

SYMBOLIZATION AND MYTHOLOGIZATION IN THE COGNITIVE STRUCTURE OF PR-DISOURSE IN BUILDING IMAGES AND BRANDS

A. M. Kazieva^{1,*}, D. A. Kazieva², A. A. Burov³, Z. A. Zavrumov⁴

¹(Philology), Professor, Department of the Russian Language and Foreign Literature, Higher School of Language Arts, European and Oriental Languages, Pyatigorsk State University

²Ph.D. (Philology), Vice-Director of Administrative Department, MRSK, North Caucasus electric distribution company

³(Philology), Professor, Department of the Russian Language and Foreign Literature, Higher School of Language Arts, European and Oriental Languages, Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University

⁴Ph.D. (Philology), Professor, Department of Linguistics and Intercultural Communication, Institute of International Service

Published online: 1 February 2018

ABSTRACT

The interest of the scientific community to the institutional types of discourse, including PR-discourse in its different manifestations and types, determines the relevance of the issue under analysis. The purpose of the paper is to identify the role of symbolization and mythologization in implementing the linguistic pragmatic model of Russian language PR-discourse. General scientific methodology is considered to be the main approach to study this issue, this methodology stating that language being one type of social activity is determined by the public consciousness and communication in its development and is closely connected with these processes. Discourse being a communicative event shows its interactive nature in terms of language with its level being referred to the cognitive pragmatic potential of communicators. Discourse is always socially marked, and here we can speak about the expressed personal and sociocultural features of the communication participants, their background knowledge and intentions.

Author Correspondence, e-mail: author@gmail.com

doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jfas.v10i2s.46>



The research leads us to conclude that symbolization and mythologization are manifested at all levels of PR-discourse, represent its synergetic nature, which is determined by its symbolic, textual and communicative dialogue origin. The materials of the paper can be useful in the studies devoted to the development of theoretical and practical courses in the issues of text linguistics and cognitive linguistics, as well as special seminars in intercultural communication, pragmatic linguistic and linguistic cultural studies.

Keywords: PR-discourse, symbolization, mythologization, brand, linguistic culture, image, media discourse, linguistic cognitive structure.

INTRODUCTION

PR-discourse specific character in image formation is mainly determined by the main features of the phenomenon itself. Surely, image, as well as brand is characterized by particular symbolization and mythologization aspects being present in its structure. This approach is supported by the fact that both image and brand are simulacra of the social phenomena (personalities, institutes, organizations, etc.) in translating the understanding of these phenomena with a two-sided nature – sender, on the one side, and sendee, on the other side, this helps one to follow the path of selection synthesis and translation of the information about the image's subject and the expectations of the target group.

O. F. Rusakova and V. M. Rusakov identified several projections which are essential in image production:

- 1) *projection of subject's ambitions* – how a represented subject would like to be seen in the public eye (attractive image);
- 2) *projection of joining the model sample* – desired model of loyal and faithful attitude of public to a presented subject;
- 3) *projection of public opinion* – how the represented subject can be perceived by the public opinion;
- 4) *projection of public preferences* – enquiries, expectations, values, status ambitions and dreams of the target audience [20: 147].

Scientists point out that strategic interests of the imagined objects are important in the projection coordinates of subject's ambitions and joining the model image, while these projections of the public opinion and public preferences reveal the value assessment opinion of the sendee towards this subject.

All types of discourses are sign systems; therefore they can be subject to the semiotic structure analysis. The general structural and linguo-pragmatic model of PR-discourse allows

bringing together communicative, cratologic and semiotic approaches to its study within a unified theoretical and methodological complex. PR-discourse is obviously composed of three structured constructs: communicative structure, structure of power relations and semiotic system structure. Their unity can be consistently described in the context of the notion of the PR discourse as symbolic capital. Such approach allows us to supplement our research concept with two important notions characterizing the PR discourse--*symbolization and mythologization*.

A term *symbolic capital* was introduced by P. Bourdieu who consider it to be “any property (any type of capital: physical, economic, cultural, social) when it is perceived by social agents with their perception categories which enable them to recognize (notice) and accept, add the value to this property. (For example: honor in the Mediterranean countries is a typical form of symbolic capital which exists in the form of reputation, i.e. its understanding of others to the extent they share a set of believes making them notice and assess the properties and particular deeds as honorable or dishonorable). In other words, this is the form for any type of capital which it is perceived through a perception category being a result of incorporation of divisions and oppositions embedded into the distribution structure of this type of capital” [4: 144].

Above mentioned definition of a symbolic capital definitely characterizes all three structural components for PR-discourse: focus on a message and perception of non-utilitarian values define the communication profile; the symbolic nature of the capital manifests a semiotic profile since the symbolization always presupposes a particular semiosis; the term capital has a powerful potential with the power of symbolic capital, as well as “discourse power” structurizing the world perception, including positioning the hierarchy of PR-relation subjects. Seeing PR-discourse as a symbolic capital helps to identify a number of features which enhance our understanding of it. Capital being one of the key notions in political economy is a category denoting a process of value self-expansion through investments of new means of production, which ultimately contributes into its conversion into goods and money. K. Marx believed that movement and expansion of capital is closely connected with class controversies which show the inequality in exchange between proletariat and bourgeoisie [16]. J. Baudrillard’s political economy of sign is structured the same as the Marx’s one: symbolic capital is its movement power, while the symbolic exchange is the main type of exchange [2; 30].

J. Baudrillard pays attention to the involuntary nature of the symbolic exchange as a power which gives rise to the controversies between the participants of the exchange. These

controversies are determined by different status of the communicators, with the situation not being represented in the appropriate form in the institutional discourse. The exchange process and the objects of the exchange undergo the process of mythologization through the notion of need which helps to define the exchange as a process typical for a human nature.

