Giulia Gerbi

καινῶς εἴρηται: The concept of novelty (καινότης) in the *Praeparatio sophistica*

1 Introduction: Novelty in literature and erudition between criticism and appreciation

To provide readers with a useful guide to correct Attic was a major but not unique aim of Phrynichus' *Praeparatio sophistica*. With his imposing work, Phrynichus wished to offer his intended readers – aspiring rhetoricians – a well-rounded linguistic and stylistic education, in order to make them capable not only to acquire proficiency in correct Attic Greek, but also to master different registers depending on genre and context on a case-by-case basis. As proof of such purpose, the epitome still preserves the traces of an articulate evaluative vocabulary meant to inform the readers on the genre, register, and communicative occasion for which a form is suitable, or else on the group of speakers from whom a certain usage is expected.[1] The evaluation of style is given room too: criteria such as pleasantness, elegance, efficacy, visual power, conciseness, and originality (expressed by the adjectives καλός, φιλότιμος, χρήσιμος, ἐναργής, σύντομος, and καινός) now and then surface in the *PS*. Among these, the category of καινότης ('novelty', 'originality'), stands out for recurring more frequently than the others in the *PS*, in both the epitome and in the indirect tradition. Phrynichus' interest in καινότης that emerges from the *PS* is also openly borne out by Photius, who remarks that the *PS* collects expressions 'which are formulated and structured in an elegant and original manner' in his *Bibliotheca*.[2]

The concept of novelty plays an important role in Greek culture as a whole, which experiences and remarks it in various areas since its beginnings. D'Angour (2011, 13) notes that the relevance attributed to novelty is peculiar to Greek civilisation:

> These different kinds of novelty are remarked on by Greek poets, artists and thinkers in a more direct, ample and self-conscious manner than can be found in the surviving docu-

1 For an exhaustive list of the evaluative terminology featuring in the *PS*, see Tribulato (this volume).

2 Phot. *Bibl.* cod. 158.100a.36–7: τῶν χαριέντως τε καὶ καινοπρεπῶς εἰρημένων τε καὶ συντεταγμένων.

Open Access. © 2025 the author(s), published by De Gruyter. This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.
https://doi.org/10.1515/9783111580319-006

> ments of any other ancient culture; and the notion of innovation (*kainotomiā, to kainon*) is more regularly and explicitly raised by Greek authors than in any earlier corpus of ancient texts.

As far as the vocabulary denoting novelty is concerned, D'Angour (2011, 66–73) discusses the differences between the two Greek words for 'new' – νέος and καινός, with their respective cognates – highlighting that, although in many cases they eventually overlap, they originally express different semantic aspects of the concept of 'new'. The already Mycenaean νέος, which is attested, together with its cognates, since Homeric Greek, refers to chronological novelty, meaning 'recent' or 'young'. καινός, which spreads through Classical Greek from the early 5th century BCE onwards,[3] represents instead an intentional and subjective novelty, meaning 'innovative', 'original': καινότης thus denotes a concept of novelty connected to the productive originality of the craftsman and of the author. As pointed out in D'Angour's reconstruction of the semantic spectrum of novelty (22, fig. 1), whereas νέος is purely descriptive, καινός implies an evaluation.

When it touches the sphere of society and religion, novelty is often perceived as a threat, for in these areas the Greeks tend to be conservative and to resist change; this is for instance illustrated by the fact that one of the charges levelled against Socrates was the accusation of καινοτομεῖν 'to innovate': see e.g. Pl. *Euthphr*. 3b.6–7: (ΕΥΘ.) ὡς οὖν καινοτομοῦντός σου περὶ τὰ θεῖα γέγραπται ταύτην τὴν γραφήν, '(Euthyphro) So, he has brought the indictment against you for making innovations in religion'.[4] When innovation concerns literature, language, and style, by contrast, it is often viewed with interest, and καινός often expresses a positive evaluation. Novelty is presented as a desirable feature for poetic invention since Homer: see *Od*. 1.351–2: τὴν γὰρ ἀοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι, | ἥ τις ἀϊόντεσσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται, 'for men praise that song the most that comes the newest to their ears'[5] and is more than once referred to in

3 D'Angour (2011, 71–2) identifies the first certain literary occurrence of καινός in Bacchylides (19.31), but the word could already feature in Archilochus (fr. 91.31 West. The text is uncertain: West 1998, 34 prints καινῶν but foresees the possibility of reading κλίνων in the apparatus).

4 Transl. North Fowler (1914, 11). See also the phrasing κόμμα καινόν, 'new coinage [Gods]' in Ar. *Ra*. 890, expressing Dionysus' disdain for the new deities invoked by Euripides (cf. Del Corno 1985, 210).

