# The Commercial 'All That We Share': A Contemporary Reality Television Myth

**V. Karuza Podgorelec**

Departament for Communications Television Studies, University of Osijek, Osijek, Croatia

## ABSTRACT

*The aim of the paper is a semiotic analysis of the commercial All That We Share by TV 2 Denmark A/S within the contemporary theoretical framework of Barthes, Fiske, Hartley, Silverstone and Solar. The paper briefly outlines the theories these authors developed regarding myth as discourse, the mythical and bardic role of television, television as a transitional object that participates in the establishment of ontological security and myth as an expression of mythical consciousness that still coexists with other forms of consciousness. The text of All That We Share is viewed in relation to the goal of creating and achieving results, by analysing the affiliation of media and genre and by a semiotic analysis of its structural components, as well as the expressive means used. The paper attempts to prove that the text is a contemporary reality TV myth that uses digital distribution models and the moment of emergence of curatorial culture in which, apart from losing the clean boundaries between genres and the media, the viewers take on the role of distributors and co-creators of the narrative. The text does not only stay within the code of the television and the mythical code but it also presents these codes in their direct, simple and clear form. This form of storytelling, harmonised with the precise selection of the initial moment of text distribution that strongly contextualises it, contributes to the creation of its meaning, enhances its distribution and ensures the global success of the text.*

*Key words: All That We Share, discourse, myth, television, semiotics*

## Introduction

"The world of television is clearly different from our real social world, but just as clearly related to it in some way. We might clarify this relationship by saying that television does not represent the manifest actuality of our society, but it rather reflects, symbolically, the structure of values and relationships beneath the surface"[1]. This structure of values that is active beneath the surface of societal divisions was chosen as the basis of a three-minute commercial called All That We Share[2], promoted by TV 2 Denmark (TV2) which is the main television channel of Danish public television TV 2 Denmark A/S. Our intention is a semiotic analysis of the creation of this text's discourse that achieved worldwide success and received multiple awards back in 2017. The mythical story about equality also created the one about Danish public television as television that unites. Thus, another myth was created, belonging to Denmark's mythology that uses humanity to break down stereotypes about the differences in a multicultural society. We wish to clarify at the very beginning that we do not see myth as a truthful or untruthful text, but rather as a discourse. The theoretical framework that we will use in this analysis is composed of: Roland Barthes' insights about myth as a sign of a second-order signification, the insights by John Fiske and John Hartley into myth-creating and the bardic role of television, Roger Silverstone's insights into the role and the nature of television narrative that retains structural and semantic characteristics of the mythical story and into the overall role of television as an incarnation of an ancient heuristic intermediary, and Milivoj Solar's insights into myth as a story and an expression of mythical consciousness. Mircea Eliade [3] perceives the understanding of the structure of traditional societies' myths as a way of better understanding of the contemporary ones and Silverstone[4] warns of the paradox of television being distinguished from the institutions of so-called primitive societies only by technology. Therefore, it seems necessary to make a sketch of a phenomenon of myth so that we are able to understand the elements of mythical thought and expression in this contemporary text more easily.

## What is a Myth?

Solar recalls that Greek philosophers contrast mythos with logos although both words have almost the same meaning: word, speech, and that the very act of contrasting mythos narrows its meaning on one hand to a story, yet, on the other hand, it widens it to a certain kind of basic opposite to cognisance. Myth addresses us so that the story is conveyed spontaneously, sometimes as a form, and other times as something amorphous, sometimes as a narrative and other times as a way of thinking, sometimes as a fabrication and at another time as a basic truth[5].

## Mythical thought

The concept of mythical thought was developed by Ernst Cassirer[6] in the context of a theory about creating symbols via basic symbolic forms: myth, language, science, art and religion. Mythical thought embodies the understanding of time and space based on the opposition between the sacred and the profane. It organises time as a process from some beginning to some end, as an entirety that is easily understood as a cycle. Moreover, just like space, it is defined in reference to some content[4, 5]. The sacred is the opposite of the profane and it corresponds to power and reality. "The sacred is saturated with *being*" [7]. Sacred space is a sign created by human experience as real, powerful, full of meaning; it is a focal axis of any future orientation. A contemporary, mostly desacralized existence still holds traces of such a valuation of the world shaped with places that hold an individual, 'unique' meaning in one's universe[7]. 'Mythical speech'[8] is characterised by connecting images, ideas or names by bringing them onto the same plane; something like identification occurs[5].[a] By introducing unambiguously into ambiguity, myth manipulates the disabled sign by transforming meaning into form, and the receiver, in so doing, accepts semantic equivalences as real relations, they accept that what was told as real[8]. As such, mythical speech stands for the usage of language based on the power of naming that becomes a certain act of determination or even transformation. This means that, by the act of belief, words acquire strictly established semantic determinations and

strive to be unambiguously accepted. Due to these characteristics of mythical thinking in myth, an object can also, by finding itself in a new place, lose connection with its previous state and become another object. Thus, the capability of a mythical space to also model some other, non-spatial relations such as value or semantic ones arises[5]. Myths are made of mythemes, constituent units that have the nature of relations, and as a myth does not bring isolated relations but 'bundles of relations', mythemes in myth should be read as structured both syntagmatically and paradigmatically because bundles of relations are made precisely by paradigms[9]. Mythemes constitute sequences of oppositions that go through permutations and transformations in the process of creating the final significance of a message[9]. Ritual and myth are closely related, mutually supportive and they reproduce one another[9]. They are languages that translate ideas and send collective messages. They both express and attempt to resolve uncertainties related to the position of any kind of aspect of a culture, not just of an individual[4]. The ritual in which an individual partakes in collective actions that were once already performed confirms that myth explains the real nature of the phenomena that surround us[5], and that an act of belief is contributed by the totality of myths that are connotatively present in the mythical speech itself, but also by those present in the mind of the receivers[1].

## The contemporary myth

Myth will, by using a spontaneously transferred story, establish meaning through analogies, and name objects and occurrences that refer to the whole, not only to the separate entities - because it does not speak about the individual, but about the general and essential for our life and the world. It is a text that invokes the immediate certainty of what has been said. It does not explain or prove but proclaims; and confirms itself as the truth by numerous repetitions and oral dissemination[5]. In contemporary culture, myths are not distributed so that they create clearly shaped mythologies but are included in everyday life together with ideologies, elements of popular culture, science and alike. Mythical thought is nowadays diffused. Mythical elements are included in contemporary culture, and those who create and accept myth can think in several ways[5]. The trust in myth is like the one we have in what we see and hear[5]. Trust in the seen and said changes the way of understanding so that the seen and said becomes simply a fact based on a belief system that was created earlier in our consciousness. As the area of beliefs is established as a system of varying and complementing stories, mythical speech determines the significance within a paradigmatic set of units formed by a class of similar expressions. In doing so, mythical speech uses both the elements of science and literature. Nevertheless, it does not derive evidence in metalanguage but rather by a concatenation of classes of speeches into a system which we accept or do not solely by believing or not believing in the speech offered by myth[5]. A contemporary myth uses ordinary language which contributes to its realism and

---

[a] According to Barthes[8] we use the term mythical speech "to mean any significant unit or synthesis, whether verbal or visual: a photograph will be a kind of speech for us in the same way as a newspaper article; even objects will become speech, if they mean something." Speaking of mythical sign, ordinarily we use Barthes terms. "We now know that the signifier can be looked at, in myth, from two points of view: as the final term of the linguistic system, or as the first term of the mythical system. We therefore need two names. On the plane of language, that is, as the final term of the first system, I shall call the signifier: meaning (my name is lion, a Negro is giving the French salute); on the plane of myth, I shall call it: form. In the case of the signified, no ambiguity is possible: we shall retain the name concept. The third term is the correlation of the first two: in the linguistic system, it is the sign; but it is not possible to use this word again without ambiguity, since in myth (and this is the chief peculiarity of the latter), the signifier is already formed by the signs of the language. I shall call the third term of myth the signification. This word is here all the better justified since myth has in fact a double function: it points out and it notifies, it makes us understand something and it imposes it on us"[8].

easy acceptance. We have problems giving in to what we do not understand, especially in crises[5], and common sense recognises that which it encounters in everyday life as real[4]. Another attribute of mythical thought is still present nowadays – the one that manages the conflict of two forces in a dramatic manner, of elementary shape of a person's experience, that it surrounds everything seen with a special atmosphere and that it assigns some exceptionally emotional attributes to all objects[6]. Myth is therefore not always a 'pure myth' nowadays[5]. As a discourse, it functions within a wide variety of manifestations, from the level of an idea, the interpretation of an occurrence, to the level of interpreting culture. Fiske and Hartley[1] will say that televisual mythology has that role. Silverstone[4] does not think it is unusual for a television narrative to possibly lose elements of ritual and the sacred in its manifest layer - to lose the literal unambiguous belief in the truth of what was spoken or that simplicity, normality and realness conceal the mythical basis. However, underneath those layers there is a mythical dimension of an explanation that introduces order in a way appropriate for common sense.

