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LEXICAL COLOURING IN E.M. FORSTER'S NOVELS

4.1. Introduction:

Lexical colouring is a linguistic term introduced by Scotton (1985). As already stated in Chapter 1, lexical colouring, according to Scotton:

Consists of embedding a lexical choice implying a value judgment in an otherwise neutral utterance.
Functionally, it is related to style shifting [at the lexical level], but structurally it is different since it does not involve a change in style but rather value-laden lexical choices within the same style as the ongoing exchange.

(Scotton, 1985:106)

Lexical colouring is a powerful linguistic feature associated with powerful speakers because it is a tool to control the interaction by passing judgment on its content. Scotton (1985) has identified three different functions for lexical colouring. First, it can be used for passing judgment on the interactional content. Second, it can be employed to set up a negative evaluation of the content or something in the content. And third, it can be encoded to trivialize either the addressee or his contribution.

4.2. Lexical colouring and a model of markedness

According to Scotton, lexical colouring is a feature of powerful language used by speakers to negotiate their power in a talk exchange. It is powerful because “it represents a type of
marked choice” (ibid: 108). This argument is based on a model of linguistic code choice holding that participants in any talk exchange make and interpret linguistic choices in terms of a theory of markedness introduced by Scotton (1983). According to this model, all linguistic choices are seen as indexical of a rights and obligations set (RO set) holding between participants. That is, any choice points to a particular interpersonal balance and attempts to negotiate its acceptance. Speakers, Scotton argues, hold this theory of markedness naturally as part of their communicative competence about the connection between linguistic choices and social relationships. This association, she further claims, is speech community specific with speakers knowing what choice is unmarked and which others are marked for a specific exchange, as long as the exchange is conventionalized and therefore covered by norms.

In this model, linguistic choices take place within a normative framework, but still are not determined. A normative framework is posited because a societal consensus must be the basis for interpreting the social meaning of choices, associating each with a rights and obligations relationship and assigning unmarked choices for conventionalized exchanges. But, within the framework, speakers have options. They can make any of a range of choices, constrained only by the relative attractiveness of alternative choices and their outcomes. Thus, this model is related to theories of social behaviours based on costs and rewards (Thaibaut and Kelly 1959, for example).
Within the framework of this model, marked linguistic choices play a dominant role in redefining the social relationships between participants in the conversational exchange, as stated by Scotton (1985):

Marked choices in conventionalized relationships, however, rock the social boat, or at least alter its course. They are signals of the speaker's intent to change the relationship with the addressee, in terms of the rights and obligations balance—to dis-identify with the normative balance. Further, by implication, the marked choice is a negotiation to establish a different RO set as unmarked.

( Ibid: 109)

One of the most important claims of his model is that marked choices are, in general, powerful linguistic features for two reasons. First, they always encode personally motivated dis-identifications with the unmarked choice, the expected. Such a move, Scotton argues, is powerful because “any change, pleasant or not, disrupts an ongoing exchange” (Ibid: 110)

Second, conversational turns including marked choices lead to uncertainty. For example, a boss who says to a subordinate in anger “Kindly get your ass in here” underlines his rude request by switching from kindly, a lexical choice associated with extra-polite exchanges, to a casual style. Thus, the addressee becomes uncertain how a speaker intends the exchange to proceed. As the addressee’s uncertainty increases, the potential for the speaker to take more charge overall increases.

The model considers both the speaker and the talk exchange as the dynamic factor affecting lexical choices. It makes use of
Halliday's (1975) characterization of the context of speech event as complex of three dimensions: field, mode and tenor of discourse. Field of discourse refers largely to subject matter; mode refers to medium selected; and tenor depends on relationships among the relevant participants. However, the model concentrates mainly on the tenor of discourse, but is motivated by the speaker not the exchange. Gregory and Carroll (1978:8) recognize two types of tenor: personal and functional. Personal tenor has to do with relative status relationships, such as mother and son, employer and employee, teacher and student, and so on. Functional tenor refers to the use to which language is put, such as teaching, persuading, scolding, etc. Both types of tenor, however, refer to linguistic variation relating to participant relationships.

This model will be adopted in the analysis of the concept of lexical colouring in E.M. Forster's novels. It is, I think, the first time the model is used in the analysis of literary dialogues and utterances.

4.3. A Stylistic Analysis\(^1\) of Lexical colouring in Forster's novels

Lexical colouring is very much present in E.M. Forster's novels. It has been found that E.M. Forster's characters use this communicative strategy either to negotiate their power position or to empower themselves in conversational exchanges. Given below is an analysis of the concept in E.M. Forster's literary dialogues.

\(^1\) This type of stylistic analysis is an application of the contextualized approach or “contextualized stylistics” (see chapter-1: 24-28)
4.3.a. Where Angels Fear to Tread

In *Where Angels Fear to Tread*, Lilia uses lexical colouring against her mother in law, Mrs. Herriton. It takes place when Lilia is in the station, leaving for Italy. She says, addressing her daughter.

"Good-bye darling. Mind you're always good, and do what Granny tells you." (WAFTT: 4)

The use of the title *Granny* is lexical colouring. Lilia uses this title despite the fact that she knows that her mother in law doesn't like being referred to as Granny, as Forster tells us "Mrs. Herriton hated the title of Granny" (WAFTT: 4). Lilia intends to use this title to annoy Mrs. Herriton with whom she maintains a bad relationship, especially after Charle's death (Lilia's husband). In terms of Scotton (1985), Lilia, using this lexical choice, deviates from "the rights and obligations set (RO set) holding between her mother in law and herself. The title Granny is a marked choice, i.e. verses the unmarked choice, say, for example, grandmother. In Lilia's terms, Granny is a marked choice used to violate her mother-in-law's positive face wants. Deviating from a social norm by means of selecting a particular linguistic choice is a powerful language future used by speakers to negotiate their power (Scotton 1985). Mrs. Herriton does not like the term Granny at all. Later in the novel, Lilia's daughter adopts the term after her mother, and addresses her grandmother, using the same title:

"And, Granny, when will the old ship get to Italy?" Asked Imra.
“Grandmother, dear; not Granny,” said Mrs. Herriton, giving her a kiss. (WAFTT:6)

Mrs. Herriton in her conversational turn shows her disannoyance with the title, and prefers to be addressed as grandmother. She corrects her granddaughter in order not to develop this linguistic habit after her mother.

