

POWER AND POLITENESS IN HISTORICAL NOVELS SET
DURING THE AMERICAN CIVIL WAR

Master's Thesis
Jouni Jussila

University of Jyväskylä
Department of Languages
English
November 2015

JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO

Tiedekunta – Faculty Humanistinen tiedekunta	Laitos – Department Kielten laitos
Tekijä – Author Jouni Jussila	
Työn nimi – Title Power and Politeness in Historical Novels Set During the American Civil War	
Oppiaine – Subject Englannin kieli	Työn laji – Level Pro Gradu -tutkielma
Aika – Month and year Marraskuu 2015	Sivumäärä – Number of pages 76
<p>Tiivistelmä – Abstract</p> <p>Kommunikointi komentajien ja alaisten välillä on perusedellytys sotilasoperaatioiden onnistumiselle. Tällaista kommunikaatiota tarkastellessaan tutkijat ovat nostaneet esille komentajien väliset valtasuhteet, muodollisen vs. epämuodollisen vuorovaikutuksen, spesifin sotilasdiskurssin ja pyrkimyksen maksimaaliseen tehokkuuteen vuorovaikutuksen keinoin. Tämä tutkielma tarkastelee, millä keinoin sotilaskomentajat ilmaisevat keskinäisiä valtasuhteitaan Amerikan sisällissotaan sijoittuvien romaanien dialogissa.</p> <p>Tutkielman pääasialliseksi teoriakehykseksi valittiin vuorovaikutuksellista sosiolingvistiikkaa edustava Brownin ja Levinsonin kohteliaisuusteoria, jonka pääpaino keskittyy keskustelukumppanin ”kasvojen” säilyttämiseen tai uhkaamiseen. Koska aineistona käytettiin kaunokirjallisuutta ja koska romaaneissa komentajien valtasuhteita avataan myös dialogin ulkopuolella, kohteliaisuusteorian tueksi otettiin käsitteitä stilistiikan puolelta kerronnan ja ajatusrepresentaatioiden analysoimiseksi. Valtasuhteita käsiteltiin tiukassa yhteydessä armeijainstituutioon ja siitä kumpuaviin hierarkkisiin sotilasarvoihin. Analyysi tapahtui soveltaen valittuja metodeja romaaneista lainattuihin otteisiin.</p> <p>Kasvoja uhkaavat toimet osoittautuivat valtasuhteiden ilmaisun kulmakiveksi. Alaisuuden tärkeimpiä indikaattoreja olivat kunnioittavat fraasit ja kohtelias käytös ylempiarvoisia kohtaan. Valtasuhteiden ilmaisutyylin katsottiin riippuvan kulloinkin kyseessä olevista henkilöistä, kanssakeskustelijoista ja tilanteesta. Henkilökohtaiset suhteet komentajien välillä johtivat usein tilanteisiin, joissa oletusarvoinen hierarkia kääntyi pääläelleen. Kohteliaisuusteoria osoittautui soveltuvaksi metodiksi myös vuorovaikutuksen representaatioiden analysoimiseen, mutta lisää tarkennusta kaivataan sellaisten tilanteiden tarkasteluun, joissa keskustelutilanteen ulkopuolella olevan henkilön kasvoja uhataan. Stilistiikka arvioitiin hyödylliseksi lisäksi teoriakehykseen, mutta ongelmia tunnistettiin universaalisti pätevien päätelmien muodostamisessa stilistiikan tulkitsevan luonteen vuoksi.</p>	
Asiasanat – Keywords power relations, interactional sociolinguistics, politeness theory, stylistics, army, military communication, hierarchy, American Civil War	
Säilytyspaikka – Depositor Kielten laitos / JYX	
Muita tietoja – Additional information	

Table of contents

1 Introduction	4
2 Set-up of the study	6
2.1 Aims	6
2.2 Data selection and collection	7
2.3 Key terminology of the data	8
2.4 Methods of analysis	10
3 Power and military organization	11
4 Stylistics	14
4.1 Definition, key branches and applications of stylistics	14
4.2 Key concepts of stylistics relevant to the present study	16
5 Politeness theory	17
5.1 Background and aims of politeness theory.....	17
5.2 Central concepts of politeness theory	18
5.3 Strategies for doing FTAs	20
6 Previous research.....	22
6.1 Previous research related to politeness theory	22
6.2 Previous research on the use of language in military contexts	24
7 Analysis	27
7.1 Expression of power relations in Confederate interactions	28
7.1.1 Major General Heth's status report to General Lee.....	28
7.1.2 Lieutenant General Longstreet presses Gen. Lee for more troops	31
7.1.3 Maj. Gen. Hood's protests left unheeded by Lt. Gen. Longstreet.....	35
7.1.4 Gen. Lee reprimands Maj. Gen. Stuart	38
7.1.5 Colonel Fairfax delivers Maj. Gen. Pickett's report to Lt. Gen. Longstreet.....	43
7.1.6 Gen. Lee's harsh criticism of Lt. Gen. Hill	47
7.1.7. Summary.....	50
7.2 Expression of power relations in Union interactions	51
7.2.1 Brigadier General Hancock inspects his commanders	51
7.2.2 Maj. Gen. Sykes' refusal to withdraw	56
7.2.3 Col. Chamberlain confers with subordinates.....	59
7.2.4 General Grant calms Maj. Gen. Sheridan	62
7.2.5 Maj. Gen. Hancock firmly in command	66
7.2.6 Summary.....	68
8 Conclusion	69
9 Bibliography.....	75

1 Introduction

A simplistic way to approach waging war is to divide it into a few fundamental components: commanders give orders and soldiers carry them out. This is a modern view of warfare, and it has been accepted widely ever since Clausewitz (1998), Jomini (2005) and other illustrious military thinkers formulated and developed it. However, when attempting to examine the matter in even slightly more detail, one is faced with a multitude of obstructions and questions. Are battles truly won in such a simple manner? Are high-ranking generals to be applauded on a battlefield victory, or was it rather the junior commanders who had a more decisive role in a fight? Are initiative and surprises to be left unaccounted for, and thus are we to assume that all victories are a result of meticulous planning? A student of warfare realizes quickly that many uncertainties and variables surround the art.

Due to the often unpredictable nature of warfare, success on the battlefield is highly dependent on the ability of commanders to communicate with their subordinates and vice versa. Such communication is necessary to ensure that all members of the chain of command are aware of the situation at hand and are thus prepared to handle it in the most efficient way. This was particularly true in times when gunpowder smoke hampered the vision of a battlefield commander and the slow communication system which employed couriers as a means of relaying messages between commanders challenged the flow of information. Although the advent of wireless communications has greatly hastened the communication between commanders and thus facilitated controlling masses of soldiers and equipment under fire, clear and concise interaction with one's subordinates is nevertheless equally important in modern times as it has been in the past. In fact, adequate communication between commanders appears to have been a crucial constituent of battlefield victories throughout the ages.

Wars and other conflicts are most often studied from the point of view of representations, i.e. researchers seem to be more interested in examining how particular conflicts have been and are represented in various media rather than working out the constituents of battlefield tactics and larger strategy that are related to interaction between commanders. Chang and Mehan (2006), for example, analyse how the 911 terrorist attacks were represented in US media, and Chouliaraki (2005) studies the justification of the Iraq war through its representations. Another popular way to approach warfare studies is to examine how people remember wars, as is illustrated by Achugar (2008), who studies memories of Uruguayan military dictatorship.

Studying power relations in a military context appears to have been most fruitful when researchers have had the chance to record actual interactions between soldiers. Disler's (2005) doctoral dissertation on power relations between military commanders as well as gender issues in the said context is a prime example of such research. In her dissertation, Disler explains how power relations are formed and maintained between various commissioned and non-commissioned officers of the United States Air Force. Disler also introduces the issue of gender to the matter and analyses the sometimes different power relations between male and female soldiers. Halbe (2011) and Achille, Schulze and Schmidt-Nielsen (1995) had similar opportunities of recording and analysing military interactions.

The present study engages with the study of military leaders' interactions in historical novels depicting the American Civil War (1861-1865). The aim of this thesis is on the one hand to examine the communication strategies which military commanders employ when communicating with their subordinates, and on the other hand to work out how the subordinates respond to orders that they receive from their leaders. As superordination/subordination caused by a system of different ranks can be regarded as the starting point of effective administration in a military context, commanders are situated in a position which gives them access to the power of issuing orders to their subordinates. This means that specific power relations exist between superordinates and subordinates. Such power relations serve as the primary focus of the present study. One theoretical hypothesis of this thesis is that since power relations exist between military leaders, there must be one or more ways, both verbal and non-verbal, in which the commanders express those relations in their interactions with their subordinates. Therefore, the research question of the present study is as follows: How are interpersonal power relations expressed in the dialogue and narrative passages of historical novels set during the American Civil War?

Three historical novels set during the American Civil War serve as the data of the present study: *The Killer Angels* (Shaara 1975), *Gods and Generals* (Shaara 1996) and *The Last Full Measure* (Shaara 1998), written by Michael and Jeff Shaara. These novels have been chosen as the primary data of this study because of the detailed dialogues between the characters. Novels are an easily accessible form of data and present the possibility of adopting an interdisciplinary approach to their analysis, which is explained in more detail below. Another justification of selecting novels as the data is to find out how applicable the chosen methods are to literary representations of interpersonal communication.

The present study draws extensively on previous research conducted in the field of interactional sociolinguistics, as interaction serves as a key focus of the thesis. Particular emphasis is given to the politeness theory formulated by Brown and Levinson (1987), since politeness can be regarded as a major factor in guiding the interaction between commanders. Brown and Levinson's insights on face-threatening acts, using honorifics and other aspects of politeness are applied to the data in order to analyse how the power relations between commanders are realized in their discussions. In this thesis, the politeness theory is applied to the analysis of dialogue in the novels.

As the authors of the chosen novels employ various other narrative strategies in addition to dialogue when describing the characters and their thoughts, narrative passages are a crucial component of the interactional passages of the novels and thus cannot be separated from the dialogue when examining power relations between the commanders. Politeness theory does not enable the analysis of such narrative passages. Thus, concepts from stylistics are adopted to analyse e.g. thought presentation and to illustrate how the narration of the novels contributes to the expression of power relations between the characters.

2 Set-up of the study

The set-up section of the present study presents the goals of the thesis, justifications for the selection and collection of the data as well as the methods of analysis. In addition, a section explaining the military vocabulary used widely in the analysed excerpts is included to ensure that all meanings meant in the discussions are understood correctly.

2.1 Aims

Expressed in general terms, the purpose of this study is to examine how military leaders in historical novels set in the American Civil War exert power on their subordinates and how those subordinates respond to it. In other words, then, this thesis aims to illustrate how the power relations that exist between commanders and that are formed on the basis of a system of different military ranks are realized in the dialogue of the novels. As it has been mentioned in the introduction section, it can be assumed that since power relations exist between military leaders, there must be one or more ways in which the commanders express those relations in their interactions with their subordinates. Thus the concrete goal of the present study is to work

out how those relations are expressed in interactions, and that goal has been formulated into the following research question: How are interpersonal power relations expressed in the dialogue and narrative passages of historical war novels set during the American Civil War?

Military institutions are a rather unique setting from the point of view of acquiring and using power: the power of military commanders over their subordinates is tied strictly to the institution that both serve, meaning that a high-ranking general cannot exert his or her power over a civilian, for instance, and expect to be obeyed in a similar way as in a military context. It is precisely this idea of fundamentally equal people willingly serving a system that renders them unequal that makes military institutions an interesting target of research. The research question of the present study is specifically tailored to provide an answer to the question of how superordinate and subordinate statuses are realized when commanders interact with each other.

As novels are utilized as the data of this study, it must be kept in mind that the conversations depicted in these books are only representations of the interactions that the commanders of the American Civil War engaged in. Therefore, the secondary aim of the present study is to find out the extent to which the concepts of politeness theory can be applied to novels and to see if problems arise due to the representative nature of the data in question.

2.2 Data selection and collection

A trilogy of novels concerning the American Civil War has been selected as the data for this thesis. The origins of the trilogy lie in the book *The Killer Angels* (1975), which American novelist Michael Shaara wrote after being inspired by the book *The Red Badge of Courage* written by Stephen Crane. According to Shaara, Crane wrote his book in order to receive insights on what it actually was like for soldiers to be on the battlefield, i.e. what they saw and how they felt. Shaara wrote his book with this particular purpose in mind. *The Killer Angels* ended up being awarded the Pulitzer Prize as well as reworked into the classic film adaptation *Gettysburg* (1993). The novel discusses the climactic battle of Gettysburg from the points of view of key commanders who took part in that battle on the sides of both the Union and the Confederacy.

After Shaara's death, his son Jeff was approached from various directions with pleas to continue his father's work. The younger Shaara conducted extensive research on the Civil War and wrote

a novel that would initiate his writing career: *Gods and Generals* (1996) became a prequel to *The Killer Angels*, was praised by critics and the public and later spawned the sequel *The Last Full Measure* (1998), which completed the trilogy of these Civil War novels. Staying true to his father's style, Jeff too tells the story of the war through the eyes and mouths of the most influential commanders who served on both sides of the conflict. The dialogue attempts to represent as closely as possible the minds of the historical figures portrayed in the novels, and narrative passages contribute to the story-telling to create a successful description of the tragic event that scarred many generations of Americans.

The American Civil War has been chosen as the focus of the military interactions examined in the present study because the conflict has been proven to be immensely interesting for military historians and casual readers alike. A crucial factor in making this war particularly intriguing is the fact that both sides boasted an impressive array of quite different commanders. The South gave birth to proud, chivalrous and aristocratic gentlemen of high military capabilities, such as Robert E. Lee or Ambrose P. Hill. In contrast, the high command of the Union was plagued by ineffective generals who most often received their commissions through political favouritism. Of course, men like Ulysses S. Grant and Winfield S. Hancock proved that the North was not utterly devoid of fighting men who could achieve outstanding results. Indeed, both belligerents boasted brilliant triumphs and crushing defeats at the end of the war: it is precisely this polarity between the clashing commanders and yet the fairly equal distribution of success (until the growing pressure on the Confederates and the final Union victory) that makes the Civil War immensely interesting from the point of view of studying interaction between its commanders.

2.3 Key terminology of the data

As the excerpts from the novels contain numerous words specific to military discourse and commonplace expressions that have a distinct meaning in a military context, a short explanation of the most frequently used terms is given here in order to clarify the analysis. Such terms are written in italics and are followed by an explanation combined with references to military history books dealing with the said subject. At the end of this section, a few observations on the tactics of the 1860s are made to present a summary of how war was waged during that period.

Regiment, brigade, division, corps. Nominations given to army units, i.e. groups of men, the sizes of which are more or less regulated. Soldiers were grouped into the units described above

not only for the sake of administration but of cohesion on the battlefield as well: men marched and fought as regiments, brigades, divisions etc. Such organization ensured that a large body of men could be controlled effectively by a much smaller collection of men, i.e. officers and other men of high rank. In addition to providing a concise explanation on the sizes and organization of said units, Groom's (2013:21) list is also helpful in understanding the hierarchy between these formations and the ranks of the men that lead them:

Regiment (ten companies) 1,000 men, commanded by a colonel
Brigade (four to six regiments) 4,000 men, commanded by a brigadier general
Division (three to four brigades) 12,000 men, commanded by a major general
Army Corps (three to six divisions) 36,000 to 72,000 men, commanded by a lieutenant general

Infantry, cavalry, artillery. Different arms of an army that have specific tasks on the battlefield. Infantry, or foot soldiers, formed the mainstay of both armies during the American Civil War. Their task was perhaps the most important one, as infantry was responsible for facing, repulsing and routing enemy troops as well as securing objectives set for commanders, such as a good position with strategic value. The primary weapon of an infantryman of the period was a single-shot firearm that, compared to the standards of modern-day weapons, was frightfully inaccurate and slow-firing. Certain attributes, e.g. militia, volunteer and regular, can be given to infantrymen to reflect the extent of their training: for instance, militia troops are ordinary citizens who have been provided very hasty and rudimentary training, whereas regular troops are battle-hardened veterans (Groom 2013).

Cavalry refers to soldiers who fight and move on horseback. By the time of the Civil War, cavalry had lost much of the glory it had held during the Napoleonic Wars, where a determined assault by horsemen could have a devastatingly demoralizing effect on the enemy. With the advent of more accurate small arms with significantly longer range, a cavalry charge against infantrymen turned out to be a costly affair. As such, horse troopers were much more valuable in gathering intelligence, i.e. information on the whereabouts and the strength of the enemy. Nevertheless, dismounted troopers armed with repeating rifles and in possession of good cover could stand up to infantry for quite some time (Sears 2004).

Artillery, or, simply put, cannons, possessed the greatest amount of firepower of contemporary arms. Artillery was equally powerful in offense and defence, as it could be utilized to harass enemy troops or hamper their advance. Furthermore, different types of artillery ammunition

provided commanders with additional tactical options: cannons could be loaded with simple round shot, explosive shells or ordnance resembling a shotgun shell designed for close combat. At the time period, cannons were grouped into batteries that consisted of around four to six guns (Groom 2013:22-24).

A note on tactics. As the standard infantry weapons of the day were capable of around three shots a minute, a single infantryman firing his rifle or musket at the enemy would have accomplished little more than a noisy distraction. In contrast, when a regiment or a brigade fired its weapons at the same time, the result could have disastrous effects for the troops facing such murderous fire. This meant that men had to be instructed not only to load and fire their weapons in unison but also to move as a compact unit in order to maximize the effect of their fire. This was achieved by having the men formed in long lines that could deliver a shattering wall of fire. The drawback of such a formation is that its sides, i.e. flanks, and rear are very vulnerable, causing the incentive for commanders to secure their flanks whenever possible.

2.4 Methods of analysis

To illustrate the realization of power relations in the novels, the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) is applied to the data. Both universal aspects of politeness and the more specific face-threatening acts are applied to the data to exemplify the various realizations of power relations between the commanders. Both dialogue and narrative passages are used in the present study to analyse the power relations that exist between the characters. Several extracts are examined in detail by utilizing concepts provided by previous research and the methods chosen for this thesis. Furthermore, interactions with different types of settings are used to illustrate the various strategies that the commanders employ when realizing power relations in practice. As such, the excerpts chosen for analysis range from simple issuing of orders with prompt acceptance for the part of a subordinate, negotiation of orders, disputes and even outright insubordination. Such a variety of interaction situations shows how power relations can be realized in a quite varied way and also what types of reactions they cause.

Whenever narrative passages are deemed crucial for the realization of power relations in the novels, stylistics is applied to such passages to further illustrate the interaction between commanders. Thought representation, such as direct or free indirect thought are taken advantage of to exemplify how narration contributes to the expression of power relations.

3 Power and military organization

In this section, the theoretical background of the present study is examined. First, some general observations on power and military organization are made, followed by an overview of stylistic analysis and its applications. Lastly, the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson is presented with insights on the background, aims, central concepts and applications of the theory.

On a general level, multiple theories have been formulated on what power is considered to be. Various points of view have been adopted, such as that of a subject rather than power itself (Foucault 1982), and power has also been discussed as being a particular inequality that exists between two interactants (Fairclough 1995). Power in this study is examined as being inseparable from the military institution. Power comes from the military rank bestowed by the institution, and power is the ability to control one's subordinates by relying on that rank. Power relations, then, are used to describe the interactions that happen between superordinates and subordinates and which are characterized by the differences that arise from the differing ranks.