## The Mythical Nature of Television

Barthes sees myth as a second-order semiotic system that transforms what is in the sign in the first system into a mere signifier while impoverishing the sign used[8]. And while in the first order of signification the sign is self-contained, in the second order a simple meaning is confronted with a whole range of cultural meanings derived from the way society uses and values the signifier and the signified. The range of cultural meanings that are generated in the second order cohere in the third order of signification "into a comprehensive, cultural picture of the world, a coherent and organised view of the reality with which we are faced" [1]. This brings us to Fiske and Hartley's[1] study of television as a contemporary bard who communicates central concerns of his time and who intercedes to members of a community a confirming, reinforcing version of themselves through a range of messages.

## Television as a bard

Myth, the traditional bardic speech, and television function on the connotation level, so the viewer does not need to notice their expression consciously. In society the television acts as a major agency for the daily enactment of co-existence of cleavage (as a potential trigger of change) and continuity, stability (Fiske & Hartley, 2004:88)[1]. It simultaneously allows 'convergent selectivity'[1], a phenomenon where a group freely, in family surroundings, chooses similar opportunities. In doing so, bardic discourse will always strive for meanings to be consistent with the majority's acceptance of values, and if a certain value can no longer or again claw back its socio-central position, the audience is left with the conclusion that their reaction is unsuitable for reality and that it is necessary to introduce

changes in order to cope with changed circumstances[1]. In the messages of television discourse Fiske and Hartley detect seven bardic functions. We will provide a short overview in three points because we claim they are highlighted in the text of All That We Share. The authors use them to create the structure and unambiguousness of the level of the sign-expression in order to guarantee the readability and the way in which the text is perceived, thus invoking the power of mythical revelation.[b] Firstly, this is an expression of the main features of the established cultural agreement about the nature of reality and the involvement of individual members of society in the prevailing value systems. Secondly, it is the interpretation, justification and celebration of certain acts of individuals (using mythology of individuality) and exposing the inappropriateness in the cultural understanding of personality, due to the pressure of culture to refocus because of new beliefs. And thirdly, it is a transfer of a feeling of cultural belonging - security and inclusion, and ensuring the practical appropriateness of culture by validating its mythology and convincing the viewer that their status and identity as an individual is guaranteed by culture as a whole[1]. Television offers a synergy of the fictional and the factual, in the minds of the viewers transformed into a culturally and ideologically determined worldview. Fiske and Hartley for this bardic function use anthropological term 'ritual condensation'[1]. Abstract ideas are transformed into a material form (concrete television text) in such a way that ritual condensation of the dominant criterion is performed. The process of television ritual condensations occurs at the level where mythical speeches cohere into sequences or mythologies[1]. Malinowski already showed that myth answers the questions of the members of the culture which created it by confirming a belief necessary or useful for the community[11]. Fiske and Hartley update this approach and state for television and myth: "They emerge as the conventions of seeing and knowing, the a priori assumptions about the nature of reality which most of the time a culture is content to leave unstated and unchallenged"[1]. As myth is dependent on a cultural moment, myths are changing and renewing, and Fiske and Hartley believe that television plays a significant role in this process nowadays. "It constantly tests the myths against reality and thus shows when their explanatory power has decreased and the need for change becomes more pressing."[1].

## Television as a transitional object in creating ontological security

Solar considers that myth always answers the questions regarding "that which interests us as individuals, which concerns us 'inside' because it encourages us to speak about the things we don't really like to discuss, and which must come to the fore one way or the other"[5]. He agrees with Lévi-Strauss[9] who says that the main purpose of mythology "is to provide an outlet for re-

---

[b] The term 'level of the sign-expression' is used according to Hjelmslev (1969:47)[10] who considers sign as a function "generated by the connection between an expression and content".

pressed feelings". Silverstone feels similarly. Unlike Barthes[8], who regards myth as a parasitic discourse and a tool for producing ideological manipulations, Silverstone[4] resorts to Gramsci's[12] recognition of what we call 'common-sense' and sees myth as a person's intermediary in managing reality. Our everyday world is fragile and sources of insecurity are found beneath its surface. Myth brings order into chaos by the language of common sense based on the practical and mundane. Common sense is not rigid and immovable but is in a continuous process of transformation and its own enrichment. It is embedded in customs, tradition, religious thought and experience. The mythic bridges, mediates and translates the unknown, the unconscious or the unknowable to the common sense into acceptable and familiar forms[4]. Television as well as myth operates in the field of common sense, between 'super-cultural' and 'pre' or 'anti' or 'non' cultural knowledge[4]. Television's efficiency is precisely about the ability to translate the incomprehensible, the unknown, the repressed, and the hidden, into the known, everyday and familiar. Television articulates as well as preserves the boundaries between these worlds. "And while it transcends the boundary of the acceptable and the known and seeks continually to extend it, it nevertheless marks that boundary clearly and unambiguously. Within that boundary we are secure and through television we are always within it"[4]. Silverstone develops Giddens[13-16] notion of ontological security. It is a belief in security, an emotional phenomenon based on trust in ourselves and in the world, stemming from the routine of active participation in the world by which we control fear and insecurity. Communication with objects and relationships that we trust creates the matrix of our habits, the seriality of our activities, and the spatial-temporal framework of everyday reality and due to the contemporary distance and mediatisation of these objects and relationships, created ontological security becomes psychologically inadequate nowadays[17]. Silverstone accepts Winnicott's[18-20] theory of personality development and transitional objects that enable the development of an individual and culture. The individual and culture develop through transitional phenomena and by connecting the person with their environment through subjectively perceived potent spaces - those in which identities are formed.

Based on Giddens and Winnicott's insights, Silverstone developed a theory of television as a cultural transition object. Television participates in the creation of ontological security, and with it the modern person develops a close predictable cyclical ritual communication within which television mythical narratives operate. Like myths, ontological security is created through the known, predictable, and common sense, where the truth about the soundness of common sense is confirmed by the repetition of symbols of daily life offered through television narratives. Television offers narrative models for personal experiences and creates awareness of temporal and spatial relationships. It offers a ritual transition from the world of profane daily life into a sacred routine of programme schedules and participates in the ritual-ization of important events in personal life[17]. It acts as "the bridge between the everyday and the transcendent, the known and the unknown, the sacred and the profane"[4]. "Television is not sacred; nor is it profane in any strict sense of the term. But the emotions and the power of the sacred are preserved despite the secularisation of television's manifest content"[4]. Therefore, the way in which a mythical television message is perceived, the belief in it and the need for it originate both from everyday life rituals and the human need for ontological security that is realised through the predictable and the familiar[17].

The text of All That We Share intensively uses elements of mythical thought, the original structure of myth built by opposing mythemes, the model of establishing the story as a revelation, the belief in the realism of television's narrative, culture's need for the bard to create central attitudes and that the process of creating ontological security is continued through television. First of all we will provide data about the purpose of the text's creation, and then analyse the strategies used and results more closely.

## The Purpose of Creating the Text

TV2 is Denmark's most watched family television channel, and the commercial All That We Share was supposed to popularise their strategy of inclusive programme creation[21, 22]. In the age of revolutionary changes in television media, television programming for mass audiences is threatened by trends in television audience segmentation and channel proliferation. The aim of the commercial was to resist audience segmentation tendencies and their compartmentalisation into social media 'balloons' resulting in further segmentation. However, the television channel did not want to influence only the Danes, but the international public as well because research has shown that foreign impressions of their country are important to the Danes[21].

The strategic intention was to produce a text that would not only convey the idea of inclusivity but would prove the existence of shared values[21]. A synergistic play of meanings was designed between the title of the work (All That We Share), a mythical discourse: highly emotional and sacred, exemplary and significant notice for the society that will serve as an example[3] and awaken the desire to convey (Share!), and the content itself: a story about recognising human values (All that we share.). The strength of the narrative was supposed to expand into the perception of TV2 channel as 'television for all'. The creators stated: "There is a global discourse that our societies are falling apart. In Denmark, the debate is most often about cohesiveness and even in the homogeneous Danish society, it sometimes sounds like the different groups have nothing or very little in common. If you want to be a TV channel for everyone, you must believe that we do have a lot of things in common. But it is a political statement to say it. Therefore, we needed to show it."[21].