Similarly, Harriet resorts to using a lexical choice that carries a value laden judgment in her dialogue with Philip. Harriet is in a more powerful position than Philip. Throughout the novel, she exercises her power on him by means of giving orders and obligations. The incident takes place when Harriet gets fed up of Philip’s frequent failure to convince Gino to leave his baby to them:

“You’ve said a lot of smart things and whittled away morality and religion and I don’t know what about the baby”? (WAFTT: 28)

The use of whittled away is lexical colouring because it evaluates the speech content. It is used by Harriet to trivialize Philip as well as his contribution in his previous turn. The use of this lexical choice suggests that Harriet passes a negative judgment on Philip’s contribution. She could have used a lexical choice having a more positive connotation, such as quote, or invoke. But as she is quite unhappy with her brother, she finds no other solution but to express her inner feeling linguistically through lexical colouring. In the same conversational turn, Harriet reveals that she has used that lexical choice to express her anger and discomfort with her brother, as she proceeds:
"You think me a fool, but I've been noticing you all today, and you haven't mentioned the baby once. You haven't thought about it even. You don't care Philip. I shall not speak to you. You are intolerable". (WAFT:98)

Likewise, Caroline uses this communicative strategy to show her contempt for Harriet. Consider, for example, the following excerpt from her dialogue with Philip:

"You ought to bundle Harriet into a carriage, not this evening, but now, and drive her straight away" (WAFTT: 150)

In the above excerpt the lexical choice bundle is lexical colouring because in using it Caroline sets up a negative evaluation against Harriet. The word bundle has the implication of pushing something somewhere quickly and roughly. Thus, Harriet is made as if she were a useless thing being bundled. It further suggests that Caroline is very much annoyed with Harriet and that she wants to get rid of her as soon as possible. Throughout the novel, Caroline and Harriet maintain an unfriendly relationship because Caroline opposes the idea of kidnapping Gino's baby. In the excerpt she prefers to use the lexical choice bundle verses lexical choices with more positive connotations, such as rush or hurry.

Even E.M Forster uses lexical colouring against Harriet through his narrator. See, for example, this rhetorical question:

"Who would bridle Harriet's tongue" (WAFTT: 153)

The use of bridle is lexical colouring with a negative connotation. Forster selects this lexical choice to set up a negative evaluation against Harriet. He would have used a less negative value laden lexical choice, such as stop or cease. Although bridle and tongue are collocations, and that bridle is the best choice in this context,
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it gives a negative judgment of Harriet in the sense that she cannot control herself from talking, which suggests a bad communicative behaviour in her character. Thus, with this lexical choice Forster really succeeds in passing a full negative evaluation on her. It can be argued here that Forster's narrator stands by Caroline and supports her position against Harriet.

Lexical colouring is also well exploited by Philip in his dialogue with Caroline. He employs a positive value laden lexical item when he appears to lose Caroline for good.

"Well good bye; it's all over at last; another scene in my pageant has shifted." (WAFTT: 153)
The word pageant is lexical colouring containing a positive evaluation of Philip's speech content. It suggests that his life has been extraordinarily happy since he met Caroline. Philip uses this lexical choice in lieu of some less positive value laden lexical choices such as show, i.e. he could have said "another scene in my show has shifted". However, his insistence on using this lexical choice seems to be an attempt by him to fulfill some of Caroline's positive face wants that he does not like to leave her because she is the only one who can make his life a pageant. With this type of use, Philip passes a positive evaluation on Caroline and succeeds to make her feel for him:

"Good bye: it's been a great pleasure to see you. I hope that [Pageant] won't shift, at all events." She gripped his hand.

(WAFTT: 153).

In terms of Scotton (1985: 116) initiating the use of socially significant variants encoding solidarity is a move to augment the speaker's power. Thus, it can be argued here that Philip in the
above excerpt negotiates his power by selecting a significant lexical choice encoding solidarity with Caroline. It is worth mentioning that in terms of Scotton, solidarity is a move taken by the speaker who assumes the role of the superior in conversational exchange.

4.3.b. The Longest Journey

Lexical colouring is also found in *The Longest Journey* with considerable occurrences. For example, Mr. Pembroke resorts to this communicative strategy when he happens to comment on three men he met at Cambridge. He says, addressing his sister, Agnes:

"One of the men, too, wore an Eton tie, but the other, I should say came from very queer schools, if they come from any schools at all." (TLJ: 16)

In the above excerpt the use of queer is lexical colouring, for it implies a negative evaluation of the schools and those who study there. Making a negative evaluation through lexical colouring is a powerful language feature in which the speaker negotiates his power in relation to his addressee or referee (third person non present). The lexical choice *queer* carries a more negative connotation than, let's say, odd or strange, which are more or less synonymous with queer.

Similarly, Ansell uses lexical colouring in his dialogue with Rickie. The incident occurs when Rickie complains to Ansell that he doesn't have a house like him and that he can't find a house better than Cambridge. Then, Ansell replies to him in this manner:

".........I can't think why you flop about so helplessly, like a bit of sea-weed. In four years you've taken as much root as any one" (TLJ: 75).
In using the lexical choice *flop about* Ansell does two things simultaneously. First, he passes a negative judgment on Rickie, being unable to take a decision on personal matters (selecting a house). Second, he trivializes him as well as his speech contribution in the preceding conversational turn. Furthermore, his simile (like a bit of sea-weed) reinforces the negative evaluation implied in the lexical choice (*Flop about*). Ansell could have employed the word *ramble* which, I think, has a less negative connotation than *flop about* at least in this context.

In the same dialogue, Rickie uses a lexical choice that can more or less be described as lexical colouring. Rickie is very proud of Cambridge and those who belong to it. He thinks that Cambridge students are really distinguished. His enthusiasm to the university leads him to say:

"I wish we were labeled" (TLJ: 75)

In the above excerpt Rickie means that students of Cambridge should be distinguished from others. However, his lexical choice "labelled" seems to be inappropriate to the context. The word label is used to describe the characteristics or qualities of people, activities or things often in a way that is unfair (cf. Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary, 2003: 695). Although Rickie wants to emphasize consolidation with Cambridge and those who study there, he fails to select the lexical item that conveys the meaning intended. The word "labelled" has a less positive connotation than the word distinguished, and that in using it Rickie's speech content is negatively evaluated. This lexical choice causes
conversational uncertainty to Ansell who doesn’t like Rickie’s description and proceeds to ask him:

"Why labels?" (TLJ: 76)

In terms of Scotton (1985), a linguistic choice that raises the addressee’s uncertainty is seen as a powerful language feature.

Rickie also uses lexical colouring with Mr. Pembroke, who asks him if women lose a lot by not knowing Greek:

"Did women lose a lot by not knowing Greek".

"A heap” said Rickie, roughly. (TLJ: 83)

The use of “heap” is lexical colouring because it has a less positive connotation than, let’s say, “lot” or “much”. Besides, the use of the quantifier “heap” shifts Rickie’s style to informal, which doesn’t suit the topic being discussed, i.e. education. Rickie’s style is evaluated as a marked downward shift which, in Scotton’s system, is a powerful language feature because such a type of use “may be seen as trivializing the addressee or topic under discussion” (Scotton 1985:116).

