when Urban T. Holmes invited me to contribute to this volume in Dr. Schutz’s honor, he wrote me: “The theme of the book will be Lexicography but we are interpreting the term broadly and would like to include stylistics.” Since, as a stylistician, I read any sentence as a palimpsest, I believed to find beneath the lines the following thought: “You know that we would like to have only strict lexicologists as contributors according to the sound principle Άγεμέτρησ μὴ εἰσίτω but since you cannot do such a thing, write something about stylistics; what’s the difference?” This was a challenge and, in order to save face, I thought it would be a good thing to write about a combination of specialties as far as vocabulary is concerned: their separation, mutual penetration, and methodological similarities and disparities. I wished to do this all the more since this problem has been for me, not only a theoretical one, but one that has created difficulties from my earliest scholarly efforts to some rather recent dissertations which I have had to direct. Thus, what I want to submit to your pertinent judgment will be a macédoine, as the French say, of problems, discussions, criticisms, and experiences. My attempt has, beyond these personal considerations, a certain actuality, since
the Russians, as I learn from the latest number of the *Revue de linguistique romane*, have created chairs “de lexicologie et de stylistique.” In our western romance-language camp, the sociologically minded lexicologists would prefer to sever the link between lexicography and stylistics. Therefore, Greimas and Matoré only expect that “la lexicologie entretiendra avec la stylistique des rapports courtois, mais distants.” Other western lexicologists, like Julio Casares who has no less than four chapters on our problem, and G. von Proschwitz, are for closer relations between the two disciplines because: “Bien des fois la création d’un mot nouveau dépend uniquement de considérations de style.”

The point stressed by Von Proschwitz may be considered the most evident among the many relationships between lexicography and stylistics, the point that a stylistic word or meaning creation finally becomes a lexical necessity. Lexicography, the definition and description of the various meanings of the word which are of compulsory acceptance for everybody, makes the entry of an individual word or semanteme only possible when the word starts spreading from an “occasional” application to a “usual” one, according to the terminology of Hermann Paul. At that moment the word becomes free of context and enters a “easier de cases isolées.”

The specific conditions under which a stylistically created word or its personal semantic interpretation has escaped into the lexicon by semantic necessity are difficult to assess. We generally can observe the process only diachronically: e.g., abstracts such as *alliance, ménage, abstinence, faveur, justice,* and *miséricorde* have become as concrete as *ring, married couple, ecclesiastical law, silk ribbon, judge,* and *dagger* had become earlier; yet “idealistic” explanations out of the “spirit”
of an epoch remain unsatisfactory. Albert Douglas Menut, searching for genuine and pseudo-doublets, found that the lexicalization process of a stylistically created learned doublet is slow, hard, and rare. Whether it is due to the humanistic endeavor of Oresme or to an attempt at satirizing pedantism on the part of Rabelais, its lexical acceptance only depends on semantic necessity. To understand this general concept of necessity, it will be well to recur to the precision which Walter von Wartburg gave to Gilliéron's rough concept of unbearable homonymy. At the moment, Von Wartburg explains, when the Gascons were forced to replace gal ("rooster"), because it had become homonymous with gat ("cat"), by something else, they would not have been able just to "invent" a word bigey ("vicaire") for this purpose. A witty mind had compared the cock among the hens to the "vicaire qui a la charge des pieuses et dévotes femmes du village" long before the appearance of this unbearable homonymy made another word mandatory. The individual metaphor chosen by the community at that moment, faute de mieux, then lost its wit and affectivity and became a neutral term for general usage.

New words and meanings crying for lexical admission in general not only find the drawers of the lexicographer closed but are still held back in the stylistic domain by syntactical fetters. Closeness to concrete expressions, linkage to exclamations, blends with the indefinite article, make abstracts temporarily concrete; but severed from such contexts, they simply fall back into their abstractness. Thus the lexicon cannot deduce a usual meaning from Lorca's concretizations: "¡Qué pena tan intensa la fachada sin cristales . . . qué amargura la casona deshabitada!" Since the connection of Spanish female proper names with the mysteries and shrines of Mary (Asun-
ción, Concepción, Anunciación, Dolores, Rosario, Reliquia, Gloria, Pilar, Monserrat) have already prepared speech habits of a strong abstract-concrete twilight, so that a lover may call the beloved one alboroto, arrebato, encanto, espasmo, locura, tortura, obcecación, one would think that such expressions were ready for usual concrete lexical meanings. But this is not the case. They remain in an area of affectivity and, even in contact with those very proper names and clearcut concrete concepts, particularly accompanied by very concrete adjectives, they cannot escape from their stylistic context and from their condition as Augenblicksbildungen (Beinhauer), e.g., “¡Oye, estupefacción morenita—Soledad, mí gloria bendita—encanto, cielo, paraíso!” 11 Olaf Deutschmann lists one single example of an abstract exclamation having become a popular designation of quantity. The usual critical astounded outcry “¡qué barbaridad!” has led to the expression una barbaridad de with the lexical meaning of “many”: una barbaridad de libros.12