5 Transl. Murray (1919, 39). According to West (in Heubeck, West, Hainsworth 1988, 119), by 'newest song' Telemachus means poetic originality (see also D'Angour 2011, 184–8), but the passage is open to different interpretations and touches on many issues, notably the modes of poetic inspiration, and the poet's standing in respect of his audience and of the dominant social group (in this case, Penelope's suitors). Telemachus' words on Phemius' song have been the subject of a rich harvest of studies; the passage has recently been discussed in detail by Borsoni Ciccolungo (2016, 21–43, with bibliography). According to Borsoni Ciccolungo (2016, 43), Telemachus, being

lyric, when poets ask the Muses for inspiration of innovative verses or claim the novelty of their poetry (see e.g. Pi. *O*. 3.4: μοι νεοσίγαλον εὑρόντι τρόπον 'When I found out a sparkling new mode').[6] Pindar plays a decisive role in shaping the concept of poetic novelty and, accordingly, a specific vocabulary that describes it, anticipating, even if at a very early stage, ideas that will be developed by Hellenistic literary criticism.[7] In Classical literature there is abundance of references to novelty as a desirable quality:[8] Aristophanes provides some famous examples, as it is the case in *Nu*. 545–8,[9] where the poet praises his innovations:

> κἀγὼ μὲν τοιοῦτος ἀνὴρ ὢν ποιητὴς οὐ κομῶ
> οὐδ' ὑμᾶς ζητῶ 'ξαπατᾶν δὶς καὶ τρὶς ταὔτ' εἰσάγων,
> ἀλλ' αἰεὶ καινὰς ἰδέας εἰσφέρων σοφίζομαι,
> οὐδὲν ἀλλήλαισιν ὁμοίας καὶ πάσας δεξιάς.
>
> And I myself, being a poet of the same kind, do not act like a bigwig, nor try to fool you by presenting the same material two or three times; rather I have the skill to present novel ideas every time out, none of them like the others and all of them ingenious.

Innovative formulations are also commended in *Frogs* since the prologue, where Dionysus warns Xanthias against telling the same joke on the weight of his burden.[10] A positive assessment of literary novelty is also made by Aristotle, who includes τὸ καινοτόμον, 'novelty', among the qualities of the Platonic dialogues, for which he expresses admiration: *Pol*. 1265a.10–2: τὸ μὲν οὖν περιττὸν ἔχουσι

informed from Athena about Odysseus' vicissitudes, perceives Phemius' performance on the *Nostoi* as a 'newest song', for it tells contemporary and ongoing events. In this reconstruction, νέος would refer to the Odyssey's materials and underline the exceptionality of Odysseus' return.

6 On the novelty to which Pindar refers, see Catenacci in Gentili *et al.* (2013, 417–8).

7 See Borsoni Ciccolungo (2016, 116–30) (in particular 130), discussing Pi. *N*. 8.19–23, in which the novelty of poetic *inventio* is put in relation to a rupture with the tradition which is likely to attract envy and disparagement (φθόνος). On the concept of novelty in poetry and its evolution from Pindar to the Hellenistic age, see Borsoni Ciccolungo (2011).

8 The examples here provided are by no means an exhaustive review of the many texts that deal with, or refer to, literary innovation. A more complete picture is found in D'Angour (2011), Borsoni Ciccolungo (2016), where these and many other passages are discussed.

9 Novelty, which often features in Aristophanes' comedies, is a recurrent theme in *Clouds*, where the conflict between old and new is crucial and the notion of καινότης is repeatedly associated to discourse: note, for instance, that the chorus tells the Wrong argument that he must come up with an original discourse if he wants to stand a chance to defeat his rival (*Nu*. 1031: δεῖ σε λέγειν τι καινόν, 'you need to say something new') and that Pheidippides is called the champion of new discourses (*Nu*. 1397: καινῶν ἐπῶν).

10 See Ar. *Ra*. 1–18. The reference is to a repertory joke in Comedy: the comic poets Phrynichus, Lycis, and Ameipsias are called into question for their resorting to such trivial humour (on the passage, see Del Corno 1985, 155–7; Dover 1993, 191–2).

πάντες οἱ τοῦ Σωκράτους λόγοι καὶ τὸ κομψὸν καὶ τὸ καινοτόμον καὶ τὸ ζητητικόν 'Now, all Socrates' discourses (i.e. by Plato) have brilliance, cleverness, novelty and are keen to inquiry'.[11] Finally, novelty in language and style is usually valued by ancient erudition; scholia often express appreciation for innovation inasmuch as it represents a variation (ποικιλία) which avoids monotony and attracts the reader's attention (see Nünlist 2009, 198–201). In rhetoric too, the criterion of novelty is employed for evaluating style; Hermogenes, for instance, uses καινοπρεπής ('novel') for σχήματα in *Id.* 1.12, 248 Rabe. Novelty encompasses various traits and focuses on various aspects of style, grammar, and vocabulary: it may consist, depending on the genre, in the variation of epithets and formulae and in the avoidance of homoioteleuton (all related to poetry), in the change of the grammatical case, in the choice of rare words, or of uncommon figures of speech (all related to prose: see D'Angour 2011, 207–9; Nünlist 2009, 199). These devices, carefully measured, contribute to create stylistic originality and to make the reader attentive and pleased, increasing the text's communicative efficiency.