## Documentary Discourse with a Mythical Story's Narrative Characteristics

Myth will be present within the narrative structure because mythical thought, the mode of expression and mythical character can thus be established. A mythical story's structure is substantially conditioned by a truth revealing function, so the questions asked are answered apodictically, finally and completely, with a simple sequence of events. Meaning is realised at the level of the signified, so it cannot be retold and translated. Mythical explanation creates a closed form of storytelling, it is summarised into an occurrence which is covered as a whole[5]. Such is our text, a simple linear closed narrative structure. The syntagm that brings the course of action is formed by the contrast of meaning and values as the main rule of combining, which catalyses and then fixes the signification of paradigmatic set of units in the syntagm. Basically, an opposition is used: the past (darkness, profane, lack of wholeness: 'we / they') – the future (light, sacred, created completeness: 'all of us'). This opposition is the bearer of the value opposition 'bad – good', that is, the initial lack and final finding of value that gives birth to security. Mythical consciousness explains the present by using the past, and each myth has its own correlative with which it is in a kind of contradiction. Thus, myths constitute a system of oppositions that allow for a kind of absolute classification, with contradiction being a distinctive characteristic. Therefore, the classification can only be explained by materialising one of the poles of the relation and making it the basis of the explanation of the other. The same is in our text.

As the addressing mode is typically televisual – speech at the same time 'anchors', fixes meaning and manages the interpretation[23]. It appears in two typically television forms: as a voice-over commentary and as a studio host. As typical for television, the details in the shots are reduced, and this characteristic reflects on the aesthetic that emphasises the medium shots, especially the close-ups. The editing rhythm is fast, so sound (primarily speech, then music) becomes the basic carrier of the continuity of attention and meaning[24]. This enabled the formation of a dominant semantic field to the invisible narrator. The whole story unfolds at a steady pace dictated by the music and the narrator's calm speech. Speech syntagms of equal length follow uniform speech pauses, slightly longer only if they are anticipatory. The music then accentuates individual protagonists or events. The elements created in this way create a distinct rhythm, first as a cohesive force that supports the experience of connection between the time and space of action, and then as a factor in creating the overall ritual atmosphere of revelation.

## Affiliation to the genre

Television genres should also be seen as cultural categories, not merely as categories of similar textual characteristics[25]. One of their features intensified back in the postmodern era is mutual re-articulation, the appropriation of narrative strategies or other characteristics, hybridisation and pronounced intertextuality. All That We Share uses reality TV genre convention and its communication connotations so we may characterise it as a reality TV myth which deprives its commercial role by emphasising the overall dramatized realism by the discourse of reality TV. Eighty Danish volunteers from different social groups considered forty questions of a personal nature and decided to answer them honestly in public and thus participate in a social experiment[27]. The respondents did not know each other, and during the eleven-hour recording, no one but the teenagers was allowed to use mobile devices. They were grouped into ten equally numerous groups by socio-demographic criteria, and were filmed by four cameras which they did not pay attention to. Thirty-five hours of recorded material were edited into a three-minute commercial that linearly depicts the recorded experiment[28]. In short: at the beginning of the text, each social group, with a voice-over presentation, occupied the space of one of the rectangular plots drawn on the studio floor. We will name these groups 'basic groups'. Then the studio host asked the participants personal questions and individuals from the basic groups, signalling an affirmative answer, would appear in a visually and spatially separated part of the studio. In this way, new temporary groups of respondents would be created, connected by an affirmative response of a personal nature. We will name them the 'evolved groups'. The protagonists' confrontation was achieved through a dynamic establishment of evolved groups that were different each time. In the end, all participants were in the same evolved group of those who love Denmark, and thus a new equilibrium was established. Then in the epilogue, the significance of equivalency with the TV2 channel was added to the equilibrium. The epilogue closed the text and the shown series of events declared: *Humanity is a unifying link, and TV2 unites us.* Story world of the commercial did not optimally emphasise similarity factors[29] in relation to the reality of Danish society. When forming the paradigmatic set of units *Society,* selected were nurses, business people, the lower middle class, men prone to violence, members of various ethnic minorities, old inhabitants, football fans, urban teenagers, rural people and fitness enthusiasts. Their selection, appearance, clothing, and the voice-over speech describing them are established signs, almost clichés. This way of forming an aesthetic code is already determined by the nature of the media, the expectations of the audience and the need for popularity[1], as well as by the nature of the hybrid genre to which the text belongs, and which uses clear, familiar, widely readable codes.

Television is particularly well suited to taking a sign and generalising it into a broader sign, and discourses of the commercial additionally "despecify the sign and refer it to the myth order of signification entirely"[1]. The same is in this text. The respondents appear as generalisations that add to the original sign a level of culturally determined meaning. The discourse derived from the documentary fly-on-the-wall genre, previously stylised and modified by the reality TV genre cluster[30,31], and the discourse

of the confessional talk show genre[32] were used in the creation of the text. The melodramatic element is emphasised by the introduction of the ritual of leaving the group in response to personal questions, while the answers are syntagmatically structured are used as a highly emotional narrative. The characters and relationships of the subjects are schematised during the development of the story, and the studio host is placed in the privileged position of 'the master of the ceremony'. The melodramatic 'stripping' of personal truths in front of the mass audience is one of the characteristics of both reality TV and the genre of confessional talk shows[32]. The viewers recognise a popular code in which, according to the poetics of the confessional talk show, "personal is political"[32]. Reality TV brings a new aesthetic of visual realism, combining factual and entertaining elements and introducing simulations and spectacle as part of the convention[33]. The overall action is driven directly by the production processes; Hill calls them "made-for-TV reality"[30]. As usual for the mythical construction of characters and their relationships, in this text the characters are, in their own way, cleansed of all coincidences that would not constitute hinges of the narrative[34] or of the psychological processing that requires subsequent reflection and an effort to subsequently interpret the ambivalences. The characters' relationship and their position will change during the course of events, and the events will be the ones to determine the scheme of possible relationships[5]. The characters will thus become intersections of basic relationships. As reality TV is a popular group of genres, a wide range of recipients is already accustomed to the code and will easily be able to understand it as natural. In this scheme of relationships, characters and actions, we easily recognise our own feelings and find our place. It should not be forgotten that television consciously produces a sense of intimacy. It connects the viewer's conception of self (or desired conception of self) to the programme, thus producing a relationship of sympathy. Television texts emanate familiarity shared with all[24], which directly helps to recognise one's own feelings in relationships and in the position of the characters and to create an impression of realism.

## Creating mythical space

The text of All That We Share was created, typically in a televisual way, in a styled large indoor space, a studio, and the scene was filmed with multiple cameras at the same time. The story begins with defamiliarisation, a fade-in of the geometrically composed extreme wide bird's eye view shot of a grey-black enclosed space, which in the diegetic reality of the commercial will symbolise the entire human world.[c] First, we see an achromatic rectangular space in which, in its golden section, along its three edges, ten rectangular areas are framed in white on the floor, in which the protagonists will stand, thus forming the *Society* paradigm, and one third of the space is not covered,

black (timecode (TC): 00:00:00-00:02:08)[2]. From the physical and psychological space thus established, the protagonists, when answering, move towards the previously hidden physical and psychological area of truth. It is created by a light grey-turquoise surface moved away from one of the studio walls that is illuminated by the low bright light from behind. The light from behind penetrates upward and unceremoniously connotes a focus on holiness. The separation of darkness from light and non-colour from colour form a clearly readable opposition between the sacred and profane space. The ritual of answering by moving to another space and the drama it produces serve the purpose of revelation. The shift to a new space creates new semantic determinations – it re-establishes characters, dedicates the act of responding, and identifies the person and the response they have non-verbally uttered. Thus, the conceived ritual places the text on a plane that rises above the actual representation, synthesising reality and conceptualising it.

The relation between the visible and the invisible in the space shown is extremely active, so the frame becomes one of the important creators of the experience of the text[29]. Protagonists enter and exit the frame, some of them only half-displayed at the very edge of the frame, some watching the rest or the off-stage action. Due to the created tension between the visible and the invisible, we are aware of the whole space, its symbolic toponyms, and the interrelations of the protagonists and their internal tensions: the frame simultaneously entangles and separates entities, unites them, contextualises them and denudes them separately in front of the viewer.