Ferdinand de Saussure had already seen that syntagmatic relations in contradistinction to associative relations are not helpful in creating lexical meanings.13 The radical change of the positive meaning of pas, point, personne, rien to negative meanings on a lexical level because of syntactic “contagion,” as Darmstetter called this change, is extremely rare. An associative relationship, on the other hand, may entitle great language makers to impose upon the lexicon meanings occasionally given by them to a special word. A case in point is Victor Hugo’s successful semantic change of fauve from “yellowish red” to “wild,” both qualities referring at first to game.

Modern lexicographers, semanticists, and stylisticians are
agreed on the necessity of looking at words not in isolation but within their word area, their linguistic field. The word area of the lexicographer and that of the stylistician are, however, very different. The lexicographer’s wordfield has to be looked for within the language, that of the stylistician within individual speeches. The lexicographer’s wordfield makes sense only within a diachronic situation, even if he chooses a limited historic layer of words. If this layer is not contrasted with another layer as to shifted meanings and word substitutions, the field primarily analyzed makes no sense, at least not in the concept of Jost Trier, founder of the Wortfeld-Theorie. To him, the relationship between the “feudal” field of knowledge, wisdom, and shrewdness of around 1100 a.d. makes sense only if opposed to the “mystical” field of wisdom, art, and knowledge of around 1300 a.d. Kurt Baldinger has established the notional wordfield with its synchronic and diachronic dimensions as the conditio sine qua non for any scientific lexicography. A lexical wordfield is supposed to reveal, at least as a by-product, usual meanings which are unknown to, or ignored by, the traditional dictionarics. A student of mine, Sr. M. Lucy Tinsley, produced such meanings, e.g., for dévotion and esprit in her wordfield study on spirituality, which has been acknowledged by Vidos as particularly valid among the few wordfield studies existing in the Romance sector because of its diachronical, wide range.

A fence-straddler between lexicography and stylistics is that type of onomatological study which reveals the ideology of an author and, at the same time, the ideology of an epoch on the basis of the meanings distilled from an important word. A case in point is the recent study by Henri Vernay, Les Divers sens du mot “Raison” autour de l’œuvre de Marguerite d’An-

The wordfield study of the stylistician, as already mentioned, makes sense only within the *parole* of a text. His wordfield concerns concepts dependent on a literary, often fictional, frame of information. It is strictly synchronic. If comparative fields are introduced, they have only the purpose of bringing out nuances of meaning with uttermost precision. These nuances are primarily not destined to enter the lexicon but to deepen the understanding of the text. Another student of mine, Sr. Gonzaga L'Heureux, has, with the aid of stylistic wordfields, grasped mystical language; and through it, the spiritual progress and growth of the Ursuline mystic, Venerable Mother Marie de l'Incarnation, O.S.U.18 The originality of her research consists in the discovery that the same word assumes different connotations and new meanings in the new configurations of constantly higher levels of spiritual life. Are such "technical" meanings fit to enter the dictionary? There is, of course, a difference between words of engineering, pharmacology, and chemistry and words of degrees of piety. Therefore such a connoisseur of these matters as J. Dagens actually believes mystical terms should be included in the dictionary, all the more so because the liberal lexicographers of the nineteenth century did not know them or avoided them purposely.19