J. Baudrillard thinks that the purpose of the political economy of sign is to find the controversial nature of the exchange discourse and object exchange discourse in the mythology-based sign forms: “discourse must be read in its class grammar, class accents, in controversies between an individual and its social status or between a whole group and its social status, in the controversies articulated in the object discourse” [2: 19].

Therefore, we argue that PR-discourse definition should stress the idea of symbolization being its basis and helping in production and translation of meanings during the semiosis of different objects.

In the cognitive structure of the PR discourse, symbolization and mythologization are most clearly manifested in the processes of building images and brands. Without going into details of PR practices, we want to focus on pragmatic linguistic and linguistic cognitive features of these PR processes. The real prototype is “coalesced” with a simulated image in the image discourse to achieve the suggestive effect: the target group is to trust the created image, being able to imagine it in specific special temporal coordinates. Branding is based on marking a particular product by highlighting its specific features that differentiate it from other similar goods. Thus, a brand enhances communication between the producer and the consumer and, as a result, creates new knowledge, which, moreover, can be defined as emotive knowledge. Symbolization and mythologization also play an important role in brand building, as certain properties are attributed to the product, and the consumer perceives a set of functional and emotional elements that form an idea about the product/service in an associative unity with the product/service itself.

The results of the study into the phenomenon of symbolic in the general humanistic framework give the opportunity to look at the brand from a semiotic perspective. Versatility of symbolization in PR-discourse structure determines the diversity in perceiving this object by different scientific spheres, which leads to some non-clarity in methodology of its applied analysis. Following J. Baudrillard a symbol is seen as the main element of social communications, although this does not determine the possibility for its applied study. Cognitive and phenomenological sociology lacks a detailed empirical study of a symbol, which, we believe, covers some gaps in phenomenon perception. What is more, production of

meta text statements about a symbol when a phenomenon must be described in symbolic structures – language units – brings some difficulties.

O. A. Karmadonov analyzes the practices in analyzing the symbolic and symbolization in the empirical studies [15], this leading him to make an important conclusion about the importance of H. Lasswell's two large-scale projects focused on age symbolism and key symbols of modern politics, as well as the studies of associations evoked by particular words in men and women of three ages, the studies carried out by D. Levitt in terms of empirical phenomenological approach "to age aspects of symbolic thinking in word associations and words' symbolic meaning". We feel that an original method of trans-symbolic analysis (TSA) developed by O. A. Karmadonov should be paid special attention to. The objects are looked at as symbolic triads with cognitive, affective and activity symbols, which identifies their important characteristics:

- 1) a phenomenon of social change is seen as the main reality for the modern social world;
 - 2) all stages of the research starting from "the preliminary" world understanding to specific stages of empirical stage are potentially descriptive;
 - 3) a symbol as a structurizing component becomes a universal category in terms of theoretical heuristicity, empirical utility and acceptability for the humanistic framework on the whole.
- Methodological basis. Empirical developments in the field of sociology of communication allow us to consider only one aspect of the brand within the PR-discourse framework--its linguistic cognitive, semantically meaningful potential, which, however, prevents us from a comprehensive study of this phenomenon. In this connection, it should be noted that the brand greatly influences the linguistic worldview, as it presents traditional meanings and values in innovative cognitive structures. The most important socio-cultural functions of the brand provide for positioning and personalization of the consumer life style, acting at the same time as a way to manifest identity and social stratification. In the context of the PR-discourse, the brand definitely allows demonstrating that an individual belongs to a particular socially important reference group, symbolically formalizing its system of values.

Sociocultural process is mainly determined by the peculiarities in world understanding by an ethnic group, which ultimately defines the humanity development [10: 60].

It is obvious that branding can also have a negative impact on the system of socio-cultural communication: for example, a brand is able to change the structure and motivation of consumption among our contemporaries, so that symbolic forms, 'shells' of goods, but not their properties and functions, acquire special significance. The world understanding underlies the world seeing by a language personality and is represented in the linguistic rhetorical world

understanding through discursively finding the hierarchy in the axiological system of ethnos in social cultural coordinates [7].

Cultural symbolism is a determinant of the brand's linguistic cognitive structure within the PR discourse, and its role has been steadily growing over the last 30-40 years in close connection with the increased influence of the processes of national identification and personal self-identification. Brands, as powerful PR tools, have an impact on the traditional axiological system, which generally proved to be destructive for the system of culture. Nevertheless, we cannot ignore creative or ontological potential of brands, and this aspect is very important for our research concept.

Linguistic cultural potential of a brand can, first of all, be seen in the integration of the universal cultural practices, ontological resources of an image and ethnospecific embodiment of a brand. Since the symbolization addresses the culture system, a brand can identify the religious entities in the sociocultural process. Therefore, it is reasonable to conclude on multi-dimensional correlations between PR-discourse and branding being its component with the anthropocentric framework for society development.

All levels in brand structure represent the symbolization markers: the symbolization can be seen in graphic and color symbols, in personified images, in brand name, in its verbal message, slogan. Iconic nature of a visual component translates the inner meanings of PR-communication subject, thus stating this type of institutional discourse in a sociocultural space. Relevant needs of the PR-communication object, its targets, motivation are expressed in the anthropological attributes of a brand and, as a result, presuppose its personified symbolization. Let us note here that brand axiology being one of the fundamentally important components is also based on a system of cultural values, which obviously means verbal and visual symbolization. Verbal symbolization, in its turn, addresses the metaphoric resources of natural language, which directly connects this problem with a communicative repertoire of a personality. It is the verbal component that can adequately represent the inner meanings of the symbol's semantic space, thus shaping a personality identity to the target audience.

