

## VARIATION IN FUNCTIONS OF NARRATIVE IN MILITARY DISCOURSE

*Liudmyla Pelepeichenko, National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine, Ukraine, pelepln2014@gmail.com*

*Tetiana Podufalova, H. S. Skovoroda Kharkiv National Pedagogical University, Ukraine, podufalova.tatyana@gmail.com*

*Svitlana Revutska, National Academy of the National Guard of Ukraine, Ukraine, svetrev2014@gmail.com*

Original scientific paper

DOI: 10.31902/fil.40.2022.11

**Abstract:** This article identifies kinds of variation in functions of narrative in military discourse and conditions that determine their realization. It proves that the function of narrative proper is observed only in certain types of military didactic discourse, when the speaker's goal is confined to providing accurate information (teaching how to use weapons, self-defense techniques, etc.). In other types of didactic discourse, the narrative function is supplemented with the functions of educating and affirming society's value priorities. The types of variation are determined by discourse conditions: the social context of communication and the speaker's illocutionary goal. In instructive speeches, the function of conveying information can be supplemented with that of affirming society's value priorities. In informative speeches, the narrative function is often accompanied by the functions of evaluation and refutation of rumors, myths, or someone's statements. Special occasion speeches are characterized by the rearrangement of functions: the narrative function becomes supplementary, and the functions of evaluation, worldview formation, and value priorities affirmation become the main ones. Inspirational speeches are most often built on the syncretism of narrative and persuasion. In all speech genres of military discourse, the function of a grand narrative is the formation of military personnel's positive image.

**Keywords:** variation in narrative, function, military discourse, text

### **Introduction**

Narrative as an interdisciplinary research subject has been closely and comprehensively studied; however, it is still the focus of attention due to a number of reasons. Firstly, the phenomenon itself is common in all areas of human activity; in each of them it displays new properties,

prompting researchers to consider them. Secondly, it is a well-constructed narrative that often determines the success of communication, which makes us look for conditions that ensure the achievement of communication goals and those that prevent communication. Thirdly, new scientific paradigms require analysis of traditional ideas about many phenomena, including narrative, from different perspectives.

The issue of functions of narrative is of particular significance to communication, since it is the functions of language units that contribute most to the realization of a speaker's intentions. Scholarly literature describes functions of narrative in different areas of study: in literary studies (Bystrov; *Literary Encyclopedic Dictionary*), psychology (Chepeleva, Smulson, Shilovska and Gutsol; Schiff; Nelson), medicine (Lysanets; Thurnherr, Rudolf von Rohr and Locher), politics (Kirillov, Sheigal), and many others (Brownlie; Simmons; Afanasiev; Kazakov; Mozheiko). Less attention is paid to the military sphere, although it is as significant for the life of society as the other spheres. Military discourse covers many communication situations: communication between members of military units, contacts between military personnel and civilians; interaction within one country and on an international level. In military discourse practices, there can be found a variety of situations in which narrative plays an important role, if not a primary one. Thus, Wasinski substantiates the existence of a recurring military grand narrative in the modern state-centric world and describes its consequences (57-76). Achugar investigates in detail the Uruguayan military's argumentative narrative about the last dictatorship (1973—85). A number of scientists study the strategic narrative in the military sphere (Barovska; *Stratehichnyi naratyv*). Yet, a military narrative in general has not been extensively studied. Having chosen narrative in military discourse as an object of study, we are well aware of the numerous problems that are to be resolved, and of the impossibility of doing it within one article. Consequently, we limited the subject of analysis to the study of variation in functions of narrative in military discourse.

The aim of the paper is to distinguish kinds of variation in the functions of narrative in different subtypes of military discourse, to identify their linguistic expression, and also to determine the factors the variation depends on. To achieve the aim, we have to fulfill a number of tasks, using research methods appropriate to each of them:

1. At the first stage, it is necessary to clarify the terminology of the study, since among scholars there are some differences in the interpretation of the basic terms of our paper, *narrative* and *discourse*. To resolve this problem, we use general scientific methods: analysis, synthesis, comparison, and generalization.

2. The following stage involves defining subtypes of military discourse that represent narrative proper with its main function. Here we apply the method of observation, during which we identify all possible situations in which the military uses narrative, and the method of classification whereby we classify the situations according to the key purpose of a text.

3. The task of the next stage is to resolve a set of questions regarding the kinds of variation in the functions of narrative: in what subtypes of military discourse this phenomenon occurs; what variation manifests itself in, and what its reasons are; and which factors influence the type of variation. This stage employs the aforementioned research methods as well as several others: the method of identification (we identify subtypes of military discourse, kinds of variation and their markers); the method of comparison (in order to identify features of variations in different subtypes of military discourse).