The adepts of the stylistic wordfield do not operate with the lexicographer's *Feldkern* but with *mots-thèmes* and *mots-
clefs, which spring from the subject matter of a work and the attitude of its author. Pierre Guiraud, who does not know, however, that Leo Spitzer with his Motiv-und-Wortforschung has already paved the way, has combined the motive-word principle with the statistic principle of frequency. He tries to find in any text the highest recurrence of ordinary words (mots-thème) and the frequency of écarts from ordinary basic vocabulary (mots-clefs). Guiraud makes the worst mistake a stylistician (vs. lexicographer) can make: he severs the words from their context, forgetting that the vocabulary he analyzes is, in the final analysis, a contextual vocabulary; and he is not entirely clear in purpose when, by frequency count, he singles out from Corneille's language a specific group of words like mérite, estime, devoir, vertu, générosité, gloire, pouvoir, honneur, coeur ("courage"). They certainly do not represent an area. Guiraud is more articulate in his wordfield studies of the symbolists. Here, he defines the mot-poétique, which is not eligible for the dictionary: "La valeur poétique d'un mot est une association complexe, où le sens . . . est bien moins opérant que d'autres qualités." This brings up the real contextual vocabulary problem which Ullmann calls "semantics of 'la parole.'" Guiraud pays only lip-service to quality and value within his structural type of linguistics.

Much more refined is the study of wordfields in Pascal by Dom Michel Jungo. He constructs, for instance, a field of vanité which contains words like affectation, grimace, air, bigotterie, pédant, brave, se piquer, enfiler, faire monstre. This field is, of course, valid only for Pascal's own ideology and preoccupations, not as a field of general associations which should enter a "dictionnaire d'idées." Now, from Pascal's langage and his esthetic-moral wordfields—considering his
irony, spirituality, biblicism, Augustinianism, Jansenism—Jungo constructs five vocabularies: general; systematic (word-families in the sense of modern dictionaries [Corominas]); analogical (grouping in the sense of Hallig and Von Wartburg); statistic; and lexicological (semantisms worthy of entering the lexicon, e.g., *s'abêtir, divertissement*).

If the stylistician remains in his own domain and does not ape, but explores, lexicographical methods, then he can open new dimensions of a word, as Gérald Antoine has done with Baudelaire’s key word *gouffre*. He develops Baudelaire’s bipolar symbolism according to which *gouffre* means Hell as well as Heaven, torment as well as bliss, and so, as M. Antoine states, do its poetically symbolic synonyms *ciel, mer, chevelure*.

A borderline of lexicography and stylistics might also be drawn between phraseological fixity and verbal mobility within unstable word clusters, phrases, and clauses, just as there is between frozen and living metaphors. The lexicon absorbs all those word-compounds whose elements are not understandable if separated, coined expressions with nuances for which the French language has so many terms: *cliché, dicton, locution courante, formule consacrée, idiotisme, expression proverbiale, tour, tournure*. The lexicographer shares with the stylistician the problem of how much of this phraseological material belongs to the lexicon; and he builds, with the latter, surplus-material dictionaries which are far removed from the basic *Wörterbuch*. These are called stylistic and paremiological dictionaries, *Satzlexica, Le Mot dans la phrase*, etc. In the Spanish sector, the dictionaries of *modismos* and *refranes* play an enormous role. One actually cannot do without the *Gran Diccionario de refranes*, by José María Sharbi, or the Re-
franero español, by Sainz de Robles. Spanish, along this line, cannot be compared with French or Italian, since “l'espagnol est une langue dont le vocabulaire et chaque mot a priori ont un sens large.” The role of the lexicographer when confronted with phraseological material is always a diachronical and explanatory one, the same as it is for the “cultural” words, e.g., estribo (“stirrup,” or “step of a coach”). Why has the phrase “El abad canta donde yanta?” preserved its archaic meaning since the Middle Ages? Why has “Avoir du foin dans ses bottes?” had the same meaning since the sixteenth century? The stylistician will be interested in such frozen locutions only in the stage of their creation, or when affective, stilted, ironical usage within particular social or literary contexts might defrost these archaic expressions. He watches also whether a creative application instils new force into elements of such compounds, which as a whole have been petrified while their single elements are still in flux. Archaism remains, in general, the hallmark of lexical locution.

The now generalized idea of a thesaurus vs. lexicon, based on the principle of the collocation of words, has made considerable inroads in stylistics in France also because the thesaurus lists, in addition to fixed idioms and clichés, all possible variations and constructions. A verb, for instance, like passer would appear, according to the so-called projet Dubois, as case zero (les jours passent), together with ten syntactically conditioned and unconditioned modifications and expansions. This is, however, not as new as it looks, since Caro and Cuervo had already conceived of a Diccionario de construcción y regimen de la lengua castellana which is presently being published in Colombia.