Nevertheless, innovation can breed discontent also when it concerns literature and art: a prime and well known example is the contempt of some comic authors – among which Aristophanes and Pherecrates – for the musical innovations which took place in the last decades of the 5th century.[12] There is no shortage of cases in which innovation in language and style is perceived and presented as a disliked trait, in particular when it results in artificiality and obscureness. Comedy offers some examples of mockery of people using abstruse language: see, for instance, the comic fragment attributed to Strato (fr. 1), where a cook is called Σφίγγ(α) ἄρρεν(α) ('a male Sphinx') for his puzzling use of καινὰ ῥήματα ('new words') that his employer cannot understand.[13] It is possibly also the case of Ar. fr. 719 (cf. Phryn. *PS* fr. *236): ῥήματά τε κομψὰ καὶ παίγνι' ἐπιδεικνύναι | πάντ' ἀπ' ἀκροφυσίων κἀπὸ καναβευμάτων ('To display refined expressions and jokes all [fresh] from bellows and frameworks'); the distich, which metaphorically alludes to innovation in language, could be originally part of an invective discredit-

11 But note that according to Halliwell (2006, 197–9) the vocabulary's choice leaves some room for ambiguity. Although recognising Aristotle's appreciation for Plato's dialogues, Halliwell highlights the ambivalence of κομψός and καινοτόμος, this latter in particular being often 'associated with negative judgements on change and instability' (Halliwell 2006, 199).

12 On Aristophanes' criticism toward the new dithyramb, see Zimmermann (2008, 117–28). On Pherecrates, fr. 155, see Napolitano in Franchini (2020, 242–94), with a rich bibliography.

13 See De Martin (2025, 323–402, in particular 354–61, on the fragment's interpretation; 364–5, on the expression καινὰ ῥήματα).

ing someone for his abstruse use of language.[14] καινολογία ('novel language', perceived as a 'strange language', see LSJ, s.v.) features among the flaws that Dionysius of Halicarnassus – who, in *Lys*. 3, advocates for a 'natural' style and does not welcome deviations from it[15] – reproaches to Lysias' predecessors:

> τοῖς δὲ προτέροις οὐχ αὕτη ἡ δόξα ἦν, ἀλλὰ βουλόμενοι κόσμον τινὰ προσεῖναι τοῖς λόγοις ἐξήλλαττον τὸν ἰδιώτην καὶ κατέφευγον εἰς τὴν ποιητικὴν φράσιν, μεταφοραῖς τε πολλαῖς χρώμενοι καὶ ὑπερβολαῖς καὶ ταῖς ἄλλαις τροπικαῖς ἰδέαις, ὀνομάτων τε γλωττηματικῶν καὶ ξένων χρήσει καὶ τῶν οὐκ εἰωθότων σχηματισμῶν τῇ διαλλαγῇ καὶ τῇ ἄλλῃ καινολογίᾳ καταπληττόμενοι τὸν ἰδιώτην.
>
> [Lysias'] predecessors did not have the same opinion. Whenever they wished to add colour to their speeches, they abandoned ordinary language and resorted to artificial expression. They used a plethora of metaphors, exaggerations, and other forms of figurative language, and further confused the ordinary members of their audiences by using recondite and exotic words, and by resorting to unfamiliar figures of speech and other novel modes of expression (transl. Wiater 2011, 322, adapted).

The framework I have described above is by no means exhaustive: it has the sole purpose of emphasising the crucial role that the concept of novelty had in Greek literary and erudite production in its multiple perspectives, at times positive (inasmuch as it concerns narratological or linguistic innovation, differentiation from an established tradition, or it is a useful rhetorical device), at times negative (inasmuch as potentially abstruse, and a hindrance to communicative effectiveness).[16]

14 Bagordo (2018, 472–6). A disparaging sense was already imagined by Mattusch (1975, 316). However, several critics understand the passage oppositely, as a praise of linguistic and stylistic innovation; for more detail see Gerbi (2023a), with bibliography.

15 On Dionysius of Halicarnassus' theory on language and style, see De Jonge (2008). Note that Dionysius also uses καινοτομέω meaning that a theory does not rest on solid foundation in *Comp*. 25.67: καὶ ὅτι ἀληθῆ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ καὶ οὐδὲν ἐγὼ καινοτομῶ, 'And that this is true and that I am not inventing anything'.