Clegg et al. (2006:2) describe power as a force that brings people together to achieve certain goals. As such, the authors establish an inseparable link between power and organization. The authors describe these goals that are achievable through organization thus:

With organization almost anything can be attempted: wars waged, empires challenged, worlds conquered, space explored, and good fortune built. Positive, wonderful things may be achieved with power: tyrannies defeated, democracies created, relationships forged, and freedoms established. Equally however, as we learn from the daily news, the power to achieve each of these good things may entail violence being unleashed, domination being enforced, and manipulation being employed.
(Clegg et al. 2006:2)

The authors' definition of power is very applicable to a military context, as armies are indeed organizations of people that can be assigned different goals, such as defence, invasion and police work. As large bodies of men require co-ordination to act together in order to achieve such goals, it is plain that strict discipline must be employed. This discipline is attained via a system of differing military ranks. For example, privates are required to obey their non-commissioned officer, non-commissioned officers take orders from commissioned officers and generals possess the highest authority regarding command decisions. As such, there is inherent power in this hierarchical structure that is designed to allow a relatively small group of people to direct and control much larger bodies of people.

The concept of status is useful when examining the hierarchical system of military ranks. As the system bestows a superior position to a person of higher rank, that person can rely on his or her status as a superordinate and so to be obeyed without question. (Watts 1991: 55) provides the following definition for status:

an individual's position in the structure of social relationships with respect to other individuals. Position may be determined in a number of ways, through education, wealth, age, sex, etc., or by the possession of specific mental or physical abilities. Status is thus dependent on the set of values attached to these and many other features by the culture concerned, and it is crucially involved in systems of social hierarchies which help to determine who possesses greater potential power in what social activities. It thus fluctuates from culture to culture and, within a culture, from social group to social group.

When examining the military institution, the key observation in Watts' definition is the fact that the link that power has to social hierarchies determines superiority in social activities and social groups. Therefore, exerting power in a military context is to be seen in direct connection with what is being said and where: soldiers adopt and accept their differing ranks, i.e. their statuses, because those statuses have been given to them by the military institution.

The military system in which orders are relayed from the top to the bottom is meant to achieve efficiency in military operations. According to Clegg et al. (2006:7), "efficiency may be defined as achieving some predetermined end at the highest output in terms of the least input of resources". In a military context this means that commanders attempt to achieve their set goals with as little complications as possible, i.e. they give out orders and expect them to be carried out while focusing their own attention to overall command of the whole situation at hand.

One key factor in achieving efficiency is the use of specific discourse to ensure that participants grasp instantly the subject at hand and recognize the means with which it can be handled in the most efficient manner. Clegg et al. (2006:17) argue that "organizations and individuals use discourses purposefully to shape the political situations in and through which they can act and perform". This is particularly true in the case of military organizations, where everyday words such as *guns*, *ground* and *flank* have very specific meanings and are used frequently to make e.g. descriptions of the situation on a battlefield as precise as possible. Military terminology relevant to the present study is explained in more detail in chapter 4.3.

The collection of articles edited by Mayr (2008), too, discusses power in direct connection with organizations, or institutions. In fact, in Mayr (2008) the authors present power as being

inseparable from institutions: one of their main claims is that there is power in the way that institutions represent themselves through e.g. informing or giving speeches. As such, Mayr et al. identify power in the discourses that institutions employ when interacting with other members of the society. As for the authors' views on what they mean with the word "institutions", they provide the following definitions:

1. An established organization or foundation, especially one dedicated to education, public service or culture.
2. The building or buildings housing such an organization.
3. A place for the care of persons who are destitute, disabled or mentally ill.
(www.thefreedictionary.com/institution)
(Mayr 2008:4)

Aboussnougua and Machin (2008) examine defence discourse first from the point of view of monuments built in Britain to commemorate those who gave their lives in the First World War. The authors identify several means through which these monuments imply a particular kind of military discourse. For instance, Aboussnougua and Machin argue that the poses, bases and characteristics of such WW1 statues all carry meaning: soldiers are presented in victorious poses, they have been lifted on tall pedestals so as to appear in a position of power over their viewers and they are depicted as energetic, well-fed and cheerful young people.

Thus, according to Aboussnougua and Machin, the way in which these statues are presented reflects their builders' want to show to the public that the soldiers who fought in the war were justified in doing so and that they served in good conditions and health. More truthful representations of thin and weakened men covering in terror in muddy trenches would convey a strikingly different message, as Aboussnougua and Machin point out. As such, these monuments have the power to influence their viewers by presenting to them a very specific view of the soldiers who took part in the Great War. This serves as an insightful example of how institutions can exert their power in such mediated ways as well.

As power can be mediated through works of art, it can be argued that the novels written by the Shaaras have power of their own as well. Since the novels depict a particular representation of the American Civil War, it can be claimed that the authors exert their power by presenting that representation to their readers and make them believe that this is what actually happened during the conflict. Even if what the authors tell their readers is just one representation of American soldiers, that representation has the power to influence the ideas that its readers have regarding

the described participants. As such, widely accepted representations in particular possess a great deal of power over their audiences.

4 Stylistics

The role of stylistic analysis in the present study is designed to lend support to what is regarded as the main focus, i.e. applying the politeness theory to the analysis of the data. In this section, a definition of stylistics is provided and its key branches are presented, after which examples of applying stylistics to literature are examined. Furthermore, as stylistic concepts related to thought representation are considered to be particularly useful for the purposes of this thesis, such concepts are presented at the end of this section.

4.1 Definition, key branches and applications of stylistics

Stylistics can be regarded as a set of tools with which one can analyse literary works, such as poems, plays and prose. According to Short (1996:1), “stylistics is an approach to the analysis of (literary) texts using *linguistic* description”. Stylistics combines linguistic concepts with personal interpretation and evaluation to provide analysts with a comprehensive method for approaching their chosen data. The idea of seeing stylistics as a toolbox is taken further by Nørgaard, Montoro and Busse (2010), who point out that since stylistics is very much an interdisciplinary method of analysis, researchers can choose a particular branch of stylistics or the “tools” that suit their aims best in studying the text type of their choice. Nørgaard et al. (2010:1) also make the observation that the use of stylistics has expanded to studying news reports, films and other multimodal publications. Such varied targets of research illustrate the many possibilities of applying stylistic analysis into different types of texts.

The collection of papers written for the fifth volume of the Poetics and Linguistics Association (Watson 2008) serves as an excellent introduction to stylistics. In addition to providing insights to the current state of stylistics and how it is viewed by students, the book also presents an overview of the various branches of stylistics and recent discoveries made within them. The first branched presented in the book is cognitive stylistics. As Chao’s (2008) paper illustrates, the aim of cognitive stylistics is to look beyond the text itself and to take into account how the response of the reader is directly connected to making meaning out of the text. This is particularly true in the case of texts in which e.g. broken sentences and vague words are used

frequently. Therefore, as the name of the branch implies, cognitive stylistics is firmly based on cognition as a starting point for analysing meaning-making.

The second branch introduced in the compilation is corpus stylistics. According to Consiglio (2008), corpus stylistics can be seen as a combination of corpus linguistics and stylistics, i.e. as a method in which both quantitative and qualitative analysis are taken advantage of. This she explains by presenting her study in which she compares the frequencies of certain words used in Shakespeare's "King Lear" to their equivalents in a revised version written by another author. Consiglio then uses this numerical data to draw qualitative conclusions on the differing styles of the two versions.

The third and last branch that the book introduces is pragmatics and discourse stylistics. Being aware of how pragmatic features and notions of discourse give shape and meaning to real-life conversations is essential to how we understand such interactions. Pragmatics and discourse stylistics applies this idea to written representations of discussions. Troyer's (2008) paper shows how this branch is especially useful when applied to analysing dialogue in literature. He uses Sherman Alexie's "What You Pawn I Will Redeem" as an example to illustrate how knowledge of the relationships between Native Americans can be employed to gain a deeper understanding of the dialogue between them. The present study can be categorized under this branch, as specific discourse is given emphasis when analysing the interactions between characters.

Short (1996:4-7) illustrates how linguistic information can be employed in the analysis of literary texts by examining an excerpt from Romeo and Juliet ("Come, we burn daylight, ho!"). Short claims that intuitive knowledge of grammatical relations is a prerequisite for interpretation. As such, he goes on to explain that since we know that "daylight" cannot be the object of the verb "burn", we must formulate a non-literal interpretation of the passage, "e.g. 'we are wasting time'" (Short 1996:5) With this example, Short displays the importance of doing linguistic description as explicitly as possible when presenting evaluations of texts, as such conduct leads to justified interpretations. Therefore, the aim of stylisticians is "to make their descriptions and analyses as *detailed*, as *systematic* and as *thorough* as possible" (Short 1996:6). Such an approach is particularly helpful when analysing the dialogue of novels, as such material can often contain features like implying a certain tone of voice that one has to interpret and then justify that interpretation.

As another example of stylistic analysis, Short (1996:16-27) examines the poem “Wants” by Philip Larkin. In doing so, he follows the conventional process of stylistic analysis, i.e. he starts with his own general interpretation of the poem, then notes several linguistic features which support that interpretation and finally combines the first two steps to finish with an evaluation of the poem. His addressing of the linguistic stylistic features of the poem is particularly detailed: he takes into account such varied components as lexis, semantico-syntactic deviations, grammar and phonetic patterns. Short’s remarks on the evaluation part of his analysis reveal the benefits of doing stylistic analysis, as he confesses that he was initially unable to come up with some of the interpretations that did not arise until the evaluation phase. In addition, he once again emphasizes that basing one’s analysis on such detailed features helps in the justification of one’s interpretation. Similarly, the present study attempts a linguistically and stylistically grounded interpretation of military interactions by examining e.g. specific discourse, gestures and expressions.

4.2 Key concepts of stylistics relevant to the present study

As stated above, the dialogue sections of the data of this thesis are analysed primarily via concepts of the politeness theory. Therefore, stylistic insights regarding speech representation are not given emphasis; instead, relevant narrative passages in the data are analysed through stylistic concepts concerning narration and thought representation. Interesting details of the power relations between the characters appearing in the data are revealed outside dialogue, which justifies the use of these concepts.

The first of these concepts is *narrator’s representation of thought (NRT)*. An example of NRT could be “He spent the day thinking” (Short 1996:311). As the name implies, in such cases thought representation is left for the narrator to carry out. Also, NRT can be regarded as a concise and convenient way of expressing characters’ thought processes without going into too much detail, as Short states. In contrast to NRT, *direct thought (DT)* and *indirect thought (IT)* show more attention towards characters and their thoughts. These can be exemplified, respectively, as follows: “‘He will be late’, she thought”, and “She thought that he will be late” (Short 1996:311). Lastly, a particular variant of indirect thought is *free indirect thought (FIT)*, where the distinction between narration and thoughts may not always be quite clear, such as in “He was bound to be late!” (Short 1996:311). Thought representation constitutes a major part of the expression of the power relations in the novels, and so the aforementioned concepts prove

very useful to the analysis.

5 Politeness theory

Applying the insights of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory to the war novels is the main focus of the present study. As such, this section aims to provide an overview of the theory with a specific focus on the concept of face-threatening acts and how to utilize them. In addition, some remarks by Brown and Levinson on the use of honorifics are made to establish a link between the theory and a military context.

5.1 Background and aims of politeness theory

The politeness theory of Brown and Levinson (1987) is a widespread model that has been applied to, among others, sociological, linguistic and literary studies. The fundamental idea of the authors, i.e. that politeness and particular strategies with which it is expressed are inseparable components of interaction, has drawn researchers from a broad array of fields of research to the model, thus preventing politeness theory from becoming outdated.

Brown and Levinson (1987:55) state that the starting point of their book is to find out why people express themselves in quite different ways in different situations and when interacting with different people. They identify politeness as the primary motive for such behaviour in language use and claim that politeness is a crucial factor for people when managing social relationships. In relation to politeness, Brown and Levinson emphasize the role of rationality when employing politeness strategies: according to the authors, people employ rational thought processes when choosing politeness strategies and especially when evaluating how much damage those strategies might cause for addressees.

Brown and Levinson (1987:56) give four distinct purposes for their theory. First, they intend to "identify some principles of a universal yet 'social' sort", meaning that their study has cross-cultural implications and might suggest that some aspects of politeness need not be tied to certain locations or cultures. Second, as mentioned above, they emphasize the role of rationality "in the derivation of inferences beyond the initial significance of words, tone, and gesture". Third, they identify message construction as an essential part of strategic language use. Here they divide interaction into the expression of social relationships and strategic language use.

Fourth, they aim to dismiss the proposed cultural relativity of interaction, and so return to their first aim concerning universal principles of politeness.

5.2 Central concepts of politeness theory

Brown and Levinson (1987:61) base their politeness theory on the two following presumptions: first, "that all competent adult members of a society have (and know each other to have) 'face', the public self-image that every member wants to claim for himself". Second, the aforementioned members of a society are also assumed to possess "certain rational capabilities, in particular consistent modes of reasoning from ends to the means that will achieve those ends". In other words, the theory implies that, on the one hand, people have certain wants and wish to be treated in a certain way, and on the other hand, through the process of reasoning, people choose the best strategies with which they approach those wants, both their own and others'.

The concept *face* is a central constituent of the politeness theory. The authors divide this definition of face into two sections, negative face and positive face. According to Brown and Levinson, negative face is defined as a person's claim to the right to act freely and without imposition. For instance, if someone was given an order to do something, that order would be a direct threat to his or her negative face, as it would challenge the person's wish to act on his or her own. The authors associate threats against negative face with common formal politeness (1987:62). As for positive face, Brown and Levinson use the concept to illustrate an individual's wish to be admired for his or her values, achievements, looks etc. Our positive faces, then, reflect our want to be approved on the basis of something that we possess. As the authors (1987:62-63) point out, wants related to positive face may not always be as obvious as ones related to negative face, as they can be both material ("going to the opera... playing tennis") and non-material things ("love, liberty, piety"). As faces play a crucial part in the politeness theory, politeness itself can therefore be seen as the endeavour to spare the faces of other people from damage.

As mentioned above, faces can be threatened in various ways. The authors call these ways *face-threatening acts*, or *FTAs* for short. Brown and Levinson (1987:65) present a detailed definition of FTAs:

Given these assumptions of the universality of face and rationality, it is intuitively the case that certain

kinds of acts intrinsically threaten face, namely those acts that by their nature run contrary to the face wants of the addressee and/or of the speaker. By 'act' we have in mind what is intended to be done by a verbal or non-verbal communication, just as one or more 'speech acts' can be assigned to an utterance.

As such, FTAs and their strategic selection in language use is at the heart of the politeness theory. As particular types of FTAs against negative face, the authors (1987:66) list such acts as orders and requests, suggestions and advice, reminding as well as threats and warnings. Being FTAs which threaten negative face, all of these include a more or less visible implication that actions will be taken to restrict the addressee's freedom of imposition, should he or she ignore the aforementioned acts. Other such acts can include offers and promises that comply the addressee to be indebted to the speaker, while expressions of envy or strong emotions for the part of the speaker may cause the addressee to "take action to protect the object of S's [the speaker's] desire, or give it to S" (Brown and Levinson 1987:66).

As positive face is composed of values and wants that we wish others to admire, FTAs directed towards positive face indicate "that the speaker does not care about the addressee's feelings, wants, etc. - that in some important respect he doesn't want H's [the addressee's] wants" (Brown and Levinson 1987:66). Such FTAs can be realized as expressions of disapproval, criticism, contempt, complaints, insults, disagreements or non-cooperation, for instance. In other words, then, FTAs threatening positive face occur in non-formal situations in which the FTA is not directed towards the addressee's want to act freely (as is the case in FTAs against negative face), but rather towards the addressee him/herself and his or her wants. It is important to note that some FTAs can overlap with each other, as quite a few of them, e.g. complaints or threats can threaten both positive and negative face (Brown and Levinson 1987:67).

As Brown and Levinson (1987:67) illustrate, FTAs need not always be directed towards the addressee's face: the speaker's face may also be in danger of being threatened. For example, the speaker may express thanks and thus humble his or her own face, or the speaker might make excuses for a previous FTA that the addressee has criticized. Furthermore, the speaker may make promises and offers which he or she is unwilling to fulfil and therefore threatens his or her own freedom of imposition. In turn, the speaker can damage his or her positive face via e.g. self-humiliation or admissions of guilt, meaning that his or her positive want to be respected is threatened. As such, the strategic choices of both the speaker and the addressee made during the discussion can affect greatly whose face (and which face, negative or positive) is being

threatened.

5.3 Strategies for doing FTAs

As a basis for strategies for doing FTAs, Brown and Levinson (1987:68) state that “in the context of the mutual vulnerability of face, any rational agent will seek to avoid these face-threatening acts, or will employ certain strategies to minimize the threat”. This they explain in other words as a three-pronged rational process of assessing three factors: “(a) the want to communicate the content of the FTA x , (b) the want to be efficient or urgent, and (c) the want to maintain H’s face to any degree”. Therefore, as the authors claim, the speaker will choose the strategy that has the least chance of threatening face, unless his or her want to be efficient or urgent exceeds his or her want to maintain the addressee’s face.

Brown and Levinson (1987:68) have compiled a list of various types of strategies for doing FTAs. These strategies can be divided according to whether or not the participants are able to identify clearly the communicative act which led to doing the FTA, whether or not action is taken to tone down the FTA and, if such actions are taken, whether positive or negative face is the target of the toning down. First, the authors discuss the concept of *on-record* in the following way: “An actor goes on record in doing an act if it is clear to participants what communicative intention led the actor to do [the FTA] (i.e., there is just one unambiguously attributable intention with which witnesses would concur)” (Brown and Levinson 1987:68). As such, a specific promise made by the speaker would be considered a case of going on-record, as is illustrated by the authors.

In contrast to going on record, going *off-record* when carrying out an act means that no unambiguous intention can be associated with the act (Brown and Levinson 1987:69). This means that the speaker cannot be regarded as having committed himself or herself to the act. The authors give the following example to illustrate their definition: “If I say ‘Damn, I’m out of cash, I forgot to go to the bank today’, I may be intending to get you to lend me some cash, but I cannot be held to have committed myself to that intent”. Therefore, it can be argued that off-record acts are very closely related to such classic examples of pragmatics like “It’s rather cold in here”, with which the speaker is not making a declarative statement but rather requesting the addressee to close an open window, for instance. Indeed, Brown and Levinson (1987:69) note that “linguistic realizations of off-record strategies include metaphor and irony, rhetorical

questions, understatement...” etc., meaning that, for the part of the addressee, understanding off-record strategies requires knowledge of such linguistic subtleties.

When an on-record act is done with maximum efficiency and without chances of different interpretations, it is considered to be done *baldly, without redress* (Brown and Levinson 1987:69). The authors exemplify this with a simple request saying “Do X!”. This strategy is very direct and might turn out even outright aggressive; as such, Brown and Levinson (ibid.) acknowledge that

normally, an FTA will be done in this way only if the speaker does not fear retribution from the addressee, for example in circumstances where (a) S and H tacitly agree that the relevance of face demands may be suspended in the interests of urgency or efficiency; (b) where the danger to H’s face is *very* small, as in offers, requests, suggestions that are clearly in H’s interest and do not require great sacrifices of S... and (c) where S is vastly superior in power to H, or can enlist audience support to destroy H’s face without losing his own.

The opposite of doing an act baldly and without redress is to moderate it with *redressive action*. By this the authors mean that the speaker acts in such a way which clearly does not intend to damage the addressee’s face and even wishes to abide by the wants of the addressee according to which face the speaker chooses to redress. Consequently, the speaker may employ either *positive politeness* or *negative politeness* according to that decision. As their names imply, positive politeness is directed towards redressing positive face, whereas negative politeness attempts to minimize threats against negative face. By turning to positive politeness, the speaker implies that he or she wants, admires, respects etc. the addressee’s wants, while negative politeness is geared towards preserving the addressee’s freedom from imposition.

Brown and Levinson (1987:179) mention *honorifics* as a particular substrategy of negative politeness. The authors show particular interest towards certain grammatical forms of languages used in South-East Asia that include various degrees of politeness. However, from the point of view of the present study, more relevant is the definition of honorifics as indicators of social status between individuals operating in predefined situations. For instance, military commanders address each other in a certain way, such as by using the honorific Sir, or alternatively by referring to superordinates/subordinates through their ranks, e.g. General, Colonel or Lieutenant. (The examples of addressing through rank given here follow the model used in the data of this thesis. Military honorifics are very much tied to different cultures, and

so additional honorifics might be needed in certain countries, as is the case with the Finnish model “herra kenraali” as opposed to “General”, for example.)