The same communicative strategy is also used by Agnes against Rickie when she addressee him in this way:

“You are cracked on beauty” (TLJ: 83)

Although Agnes attempts to praise Rickie’s positive face, the use of cracked here doesn’t serve her purpose, as it gives a negative evaluation of Rickie. The use of fond of would have been a better choice in this context, as far as positive connotations are concerned.

At another occasion, Agnes resorts to using lexical colouring to trivialize Rickie’s positive attitude towards people. Rickie
believes that one should not hate mankind for any reason. Agnes, on the other hand, has a discriminatory attitude against low class people and treats them badly. See, for example, the following excerpt from one of her dialogues with Rickie:

"Whaout about yr great theory of hating no one." (TLJ: 140).

The use of theory is lexical colouring because Agnes in using this lexical choice clearly aims at trivializing Rickie and passing negative judgment on his attitude. By using this marked lexical choice against her husband, Agnes violates the rights and obligations balance holding between them, and assumes the role of the superior in the conversational exchange.

Similarly, Mrs. Failing selects a lexical item that implies a negative evaluation of the content. Replying to Agnes’s apology for being rude, Mrs. Failing says:

"My dear, you may. We're all off our hinges this Sunday. Sit down by me again" (TLJ:154).

The expression of our hinges functions as lexical colouring with a less positive connotation than, for example, “out of our moods”.

Tilliard also makes use of lexical colouring when he happens to comment on Rickie’s assertion that Ansell is a Philosopher.

"But Mr. Ansell is a Philosopher".

"A very kinky one" (TLJ: 169).

The use of "Kinky" by Tilliard for describing Ansell suggests that he is more passing a judgment than making a description. The word Kinky is evaluative in this context because it is used to evaluate someone or something that is unusual, strange, and possibly exciting, especially in ways involving unusual sexual acts. This lexical choice can be interpreted in two ways. It may be
seen as an attempt made by Tilliard to make a negative judgment on Rickie’s contribution that Ansell is a Philosopher, i.e., Rickie’s idea is a very kinky one. Or it may be interpreted as a negative evaluation made by Tilliard against Ansell, i.e., Ansell is a very kinky Philosopher. In both cases, however, the word kinky is highly evaluative and therefore it is lexical colouring.

Similarly, Waddington employs the concept of lexical colouring to describe a meal he had with Rickie and Agnes. He says, addressing Ansell:

“But certainly it was a very stony meal” (TLJ: 201)

The use of the word stony makes Ansell unable to predict the meaning intended by Waddington, and therefore he asks for further explanation of the word.

“What kind of stoniness?” (TLJ: 201)

As a matter of fact, the word stony implies more than one meaning. It may suggest that the meal was heavy and delicious, after which Waddington felt his stomach extraordinarily full. Or it may suggest that the meeting on the meal was not pleasant and no one showed sympathy or kindness for Waddington. It may further suggest that the people in the meeting kept silent, which made it boring. The last meaning is not applicable here, as Waddington replies to Ansell’s enquiry with:

“No one stopped talking for a moment” (TLJ: 201)

Using a lexical item that has more than one meaning or what is called in the world of semantics “Polysemy”, is a powerful language feature, for it makes the hearer unable to decode the exact meaning intended by the speaker, and thus it increases his
Another case of lexical colouring in the *Longest Journey* is found in the dialogue between Stephen and Ansell. Despite the fact that Ansell was too generous with Stephen by lending him some money to buy tobacco, Stephen despise him by selecting a lexical item implying a negative evaluation of Ansell. He says to him:

".... How I took a shelling from a boy who earns *nine bob* a week;"  
(TLJ: 243)

It is clear that Stephen in this excerpt attempts to trivialize Ansell and pass a negative judgment on him. The use of *nine bob*, and the vocative term *boy* bear a highly negative evaluation against Ansell. Forster, through his narrator, tells us that Ansell gets annoyed with Stephen for using that negative value laden lexical choice, describing the impact left upon him by saying:

*Ansell saw it was useless to argue. He perceived beneath the slatterly use of words, the man,- buttoned up in them, just as his body was buttoned up in a shoddy suit,- and he wondered more than ever that such a man should know the Elliots.*  
(TLJ: 243)

Thus, Ansell judges Stephen through the lexical choices he has used and concludes that he cannot be a relative of Elliot’s family, let a lone being Rickie’s half brother. It seems reasonable here to argue that Ansell makes a comparison between Rickie and Stephen
with respect to their verbal behaviour and the way they speak, and judges that they can never be brothers.

Stephen falls in the same trap in his dialogue with Agnes. Agnes knows that Stephen has come to her to tell the news that he is Rickie’s half brother (see chapter 3, PP.105-107). In an attempt to trivialize him along with his news, she addresses him in this manner:

“Will you tell your tremendous news to me?” (TLJ: 247)

Agnes, who is not interested in what Stephen is going to say, uses the word “tremendous” for describing his news. It is clear that the lexical item selected by Agnes is not intended to give a positive evaluation about the news she already knows. Rather, it is used as a powerful language feature aiming at trivializing her addressee along with his coming news. When Stephen starts telling the news, Agnes does not interact with him. Instead, she uses the leading question “yes” twice, which is a feature of powerful language:

“It’s very odd. It is that I’m Rickie’s brother. I’ve just found out. I’ve come to tell you all.”

“Yes?”

“Half-brother I ought to have said”

“Yes?” (TLJ: 247)

Then, Stephen tries to explain his news in detail, but he is faced with another lexical colouring from Agnes:

“There is no occasion to inflict the details” (TLJ: 247)

The use of inflict is lexical colouring because it makes a negative evaluation of Stephen’s speech content and it indicates that Agnes doesn’t have the desire to hear from him. She selects the word inflict in lieu of, for example, explain or go through, which both
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have more positive connotations than inflict. The use of the lexical colouring and the leading question “yes” which are powerful language features, cause conversational uncertainty and unpredictability to Stephen. His next conversational turn is characterized by powerless style features, such as hedges and hesitations “you see....”, and Forster describes his verbal reaction by saying “delicacy he lacked” (TLJ: 248).

On the contrary, Agnes gains ground, controlling the conversation and her interlocutor. Once again, she uses lexical colouring against Stephen, saying to him:

“I see why you have come here, penniless”. (TLJ: 248)

The use of penniless is another lexical colouring, which trivializes Stephen and evaluates him negatively. Although other lexical choices, such as indigent, needy, bankrupt, or impecunious have almost the same meaning, they are less trivializing, I think, than the word penniless. Stephen, whose face is severely violated, is shown unable to retort to Agnes or retain what is left of his conversational power. His turn after this lexical colouring is portrayed by Forster’s narrator:

“He is mouth fell open and he laughed so merrily that it might have given her a warning.” (TLJ: 249)

As a matter of fact, in this dialogue Agnes takes advantage of her husband’s advice that she should take “the offensive, instead of waiting till he began his blackmailing” (TLJ: 249). She also makes use of Aunt Emily’s instructions that “one’s only hope with Stephen is to start bullying first” (TLJ: 249).
Likewise, Rickie resorts to lexical colouring as a communicative strategy to retort to Ansell's contribution in which he shows great sympathy with Stephen and intolerable contempt for Rickie. In an attempt to trivialize all what Ansell says, Rickie uses a lexical choice with an evaluative function. He says, addressing Ansell:

"It's easy enough to preach when you are an outsider."