16 An interesting passage in this respect occurs in the description of an anepigraphic historical writing by Agatharchides contained in Photius' *Bibliotheca* (cod. 213.171a.6–b.17 = *BNJ* 86 T 2). While presenting the style of this text, Photius comments that 'it is the case that this man, judging by what we have learned by going through his work, is distinguished and sententious, delighting more than other writers in the grandeur and dignity of his style, but not at all employing unknown words (λέξεσι μέντοι λογάσιν οὐ πάνυ προστεθειμένος), and not employing common words throughout the whole of his narrative, and not making up new words himself (γεννῶν δὲ αὐτὸς οὐ λέξεις). But, a craftsman in the use of words, if ever there was one, by creating a kind of novel appearance but not with novel words, he perfects his style (καινήν τινα μὴ καιναῖς κεχρημένος λέξεσι φαντασίαν πέμπουσαν ἀποτελεῖ τὴν φράσιν). He so ably creates his work that his innovation does not seem to be an innovation (ὡς τήν τε καινοτομίαν μὴ δοκεῖν εἶναι καινοτομίαν) and he furnishes clarity not less than that provided by usual words (καὶ τὸ σαφὲς οὐκ ἔλαττον τῶν ἐξ ἔθους λέξεων παρέχειν)' (cod. 213.171a.27–38; transl. Burstein 2012, adapted).

In what follows, I will examine how and to what extent the idea of novelty is developed within the framework of Atticist lexicography (section 2), and by Phrynichus in particular, focusing on some glosses of the *PS* (section 3) and of its indirect tradition (section 4) that usefully illustrate how this concept is treated in the lexicon and help us reconstructing Phrynichus' theory of style, also in the light of the epitomising process that the lexicon underwent (section 5).

2 Novelty in Atticist lexica: A peculiar trait of Phrynichus' theory of style

Although the concept of novelty was very much present in both literature and erudition, it is extremely rare in Atticist lexicography. The one notable exception is represented by Phrynichus, who develops this concept more frequently in his *PS*, so much so that the interest in novelty can be considered a distinctiveness of his with respect to the rest of Atticist scholarship.

Considering indeed Moeris' lexicon, Pollux's *Onomasticon* and the *Antiatticist* as a control group for the treatment of the terminology of καινότης by Atticist lexicographers,[17] it emerges that the occurrences of καινός and καινότης as evaluative terms are, in comparison, very scarce. Only two parallels are to be found: one in Moeris and one in Pollux. In Moeris, καινός qualifies the adverbs ἀλλαχόθι, ἀλλαχόθεν, and ἀλλαχοῦ, with the expansion -αχ- between the stem and the ending, which are compared to the series ἄλλοθι, ἄλλοθεν, and ἄλλοσε:

> Moer. α 18: ἄλλοθι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλοσε Ἀττικοί· ἀλλαχόθι ἀλλαχόθεν ἀλλαχοῦ καινότερον Ἀττικοί καὶ Ἕλληνες.
>
> ἄλλοθι ('elsewhere'), ἄλλοθεν ('from another place'), ἄλλοσε ('elsewhither') [are used by] Attic-speakers; ἀλλαχόθι ('elsewhere'), ἀλλαχόθεν ('from another place'), ἀλλαχοῦ ('elsewhere') [are] recently [used by] both Attic-speakers and Greek-speakers'.

This entry poses some problems. Along with being the only occurrence of this use of καινός, otherwise unparalleled in Moeris' lexicon, the gloss as we read it,[18] with the pericope 'καινότερον Ἀττικοί καὶ Ἕλληνες', is found only in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 (C), which belongs to the Parisian recension, whereas the manuscripts of the Vati-

17 On a possible occurrence of καινότης in Pausanias' lexicon see below (note 300).

18 Hansen (1998, 72). Note that the actual distribution of the readings in the manuscript tradition differs from what is recorded in Hansen's apparatus. I thank Maria Giovanna Sandri and Andrea Pellettieri for their valuable advice on the manuscript transmission of this gloss.