6 Previous research

In this section, previous research relevant to the present study is presented. This section is divided into two parts: first, previous applications of politeness theory are examined from the point of view of both real-life discussions and dialogue used in novels. Second, studies by Disler (2005), Halbe (2011) and Achille, Schulze and Schmidt-Nielsen (1995) are presented in order to illustrate how military discussions have been treated as data in earlier studies.

6.1 Previous research related to politeness theory

Locher's (2004) study on how power and politeness are closely related to each other in disagreements is a prime example of how politeness theory can be applied to various kinds of data with interesting results. Her data includes, among others, a discussion between a team of physicists who work at a laboratory. The institutional hierarchy in which the physicists are placed in unequal positions of power serves as a backdrop for the discussion and affects directly the ways in which the participants interact with each other. As such, the participants act according to the power relations that exist between them and thus have to either negotiate the unavoidable FTAs through politeness or simply state their opinions without redressive action. Choosing either act depends on their standing in relation to the other participants.

Locher provides an example where one of the physicists, Karl, does an FTA by questioning whether it is justified to alter the work schedule as proposed by another physicist, Ron. The FTA itself is straightforward, but Karl struggles while doing it as he is new to the team and so has little power over such broad issues, which he explicitly acknowledges. Karl's speech act is further complicated by his frequent use of hedging and tokens of hesitation as well as by the fact that many of the other participants expressed their wish to speak after Ron's proposal; thus, Karl can be seen in a very difficult position from the point of view of doing an FTA without serious threat to both Ron's face and his own.

As such, Karl constructs his FTA in such a way that it remains on a very general level: he does not directly criticize Ron's proposal, but instead does it indirectly by referring to standard

procedures of the laboratory. Karl also gives his impression on the subject rather than making a direct statement and emphasizes his status as a newcomer to the group, as is illustrated by his frequent use of the word “would” and the hesitation marker “uh”. The result is that both Karl's and Ron's faces are redressed and a heated discussion is initiated on the topic raised by Karl.

A different example of an FTA arises in the data directly after Karl's speech act. One participant named Bill concurs with the concerns expressed by Karl and speaks out his mind accordingly. However, in contrast to Karl's FTA, Bill's FTA is constructed in a much more direct way with no hesitation markers: he asks a clear question and makes a concise statement on the issue being discussed. The primary reason for Bill's avoidance of redressive action is that he is in possession of a much higher rank than Karl. Therefore, he is not afraid to threaten Ron's face through criticism of his proposal, as such action would not endanger Bill's superior position in the team. As these two excerpts show, Locher's study illustrates in an insightful way how power is directly related to the strategic choice of FTAs and whether or not redressive action is needed.

Similarly to what the present study attempts to do, Lewis (2008) tests how the model can be applied to the novel “American Psycho” by Bret Easton Ellis. Lewis presents extracts from the novel and examines the different FTAs done in them by the characters participating in the conversation. A particularly interesting feature about Lewis' study is that he assumes a deliberately critical stance towards Brown and Levinson's theory and suggests that a few additions be made to it to further clarify the evaluation of FTAs, their functions and, most importantly, the goals that participants aim to achieve by using them.

Lewis (2008:183) gives the following example when analysing FTAs used in the novel:

“Oh wait, guys, listen, I got a joke.” Preston rubs his hands together.

“Preston,” Price says, “you are a joke. You do know you weren't invited to dinner.

By the way, nice jacket; nonmatching but complementary.” (Ellis, 1991: 36)

According to Lewis, Preston's speech act shows his want to be included in the company of the other men by addressing them with the informal, friendly word “guys”. This want is denied by Price, who does an FTA by both interrupting Preston before he can start telling his joke and by stating explicitly that Preston's company is unwanted (Lewis 2008:183). Thus, on the one hand, Price threatens Preston's negative face by restricting his wish to speak freely, and on the other

hand Price also attacks Preston's positive face consisting of his wish to be accepted as a part of the group. Furthermore, as Lewis points out, Price's sarcastic remark about Preston's suit can also be regarded as an FTA against Preston's positive face.

One key target of Lewis' criticism is the fact that Brown and Levinson make a clear distinction between positive and negative face. This leads to the interpretation that both types of face are “mutually exclusive” (Lewis 2008:184). Lewis illustrates this by examining the line “You do know you weren't invited to dinner” from the previous excerpt: according to Lewis, the FTA in question can be considered a threat against both Preston's positive and negative face, as it seems to imply that Preston is not free to join the other men and also that Preston's wish to be accepted by the others is not wanted. Consequently, Lewis (2008:184) argues that “it must be acknowledged that FTAs can be motivated by multiple purposes and achieve multiple effects, and may therefore threaten both negative and positive faces simultaneously”. Here is an important insight from the point of view of the analysis carried out in the present study, as there turn out to be multiple interpretations when examining the target of the FTAs.

6.2 Previous research on the use of language in military contexts

The purpose of Disler's (2005) doctoral thesis is to study the realization of power relations in military interactions. Disler's data consists of recorded discussions which she has acquired from her colleagues working in the US Air Force. The thesis combines quantitative analysis with qualitative description: Disler has compiled statistics on how many times honorifics, such as Sir or Madam, were used in her data, and takes advantage of those numbers when illustrating how superordinates/subordinates communicate with each other. An interesting feature of *Talking in the ranks* is that Disler introduces the gender aspect into her study, meaning that the realization of power relations is given a wider perspective via looking at how female soldiers are treated in a male-dominated environment.

By referring to previous research on places where a certain type of communication is required, i.e. communities of practice, Disler (2005:46) summarizes a large portion of the fundamentals of military interaction: among others, she lists such components as “the absence of introductory preambles, as if conversations and interactions were merely the continuation of an ongoing process; knowing what others know, what they can do, and how they can contribute to an enterprise; jargon and shortcuts to communication; and shared discourse that reflects a certain

perspective on the world". In other words, when applied to a military context, these characterizations mean that soldiers need not go through extensive introductions to initiate a conversation, are aware of each others' responsibilities and capabilities, and use such a vocabulary that all of them understand and can take advantage of to the fullest.

Disler highlights the applicability of interactional sociolinguistics to military discussions. She argues:

A basic tenet of interactional sociolinguistics is that meaning in discourse is socially constructed, constantly being reinvented through interaction. Without question language use within a military context is one example of a social construct in which the military at large [...] is made up of what are innumerable groups of people engaged in the mutual endeavor of defending the nation, during which emerge ways of working and talking, as well as common values, beliefs and power relations.

(Disler 2005:63)

Here Disler draws an interesting connection between the purpose of the military institution, i.e. "the mutual endeavor of defending the nation", and the way its members create both a discourse of their own and a system of differing ranks to achieve this goal efficiently. This statement reflects ways in which maximum efficiency can be regarded as the basis of military discourse and the system of ranks, and is in agreement with the observations of Clegg et al. (2006) on the role of efficiency in organizations.

Halbe's (2011) study is another excellent example of studying interactions and politeness between military personnel. In her study, she observes a US battalion in their daily occupations that range from briefing sessions, physical training and more informal discussions between peers. In addition, Halbe bases her conclusions on a questionnaire and interviews concerning communication between the members of the battalion. The author states that due to the relatively small size of the observed army unit, all conclusions cannot be applied to similar formations as some features of communication can be unique to the battalion in question.

One key observation made by Halbe is the fact that military interactions can be divided into two styles. First is the formal one, which is used between subordinates and superiors and usually involves a salute made by the subordinate and answered by the superior. Another major part of the formal style is the use of respectful words, such as "Sir/Ma'am" or the rank of the superior combined with his or her last name. The response of the superordinate can be much more

relaxed, which exemplifies the hierarchical nature of military ranks. The second style is more informal and is employed most often when conversing with one's peers: for instance, officers might greet each other with a "Hello" followed by the first name of the recipient. Halbe (2011:6) does identify interesting exceptions to these two styles, such as a subordinate challenging his superior to outrun him by saying "come on old man" during physical training. It appears that the use of the aforementioned styles is tied tightly with the context in question, which is true also in the analysed excerpts of the present study.

Halbe examines the interactions from the point of view of three categories: directives, advice and suggestions as well as criticism. The category of directives encompasses simple orders, but some variation is added to the category by involving requests, such as "Can you do". The category includes the sub-category "responses to directives". Combined together, directives and responses to directives form the mainstay of interactions between subordinates and superiors. Advice and suggestions, on the other hand, are more often employed between peers, although Halbe points out that a staff sergeant may occasionally provide suggestions to a superior on technical matters, for instance. The author identifies criticism as being rare and taken care of either half-seriously (e.g. joking between peers) or in an encouraging manner (e.g. privately with a subordinate). As such, Halbe concludes that military interactions appear to be much less formal than commonly believed.

In their study, Achille, Schulze and Schmidt-Nielsen (1995) examine the communication between a team of soldiers serving in the US Navy. The researchers were allowed to observe a combat simulation in which the team took part and to record the interactions that took place between the team members during the training. Based on their observations, the authors (Achille et al. 1995:97) present four key principles of effective teamwork in the Navy: firstly, information must be given as accurately as possible, meaning that the use of specific military terms is absolutely essential. Secondly, information must be relayed as briefly as possible due to the limitations of the messaging system in use. Thirdly, attention must be paid to the content of the information that is being relayed. According to the authors, this means that interpreted information is to be preferred over raw data. Fourthly and lastly, the ones giving information should identify themselves in order to quicken the processing of information and orders.

Having analysed the recordings, the authors identify clear improvement in the communication between the team members over the course of the training. Whereas earlier on there were

instances of unnecessary speech acts such as “umm” and “I think”, the number of such utterances decreased greatly towards the end of the simulation. Similarly, an increase in the use of specific military terminology was observed as well. Furthermore, identifying oneself and the receiver of the message as well as acknowledging received information was more frequent at later stages. Much of the improvement was attained due to the debriefing sessions that were held in order to evaluate the teamwork and to identify issues that needed more consideration. As such, the study shows that communication, both during missions and after them, has a crucial role in determining the success of military operations. The same conclusion can be drawn from the findings of the analysis section in the present study.

7 Analysis

The structure of the analysis section is as follows: each example consists of an overview paragraph, an excerpt taken from the novels and the analysis. The overview paragraph contains a brief summary of the situation at hand to provide a background to the excerpt. The summary is followed by an excerpt that is abbreviated whenever deemed necessary, so as to ensure that only features regarded as relevant for the purposes of the present study are examined. Then, the dialogue sections of the excerpt are analysed by employing the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson. Lastly, narrative passages concerning the expression of power relations are examined through stylistic analysis. Conclusions on the interactions are provided at the end of the example, and the process is repeated for each excerpt.

The analysis section of the present study is divided into two themes: Confederate and Union leadership styles are examined in their own segments. After separate analysis, the two are compared with each other, and concluding remarks on these comparisons are made in the conclusion section. The aim of this comparative approach is to see whether there are marked differences in the interactions between the fundamentally different sides: many Southern generals depicted in the books are military academy graduates, whereas the Union in the novels boasts a wider array of civilian volunteers. Another justification is to see if the interactions are affected on the one hand by the growing pressure against the Confederacy and on the other hand by the gradual strengthening of the Federal army.

7.1 Expression of power relations in Confederate interactions

Instances of expressing power relations between Southern commanders are analysed first. The following six excerpts have been chosen on the basis of the frequency of FTAs (or a significant lack of them) and the nature of the interactions. In other words, these excerpts are considered fruitful from the point of studying the power relations between commanders and otherwise interesting in the sense that, in some of them, both commanders and subordinates behave rather curiously and in unexpected ways. The excerpts have been arranged chronologically: the first five depict the progression of the battle of Gettysburg, 1863, and the last one occurs in 1864. This order has been chosen to illustrate the development of the expression of power relations between Southern commanders, i.e. to see how they act in accordance to the pressure of the war that is constantly building up against them.

7.1.1 Major General Heth's status report to General Lee

The following excerpt is from *The Killer Angels*. The battle depicted here is one fought near Gettysburg, a small town located in the state of Pennsylvania, in the year 1863. The battle that is about to unfold will have severe consequences beyond the high list of casualties inflicted on both sides: not only will Gettysburg turn out to be the first battlefield defeat for Robert E. Lee, the commander-in-chief of the eastern army of the Confederacy, but this defeat will also discourage Lee from invading the North ever again with his battered army (Sears 2004).

The situation in this excerpt is as follows: the division of Confederate general Henry Heth has advanced towards the town of Gettysburg, hoping to secure some shoes for the troops. However, they are confronted by Union cavalry under John Buford, who has chosen to defend his position until he is reinforced by the rest of the army. Heth has orders not to begin a general engagement, but the fight has already begun and he opts for driving out the seemingly small detachment of enemy troops. After a while, he meets Commanding General Robert Lee and explains the situation to his superordinate. Heth starts the conversation:

“Sir, beg to report.”

“Yes.”

“Very strange, sir. Situation very confused.”

“What happened?”

Lee's eyes were wide and very dark. Heth said painfully, “Sir. I moved in this morning as directed, I thought it was only a few militia. But it was the dismounted cavalry. John Buford. Well, there weren't all that many and it was only cavalry, so I just decided to push on it. The

5

boys wouldn't hold back. I thought we shouldn't ought to be stopped by a few dismounted cavalry. But they made a good fight. I didn't expect... They really put up a scrap." 10

"Yes." Lee was watching his eyes.

Heth grimaced, blowing. "Well, sir, they wouldn't leave. My boys got their dander up. We deployed the whole division and went after them. We just about had them running and then all of a sudden I see us moving in on infantry. They got infantry support up from the south. The boys got pushed back. Then we re-formed and tried again, couldn't stop there, sir, but there's more infantry now, I don't know how many. But I don't know what else we could have done. Sir, I'm sorry. But it started out as a minor scrap with a few militia and the next thing I know I'm tangling with half the Union army." 15

[...]¹

[Lee] looked once more at Heth; his anger died. No time for blame. But there *must* be information. 20

[...]

There was a sudden fire on the left, a burst in the north. Lee felt an acute spasm of real anger. He clutched his chest. *I know nothing.*

Heth said, "I'd better look to my flank." He moved away.

(*The Killer Angels*, 101-103)

The discussion begins with a standard procedure of military doctrine where a subordinate asks for permission to explain the ongoing situation to his commander. The first word that Heth utters, "Sir", already indicates that Lee is superior to Heth in rank. Heth must employ the proper honorific to express his respect towards his superordinate, as is required of soldiers in such cases. Heth uses the word "Sir" numerous times during the conversation; indeed, his frequent use of the honorific can be considered somewhat excessive, as less instances of "Sir" would arguably hasten the reporting. In addition to Heth adhering eagerly to the norms of military addressing, he can also be interpreted as showing politeness toward Lee, as Lee in the novels is presented as being immensely popular among all ranks of Confederate troops. Also, it can be suggested that Heth is attempting to tone down possible criticism towards his reckless actions by overemphasizing his subordinate status.

Heth receives permission to report, and he begins a lengthy narrative on how he wound up facing ever-growing numbers of the enemy. The structure of the conversation is another indicator of the power relations between the two men: it is up to Heth, the lower ranking general, to make the main contribution by telling all he knows about the situation, while Lee the commander needs only to make short acknowledgements and questions, for instance "Yes" and "What happened?". Thus, the asymmetric participation of the men illustrates what types and especially how long speech acts commanders are expected to carry out according to their rank.

The content of Heth's explanation seems to indicate further that he is in a subordinate position

¹ Three dots within brackets indicate that passages that are considered irrelevant for the present study have been left out from the excerpt.

and thus was only following orders. Heth's desire to evade the blame for the failed attack is evident in expressions such as "I moved in this morning as directed" and "The boys wouldn't hold back", and he tries to justify his actions e.g. by stating that "I thought it was only a few militia" and "I thought we shouldn't ought to be stopped by a few dismounted cavalry". The word "thought" is featured often in Heth's explanation, implying that he was relying on his presuppositions and intuition. Heth's uncomfortable situation (both on the battlefield and before Lee) is emphasized by the narration, e.g. in "Heth said painfully" and "Heth grimaced".

Heth becomes downright apologetic towards the end of his speech act, as he says: "Sir, I'm sorry." The apology combined with "Sir" appears to reflect Heth's regret for the mistake, and yet his statement that comes before it ("But I don't know what else we could have done") implies that he has done all in his power to carry out his orders. Heth concludes his report with the statement "The next thing I know I'm tangling with half the Union army", perhaps hoping to emphasize that he has unwittingly faced a dire situation. Facing "half the Union army" is a gross overstatement, as the troops that Heth engaged with were hardly even half of the single corps he was facing. As such, combined with the preceding statement, the apology can be interpreted as further evidence of Heth's complying with his subordinate role.

As Lee's superior status allows him to mainly listen to Heth's report without speaking too much, his power relations with his subordinate are illustrated in narrative passages rather than in his speech acts. The expression "Lee's eyes were wide and very dark" seems to suggest that he is quite displeased with Heth's performance. Here, Lee does not express his emotions verbally, and so his "wide and very dark" eyes are quite powerful in reflecting his role as the disappointed commander. His disappointment comes very near to being manifested in a direct FTA, but instead "his anger died". The next passage consisting of free indirect thought ("No time for blame. But there *must* be information") shows that Lee is already past the issue.

Nevertheless, upon hearing blasts of unidentified artillery, "Lee felt an acute spasm of real anger", which is followed by a frustrated passage in free indirect thought: "*I know nothing.*" Lee is angered by Heth's lack of information because it is the Commanding General's duty to be aware of the current situation on the battlefield. Lee is however reluctant to do an FTA, as he might feel that the risk of damaging both his own and Heth's face is too great: after all, he himself must retain his image of a calm commander-in-chief, and Heth's face must be preserved so that the power relations between the two remain undamaged. Indeed, interactions between

many Civil War commanders became cold precisely because of bald on-record FTAs made by superordinates, as is illustrated in later examples. Overall, this example can be regarded as presenting a good overview of the roles that commanders of differing ranks adopt when conversing with each other.

7.1.2 Lieutenant General Longstreet presses Gen. Lee for more troops

The next excerpt is taken from *The Killer Angels*. The situation on the battlefield is as follows: it is the morning of the second day of the battle, and parts of both armies have sustained heavy casualties. The commands of Confederate generals Hill and Ewell have carried the main weight of the previous day's battle, and are thus left as reserves. General Longstreet's First Corps, however, has only recently arrived on the battlefield, and Commanding General Lee plans to use those fresh troops in an offensive push on the present day. The excerpt starts with Lee and Longstreet discussing the details of the attack. Longstreet has just arrived at Lee's headquarters.

“General,” Lee said.
 Longstreet grunted. There was bright heat in Lee's eyes, like fever. Longstreet felt a shudder of alarm.
 Lee said, “I like to go into battle with the agreement of my commanders, as far as possible, as you know. We are all members of this army, in a common cause.” 5
 Longstreet waited.
 “I understand your position,” Lee said. “I did not want this fight but I think it was forced upon us.”
 [...]
 [Lee]: “I spoke to Ewell of your suggestion that he move around to the right. Both he and Early were opposed.” 10
 “*Early*,” Longstreet grimaced, spat.
 “Yes,” Lee nodded.
 [...]
 “We must attack,” General Lee said forcefully. “We *must* attack. I would rather not have done it upon this ground, but every moment we delay the enemy uses to reinforce himself. We cannot support ourselves in this country. We cannot let him work around behind us and cut us off from home. We must hit him now. We pushed him yesterday; he will remember it. The men are ready. I see no alternative.” 15
 “Yes, sir,” Longstreet said. He wants me to agree. But I cannot agree. Let's get on with it. 20
 Lee waited for a moment, but Longstreet said nothing, and the silence lengthened until at last Lee said, “You will attack on the right with the First Corps.”
 Longstreet nodded.
 [...]
 “All right,” Longstreet said. “But I don't have Pickett. I have only Hood and McLaws.” 25
 Lee said, “You will have to go in without him.”
 Longstreet said stubbornly, “Law's Brigade is still coming up. I must have Law.”
 “How long will that take?”
 “At least another hour.”
 “All right,” Lee nodded 30
 [...]
 [Longstreet:] “It will take time to position the men, the artillery.”
 “At your discretion, General.”