Symbolization and mythologization being the grounds to develop an image and brand in the structure of PR-discourse are manifested in a set of particular principles:

- axiological isomorphism of a brand as its correspondence of PR-object's purpose and mission with a value system of the target groups;
- intensification of the semantics for the brand's main attributes on the basis of their identity;

- brand's personalization developing its image in the cultural and anthropological perspectives, ultimately objectifying the linguocultural identity of PR-discourse addressee;
- brand's representation in the terms of verbal and graphic symbolization in implementing the cultural codes, which manifests the associations, archetypes and emotional impulses and places a personality into a communicative space appropriate for the linguistic culture;
- an axiological component of a brand, and of PR-discourse, on the whole, is intentional in its nature, which can be seen in all levels of brand and which defines its semantic space;
- metaphors being cognitive semantic constructions translating and modifying the cultural codes are the necessary elements in the structure of a brand and PR-discourse.

These principles in their unity ensure a fundamental property of PR-discourse and brand, that is, high level of their figurativeness. S. G. Ter-Minasova states that "mentality is a thinking and spiritual tuning of both a person and a society on the whole" [21: 196]. V. G. Nesterenko argues that "the notion of "mindset" means a particular set of developed unconscious forms of world perception typical for a particular group of people, which define the overall features for the attitude and behavior of these people towards the phenomena of their being – life and death, health and disease, work and consumption, nature, childhood and senility, family and state, past and future", while " mentality is a system of unconscious life and behavior regulators typical for a particular group of people, which directly follows from the corresponding mindset and supports, in its turn, this mindset" [9: 76].

PR-discourse is considered to be symbolic and mythological in its nature since the phenomena within its framework (image, brand, etc.) are cultural texts, with their own symbolic language which is characterized by social and linguistic cultural symbols. The nature of PR-discourse symbolization is determined by:

- inseparable unity in its structure and visibility (subject and meaning, whole and part, etc.) with clear activation of cognitive potential of PR-message addressee;
- dialogue nature of meaning implementation for PR-messages, additional nuances and meanings being revealed in a communicative act;
- constant personification of images translated in the form of PR-statements in social and linguistic cultural communication space.

This set of factors determines a meaning space for PR-discourse with the semantic space having the system of symbols – a text addressed to a target group. Therefore, it is quite logical

that symbolization underlies the production of a text – context varied and dynamic structure with its impact on the inner world and axiological structure of PR-addressee. PR-discourse semiosis affects all language practices which are implemented in this communicative space with PR-concept focusing on particular coordinates of the communicative information space. Symbolization and mythologization going through all levels of PR-discourse express its synergetic nature which is determined by its symbolic, textual and communicative dialogue nature.

PR-discourse appears to represent a consolidating force: it can unite the individuals into groups in one communicative space. Therefore, its main purpose in preserving the personification and focus on individuality is to reach the overall intensification of meanings and values.

Symbolization becomes particularly important in the structure of PR-discourse due to the possibility to stimulate standard behavior of the target groups through purposeful production of associations linking PR-subject and cultural symbols manifested in language. Special referentiality is typical for PR-discourse: symbolization in its structure identifies the implicit meanings with the produced inner semantics not represented in PR-text but still perceived and decoded by a carrier of a particular linguistic culture. Communicative space expands due to the accumulation of symbolic capital in a communicative act, which on the whole contributes into the intentional efficiency of this institutional discourse.

Symbolization process in PR-discourse structure is intensified due to the naming being an obligatory component of a brand. Naming is a set of techniques to create a name for an organization, a trade name for a product or service, the process being based on verbal symbols, which typically presupposes one to take the symbolic nature of a language into account. Naming techniques always regard the results of the studies in different spheres of general humanistic paradigm (cultural studies, psychology, sociology, linguistics, marketing, etc.), but its concept basis consists of a statement about a symbolic nature of a language sign together with the ideology of integrated communications. Authenticity of the properties for a particular brand in PR-discourse structure nearly reflects the onomatology development of PR-communication subject, thus showing different levels of pragmatic competences typical for a linguistic culture carrier. Brand name's ability to reveal the essence of the whole which can not be narrowed down to its parts is the main requirement to a brand name. It is the symbolization that helps to create a brand mythologem attaching it to a target group of PR-communication subject.

Introduction of carriers of the linguistic culture into the communicative space and explication of their overall axiological system contribute into the tolerance development of the images in the cultural symbolic capital of PR-discourse. What is more, a brand being an example of PR-discourse is included into the value system, which makes it to be value carrier. This happens since a brand is assigned a symbolic function of ideal and value translation (freedom, family, love, financial well-being, success, acknowledgement, etc.). This is how PR-discourse puts the life of a person and a society under the control of a brand being a purposefully created image of PR-communication subject, the stereotypes of perception and behavior, including the communicative ones, objectifies the symbolic space of brand and develops the trust of a person / group to it by involving the brand in an axiological system.

Symbolization determines the image semiosis since it creates a symbolic mask which defines both the appearance and behavior, including communicative and verbal ones, for its carrier. Symbolization development vector is set by the correspondence with the defined ideal in a communicative space of PR-discourse, with the most expressive models in communicative and pragmatic terms being developed in a competition with other images and brands.

Typical features of PR-discourse which are revealed in symbolization and mythologization processes give PR-discourse special intentions with the dominating being the intention to attract attention.