## Directorial procedures and the realism of a mythical story

For the mythical speech that emerges from associative relations of form and concept and that wants to emphasise that it proclaims the truth, a realistic impression is crucial. Thus, codes related more closely to the normal codes of perception of the real world and stylised documentary procedures are applied to make it difficult for the viewer to define the boundary in relation to reality[1]. Frequent narrow depth of field shots achieved by using a telephoto lens eliminate the superfluous from the focus and the shot seems denser and lacks a sense of space[29]. Choosing sharpness by using a telephoto lens allows 'stolen', 'captured' scenes and isolation of the protagonist important to the narrative, without losing the impression of a documentary view and the 'invisible' cameraperson. In addition to this, accompanying camera and hand-held camera methods are used. It creates vitality, a feeling that there are no constructed actions, positions and situations, that the camera adapts to events and only captures a unique moment. The over the shoulder shots allow the viewer a privileged position of someone who is watching a 'stolen scene'. The attributes of the unpredictability and maladjustment convince the viewer of closeness to the real world, to its realistic representation, although these are shots that Peterlić[29] calls the author's shots due to the obvious use of

---

[c] The term 'defamiliarisation'(ostranienie) is coined by Shklovsky35 to distinguish poetic from practical language on the basis of the former's perceptibility.

the technique. A factual TV method of directly addressing the viewer, a typical feature of television realism [24] that eliminates the illusion of camera unconsciousness, is also stylised. In our example, it is applied solely to group portrait scenes on stage when the evolved group is fixated after catharsis, the responses. Such a manner of address promotes contact with the viewer in the most straightforward way and calls for immediacy, sympathy and recognition. As Ellis puts it, the event is "co-present" with the viewer who is observing it[24]. A tendency to optimally emphasise the factors of similarity with the real world is also evident in overcoming the horizontal camera position at eye level. In addition, even when the director uses a bird's eye view shot, the author's shot, it remains emphatically in the function of storytelling and the easier understanding of the story. Apart from at the beginning and at the end, the director only uses a cut as a transition, often while the protagonists are in motion or in the middle of the narrator's words, which unites and dynamizes the action, contributing to the feeling that the story is uniformly, continuously, naturally evolving. Table 1 provides an overview of the structural components of the text, which we analyse in more detail below.

**TABLE 1**

STRUCTURAL COMPONENTS OF THE COMMERCIAL 'ALL THAT WE SHARE'

| Structural component | Duration (TC) | Number of shots |
|---|---|---|
| Prologue | 2" (00:00:00-00:02:08) | 1 |
| Exposition | 39" (00:02:09-00:41:13) | 18 (2-19) |
| Rising action | 44" (00:41:14-1:23:15) | 23 (20-43) |
| Climax | 1' 13" (01:23:16-02:36:02) | 33 (44-77) |
| Falling action | 5" (02:36:03-02:41:02) | 3 (77-80) |
| Resolution | 12" (02:41:03-02:53:13) | 6 (81-87) |
| Epilogue | 6" (02:53:13-00:02:59:23) | 2 (88, 89) |

' - the minute, " - the second, order of elements of timecode in parentheses – minutes:seconds:frames

## Prologue and Exposition

The prologue opens up with a fade-in: the space of *Society* opens up from the dark. There is no one but the TV crew, television as the witness to tell the story (TC: 00:00:00-00:02:08)[2]. The exposition sets the initial equilibrium of the drawback. The voice-over immediately states: *It's easy to put people in boxes.* In doing so, the lead *it's easy* and the blackness of space imply the bard's attitude towards *Society*: such a society needs to change (TC: 00:02:09-00:05:20)[2]. The narrator then, in succession to the groups entering, gives 'names-determinations' in contrast and the syntagm is formed out of the permanent semantic oppositions.[d] The umbrella opposition is: *Us / Them* (TC: 00:05:21-00:10:18)[2]. The following are the op-

[d] The term 'name-determination' is functionally used to emphasise verbal naming, whereby an entity is unambiguously identified with the name added.

positions: *The high earners / And those just getting by; Those we trust / And those we try to avoid; There's the new Danes / And those who have always been here; The people from the countryside / And those who have never seen a cow; The religious,* in the sense of passionate sport fans / *And the self-confident,* in the sense of fitness enthusiasts (TC: 00:10:19-00:34:23)[2]. The final opposition is: *There are those we share something with / And those we don't share anything with* (TC: 00:34:24-00:41:13)[2]. Each compound signified had a different compound signifier, so they were immediately and unambiguously legible [36]. The bardic role of expressing the main features of the established cultural agreement about the nature of reality and involving individual members of society in the prevailing value systems is expressed literally and visually unambiguous. We see agreement on the nature of reality so that we see members of society involved in the prevailing value system, and oral logic convinces us that changes must be made in the established cultural agreement (past = bad). Significance is not obtained through the use of structures of formal logic, but speech accompanied by visual images offers an acceptable translation of the complex reality. Because of bardic socio-centrality in the selection and creation of mythemes, the significances we favour are constituted[1]. The intention indicated by an initial clue is summed up by the final opposition in which we literally see how *it's easy to put people in boxes* and divide them into *Us* and *Them*. The final opposition is built by contrasting the extreme wide shots of the members of all paradigmatic registers (*Those we share something with*) and the close-ups of separated members from these registers: lower middle class, musclemen and business people who earn a lot (*Those we don't share anything with*). This implies the dominant address of a prevalent social group, the middle class. The world of *Society* is depicted by a sudden spatial leap into the extreme wide shot, in a spectacular way to remember the signification and to potentiate the negative prefix, the closed nature, restraint and ubiquity. The spatial leap brought by the extreme wide shot, the geometric shot, the defamiliarisation and the mass of the protagonists is a striking direct contrast to the empty space of the prologue: it is the final definition of society. How are contrasting mythemes created? Immediately upon introducing the protagonists into the space, the first system of meanings is moved to the next level. The groups consist of real people connected by one distinctive characteristic: profession, ethnicity, age, hobby or wealth. It serves to make the group a singular entity by means of the culturally determined meanings attached to it, and to assign a name to that entity which is also its essence. Meaning becomes a form ready to receive the new signified; it is not a symbol, but is offered to us a "rich, fully experienced, spontaneous, innocent, indisputable image" (Barthes, 1972: 117)[8]. As an example, we will only analyse the creation of the first mytheme (TC: 00:00:02:09-00:00:08:03)[2], since the way in which the opposition and names-determinations are created is the same in all the mythical speeches of the introduction.

Nurses are too natural for us to experience as symbols. Their selection will take care of the overall vitality and suggestion of reality. Yet the fullness of their lives is impoverished and made available to the concept. On one hand, in our minds, they are illuminated by the angelic warmth and beauty of the leader whose face was the focus of the only medium shot of the group (TC: 00:00:04:14-00:00:05:20)[2], and on the other hand, by their various physiognomies and imperfections, they support the idea of a real and not symbolic representation. Assigning name-determination to the nurses in white *Us*, led by *the Good Angel*, fixes our recall of all the myths related to caregivers of the sick and the misty idea of ourselves in situations where we have experienced ourselves as good and righteous. In this way, it invokes the general and individual history of humanity, our connection to the ideal of goodness expressed through beauty, warmth, comfort, sacrifice: through a woman as a source of life and grace. It calls upon what we want to be and all the hopes that we truly are that. A well-established and well-known code guarantees that the recipients have understood the connotative meaning. This signification is thus created from manifest signifiers and the signified whereby the signified is present through the signifier and unambiguously fixed by speech.

## Rising Action

The rising action establishes a dialogue between *the Society* and *the Neutral questioner* (TC: 00:00:41:14-1:23:15)[2]. It brings a twist and the formation of a ritual question-and-answer action. The formation of evolved groups breaks down the basic groups: a kind of neutralisation occurs. As individuals are separated from previously created entities to create an evolved group, so the entities lose their pertinence in part (cf. Barthes, 1968:73-86)[36] and their significance is modified. The formation of evolved groups takes place in a previously hidden space. The rising action, therefore, serves to establish the ritual of the deconstruction of *the Society* established by the exposition and institutes a new physical and psychological space of *Truth and Light*. This is a chronology of seven complex signs of the syntagm of this ritual: 0. Entities in introductory positions (*the Society*) → 1. Question → 2. The first reaction of the members of *the Society* → 3. Courageous individual or individuals come forward first → 4. Others move too → 5. In the position of the *Truth and Light* an evolved group of a new identity is fixed → 6. Return to the starting points → 7. A new question and the beginning of a new cycle. The rising action begins with the syntagm: *Who in this room was the class clown*? (TC: 00:53:15-01:13:19)[2]. The second syntagm in the chain (*Who are stepparents*?) expels the redundant elements of the basic ritual syntagm (TC: 00:01:13:20-1:23:15)[2]. This is possible because the ritual code is adopted and only the parts relevant to the narrative need to be emphasised when repeating the ritual.