“Sir.” Longstreet bowed slightly.
(*The Killer Angels*, 183-184)

Already the start of the strategy meeting implies that the superordinate-subordinate relationship between Lee and Longstreet is quite unique: Lee starts the discussion by greeting Longstreet, to which Longstreet answers with a rather impolite grunt. As dictated by military decorum, let alone commonplace politeness, Longstreet is expected to reply to Lee with at least a short greeting of his own, which he nonetheless fails to do. It can be argued that such behaviour would be tolerated by few other superordinates. What enables Lee to dismiss this apparent FTA against his superior rank is the close relationship that he has shared with Longstreet almost throughout his command. In the novels, Lee is shown to rely on Longstreet's advice whenever planning major offensives, and he frequently refers to Longstreet as his “Old War Horse”. Longstreet, in turn, considered himself to be Lee's first lieutenant, i.e. second in command, as pointed out by Hennessy (1999:34). Furthermore, this sort of more relaxed behaviour between colleagues is in line with Halbe's (2011:6) observations on informal army interactions between higher-ranking officers. All in all, no FTA is made, and the discussion continues.

Much of Longstreet's apprehension during the discussion is explained by the narrative passage that follows the beginning of the conversation: “There was bright heat in Lee's eyes, like fever. Longstreet felt a shudder of alarm.” The burning sensation attached to Lee's eyes suggests that the Commanding General is anxious to have the attack started. The urge to take the initiative and attack on his own terms was, after all, the main idea that guided Lee's strategy up till the last campaigns of the war (Sears 2001:151). Longstreet, however, in the novels is depicted sometimes as being notoriously deliberate in his movements. As such, from the beginning of the battle, Longstreet has been sceptical about attacking the Federals headlong, and so he is positively alarmed as he senses Lee's wish for a direct assault.

The next remarks Lee makes are curious when examined from the point of view of superordinate-subordinate relations. According to him, it is his wish that his commanders are of the same opinion regarding their battle plans and even refers to the cause of Southern independence as a basis for their mutual agreement. He also claims to understand Longstreet's reluctance to fighting a battle that “was forced upon us”. Apparently, Lee is attempting to soften the attack order that will follow eventually, as he knows that Longstreet will oppose it strongly. In other words, Lee's statements can be regarded as redressive actions that precede an FTA against Longstreet's wish to fight the battle in his own defensive style.

Lee's style here is remarkably careful. Other commanders might not bother to approach the task of giving an attack order in such a roundabout way, as that would contradict the need for maximum efficiency. Granted, the Federal army is in possession of strong defensive terrain and the attack is to be made with two divisions, so careful planning is essential. Nevertheless, Lee seems to make a great effort in putting his wishes into words as softly as possible and, most importantly, in such a way that Longstreet's feelings are respected. Speaking strictly from the point of view of effective organizational leadership, Lee's cushioning can be deemed redundant, as ordering the attack could arguably be done in a much more concise and to-the-point way. These passages serve as another illustration of the close relations between the two generals.

What follows is an interesting example of Longstreet committing an off-record FTA not against Lee, but against another officer in the Confederate army, i.e. General Early of Ewell's corps. Lee's comment on the opinions of Ewell and Early draws the following reaction from Longstreet: "*Early!* Longstreet grimaced, spat." The italics imply a certain stress on Longstreet's tone, and the narrative passage following it emphasizes Longstreet's overt disgust towards the general in question. This off-record FTA itself could be categorized as one directed towards Early's positive face regarding his wish to be respected by his colleagues in the army. One would expect some sort of reproach from Lee as a Commanding General whose priority should be the maintenance of good relations between his subordinates, but instead he replies with a simple "Yes". Combined with the narrative passage "Lee nodded", Lee's answer could imply that he shares Longstreet's reservations concerning Early. In any case, it illustrates Lee's unwillingness to criticize his subordinate on such matters, i.e. to exert his superior status over Longstreet.

The next, rather long-winded statement by Lee contains numerous reasons in favour of making the attack: Lee mentions how time is crucial as the enemy cannot be allowed to reinforce itself, he refers to the problem of supplying the troops and maintaining communications on hostile land, he points out that an attack was carried out the day before and that the men are ready to repeat it. As has been mentioned above, the two generals disagree on how to conduct the battle, and as such Lee's speech can be regarded as presenting arguments to Longstreet on the fact that an attack would indeed be the wisest option. It is another curious example of a superordinate arguing a case with his subordinate, which in theory should be unnecessary in a military context due to the established ranks. This exceptional conduct is finally followed by a piece of standard military etiquette as Longstreet replies to Lee with a "Yes, sir". The passage "He wants me to

agree. But I cannot agree. Let's get on with it.” reflecting Longstreet's free indirect thought shows that he is still unwilling to commence the attack, but nevertheless he is complying with his subordinate position, at last.

After giving Longstreet a rather lengthy moment for disagreeing with the plan, Lee issues, for the first time during the discussion, a direct order that one would expect from a Commanding General in the first place: “You will attack on the right with the First Corps.” Longstreet replies with a simple nod. The generals then move on to discuss the details of the plan. Longstreet points out that one of his divisions is yet to arrive on the battlefield and wishes to wait for it, but Lee forbids such a delay. Here Longstreet's negative face concerning his want to operate according to his own wishes is being threatened, and so he goes on to demand stubbornly that he be given at least one brigade that is currently marching towards Gettysburg. This time Lee agrees, even though his plans are consequently delayed at least by an hour. Such bargaining by a subordinate for additional troops is quite unusual; subordinates may always request reinforcements, but such direct demands to one's commander can be deemed rather rude. Here it seems almost as if the roles of superordinate-subordinate have been reversed.

The strategy meeting is concluded by Longstreet's comment on the time-consuming deployment of the troops. Lee could take this as an FTA against his wish for the plan to proceed without delays, but instead he accepts it with an obliging “At your discretion, General”. Longstreet seems to have regained some of his proper military decorum, as he finishes the discussion by saying “Sir” and by emphasizing his deference with a slight bow. Now that the attack has been agreed on by both parties (at least seemingly), the apparent strain on the relationship between the two generals has been relieved, at least for the time being.

In summary, the exchange is highly exceptional in the sense that the superordinate and subordinate seem to act in ways quite contrary to their assumed roles: Longstreet refuses to reply to Lee's greeting in a proper way, criticizes a fellow officer in front of his Commanding General, demands for additional troops and points out delays to the execution of the plan. Lee, on the other hand, takes great pains to assure Longstreet that his opinions are respected and to elaborate why the attack should be carried out. Only quite late to the discussion does Lee live up to the role of a commander-in-chief and issue a direct order. From the point of view of the politeness theory, it can be argued that Lee seems to evaluate the risk of permanently damaging his good relations with Longstreet too high, and so he refrains from doing major FTAs against

his first lieutenant.

7.1.3 Maj. Gen. Hood's protests left unheeded by Lt. Gen. Longstreet

The following excerpt comes from *The Killer Angels*. At this stage of the battle of Gettysburg, the plan made by Lee and Longstreet to attack the Union left flank is about to be started. General Hood, one of Longstreet's division commanders, is to carry the main force of the assault. However, the Confederates soon discover that the Federal left is anchored in strong positions amidst the boulders of a rocky hill named Devil's Den. Upon seeing the formidable terrain against which he is supposed to advance, Hood expresses his doubts and urges the high command to revise the plan. Hood first sends his adjutant to negotiate with Longstreet, and afterwards visits him in person. Their discussion begins thus:

Hood said, "General, the ground is strewn with boulders. They are dug in all over the ground and there are guns in the rocks above. Every move I make is observed. If I attack as ordered I will lose half my Division, and they will still be looking down our throats from that hill. We *must* move to the right."
Longstreet said nothing. 5
[...]
Hood said, "How can you mount cannon in that?"
Longstreet: "Sam..." He shook his head. He thought of it again. No. Too late. I cannot go against Lee. Not again. He said, "Sam, the Commanding General will not approve a move to the right. I argued it yesterday. I argued it all morning. Hell, I've been arguing against any attack at all. How can I call this one off? We have our orders. Go on in. We're waiting on you." 10
[...]
Hood: "Let me move to the right, up the Round Hill. If I could get a battery there..."
Longstreet shook his head. "Not enough time. You'd have to cut trees; it would be dark before you were in action." 15
[...]
Longstreet said, "You're going to have to take that hill."
He pointed.
Hood said, "They don't need even rifles to defend that. All they need to do is roll rocks down on you." 20
Longstreet said, "But you're going to have to take it."
"General, I do this under protest."
(*The Killer Angels*, 201-203)

Hood expresses his subordinate status by addressing Longstreet with his military rank. He then gives a lengthy account concerning the difficult terrain of Devil's Den and the enemy's strong positions. In a military context, the phrases "they are dug in all over the ground" and "there are guns in the rocks" are frequently used to denote the fact that "the enemy has fortified a large portion of the terrain" and "enemy artillery has been placed on the hill". As such, they are a part of a specific type of discourse, i.e. military discourse, and so serve as vocabulary that gives

structure and guidance to the discussion at hand.

Hood complains that he is unable to deploy his troops in secrecy and will expect high casualties if the attack is to be made according to the plan and ends his explanation with a much stressed request that his division “*must* move to the right”. Pointing out flaws in one’s commander’s plan and demanding that it be changed is a serious attack against the superordinate, meaning that Hood’s behaviour in this situation is in sharp contrast with how a division commander would be expected to comply with an order from his corps commander. Not only is Hood’s freedom of imposition in danger here, but he also shows compassion towards his troops, fearing that they will suffer terribly in the planned charge, and so he is forced to disobey a direct command.

One might expect Longstreet to lash out at Hood and perhaps reprimand him for his insubordination, but instead the corps commander remains silent. Hood emphasizes the difficult task set for him by asking rhetorically “How can you mount cannon in that?”, implying that positioning Confederate cannon on the rocky hill will create serious problems. Then, Longstreet speaks for the first time during the conversation. He starts by addressing Hood with his nickname Sam. The informal use of a nickname is a clear indicator of familiar relations. The fact that Hood is able to dispute Longstreet’s orders without rebuke and that Longstreet casually refers to his subordinate by a nickname illustrates the close relations between the two.

The next part of the discussion is composed of a combination of narration, narrator’s representation of thought and free indirect thought. They all reflect Longstreet’s reluctance to carry out the attack at all: he shakes his head, perhaps to dismiss both his and Hood’s protests, then starts to reconsider the whole matter again, but finally decides that recalling the attack is impossible by now. The passage “I cannot go against Lee” is the most important one here, as it indicates that Longstreet gives highest priority to maintaining his relations with Lee. Thus he tells Hood that Lee will not authorize a flank attack and that Longstreet himself has disagreed with the plan. A curious detail regarding the argumentation styles of the two generals is the fact that both employ rhetoric questions to emphasize their points of view. Whereas Hood’s question (“How can you mount cannon in that?”) is used as another reason to change the plan, Longstreet employs a rhetoric question to argue that he is powerless to stop the attack: “How can I call this one off?” Both questions reflect rather effectively the challenge that both commanders have to face involuntarily.

The discussion has reached the point where further argument is fruitless, and so Longstreet's only option is to refer to both commanders' duties as officers: "We have our orders." This is an explicit statement of the power relations that exist between Lee, Longstreet and Hood. Despite Lee's politeness towards Longstreet and roundabout approach to issuing the attack order in example 2, Longstreet could be persuaded to act only with a direct order, and so Longstreet in turn exerts his superior position over Hood to instruct him to "Go on in". Furthermore, Longstreet urges Hood with the rather blunt statement "We're waiting on you". This can be interpreted as an FTA against Hood's positive face, i.e. his wish to be admired as an efficient commander who reacts fast to orders is being threatened. Any Southern officer with Hood's combat experience and tremendous reputation would hasten to undo such an offence, and so Longstreet's FTA can be deemed quite efficient in spurring Hood into action.

Hood pleads one last time for an attack around the right side and implies that one Confederate artillery battery positioned there would drastically improve the Southerners' chances of success. Longstreet remains adamant, however, and points out the time-consuming process of preparing the gun positions. He is not willing to argue the case any further, and, pointing to Devil's Den, simply states: "You're going to have to take that hill." Hood protests till the very end and makes the desperate claim that the enemy will not even need weapons to repulse the charge. This has no effect on Longstreet, and Hood's comment is met with a repetition of Longstreet's earlier statement: "But you're going to have to take it."

Finally realizing that nothing he says will make any difference, Hood ends the discussion by saying "General, I do this under protest". By uttering a formal protest to his commander, Hood makes it clear that he is operating against his will. Due to Longstreet and Hood's close relation, Hood does not bother to use the word "General" repeatedly during the discussion, but he uses it again during his final speech act to highlight his formal protest. Only after a long sequence of insubordinate statements does Hood revert back to a speech style which follows military decorum expected from a subordinate.

This exchange between Longstreet and Hood could be summarized as a clash of duties. As a division commander, Hood's primary duty is to see to the well-being of the great number of men serving under him. His estimate of the hill designated as the objective of his attack, of the strength of the enemy occupying it and of the probable casualties inflicted to his men leads him to argue that making the attack will prove too costly for his division. As a result, he considers

the duty to his men greater than the duty to obey his corps commander. Hood's resolve is therefore enough for him to challenge the power relations between him and Longstreet. Longstreet, on the other hand, seems to give more value to his relations with Lee than those between him and Hood, and so he does not give in to Hood's protests. Longstreet seems to have tired with arguing against Lee, and so he resolves to abide by the will of the Commanding General. The close relations between Longstreet and Hood are not enough to prevent them from doing FTAs against each other, and likewise those close relations are not enough for Longstreet to authorize a change in the plan; Hood is compelled to carry out the costly charge.

7.1.4 Gen. Lee reprimands Maj. Gen. Stuart

The next excerpt chosen for analysis is taken from *The Killer Angels*. At the time of the discussion carried out in the excerpt, the second day of the battle of Gettysburg has been concluded. Cavalry commander J.E.B. Stuart has been conducting a prolonged raid behind the enemy lines, and his absence during the first days of the fighting has left Lee's army with dangerously little intelligence on the enemy's whereabouts. Many Confederate officers have deemed Stuart's actions during the last few days as nothing more than self-conscious bravado, and since Stuart's absence has denied the army of its crucial cavalry scouts, the missing horseman has been criticized harshly among Southern camps. Even the usually tolerant Commanding General Lee has expressed his displeasure with Stuart, and now that the cavalry general has finally arrived to report back to his superior, the two engage in the following conversation:

Stuart came up, saluted pleasantly, took off the plumed hat and bowed.
 "You wish to see me, sir?"
 "I asked to see you alone," Lee said quietly. [...] "I am sorry to keep you up so late."
 "Sir, I was not asleep," Stuart drawled, smiled.
 [...] 5
 [Lee] said, "Are you aware, General, that there are officers on my staff who have requested your court-martial?"
 Stuart froze. His mouth hung open. He shook his head once quickly, then cocked it to one side.
 Lee said, "I have not concurred. But it is the opinion of some excellent officers that you have let us all down." 10
 "General Lee," Stuart was struggling. [...] "Sir," Stuart said tightly, "if you will tell me who these *gentlemen*..."
 "There will be none of that." Lee's voice was cold and sharp. He spoke as you speak to a child, a small child, from a great height. 15
 [...] "I only ask that I be allowed—"
 Lee cut him off. "There is no time," Lee said. He was not a man to speak this way to a brother officer, a fellow Virginian; he shocked Stuart to silence with the iciness of his

voice. 20
 [...]

 "General Stuart," Lee said slowly, "you were the eyes of this army." He paused.

 Stuart said softly, a pathetic voice, "General Lee, if you please..." But Lee went on.

 "You were my eyes. [...] That mission was not fulfilled."

 Stuart stood motionless. 25
 [...]

 "General Lee." Stuart was in pain, and the old man felt pity, but this was necessary;

 [...]

 [Lee] wanted to say, it's all right, boy, it's all right; [...] His voice began to soften. He

 could not help it. 30

 "It is possible that you misunderstood my orders. It is possible I did not make myself

 clear. Yet this must be clear: you with your cavalry are the eyes of this army. Without

 your cavalry we are blind, and that has happened once but must never happen again."

 [...]

 It was done. Lee wanted to reassure him, but he waited, giving it time to sink in, 35
 [...]

 Stuart stood breathing audibly. After a moment he reached down and unbuckled his

 sword, theatrically, and handed it over with high drama in his face. Lee grimaced,

 annoyed, put his hands behind his back, half turned his face. Stuart was saying

 that since he no longer held the General's trust, but Lee interrupted with acid vigor. 40

 "I have told you that there is no time for that. [...] You must take what I have told you and

 learn from it, as a man does. There has been a mistake. It will not happen again. [...]

 You are as good a cavalry officer as I have known, and your service to this army has

 been invaluable. [...] All your reports are always accurate. But no report is useful if

 it does not reach us. And that is what I wanted you to know. Now." He lifted a hand. 45

 "Let us talk no more of this."

 Stuart stood there, sword in hand. Lee felt a vast pity, yet at the same time he could

 feel the coming of a smile. Good thing it was dark. He said formally, "General, this

 matter is concluded. There will be no further discussion of it. Good night."

 (*The Killer Angels*, 264-266)

Already before saying anything, Stuart displays his subordinate position by saluting his Commanding General, taking off his hat and bowing. A salute would arguably suffice for one to honour one's commander, but Stuart exaggerates the act by complementing it with other respectful gestures (notice also the word "pleasantly" that is used to describe Stuart's salute). Here he might be attempting to soften the anticipated criticism from Lee. Stuart in the novels is presented as one of the most flamboyant officer in the Confederate Army; he relishes wearing ornamental uniforms, tends to address his superiors in a dramatic way and occasionally employs French phrases to fashionably accentuate his cavalier demeanour. When combining these characteristics with Stuart's rather original way of confronting his superior, one is left with the image of Stuart as quite an unusual character whose eloquent behaviour is not what one would expect from a soldier.

Stuart starts the conversation by referring to Lee's request to see him and uses the appropriate honorific "sir". How Lee replies to this sets the tone for the remainder of the exchange: not only does he imply that he wishes to have the discussion in private due to sensitive issues (i.e. Stuart

being accused by other officers for abandoning his duties), but also the fact that Lee speaks “quietly” indicates that Stuart had better listen carefully to what his superior has to say. Despite this hint at a strained atmosphere, Lee apologizes somewhat curiously for making Stuart wait for so long; there is a degree of politeness in Lee’s apology that one might not expect from other commanders. Considered from the point of view of Lee’s later remarks, his apology can be interpreted as redressive action that is employed in advance of FTAs.

Stuart replies to the apology by stating that he had not yet gone to sleep and tops it off with a smile. Stuart’s reaction suggests that he is quite happy to talk to his superordinate regardless of the time and circumstances. However, this cordial tone is not adopted by Lee, who promptly moves on to state that Stuart has been attacked with heavy accusations from other officers. Stuart’s positive face linked with his desire to be admired by his fellow officers has thus received a severe blow, and the narrative phrases “Stuart froze” and “his mouth hung open” aptly illustrate his shock. Lee continues by repeating the accusation and also distances himself from it; apparently he himself judges the risk of permanently damaging his relations with Stuart too high and therefore refrains from doing an FTA of his own.