Here we should note that the category of language game appears to be the main one in terms of intentional profile of PR-discourse looked at from linguistic cultural perspective since intention can be implemented in a PR-campaign as a performance. One of the first PR-discourse and image discourse is seen in the categories of theatrical performance of Erving Goffman who introduced a notion of “personal foreground” being a standard set of expressive means and devices intentionally or unintentionally developed by a person in the course of performance to define image representation of a particular character [56].

Mythologization of PR-discourse is determined by a modern situation in a social cultural space with the brands being its center. Brands embody dreams and hopes, people’s understanding of themselves and the world around them, thus manifesting, first of all, the promises to make the dreams come true. Since any myth – from archaic to individual ones – is centered around the understanding of what should be, the myth of PR-discourse and brand, in particular, is grounded on a legend of product / service / organization/ etc. authenticity. Mythologization of this factis in its representation as a magic artifact, service provided by a company or being among the staff / clients of a company is seen as acquiring a mythical power helping a client to make the dreams true. Message of PR-discourse is to express a

mythological function which used to be fulfilled by religion and ideology in the previous epochs.

Mythologization is done by attracting celebrities, famous people, events and news preparation, and PR-campaign starts when the mythology of product / service / organization brand is completely developed in customers' mind.

The role of mythologization in linguistic cognitive activity of a linguistic identity and linguistic society is considerably great. The world is chaotic without myths, therefore it is full of illusions and unpredictable. A person overcomes this difficulty in communicating the structure, logics and order to the world. Any mythology tries to order the reality with super- and meta-real, which helps a person to uncover a transcendental reality, thus making the being of a person real itself. Natural beginning, nature in this case, is seen as an expression of "supernatural" which is connected with the real being.

M. Eliade believes that social being is hierophany – manifestation of the Sacred (from Greek *hieros* meaning Sacred and *phania* meaning manifestation) [26: 17], here we can a direct correlation with theophany which is referred to the embodiment of the infinite Godhead in a finite creature. A person's religious life becomes meaningful in the world full of Sacred, and this communicates the values, ability to take action to a person. The same is true for a specialist in any sphere, where the laws of nature which are behind the reality, as well as the patterns helping to think over these laws in a rational or any other manner are important. A person has life guide points and the possibility to transform the reality which are grounded on the acquiring the knowledge about the sacral (Sacred and Absent) as the knowledge of the true reality. In this way the world around us is filled with senses which form its semantic space constructing a new reality.

It is obvious that the final purpose of mythology is to describe different, sometimes dramatic, expressions of the Sacred in the world rather than to speak only about the constructive deeds of the Gods and Heroes. These "breakthroughs" of the sacral are recorded with the rituals, ceremonies, festivals. Any myth tries to reflect the reality on the whole or its part, which ultimately explains the origin and the essence of things ("why" is always embedded into "how").

The understanding of a myth is based on the first association which comes to mind towards this term – myth is interpreted as a story about the Gods and Heroes with no clear opposition of the subject and object, the myth being thought of as some synthesis of sensitive and rational – a kind of "thought-image" [19: 849]. Nevertheless, a myth is not an archaic category: it is closely connected with culture, while mythological structures constitute the

fundamental part of society, politics, culture, science. It is impossible to identify the time when the archaic myths were created, these are the myths constituting the foundation of consciousness, mentality, culture of the whole nations and peoples. Other myths are also essential, they acquire the important cognitive status with time. The development of the consumer needs and the consumer's sophistication, as a result, reduce the likelihood to surprise him. A company's strive to take its own place "in the network of global market links" [22: 19] makes it both create a unique product and produce new needs, that is only "unique globally" [ibid.].

Myth is developed in philosophy conceptualizing it as the earliest form of the humanity's religious culture, as an expression of the world perception and world understanding in the epoch of its origin. Here M. Weber specifies that the whole development of the humanity is myth unspelling, i.e. mythical ideas and images lose their previous values, a person sees the world in a more rational matter, a person starts thinking in scientific categories [6]. It is obvious that mythological consciousness is gradually transforming into a scientific one constructed on a logic argumentation.

The myth category is "eternal" due to a number of factors:

- 1) philosophy takes the main themes from a myth;
- 2) humanity always values "family intuitions";
- 3) a person does not unspell the world, as M. Weber puts it, but rather "respell" it, this produces new myths (advertisements, cinematography and politics are the modern myths).

Main factors tend to be extended with the other ones: culture creates strong emotional images; it is rarely the case when a person is completely satisfied with his status, which is partly determined by his strive for a development and possession of something created / imposed; myths help some people to have an easier life, to overcome deprivations, grieves; some myths and the world they create can give a clue what to do in a particular situation in the same way as the myths in the Ancient Times were meant to explain many phenomena, etc.

Traditional and new myths are characterized with the differential features, including different nature of their origin: the first myths "came from the darkness of non-understanding and unknown" [22: 67], the second ones resulted from the excess of information and personal inability to find oneself, which requires one to have concepts (i.e. myths) locating a person in a social space.

It is necessary to note that mass culture is likely to be the first cultural formation in the history of humanity with the key property being no interest towards otherworld being. Supernatural is

explained in a mass culture in a detailed and word-for-word manner, it serves the earthly purposes and needs.

The development and functioning of the social myths make one address the innovative notion of mythodesign meaning the projection of myths, creation of myth images, analysis of its logic, form and content with particular techniques. S. Bykov defines mythodesign as follows: mythodesign is “a method to organize information, it should be structurized, it should be organized and harmonically planned. This brings about the contact with the audience. Mythodesign is insight, management and satisfaction of the consumers’ needs through communication” [5].

