian sensations]

„Nokia – telefoane pur și simplu” (Nokia) [Nokia – simply phones]

Antithesis is a rhetorical figure that creates an opposition between two objects, concepts, or ideas, placing them symmetrically to emphasise the contrast. This rhetorical form is used to highlight values and profound truths, capturing the audience's attention by presenting opposing terms. In advertising discourse, antithesis creates the impression of reconciling opposites, such as usefulness and

pleasure, order and change, tradition and technology, social and individual aspects. Relevant examples of antithesis in advertising include:

„Buline neserioase de ciocolată.” (M&M's) [*Unserious chocolate dots.*]
„Periculos de bun!” (Lion) [*Dangerously good!*]

4. Conclusion

The presence of rhetorical figures in advertising discourse represents one of the preferred methods of supporting argumentation. All these techniques arise from the constant appeal of advertisers to the linguistic resources available.

The use of rhetorical techniques in advertising discourse considers the functions they are meant to fulfill: to motivate the receiver, to offer the "pleasure of the text", to provoke an emotional response, and to facilitate memorisation.

5. References

- Adam, Jean-Michel, Bonhomme, Marc. *Argumentarea publicitară. Retorica elogiului și a persuasiunii*. translated by Mihai-Eugen Avădanei, Iași, Institutul European, 2005.
- Adam, Jean-Michel. *Lingvistica textuală. Introducere în analiza textuală a discursurilor*. translated by Corina Iftimia, Iași, Editura Institutul European.
- Avădanei, Ștefan. *La început a fost metafora*. Iași, Editura Virginia, 1994.
- Bonhomme, Marc. *Pragmatique des figures du discours*. Honoré Champion Éditeur, Paris, 2005.
- Coșeriu, Eugen. *Lecții de lingvistică generală*. Chișinău, Editura Arc, 2000.
- Dumistrăcel, Stelian. *Limbajul publicistic românesc din perspectiva stilurilor funcționale*. Editura Institutul European, Iași, 2006.
- Goia, Vistian. *Retorică și argumentare*. Cluj, Editura Dacia, 2007.
- Rovența-Frumușani, Daniela. *Analiza discursului. Ipoteze și ipostaze*. București, Editura Tritonic.
- Savin, Petronela. *Discursul repetat de La Eugeniu Coșeriu la Stelian Dumistrăcel*. In vol. *Discursul repetat între alteritate și creativitate. Volum omagial Stelian Dumistrăcel*, editor Cristinel Munteanu, Institutul European, Iași, 2007, pp. 77-86.
- Savin, Petronela. *Spații pragmatico-discursive ale comunicării despre alimentația tradițională*. In Adrian Chircu, Maria Aldea (ed.), *Din dragoste de dascăl și de voroavă. Omagiu doamnei profesor Elena Dragoș, la aniversare*, Secțiunea Studii, Casa Cărții de Știință, Cluj-Napoca, 2019, p. 266-275.
- Savin, Petronela. *Sub(stilul) gnomic în concepția lui Dumitru Irimia*. Ofelia Ichim (coord.) Alina-Mihaela Bursuc, Marius-Radu Clim, Ofelia Ichim,

Veronica Olariu, Ana-Maria Prisacaru, Ioana Repciuc (editori). *România în spațiul euroatlantic: interferențe culturale și lingvistice*, București, Editura Tracus Arte, 2020, p. 305-310.

Sălăvăstru, Constantin. *Discursul puterii*. București, Tritonic, 2009.