( TLJ:254)

Although the word *preach* has a positive connotation when used in other utterances, Rickie uses it to pass a negative evaluation on Ansell's contribution in the preceding turn. The context in which the word preaching is used does not at all suggest that Rickie makes a positive judgment on Ansell's speech content, for he uses this lexical choice after getting offended with Ansell's contribution. This really suggests that he wants to render his addressee's contribution trivial and unworthy.

4.3.c. A Room With A View

Lexical colouring is also used as a communicative strategy by E.M. Forster's characters in *A Room With A View*. For example, old Mr. Emerson uses this communicative strategy in his dialogue with Lucy who comes to thank him for giving them (she and her cousin Miss Bartlett) his room at the pension. Mr. Emerson feels that he need not be thanked for what he did, and therefore addresses Lucy in this way:

"I think that you are repeating what you have heard old people say. You are pretending to be touchy; but you are not really." (ARWAV:21)
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The use of touchy is lexical colouring because it has a negative impact on the addressee (Lucy), who considers that the lexical item selected by Mr. Emerson evaluates her negatively. Therefore, she rejects his judgment by means of using a negative assertion.

"I am not touchy, I hope." (ARWAV: 21)

Although she takes the risk of being impolite by disagreeing with her addressee, she softens her FTA (disagreement) by using the hedge, I hope. In terms of Scotton (1985) a lexical choice that causes a negative impact on the addressee is lexical colouring. Lucy exhibits this impact by rejecting Mrs. Emerson's lexical choice. Had she not considered Mr. Emerson's use of touchy as a negative evaluation passed on her, she would not have rejected it.

Similarly, Lucy adopts the same communicative strategy when she happens to comment on George's description of his father that he is kind to people. She says to George:

"I think that a kind of action done tactfully."

"Tact!" (ARWAV: 23)

The impact of using the adverb tactfully on George is quite obvious. It indicates that Lucy has given a negative evaluation of George's father by using this lexical choice. George is shown unable to take his conversational turn properly. He just repeats her last phrase half completed "tact!". Forster reveals to us through his narrator the negative impact of this lexical choice on George, illustrating that Lucy's lexical choice was wrong:

He threw up his head in disdain. Apparently she had given the wrong answer. (ARWAV: 23)
The same communicative strategy is used by Miss Lavish, but against herself. It takes place when she asks Lucy to describe a murder incident she saw in the piazza.

"We literary hacks are shameless creatures. I believe there is no secret of the human heart into which we wouldn't pry."

(ARWAV: 47)

The word hacks is lexical colouring implying a value judgment. Miss Lavish could have used lexical choices with positive connotations, such as writers, groups, people, etc. It seems reasonable here to argue that Miss Lavish adopts this strategy to soften the FTA that may result from her requesting Lucy to narrate the murder story. Although in using this lexical choice she passes self negative evaluation and belittles her self considerably, she, in return, manages to make Lucy tell the story after she had refused to tell it (see ARWAV: 47).

The idea that using a particular lexical choice may highly violate the rights and obligations balance (Ro set) holding between conversational participants is clearly shown in the dialogue between Freddy and his mother. The excerpt below shows how Freddy deviates from the norm by selecting a marked lexical choice that one can hardly expect from a son addressing his mother:

"I don't see you ought to go peeping like that"

"Peeping like that! Can't I look out of my own window?"

(ARWAV: 81).

In using peeping, Freddy passes a negative evaluation on his mother, for the lexical item peeping has an obvious negative connotation. Thus, Freddy pays no attention to the rights and
obligations set, or what is called by sociolinguists as role relations holding between son and mother. The mother, on the other hand, exhibits the negative impact of this negative value laden lexical choice on her positive face by repeating his lexical colouring in an exclamatory tone “peeping like that!”, which clearly reveals that she gets surprised at the way her son addresses her.

Similarly, Lucy trivializes George’s contribution and renders his argument unworthy. The incident occurs in their dialogue when George takes a long conversational turn in which he makes hard efforts to convince Lucy not to marry Cecil. After finishing his turn, she replies to him in this manner:

“May I ask what you intend to gain by this exhibition?”

(ARWAV: 165)

In using the lexical choice exhibition, Lucy turns all what George has said trivial and nonsense, and thus makes a negative evaluation of George speech content. Although the word exhibition has a positive connotation when used in other utterances, the way it is used here and the context in which it is involved does not suggest the same. For, Lucy, who is up till now engaged to Cecil, cannot be imagined to make a positive evaluation of George speech content in which he attacks her fiancé severely. The only possible interpretation of using this lexical choice, it can be argued, is to pass a negative judgment on both George as well as his contribution.

Similarly, Mrs. Honeychurch (Lucy’s mother) resorts to using lexical colouring as a communicative strategy to pass a negative judgment on Lucy’s action. Lucy had broken off her
engagement with Cecil, and instead of informing her mother about this family affair, she happened to reveal it only to her cousin, Miss Charlotte, and Mr. Beebe. When they meet, the mother addresses her daughter as follows:

"You know, Lucy. You and Charlotte and Mr. Beebe all tell me I’m so stupid, so I suppose I am, but I shall never understand this hole-and corner work. You’ve got rid of Cecil—well and good, and I’m thankful he’s gone, though I did feel angry for the minute but why not announce it? Why this hushing up and tiptoeing."

(ARWAV: 190)

In the above excerpt, Mrs. Honeychurch uses three negative value laden lexical choices in the same conversational turn. She starts with hole and corner work in which she makes a highly negative evaluation of Lucy’s action. The use of hole-and corner in this particular context has a negative connotation, for it makes Lucy look as if she had done something which is highly disapproved and condemned by people. Similarly, in using hushing up and tiptoeing Mrs. Honeychurch again attempts a negative evaluation as well as judgment on Lucy’s action. Mrs. Honeychurch could have used a more positive value laden lexical choice that is “Secrecy” in lieu of the three. But it seems that she wants to make a negative evaluation of her daughter’s action in order to avoid doing it in future.

This powerful linguistic feature leads the future conversation uncertain and unpredictable on the part of Lucy. She is shown unable to defend herself or retort to her mother. She just remains silent, which is the best communicative strategy a person resorts
to when he is unable to retort to the FTA. Forster tells us this through his narrator:

"Lucy was silent. She was drifting away from her mother."