Mythodesign definitely produces different structures, including brands. Specific nature of the mythodesign and its functions are determined by, first of all, the peculiarities and purposes of a myth creator who should possess knowledge in psychology in the area of understanding the moods and wishes of the consumers, as well as fulfill his creative potential in reproducing these moods and wishes. “The status of a myth creator is characterized by knowledge in the subject area of myth, while the status of the one living in a myth is characterized by the lack of myth creator’s knowledge in the subject area of myth” [22:74], this eliminates the feeling of illusion for the ones living in a myth as they don’t understand this myth is imposed. Myth producer constructs communicative subject field of this myth including the subject, information about the myth reflecting the consumer’s expectations.

Modern information society determines the creation of new values, social order and people relationships are transformed. Erich Fromm specifies the key feature of modern people “with market nature” – focus on buying and accumulating the most different values, “they have their own hypertrophic, constantly changing “I”, no one has “self”, core, the feeling of identity” [23: 326]. Mythodesign is supported by what is left in every person from mythological consciousness. However, only properly constructed myth possesses the acting suggestion on an addressee, penetrating power towards his subconsciousness. And here C. G. Jung’s theory of archetypes is provided with additional arguments. Jung shows that particular mythological systems at the level of imagination and language are transformed into parables, fairy-tales, superstitions, feelings, dreams, legends, dogmas and finally into needs and motives at the mundane level [26; 27; 28], and ultimately into the consumer preferences.

PR-discourse mythologization can be seen in, first of all, its ability to translate a particular message – a text with a polycode structure. The text appeals to the purposes, motives, and expectations of the addressee. Myth and text are, in fact, the basis of any PR-message structure. Myth gives particular suggestive force to an image and brand, while the structure

itself is mythological by nature. Actually the image becomes a myth representation, the way the society wants and can accept it, and the branding mechanisms become especially efficient with a priority in understanding the target audience, its motives, needs, wishes and problems. Stereotypical images of the Blessing and Curse translated by PR-discourse explicitly/implicitly are specifically suggestive as they are archetypical. PR-subject is always considered to be a guarantee to acquire the Blessings and magic power which can destroy the Curse / enemy. So, PR-discourse has one strategic purpose and implements just one single function – it produces the image of social power which is responsible for giving the Blessing to the address and protecting it from the Curse.

Thus, *mythologem of the fight between the Blessing and Curse* is the semantic dominant point that organizes the conceptual space for PR-discourse and finally differs it from other institutional discourses. The main functions of this mythologem make up a unity with the most significant functions being

- the function to *idealize* an imagining object;
- the function to *identify* the presenting subject with the power of the Blessing and the dangers arising on the road to possess the Blessing with the power of the Curse;
- the function to *mobilize and to organize* the proponents of the Blessing around the presenting subject.

This mythologem is surely represented rather clearly in the political images of particular people, parties, movements, state and international institutes. Big corporations are also supported by producing this mythologem in their PR-discourse.

It is quite natural that in the modern world PR-discourse comprises an important part in media discourse. This, in its turn, determines the active penetration of stereotypes and components of the axiological system typical for the society of mass culture and mass consumption in the structure of PR-discourse. Discourse of success as a stereotypical set of attributes for a successful man or a successful enterprise is recognized to be a rhetorical ideal for this society. What is more, this discourse can also include many publications, courses and trainings aimed at teaching the methodologies of success achievement in a particular area, guidelines and courses in management (reputation management, time management, etc.) and leadership.

Presently impact on the target groups of TV, advertising, Internet, glossy papers which translate the stereotypical images of success contributes into the mythologization of success. PR-discourse also focuses on the production of success mythologem which acquires additional semantic pragmatic characteristics in its interaction with different spheres of daily life activities typical for a carrier of linguistic culture.

Results. Cognitive structure of PR-discourse is characterized by symbolization and mythologization functioning in its coordinates, which is representative in the production of an image and brand. These phenomena are cultural texts with the obligatory symbolic language, as well as social and linguistic cultural symbols on the whole. Symbolization and mythologization are manifested on all levels of PR-discourse, represent its synergetic essence which is determined by its symbolic, textual and communicative dialogue nature.

Special referentiality typical for PR-discourse manifests itself in the following important aspects: structure of this type of discourse is characterized by symbolization which reveals the implicit meanings, inner semantics, which are still perceived and decoded by the carriers of particular linguistic culture. Symbolic capital of PR-discourse accumulated in a communicative act expands a communicative space of a society and intentional efficiency. Cultural symbolic capital of PR-discourse is a set of strong images in the consciousness of linguistic culture carriers, which is included into the communicative space and reserves an integral axiological system of society.

Symbolization provides image semiosis with a symbolic mask defining the look, communicative and verbal behavior of its carrier. Polycultural space directs symbolization, while a strive to match the ideal dictates constant comparative practices towards other images and brands.

The starting point for the mythologization in PR-discourse is the understanding about the obliging as any other myth (archaic, cultural, individual, etc.). PR-discourse myth is implemented as a statement about the unique character of a product / service / company, etc. Mythologization represents such an object as a magic artifact, while in this case the services provided by a company or belonging to staff /clients of the organization are interpreted as acquiring mythic power by a costumer which definitely should contribute into the implementation of dreams, wishes and hopes. Therefore, mythological function, in addition to a societal one, is implemented in the form of a message in PR-discourse.

PR-discourse implicitly / explicitly translates the stereotypical images of the Blessing and the Curse with a special suggestion due to their archetypical nature. PR-subject is always considered to be a guarantee for acquiring the Blessing and magic power, ability to destroy the Curse / enemy. This statement narrows down the functions and purposes of PR-discourse to just one function – to create the image of social power which can provide the addressee with the Blessing and protect him/her from the Curse.