Several features in Stuart’s next line both reflect his agonized feelings and his unwillingness to completely lose control in front of his commander: he is “struggling”, he speaks “tightly”, and the use of italics in “*gentlemen*” hints at a stress in his voice. In contrast, Lee appears to be perfectly in control of himself as he quickly interrupts Stuart with a stern comment made in a “cold and sharp” voice. Furthermore, the narrator describes Lee speaking “as you speak to a child, a small child, from a great height”, emphasizing Lee’s authoritative position in relation to Stuart. Stuart persists and utters “I only ask that I be allowed-”, but again Lee cuts him off bluntly and claims that “There is no time.” Here Lee is acting well the role of a Commanding General: his top priority is to retain co-operation between his subordinates, and so no time is to be wasted on officers’ squabbles.

The narration provides more insights into Lee’s brusque manner: readers are told that “He was not a man to speak this way to a brother officer, a fellow Virginian”. As the narration implies, Stuart would expect Lee to be more tolerant towards another officer sharing the same cause, let alone one hailing from the native state of the Commanding General. Nevertheless, these facts are not enough to prevent Lee from doing FTAs against Stuart’s negative face, i.e. his want to speak freely without interruption. Lee appears completely focused on his task of maintaining

the coherence of his officer corps, and so he cannot afford to deal with Stuart in a more polite way. It is this unusually cold behaviour combined with “the iciness of [Lee’s] voice” that shocks “Stuart to silence”.

What follows next is an off-record FTA done by Lee. During his next few lines he criticizes Stuart for neglecting his duties as a cavalry commander. This critique is highlighted by Lee’s slow manner of speaking, as if he wishes to let every word sink into the mind of his subordinate. Stuart expresses a wish to defend himself, and the way in which he is described to speak, i.e. “softly, [with] a pathetic voice”, emphasizes his role as a subordinate who regrets his mistakes. Nevertheless, Lee interrupts him once again and continues his accusations. It is worth noting how Lee does his FTA (against Stuart’s positive want to be admired by colleagues and commanders alike) in an indirect way: instead of saying “you failed to fulfil your mission”, Lee states that “that mission was not fulfilled”, giving it a passive and less direct tone. However, this does not make the FTA any easier for Stuart to receive, and he is left speechless and standing “motionless”.

Stuart is shattered by Lee's speech: he “was in pain”, the narrator tells us. Yet Stuart is still mindful enough to address his superior properly as “General Lee”; no doubt he wishes to ask for forgiveness in accordance with military decorum. For the first time during the discussion, Lee is shown to feel some sympathy towards Stuart, as is indicated by the passage “[Lee] felt the pity rise, and he wanted to say, it's all right, boy, it's all right... His voice began to soften. He could not help it.” An interesting detail in the exchange is the fact that the narration makes Lee seem to act as a father speaking to his son: notice the similarities between the passages “He spoke as you speak to a child, a small child, from a great height” and “it's all right, boy, it's all right”. As is shown by Lee's softening voice and the fact that “He could not help it”, the Commanding General seems to have finished his criticism.

Lee is remarkably forgiving in his next line: “It is possible that you misunderstood my orders.” He could very well accuse Stuart of having misunderstood the orders, for instance. Lee even goes as far as admitting that he himself might have issued the orders too vaguely. This can be interpreted as redressive action that is done afterwards to soften the previous FTAs. Again, Lee favours a more passive tone when saying that “Yet this must be clear” instead of saying “I want to make this clear”, for example. The passive tone is repeated in “that has happened once but must never happen again”, where Lee seems to be reluctant to state that “you have failed once”

and "you must not fail again". Lee is done with doing FTAs, and now he appears to simply want to bring the discussion to a conclusion and have Stuart learn from his mistakes.

Stuart seems to be unwilling to learn from this lesson, as he attempts to redeem himself and save his pride in a very dramatic fashion, i.e. by presenting his sword to Lee. This act is more often associated with generals of opposing sides meeting after a battle and the commanders of the losing side presenting their swords to their victors, but it can also be utilized as a gesture of relieving oneself ceremoniously from command when one is faced with outspoken doubts concerning one's military capabilities. The behaviour that Stuart displays here, however, is unnecessarily pompous, since the two men are meeting in private at a late time and, more importantly, it is not at all Lee's aim to relieve Stuart of his command. This is why Lee is depicted acting in a frustrated way, as is illustrated by the passage "Lee grimaced, annoyed, put his hands behind his back, half turned his face."

Stuart's dramatic performance makes Lee commit one last FTA against Stuart's positive wish to speak freely, as Lee interrupts him "with acid vigor". Exasperated by Stuart's dramatic gestures, Lee lists numerous reasons for not accepting Stuart's resignation. The line "You must take what I have told you and learn from it, as a man does" is an example of Lee's forgiveness, and it can also be interpreted as a very strategic FTA: should Stuart continue to persist with his resignation and not learn from his mistake "as a man does", other officers could deem his behaviour unmanly and therefore pose a threat to Stuart's positive face. Thus, Lee is manipulating Stuart here quite masterfully. Notice again the passive tone in the lines "There has been a mistake. It will not happen again". Lastly, before finishing his speech, Lee engages in redressive action for his previous FTAs by complimenting Stuart's abilities as a cavalryman.

As Lee possesses a superior status, it is up to him to finish the conversation. At the end of his speech he says: "Let us talk no more of this." This conclusion of the matter is highlighted with Lee lifting his hand as if blocking any possible attempt by Stuart to pursue the discussion. Stuart takes the hint and stays silent obediently. The narration at the end of the exchange shows that Lee regrets having to rebuff his subordinate: "Lee felt a vast pity, yet at the same time he could feel the coming of a smile." The developing smile on Lee's face points to further redressive action that he is about to make. He nevertheless opts for not doing so, and the passage in free indirect thought, "Good thing it was dark", implies that Lee wishes to hide his sympathy from Stuart.

The discussion is concluded by Lee, who makes full use of his superior position: "General, this matter is concluded. There will be no further discussion of it. Good night." Due to his rank, Lee is able to state explicitly that the two commanders are finished with talking about the matter and that nothing more will be said about it. Especially the final words uttered by Lee, "Good night", give Lee's speech a very final tone, as they hint that Stuart is dismissed. Furthermore, Lee's authoritative role is emphasized by the fact that he speaks "formally" to Stuart.

In summary, the two officers act very much according to their respective roles in this example. Stuart the subordinate salutes and employs the honorific "Sir" and the title "General". He asks to be informed of the officers who have voiced their protests against him instead of throwing a tantrum or displaying otherwise unmilitary behaviour in front of his commander. After all, one would expect soldiers to act in a controlled way void of emotion for maximum efficiency of communication. Stuart also attempts a formal resignation, although one that is needlessly dramatic. All in all, then, he is the very image of an obedient subordinate during this discussion.

Lee also handles his position as the Commanding General well here: he states clearly that there is controversy between his officers, interrupts Stuart when necessary to explain himself further and declines Stuart's resignation in favour of restoring good relations amongst his subordinates. Judged from the point of view of FTAs, Lee manages to express other officers' critique towards Stuart while refraining from making accusations of his own that would permanently damage the relations between the two. Lee's use of FTAs is strategic also in the sense that they can be considered to be geared towards spurring Stuart into performing his duties more effectively.

7.1.5 Colonel Fairfax delivers Maj. Gen. Pickett's report to Lt. Gen. Longstreet

The next excerpt is taken from *The Killer Angels*, and the underlying situation in it is as follows: Hood's attack (which was discussed above) on the Federal left has been repulsed with a heavy cost, and the casualties shock Longstreet deeply. Not only were many men lost, but Hood himself is seriously injured, and after visiting him at a field hospital Longstreet is left in a depressed state of mind. He rides through the Southern camps, issuing orders in preparation for the next day, when he is confronted by Major Fairfax, one of his staff officers. Fairfax has just returned from Longstreet's division commander Pickett's camp and is expected to relay information on Pickett's whereabouts, as he was still making his way towards the battlefield during the assault. Longstreet is accompanied by another staff officer of his, Major Sorrel. The

discussion starts thus:

Up the road at a gallop: a handsome horseman, waving a plumed hat in the night. He reined up grandly, waved the hat in one long slow swop, bowed halfway down off the horse – a broad sweeping cavalier’s gesture. Fairfax, another of Longstreet’s aides. “General Pickett’s compliments, sir. He wishes to announce his presence upon the field.” Longstreet stared, grunted, gave an involuntary chuckle. “Oh grand”, Longstreet said. “That’s just grand.” He turned to Sorrel. “Isn’t that grand, Major? Now, let the battle commence.” He grimaced, grunted. “Tell General Pickett I’m glad to have him here. At last.”
[...]
“General Pickett is gravely concerned, sir. He wishes to inquire if there are any Yankees left. He says to tell you that he personally is bored and his men are very lonely.” Longstreet shook his head. Fairfax went on cheerily: “[...] General Pickett instructs me to inform you that his is a sensitive nature and that his feelings are wounded and that he and his Division of pale Virginians awaits you in yon field, hoping you will come tuck them in for the night and console them.”
“Well,” Longstreet mused. “Fairfax, are you drunk?”
“No, sir. I am quoting General Pickett’s exact words, sir. With fine accuracy, sir.”
“Well.” Longstreet smiled once slightly, shrugged. “You can tell General Pickett I’ll be along directly.”
Fairfax saluted, bowed, departed.
(*The Killer Angels*, 242)

Upon his entrance, Fairfax’s conduct is very much like Stuart’s: he too sports a plumed hat, “[reins] up grandly”, “[waves] the hat in one long slow swop” and “[bows] halfway down off the horse” in “a broad sweeping cavalier’s gesture”. Also similarly to Stuart, Fairfax’s eloquent behaviour is altogether unnecessary when confronting one’s superordinate. A crisp salute and a prompt report, for instance, would be much more efficient. It may very well be that Fairfax is influenced by Pickett’s pompous style, as is shown later during the discussion. Fairfax’s demeanour could also be interpreted as a sarcastic imitation of Pickett. Whatever the interpretation, Fairfax’s report certainly aids in softening Longstreet’s mood.

Fairfax initiates the discussion by saying “General Pickett’s compliments, sir. He wishes to announce his presence upon the field.” Commanders are seen instructing couriers to present one’s compliments to other officers (and especially superordinates) numerous times in the novels. This combined with how Pickett “*wishes* to announce his presence” emphasizes Pickett’s display of subordination. The fact that Fairfax delivers the message and utilizes the honorific “sir” in turn illustrates his subordinate role in relation to both Pickett and Longstreet. This message is not received well by Longstreet, however; he replies to the content of Pickett’s dispatch and possibly Fairfax’s dramatics with a simple stare followed by a grunt and an “involuntary chuckle”. As has been seen in previous examples, Longstreet’s military etiquette is rather unusual in front of his superiors, let alone subordinates. It must also be kept in mind

that he has just witnessed a failed attack, and he lets out his frustration during his next lines.

“‘Oh grand’, Longstreet said. ‘That’s just grand.’ He turned to Sorrel. ‘Isn’t that grand, Major? Now, let the battle commence.’” Longstreet’s speech on lines 5-7 is filled with bitter sarcasm provoked by Pickett’s report. Longstreet’s false delight concerning the arrival of reinforcements implies that Pickett’s division could have had a significant effect on the outcome of the day’s battle, had they only arrived earlier. Longstreet takes the sarcasm further by addressing Sorrel, as if sharing the good news with the major. His speech could be interpreted as an FTA against both Pickett and Fairfax: Pickett because his message was very badly timed, and Fairfax because he is the one who brings the ill-fortuned information. Including Sorrel in the remark gives additional weight to the FTA, as he, unlike Fairfax and Pickett, is aware of how meaningless the arrival of the division is under the current circumstances. Longstreet’s dark mood is highlighted by his non-verbal communication, as is shown by the passage “He grimaced, grunted”.

Longstreet does another FTA against Pickett as he says “Tell General Pickett I’m glad to have him here. At last.” An otherwise cordial message is turned upside-down with the inclusion of the words “at last”, further suggesting that Pickett should have marched much faster and joined the battle. Longstreet’s speech here and on previous lines is explicitly critical of his subordinate, Pickett. The fact that he voices such criticism in front of two other subordinates seems quite risky from the point of view of damaging faces. Issuing the order to relay the sarcastic remark of arriving at last to Pickett provides further evidence of an impolite command style (it can of course be speculated whether Fairfax was issued exactly such an order and whether he delivered it). Longstreet’s behaviour is a clear indicator of Longstreet’s superior position in the power relations between these men.

Pickett’s dispatch turns out to be much more eloquent than a simple message stating his arrival. The lines 10-11, on which Fairfax quotes Pickett, reveal much about Pickett’s character: the message is worded rather playfully, illustrating Pickett’s jolly style when communicating with fellow officers. The message also hints at Pickett’s genuine concern for being left out of the fight altogether, revealing him to be an eager warrior as well. Nonetheless, as has already been mentioned, Pickett’s arrival is far too late to influence the battle of the second day, and so Longstreet resorts to a dismissing gesture by shaking his head and not saying anything at all. Still, we are told that “Fairfax went on cheerily”, which implies that Fairfax is either unaffected

by Longstreet's blunt manner or prefers to quote Pickett's message in its entirety.

Fairfax finishes quoting Pickett's message, which is equally jolly in tone as the rest of it. The lines concerning Pickett's "sensitive nature" and wounded feelings can be regarded as further evidence for his displeasure with having been left out from the battle. They could even be viewed as FTAs against Longstreet, were they not written in such a hearty manner and to a close friend. Pickett employs one last piece of humour by stating that his men hope that Longstreet "will come tuck them in for the night and console them", giving a quite father-like image of the corps commander. In his current state of mind, Longstreet seems too distracted to receive this last remark well, and after uttering a puzzled "Well" he asks if Fairfax is drunk, suspecting that his subordinate might be making up the message under the influence of alcohol.

Here Longstreet commits an FTA against Fairfax's positive face concerning his wish to be admired for his soldierly conduct rather than falling for the temptations of liquor, which was the fate of many commanders of the period as they broke under the stress of the war (Sears 2003:244). Fairfax quickly counters this by stating that he is "quoting General Pickett's exact words" and "with fine accuracy" at that. Consequently, Fairfax undermines the FTA by showing that he is only doing as ordered, and tops it off by using the honorific "Sir" three times on line 17, at the end of each sentence. This is effective in expressing his subordination in relation to Longstreet.

Longstreet's suspicions seem to fade away as he accepts the explanation and even manages a brief smile for the first time during the discussion. He appears to finally give in to Pickett's quite unique reporting style and says to Fairfax that "You can tell General Pickett I'll be along directly". Note the use of the words "You can tell" instead of "Tell", for example, which makes the order a bit toned down. This can be interpreted as redressive action for the previous FTA against Fairfax. Fairfax acknowledges the order with a proper salute and also a bow, implying additional politeness and perhaps acknowledgment of the redressive action as well. Fairfax departs for Pickett's camp once again, finishing the discussion.

In summary, the markers of power relations are expressed very clearly in this example. Being one of Longstreet's staff officers and thus his direct subordinate, Fairfax indicates his lower status in a number of ways: he salutes at the beginning and the end of the exchange, employs the honorific "Sir" frequently and adds a dramatic touch to it all with his cavalier gestures. As

Fairfax is instructed to deliver a message from Pickett, the fact that he quotes that message exactly as worded by Pickett indicates his obedience and thus subordinate position to Pickett as well. Furthermore, Fairfax manages to give a prompt and satisfactory reply to Longstreet's suspicions about him being drunk, handling his subordinate role very properly.

For his part, Longstreet makes his higher position equally clear, albeit in a brusque way. Grimacing, grunting and shaking his head constitute Longstreet's demeanor in this excerpt, making him appear impolite and dismissive of both the report from Pickett and its bearer. Longstreet's sour mood leads him to do an off-record FTA against two subordinates, Fairfax and Pickett, at the same time, and even in front of another subordinate, Sorrel. As Longstreet possesses the high-ranking status of a corps commander, one might assume that he would try his utmost to preserve good relations and unity in his command. Still, Longstreet apparently weighs the risk of damaging relations low enough to vent out his frustration. Even the close relationship between Longstreet and Pickett does not refrain Longstreet from attacking his old friend verbally. Longstreet does another FTA against Fairfax (with very little, if any consequences) before finally warming up to the idea of visiting Pickett's camp. His redressive actions appear to ease the tensions which arose during the discussion.

7.1.6 Gen. Lee's harsh criticism of Lt. Gen. Hill

The following excerpt is taken from *The Last Full Measure*. At the time of this discussion, the war has entered its fourth year and changed drastically in nature when compared to previous engagements. After Gettysburg, the opposing armies of the novels are no longer seen attempting massed assaults against well-defended positions, and digging trenches begins to form the mainstay of battlefield tactics especially in the Confederate army. General U.S. Grant has arrived from the West with substantial reinforcements, and Lee's hopelessly outnumbered troops are forced to adopt a defensive strategy. The war now starts to follow a rather regular pattern in which the Confederates keep falling back, secure good ground and allow the Federals to waste their numbers charging against Southern trenches until the Confederates are compelled to begin another retreat. In this excerpt, the Federals have managed to secure good ground without any effort from A.P. Hill's troops to stop them. Lee confronts Hill, which results in a very strained conversation:

To the north, along the river, there was a small wave of musket fire, scattered thunder

from big guns. Lee looked that way, knew that Grant's men had filled the woods
 between Hill and the river, thought, They should not be there, they should be on the
 other side of the river. He felt the anger again, stared hard at the sounds. Some dark
 place inside of him was suddenly boiling up, the control slipping away. He looked at 5
 Hill, the weakness, the frailty, one more failure, and let his voice rise, bursting out of him.
 "General Hill, why did you not do as Jackson² would have done? Those people should not
 be there, they should never have been allowed to cross the river. You should have thrown
 your whole force on those people and driven them back!"
 His voice cracked, the breath gone. His fists were clenched, and the sweat soaked him again. 10
 Hill stared at him, seemed to sink down, feeling the weight of Lee's anger. Hill looked down
 then, said, "Sir, we did not... we did not learn of the enemy's crossing—"

Lee turned, was not listening to what Hill was saying, the explanation, heard only the fight
 within himself, the struggle for control. He held up a hand, stopped Hill in mid-sentence.
 "It is done. Prepare your defense, General. I must return to my headquarters." 15
 Hill saluted, and Lee turned.
 [...]

[Lee] glanced at Hill, said, "General, we must be vigilant. General
 Grant is coming again."
 (*The Last Full Measure*, 250-251)

The narration is very effective in showing how Lee's anger builds up as the unfavourable
 situation on the battlefield starts to become clear to him. The passage in direct thought, "They
 should not be there, they should be on the other side of the river" illustrates Lee's strategic plans
 and foreshadows the anger that arises when those plans are thwarted by the inaction of Hill.
 Especially the passage "Some dark place inside of him was suddenly boiling up, the control
 slipping away" describes well the rage that Lee is about to unleash. Those tense feelings
 combined with Hill's frail appearance described on line 6 as well as Lee's free indirect thought
 passage "one more failure" agitate Lee so much that he does a serious bald off-record FTA
 against Hill.

Lee exclaims: "General Hill, why did you not do as Jackson would have done? ... You should
 have thrown your whole force on those people and driven them back!" What makes this FTA
 particularly powerful is the fact that Lee is comparing Hill with the late General Jackson and
 stating explicitly that Hill has performed poorly in comparison. Lee thinks about Jackson
 numerous times during *The Last Full Measure*, particularly when imagining how Jackson would
 have turned a lost opportunity into a splendid victory (no doubt inspired by Jackson's brilliant
 victories, such as his campaign in the Shenandoah Valley in 1862 [Cozzens 2008]). This leads
 Lee to frustration whenever he hears of mistakes made by Jackson's replacements, i.e. generals
 Ewell and Hill. Especially the fact that Hill is commanding a part of Jackson's old troops sets
 great expectations on him; he has failed to live up to those expectations, and that is why Lee's

² Thomas "Stonewall" Jackson, one of the South's most celebrated commanders, known best for his perpetual
 strive to press the enemy hard (Sears 1998).