Analysis was conducted on the following written and oral texts: textbooks and teaching aids for cadets (McNab; Ranger Handbook; Webfoot Warrior Battalion); instructing cadets in the learning process: handling weapons, swimming, etc. (US Navy SEALs); instructing combat personnel before starting to perform service and combat missions (Vidsiohodni do okhorony); public speeches by military leaders (NATO Secretary General; University of Texas); statements by military commanders in the media (US Military Briefing); narratives of Ukrainian and NATO servicemen (University of Texas; NATO Secretary General; Vidsiohodni do okhorony). All texts selected for analysis reflect the discursive practices of the 21st century military.

### **1. Definitions of Narrative and Approaches to Studying It**

Approaching the first of the tasks, we ascertained two facts: the existence of significant differences in the definitions of narrative in different scientific studies and the absence of contradictions between different definitions. Here we can talk not about the debates on the definition of the concept under analysis, but about the consideration of the phenomenon from different angles, which seem to expand the notion of the object under study. There are common features in the

scholars' approaches too. Thus, everyone agrees on the categorization of the concept: a narrative is a telling of a story (which is also denoted by the related word "narration"), a message. In the terminology of many scholars, narrative is also defined as a story, which realizes the derivative meaning of "narration" (Brownlie; Bystrov; Kazakov). Some scholars refer to narrative as a form of discourse "through which we reconstruct and represent past experiences for ourselves and others" (Schiffrin 321). According to B. Schiff, the narrative allows the researcher to penetrate into the essence of the process of meaning formation (3), with which one cannot but agree. Others call narrative a discourse formation represented in a text form (Bystrov 17). Siobhan Brownlie believes that discourse is "a surface manifestation of a narrative, connected to the narrator and the context of storytelling" (147).

If we ignore the opposition "discourse form – text form" and consider narrative as a component of discourse, expressed in text, then we can assume that the given interpretations do not contradict the generally accepted one. Nevertheless, it is very important for the study to specify what approach was chosen as the main one in the analysis of narrative, since the chosen approach will require accentuation of specific features of narrative represented in the definition. For instance, when following a literary approach, it is logical to accept the definition of narrative given in *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*: "An account of actual or imagined events told by a NARRATOR. A narrative is made up of events, the STORY, and the arrangement of those events, the PLOT" (Quinn 278), and focus on the analysis of the plot and the story. In psychology, narrative is interpreted very broadly: as a form that organizes experience and controls actions and emotions; as a cognitive scheme that enables us to explain and overcome difficulties; as a result of discourse work established in social interactions; as an account of the past, providing self-comprehension; as a tool for identity formation, giving life unity and purpose, etc. (Schiff; Turusheva; Chepeleva, Smulson, Shilovska and Gutsol).

A new approach to narrative analysis, called Root Narrative Theory, focuses on identifying features of the narrative that provide mutual understanding between the parties in conflict, and harmonization of relations even in the face of radical disagreements (Simmons 3). In this case, we can talk about the peacemaking function of the narrative.

For all the variety of interpretations, one has to agree with the fact that in real situations narrative acts either as a cognitive scheme, or an account of the past, or in any other of its hypostases mentioned above.

The definitions of narrative in journalistic discourse (Kaverina) and political discourse (Kirillov; Sheigal) differ from the aforementioned. Andrei Kirillov defines the genre structure of political narrative presented in the media as an announcement, a political commentary, an interview, public speaking in the media, an open letter, and a political caricature (5). As Valerii Tiupa notes, “Modern narratology goes beyond narrative poetics, representing rhetoric of narrative discourse as one of the most important types of human speech” (69). A broad interpretation of narrative has been noted by other scholars. Thus, Brian Schiff notes, “the term, ‘narrative’, is so widespread that the sense of the word has become stretched and overextended. Its meaning is diffuse” (33). David Herman also paid attention to the lack of clear boundaries between different forms of speech, in particular, explanation and description.

We use a discourse approach to define narrative. We do not disagree with the conclusions reached by other scientists, rather, we take them into account, though the specificity of our definition lies in the fact that we focus on the sphere of realization and existence of the narrative - discourse. In our approach, a narrative is a discourse component implemented in the form of a text, in which a narrative is presented about a message, events, phenomena, processes with or without explanations, or a consistent presentation of facts or thoughts. As you can see, in comparison with the existing definitions, we have somewhat expanded the range of types of narration by elucidating its varieties. Let us add some clarifications to our definition.

Even in the works of the founders of the theory of narrative, V. Labov and J. Waletzky, it was noted that the narrative is realized in two forms - as a process and as a result of this process, that is, as a text. B. Schiff also pointed out the difference between the concepts of story and storytelling. These two perspectives require different methods of analysis. In our work, the narrative is studied as a text, that is, not as a process, but as its result.

Theoretical sources distinguish between two types of narrative that are in hyponymic relations: a grand narrative (big narration) and small narratives (Kazakov). A grand narrative as a hyperonym pursues the main goal of a story, and small narratives are subordinate to it and represent stages of achieving the main goal.