It means that mythologem of the fight between the Blessing and the Curse is the semantic dominant point in a communicative space of PR-discourse, which fundamentally differs this

discourse from other institutional discourses. The main functions of this mythologem make up a unity with the most significant functions being

- the function to *idealize* an imagining object;
- the function to *identify* the presenting subject with the power of the Blessing and the dangers arising on the road to possess the Blessing with the power of the Curse;
- the function to *mobilize and to organize* the proponents of the Blessing around the presenting subject.

In the context of the current situation PR-activity should be implemented in the sphere of integrated communications since the company's development is connected with understanding the importance of reputational and communicative management. Focus on both the external and internal audience is recognized to be the main peculiarity of the integrated communications, with the image components being fundamentally adjusted to the most important target groups for the company (investors, shareholders, consumers, personnel, etc.). The theory of the integrated communications is significant for the modern communicative situation with the PR priorities lying in this very sphere. Marketing ideology is known to be directed outside only, while the integrated communications develop an integral positive image in perceiving both the external and internal addressee. PR-discourse analysis in terms of Russian philology, including its status and functioning in a polycultural space defines the correlation between the communicative strategies aimed at the external consumer / client and at the company's personnel being a collective linguistic personalities.

Efficiency of the integrated communications in PR-discourse structure is determined by greater control over the communication process, which, in its turn, requires one to study the factor of an addressee. Due regard to the peculiarities of the addressee helps a company to manage the relationships with clients / consumers / social groups in a very qualitative manner. Personnel management also benefits from applying the means of integrated communications since they are aimed at the staff's mood, motivation and purposes: thus, top-management uses this type of communication to distribute the human resources properly, to provide the information necessary for the efficient performance.

The factor of an addressee presupposes the understanding of a social status and particular specific features of a discursive event. It is this sphere where the differential features of the statements implementing different strategies of being polite are particularly clearly observed.

The factor of an addressee presupposes its constant participation in a discourse from an interpreter's perspective, which enhances an interactive discourse model in terms of the

principle of focusing on an addressee in an interpreting process, in other words, on one's own understanding about addressee's *extra linguistic knowledge*.

In mass media discourse the factor of addressee is complicated with the following parameters:

1. High degree of addressee or audience uncertainty in the narrative genres of media discourse (article, advertisement, public speech, commentary, press-release, etc.). Many techniques to identify the target audience are used to reduce the uncertainty degree and to increase the forecast degree for the interpretation processes.

2. An addressee in dialogue genres of media discourse (interview, talk-shows, etc.) is divided into the addressee oneself and the audience. And here we can speak about strong structure of the communicative interactions. This refers not only to the procedure, that is the nature of answers and their order. Structure or order of these discourse events is also determined by predefined and preset features of the roles fulfilled by the communicants, as well as by the implementation of the Pragmatic Control Principle. This can be explained by the fact that controllability of communicative interactions is one of the characteristics of these genres in media discourse. In the controlled communicative interactions one or all participants in this or that way are limited in their ability to implement their communicative purposes, intentions and impulses.

Integrated communications provide a comprehensive approach to a PR-subject which is manifested in the intention of a PR-text. Focus on the company's image is the main starting point in the sphere of integrated communications to create this text. Integrated communications are specific in their manifestation of fascinating signals and techniques: excessiveness, concentration of attention on the exceptional positive picture, "persuading signals" ("baits", "dummies") become the carriers of joy and satisfaction. A complete set of verbal techniques in PR-discourse is fascinating, which surely organizes a communicative space in a rather specific manner.

There is no doubt that the strategies and tactics of manipulating fascination are typical for the integrated communications. Let us note here that tactic techniques being successful findings are gradually turned into PR-technologies which can travel from one text to another, thus creating one communicative space.

In the center of the brand symbolic space there is a semantic core formed by the elements of the PR-discourse value system, which helps to identify and specify the properties of this linguo-cognitive construct. Being a certain modification of the image, the brand is a concentration of creative communication possibilities and socio-cultural meanings, in many respects reflecting the linguocultural specifics of the PR discourse. The brand is an open

multivariable system, the meanings of which are enriched in their contextual interaction; the syncretic brand structure (a combination of verbal and non-verbal components--colors, graphics and personalized attributes) has a definite impact on the target groups that are important for the company.

Discussion. The linguocreative possibilities of symbolization are realized in the PR-discourse structure through the synergy of its elements; the communicative and pragmatic potential is formed by inclusion of the brand into the semantic space of cultural codes. The brand's ability to develop certain characteristics in the consumer, both as an object of PR-discourse and as a subject of society (bearer of a certain axiological system and style, and the meaning of life), actually objectifies the creative potential of the brand. In this perspective, the brand can be defined as a specific tool for positioning and personalizing the consumer's life style and a means of national and personal identity manifestation and social stratification. The objects of the PR-discourse acquire their identity as a result of exposure to the given brand standardization parameters, which, in turn, forms a conscious adjustment of their social role. In the semantic space of the PR-discourse, association of an object with a brand acquires existential character in terms of individualization and positioning of a lifestyle. The brand also promotes social stratification through the integration of specific communities, consolidated in real or virtual social and linguocultural space. From this point of view, symbolization in the structure of the PR-discourse appears to be the main driving force for social development, as the brand promotes formation of interpersonal groups, which in the long run can compensate for the lack of social ties between people in the post-industrial information society.