Nothing is more hated by the lexicographer and more loved
by the stylistician than polysemic ambiguity. What equivalent should a lexicographer choose for “translating” the locution, “Je suis la cinquième roue au carrosse,” when according to different situations and environments, it may mean: “I am out of work,” “I am bored,” “Nobody cares for me,” “I am a liability to everyone,” “They are fed up with me”? Actually, he will have to empty the locution of its wealth of psychological nuances by the pale rendering “to be superfluous,” with some possible interpretative hint of affective, conversational, vulgar usage. But the stylistician studying Mallarmé’s sonnet of the white swan, handicapped in his movements by the frozen lake, is urged to ponder the many possible meanings of the expression “des vols qui n’ont pas fui”: a child that dies in innocence; a woman who preserves her virginity at the cost of motherhood; a poet who keeps his great vision in the stage of thought and never betrays it by writing it down; a painter, a “Raphael without hands,” who keeps the concept of ideal beauty from contamination by line and color.

The same problem of handling ambiguity concerns the problem of synonyms. The lexicographer, concerned with conceptual synonyms to be defined and elucidated by antonyms, will be glad if he feels able to make a list of shaded quasi-synonyms within the language. The stylistician will hunt for synonyms which express emotions and, more vaguely still, mixed feelings, and will also include in his synonymic lists of special texts metaphors, metonymies, epithets, and appositions—all of which help to interpret the more psychological than logical synonyms and their, from an aesthetic viewpoint, kaleidoscopic arrangements within a text.

There are cases in which the tasks of the lexicographer and the stylistician fall closely together. The lexicologist, not the
syntactician, has to deal with word formation also. He has to consign to the dictionary words with distinguishable suffixes, be they augmentative or diminutive, and words with original suffixes which have become meaningless, or formal, endings. He has to explain through these actual, or virtual, suffixes the original meaning. From a synchronic viewpoint, there may be at issue a quite normal word, a neologism, an archaism, or a technicism; but diachronically, there is the etymological problem. A classical example is the French word *soleil*. The great Meyer-Lübke once caused hilarity among his colleagues when, as a stylistician-lexicographer, he tried to explain the etymon of this gigantic heavenly body, *soliculus*, by "little" sun instead of treating it as a word of endearment, or a formal substitute, as he finally did in his REW. J. Corominas accounts for the probable shift of "goodly" to "beautiful" in the diminutive *bonito* (from *bueno*) as a normal process in an area of a *kalòs* *k’èγαθως*-concept which almost repeats the vulgar Latin *bellus* from *bonulus* from *bonus*. In languages with very lively suffixes, such as Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese, the lexicographer has been able, as far as suffixes are concerned, even on a synchronic level, to grade word meanings according to notional, emotional, temperamental, evaluative, courteous, effusive, and affective meanings. This has been made clear by Amado Alonso in his telling studies on "Semiología y estilística."  

There exists also a curious circuit from special lexicon, to style, to the general lexicon. Saint-John Perse, because of the number of his readers since he won the Nobel Prize, will be able to bring the obsolete, rare, exotic, technical connotations of his vocabulary into general lexicon consciousness. Giacomo Devoto describes this problem as far as popular terms and
dialectisms are concerned. They can be (says Devoto) if overdone, a misuse; but if used with moderation, they become an artistic fact, an isolated and concrete realization of an expressive exigency; although they are not yet an element of general linguistic tradition, they may become so later.\textsuperscript{31} A case in point is the use of medical terms for the characterization of Charles in \textit{Madame Bovary} as short of brains, and for depicting the boasting pharmacist Homais as proud of his alleged culture. The material is so overwhelming that a bulky dissertation has been written on it.\textsuperscript{32} In Old French, as Halina Lewicka has shown, a use of a suffix for comic intent might bring the word into the dictionary as a neologism; conversely, an ending taken from a dictionary under the necessity of finding a rhyme may create a new learned substitute with solemn-comical implications: \textquoteleft\textquoteleft Jamais je n\textquoteleft\textquoteleft;eus intention / De faire omicidation.\textquoteright\textquoteright \textsuperscript{33} In modern times, one may even follow closely the way by which the realists launch their popularisms into the general lexicon. Flaubert uses italics for words that are not yet \textit{comme il faut}. Balzac justifies them by hinting at their use by vulgar persons.\textsuperscript{34} Their possible diffusion\textsuperscript{35} or short life\textsuperscript{36} decides whether they belong to a dictionary or to a glossary only.