One of the interesting phenomena of grand narrative in military discourse is described in the work of Christophe Wasinski. The author substantiates the idea of the existence of a recurring military grand

narrative in the modern state-centric world - a grand narrative that rationalizes and justifies war by various means. The issues considered by the author require a special analysis of military business documents, which goes beyond the scope of the tasks set in our work, however, the consequences of such a grand narrative, as noted by the author, should be considered as functions of the narrative in military business documents. In general, the framework of the relationship between grand narratives and small narratives in military discourse has not yet been revealed. In the course of our research, we will find out how the narrative functions in different subtypes of military discourse.

Mariana Achugar explores the argumentative narrative of the Uruguayan military about the last dictatorship (1973-85). This perspective of analysis helps to see that variants of the argumentative narrative can explain and even justify human rights violations. The author investigates the role of historical conditions and other social factors in transforming the military's argumentative narrative about dictatorship. Achugar's research confirms the meaning-forming role of the narrative, postulated in the works of B. Schiff. In the context of our article, we will clarify the variability of narrative functions within different types of military discourse.

Turning to the second key term of our work, we note that in the definition of the concept of "discourse" we concur with the position of T. A. van Dijk, who considers it as "a complex communicative phenomenon that includes, in addition to the text, also extralinguistic factors (knowledge of the world, attitudes, goals of the sender) necessary for understanding the text" (7). In the author's opinion, the factors defining discourse can be differentiated between three types of contexts: social context (what refers to "knowledge about the world as applied to a specific situation"), pragmatic context (what refers to the attitudes and intentions of the speaker) and linguistic context (the language of the text in the relevant situation).

Types and subtypes of discourse can be distinguished according to different criteria. We classify discourse types according to three criteria. First, by field of activity: we analyze the military discourse, that is, the communicative phenomena that take place in the military sphere. Secondly, we distinguish the subtypes of military discourse according to the type of communication and the purpose of said communication. In the military sphere, different types of communication are practiced, and distinguished on the basis of their participants: interpersonal, public, and mass. Elucidation of the narrative in interpersonal and mass

communication requires a special analysis that goes beyond the scope of the tasks set in our work. In this regard, the object of our study is public communication. Thirdly, we distinguish the subtypes of military discourse according to the purpose of creating a narrative text. Having chosen the type of communication, we can thus investigate the purpose of creating a narrative text. In our observations, the main narrative goals of public communication within military discourse are as follows: to teach (didactic subtype of military discourse = didactic discourse); to instruct regarding any actions (instructing discourse = instructing subtype of military discourse); to convey information (informing discourse = informing subtype of military discourse); to convince (persuasive subtype of military discourse = persuasive); to refute someone's statements (subtype of military discourse - refutation = refutative); to inspire (inspiring subtype of military discourse = inspiring discourse). Note that the terms "discourse type" and "discourse subtype" are used as synonyms.

## **2. The use of narrative in different subtypes of military discourse**

All scholars are aware of the importance of studying the scope of narrative use, as indicated in various works of psychology (Schiff; Chepeleva, Smulson, Shilovska, and Gutsol), linguistics (Bystrov), and other scientific areas (Afanasiev and Vasylenko; *Stratehichnyi naratyv*). Much attention is paid to the analysis of functions of narrative (Afanasiev and Vasylenko; Thurnherr, Rudolf von Rohr, and Locher; Schiff); moreover, their diversity is noted in the works by different researchers (Chepeleva, Smulson, Shilovska, and Gutsol; Sheigal).

It is clear that both the structure and the content of the text depend on the type of discourse in which the narrative is produced. Let us present our observations on the use of narrative in military discourse.

1. In military discourse, narrative is widely used both in oral and written forms of speech.

2. The function of the narrative is categorized in the following subtypes of military journalistic discourse: a) didactic (implemented in the process of training cadets, as well as internships or other forms of advanced training for officers); b) briefing (implemented before the start of various types of service and combat activities - daily guard, patrol, special operation, etc., and can also be used as a means of didactic discourse); c) informing (implemented at briefings, press conferences, meetings, official celebrations, and in the delivery of motivational speeches prior to complex tasks, etc.).

3. The main function of the narrative (message, consistent presentation of facts, etc.) very rarely exists as the sole function. When analyzing two of those types of discourse - didactic and instructive, for example, which would appear to require only the main function in the form of presentation of facts, they also utilize the other functions.

### **3. Types of variation in the functions of the narrative and the factors that determine them**

Our analysis of the material showed that the variations in the functions of the narrative are capable of "creating a real life experience and interpretation of life" (Schiff 3), forming new meanings, and influencing the addressees, thus confirming the relevant conclusions postulated in the works of B. Schiff. As a result of our research, we have identified specific types of variation in narrative functions, the social context factors that determine them, as well as the specifics of the use of linguistic means in the transformation of these narrative functions. Let us explore the types of variation, starting with the subtypes of military discourse.