FTA here shocks him so badly. The FTA, then, is directed towards Hill's positive face related to his wish to be admired as a capable officer and also as a suitable inheritor of Jackson's old corps.

When compared to the previous excerpts, Lee's behaviour here is very different. We have seen him always in control: even when clearly angered, he has managed to contain it and calmly point out mistakes to his subordinates. When doing FTAs, he has toned them down and made them seem more impersonal. In contrast, here he is accusing Hill directly of his failure. He asks Hill why "did *you* not do as Jackson" and claims that "*you* should have thrown your whole force on those people". Lee's disappointment is not left unclear in the slightest. His men have learned to expect a firm but understanding style from him as their Commanding General; there is little trace of that in Lee's speech in this discussion. Nevertheless, it is the duty of a Commanding General to ensure that his men perform to the best of their ability.

As if the FTA itself was not enough to startle Hill, Lee's appearance gives the accusation additional weight: his voice cracks, his fists are clenched and he is soaked in sweat. We are told that as a reaction to this anger, "Hill stared at [Lee], seemed to sink down", and before replying he "looked down", making him appear as the regretful and submissive subordinate. Hill attempts to explain in a stammering way that his troops were not aware of the enemy closing in (line 12), but Lee interrupts him "in mid-sentence", doing another FTA, this time against Hill's negative face concerning his wish to speak freely. Lee's body language is equally important in constituting the FTA as are his words: he turns away from Hill to show disinterest towards his explanation and then holds up a hand as a dismissive gesture. Furthermore, the narration reveals to us that Lee is not even listening to Hill and instead "heard only the fight within himself, the struggle for control". It seems that Lee already regrets doing the FTA, or at least endeavours to return to his usual calm self.

"It is done", Lee says, as if he has already moved on and starts to prepare for the imminent battle. He then gives Hill a direct order: "Prepare your defense, General." The imperative "prepare" and the use of Hill's rank are tokens of Lee's superior status. Hill acknowledges both that status and the order with a proper salute. After that, Lee turns away from Hill, giving a rather impolite sign that the discussion is concluded. However, Lee seems to feel an urge to still say something to Hill as he states: "General, we must be vigilant. General Grant is coming again." The fact that Lee glances at Hill instead of looking at him directly, for instance, hints

that Lee is still feeling somewhat angered and thus wishes to distance him from his subordinate who has performed so poorly. Nevertheless, Lee's last speech could be interpreted as redressive action for his FTA, since it implies that Lee has put Hill's bad conduct in the past as the threat of the Federal commander approaching preoccupies his mind.

All in all, the way Lee acts in this discussion is not only in marked contrast with his behaviour in previous excerpts but it is also highly unusual of him, the ever-calm Commanding General. The poor fortunes of the Confederacy and the steady strengthening of the Union clearly have a depressing effect on Lee. Lee's explosive outburst comes as a complete surprise to Hill, and both men seem equally shocked at the sudden anger: Hill's reply to Lee's accusation is very weak, whereas Lee struggles to regain control almost immediately after the off-record FTA. By comparing Hill with Jackson and explicitly stating Jackson's superiority over Hill, Lee is making a very risky move that could permanently damage his relations with Hill. Still, little damage seems to have been caused since Hill voices no protest and acknowledges further orders with a salute as expected of a subordinate. The power relations between the two men appear unharmed, and Lee wants to ascertain that by employing redressive action at the end of the discussion.

7.1.7. Summary

To summarize all the analysed Confederate interactions, Southern generals employ two major strategies to express their power relations: honorifics and FTAs. Whenever a Confederate subordinate uses the honorific "Sir" or a military rank to address his superior, he puts himself automatically into a subordinate position, as both "Sir" and the superior rank that is being used contain an implicit expression of respect and submission from the part of the speaker. A subordinate can emphasize his lower rank by employing these words multiple times during a discussion. In contrast, a superordinate does not need to use a similar strategy, because he possesses a higher rank: instead, he can rely on addressing subordinates by their ranks alone, or by their rank combined with their surname. A less formal option, but one that highlights superiority even more, is addressing a subordinate with a nickname, which is also a clear indicator of close personal relations.

Using FTAs turns out to be a very powerful strategy in the expression of power relations in these excerpts. Whenever a commander does an FTA against his subordinate, i.e. accusing that

subordinate of behaving improperly, ineffectively or even being drunk, the commander is exercising his power over his subordinate, as the subordinate is unable to make similar accusations due to his inferior rank. Such FTAs can be used both directly and in a hinting, more indirect way; both ways can be equally successful if used correctly. In these excerpts, commanders often manage to use FTAs in a strategic way to achieve different goals, such as ensuring that subordinates carry out their orders or that they behave more efficiently on the battlefield in the future.

One defining feature of the expression of power relations by Southern commanders is that it is unique depending on the person. In other words, there are distinct styles of doing this in the Southern army. For instance, Commanding General Lee is very rarely seen treating his subordinates in a way that threatens their relations permanently. His style is indirect and conciliatory yet effective, and when his frustrations finally manifest as a violent, uncharacteristic outburst, it is very effective indeed in ensuring that his wishes are obeyed next time. A sharp contrast to Lee's style is that of Longstreet, who dismisses honorifics and respectful speech as he pleases: at times, it seems that it is Longstreet who is in command and not Lee. Nevertheless, Longstreet's brusque manner never escalates into enmities between him and his commander due to their good-natured relations. As such, it is clear that personal camaraderie is a decisive factor in the expression of power relations in the Confederate army.

7.2 Expression of power relations in Union interactions

Next, excerpts that feature interactions between Federal soldiers are examined. These five excerpts have been selected because they are regarded as well-suited to be analysed from the point of view of studying the power relations between commanders: the presence of differing command styles ensures that the interactions provide ample material for analysis. The excerpts have been arranged chronologically, starting from the battle of Fredericksburg 1862 and ending in 1864, towards the end of the war. After a summary of these Federal exchanges, the findings from this section and the previous one are compared in the conclusion.

7.2.1 Brigadier General Hancock inspects his brigade commanders

The next excerpt is taken from *Gods and Generals*. It is the year 1862, and the two armies are about to fight an important battle at Fredericksburg, Virginia. The second year of the war is

drawing to a close, and the Union army is desperate for a single meaningful battlefield victory: up until now, it is the Southerners who have managed to humiliate their blue-clad counterparts in every major battle. Now the opposing forces have gathered near the town of Fredericksburg and are watching each other intently. Lee’s army has taken good defensive positions on a hill near the town, and the Federal army under General Ambrose Burnside is poised to strike the Confederates. Before beginning the uphill assault against the Confederate positions, Federal division commander Winfield Hancock inspects the units of his three brigade commanders: Zook, Meagher and Caldwell. The attack is to be carried out with the strength of three divisions, of which Hancock’s is second in the line.

Hancock moved the horse up through his own lines. Sam Zook, one of his brigade commanders, another Pennsylvanian, was waving at French’s men, leading a cheer, watching them move away. Then he saw Hancock.
 “You’re the first line, Sam. Clear the way.”
 Zook was smiling broadly, ready for the fight, and he yelled out, over the sounds of the incoming shells: “General, you best tell old French to hurry it up, or move out of the way! We’re heading for the top of the hill!”
 Hancock forced a smile, nodded, pulled his horse back and faced the front of his second line, the Irish Brigade – Meagher’s men.
 [...] 10
 He saw Meagher now, standing, fragile, his staff helping him up onto a horse³, and he rode that way.
 [...] 15
 Meagher was holding a salute as Hancock pulled up, and Hancock said: “General, are you fit?”
 Meagher tried to smile, and Hancock saw he was pale, weary.
 [...] 20
 “General Hancock, I will lead me brigade. We are a-headin’ up that there hill, sir. We will do the old Emerald Isle proud this day, that we will.”
 “I have no doubt about that, General.” He returned the salute, spurred the horse, rode through the men toward his third line, Caldwell’s brigade.
 [...] 25
 “General Hancock, sir, we are ready.”
 “General Caldwell, do not advance until the Irish Brigade has moved out two hundred steps. Count them if you have to, General.”
 Caldwell was not smiling, and Hancock knew he could be a bit reckless, too much in a hurry, but still, he could move his men, could be counted on to bring up a strong line.
 Caldwell nodded, was already watching the lines to his front, waiting.
 (*Gods and Generals*, 330-331)

Throughout the excerpt we see Hancock riding amongst his troops and visiting each of his brigade commanders. By showing himself to his troops, Hancock acts as a classic example of a morale-boosting division commander, which is particularly beneficial to the soldiers before a big battle. Furthermore, the fact that Hancock communicates face-to-face with his brigadiers

³ Meagher’s leg was wounded during the Battle of Antietam as he fell under his horse, which was shot during an assault (Sears 2003:243).

instead of sending couriers, for instance, is an effective way of personally emphasizing his power over his subordinates. First in line of Hancock's brigadiers is Samuel Zook, whom Hancock addresses with the nickname "Sam" on line 4. By favouring "Sam" over e.g. "General Zook", Hancock gives the impression of close relations, and it is arguably because of that close relationship that Hancock does not consider it necessarily to speak to Zook in a more formal way. Regardless of that, Hancock issues the direct order "Clear the way", thus exerting his power over Zook.

Zook is depicted here as being in high spirits: we are told that he is "smiling broadly" and also that he is very eager for the charge to commence (lines 5-6). Note how differently Zook refers to Hancock and French, two officers of equal rank in the same corps: Zook addresses Hancock, his direct superordinate, as "General", whereas he uses the very much more informal "old French" when referring to the other commander. This could be interpreted in the way that although Hancock and Zook seem to share close relations, Zook nevertheless opts to express politeness towards his division commander, but on the other hand he is comfortable with addressing another superior officer in a more familiar and even joking way, possible because he has little reason to fear for a rebuff from Hancock. Of course, we must take into consideration the fact that French is not present during this discussion; Zook's behaviour would arguably be more deferential in such a case, as uttering "old French" in person to a superordinate would constitute a severe FTA.

On line 8 Hancock is shown to react in a restrained way to Zook's enthusiastic outburst: "Hancock forced a smile, nodded", and then moved away to converse with another brigadier of his. It is possible to interpret Hancock's reserved response in the way that he is concerned for Zook. It is easy to imagine eager officers skilled in verbal boasting to be revealed as ones who have little skills when the actual fighting begins. It is also worth noting that prior to Fredericksburg, Hancock in the novel has not had the chance to see how Zook fights. These insights help us understand why Hancock does not join in Zook's battle-hungry bravado. Nonetheless, Hancock does not do FTAs or otherwise instruct the brigadier to act more cautiously. This hints at Hancock's respect towards Zook and acts as another indicator of their close relations.

After parting ways with Zook, Hancock rides to meet with his second-in-line brigadier, the Irish General Thomas Meagher. Meagher salutes Hancock, and in fact holds the salute all the way

till line 20; as standard military etiquette requires that a subordinate hold his or her salute until it is replied to by a superordinate, it can be assumed that Meagher finishes the salute only after Hancock returns it on line 20. The fact that Meagher keeps his hand in a saluting posture throughout the conversation is a strong indicator of both his insistence on following military protocol and also his respect towards Hancock. This is further emphasized by the fact that Meagher is altogether in a very weak state: he requires help from his staff when mounting his horse, he attempts to smile and looks “pale, weary”. Regardless of his grievous injury, Meagher is putting up a very strong front here as a field commander and also as a subordinate.

Being well aware of Meagher’s wound, Hancock politely asks him the following on lines 14-15: “General, are you fit?” Here is an interesting difference with the way Hancock addressed Zook a moment ago. Hancock called Zook by his nickname, whereas he speaks to Meagher with the title “General” and thus expresses respect. This points towards a more restrained and formal relationship between these two men. Furthermore, Hancock does not issue direct orders to Meagher as he did with Zook, which might imply that Hancock sees no sense in instructing a more capable subordinate, i.e. Meagher, who understands thoroughly his mission in the upcoming battle. Further proof of Hancock’s respect towards Meagher is the fact that he does not order the brigadier to be replaced with another, more fit officer for the time of the assault. Such an act could have resulted in Hancock committing a serious FTA against Meagher’s positive face; Meagher could have reacted very badly to being dismissed from the Irish Brigade, and therefore it can be argued that Hancock weighed the risk of damaging permanently his relations with Meagher too high. As such, no FTA by Hancock is done in this particular conversation.

Meagher replies to Hancock's inquiry by assuring his commander that he will take part in the battle. Meagher also acknowledges that the brigade is well aware of the hill being the primary target, and also states that they will do Ireland justice. This is all in marked contrast with Zook's fiery speech. Meagher’s clam style of speaking may well be the result of his wound, but it can also be interpreted as exemplifying his deference towards Hancock; in such a case, Meagher can be regarded as restraining himself in front of his superordinate and not give into bragging like Zook. This interpretation is supported by Meagher's use of “General” and “sir” on line 18. Hancock seems to take Meagher's quiet confidence well and responds with a polite “I have no doubt about that, General.” Hancock then rides away, leaving the conversation without having exerted his power over Meagher one single time.

Last in line is the brigade of John Caldwell. Upon meeting Hancock, Caldwell utters: “General Hancock, sir, we are ready.” The tone of his speech is very much that of a subordinate, as he employs both the title “General” and the honorific “Sir”. Next, Hancock gives Caldwell very specific instructions on how to time the advance behind the Irish Brigade: Caldwell is ordered not to move until a space of 200 steps has been left between the brigades (lines 24-25). It is interesting to note that in contrast to Hancock’s conversation with Meagher, during which the division commander spoke very deferentially and gave his subordinate no direct orders, here Caldwell is not only given a strict measure to follow during the attack, but he is also told to “count [the steps] if you have to, General”. Already in his first utterance to Caldwell, Hancock has taken advantage of his power over Caldwell to issue two orders to his subordinate.

The next passage, given in narrator’s representation of thought, explains why Hancock seems to be compelled to adopt a more instructive command style when dealing with Caldwell. On line 26 it is stated that “Hancock knew he could be a bit reckless, too much in a hurry”. No doubt Hancock is of the opinion that voicing these thoughts to Caldwell would constitute a direct FTA against Caldwell’s positive face, and therefore Hancock decides to give orders the purpose of which is to keep Caldwell tightly under his control. In other words, Hancock evaluates the risk of damaging his relations with Caldwell too high, were he to say out loud the thoughts described above, and so by exerting his power through the orders, Hancock manages to preserve Caldwell’s positive face. Caldwell receives the orders with a simple nod, which proves that he has taken no offence from Hancock’s careful instruction.

In summary, this excerpt includes three separate discussions that differ from each other drastically at times. The main differences seem to arise from which brigade commander Hancock is addressing at a particular time. First, he speaks to Zook in a very informal way, employing the nickname “Sam”, but on the other hand, he also issues a direct order to Zook. Hancock’s wary response to Zook’s fiery attitude reveals a struggle within Hancock: his uncertainty concerning inexperienced officers and the fact that he is speaking to a friend are at odds. Second, Hancock communicates with Meagher with much more respect. It is clear to see that both men value each other’s military experience, and as Hancock seems to believe that Meagher grasps the objective perfectly, he does not engage in any order-issuing whatsoever. Third, it is Caldwell who receives the most detailed instructions. Hancock is aware of Caldwell’s impulsive fighting style, and issues strict orders to keep the impatient commander under his control. There are numerous potential instances in which Hancock could have done

FTAs against his brigadiers, but opts not to do them.

7.2.2 Maj. Gen. Sykes' refusal to withdraw

The excerpt that follows is taken from *Gods and Generals*, towards the end of the novel. It depicts the opening skirmishes of the Battle of Chancellorsville, fought in 1863 in the woodlands of the Wilderness, Virginia. The supreme command of the Federal army has once again been bestowed upon another man, this time to General Joseph "Fighting Joe" Hooker. Contrary to the timid and ultimately unsuccessful charge formulated by General Burnside near Fredericksburg, Hooker is determined to crush Lee between two pincers formed by two huge sections of the Union army. Despite a plan that would appear to lead to a decisive confrontation, Hooker for some reason starts to display hints of doubt towards the whole operation. The Federal troops are suddenly ordered to a halt by Hooker, giving the outnumbered Confederates the upper hand. Consequently, the Confederate corps of "Stonewall" Jackson is allowed to manoeuvre freely, resulting in the total rout of the XI Corps under General Oliver Howard and thereafter a crushing blow to the Federals. This excerpt takes place just before Hooker's sudden order to retreat. Corps commander Darius Couch receives the order from Hooker's courier and discusses the situation with two division commanders: his direct subordinate Hancock and General George Sykes from the neighbouring corps.

In the distance there was a man on a horse, moving awkwardly along the side of the road, pressing hard up the hill toward them. Couch said: "That's Loveless... from Hooker."
[...]
[Loveless:] "Sir... your orders, sir!" 5
[Couch takes the orders from the courier and reads them.]
Suddenly, [Couch] gripped the paper hard, crushing it, stared ahead at nothing.
"We have been ordered to withdraw."
Hancock waited for more, said, "You mean, my division?"
Couch looked at him, grim and hard, said, "No, General. Both divisions. The *army*." 10
General Hooker is recalling all units back to Chancellorsville. [...]"
Sykes stared at Couch, his mouth open slightly, and he turned to the east, pointed:
"Sir, we have pushed the enemy back! The field is ours, we must advance..."
[...]
"No, General. The order clearly names your division as well. [...]" 15
Sykes was shaking his head, waved an arm wildly [...]
[Sykes]: "We cannot withdraw! General, we simply cannot!"
[...]
The soldiers began to close in around the men on the horses,
[...]
A man yelled out, "We ain't turnin' back! We got the rebs on the run!" 20
[...]
Couch said, "General Sykes, you will form your division and march in column toward Chancellorsville. [...]"

Sykes started to say something, waved his arm again, and Couch raised his voice, said with a dark anger, "There will be no further discussion! You will carry out your orders, General!" (*Gods and Generals*, 399-400)

Couch spots the courier Loveless and waits for him to reach the gathering of the three generals. In a breathless tone Loveless presents the orders to Couch while employing the honorific "Sir" twice in quick succession, a clear indicator of deference. Having been presented with the message from Hooker and having read it, Couch crushes the orders in his hands without warning, which suggests that he is not at all content with the instructions from the commander-in-chief. As such, one can imagine him uttering his comment on line 8, "We have been ordered to withdraw", with a very tense tone. Couch's angry reaction implies harsh criticism towards Hooker, but he nevertheless opts not to voice that critique in front of those present, as that could arguably have permanent and negative consequences for the part of the power relations between Couch, the division commanders and Hooker as well. For instance, the division commanders might respond badly to Couch's verbal attack and relay that to Hooker.

The sudden order to retreat seems to puzzle Hancock, as he "waited for more, said: 'You mean, my division?'" Note how Hancock does not use any honorifics when addressing Couch; this could be explained by the fact that the two have been working together for a year or so at the time of Chancellorsville and thus are acquainted enough to dismiss the formalities. Therefore, Hancock's direct approach does not constitute an FTA against Couch. Couch's angry state of mind is further proven by the narrative passage on line 10, according to which he "looked at [Hancock] grim and hard". He explains that the order has been meant for the whole army, still unwilling to vent out his evident frustration towards the Commanding General. As a curious detail, Couch addresses Hancock as "General", even though Hancock himself used no honorifics at all only a moment ago. It almost seems as if the power relations have been turned upside down now that the corps commander is the one who speaks with a deferential tone to his subordinate and not vice versa, as one would expect.