The mythical speech builds on the myth constructed earlier. Barthes warns that form ('meaning' as the final term of the linguistic system become 'form' as the first term of the mythical system) and concept in myth will play a sort of a hide-and-seek game in which form is at disposal of the concept. "The meaning will be for the form like an instantaneous reserve of history, a tamed richness, which it is possible to call and dismiss in a sort of rapid alternation" (Barthes, 1972:117)[8]. The analogy of meaning and form, and the ability of concept to correlate to form so that it subordinates the meaning to itself, represents the characteristics of myth as discourse. It is precisely the duplicity of the signifier whose impoverished appearance participates in the founding of concept, a simultaneous analogous relation of such parts of the sign and their manifestations that enable these processes (Barthes, 1972:120-124)[8]. The overall meaning of the sign that constituted the person belonging to a previously established entity has been repositioned and appears as a form in the role of a first term of the mythical speech. Its meaning is again depleted, but not in a way that we would perceive as a symbolic representation. This form is even more 'real' than the one in the introduction because it is offered as a deconstruction of the notion of the uniqueness of a human being, like a plunge into individuality and true nature.

## Climax

At the final shot of the second ritual syntagm (TC: 01:23:16)[2], the narrator is reintroduced to fix the signification. This is also the start of the climax. Third-person narration (*Them*) changes to first-person (*Us*), i.e. a double integration is performed. It emphasises *Us* through the formation of a new entity as an integrating common feature for all new groups that make up this paradigm and as an integrating common feature with the viewer. Based on this address mode, new group entities will form a compact paradigmatic register that directly correlates with the viewer. The narrator proclaims: *And then suddenly, there's Us*, and establishes the first and main semantic point of the climax. *They* will disintegrate, and *We* will take over the elements of the decomposed entities in a way that will alchemically transform them from darkness to light, from negative to positive, from profane to sacred.

In the climax, the questions within the syntagm are created on the contrast model, which we will call 'tears and laughter' because the expressions of these affective states change rhythmically. The syntagmatic chain is constructed so that the entities continue to lose their pertinence while creating a new paradigmatic axis. The axis is formed by groups established on the basis of the studio host's questions. According to the spoken names-determinations, signifiers of new characters are formed in front of the viewer, which will form this new paradigmatic axis. The ritual is performed in a way that constantly creates a kind of neutralising of oppositions: the signifiers are also formed by those members of the old paradigms who may have also participated in forming the signifier and of some other member of the new paradigm. The fact that the syntagm is not constructed by constant but neutralising oppositions by constantly forming new groups directly par-

ticipates in the creation of a semanteme opposite to that of the initial paradigmatic register. Answering questions, on the one hand, gradually destroys the semantic values ('the truths') of the paradigms originally set, whilst on the other hand, it creates a semantic value of the new paradigmatic register of *We all*, which is in an increasing contrast with the semantic value of the first paradigm register the *Society*.

The climax begins with an ellipsis of the question and answer ritual. The ritual is familiar to the viewer, it is in their conscience, and an ellipsis is introduced which condenses the action. We are already following the phase of the fixation of the evolved groups and the addition of name-determination: *We who believe in life after death, We who have seen UFOs* and *And all of us who love to dance.* The motif of the initial elliptical syntagmatic chains will be called 'lifestyle' (TC: 01:28:08-01:36:02)[2].

The next syntagmatic chain is created by two syntagms that abruptly leave their bright atmosphere. Their motif is 'good and evil' (TC: 01:36:03-01:54:05)[2]. Dramatically, in silence, an evolved group is formed, which is mostly seen sideways or from behind. When the narrator says: *We ...* the close-up of a tattooed young man stands out from a basic group of musclemen. He looks to the side and down, his head shielded from a direct view towards the hall, however, the camera's side view documents that moment and nevertheless reveals his face. We see his tattooed neck, traces of boyhood, some memory and discomfort about standing in the first row. The moment he turns his head forward and decides to look directly ahead of him, the narrator continues: *... who have been bullied*. In doing so, he reveals a 'secret' about the aggression that the boy experienced, and turns the act of being on stage into an act of courage, of the sacrifice for others who lack that courage. Unlike earlier wider shots, similar to family photographs taken with a camera directly in front of the object, the close-up oblique pan shot of the rest of the evolved group of harassed, sad but direct looks – is the only shot offered to the viewer as a representation of this evolved group's fixation phase.

The young man was deliberately singled out as a member of the paradigmatic register of the introductory entity of the name-determination *Those we try to avoid*. From the history and complexity of the real young man, with the help of the existing myths of tattooed musclemen found in our minds, the form reclaims part of the meaning and is associated with the concept called the history of attackers who were victims as children. This is how signification is created: *Both the attacker and the victim*, a dual attribute that will overflow from the bearer and into the signification of the entire evolved group. The same formula was applied in the following syntagm.

This syntagm appears as a contrast to the previous one. The youngest light-skinned gentle boy of a basic group of teenagers was chosen to be at the centre of an evolving group of abusers. His evident repentance and visible discomfort over an earlier act of aggression, combined with courage – as in the previous syntagm create a sense based on duality: *A sinful angel who is repentant and is comforted by it*. There are also four musclemen involved in creating the signification on the boy's right (the force of evil) and nurses and long-term residents on his left (the force of good), as well as a blond girl who comforts him during repentance (grace). His remorse and her comfort is an integral act suggesting that repentance brings us the grace of comfort. The overflowing of this signification makes the whole evolving group a *Sinner repentant angel*.

This choice and the way in which mythical speeches are made are now greatly undermining the myth of the divided *Society*. We see the symbols seen as truth captured by the camera. The courage required for a young creature to publicly answer the questions posed in the creation of the last two syntagms reinforces a documentary impression: we are looking at the confession in which *Us* professes. The time is right for the emphatic connotative addressing of the *Us* entity. A medium shot of nurses in white whose uniforms and the laughter on their faces illuminate a black background shot is used (TC: 01:54:06)[2]. At the same time, the narrator says: *And then there's us ...* and the story will continue.

The following are four syntagms with the theme of love relationships. The first of these, as a contrast to the previous two, brings out a loud joyful laugh. Syntagms and names-determinations are listed again, following the contrast model: *The lucky ones, who had sex this past week / We who are broken-hearted*; *We who are madly in lo*ve */ We who feel lonely* (TC: 01:55:15-00:02:16:06)[2]. A syntagm is then introduced with a theme of the identity of diversity and its acceptance in society. It is composed of the main (bisexuality) and the inserted syntagm (recognising someone else's courage) and represents the third, final ritual sacrifice of a young man (TC: 02:16:07-02:36:02)[2]. It is a reality TV version of sacrifice, of full public disclosure in front of the whole of society, of personal isolation, the exposure of oneself for and on behalf of others. It leads to an emotional climax, sanctifies the story and makes it an undeniable truth (cf. Girard, 1979:79-85)[37]. Sacrifice, the typical matrix of mythical and ritual forms pointed out by Girard, represents the moment of the creation of the sacred in this myth as well. It also brings a decisive recognition of the importance of sacrifice to the community. The motif of the youngest son, who eventually ends up as a hero and a victor (cf. Bettelheim, 2010:102-111)[38] does not only have a therapeutic role he plays in the fairy tale, for this is a myth. Here, in addition to the personal one, social hope, arising from the pressure, is also affirmed. We will decompose the syntagm for the purpose of analysis.

A young, fragile bisexual creature bravely steps out of the *Society* and reveals itself. Elaboration of the stages of a young man walking on stage without the narrator's commentary and the wide bird's eye view shot that clearly states that he is the only person answering the question – amplify the drama since we do not yet know what secret the segregation will reveal. Because of the directorial procedures, we do know that it is important, profound. We find out 'the secret' named-determined: *We who are bisexual,* when a young man is already illuminated by the light and sacredness of the position of *Truth and light*. The

*Society* for which he sacrificed himself honours him at that moment with long thunderous applause to which the narrator meaningfully attaches the name-determination: *And we who acknowledge the courage of others*. Thus, the young man's sacrifice transformed the *Society*; through sacrifice, it recalled hidden goodness and humanity. All the processes are presented realistically, literally, clearly and unambiguously. In front of the viewer's eyes, the bard interprets, justifies and celebrates the actions of individuals and exposes the inadequacies in the cultural conception of personality, due to the pressure of contemporary culture to shift to new liberal beliefs. This scene ends the sacrifices and life should now be celebrated.

## Falling Action, Resolution and the Epilogue

The falling action, modelled on the climax's beginning, is made up of two life-themed syntagms, represented by an ellipsis and names-determinations: *We who have found the meaning of life / And we who have saved lives*, and it will serve to create an overall signification (TC: 02:36:03-02:41:02)[2]. The two last names-determinations are in such a relationship that the second encompassed the first. They have formed the final sequence: *sense + life + goodness + humanity = all of us*. In other words, in one possible reading of this complex signification, the concepts *We are life, We are goodness and humanity* and *We are the sense* united create: *All of us who are, we are both the sense and the goodness*; everyday, spoken: *All of us are human!* The signification of the nurses' portrayal in the last medium shot – a close-up of the main bearer, *the Good Angel* (*woman-life-goodness-beauty*), who we first saw in the introduction – is overflowing onto all the participants. Everyone becomes a singular entity *We are all humans!* In this way, a new equilibrium of acceptance and security was established, completely opposite to the initial one, which will be confirmed by the falling action.