**3.1. Didactic discourse.** In didactic discourse, as a rule, the primary functions are of education and the formation of a positive image of the military. At the same time, the formation of a positive image is a function of the grand narrative (of the entire textbook or manual), and other functions are implemented by small narratives (in each section, corresponding to the content of the text). This is how the chapter "History of the Rangers" begins (hereafter, in italics type, we highlighted the markers of the updated narrative function):

The history of the American Rangers is a *long and colorful saga of bravery, courage and outstanding leadership*. This is a story about people *whose skills in the art of combat have been surpassed by few*. Only the *major of their many exploits are described here* (Ranger Handbook).

The impact is achieved by juxtaposing the concepts of HISTORY and SAGA. If a history is a chain of consecutive events or a narrative of them, then a saga in the ordinary (not scientific) understanding is not a dry account of consecutive events, but a poetic narrative, a story about extraordinary events, people, or facts. The emotional impact is enhanced by context, all components of which have positive rational and emotional evaluations. As can be seen from the above example, the functions of evaluation, the formation of a positive image of American

Rangers, and the development of patriotism in them are realized, and the story itself about the history of Rangers serves as an argument supporting the evaluations. Evaluation markers (they are printed in italics) are metaphors and epithets the text abounds with, as well as hyperbole. It should be noted that in the described case, there is syncretism of the functions of narration and of emotional impact. Throughout the statement of facts, the emphasis is either on the narrative, or on the impact, or on the two simultaneously, that is, these two functions are constantly realized. The described type of variation is observed in the handbooks we analyzed (Ranger Handbook; McNab; Webfoot Warrior Battalion).

Let us summarize the results of our observations about the didactic discourse presented in textbooks for cadets. In their texts, the narrative serves two purposes: the narration itself and the emotional impact, which is subjugated to the goal of education. The educational impact is provided not only by the content of the facts, but also by the way they are presented— through the emotional halo of linguistic means.

**3.2 Instructive discourse.** Instruction is presented in two subtypes of military discourse: didactic and instructive. Instruction in didactic discourse, according to our observations, is the only subtype of military discourse in which the narrative implements its main function - the function of a consistent presentation of facts, actions, or events. For example, training with weapons or swimming (US Navy SEALs). There are no emotionally colored words in the narratives of the analyzed type. The syntax of the text ensures conciseness and simplicity of presentation. Complex sentences used by instructors have no more than two components.

In instructions on performing professional duties, narrative often fulfills the function of affirming society's value priorities, in particular respect for the rule of law. For instance, instructing the military personnel of the National Guard of Ukraine, who were to begin patrolling with the police, the deputy head of the Main Directorate of the National Police in one of Ukraine's regions, said:

Dear officers,

I want, firstly, to thank you for your work. Well done! We count on you very much. You have never let us down, and I really want it to be the same in the future. [...] We all work in a single system, we all work *towards the same goal – maintaining the rule of law, preventing crimes on patrol routes* (Vidsiohodni do okhorony).

In the given example, the function of affirming society's value priorities is performed by a grand narrative. Small narratives (mentioning the previous clear joint work; reporting on the rules for interaction with the police, etc.) perform the function of closing the distance between the speaker and the addressee, focusing on the cooperation strategy, etc. The function of affirming value priorities is expressed explicitly, and the text presents an unusual combination of functions. The strategic move (the stratagem) of "praise" was used not only and not so much to give positive facts, but also to motivate the officers to flawlessly perform their professional duties. The language is lacking in excessive emotionality, but contains lexemes with a positive rational evaluation. Although the syntax of the speech contains multi-clause complex sentences, it is not "burdened" with them. The narrative presents not the syncretism of different functions, but their complementarity, with narrative proper being the main one.

Narrative proper is also realized in some types of didactic discourse, such as swimming training (US Navy SEALs), training in the use of weapons (Air Force BMT), and similar ones, which require accuracy in the presentation of the sequence of actions. Below is an example of didactic discourse – training in handling and firing the M16A2 rifle, which fulfills the function of narrative proper:

You always bring the weapon up to you. You don't go down to the rifle.

So what's our first step? Everyone charge! Remember you are charging not locking the bolt to the rear. Pull back let go like a slingshot. Put your weapons on semi. If you say the steps and you tell yourself what to do, you can't fail (Air Force BMT).

**3.3. Informative discourse in a briefing situation.** At first glance, it may seem that the main function of narrative is presented in an informative speech. However, the data analysis allowed us to come to the conclusion that narrative in this type of discourse performs not only the function of conveying information, but also a number of others, in particular, the explanation of the motives for actions, the formation of a worldview, the evaluation of events, the creation and maintenance of the image of an organization. Let us look at an example of a speech by an American officer that took place on July 30, 2002 (US military Briefing). At a US military briefing, Colonel Roger King, a US military spokesman at Bagram, the main US base in Afghanistan, spoke about an event when coalition forces came under enemy small arms fire while

conducting a reconnaissance mission. A number of Afghan civilians were killed by a US air strike. The London Times published allegations which suggested that the American military had tried to cover up the number of Afghan civilians who were killed. In the text of Roger King's speech, all the features of narrative are explicitly presented: the colonel narrates the events, consistently expounding on the actions of the participants, supporting his arguments with facts and references to the days of the week when certain events occurred. However, his story is not an end in itself – it is aimed at refuting, firstly, the rumors about an unprovoked attack by the American military on Afghan civilians, and secondly, the facts published in The London Times:

The one thing that was most disturbing to me was the allegation that US personnel or coalition personnel were removing evidence from the site. That's exactly right – they were removing evidence from the site because it was a fact-finding mission, they were sent to gather evidence. *But the way that it was written in the London Times article made it seem as if this was a bad thing and that we shouldn't have been doing it when it was the sole purpose of sending the team down there in the first place* (US military Briefing).