Curiously, the discussion takes an unpredictable turn, as it is not Hancock, Couch's direct subordinate, who reacts to the order, but rather Sykes from the neighboring division. The passage "Sykes stared at Couch, his mouth open slightly" on line 12 is apt in foreboding Sykes' insubordinate response. Sykes immediately ignores the order and tries to persuade Couch to take advantage of the progress that the troops have already made. Sykes' protest is given weight

by how “he turned to the east, pointed”, which leaves no doubt as to the direction in which Sykes is attempting to push his superior officer. As the order comes from the highest authority on the field, i.e. the commander-in-chief, no room for interpretation is allowed for the part of any lower-ranking officer. As such, the fact that Sykes opposes Couch (and therefore Hooker, indirectly at least) is a marked indicator of insubordination. Nevertheless, Sykes still uses the appropriate honorific “Sir” in conjunction with his protest, meaning that Couch is still the one in a position of superior power.

Hooker’s order prevents Sykes from acting freely without imposition, i.e. pushing the troops forward and routing the Confederates from the field. Therefore, the order can be interpreted as an FTA against Sykes’ negative face. As a result, Sykes protests to Couch, which can be considered an FTA against Couch’s positive face: here, in turn, Couch’s desire to be admired as a field commander who knows precisely when to push the advantage is being contested. Regardless of the FTA, Couch replies to Sykes in a calm manner and does not continue the attack. Now Sykes’ gesturing becomes more animated, as he “was shaking his head, waved an arm wildly” (line 16). His speech follows a similar pattern as he exclaims: “We cannot withdraw! General, we simply cannot!” The whole passage is very effective in presenting a situation in which Sykes seems to be balancing precariously between insubordination and subordination. On the one hand, opposing a superior officer (from another corps, even) is certainly exceeding Sykes’ authority, but on the other hand, he still clings on to the title “General” when protesting further.

Sykes is not the only one to exceed the range of his power. Shortly after Sykes’ previous line, a group of soldiers gathers around the generals, and one man shouts: “We ain’t turnin’ back! We got the rebs on the run!” Although man’s military rank is not identified (the local dialect suggests an infantryman), all lower-ranking soldiers are expected to express respect towards general officers. Therefore, such a straightforward exclamation with no honorifics or titles whatsoever constitutes an intense FTA against the positive faces of all the generals present. It seems that Sykes’ defiant behaviour has inspired the foot soldiers as well to contest the order. What would seem to escalate into a positively volatile situation with a total breakdown of discipline is calmly handled by Couch, who seems to have taken no offence from the unidentified soldier’s outburst. On a side note, Hancock’s reaction to the order has still not been shown. From the point of view of his fighting capabilities, one would imagine him to side readily with the foot soldier, but he appears to avoid further FTAs against Couch.

Near the end of the discussion, Couch says: “General Sykes, you will form your division and march in column toward Chancellorsville...” (lines 23-24). Notice the use of “you will form” instead of, for example, “form your division”. Using “will” gives the impression that Couch is issuing more formal orders instead of concise battlefield commands. This deferential tone is emphasized by the use of “General Sykes” at the beginning of the order. In addition to exerting his power over Sykes, Couch also seems to attempt to pacify the potential crisis by acting in a calm manner. This, however, has no effect on Sykes, who “started to say something, waved his arm again”, clearly implying that he is still not satisfied. Now, for the first time during the conversation, Couch lets out his frustration on lines 26-27 as he “raised his voice” and “said with a dark anger: ‘There will be no further discussion! You will carry out your orders, General!’” This final display of absolute power by Couch settles the matter, and shortly afterwards Sykes rides away to prepare his division for the withdrawal.

In conclusion, this excerpt contains tensions in power relations, as it seems that the courier from Hooker, Loveless, is the only participant who speaks to his superiors in the proper way. Hancock, for example, discards all honorifics and titles when addressing Couch, his corps commander. Of course, it could be speculated that had Hancock been given more lines and lengthier ones, he might have employed the aforementioned words more frequently. As for Sykes, his use of honorifics and titles is correct, but otherwise almost all of the discussion between him and Couch has him opposing the superior officer constantly. This assigns Hooker as another target of Sykes’ attack, as he is the one who compiled the order originally. Couch suffers FTAs from not only Sykes but also from the soldier, making the situation seem like a crisis where battlefield success is given more credit over power relations. It is only at the end that Couch submits to his anger and gives a final order to Sykes angrily. As opposed to Couch’s earlier calmer commands, a harsh tone seems to have been necessary to finally remind Sykes of his inferior position.

7.2.3 Col. Chamberlain confers with subordinates

This excerpt is taken from *The Killer Angels*. The battle of Gettysburg is nearing its climax of the second day as Hood’s assault on the Federal left reaches a critical stage: the 20th Maine regiment is positioned on the extreme left flank of the Union army, and that regiment receives repeated heavy blows from Hood’s infantry as the Confederates struggle to turn the enemy’s lines. As the battle rages on, the 20th Maine suffers nearly 50% losses and exhausts its

ammunition. It is clear, however, that the Confederates are also greatly fatigued by the fight. Knowing that a decisive blow must be struck immediately, Colonel Chamberlain, the commander of the regiment, is about to order the attack for which he and his men will become famed. Chamberlain calls for the other officers of the regiment to gather around and starts issuing orders.

“Let’s fix bayonets,”⁴ Chamberlain said.
For a moment no one moved.
“We’ll have the advantage of moving downhill,” he said.
Spear understood. His eyes saw; he nodded automatically
[...] 5
Chamberlain said, “They’ve got to be tired, those Rebs. They’ve got to be close to the end. Fix bayonets. Wait. Ellis, you take the left wing. I want a right wheel forward of the whole Regiment.”
Lieutenant Melcher said, perplexed, “Sir, excuse me but what’s a ‘right wheel forward’?” 10
Ellis Spear said, “He means ‘charge’, Lieutenant, ‘charge’.”
Chamberlain nodded. “Not quite. We charge swinging down to the right. We straighten our line. Clarke hangs onto the Eight-third, and we swing like a door, sweeping them down the hill. Understand? Everybody understand? Ellis, you take the left wing, and when I yell you go for it, the whole Regiment goes forward, swinging to the right.” 15
“Well,” Ellis Spear said. He shook his head. “Well.”
“Let’s go.” Chamberlain raised his saber, bawled at the top of his voice,
“Fix bayonets!”
(*The Killer Angels*, 226)

Being the ranking officer and the commander of the regiment, it is up to Chamberlain to make the decisions on how the regiment will act during battles. Rather than giving the order to prepare for the charge straight away, Chamberlain says “Let’s fix bayonets”, as if presenting his idea to his subordinates and waiting for it to be commented on. The fact that “For a moment no one moved” tells a great deal about the situation at hand: the idea of charging overwhelming numbers with a single exhausted regiment sounds very hazardous, and so the officers are positively stunned by this suggestion. Chamberlain’s next line provides further evidence for the interpretation that he seems to be arguing a case instead of giving a direct order: “We’ll have the advantage of moving downhill.” It is mentioned in the novel that Chamberlain was a college professor and not a professional soldier like many others in the army; this could provide an explanation for the fact that he feels compelled to justify his plan.

Lieutenant Spear is the first to grasp Chamberlain’s scheme. Instead of acknowledging the order

⁴ Upon hearing the order “fix bayonets”, infantrymen of the time were trained to attach bayonets (sharp blades with a socket) to their muskets, in practice turning the firearms into a spear for close combat. Often the sight of men charging with bayonets fixed was enough to make the opposing side flee in terror (Groom 2013:24).

verbally or even protesting, he simply “[nods] automatically”. This seems to imply that Spear has great confidence in his commander. Chamberlain lists more arguments in favour of the charge and then, somewhat curiously, gives the order but says “Wait” and issues more detailed instructions. Note how Chamberlain addresses Spear by his first name Ellis; this hints at close relations between the two (both were professors by trade and indeed enjoyed each other’s company throughout the war, as is shown in the novels). Chamberlain orders “a right wheel forward of the whole Regiment”, thus employing specific military discourse and expecting to be understood. The meaning of the phrase is nevertheless lost on the “perplexed” Lieutenant Melcher, who promptly asks for clarification. He emphasizes his subordinate role by using both the honorific “Sir” and the polite phrase “excuse me”.

Spear, having understood the orders perfectly, shows signs of exasperation as he says “He means ‘charge’, Lieutenant, ‘charge’.” Spear’s repetition of the word “charge”, as if speaking deliberately clearly to a less intelligent being, and the fact that he cuts in before Chamberlain’s reply suggest an FTA towards Melcher’s positive face concerning his wish to be accepted by his fellows on the basis of his military knowledge. Spear’s line may in fact be interpreted as a double FTA, as he can be regarded as attacking Chamberlain’s negative face as well, i.e. Chamberlain’s wish to speak for himself is being threatened here.

Regardless of that, Chamberlain’s polite line “Not quite” combined with him nodding create an interesting situation where Chamberlain seems to redress Spear’s FTA towards Melcher and at the same time expresses his intention of correcting Spear’s interpretation. Chamberlain then explains his plan, i.e. making the whole regiment wheel to the right while maintaining contact with the neighbouring 83rd Pennsylvania regiment. He ends the explanation by asking “Understand? Everybody understand?” on line 14, arguably wanting to make sure that all officers comprehend how the risky manoeuvre is to be executed.

Chamberlain repeats his order for Spear to take command of the left half of the regiment (again using his first name) and also repeats the order for the right wheel. It makes sense that a superordinate repeats his orders at least once in chaotic battle conditions and especially when carrying out difficult movements that require precision from the troops. Spear’s acknowledgment of the order, on the other hand, is highly unusual. He utters “Well”, shakes his head and repeats the word “Well”. One is left with the impression that Spear is greatly impressed with Chamberlain’s audacious plan; his words seem to carry the same meaning as the phrase

“Well I’ll be” could carry in the same situation, for instance. Be that as it may, Spear’s informal reply is another token of the friendly relationship between the two professors. The discussion is concluded by Chamberlain, who says “Let’s go” and then shouts the order “Fix bayonets!”

In conclusion, the irregular structure of the turn-taking and the content of the turns themselves in this excerpt make the discussion interesting. Chamberlain starts the exchange: since his first line is not exactly a direct order, it does not draw prompt replies, and so Chamberlain resorts to making numerous arguments to persuade the other officers. Chamberlain’s brief military experience and the fact that he is relatively new to the command of the regiment could very well explain his unusual justifying here. Nevertheless, this is followed by a more assertive tone, as Chamberlain gives commands in a rapid succession, e.g. “Fix bayonets”, “Wait”, and also the words “I want” on line 7 show clearly who is in command. Lieutenant Melcher requests an explanation very properly, which unfortunately draws an FTA from Lieutenant Spear. Chamberlain handles his superior role adeptly, as he manages to both redress Spear’s FTA and explain his plan in a way that leaves nothing unclear. To make that sure, he asks repeatedly if all the officers understand him. Both Chamberlain and Spear go against military etiquette in their informal exchanges, which nevertheless seems to hasten their discussion rather than hamper it.

7.2.4 General Grant calms Maj. Gen. Sheridan

This excerpt is taken from *The Last Full Measure*. The tide is turning against the Confederate army in 1864 as Union commander-in-chief Grant spares no effort in reinforcing the Federal Army and subduing Lee with sheer numbers. At the time of this discussion, Grant is massing his troops in pursuit of Lee’s army, eventually resulting in the Battle of the Wilderness, the next major clash between the opposing forces after Gettysburg. Since arriving from the west, Grant has made some changes in the command structure of the eastern army under the command of General Meade. One major change is the appointment of General Sheridan to the overall command of the cavalry corps. Not only do Sheridan and Meade share the same tendency to temperamental outbursts, but they also have equally different opinions on how the cavalry should be used. Consequently, Sheridan rides to Grant’s camp with the intention of complaining directly to the commander-in-chief. In this conversation, Grant is in the company of his chief-of-staff, Colonel Rawlins.

Sheridan saluted, and Grant could see he was furious. “Sir! We have been ordered... General Meade has ordered...” He was red-faced and looked down for a moment. Grant said, “General, please proceed. Is there a problem?”

Sheridan closed his eyes, clamped down, seemed to be fighting for control. “Sir, General Meade has ordered most of my men to the east, toward Fredericksburg. There are reports that some of the enemy’s horsemen have been located in that area.” [...] Sheridan took a deep breath. [...]

[Grant]: “Yes, so... what is your concern, General?”

“Sir! General Meade has us guarding wagon trains! Surely the commanding general understands that we can better serve the army by spreading out farther to the south [...]” Grant glanced at Rawlins, could feel his chief of staff shifting nervously on the horse, impatiently waiting for an opening [...]. Grant said, “You have something to say, Colonel?” Rawlins tried to look surprised, said, “Oh... well, sir, if I may offer. A sizable portion of General Sheridan’s men are already in position down below us. General Wilson is protecting our right flank. I had thought General Sheridan would be pleased that his men are, in fact, being used in valuable service.” [...]

Sheridan jumped in and said: “Sir, General Wilson is new to command. If it had been my decision, *his* division would guard the wagons. [...] pardon me, sir, but General Meade is giving credibility to the threat from Stuart. I have seen nothing to indicate that this threat exists.”

There was a silent pause, and Grant said, “General, has General Wilson located the enemy’s cavalry?”

Sheridan looked down, seemed suddenly embarrassed. “I... don’t know, sir. I have not received word from General Wilson in... some time.”

“Well then, until you do, I would tend to go with General Meade’s instincts. He has been here before, he has dealt with Stuart before. Unless you can determine with certainty that his orders are a mistake... I would suggest you obey them.”

Sheridan nodded, said, “Yes, you are correct of course, sir. [...] If you will excuse me, sir.” Sheridan saluted, turned the horse, and the troops followed after him. [...]

Rawlins smiled, said, “General Sheridan is a might small for a job this big, wouldn’t you say, sir?” [...]

[...] 35

“Colonel, General Sheridan will be big enough for all of us before this is through.”

(*The Last Full Measure*, 117-118)

Sheridan the subordinate salutes his commander and begins the discussion with the proper honorific “Sir”. Sheridan is clearly in an agitated state of mind, as is illustrated by the narrative passages “Grant could see he was furious” and “He was red-faced”. Sheridan’s agitation is also evident when he speaks, as he makes a few false starts on lines 1-2 before drifting off to a tense silence and “[looking] down for a moment” as if to compose himself. Grant expresses politeness towards Sheridan by urging him to continue (note the use of “Please” on line 3) and by inquiring whether there is a problem. Sheridan makes a visible effort to control his anger on line 4, probably to appear as calm as possible before Grant. He then reports General Meade’s orders for his men and ends the speech by “[taking] a deep breath”, as if preparing for his next line and also still struggling for control. Grant remains polite and asks Sheridan to explain his evident misgivings.

Sheridan then unleashes his criticism: he reports in a frustrated tone that General Meade has placed the majority of the cavalry troopers to defend the supply wagons and argues that they could be put to better use. Sheridan is clearly impatient to put his cavalry into what he considers good use. Thus we can see why he is so appalled by the present deployment of his riders. Furthermore, as Sheridan was brought to the east specifically to take command of the cavalry, it is easy to see why he is agitated now that that command is being contested by Meade. Sheridan's speech can be interpreted as an FTA against Meade's positive face, i.e. Sheridan is stating that Meade is not to be respected as a commander who knows best how to use cavalry most efficiently.

This draws a response from Rawlins, although in a rather indirect way: on lines 12-13, Grant notices how Rawlins' body language indicates a clear request to speak. Being only a staff officer, Rawlins knows that he should have no say in a discussion between two generals. However, Grant has come to respect Rawlins during their long friendship and seems to predict that he could make a weighty contribution to the conversation. Grant lets Rawlins speak, and Rawlins aptly "tried to look surprised" so as to emphasize the fact that he himself did not request permission to speak, highlighting that impression by saying "Oh... well, sir, if I may offer." Rawlins then goes on to explain that some of Sheridan's troopers under cavalry commander Wilson are indeed stationed in support of the infantry instead of guarding the wagons, thereby challenging Sheridan's FTA against Meade.

Sheridan quickly counters this by stating that General Wilson has little experience as a field commander and that Sheridan himself would have posted a more able commander to support the infantry. Also according to Sheridan, Meade suspects that Stuart's cavalry is nearby, although Sheridan himself has not seen any Southern horsemen in the vicinity. These statements (lines 19-22) give further weight to Sheridan's criticism of Meade and his handling of the cavalry. An interesting detail is that although the previous line was spoken by Rawlins, Sheridan replies to Rawlins' speech but directs his response towards Grant. Rawlins, in fact, acted in the same way by indirectly referring to Sheridan in his speech instead of addressing his words directly to Sheridan. By excluding Rawlins from the conversation, Sheridan gives the impression that he need not speak to a Colonel but instead should reply only to his superior, Grant. Here is a distinctive indicator of the power relations between the three men, and Sheridan highlights his own subordinate status in relation to Grant by repeatedly using "Sir" and with the polite line "Pardon me, sir".

Grant is still acting very patiently when dealing with Sheridan as he asks if General Wilson has actually reported on any activity by enemy horsemen. This question makes Sheridan act awkwardly: “Sheridan looked down, seemed suddenly embarrassed.” He replies in broken sentences that he is not aware of General Wilson’s situation. His embarrassment is explained by the fact that Grant has exposed a flaw in Sheridan’s command: Sheridan has not contacted his subordinate, Wilson, in a while and thus is left with no intelligence on what is happening at Wilson’s command. Therefore, Sheridan has ignored his duty as a superordinate to keep in touch with his subordinate. This could hint at strained relations between Sheridan and Wilson, since Sheridan has doubted Wilson’s capability a few times during the conversation.

We have seen how Grant undoes Sheridan’s critique towards Meade with a single question, leaving Sheridan in a very uncomfortable situation. Regardless of that, Grant still retains his calm tone on lines 27-29 where he persuades Sheridan to abide by Meade’s instructions; notice the rather indirect suggestion “I would tend to go with General Meade’s instincts” and the toned-down order “I would suggest you obey them”. Here Grant is demonstrating remarkable tolerance for Sheridan’s complaints and also great patience when instructing Sheridan on how to proceed. After all, as supreme commander of the eastern army, Grant could instead issue very direct orders and be obeyed without dispute. The lack of such behaviour in this conversation illustrates the respect that Grant displays towards Sheridan as well as Grant’s belief in Sheridan’s talent.

Sheridan replies to Grant by saying “Yes, you are correct of course, sir... If you will excuse me, sir”. By suddenly changing his embarrassed tone to a brisk one, Sheridan might be compensating for the awkward revealing of his mistake. After speaking his line, Sheridan salutes and leaves Grant’s camp. Rawlins then makes an attempt at a humorous remark by quipping that “General Sheridan is a might small for a job this big, wouldn’t you say, sir?”, thus commenting on Sheridan’s unfounded critique towards Meade and his poor communication with Wilson. Grant, however, does not appreciate the joke, and instead replies in a serious manner: his closing line reflects his firm belief in how Sheridan will manage the job in the end.

In conclusion, power relations are expressed in differing ways in this discussion. Although Sheridan is voicing some serious protests against his direct superior officer, Meade, he nevertheless acts as is expected of a subordinate when reporting those protests to Grant: Sheridan employs both the honorific “Sir” throughout the exchange and polite phrases, such as

“Pardon me, sir” and “Yes, you are correct of course, sir”. Grant is similarly polite: he urges Sheridan to speak his mind, poses questions instead of demanding explanation and suggests rather than issuing direct orders. Sheridan in the novels is shown to be one of Grant’s trusted commanders, and therefore Grant seems unwilling to exert his formal power over his subordinate. Rawlins’ contributions make an interesting addition to this conversation. Neither Rawlins nor Sheridan address each other directly, but instead interact as if using Grant as a medium. This highlights the fact that a staff officer has no power in conversations between generals, unless of course given permission to speak. This and the fact that Rawlins speaks in a humorous way to the commander-in-chief at the end of the discussion exemplify the close relations between Rawlins and Grant.