can recension, cod. Laur. Plut. 91. sup. 10 (F), cod. Vat. gr. 1882 (V), and cod. Darmstadt 2773 (D), actually transmit a different text. Indeed, D, whose text is abridged, omits the pericope, F has κοινόν ('common'), while V has κοινότερον ('more common'). The forms of κοινός transmitted by the Vatican recension would perfectly fit Moeris' schema Ἀττικοί vs. Ἕλληνες, often rendered as Ἀττικοί vs. κοινός, and it would be plausible that Moeris discourages the use of ἀλλαχόθι, ἀλλαχόθεν, and ἀλλαχοῦ for their being typical of common language. However, notwithstanding the disagreement between the two recensions and the isolation of καινότερον, this reading is perhaps worth defending as being *difficilior*. The confusion between καινός and κοινός is of course paleographically common, but in this context, it seems more likely for καινότερον to have been corrupted into a form of κοινός rather than the other way around, if only because a scribe could easily be led to favour κοινός for its consistency with the lexicon's structure. In Moeris' passage, in any case, καινός is unlikely to be referred to stylistic evaluation, as it is in Phrynichus, and it is rather intended in a chronological sense, in order to assign the two series of words to two different chronological phases of Attic.[19]

The passage of the *Onomasticon,* in which καινός is applied to the use of τραπεζοφόρον ('table-stand') in place of τράπεζα ('table'), is a rather different case:

> Poll. 10.69: ἔξεστι δὲ τὴν τράπεζαν, ἐφ' ᾗ τὰ ἐκπώματα κατάκειται, τετράπουν τε τράπεζαν εἰπεῖν καὶ μονόπουν, καὶ εἴ τις βούλοιτο φιλοτιμεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν καινότητα τῆς χρήσεως, τραπεζοφόρον. <οὐκ> ἐπὶ τούτου μὲν γὰρ εὗρον τοὔνομα ἐν τοῖς Ἀριστοφάνους Γεωργοῖς· ἐπεὶ δ' οὖν εἴρηται ὁ τραπεζοφόρος, ἔστι καταχρῆσθαι τῷ ὀνόματι ἐκεῖ ῥηθέντι ἐπὶ τοῦ τὴν τράπεζαν φέροντος, ᾗ ἐπῆσαν τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αἱ μυρρίναι.
>
> It is possible to call the table on which the drinking-cups lie, τετράπους τράπεζα ('four-footed table') and μονόπους τράπεζα ('one-footed table'), and, if one wants to aspire to the novelty of use, τραπεζοφόρον ('table-stand'). Indeed, I <do not> find the word used with this meaning in Aristophanes' *Farmers* (fr. 127): since it is said ὁ τραπεζοφόρος, it is possible that the word here said [i.e. in the passage] applies to [the person] who carries the table on which laid the myrtle-wreath for the magistrates.[20]

19 Since ἄλλοθι, ἄλλοθεν, and ἄλλοσε are already Homeric forms, Moeris is likely to consider them as being representative of an old phase of Attic. On Moeris accepting Homeric forms as being proto-Attic see Swain (1996, 56). Whereas ἀλλαχόθι is attested later, ἀλλαχόθεν and ἀλλαχοῦ are both attested in Attic authors of the 5th century (among others: Antiphon, Lysias, Aeschylus, and Sophocles); they thus stand a good chance of being accepted by Moeris, not proscribed for being 'common' as in the reading of cod. F. Note, however, that according to the LSJ (s.v. ἀλλαχοῦ) ἀλλαχόθι, ἀλλαχόθεν, ἀλλαχοῦ would be discouraged by Moeris' as being less Attic.

20 Blaydes (1885, 56) suggested emending ἄρχουσιν into ᾄδουσιν ('those who sing'). On this fragment see Bagordo (2022, 45–6); Ceccarelli (2019, 256–8); Pellegrino (2015, 96).

Here καινότης refers to the use of τραπεζοφόρον[21] as a synonym of τράπεζα ('table'). Since τραπεζοφόρον is likely to be a recent word (see Valente 2013, 156, n. 69), unattested in Classical Greek, Pollux may simply link novelty to the use of recent vocabulary. Nevertheless, here καινότης is presented as a trait which one can value and aspire to – arguably in order to impress one's audience, readers, or interlocutors – and may also denote an innovative, not only modern, linguistic use. Pollux's use of καινότης as a criterion pertaining to style in this passage nears the conception of novelty that we find in Phrynichus, who frequently develops it within the framework of his theory of style.

3 Phrynichus on style: καινότης as evaluative category in the *PS*

As the comparison with Atticist lexica demonstrates, the attention to novelty is a distinctive interest of Phrynichus. A further distinction must be drawn between his works, for in the *Eclogue* the notion of καινότης is anything but frequent: here, the unique occurrence of an evaluative καινός is in Phryn. *Ecl*. 330 (on which see below). On the contrary, καινότης is well represented in the *PS*, to the point that this evaluative category still survives despite the heavy epitomisation that the work suffered. The text of the *PS* that we read in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 preserves six entries where καινός is used to underline the novelty of a form:

> Phryn. *PS* 65.20–1: ἔξηβον· τοῦτο καινόν. καθωμιλημένον τὸ ἔξωρον.
>
> ἔξηβον ('past his youth') (Aesch. *Th*. 11): This word is original. ἔξωρον ('too old') is used currently.
>
> Phryn. *PS* 75.19: ἰσῆλιξ· καινότερον τοῦ ἡλικιώτης.
>
> ἰσῆλιξ ('equal in age'): It is more original than ἡλικιώτης.
>
> Phryn. *PS* 94.21–95.4: οὐδὲ πάτταλον ἂν δοίης· Ὅμηρος τὸ ἄγριον καὶ ἄξενον δηλῶν 'οὐδ' ἄλα ἂν δοίη' περί τινος ἔφη. Ἀριστοφάνης μεταβαλὼν ἐπὶ τὸ καινότερον 'οὐδὲ πάτταλον', εἶπε, 'δίδωσι'. πάτταλον γὰρ κἀν ταῖς ὁδοῖς ἐρριμένον ἔστιν εὑρεῖν. δύναται συμβολικῶς εἰπεῖν τὸν διὰ βρόχου θάνατον.

21 Pollux here attests to the use of the neuter τὸ τραπεζοφόρον (see LSJ and *GE,* s.v. τραπεζοφόρος), as it is arguable from the following disambiguation with the masculine (ὁ τραπεζοφόρος) occurring in Ar. fr. 127. Latin borrowed this form as *trapezophorum* (neuter, see Cic. *Fam*. 7.23.3).

You would not even give a spike: Homer (*Od.* 17.455) says of someone 'You would not even give some salt', to signify that he is harsh and unwelcoming. Aristophanes (fr. 939), transforming [it] into a more original [expression] said: 'They do not even give a spike'. For a spike [is something so worthless that it] can even be found thrown down in the streets. It can be said, symbolically, of death by hanging.

Phryn. *PS* 99.14–9: πολιτοκοπεῖν· καινότερον τοῦ δημοκοπεῖν, καὶ ἔοικε ταὐτὸν σημαίνειν. κόπτειν δὲ νῦν ἐστι τὸ λιπαρῶς ἐγκεῖσθαι καὶ πείθειν παρὰ γνώμην. καὶ πολιτοκόπος καὶ δημοκόπος. Πλάτων δὲ ἐν Πεισάνδρῳ τὸ πολιτοκοπεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ λοιδορεῖν καὶ κωμῳδεῖν εἶπεν.

πολιτοκοπεῖν: '[It is] more original than δημοκοπεῖν, and it seems to have the same meaning ('to court the mob'). Here, κόπτειν means 'to urge insistently' and 'to persuade contrary to [someone's] opinion'. [From κόπτω one] also has πολιτοκόπος and δημοκόπος ('who courts the mob', 'demagogue'). Yet Plato (Comicus), in [his] *Pisander* [fr. 113], used πολιτοκοπεῖν with the meanings 'to reproach' and 'to ridicule'.

Phryn. *PS* 116.9–13: Ὑπερθεμιστοκλῆς· καινοτάτη ἡ φωνή. σημαίνει οἷον ὑπὲρ Θεμιστοκλέα τῇ σοφίᾳ. ὅμοιον Ὑπερπερικλῆς καὶ Ὑπερσωκράτης καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον. ἀλλὰ κἀπὶ τοὐναντίου Ὑπερευρύβατος ὁ ὑπερβάλλων Εὐρύβατον πονηρίᾳ.

Ὑπερθεμιστοκλῆς ('a super-Themistocles'): This form is very original. It means that someone exceeds Themistocles in wisdom. In like manner, [one could say] Ὑπερπερικλῆς ('a super-Pericles'), Ὑπερσωκράτης ('a super-Socrates') or the like. But, on the contrary, Ὑπερευρύβατος ('a super-Eurybatus') is someone who exceeds Eurybatus in wickedness.

Phryn. *PS* 120.1–2: ὑπασθενεῖν· καινῶς τὸ ἀπάρχεσθαι ἀσθενεῖν καὶ μήπω κατέχεσθαι φανερῶς ὑπὸ τῆς νόσου.

ὑπασθενεῖν ('to feel unwell'): [It is used for saying], in an original way, that one is starting to feel sick and has still not been visibly seized by illness.

An initial analysis reveals that most of the forms commented on are *hapax legomena* (as Ὑπερθεμιστοκλῆς and similar compounds and ὑπασθενέω) or extremely rare words (as it is the case for ἔξηβος and πολιτοκοπέω). It is also remarkable that the criterion of καινότης often applies to a comparison between two forms: this is confirmed by the fact that καινός is mostly used in the comparative (three times: *PS* 75.19, 94.21–95.4, 99.14–9; note also the superlative in *PS* 116.9–13).