The narration of the events in the above example serves two functions: the refutation of the allegations, which is impossible without a narrative, and the evaluation of the actions of the US personnel. Thus, we observe the combination of the functions of narrative, refutation, and evaluation. The syntax of the text is constructed in such a way that each of these functions is fulfilled in a certain position. First, there is a narrative proper in the position of an objective fact that is recognized by the subject of the speech; there follow two evaluations of the fact: his own and that of the report of the fact in the newspaper; in the final part of the speech, the function of refutation is performed.

**3.3.2. Functions of Narrative in Informative Discourse at Business Meetings of the Military Sphere.** Addressing the joint meeting of US Congress on April 03, 2019, NATO Secretary General Jens Stoltenberg spoke about the main goals of NATO's activities, presented an analysis of possible threats to the modern world and substantiated NATO's role in preserving peace.

Stoltenberg's speech is not a dry story about the history of the Alliance and its activities over 70 years. His speech is an emotional narrative that combines several small narratives (NATO Secretary General Addresses Congress). Let us call them: narrative 1 (of the

creation of the Alliance), narrative 2 (of the role of the United States in the activities of the Alliance), narrative 3 (of terrorism), narrative 4 (of modern threats to peace), and narrative 5 (of the need to strengthen NATO's power). Each of them performs a specific function, and all together they are aimed at fulfilling the function of the grand narrative – maintaining the image of NATO as a guarantor of peace, a defender of the moral values and the way of life in civilized society. The first “small” narrative is a story about the formation of NATO. Its text actualizes concepts representing the values of modern society: the Protection of the World, the Protection of Freedom, and the Power of Unity:

Our Alliance was created by people who had lived through two devastating world wars. They knew only too well the horror, the suffering, and the human and material cost of war. They were determined that this should never happen again. And they were also determined to stand up to the expansion of the Soviet Union. Which was taking control of its neighbors. Crushing democracies. And oppressing their people. So, they founded NATO. With a clear purpose. To preserve peace and to safeguard freedom. With an iron-clad commitment by all members of the Alliance to protect each other. *They made a solemn promise. One for all and all for one* (NATO Secretary General).

It should be noted that these concepts are represented in all the small narratives of the text under analysis:

The strength of a nation is not only measured by the size of its economy. *Or the number of its soldiers. But also by the number of its friends* (narrative 2);

When we stand together, we are stronger than any potential challenger – economically, politically and militarily. *We need this collective strength. Because we will face new threats.* And we have seen so many times before how difficult it is to predict the future (narrative 4) (NATO Secretary General).

The second narrative is a story about the role of the United States in NATO's activities. In it, as already shown, the same concepts are represented:

America has been the backbone of our Alliance. It has been fundamental *to European security and for our freedom.* We would not have the peaceful and prosperous Europe we see today without

the sacrifice and commitment of the United States. For your enduring support, I thank you all today. So NATO has been good for Europe. And NATO has been good for the United States (NATO Secretary General).

The emotional background, which enhances the narrative's function of impact, is created by references to Leif Erikson, Stoltenberg's parents and Stoltenberg himself. Below is an example that illustrates references to Stoltenberg himself:

I remember well, during the Cold War, when I was a young conscript in the Norwegian army. [...] But we knew that we could not take on the might of the Soviet Union alone. [...] *But we also knew that we were not alone. We knew that, if needed, our NATO Allies, led by the United States, would soon be there with us. We enjoyed a level of security that only our transatlantic Alliance could provide.* So, thanks to NATO, as a young man during the Cold War I felt safe. And that says something about the strength of our Alliance (NATO Secretary General).

The narrative under analysis performs an evaluative function: the role of the United States in NATO is positively evaluated. The following narratives (of terrorism; of contemporary threats to peace; of the need to strengthen the power of NATO) perform the functions of evaluation and formation of a worldview:

Terrorism comes in many forms. Some perpetrators *misuse religion*. Others *misuse political ideology*. They claim to be different from each other, fighting for different causes. But they are all the same. They *believe in hatred, violence, and killing innocent men, women and children*. They are nothing more than cowards. Terrorists attack *our freedom, our values and our way of life*. Our answer must be *more openness and more democracy*. Our values will prevail. *Freedom will prevail over oppression. Tolerance over intolerance. And love will always prevail over hate* (NATO Secretary General).