A dubious lexicographer is the maker of a glossary.\textsuperscript{37} His stress on style, degree of intensity, and domain of application are points which, as Weissgerber proposes, ought also to be taken over by the lexicographer. According to Bruno Migliorini, \textquoteleft\textquoteleft Vocabulari dedicati a un singolo autore raccolgono le parole in cui egli se scosta dall\textquoteleft\textquoteleft; uso generale.\textquoteright\textquoteright \textsuperscript{38} Thus the maker of a glossary decides mainly on the \textit{écarts} of a vocabulary; he becomes a lexicographer when he is dedicated to
complete "dizionari metodici d'autori," as they exist in Italy for Carducci, Pascoli, and D'Annunzio, and in France for the "Grands Ecrivains." The complete glossaries often give the lexicographer a new terminus a quo or ad quem for the history of a word. Thus Marcel Cressot, in his Vocabulaire des quinze joies de mariage, found that robe which in the fourteenth century mainly designated the habit d'homme had in the fifteenth a regression of meaning to vêtement de femme. The same Cressot makes a point of the surreptitious intrusion of Huysman's Augenblicksbildungen into the French general lexicon: érotiser, humanitairerie, corédemptrice, intémarbilité (sans souillure). On the reason for this possibility, a word will be said in the next paragraph.

Compromise between lexicography and stylistics is demonstrated by the stylistic dictionary in which, together with the most important words, the current epithets are given. The "outils grammaticaux" are listed together with all their possible constructions; and, finally, an exhaustive list of meanings (not only selected examples) is established for the polysemic "mots-vedettes." On the theoretical level, the question has been raised whether a dictionary has only to contain groups of signs called vocables or units of meaning, "unités lexicales," which enter the dictionary as lexides on their own and by the same right as the vocables. Along the line of successful suffixation, a suffix may actually be "une pédale de la langue et du style," and progressive dictionaries will accept neologisms derived from suffixation which conservative dictionaries reject. From a systematic viewpoint, one could say that in a certain historical moment the associative, situational, sociological, referential context of a word coincides with the operational, functional, syntactic, literary context of the word.
And here Cressot's study on Huysmans may be mentioned again. Huysmans was able to be so creative lexicologically only because the bohemians, on the one hand, and the clergy and educated Catholics, on the other, read the neologisms in the novels of Huysmans as a kind of *déjà vu* experience in their own language. Here also lies the justification, if any, for Georges Matoré's inclusion of the prose works of Gautier on the same level with catalogues, advertisements, special lexicons, and whatnot, when he assesses *Le Vocabulaire et la société sous Louis Philippe* by "champs notionnels" and "mots temoins." His enterprise, more sociological than linguistic, leaves only a very small margin for stylistics, perhaps in his distinction between "néologismes littéraires-plaisants" and "néologismes proprement dits." 

Confronted with the newest quantitative-mathematical and deterministic lexicography, the stylistician has to bow out. At least Pierre Guiraud gives him this advice: "La langue est entraînée dans le déterminisme statistique suivant ses lois propres. . . . La méthode la plus simple consiste à comparer le vocabulaire d'un texte avec une liste de fréquence. . . . Les spéculations sur la valeur stylistique . . . sont . . . dangereuses." A stylistician cannot accept this "conception bien connue qui établit une hiérarchie des sciences selon le degré plus ou moins élevé de leur mathématisation." Since the linguists have tried to supplant the linguists, the lexicologists are looking for other fellow travelers from the field of cybernetics, communication, and logistics. Their ideal has become high-speed computation of lexico-statistical indices with the aid of IBM electronic data-processing machines.
tactical context—which makes a shambles out of any mentalistic and humanistic tradition—there is no room for the “esprit de finesse.” The stylistician cannot do without this, however. Can the lexicographer? I do not think that a machine would be the right instrument to handle and compute such favorite words of the troubadors as pretz, valor, joy, and joven.
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