The entries concerning ἔξηβος (*PS* 65.20–1), ἰσῆλιξ (*PS* 75.19), and πολιτοκοπέω (*PS* 99.14–9) offer an interesting case study for the use of καινός in the *PS*. The three glosses, displaying the same use of καινός and sharing the same structure (A καινότερον τοῦ B), present the respective lemma as being rarer and more original than a concurring synonym. When, in *PS* 65.20–1, Phrynichus underlines the novelty of the adjective ἔξηβος ('past his youth'), he is not likely to be thinking about a chronological newness, especially since the word is already used by Ae-

schylus (*Th*. 11), but he intends rather to highlight the originality and rarity of the form compared to ἔξωρος: the latter must have been common in his time, since its use peaks precisely in the 2nd century CE. This interpretation of καινότης is confirmed by both the fact that ἔξηβος is nearly a *hapax* in Ancient Greek (its only other extant occurrence is found, centuries later, in Libanius, *Or*. 64.59) and that καινός is opposed to another evaluative term undoubtedly referring to the frequency of use: καθωμιλημένος 'current'.[22] Incidentally, this is the only extant case in the *PS* in which καινότης is opposed to another evaluative criterion offering a benchmark for its understanding,[23] whereas the fact that in all other entries it stands alone makes it more challenging to appreciate its meaning.

PS 99.14–9 compares πολιτοκοπέω 'to court the mob' to its synonym δημοκοπέω (note that Phrynichus states this synonymy cautiously, by using ἔοικε). Here too, καινός is unlikely to have a chronological meaning. After dealing with the semantics and etymology of πολιτοκοπέω, Phrynichus gives a stylistic evaluation highlighting the originality of the verb compared to the morphologically similar and more common synonym δημοκοπέω. The two verbs are mainly distinguishable for their frequency of use: whereas πολιτοκοπέω and its cognates mostly occur in the lexicographical tradition, δημοκόπος and compounds are more widely attested.[24] The case of ἰσῆλιξ, which *PS* 75.19 defines as more original than ἡλικιώτης, is similar: its only classical occurrence is in Xenophon (*Smp*. 8.1), whereas its synonym ἡλικιώτης occurs dozens of times in authors belonging to the Attic canon (among others, Aristophanes, Plato, and Demosthenes).

One can infer from these entries that Phrynichus presents as original forms which he finds in classical authors but are infrequently, if not uniquely, attested.[25] Having ascertained that in these entries καινός has no chronological references but is rather part of the vocabulary of Phrynichus' theories on style, it is worth asking what role these rare expressions had in his linguistic and stylistic theory. If, on the one hand, they could be considered as a valuable resource to attain linguistic distinction, on the other hand, they could also be seen as peculiar features to use with caution: the text of the entries as we have it prevents us from reaching ultimate conclusions. As regards *PS* 75.19, since Xenophon's status is not firm in the Atticist canon, one may wonder if the fact that ἰσῆλιξ only occurs in Xenophon is, in itself,

22 On ἔξηβος, see Gerbi (2023b), with bibliography.

23 The same opposition occurs once in the *PS*'s indirect tradition, in Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101), see below; this may suggest that, originally, the contrast between καινός and καθωμιλημένος, or else other evaluative vocabulary, could be more often found in the *PS*.

24 On πολιτοκοπέω see Gerbi (2024d), with bibliography.

25 On Phrynichus' interest in rare expressions and *hapax legomena*, a concern which peculiarly features in the *PS*, see Monaco, this volume.

a good reason to discourage the form in Phrynichus' eyes. Nevertheless, a negative sense of καινότης, although possible, would collide with what we can infer from the indirect tradition of the *PS*, where καινότης is acknowledged as a value.

4 The category of καινότης in the indirect tradition of the *PS*

The *Synagoge* and Photius' *Lexicon*, central to the indirect tradition of the *PS*, preserve items which confirm the relevance of καινότης in Phrynichus' lexicon. In Photius' lexicon, ten entries display the καινότης terminology[26] and provide us with further precious information on how Phrynichus employed this criterion:[27]