The cultural and symbolic capital of the PR-discourse is positioned as formation of images stabilized through their inclusion in a specific communicative space of bearers of a certain linguoculture and explication of their collective axiological system. Moreover, the brand, as a particular case of the PR discourse, is put into frames of the value system, actually becoming one of its carriers. This happens because the brand is endowed with a symbolic function of conveying ideals and values (freedom, family, love, material well-being, success, recognition, etc.). Thus the PR-discourse subordinates an individual's life and the society as a whole to a brand--a purposefully created image of a PR-communication subject, and stereotypes of perception and behavior, including communicative patterns, objectify the symbolic space of the brand and build brand trust with an individual/group, involving the brand into the axiological system.

The PR-discourse mythologization is determined by the current state of social and cultural space, where brands occupy the central position. Brands embody hopes and dreams, as well as

people's ideas about themselves and the world, primarily manifesting promises of realizing their desires. Since any myth--whether archaic or individual—is based on the concept of the proper, the myth of the PR-discourse, and the brand in particular, is based on the idea of a unique character of the product/service/organization, etc. Mythologization of the product is based on its representation as a magic artefact, and use of the service provided by the company or belonging to its staff or customer base is treated as acquisition of mythical forces helping to bring the customer's dreams into reality. The PR-discourse message is actually an implementation of a mythological function, which in the previous epochs was assigned to religion and ideology. The brand, as a mass culture myth (simulacrum), has a fairly simple structure of the content of its mythological message.

Mythologization is carried out by involving famous people, celebrities, figures of authority and by creating events and news, and the PR-campaign itself starts at the moment when the myth of the product/service/organization brand is finally built in the consumers' conscience.

Conclusion. Of course, the ultimate goal of any mythology is not only and not so much the story of creative deeds of gods and heroes, but a description of various, sometimes dramatic, eruptions of the sacred into the profane world. Such “breakthroughs” of the sacred are fixed by repetitive rituals, ceremonies and festivities. Any myth tends to represent reality as a whole or one of its fragments, eventually explaining the origin and essence of things (“why” is always embedded in “how”).

The treatment of the PR-discourse as symbolic capital allows us to identify a number of its properties, enhancing our understanding of the concept. As a basic notion of political economy, capital is a category denoting the process of self-expansion of the cost or value by constantly investing new means of production, which ultimately contributes to its transformation into a commodity and money. According to Karl Marx, the capital movement and augmentation are closely related to a complex of class contradictions that reveal inequality of exchange between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie (Marx, 1867, 1967). The political economy of the sign by Jean Baudrillard is structured similar to Marx's political economy: symbolic capital is its main driving force and symbolic exchange is the main type of exchange (Baudrillard, 2003).

Development and functioning of social myths dictates recourse to the innovative concept of mythodesign, i.e., design of a myth, creation of images for the myth and the study of its logic, form and content with the use of certain technologies. S. Bykov provides the following definition of mythodesign: mythodesign is “a way of organizing information, which should be structured, regulated and harmonically planned. Only this can result in establishing contact

with the audience. Mythodesign combines anticipating, managing and meeting the needs of consumers through communication” (Bykov, 2007).

Mythodesign obviously allows producing various structures, including brands. The specifics of mythodesign and its functions are determined, first of all, by qualifications and objectives of the myth creator, who must possess sufficient knowledge of psychology to understand attitudes and desires of consumers and be able to realize the creative potential for producing such attitudes and desires. Mythologization of the PR discourse is most clearly manifested in its ability to translate a certain message--a text with multicode structure. The text appeals to the objectives, motives and expectations of the recipient. The structure of any PR-messages is ultimately based on a myth and a text. The myth imbues the image and the brand with sufficient suggestive power, while their own structure has mythological character. The image actually becomes a representation of the myth, that the society is able and willing to accept, and the most effective branding mechanisms are those focused on understanding the target audience, their motives, needs, desires and concerns.

Modern linguistic paradigm has different names for media discourse which are used interchangeably as synonyms: mass information discourse [12; 18; 25; 11]. This, in turn, determines active penetration of stereotypes and other components of the axiological system of the society of mass culture and mass consumption into the PR-discourse structure. The success discourse, i.e., a stereotypical set of attributes of a successful person or enterprise, is acknowledged to be a rhetorical ideal of this society; moreover, this kind of discourse may include numerous publications, courses and workshops that focus on techniques of achieving success in a particular field, as well as manuals and courses on management (reputation management, time management, etc.) and leadership.

The success is now mythologized due to the exposure of target groups to TV programs, advertising, Internet and glossy magazines, all of them promoting stereotypical images of success. The PR discourse also ultimately focuses on reproduction of the success mythologeme, which acquires additional semantic and pragmatic characteristics in interaction with various activities of the linguoculturecarrier.

REFERENCES

1. Baudrillard, Jean (1981) *For a critique of the political economy of the sign* (C. Levin, Trans.) St. Louis, Mo: Telos Press Ltd.
2. Baudrillard J. *Simvolicheskiy obmen i smert* [Symbolic Exchange and Death]. M.: Dobrosvet, 2000. – S. 29