As can be seen from the above example, in special occasion discourse there is a rearrangement of functions: the usual function of a narrative – narration – becomes supplementary, and the functions of evaluation, formation of a worldview, and affirmation of value priorities

become the main ones. Nevertheless, the function of maintaining the positive image of the Alliance prevails over the others.

**3.3.3. The specificity of the variation of narrative functions in the context of inspiring discourse.** An original interaction of “small narratives” is often observed in officers’ inspirational speeches. Let us consider the commencement address by American Admiral William H. McRaven. In the mass media it was called “an incredible speech”, “one of the best motivational speeches”, “a memorable speech”, and, in our opinion, not without good reason.

Speaking to the graduates of the University of Texas at Austin on May 17, 2014 (University of Texas), the Admiral gives advice to young people, built on the affirmation of the value priorities of any civilized society, which is a grand narrative: “Change the world for the better”, moreover, the University’s slogan is, “What starts here changes the world”. 10 small narratives (called “10 lessons” by the Admiral) are stories about different situations that are typical of the training of Navy SEALs. They all end with a summarized piece of advice on what needs to be done to change the world for the better. Each small narrative, contrary to its definition of “small”, has the greatest impact on addressees. An interesting fact is that the stories themselves are structured in such a way that they lead the audience to conclusions – summarized pieces of advice which the speaker formulates. The conclusions are the logical ending of the narrative itself. Small narratives are sustained (extended, prolonged) metaphors built on unusual comparisons, and the strength of the emotional impact is determined by the image created by listeners themselves by correlating the referents of the text with their own experience. The officer talks about particular facts or events with a slight touch of humor, but these facts and events are metaphors symbolizing some phenomena of life. Let us consider the text of one of the small narratives:

Before the swim the instructors joyfully brief the trainees on all the species of sharks that inhabit the waters off San Clemente. They assure you, however, that no student has ever been eaten by a shark – at least not recently. But, you are also taught that if a shark begins to circle your position – stand your ground. Do not swim away. Do not act afraid. And if the shark, hungry for a midnight snack, darts towards you – then summon up all your strength and punch him in the snout and he will turn and swim away. *There are a lot of sharks in the world. If you hope to complete the swim you*

*will have to deal with them. So, if you want to change the world, don't back down from the sharks* (University of Texas).

It is interesting to note that the meaning of a summarized piece of advice cannot always be understood without the text of a narrative – it is hidden in a metaphor. Let us present the content of the summarized pieces of advice, supplying them with our comments in brackets.

1) If you want to change the world, start off by making your bed (Start with small things that will teach you how to perform large tasks correctly).

2) If you want to change the world, find someone to help you paddle (Build a good team).

3) If you want to change the world, measure a person by the size of their heart, not the size of their flippers (Judge people by their moral qualities, not by their appearances).

4) If you want to change the world, get over being a sugar cookie and keep moving forward (Keep moving forward despite difficulties).

5) But if you want to change the world, don't be afraid of the circuses (Do not be afraid of failure – it is inevitable in life).

6) If you want to change the world, sometimes you have to slide down the obstacle head first (Do not be afraid to take risks).

7) So, if you want to change the world, don't back down from the sharks (Do not retreat before your enemy).

8) If you want to change the world, you must be your very best in the darkest moment (Keep calm even in the most difficult situations).

9) So, if you want to change the world, start singing when you're up to your neck in mud (Do not lose hope, even in the most difficult situations).

10) If you want to change the world, don't ever, ever ring the bell (Never give up).

The speaker seems to convince the audience of the correctness of the moral values that he himself upholds. In this case, we observe the syncretism of narrative and persuasive functions.

### **Conclusion**

The analysis made it possible to identify the types of variation of narrative functions within different subtypes of military discourse, the linguistic expression of the variations, and the factors on which those variations depend.

1. The exclusive function of the narrative itself - a message, a narrative, a consistent presentation of facts - is noted only in instruction as a component of didactic discourse (learning to swim, handling weapons, etc.), as well as in instruction as a component of instructive discourse (when preparing a group for a daily guard, etc.). The main function is characterized by concise means of expression, simple syntax (simple sentences or complex ones, consisting of no more than two components), and lack of emotional language.

2. In other subtypes of military discourse, the functions of narrative vary. The types of variation depend on two main factors: a) the subtype of discourse; b) the key goal of the speaker (in the oral form of communication) or the author of the narrative (in the written text).

3. The following types of variation of narrative functions in military discourse have been identified: syncretism of the functions of narration and emotional impact for the purpose of education (in didactic discourse - textbooks for rangers); supplementing the main functions of the narrative (affirming societal values, maintaining a positive image of a military organization - as observed in one of the subtypes of instructive discourse, before starting to perform an official assignment); combination of functions (message, assessment, explanation of the motives for actions, refutation, formation of a positive image of the military organization - as observed in informing discourse in its various subtypes); permutation of the functions (other functions become the main ones, and the function of the narrative becomes auxiliary - as observed in the discourse of inspiring public speaking).