7.2.5 Maj. Gen. Hancock firmly in command

This excerpt comes from *The Last Full Measure*. Lee’s army has retreated from Gettysburg and taken positions in the thick woodlands of Virginia known as the Wilderness. Grant pursues the Confederate army in 1864, and his hasty attack almost leads to a catastrophic defeat for the Union as the well-prepared Southerners outnumber him initially and do heavy damage. The tide turns to favour the Federals, however, as Grant manages to amass more and more of his troops into the woods. A. P. Hill’s corps bears the main brunt of the assault while Ewell’s inactivity on the left flank allows the Federals to bring even more reinforcements to the fray. The situation becomes so desperate for the Confederates that Lee himself deems it necessary to ride to the front lines and attempt to rally the men, when finally Longstreet’s corps arrives and quells the Union attack with a surprise strike from the right. Before that, heavy fighting takes place at the centre of the line, where the Federal corps of Winfield S. Hancock is situated. In this excerpt, Hancock converses with various subordinates, from couriers to field commanders. The conversation starts as a messenger approaches Hancock during the thick of the fight.

The man reined up his horse, saluted, said, “General Hancock, we have word from General Burnside. He is moving into position on our right front. General Burnside reports he will try to assault the rebel flank, if we can only hold them in place, sir!” Hancock stared at the man, felt a burst of anger. “If we can hold them... why? So he can watch? Where the hell has he been all day? Now, we don’t need him, we are behind a big damned wall. The enemy is coming right at us!” 5

[...]

Now a man rode quickly up behind him, [...] and the man yelled, “Sir... we have a gap in the lines! General Ward reports the enemy is advancing into our center, sir!” Hancock stared at the man, watched him wilt under the hot gaze. “Yes, Captain, I can see where the enemy is assaulting! A gap? Where? Where is General Ward?” 10
 “Uh... I don’t know sir. When I left him, he was moving to the rear... with his men.”

[...]

[Hancock] saw officers now, yelled: "Dammit! Get these men back in line!"...

He turned, yelled to his staff: "Get word to all units... send support to the center!

15

Order up the reserves, to the middle of the line! Tell the officers... follow the smoke!

Go toward the smoke!"

[...]

[Hancock] pointed, yelled to an officer, "There, double quick! They have broken through!"

(*The Last Full Measure*, 173-175)

The messenger from Burnside begins the exchange with a proper salute and addresses Hancock as both "General Hancock" and "sir". His subordinate status is thus made very clear. Hancock, on the other hand, makes his superior status very apparent in turn: he makes no excuses when voicing his angry criticism towards Burnside on lines 4-6. This is emphasized by the narrative passage "Hancock stared at the man, felt a burst of anger". Hancock does not seem to have any problem with not expressing politeness towards the courier.

Hancock is of the opinion that Burnside has made a big mistake and commits off-record FTAs against both Burnside and the courier: Burnside for not acting as a competent field commander and the courier for bringing unwanted news. Another marker of Hancock's superior status is the fact that he has no qualms whatsoever swearing in front of a subordinate, e.g. in the lines "Where the hell has he been" and "we are behind a big damned wall". At a time when swearing in public was very much frowned upon, Hancock's speech is given additional weight.

Another messenger arrives promptly and reports to Hancock that General Ward, one of Hancock's brigade commanders, is under attack. Hancock replies to this message as well with imposing behaviour in the form of another hard stare, making the courier positively "wilt under the hot gaze". Hancock makes the bitter remark "Yes, Captain, I can see where the enemy is assaulting!" before addressing the more urgent matter of a gap in the lines. This makes him appear as a commander who gives priority to sniping at his subordinates in favour of conducting the battle, further proof of him making his position explicitly clear to everyone. Upon being inquired by Hancock on the whereabouts of Ward, the courier answers in broken sentences that Ward was in apparent retreat to the rear. Such cowardly conduct from a brigade commander explains the evident embarrassment of the messenger.

The fight escalates and panicked men start drifting away from the front. Upon seeing officers Hancock yells: "Dammit! Get these men back in line!" More profanity, a loud voice and a sharp order all contribute to support Hancock's superior status. After a while, Hancock issues more

orders by shouting, this time to his staff. The fact that he does not address any staff officer in particular indicates that he can very well expect to be obeyed without designating a specific recipient for his orders. Hancock takes full advantage of his authority, as can be seen on lines 14-15: each constituent of his orders is given in the imperative mood. Towards the end of the excerpt, Hancock shouts one last order to an officer, instructing him to hasten his men to hurry towards a gap in the line.

This excerpt can be summarized as the very essence of the command style of Winfield S. Hancock: he addresses subordinates in a blunt manner, does not shy from insulting both colleagues and underlings, employs profane language frequently and gives short and concise orders. Apparently, Hancock never judges the risk of damaging relations too high when committing FTAs. He could be justly criticized for his arrogant and impolite manner when dealing with subordinates; nevertheless, by the end of the last novel, his reputation as a fearsome field commander has been established. Even if his command style lacks a touch of humanity, one cannot dispute the fact that his style is very effective in expressing power relations and, most importantly from the point of view of a soldier, in achieving efficient results on the battlefield.

7.2.6 Summary

Similarly to their Confederate counterparts, the Union soldiers in these excerpts employ the same strategies to express their power relations. Subordinates utilize the honorific “Sir” in combination with military ranks to express respect towards their commanders. These are often used together and multiple times in a single utterance, which emphasizes this expression of respect. Another indicator of power is the asymmetric structure of the participants’ speech acts: particularly in battlefield situations, subordinates are expected to give a detailed explanation of the current circumstances, whereas the main responsibility of superordinates is to direct the action with short and concise orders. This rigid distribution of roles highlights the differing ranks of the participants involved.

As is the case with Southern commanders, FTAs are a major feature of power relations in Union exchanges as well. By threatening the positive or negative faces of their subordinates, e.g. openly doubting a subordinate’s military competence, Federal commanders are very effective in ensuring that their orders are carried out as intended. An interesting detail in the conversations

of the Northerners is the fact that, compared to the Southerners, more FTAs are done against people that are not present during the discussions. Couch's badly disguised contempt of Hooker in example 8, Sheridan's critique regarding Wilson in example 10 and Hancock's indirect attack against Burnside in example 11 serve as insightful evidence of this feature. Such conduct points toward a lack of respect between the men serving in the Union army, implying that some command decisions are not received well at all in the ranks of the blue-clad soldiers.

The fact that the way one expresses power relations with others is very much dependent on the person in question seems to be shared by both armies. In the Union army, the variation appears to be even greater than among the Confederates. Chamberlain's negotiative command style challenges the notion of asymmetric roles discussed above, whereas Hancock's temperamental demeanour shows that some commanders do not care about weighing the risks of damaging relations permanently, and instead do FTAs indiscriminately regardless of the consequences. As such, personalities such as these two provide interesting exceptions to what seem to be the norms of expressing power relations in discussions.

8 Conclusion

When comparing the command styles of the Confederates and the Federals, interesting similarities can be detected. First is the frequent use of honorifics, most notably the deferential "Sir", which is used by subordinates to provide a verbal expression of their inferior status in relation to the superordinate to whom the honorific is uttered. In many instances, "Sir" was employed numerous times and in conjunction with polite phrases such as "Excuse me", which highlights the speaker's wish to appear as respectful and obedient. As such, it can be argued that the use of the honorific "Sir" and utterances that imply politeness is a key strategy in expressing one's subordinate status to a commander in the analysed excerpts.

Another similarity in the expression of a subordinate status shared by Northerners and Southerners is the asymmetric structure of exchanges between them and their commanders. The superordinates in these excerpts are often seen making short comments or asking questions rather than giving long explanations to their subordinates; indeed, it is the role of those subordinates to provide explanations to present as clear as possible an overview of the situation at hand to their commanders. Therefore, there is inherent power in this manner in which superordinates can stay relatively quiet and expect to be given all relevant information without

much exertion on their own part. This position of power is further emphasized by subordinates using “Sir” repeatedly throughout their explanations.

As a hierarchical system of different ranks lies at the core of the military institution, giving orders is one of the major means with which commanders express their superior status to their subordinates. This expression of power can be either toned down or emphasized further, as is indicated by the variation in the issuing of orders in these excerpts. For example, General Lee is often seen giving orders in an indirect and distant way, whereas Hancock’s instructions are frequently combined with sharp insults. It can be argued that choosing between these two strategies is dependent on the personal command style of the superordinate in question and whether or not he wishes to maintain good relations with the subordinate being addressed at the moment.

A key feature in the expression of power relations by commanders on both sides is the use of FTAs. As commanders are placed in a superior position in relation to their subordinates due to the norms of the military institution, they are not bound by the same rules concerning respectful behaviour that apply to those whom they command. Consequently, commanders are able to do FTAs against their subordinates without fear of retort and damage to their own face. This position of power is utilized by commanders in various instances in the analysed excerpts to make it explicitly clear that they are the ones with the authority. FTAs done in this manner appear to have two primary objectives in these exchanges: they are either geared towards insulting the subordinate or structured in such a manner that is intended to encourage the subordinate to undo a mistake or improve his conduct in the future. Therefore, the commanders modify the wording of the FTA and any other relevant communicative modes, such as tone or facial expression, to his own purposes, i.e. either damaging or preserving relations with the target of the FTA.

As the rigid system of military ranks is very intolerant towards insubordination, the frequency of instances in which subordinates outright defy their commanders in the analyzed excerpts is very interesting. Notable examples include the exchanges in which Longstreet refuses to carry out an attack until he is reinforced and in which Sykes rejects the order to retreat from the battlefield. Such conduct is a blatant challenge to the rank system and therefore turns the distribution of roles upside-down: now, it is the subordinate who appears to be in a position of power, as he is able to make demands and disregard orders. Reversions such as these hint at

corroding military discipline and can therefore have disastrous results regarding success on the battlefield, where cohesion and agreement are vital. Consequently, such potential crises are dealt with by commanders in two ways corresponding to whether or not they wish to preserve good relations with the subordinate in question: either the demands are accepted, as is the case with Lee in example 2, or the subordinate is brought back under control with explosive reproof, e.g. like Couch did in example 8.

The expression of power relations in these excerpts is very much tied to the person in question and the situation at hand. For example, Lee acts very differently in examples 1, 2 and 6 due to the fact that he is addressing different people and is facing different tactical and strategic circumstances. In example 1, Lee talks to Heth in a rather distant manner and is depicted restraining anger, whereas in example 6, he unleashes his frustration at Hill without reserve. In sharp contrast, he thinks nothing of Longstreet's disrespectful manners in example 2. It can be argued that Lee's cool treatment of Heth and harsh criticism of Hill are derived from the fact that he shares no warm relations with either officer, which is the polar opposite of Lee's friendly exchange with Longstreet. Another explanation is the difficult situation facing Lee: Heth has stumbled into a fight without orders and against an enemy of unknown strength, while Hill failed to pin down the advancing Federals and thus endangered the whole Confederate army.

The changing battlefield successes of the two sides provide marked differences in Confederate and Union interactions. Lee and Longstreet in particular are plainly affected by the misfortunes that they keep facing, which manifests as increasingly blunt and even overtly contemptuous behaviour. Clashing ranks on the Federal side seem to be a dominant feature till the very last moments of the war, but FTAs done by Union commanders are most often done against people not present. This could be attributed to the fact that civilian volunteers fill the ranks of both superordinates and subordinates: high commanders without military experience do not seem to govern much respect, whereas it is easy to see lower officers with a non-military background openly criticize army regulars whose conduct and rules they do not understand. In contrast, Southern commanders, a large number of them being military academy graduates, attempt to stick to the military decorum as well as they can.

Based on these findings, the research question of the present study, i.e. "How are interpersonal power relations expressed in the dialogue and narrative passages of historical novels set during the American Civil War?", can be answered as follows: subordinates employ the honorific "Sir"

and the military rank of their superordinate to express their inferior position. In addition, they adhere to the military convention according to which they are responsible for providing detailed information and answering all questions asked. In contrast, superordinates exert their power by issuing orders to their subordinates. Superordinates are also in a position in which they can do FTAs without fear of retaliation and thus highlight their power. An exception to this observation occurs whenever a subordinate does an FTA against his commander. The expression of power relations in these excerpts is affected by several factors: personal command styles, the situation at hand, interpersonal relations and the weighing of risks when doing FTAs affect the manifestation of power in these exchanges.

Researchers such as Disler (2005), Achille et al. (1995) and Halbe (2011) have shown how the real-life communication situations of army personnel can be observed and analysed by applying the concepts of politeness theory to their data and also by examining the role of military discourse in such exchanges. This thesis adopts the same methods and applies them to literary representation of military commanders who fought in the American Civil War. Similarities can be identified in the findings of these researchers and the conclusions of the present thesis: communication plays a major role in operating the military institution, and special emphasis is given to the particular army discourse used by soldiers in order to give shape and meaning to their interactions. Interactions can be both formal and informal depending on the interactants and the situation at hand.

Combining stylistic analysis with the politeness theory of Brown and Levinson appears to have been fruitful from the point of view of the present study. While a great deal is expressed through speech in the dialogue, narration is no less important in providing a detailed description of the conversation: thoughts and moods are revealed and facial expressions as well as gesturing are described, which are highly insightful in interpreting such discussions. As such, stylistics was able to support the analysis and provide a more well-rounded picture of the conversations than what could have been acquired with just politeness theory. However, since stylistics places a heavy emphasis on personal interpretation, the conclusions that are made in this thesis on narration and thought representation cannot be presented as a universal and unambiguous truth. Interpreting a distinct tone of voice in written material, for instance, can be very dependent on the one doing the interpretation, and therefore other researchers might draw drastically different conclusions.

As for the politeness theory, it proved to be very applicable for the purpose of the present study, as FTAs were a frequent phenomenon in the analysed exchanges. The concept of face is relevant in numerous examples, as the characters struggle to either maintain or threaten the faces of both subordinates and superiors. Nevertheless, one area that proved problematic with the theory was the fact that Brown and Levinson focus on face-to-face interactions and show less interest towards instances in which the faces of those who are not present are being threatened. Is a speech act classified as an FTA only when done in person? If not, how should an insult against a person who is absent be categorized, then? More research is needed on how to view such indirect acts of impoliteness. As pointed out by Lewis (2008) in his criticism of the mutual exclusiveness of positive face and negative face, there are features in politeness theory which are not yet entirely clear.

Another particular uncertainty related to politeness theory is the fact that Brown and Levinson seem to treat all interactions as being carried out by fully rationally operating participants. However, as portrayed in the analysed excerpts, there are times when characters who suffer from immense psychological pressure due to the situation at hand lash out at their conversation partners and do severe FTAs. When General Lee scolds Lieutenant General Hill for his poor performance, Lee is shown to struggle for control immediately afterwards. An FTA is done, but can it be regarded as being used strategically, as Lee gave in to an uncontrollable rage while doing it? Can it be deemed an FTA at all if redressive action is employed right after it? After all, Brown and Levinson present FTAs as acts that are carried out in a rational manner and with a specific purpose in mind. However, Lee's behaviour illustrates that acts done after a mental breakdown are hardly rational in nature. Therefore, more elaboration for the part of politeness theory is needed on such instances where psychological factors are prominent.

Historical novels are but one type of representations of communication in an army setting, and adopting politeness theory and stylistics as methods of analysis is thus only one way of approach to the subject. It would be interesting to see how researchers would approach studying letters or diaries written by soldiers, for instance. Since representations are dependent on the viewpoints of their authors, different writers can present the same events in entirely different ways. As such, the present study could be redone by using as its data the writings of a fiercely pro-Confederacy writer or a loyal Unionist author, which would arguably provide very different results.

As this thesis shows, sociolinguistic concepts are a very applicable method of analysis when examining literary data. When those concepts are not considered to be adequate enough, another method, i.e. stylistics in this case, can be combined with sociolinguistics to create a set of tools that covers all relevant aspects of the data. In other words, an interdisciplinary approach appears to be quite useful when setting out to study representations of communication. Choosing historical wars as a setting has the benefit of ample literature written on the subject, which helps the researcher in making interpretations and familiarizing oneself with the background of the interactions represented in the data. The present study could easily be expanded by widening its scope to include more historical conflicts from different eras. Jeff Shaara is a prolific author who has written many more American Civil War books than analysed in this thesis, and he has also written extensively about the global conflicts of the 19th century in which Americans took part. There is much potential in studying the other works by this author, let alone other war novelists.

9 Bibliography

Primary references

- Shaara, J. (1996). *Gods and Generals*. New York: The Random House Publishing Group.
Shaara, J. (1998). *The Last Full Measure*. New York: The Random House Publishing Group.
Shaara, M. (1975). *The Killer Angels*. New York: The Random House Publishing Group.

Secondary references

- Aboussnoug, G. and Machin, D. (2008). Defence discourse I: the visual institutionalization of discourses in war monuments. In A. Mayr, *Language and power: an introduction to institutional discourse*. London; New York: Continuum, 115-137.
- Achille, L., Schulze, K. and Schmidt-Nielsen, A. (1995). An Analysis of Communication and Use of Military Terms in Navy Team Training. *Military Psychology* 7 (2), 95-107.
- Achugar, M. (2008). *What we remember: the construction of memory in military discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Brown, P. and Levinson S. (1987). *Politeness: some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Chang, G. and Mehan H. (2006). Discourse in a Religious Mode: The Bush Administration's Discourse in the War on Terrorism and Its Challenges. *Pragmatics* 16 (1), 1-23.
- Chao, S. (2008). Fusion Style: Towards a Poetics of the Grotesque Body. In G. Watson, *The state of stylistics: PALA 26*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 91-118.
- Chouliaraki, L. (2005). Introduction: The Soft Power of War: Legitimacy and Community in Iraq War Discourses. *Journal of Language and Politics* 4 (1),1-10.
- Clausewitz, C. (1998). *On War*. Washington: Library of Congress.
- Clegg, S., Courpasson, D. and Phillips, N. (2006). *Power and organizations*. London: SAGE.
- Consiglio, M. (2008). e-Lears: a Corpus Approach to Shakespeare and Tate. In G. Watson, *The state of stylistics: PALA 26*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 191-206.
- Cozzens, P. (2008). *Shenandoah 1862*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Jomini, A. (2005). *The Art of War*. Texas: El Paso Norte Press.
- Disler, E. A. (2005). *Talking in the ranks: Gender and military discourse*. Georgetown University.
- Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical discourse analysis: the critical study of language*. London: Longman.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The Subject and Power. *Critical Inquiry* 8 (4), 777-795.
- Groom, W. (2013). *Shiloh*. Washington, D.C: National Geographic Society.
- Halbe, D. (2011). Language in the military workplace — between hierarchy and politeness. *Text & Talk* 31 (3), 315-334.
- Hennessy, J. (1999). *Return to Bull Run: The Campaign and Battle of Second Manassas*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press.
- Lewis, D. (2008). The dynamics of face in the fictional dialogue of Bret Easton Ellis's American Psycho. *Innervate* 1, 182-189.
- Locher, M. (2004). *Power and politeness in action: disagreements in oral communication*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mayr, A. (2008). *Language and power: an introduction to institutional discourse*. London; New York: Continuum.
- Nørgaard, N., Montoro, R. and Busse, B. (2010). *Key terms in stylistics*. London; New York, NY: Continuum International Pub. Group.

- Sears, S. (1998). *Chancellorsville*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Sears, S. (2001). *To the Gates of Richmond: The Peninsula Campaign*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Sears, S. (2003). *Landscape Turned Red: The Battle of Antietam*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Sears, S. (2004). *Gettysburg*. New York: Mariner Books.
- Short, M. (1996). *Exploring the language of poems, plays and prose*. London : Longman.
- Troyer, R. (2008). Dialogue and Discourse Structure: A Speech Move Analysis of Sherman Alexie's Story 'What You Pawn I Will Redeem'. In G. Watson, *The state of stylistics: PALA 26*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi, 303-332.
- Watson, G. (2008). *The state of stylistics: PALA 26*. Amsterdam; New York: Rodopi.
- Watts, R. (1991). *Power in Family Discourse*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.