

The text I'm going to analyze is an article by the magazine Time called "A brief history of unknown soldiers".

By the title, the reader can suppose it to be a short exposition about unknown soldiers around the world, since the title doesn't nominate any specific country. However, next to the text lies a photo of a young couple walking past the American unknown soldier's tomb, so it's probably is mostly about this topic since the article is dated November 11, which is Veterans Day in the USA.

The article is organized in four sequences: the first exposes briefly the function and the origins of Veterans Day, the second tells about the first known ceremony took to honor unknown soldiers and one of the first of these commemorations which had taken place in the USA. The third sequence deepens on the American unknown soldier's history and compare it to other countries' similar rituals, while the last sequence exposes the consequences of this tradition.

The writer uses a journalistic language, which is simple and concise, and doesn't give any personal opinion about what she's writing, except on the fourth sequence, where she expresses her support to the identification of unknown soldiers saying about blood supplies given by soldiers to join the army that "although military personnel put their lives at risk for their countries, this requirement, at least, can provide closure to families who might otherwise never be able to lay their loved ones to rest". In addition, she expresses her negative position about the past Pentagon's measures to endure the unknown soldiers remained unidentified, with expressions as "even going so far as".

To conclude, in my opinion this text gives information about the unknown soldier in a very simple and understandable way, but doesn't involve the reader into the soldier's story. This is caused by the flat and unemotional way the writer tells the soldier's story, making the reader perceive it as far, thus not making him or she understand the importance of remembrance.