(ARWA: 190).

4.3.d. Howards End

Lexical colouring is very much present in Howards End. The characters use this communicative strategy to establish certain evaluation and judgment either of the addressee or of his/her style content. Besides, it is sometimes used by the characters to pass an evaluation of a third person not usually present at the conversational setting. For example, Helen employs a negative value laden lexical choice when she happens to talk about the Wilcox's family. She says, addressing her sister Margaret:

"Oh' Margaret, you don't know what you are in for. They are all bottled up against the drawing room window....." (HE: 52)

In using the adjective bottled up, Helen passes a negative evaluation on Wilcox family and trivializes them considerably. She could have used the lexical choice gathered, which would have turned the connotation positive or at least neutral. It is worth mentioning here that Helen is very much dissatisfied with the Wilcox family and therefore her lexical choice seems to be justified. Helen also uses lexical colouring to pass a negative judgment on her sister's contribution that there is no reason they should be near people, referring to the Wilcox family, who displease them or whom they displease. Helen, who thinks that her sister cares for the Wilcox's family more than is really supposed, retorts to her in the following manner:
"Really, Meg, what has come over you to make such a fuss?"

(HE-57)

The use of *fuss* indicates that Helen is making a negative evaluation of Margaret's contribution. Fuss, in its nominal form, suggests that the person shows more dissatisfaction with someone which is greater than is supposed to be. Therefore, in this excerpt, both Margaret and her argument are negatively evaluated by Helen, using the lexical choice "*fuss*".

Helen never stops using lexical colouring against the Wilcox family. Once again she resorts to this communicative strategy to pass a negative evaluation on the time she spends debating with Mr. Wilcox. She says, addressing both Mr. Wilcox and Margaret:

"We suppose it a good thing to *waste* an evening once a fortnight over a debate, but, as my sister says, it may be better to breed dogs". (HE: 120)

The use of *waste*, verses words with more positive connotations, such as spend, utilize or consume, is lexical colouring, through which Helen passes a negative evaluation and judgment on her debate with Mr. Wilcox. The idea that lexical colouring is always evaluative (Scotton, 1985:114) is very much evident in using the word waste in Helen's excerpt. In terms of Scotton, Helen negotiates her power in two ways. First, she violates the rights and obligations balance holding between her and her addresses, for her utterance will no doubt be interpreted by Mr. Wilcox that debating with him is nothing but wasting time. Second, she uses the negative value laden lexical choice "*waste*", which is a powerful
language feature used as a tool to control the interaction by passing judgment on its content.2

Similarly, Margaret establishes a negative judgment against Leonard by virtue of using a negative value laden word. Leonard, who is interested in reading each and every thing, is described by Margaret as:

"His brain is filled with the husks of Books". (HE: 132)

The use of husks turns her description upside down. It gives a highly negative evaluation about him in the sense that he is interested in reading trivial things. Trivializing words or expressions are powerful language features implying violation of the RO sets holding between participants. Although Leonard is a third person non-present in the dialogue, one can still imagine and predict the negative impact on him had he been present.

While Margaret’s evaluation of Leonard was negative, Mr. Wilcox shows some sympathy with him by describing his simple life in a more positive way:

“One minute. You know nothing about him. He probably has his own joys and interests—wife, children, snug little home,”

(HE: 133)

Although Mr. Wilcoex’s description appears to be positive, the use of snug little needs some thinking. The word snug, though has a positive connotation, it is not as positive as, for example, the word comfortable or even cozy. The collocative use of snug and little is another factor decreasing the positive value laden of the word snug.

---

3 Scotton (1985: 116)
Margaret also resorts to using lexical colouring when she happens to comment on Mr. Wilcox’s hidden personality. She says, addressing her sister, Helen:

“The are heaps of things in him more especially things that he does— that will always be hidden from me.” (HE: 159)

Margaret uses heaps as a quantifier, which is roughly synonymous with lots, which has a more positive connotation. Although the topic is serious, Margaret employs this quantifier, which lessens the seriousness of the topic and shifts her style drastically to informal. Since the topic is by far sensitive, shifting to informal style seems to be inappropriate and unjustified.

At another occasion, Margaret again uses the same communicative strategy against Leonard and his wife, who were brought by Helen to a party arranged by Mr. Wilcox. When she sees them, she immediately says:

“Oh no, it’s only my sister screaming and only two hangers on of ours, whom she has brought here for no conceivable reason” (HE: 205)

The use of hangers on leaves a highly negative impact on Helen, who feels that in using this lexical choice her sister doesn’t violate the positive face wants of Leonard and his wife only but of her own too, for it was she who brought them there. Therefore, she asks her sister to take back the word:

“Kindly take back that word, hangers on”, said Helen, ominously calm. (HE: 205)

As a matter of fact, Margaret could have used a better lexical choice with a slightly less insulting connotation. The word
dependent, for example, serves the purpose and conveys the meaning intended.

The same communicative strategy is used by Mr. Wilcox against himself after being discovered that he had had an affair with Jacky. He says to his fiancée Margaret:

"I could find excuses but I won't. No, I won't. A thousand times no. I'm a bad lot, and must be left at that." (HE: 223)

In using bad lot, Mr. Wilcox establishes a negative judgment against himself. It can be argued here that Mr. Wilcox adopts this strategy not merely to humiliate himself without gaining something in return. As a matter of fact, he knows that he has done something that can never be forgiven by Margaret; so it is wise of him to evaluate himself than to be evaluated by others. However, the way he belittles and devalues himself makes Margaret sympathize and feel for him, for she says in her next conversational turn:

"Leave it where you will, boy. It's not going to trouble us; I know what I'm talking about, and it will make no difference."

(HE: 223).

The way Mr. Wilcox evaluates himself is quite consistent with Helen's evaluation of the family as a whole. At the very opening scene of the novel, Helen sets up a negative evaluation of the Wilcox family, when she says to Margaret.

"The whole Wilcox family was a fraud, just a wall of newspapers and motor-cars and golf clubs." (HE: 22)

The metaphorical use of the phrases wall of newspapers, motor-cars, and golf clubs, all together set up a negative judgment of the Wilcox family, which suggests that they are not functionally
different from lexical colouring. However, Margaret does not agree with Helen’s evaluation. In her next conversational turn she makes an evaluation that is contradictory to Helen’s:

“I don’t think that. The Wilcox’s family struck me as being genuine people, particularly the wife.” (H.E.:22)

At another occasion, Helen goes on employing lexical colouring against the Wilcox family in their absence, causing negative impacts on her sister, Margaret. This time she selects a lexical choice that trivializes the Wilcox family, particularly Henry (Margaret’s Husband). After hearing a bell ringing inside the Wilcox’s house, Margaret asks Helen:

“Listen! What’s that?”

Helen said, “perhaps the Wilcoxes are beginning the siege.”