4. In all types of military public discourse, the following linguistic features of the use of narrative are noted: the grand narrative is not directly explicated in the text of the narrative, but can be inferred from the texts of small narratives; small narratives are detailed metaphors with a greater (inspiring discourse; speech at a congress) or lesser (discourse of a meeting, briefing) degree of imagery; the influencing effect of the narrative is achieved through the use of emotional language, as well as the metaphorical potential of small narratives.

In the process of research, our attention was drawn to another issue within the framework of the chosen topic: it is interesting to compare and contrast the functions of narrative in military and political types of discourse. We consider it as a prospect for further scientific research.

**Works Cited**

- Air Force BMT M16A2 Rifle Instruction. 2019 video. 13 April 2019 <[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=\\_DKRwzUIXx0](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_DKRwzUIXx0)>
- Afanasiev, Olexandr and Vasylenko, Iryna "Funktsii naratyvu v naukovomu teksti" [Functions of narrative in a scientific text]. *Mizhnarodnyi naukovi Internet-sympozium «Innovatsiini pidkhody do rozvytku: zdotyti dosvid i pohlad u maybutnie» z 22 po 30 veresnia 2015 roku. Sektsia - 11. Innovatsiini pidkhody do rozvytku filosofii*. Web. 13 April 2019 <<https://www.sworld.com.ua/simpoz5/20.pdf>>.
- Achugar, Mariana. Between Remembering and Forgetting: Uruguayan Military Discourse about Human Rights (1976-2004). *Discourse and Society*, 18.5 (2007): 521–547. Web. 29 September 2007 <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/42889148>>.
- Brownlie, Siobhan. Narrative Theory and Retranslation Theory. *Across Languages and Culture*, 7 (2006): 140-170. Print
- Bystrov, Yakiv. *Anhlomovnyi biohrafichnyi naratyv u vymirakh kohnytyvnoi linhvistyky i synerhetyky [English-language biographical narrative in the dimensions of cognitive linguistics and synergetics]*. Kyiv: Vidavets Kushnir G.M., 2016. Print.
- Chepeleva, Natalia, Smulson, Maryna, Shilovska, Olena, and Gutsol, Svitlana. *Naratyvni sykhotekhnolohii [Narrative psychotechnologies]*. Kyiv: Hlavnik, 2007. Print.
- Dijk, Teun A. van. *Language. Cognition. Communication*. Moscow: Progress, 1989. Print
- Herman, David. *Basic Elements of Narrative*. Chichester. UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2009. Print.
- Kaverina, Olga. Osobenosti narativnoho zhurnalistskoho discoursa [Peculiarities of narrative journalistic discourse]. *Inostranye yazyki. Ghertsenovskie chtenia: materialy Vserosiyskoi mezhvuzovskoi nauchnoi konferentsii (23-24 apreliia 2012)*. (2012): 37-39. Print.
- Kazakov, Maksym. *Grand-naratyv u istorii [Grand Narrative in History]*. Web. 10 May 2015 <<https://commons.com.ua/uk/grand-narativ-u-istoriyi>>.
- Kirillov, Andriy. *Politicheskii narrativ: struktura i pragmatika (na materiale sovremennoi angloyazychnoi pressy) [Political Narrative: Structure and Pragmatics (Based on the Materials of the Modern English-Language Press)]*. PhD Thesis. Samara, 2007. Print.
- Labov, William and Waletzky, Joshua. Narrative analysis: Oral versions of personal experience. *Journal of Narrative and Life History*, 7(1-4) (1997): 3-38. Print.
- Literary Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow: Sovetskaya Entsiklopedia, 1987. Print.
- Lysanets, Yulia. Medychnyi naratyv yak linhvistychna katehoria [Medical narrative as a linguistic category]. *Lviv Philological Journal*, 3 (2018): 145-148. Web. 18 June 2018 <[http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/lvphj\\_2017\\_3\\_31](http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/lvphj_2017_3_31)>.