A new equilibrium is attached by the resolution. The first syntagm of the name-determination: *And then there's all of us who just love Denmark* (TC: 02:41:03-02:47:08)[2], is built with a familiar code. The large number of participants, oral logic and confidentiality will create the impression of mass belief in the truth of the statement made, and the motif of patriotism towards Denmark anchors the relationship of the created myth to the actual geographical and psychological space to which it is primarily intended. However, the final celebration and release of tension after the catharsis brought about by the rising action, the climax and falling action have not yet come. This will happen in the syntagm: *So maybe there's more that brings us together than we think*, which follows (TC: 02:47:09-02:53:12)[2]. The rising action, climax and falling action were a confession ritual, and the last syntagm represents the end of the ritual. The participants lend a hand to each other, releasing the feelings produced by catharsis and achieving peace in communion. The narrative arc closes. The bard has conveyed a sense of cultural belonging, security and inclusion. They have ensured the practical appropriateness of culture by validating its mythology. The viewer is convinced that their status and identity as an individual is guaranteed by the culture as a whole. It is now time for the epilogue. During mutual congratulations and hugs between the participants, a graphic is shown that introduces us to the narrator (TC: 02:53:13-02:58:11)[2]. We learn that they represent the TV2 television channel whose programme is shared by all the members of society: *TV2 Denmark; TV2 All that we share*. In this process, the narrator and the graphic place the events in a new final context that helps to create another myth in the epilogue, one that makes the whole commercial complete, and reads: *All of us are humans, and TV2 understands this and reminds us of what is below the surface. This is the television for us.*

## Affiliation of the Text with the Medium

On the one hand, the text is strongly linked to television code, aesthetics and addressing modes. On the other hand, in the first and second stages of the promotional campaign, the text was distributed via online platforms, and the professional awards[21, 22] it received largely define it via the text of social networks. These networks played a crucial role in its global popularisation. However, it must be said that the text of All That We Share is a television text of the digital age. The use of digital computer technology for distribution and presentation is an abandoned criterion for determining the affiliation of text with the medium because many forms of culture use computer distribution (Manovich, 2003:16-23)[39]. In the age of blurring the boundaries between media, the 'overflow' of television text into other media (Brooker, 2001:458)[40] and media convergence, television theory views television as an intrinsic part of 'new media'. Television of the digital era is marked by the evolution of production practices (Lotz, 2017:2)[41] and should be observed in the context of a complex media matrix and a new hybrid interactive media practice of media consumption in which viewers combine using and viewing, "to make the new connected consumers of the future"[42].

In the digital age, television genres are being modified to accommodate both linear television and distribution via online platforms, and the modification of this text should be observed in this context. We note that its three-minute duration is not common to broadcast within television 'super-text'[43]. With the advent of online platforms, promotional forms have partially separated from the super-text, and have begun interacting with the audience as isolated texts as well. Thus, they could expand in time and introduce narrative strategies that imitate the discourse of factual texts on a new level. The door has been opened to a new hybrid, a commercial of stylised realism intended for synergistic Internet and linear television distribution.[e]

---

[e] This is supported by the fact that the same documentary discourse - a neutral stage setting, presenting an extradiegetic space, everyday people answering questions from moderators (trying to break down prejudices about people), and the same tactic of changing the initial equilibrium and establishing a new one - are applied, for example, in a three-minute commercial #Like A Girl for a hygiene supplier's brand Always in 2014. Its creators called it an epic battle to boost girls' and teenage girls' self-confidence during puberty and beyond[44].

Due to their different nature of usage, these texts follow the imperative of holding the attention and provoking the desire to share with other members of a social 'bubble'. Their basic characteristic is strong persuasiveness and emotionality, sparking a desire to trust the story and to share it. The text wants to arouse in the users the desire to speak about themselves and their worldview, i.e. to build their own virtual identity by the act of reaction. Sharing a story is the main purpose of the production for social networks that are not massive by nature, but their massiveness depends on the number of followers. Interactions in relation to the story and the users' production of texts inspired by the basic text make it possible to establish a 'paratextual'[45] network, which then spirals into the further encouragement of new sharing and the creation of new semantic values.

To conclude: the text of All That We Share was designed for a 'participatory culture' (cf. Jenkins, 2005:23, 46)[46] and simultaneous connectedness to two models of distribution, that is, it uses the viewer as 'the curator'[47] and creator of paratext. Mass reception and approval were then used in the creation of new paratexts by the media - news and videos about the reactions to the commercial[22, 28, 48, 49]. They then further developed a network of my-themes and variations of the same myth, expanding the semantic field of myth and affirming to the viewer the importance and truthfulness of the seen as well as the correctness of their personal reading when it equals the mass one. And all to bring a text with such semantic definitions back to television.

## Audience as a Participant in the Myth-making Process

The Danish version of the commercial was premiered on the Facebook and YouTube sites of the TV 2 A/S company on 20th January 2017, the day of the inauguration of US President Donald Trump[28, 50, 51]. In the first two days, the Danish-language version was viewed more than three million times and in the first three days, it was shared over sixty thousand times[52]. The second phase of the campaign was to release the English-language version of the commercial on 27th January, 2017 via same online platforms[53, 54] on Holocaust Remembrance Day, which was also the day when the Executive Order for Protecting the Nation from Foreign Terrorist Entry into the United States was signed by Donald Trump[55]. The incorporation of the film into linear television broadcasting followed immediately. Choosing when to start each phase accelerated media coverage and sharing of the commercial through social networks. The US president served as an extradiegetic antagonist; his actions were used to establish the context of dramatic conflict in the commercial itself. The campaign was a worldwide success. Its international success found its way into Danish national news and whenever another country began sharing the commercial, it would revive the interest in it in Denmark as well. "People like Richard Branson, Justin Trudeau and Ellen DeGeneres shared the film along with prominent Danes. The film not only introduced TV2's strategy of 'All that we share', as it also proved it by becoming a unifying factor in global conversation"[21]. Within the first six months, by the of June 2017, the results were impressive: 345 million unpaid (organic) views, 8.7 million online interactions (which resulted in the campaign being titled as "the most engaged campaign ever"), $96 million earned media exposure, 68% of Danes who acknowledge TV2's new position and a 27% increase of overall belief in Denmark in the message "we have more in common than what separates us"[56] (the dating and originality of the data verified 19th March 2018 in an e-mail correspondence with Anne Højbi, account director &Co./NoA). The commercial was translated by users into more than thirty languages[21]. By March 2018 the main results on social networks were as follows: more than 394 million unpaid views and more than 7.6 million shares (Share!) by users (e-mail correspondence with Anne Højbi, &Co./NoA, 19th March 2018). The campaign won numerous international awards[21, 22], and the social network Facebook awarded the commercial an annual gold medal in the category of "These brands made us fall in love"[57].

A mythical sign activates the myth chain by which we understand reality (Fiske & Hartley, 2004:26)[1]. All members of a cultural circle share a field of subjective responses, and myths act as organising structures in the field of culturally determined intersubjectivity intersubjectivity[1]. The recurring myths of a mythology are listed, so a semantically same story becomes more and more detailed and encompasses a growing semantic field, and in the repetitions comes the creation of invariant points that gradually establish something resembling semantic junctions. This creates a myth nucleus that, on the one hand, can spread, for example, into alleged scientific theories, and on the other, into reality through the behaviour of those who have taken that nucleus as a kind of revelation [5]. This pattern is visible in the perception and dissemination of the text of All That We Share.

Indefinite generalisations of everyday speech (*Us, Them*, and so on) were used within the text itself, facilitating the communication of the sharers. The distribution of the text initiates the process of its semantic expansion and the reinforcement of semantic junctions. The ability to create connected social 'balloons' within which confidence in the text is reinforced, the active awareness of similar emotions of others, the ability to express personal emotional reactions and the ability to modify a basic myth in accordance with local circumstances, all of this creates new levels of meaning, at the same time reinforcing semantic junctions and confirming the myth, as Malinowski[11] would say, as a pragmatic charter of faith and moral wisdom.