(HE: 273).

The word siege is lexical colouring, in which Helen obviously attempts to trivialize the Wilcox family. In doing so, she violates the rights and obligations holding between her and her sister, for Margaret is now a member of the Wilcox family being Henry’s wife. Her next conversational turn illustrates her disapproval of the lexical choice selected by Helen, showing that she gets annoyed with the way Helen speaks about the Wilcox family, or rather her family:

“What nonsense-listen!” (H.E.:273)

However, Forster comments on this incident, emphasizing that it can never be a cause of partition between the two sisters:

And the triviality faded from their faces, though it left something behind-the knowledge that they never could be
parted because their love was rooted in common things.

(HE: 273)

One of the most significant examples of lexical colouring in Howards End is, however, found in one of the dialogues between Margaret and Helen towards the end of the novel. In that dialogue Margaret happened to make an evaluation of late Mrs. Wilcox, with whom she had enjoyed a strong and unforgettable friendship. She says, addressing Helen.

"I feel that you and I and Henry are only fragments of that women's mind". (HE: 287)

In using the word fragments Margaret sets up an evaluation of Helen, herself, Henry and Mrs. Wilcox (Henry's late Wife). But, while she passes a negative evaluation of her sister, herself, and her husband, she gives a highly positive evaluation of Mrs. Wilcox. In terms of Leech (1983:34, 35), Margaret's utterance is characterized by a "reflexive intention", i.e. an intention whose fulfillment consists in its recognition by the hearer. As a matter of fact, one feels uncertain about Margaret intention, i.e. does she, in her utterance, intend to establish a negative evaluation of herself, Helen, and Henry, or she rather wants to set up a positive judgment of the late Mrs. Wilcox? Bach and Harnish (1979:15) point out, however, that this reflexive intention is executed only by virtue of what they call "the communicative presumption," i.e. the mutual belief shared by the speaker and the hearer that when someone says something to somebody else, it is done with some illocutionary goal in mind. Thus, it is the mutual belief between
Helen and Margaret that determines the interpretation of Margaret's reflexive intention.

4.3.e. A passage to India

The first lexical colouring found in a passage to India is in the dialogue between Dr. Aziz and Adela. Although it is the first ever conversation between them, Adela spares no time to select a lexical item that more or less implies a negative judgment.

"I want you to explain a disappointment we had this morning; it must be some point of Indian etiquette". (APTI: 57)

In using the word etiquette, Adela violates the rights and obligations balance holding between her and Dr. Aziz, for in using it she does nothing other than trivializing her addressee. Also, in using it Adela makes a negative judgment of the Indians, for her contribution suggests that disappointing others is part of the Indian etiquette. The use of the model verb must, which expresses "certainty or logical necessity" (Leech & Svartvik 1986:206), is also a factor, reinforcing her argument and negative judgment of the Indians.

Similarly, Mr. Fielding, who is in a powerful position throughout the novel, uses lexical colouring to set up a negative judgment against Adela. The incident takes place in his dialogue with Dr. Aziz who asks him why he doesn't marry Adela.

"Why don't you marry Miss Quested?"

"Good God! Why, the girl's a prig." (APTI: 102)

In using the word prig to describe Adela, Mr. Fielding evaluates her negatively. Besides, he leads the conversation with Aziz
uncertain and unpredictable, as Aziz in his next turn asks for more explanation of the word prig:

"Prig, prig? Kindly explain. Isn’t that a bad word?"

(APTI: 103).

Instead of explaining to him what the word prig means, Mr. Fielding employs another lexical choice in which he again trivializes Adela.

"Oh, I don’t know her, but she struck me as one of the most pathetic products of western education. She depresses me."

(APTI: 103)

The metaphorical use of the word products indicates that Fielding looks at Adela as something made by others, and that she strictly and blindly follows western teachings and instructions without applying her mind or providing herself a chance to think things over. With this, Fielding makes a highly negative evaluation of her character and highlights his powerful position that he is able to make an assessment of others, taking advantage of his long experience in the field of education. The use of the adjective "pathetic" is also a factor, reinforcing his negative contribution against Adela.

This powerful argument contributes a good deal to making Aziz change his opinion about Adela and cross the positive image he had drawn for her before, as his next conversational turn reveals:

"I thought her so nice and sincere." (APTI: 103)

However, Fielding regrets the way he has talked of his countrywoman. Therefore, he concludes that the reason why he

---

4 Mr. Fielding is presented as a school master in the novel.
doesn’t want to marry her is because she is already engaged to Ronny:

“But I can’t marry her if I wanted to, for she has just become engaged to the city Magistrate”. (APTI: 103).

At another occasion, Mr. Fielding also resorts to using the same communicative strategy in his discussion with Prof. Godbole to trivialize his contribution about Dr. Aziz. Godbole believes that Aziz might be guilty of the attempted rape charged against him by Adela, whereas Fielding firmly believes that Aziz is innocent of the crime. Commenting on Prof. Godbole philosophical contribution, Fielding Says:

“You are preaching that evil and good are the same”

(APTI: 158).

The use of preaching in this particular context implies that Fielding passes a negative evaluation of Prof. Godbole’s speech content. He uses this lexical choice in lieu of words with more positive connotations, such as arguing or simply saying. This is a powerful linguistic feature which creates conversational uncertainty to the addressee and makes him look trivial. It seems justified here to argue that Fielding adopts this communicative strategy to show his dissatisfaction with Prof. Godbole’s argument that Aziz might be guilty of the attempted rape charge.

Likewise, Mahmoud Ali utilizes the concept of lexical colouring during Aziz’s trial. In defense of Dr. Aziz, he selects a lexical item that carries a value laden judgment and sets up a negative evaluation against the city magistrate. The incident takes place when he happens to enquire about Mrs. Moore (the
magistrate's mother), who would have witnessed in favour of Dr. Aziz, had she been present. When the Magistrate says that he doesn’t suppose to call her, Mahmoud Ali replies to him in this way:

“You don’t because you can’t, you have smuggled her out of the country” (APTI: 198).

The word smuggle implies a negative value judgment, suggesting that the Magistrate has acted against the law. The word smuggle has the meaning of taking things or people from a place secretly and often illegally (cf. Cambridge Advanced learner’s dictionary, 2003: 1197). It can be argued here that Mahmoud Ali has been successful in using this lexical choice, which largely coheres with the communicative event. In terms of Scotton 1985, Mahmoud Ali violates the social power rituals by selecting this lexical choice against the magistrate, who is comparatively in a more powerful position both in occupation and social status (being an Anglo Indian) than him. However, the sensitivity of the case he defends makes him ignore the rights and obligations balance holding between him and the magistrate, concentrating primarily on salvaging his client from the alleged charge.