- McNab, Chris. *SAS and Special Forces Mental Toughness Training: How to Improve your Mind's Strength and Manage Stress*. London: Amber Books Ltd, 2016. Print.
- Milostivaia, Alexandra. K voprosu o delimitatsii ponyatii «tekst», «diskurs» i «narrativ». [To the question of the delimitation of the concepts of “text”, “discourse” and “narrative”]. *Philological sciences. Questions of theory and practice*, 5.47, Part I (2015): 146-149. Web. 10 October 2015. <<https://www.gramota.net/materials/2/2015/5-1/37.html>>.
- Mozheiko, Maryna. Narrativ [Narrative]. *History of Philosophy. Encyclopedia*. Minsk: Interpresservis Book House, 2002. Print.
- Nelson, Kristin. Narrative and Referential Activity. Web. 14 April 2019 <<http://www.thereferentialprocess.org/theory/narrative-and-referential-activity>>.
- NATO Secretary General Addresses Congress. 2019 video. 03 April 2019. <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Oc6VLc78oA>>
- Quinn, Edward. *A Dictionary of Literary and Thematic Terms*. New York: Facts on File, 2006. Print.
- Ranger Handbook*. Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army. Web. 15 December 2017. <[https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR\\_pubs/DR\\_a/pdf/web/ARN3039\\_TC%203-21x76%20FINAL%20WEB.pdf](https://armypubs.army.mil/epubs/DR_pubs/DR_a/pdf/web/ARN3039_TC%203-21x76%20FINAL%20WEB.pdf)>
- Simmons, Solon. *Root narrative theory and conflict resolution: power, justice and values*. London, New York: Routledge, 2020. Print
- Sheigal, Yelena. Mnogolikii narrativ. [The Many Faces of Narrative]. *Political Linguistics*, 22.2 (2007): 86-93. Yekaterinburh: Russkii filologicheskii portal. Web. 11 July 2007 <<http://www.philology.ru/linguistics1/sheygal-07.htm>>.
- Schiff, Brian. The Function of Narrative: Toward a Narrative Psychology of Meaning. *Narrative works*, 2.1 (2012). Web. 10 April 2012 <<https://journals.lib.unb.ca/index.php/NW/article/view/19497>>.
- Schiffrin, Deborah. *In Other Words: Variation in reference and narrative*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006. Print.
- Stratehichnyi naratyv: do problemy realizatsii sutnisnoi skladovoi stratehichnykh komunikatsii v Ukraini. Analitychna zapyska. [Strategic narrative: to the problem of realization of the essential component of strategic communications in Ukraine. Analytical note.]* Web. 17 September 2016. <<https://niss.gov.ua/doslidzhennya/informaciyni-strategii/strategichniy-narativ-do-problemi-realizacii-sutnisnoi>>
- Thurnherr, Franziska, Rudolf von Rohr, Marie-Thérèse, and Locher, Miriam. The Functions of Narrative Passages in Three Written Online Health Contexts. *Open Linguistics*, 2 (2016): 450–470. Web. 16 April 2016 <[https://edoc.unibas.ch/43811/1/20170519134741\\_591edb5dc95da.pdf](https://edoc.unibas.ch/43811/1/20170519134741_591edb5dc95da.pdf)>.
- Tiupa, Valeriy. “Narratologicheskii minimum. [Narratological minimum]”. *Ruskyi sled v narratolohii: Materialy Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-*

- prakticheskoi konferentsii. Balashov, 26-28 noyabria 2012* (2012): 69–75. Print.
- University of Texas at Austin 2014 Commencement Address - Admiral William H. McRaven*. 2014 video. 19 May 2014.  
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pxBQLFLei70&t=185s>>
- Vidsiohodni do okhorony publichnoho poriadku v regioni pryednalysia samostiini pishi ta avtopatruili NHU [As of today, independent foot and car patrols of the NGU have joined the maintenance of public order in the region]*. 2019 video. 01 August 2019.  
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CIXy3rZnel4&t=234s>>
- US Military Briefing at Bagram*. 2015 video. 21 July 2015. <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=kBHefkIJ7GHE>>
- US Navy SEALs Combat Swim*. 2007 video. 12 May 2007.  
<<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4IUHudMN1TU&t=12s>>
- Wasinski, Christophe. "On Making War Possible: Soldiers, Strategy, and Military Grand Narrative." *Security Dialogue*, 42.1 (2011): 57–76. Web. 17 Nov 2011. <<http://www.jstor.org/stable/26301785>>.
- Webfoot Warrior Battalion Cadet Handbook*. University of Oregon ROTC. Department of Military Science, 2003. Print.

### ВАРІЮВАННЯ ФУНКЦІЙ НАРАТИВУ У ВІЙСЬКОВОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

У статті виявлені види варіювання функцій наративу у військовому дискурсі та умови, які визначають їхню актуалізацію. Доведено, що реалізація основної функції наративу – розповідання – відзначається тільки в окремих видах військового дидактичного дискурсу, коли мета мовця обмежується подачею точної інформації (навчити користуватися зброєю, застосовувати прийоми самооборони тощо). В інших видах дидактичного дискурсу функція розповідання доповнюється функцією виховання і ствердження ціннісних пріоритетів суспільства. В інформувальному мовленні часто відзначається доповнення основної функції наративу функціями оцінки, спростування чуток, міфів чи чийось висловлювань. Для урочистих виступів характерна перестановка функцій: функція розповіді стає допоміжною, а місце основної займають функції формування картини світу, ствердження ціннісних пріоритетів. Промови з метою надихання найчастіше побудовані на синкретизмі наративу і персуазиву. У військовому дискурсі в усіх мовленневих жанрах функцією гранд-наративу є формування позитивного іміджу військової структури.

**Ключові слова:** наратив, варіювання, функція, військовий дискурс, текст.