3. Baudrillard J. Sistema veshchey [System of Things] / Per. s frants. S. N. Zenkin. M.: Rudomino, 2001. – S.31
4. Bourdieu P. Dukhgosudarstva: genezisistrukturabyurokraticeskogopolya [Spirit of State: Genesis and Structure of Bureaucratic Filed] // Poetikaipolitika. AlmanakhRossiysko-frantsuzskogotsentrasotsiologiiifilosofiiInstitutatsotsiologiiRossiyskoyAkademiinauk. M.: Instituteksperimentalnoysotsiologii, Spb.: Aleteyya, 1999. S. 35. URL: <http://bourdieu.name/content/duh-gosudarstva-genezis-istruktura-bjurokraticeskogo-polja>. 35
5. Bykov, Sergei (2007) Interviu (An Interview). *NZ. NavstrechuZvezdam (Towards the Stars)* 47: 49-51.
6. Weber M. Izbrannoe. Obrazobshchestva [Selected Works. Image of Society]. M.: Yurist, 1994. – S. 44
7. Vorozhbitova A. A. Lingvoritoricheskayaparadigma: teoreticheskieiprikladnyeiaspekty: Monografiya [Linguistic Rhetoric Paradigm: Theoretical and Applied Aspects: Monograph]. Sochi: RIO SGUTiKD, 2000. – S. 49
8. Galperin I.R. Tekstkakobektlingvisticheskogoissledovaniya [Text as An Object of Linguistic Research]. M.: Nauka, 1981. S. 139
9. Dodonov R. A. Etnicheskayamentalnost: opytsotsialno-filosofskogoissledovaniya [Ethnic Mentality: Case of Social Philosophical Research]. Zaporozhe: RA “Tandem-U”, 1998. – S. 69
10. Dushkov B. A. Psikhosotsiologiyamentalitetainoomentaliteta [Psychosiology of Mindset and Noomindset]. Yekaterinburg: Nauka, 2002. – S. 70
11. Zheltukhina M. R. Tropologicheskayasuggestivnost mass-medialnogodiskursa: o problemerechevogovozdeystviyatropov v yazyke SMI [TropologicalSuggestivity of Mass Media Discourse: On the Problem of Speech Impact of Tropes in Mass Media Language]. M.: In-t yazykoznaniiya RAN; Volgograd: Izd-vo VF MUPK, 2003. – 656 s.
12. Karasik V.I. O kategoriyakhdiskursa [On the Categories of Discourse] // Yazykovayalichnost: sotsiolingvisticheskieiemotivnyeiaspekty: Sb. nauch. tr. Volgograd: Peremena, 1998.- S.185–197.
13. Karasik V.I. Yazykovyeklyuchi [Language Keys]. Volgograd: Paradigma, 2007. 520 s.
14. Karaulov Yu.N. Natsionalnyeobrazysoznaniya v assotsiativnoystruktureslova [NationalImagesofConsciousnessintheAssociativeStructure of a Word] //

Natsionalnyy mentalitet i yazykovaya lichnost: Sb. nauch. tr. / Perm. gosuniversitet. Perm, 2002. S. 3-17.

15. Karmadonov O. A. Sotsiologiya simvola [Sociology of Meaning]. M.: Academia, 2004. S. 89

16. Marx, Karl (1867, 1967) *Das Kapital. Kritik der politischen Ökonomie (Capital: A Critique of Political Economy)*. Vols. 1-3. New York, NY: International Publishers.

17. Olshanskiy D. Politicheskiy PR [Political PR]. SPb.: Piter, 2003. 540 s.

18. Olyanich A. V. Prezentatsionnyye strategii v mezhkulturnoy kommunikatsii (lingvopragmaticheskiy i kognitivnyye aspekty)

[Presentation Strategies in Intercultural Communication (Linguistic Pragmatic and Cognitive Aspects)] // Izvestiya Nizhnevolzhskogo agrarniy universitetskogo kompleksa: nauka i vyssheye professionalnoe obrazovanie. Volgograd: Izd-vo VG AU, 2007. № 1. – S. 125-138.

19. Panov M. I. Effektivnaya kommunikatsiya: istoriya, teoriya, praktika [Effective Communication: History, Theory, Practice]. M., Olymp, 2005. – S. 140

20. Rusakova O.F., Rusakov V.M. PR-diskurs: teoretiko-metodologicheskiy analiz [PR-Discourse: Theoretical Methodological Analysis]. Yekaterinburg: Uro RAN, Institut mezhdunarodnykh svyazey, 2008. S. 167. URL: <http://www.studmed.ru/docs/document29351/pr-diskurs-teoriko-metodologicheskii-analiz> 167

21. Ter-Minasova S.G. Yazyk i mezhkulturnaya kommunikatsiya: (Ucheb. posobie) [Language and Intercultural Communication (Textbook)]. M.: Slovo / Slovo, 2000. S. 184

22. Ulyanovskiy A. Mifodizayn: kommercheskie i sotsialnyye mify [Mythodesign: Commercial and Social Myths]. SPb.: Piter, 2005. S. 188

23. Fromm E. Imetilibyt [To Have or To Be]. M.: AST, Astrel, 2010. S. 192

24. Sheygal Ye. I. Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa [Semiotics of Political Discourse]. M.: Gnozis, 2004. 326 s.

25. Eliade M. Svyashchennoe i mirskoe [Sacred and Secular]. M.: Izd-vo MGU, 1994. S. 217

26. Yung K.G. Arkhetip i simbol [Archetype and Symbol]. M.: Renesans, 1991. S. 219

27. Yakimanskaya I.S. Tekhnologichnostno-orientirovannoye obrazovaniye [Technology of Person-Focused Education] / Otv. red. M.A. Ushakova. M.: Sentyabr, 2000. S. 222

28. Yakovlev I.P. *Sovremennyye teorii massovykh kommunikatsiy: Ucheb. posob. Tekst [Modern Theories of Mass Communications: Textbook. Text].* / I.P. Yakovlev SPb., 2004. - 95 s. Yung K. G. *Cheloveki ego simvoly / Per. s angl.* SPb. : B.S.K., 1996a. S. 224

How to cite this article:

Kazieva A M, Kazieva D A, Burov A A, Zavrumov Z A. SYMBOLIZATION AND MYTHOLOGIZATION IN THE COGNITIVE STRUCTURE OF PR-DISOURSE IN BUILDING IMAGES AND BRANDS. *J. Fundam. Appl. Sci.*, 2018, *10(2S)*, 600-621.