Therefore, it seems reasonable to argue that although Mahmoud Ali is obviously in a less statusful power compared to the magistrate, his belief that Dr. Aziz is innocent of the attempted rape charge gains him another type of power realized by Scotton (1988: 199) as “interactional power”⁵. This type of power,

⁵For more detail about Scotton’s interactional and statusful power, see chapter I.PP: 43:44
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according to Scotton, enables the speaker to control “the sequential aspects of the interaction (e.g. controlling the floor) or the direction and/or outcome of the interaction (e.g. topic)” (Scotton, 1988: 199).

Similarly, Dr. Aziz uses lexical colouring against Adela in his dialogue with Fielding. After winning the case charged against him, Fielding attempts to persuade him not to ask for financial compensation for his damaged reputation. He suggests that Adela should apologize to him in public, and that he can dictate to him whatever he likes to be signed by her. Dr. Aziz pretends to accept the deal, provided that she signs the following statement:

“Dear Dr. Aziz, I wish you had come into the cave; I am an awful old hag, and it is my last chance.” (APTI: 224).

It is particularly the use of the offensive word hag that evaluates Dr. Aziz’s style content negatively. Adela obviously will not sign such a statement, and that Aziz in putting this impracticable condition wants only to render the deal impossible. It is clear that if Adela agrees to sign what Aziz has suggested, it will be strong evidence against her that it is she who wanted to do the evil at the Caves. On the other hand, Fielding seems to be offended with Aziz for making such an insulting condition and therefore he prefers to close the discussion with him indirectly:

“Well, good night, good night, it’s time to go to sleep after that.” (APTI: 224)

However, the negative impact of Aziz’s remarks against Adela seems to be so huge on him to the extent that he reopens the conversation to reveal his disapproval of what he has said:
"Oh, I wish you wouldn't make that kind of remark...It is the thing in you I can't put with". (APTI: 224)

With this contribution, Aziz realizes that he has done something wrong with Fielding's face by talking badly about Adela. Therefore, he attempts to make a redressive action in terms of seeking solidarity with him:

"I put up all things in you, so what is to be done"

(APTI: 224).

In terms of Hudson⁶ (2003: 114), Dr. Aziz shows "solidarity face" for Fielding. His utterance indicates that he approves everything in him including perhaps his disapproval of calling Adela a "hag".

However, Fielding does not show a positive response to Aziz's initiative. Instead, he highlights the threat or the violation of the rights and obligations balance committed by Aziz:

"Well, you hurt me by saying it; good night" (APTI:224).

In this piece of utterance Fielding sends more than one message to Aziz. First, he reproaches him for passing that shameful negative evaluation on Adela (Calling her a hag). Second, warning him that any verbal attack on Adela means a direct threat to his own face. And third, his act of solidarity in the previous turn does not succeed in softening the face threat he has committed. Therefore, it can be argued here that saving Adela's reputation is more important to Fielding than accepting Aziz's act of solidarity. Thus, all these complexities have, as it is seen, resulted from Aziz's using words and expressions against Adela. The incident causes a

---

⁶ Hudson (2003:114-116) discusses politeness in terms of solidarity and power. He realizes two kinds of face: "solidarity face" and "power face". Solidarity face refers to the appreciation and approval that others show for the kind of person we are, for our behaviours, values, and so on, whereas power face is realized as the negative agreement not to interfere in others' rights and affairs.
Leicester Courting in Forster's *A Room with a View* directly threatened Fielding-Aziz friendship. It would have taken it to a point of no return, had they not shown some wisdom in dealing with the matter. It is worth mentioning here that Fielding could at the end persuade Aziz to let Adela off paying.

Later on when his friend Hamidullah asks him why he let Adela off paying, he answers:

"I have allowed her to keep her fortune and *buy* herself a husband in England, for which it will be very necessary".

(APTI: 238: 239)

In using the verb *buy* in this particular context, Dr. Aziz gives a negative evaluation and impression of Adela that she cannot marry unless she pays someone to marry her. Thus, he raises a highly negative point about her that she is undesired or unwanted by men, and that if one takes the risk of marrying her, it would be merely for her fortune, not for love. His utterance also suggests that even if she succeeds in buying a husband, she will owe that success to Dr. Aziz, for he was generous enough by not demanding financial compensatory reputation damages from her.

It is therefore true to argue that Dr. Aziz in this piece of utterance could successfully convey two different messages. First, he passes a considerable negative evaluation and judgment on Adela. And second, he attracts favorable attention to himself by showing that he is not materialistic or money-grubbing.

4.3.f. Maurice:

Lexical colouring is also found in Forster's posthumously published novel, *Maurice*. For example, Risley shocks us by
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selecting a lexical item in terms of taboo words against his cousin. In his conversation with Chapman and Maurice, Risley starts:

"You didn’t see my cousin wasn’t being human".

"He’s good enough for us; that’s all I know", exploded Chapman. “He’s absolutely delightful.”

“Exactly Eunuchs are;” and he was gone. (Maurice: 34)

The use of the word “Eunuchs” astounds Chapman and raises his uncertainty to the extent that he cannot take his next conversational turn properly:

“Well, I’m______”, exclaimed the other, but with British self control suppressed the verb. (Maurice: 34)

Even Risley himself cannot stand the negative effect of his lexical colouring and immediately leaves the setting after saying it, as Forster tells us through his narrator (see his conversational turn above). Also Maurice is dissatisfied with Risley’s impolite style and suggests that:

“You could call your cousin a shit if you liked, but not a eunuch” (Maurice: 35)

He further describes Risley’s style as “Rotten style”. (Maurice: 35)

At another occasion, Maurice himself employs a lexical choice that carries a value laden judgment. Asked by Clive if his mother interferes in his own affairs, Maurice answers:

“Oh no, she wouldn’t fag herself”. (Maurice: 45).

In using the word fag, Maurice shows no respect to his mother and thus violates the social norm holding between mother and son. The word fag as a verb is UK old fashioned used to be employed for describing activities and jobs done by younger boys for their older ones at a British private school. For example, if a younger boy
fags for an older boy, he does jobs for him (cf. Cambridge Advanced learner’s dictionary: 436). Therefore, it is impolite of Maurice to use this word when he talks about his mother. He could have used the word trouble, for example, which has a more positive connotation than the word fag. The word trouble does not carry the same negative value judgment as does the word fag. Had it been used by Maurice, the meaning conveyed would have become at least neutral, i.e. neither positive nor negative.

It can be argued here that in using this lexical choice, Maurice negotiates his power with his interlocutor. In other words, he wants to show Clive that he doesn’t care for anyone even his mother, and that he can select whatever lexical choices he wants irrespective of the person he talks about or the one he addresses. Although Maurice succeeds to create uncertainty not only to Clive but to the reader also, he sets up a bad impression about himself that he pays no attention and is careless about the basic principles of the rights and obligations or role relations that should be maintained by everyone in society.