The first group responds to the text by adding iconic characters, 'Facebook reactions', shares the text via social networks and writes short comments below the published text. Users transmit the text via an online version of oral tradition and attach personal meaning to it. Socially influential individuals also responded in this way, further confirming the 'value and truthfulness' of the text by linking myths about these persons with what is seen in the

text, confirming one another. Another group of users intervenes in the text, besides commenting and sharing it further, by graphically altering it: they add captions and overdub the narrator's words in their native language to make the text more appropriate for distribution on social networks and understandable for the local community[58-60]. The third group of users organises 'social experiments' in which they repeat the narration of the commercial, adapting it to concerns of their community, and share the video through distribution platforms. A review of Facebook posts containing the hashtag of the title All That We Share[61] and YouTube and Vimeo platforms, shows that rituals were performed by informal groups[62, 63] and organisations ranging from a student camp[64], gymnastics club[65], educational institutions[66-71], religious organisations[72], volunteer associations[73] or hospitals[74]. Introducing local motifs such as patient-hospital staff relations[74], student issues[63], or the reflections of political relations between Greece and Cyprus on the lives of Laconia's children[69], broadens the semantic field of myth by retaining and consolidating invariant places. We note the basic: (a) transformation of division (word *boxes*, rectangles on the floor, participants divided into groups) into commonality and signification: *We are all humans*! through the ritual of representing groups and responding by stepping from one space to another, (b) using binary oppositions and (c) naming the source of the charter – TV 2 and the slogan All That We Share. A fourth group publishes movie-themed vlogs via online platforms[75] organises screenings and discussions about the commercial and intercultural co-existence[76]; or produces commercial-inspired educational videos about preventing peer violence[77].

## Conclusion

Although the authors whose insights have helped illuminate the myth of All That We Share do not share the same viewpoints about the intention of the myth, we do not consider it a flaw but a confirmation that the myth is impossible to be defined unambiguously. Yet, All That We Share shows that they were all right: the myth is alive. All That We Share is a reality TV myth of television of the digital age. The contemporary media context allows for a mythical announcement to take the form of a reality TV confessional documentary text which is actually an advertisement. However, it does not matter because we believe it. Not only does it use discourse to feed the idea that it itself is the bard, but it also tells us that television will continue to be a transitional object in establishing the ontological security of a modern person. Such genre paradox (advertisement = charter of truth) is a child of its time, its media and its audience. However, this does not lessen its mythical nature. All That We Share is no less a myth because it is an advertisement from its big brother, the myth of Oedipus (to stay true to both Lévi-Strauss and Solar). However, when this analysis reaches the readers, the mythology of equality between people or the mythology of the land of Denmark may replace it with a new myth, because we live in such fast-moving times.

How do we defend the claim that All That We Share is a myth? The validity and power of a myth are judged by the belief in the definiteness of the truth it has revealed, the intensity of emotions that the belief in its revelation produces, by its importance in seeing its own life and nature of the world, and a kind of therapeutic social function. The results show: the story of Denmark, in which people led by three brave young men and a woman-angel show the world that all people are the same, in the eyes of their true creator - the audience, represents a true story of real human nature suppressed by social divisions. The fact that the venue is a television studio rather than Olympus is a relative question. The values, that members of a particular culture want to get closer to, reside in both places. Television exposure to the public as a way of self-discovery is the active basis of the reality TV genre and therefore of the reality culture. The documentary discourse of the social experiment played a crucial role in the performativity and persuasiveness of the text. Turning the creator into someone who merely made it possible to express reality by using the form of recorded film, this immediacy and confidentiality created an illusion that the viewer was co-present at the confession and was making a conclusion about what they saw. Another crucial element was that the mythical story was not hidden, on the contrary, it was clearly presented: through spatial and temporal relationships, characters, ritual and an open process of nomination as an act of unambiguous creation and transformation. A simple linear ritual narrative of public confession and simultaneous public sacrifice enables members of the community to move into the sacred space of truth and communion, and at the same time to move from the past into the future. The codes used are easy to read and familiar to anyone, so they easily establish a cultural and personal connotative connection to motifs and myths in the mind of the viewer who is drawn into the melodrama of intense emotions. And once they surrendered to one myth, when they believed to the point that they needed to share it with others, the myth became alive. The viewer's need for the voice of the bard fed them, and the bard, in turn, gave that person the assurance that by the act of seeing and approving, they themselves became part of a singular entity created by the myth.

Thus, the viewer expanded the semantic field of the myth and solidified the semantic junctions of the story of *All of Us*, and as *Us* were initially Danes (this was later extended, along with the overall semantic expansion, to the entity: *All of us who love and share the commercial*), the semantic junctions strongly encompassed Denmark itself as the site of a model action, a place of unification into *Ourselves*. Denmark thus became a place of a sacred story, and Danish public television became the place and catalyst for the exemplary act of unification, rather than a company promoting its product. This myth of *Denmark that uses humanity to expose stereotypes about differences in a multicultural society* will fit into existing myth chains (mythologies) about public television and about Denmark, thus further creating our perceptions of them.