Similarly, Clive uses lexical colouring strategy in his dialogue with Maurice when they are involved in discussing a serious topic (religion and belief). Clive gets dissatisfied with Maurice’s contribution and feels that Maurice is not qualified enough to discuss such a serious topic. Commenting on one of his contributions, he says.

“Don’t go hawking out tags like “the redemption” or “the trinity”, (Maurice: 49)
Lexical Colouring in E.M. Forster's Novels

The use of *hawking out* is lexical colouring because it implies selling verses words with more positive connotations, such as invoking. In using this lexical choice, Clive does more than one thing against Maurice. First, he shows his disapproval of what Maurice says in his preceding conversational turn. Second, he passes a negative evaluation on his contribution. And third, he trivializes him along with his speech content. All these things cannot be done by a speaker unless he is in a more powerful position compared to his addressee. It is noteworthy here that Clive is superior to Maurice both in age and education (Clive begins his third year, whereas Maurice is still in the second year at Cambridge) (see Maurice: 37).

One of the most significant benefits of such a communicative strategy is that it saves our time and efforts in exploring the character's linguistic behaviour. Forster makes the reader judge his characters through the language they use and the linguistic choices they adopt. For example, throughout the novel Forster does not tell the reader or even give hints that Maurice is rude and impolite in dealing with others but one linguistic incident may be enough to reveal what is not revealed by Forster. In his dialogue with Clive, for example, Maurice uses a lexical choice that gives the reader a chance to judge him as rude and impolite. He says, addressing Clive.

“All right. Can you mend that bloody bike?” (Maurice: 73)

The use of the word *bloody* shifts Maurice's style drastically to very informal and impolite. It is an obvious clue of Maurice's coarse manners and uncouth behaviours. It is perhaps these
rudeness and vulgarity that lead the dean to send him down from Cambridge.

Even in serious discussions he cannot get rid of his prevailing informality. Consider, for example, his answer for Anne (Clive’s wife), who asks him if he really cares for the poor:

“One must give them a leg up for the sake of the country generally, that’s all.” (Maurice: 146).

The use of leg up instead of, for example, support shifts Maurice’s style to informal, which perhaps does not suit the seriousness of the topic being discussed. The word support has no doubt more positive connotations than leg up, at least with respect to the degree of formality and informality. According to Scotton (1985:116), Maurice negotiates his power by trying to establish “a multi-faceted personality”. In other words, Maurice in the above excerpt deviates from the formal style which is usually expected in such a situation, and thus increases Anne’s uncertainty of explaining his linguistic behaviour.

At another occasion in the novel, Dr. Barry resorts to using a lexical choice implying a negative value laden judgment against Maurice. He says to Maurice, who comes to him for medical consultation about his homosexuality:

“Ah, women! How well I remember when you spouted on the platform at School... The year my poor brother died it was...

You gaped at some master’s wife...” (Maurice: 138)

The use of gape here sounds as lexical colouring with a negative connotation. This is because; it implies two physical actions; sighting and opening mouth. The last one gives a negative
implication of the person being unable to control some parts of his body. Dr. Barry makes use of his powerful position in the dialogue to use this lexical choice against Maurice. The relation between Maurice and Dr. Barry is always asymmetrical, and Dr. Barry always assumes the more powerful role when talking to Maurice (cf. chapter 3, PP. 93-95)

One can argue here that Forster could have made Dr. Barry's utterance more positive or at least neutral if, for example, had let him use the word gaze, which, I think, has a more positive connotation than the word gape. Moreover, using this lexical choice (i.e. gape at) against a homosexual character raises the level of the readers' uncertainty of perceiving his contribution as true, valid and reliable.

Similarly, Mrs. Durham spares no effort to use lexical colouring against Maurice. Consider, for example, this excerpt in her conversation with Maurice and Mr. Borenius:

"Oh, don't brush it off [referring to Maurice's hair which was all yellow with evening primrose pollen]. I like it on your black hair. Mr. Borenius, is he not quite bacchanalian?"

(Maurice: 164).

The use of bacchanalian is lexical colouring implying a negative judgment against Maurice. This is because the meaning of the word bacchanalian implies uncontrolled behaviour and possible sexual activity (cf. Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary p: 78). In using this lexical choice, Mrs. Durham violates the rights and obligations balance holding between her and Maurice, who is her guest. It is quite strange of old Mrs. Durham to use this lexical
choice against her guest. She also attempts to involve Mr. Borenius in passing this negative evaluation against Maurice by asking for his supporting opinion in terms of a challenging question.

"Mr. Borenius, is he not quit bacchanalian?" (Maurice: 164)

Such a challenging question is a feature of powerful language used by speakers who assume the superior role in the conversation. (cf. Scotton, 1985: 103). Using this type of question in this particular context is an attempt made by old Mrs. Durham to gain support from Mr. Borenius for the negative evaluation she had passed on Maurice. However, Mr. Borenius survives the trap very wisely by means of changing the topic of discourse:

"But Mrs. Durham", he persisted, "I understand so distinctly from you that all your servants had been confirmed."

(Maurice: 164).

One more example of lexical colouring is found in the dialogue between Maurice and Clive towards the end of the novel. After thinking that Maurice has recovered from homosexuality, Clive is informed that his ex-lover, Maurice, is in love with the servant Scudder. This announcement shocks Clive and hurts him deeply, "for intimacy with any social inferior was unthinkable to him" (Maurice: 212). Clive assumes that Maurice has become normal, especially after hearing from him that he wants to get married. Therefore, Maurice’s last remark throws its negative shadow on Clive’s style and makes him select a lexical choice that

---

7 Before he starts speaking, Forster describes Mr. Borenius Physical reaction as "[he] raised sightless eyes". This may suggest that he didn’t like old Mrs. Durham’s remark about Maurice.
no doubt causes a negative impact on his addressee. He says, addressing Maurice:

“What a grotesque announcement” (Maurice: 212)

In using the word grotesque Clive passes a negative judgment on Maurice’s contribution in his preceding conversational turn. The word grotesque has two negative implications; it evaluates the content as ridiculous and slightly frightening. His ability of conveying two meanings using one word is a clear evidence of his lexical competence. The word selected is, I think, suitable for describing such a shameful announcement made by Maurice, although it implies a violation of his positive face that Clive does not like some of his wants.

Thus, it can be argued that lexical colouring is a significant linguistic feature existing in all of Forster’s novels. It functions as a communicative strategy and stylistic device. Forster assigns this strategy to his characters to gain ground in conversational exchanges, by controlling both the addressee as well as the conversation. In addition, Forster uses this strategy to reveal many aspects of the social relations demonstrated by the characters in their fictional dialogues. Lexical colouring, thus, has a double function; it is used by the characters as an effective communicative strategy, and by the author as a stylistic device. For more details, however, see the concluding chapter.