# REFERENCES

1. FISKE J, HARTLEY J, Reading television (Routledge, New York, 2004). DOI: 10.4324/9780203356623. — 2. TV 2, &CO / NOA, MOLAND FILM, All that we share, We love ad, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://www.welovead.com/en/works/details/38fwglsEn. — 3. ELIADE M, Myth and reality (Harper & Row, New York, 1963). — 4. SILVERSTONE R, The message of television: Myth and narrative in contemporary culture (Heinemann, London, 1981). — 5. SOLAR M, Edipova braća i sinovi (Golden marketing, Zagreb, 2008). — 6. CASSIRER E, An essay on man: An introduction to a philosophy of human culture (Doubleday Anchor Books, Garden City NY, 1953). — 7. ELIADE M, The sacred and the profane: The nature of religion (Harvest Book, New York, 1968). — 8. BARTHES R, Mythologies (Noonday Press, New York, 1972). — 9. LÉVI-STRAUSS C, Structural anthropology (Basic Books, New York, 1963). — 10. HJEMSLEV L, Prolegomena to a theory of language (University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, 1969). — 11. MALINOWSKI B, Magic, science and religion and other essays (Free Press, Glencoe IL, 1948). — 12. GRAMSCI A, Selections from the Prison Notebooks (Lawrence and Wishart, London, 1971). — 13. GIDDENS A, The constitution of society (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1984). — 14. GIDDENS A, A reply to my critics. In: HELD D, THOMPSON JB (Eds) Social theory of modern societies (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989). — 15. GIDDENS A, The consequences of modernity (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1990). — 16. GIDDENS A, Modernity and self-identity: Self and society in the late modern age (Polity Press, Cambridge, 1991). — 17. SILVERSTONE R, Television and everyday life (Routledge, London, 2003). DOI: 10.4324/9780203358948. — 18. WINNICOTT D, The maturational processes and the facilitating environment: Studies in the theory of emotional development (Hogarth Press, London, 1965). — 19. WINNICOTT D, Playing and reality (Penguin, Harmondsworth, 1974). — 20. WINNICOTT D, Through paediatrics to psycho-analysis (Hogarth Press, London, 1975). — 21. NOA, TV2 Denmark: All that we share, NoA, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.thenorthalliancecom/our-work/all-that-we-share/. — 22. TV 2, Flotte priser til 'Alt det vi deler', TV 2, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://omtv2.tv2.dk/nyhedsartikler/nyhedsvisning/flotte-priser-til-alt-det-vi-deler/. — 23. BARTHES R, Rhetoric of the image. In: BARTHES R (Auth) Image, music, text (Fontana Press, London, 1977). — 24. ELLIS J, Visible fictions: Cinema, television, video (Routledge, London, 1992). DOI: 10.4324/9780203132647. — 25. MITTEL J, A cultural approach to television genre theory. In: EDGERTON G, ROSE B (Eds) Thinking outside the box: A contemporary television genre reader (University Press of Kentucky, New York, 2005). — 26. COLLINS J, Postmodernism and television. In: ALLEN R (Ed) Channels of discourse, reassembled: Television and temporary criticism (Routledge, New York, 1992). DOI: 10.4324/9780203991329. — 27. MACLEOD D, All That We Share in TV2 in Denmark, Inspiration Room, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://theinspirationroom.com/daily/2017/all-that-we-share-on-tv2/. — 28. KLEMP A, TV2-film vinder reklame-VM efter 307 millioner visning verden over, TV2, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://nyheder.tv2.dk/2017-06-20-tv-2-film-vinder-reklame-vm-efter-307-millioner-visninger-verden-over. — 29. PETERLIĆ A, Osnove teorije filma (ADU, Zagreb, 2018). — 30. HILL A, Studying Reality TV. In: CREEBER G (Ed) The television genre book (BFI, London, 2008). — 31. BRUZZI S, Docu soaps. In: CREEBER G (Ed) The television genre book (BFI, London, 2008). — 32. SHATTUC J, The confessional talk show. In: CREEBER G (Ed) The television genre book (BFI, London, 2008). — 33. DOVEY J, Reality TV: Introduction. In: CREEBER G (Ed) The television genre book (BFI, London, 2008). — 34. BARTHES R, New Lit Hist, 6 (1975) 237. DOI: 10.2307/468419. — 35. SHKLOVSKY V, Art as technique. In: RIVKIN J, RYAN M (Eds) Literary theory, an anthology (Blackwell Publishing, Maiden, 2004). — 36. BARTHES R, Elements of semiology (Hill and Wang, New York, 1968). — 37. GIRARD R, Violence and the sacred (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 1979). — 38. BETTELHEIM B, The uses of enchantment: The managing and importance of fairy tales (Vintage Books, New York, 2010). — 39. MANOVICH L, New media from Borges to HTML. In: WARDRIP-FRUIN N, MONFORT N (Eds) The new media reader. (MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003). — 40. BROOKER W, Int J Cult Stud, 4 (2001) 456. DOI: 10.1177/136787790100400406. — 41. LOTZ A, Portals: A treatise on Internet-distributed television (Maize Books, Michigan, 2017). DOI: 10.3998/mpub.9699689. — 42. WOOD H, TAYLOR L, Cine J, 47 (2008) 144. DOI: 10.1353/cj.0.0015. — 43. BROWNE N, Q Rev Film Stud, 9 (1984) 174. DOI: 10.1080/10509208409361210. — 44. ALWAYS / P&G, LEO BURNETT, CHELSEA FILMS, #Like a girl, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=XjJQBjWYDTs. — 45. GENETTE G, New Lit Hist, 22 (1991) 261. DOI: 10.2307/469037. — 46. JENKINS H, Textual poachers, television fans & participatory culture (Routledge, London, 2005). Available from: https://epdf.pub/textual-poachers-television-fans-and-participatory-culture-studies-in-culture-an.html. — 47. ROBINSON MJ, Television on demand, curatorial culture and the transformation of TV. (Bloomsbury, New York, 2017). — 48. &CO / NOA, All that we share — Case video, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=H4qEI8QARbE. — 49. TV 2, Flere priser til "Årets virale hit", TV 2, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://omtv2.tv2.dk/nyhedsartikler/nyhedsvisning/flere-priser-til-aarets-virale-hit/. — 50. TV 2, &CO / NOA, MOLAND FILM, Alt det vi deler, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available at: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=B3_52CULpJg. — 51. TV 2, &CO / NOA, MOLAND FILM, TV 2, FB, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/tv2.danmark/videos/597635013764773/. — 52. BRORSON N, Filmen, der deles igen og igen: - Jeg fik tårer i øjnene, da jeg så reaktionerne, TV 2, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://underholdning.tv2.dk/viralt/2017-01-23-filmen-der-deles-igen-og-igen-jeg-fik-taarer-i-oejnene-da-jeg-saa-reaktionerne?cid=tv2.dk:Filmen%2C%20der%20deles%20igen%20og%20igen%3A%20%20Jeg%20fik%20t%C3%A5rer%20i%20%C3%B8jnene%2C%20da%20jeg%20s%C3%A5%20reaktionerne:ar. — 53. TV 2, &CO / NOA, MOLAND FILM, All that we share, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jD8tjhVO1Tc&feature=youtube. — 54. TV 2, &CO / NOA, MOLAND FILM, All that we share, FB, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/tv2.danmark/videos/601352856726322/. — 55. WHITE HOUSE, Executive order protecting the nation from foreign terrorist entry into the United States, White House, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states/. — 56. &CO / NOA, All that we share, We love ad, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://www.welovead.com/en/works/details/f0fwgnoEm. — 57. FACEBOOK BUSINESS, Big, bold and full of feeling: The 2017 Facebook awards winners, FB Business, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/business/news/facebook-awards-winners-announcement. — 58. BORED LIFE, Stop putting people in boxes ... after all we are all the same, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oVQW89iF6Ec. — 59. EDUCATE INSPIRE CHANGE, What happens when we stop putting people in boxes …, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Wh-xdZzyjVI&t=5s. — 60. STORM EMPIRE, Was passiert, wenn wir aufhören menschen in schubladen zu packen?, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iPA47uKWP7E. — 61. FACEBOOK, #AllThatWeShare, FB, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/hashtag/allthatweshare?source=feed_text. — 62. BATTAGLIA R, All that we share, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=HIx03o19aY0. — 63. STUDENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HOUSTON "ZEBRAPHILES", All that we share - UH edition, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=I2tcOrMj9QM. — 64. URJ CRANE LAKE CAMP, All that we share, FB, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/urjcranelakecamp/videos/10155068125684475/. — 65. GYMNASTIKHØJSKOLEN AND OLLERUP, Friday's chance: All that we share, inspired by Danish TV2: Alt det vi deler, FB, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/www.ollerup.dk/videos/1529077493793015/. — 66. PEEL SCHOOLS, All that we share (Danish TV ad inspired), YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jFlwQ_P65UQ. — 67. HERTFORD REGIONAL COLLEGE, My HRC - All that we share - Diversity awards 2017, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=baWuo0Fj7g8. — 68. GREEN HOPE FALCON, Green Hope All that we share, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aA0cQjHiH0U. — 69. GALANIS N, Όλα αυτά που μας ενώνουν - All that we share (2ο δο Σκάλας λακωνίας) βίντεο για την Κύπρο, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cyvdxXb3OOg. — 70. MILAN MEDIA, You can't put people in boxes | King David, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://

www.youtube.com/watch?v=LHnxPURgC9Q. — 71. THAMES VALLEY DISTRICT SCHOOL BOARD, It's easy to be different when you have a lot in common! #TVDSBinclusive, inspired by "TV2 | All that we share", FB, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.facebook.com/ TVDSB/videos/10155168567744983/. — 72. NEWHOPE CHURCH, Don't put people in boxes, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www. youtube.com/watch?v=zRwt25M5nGw. — 73. PALATINE PROMISE, All that we share: Diversity project, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5jjqTav4-88. — 74. UNIVERSAL HOSPITAL OF SOUTH MANCHESTER, UHSM people no boxes, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.youtube.com/ watch?v=yuGzIO0SDRA. — 75. FREACK P, Let's talk about - TV2 / All that we share, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: https://www.you- tube.com/watch?v=bXXLbARsp8c. — 76. FILM ENGLISH, All that we share, Film English, accessed 05.10.2019. Available from: http://film- english.com/2017/04/19/all-that-we-share/. — 77. SPRINGFIELD PRI- MARY SCHOOL, Y6 All that we share, YT, accessed 05.10.2019. Avail- able from: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9mfmbtST-ek.

*V. Karuza Podgorelec*

*Preradovićeva 42, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia*

*e-mail vesnakaruzapodgorelec@gmail.com.*

## PROMOTIVNI FILM 'ALL THAT WE SHARE': SUVREMENI TELEVIZIJSKI REALITY MIT

### S A Ž E T A K

Rad nastoji semiotički analizirati promotivni film *All That We Share* (Sve što dijelimo) javnog servisa TV 2 Danska A/S unutar teorijskog okvira kojeg vezano za fenomen suvremenog mita razvijaju Barthes, Fiske, Hartley, Silverstone i Solar. U radu se ukratko donose teorije koje su ovi autori razvili vezano za mit kao diskurs, mitsku i bardsku ulogu televizije, televiziju kao tranzicijski objekt koji sudjeluje u uspostavi ontološke sigurnosti te mit kao izraz mitske svijesti koja i danas koegzistira s drugim oblicima svijesti. Tekst *All That We Share* sagledava se u odnosu na cilj kreiranja i ostvarene rezultate, na način da se analizira pripadnost mediju i žanru te semiotički razlažu njegove strukturne sa- stavnice i upotrijebljena filmska izražajna sredstva. Rad nastoji dokazati da je tekst suvremeni televizijski *reality* mit koji u svojoj mitotvornoj namjeri koristi digitalne modele distribucije i trenutak nastanka kuratorijalne kulture u kojoj, osim što se gube oštre granice između žanrova i medija, gledatelji preuzimaju ulogu distributera i su-kreatora ukupnog narativa. Pri tome analizirani tekst ne samo da ostaje u okvirima kôda televizije i kôda mitske priče, nego te kôdove svjesno donosi u njihovom izravnom, jednostavnom i jasnom obliku. Upravo takva pripovjedačka tehnika, usuglašena s preciznim odabirom trenutka početka distribucije teksta koji ga snažno kontekstualizira, pridonosi stvaranju njegova značenja i akcelerira njegovu distribuciju te osigurava tekstu globalni uspjeh.