> Σ^b α 243 (= Phot. α 101, *ex* Σ´´), cf. Phryn. *PS* fr. *5: ἀγανακτῶ σου· καινὸν τὸ σχῆμα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ θαυμάζω σου καὶ ἄγαμαί σου καθωμίληται, τὸ δὲ ἀγανακτῶ σου καινὸν καὶ σπάνιον. χρηστέον δὲ τῷ σχήματι διὰ τὴν καινότητα, φησὶ Φρύνιχος.
>
> ἀγανακτῶ σου ('I am angry with you'): The construction is innovative; θαυμάζω σου and ἄγαμαί σου ('I admire you') are in fact current, but ἀγανακτῶ σου is innovative and infrequent. One should use this construction because of its novelty, Phrynichus says.
>
> Σ^b α 304 (= Phot. α 273, *ex* Σ´´), cf. Phryn. *PS* fr. *66: ἄγρυκτα καὶ ἄλεκτα πέπονθα· τὸ μὲν ἄγρυκτά ἐστιν ὥστε μηδὲ γρύξαι διὰ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν τῶν κακῶν· γρύξαι δέ ἐστι τὸ βραχύτατον φθέγξασθαι, ὃ καὶ ἀναρθρόν ἐστι, μυγμῷ ἢ στεναγμῷ παραπλήσιον. κέχρηται δὲ αὐτῷ καινότατα Φερεκράτης· '(A) τί δ' ἔπαθες; | (B) ἄγρυκτα καὶ ἄλεκτα· ἀλλὰ βούλομαι μόνῃ | αὐτὴ φράσαι σοι'.[28]
>
> I have suffered unspeakable and indescribable things: ἄγρυκτα ('unspeakable') is [when someone] cannot even speak (γρύζω) out of the enormity of the evils; γρύζω means to utter a very brief sound, which is unarticulated, nearly resembling moaning or sighing. Pherecrates (fr. 168) uses this expression in a very original manner: '(A) What did you suffer? (B) Unspeakable and indescribable things, but I wish to speak only with you'.

26 All entries belong to α: this is not surprising, since the section of entries in α is often the widest in lexica and since these glosses come from an expansion in α of the *Synagoge*, see below.

27 From the following list is excluded Σ^b α 834 (= Phot. α 899), on ἀλάστωρ: the entry has been ascribed to Phrynichus by Crönert (1907, 62), but it has not been included among the fragments of the *PS*; on the other hand, the entry, alongside Phot. α 896, 897, and 898, is acknowledged as belonging to Pausanias' fragments (α 61). For further information on these glosses see Theodoridis (1982–2013 vol. 1, 95–7); Erbse (1950, 157).

28 The text is here presented as it is transmitted by the *Synagoge*'s tradition. Pherecrates' text (fr. 168) reads: 'τί δ' ἔπαθες; | ἄγρυκτα κἄλεκτ', ἀλλὰ βούλομαι μόνῃ | αὐτῇ φράσαι σοι'.

Σ[b] α 404 (= Phot. α 414, *ex* Σ´´), cf. Phryn. *PS* fr. *91: ἀείνως γλῶσσα καὶ ἀείνως φωνὴ καὶ ὀργὴ καὶ ἐπιθυμία, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ὁμοίων χρῶ. Κρατῖνος· 'γλῶσσάν τέ σοι | δίδωσιν ἐν δήμῳ φορεῖν | καλῶν λόγων ἀείνων, | ᾗ πάντα κινήσεις λέγων'. ἐρεῖς δὲ καὶ τὸ ἀείνως ποταμὸς καὶ ἀείνως κρήνη, διὰ τὸ ἐγκεῖσθαι τῇ λέξει τὸ νάειν, ὅπερ ἐστὶ ῥεῖν. ἴδιον δὲ ὕδατος τὸ ῥεῖν· τὸ δὲ γλῶττα ἀείνως πάνυ καινὸν καὶ ἐναργῶς εἴρηται ἐπὶ τῆς δεινῆς εἰπεῖν.

Ever-flowing tongue, and ever-flowing voice, and anger, and desire. Use ('ever-flowing') with expressions of the same kind. Cratinus (fr. 327): 'he/she/it offers you a tongue to wield in public, ever-flowing with persuasive words, with which you will accomplish everything when you speak'.[29] You will also say 'ever-flowing river' and 'ever-flowing source', for in the word (ἀείνως) is embedded νάω, that is to flow.[30] Flowing is a distinctive feature of water, but 'ever-flowing tongue' is said in a very original and vivid manner of the tongue which is clever at speaking'.

Phot. α 551 (cf. Phryn. *PS* 20.1–2): ᾄδειν ὅμοιον· καινοτάτη ἡ σύνταξις καὶ Ἀττικῶς, εἰ καί τις ἄλλη, εἰρημένη. σημαίνει δὲ τὸ μάτην λέγειν, ὡς εἰ καὶ ἄλλως ᾄδειν ἐθέλοι τις ἐν οὐδενὶ πράγματι ἀνυσίμῳ. Εὔπολις ἐν Ἀστρατεύτοις 'ὅμοιον ᾄδειν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστ' ἄλλως ἔχων'. Ἀριστοφάνης δὲ ἐν Γεωργοῖς ἐξηγούμενος τὸ ᾄδεις, ὅπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ μάτην λέγεις τίθεται, παροιμιῶδες αὐτὸ ποιεῖ· φησὶ γάρ '(A) καὶ τὰς δίκας οὖν ἔλεγον ᾄδοντες τότε; | (B) νὴ Δία, φράσω δ' ἐγὼ μέγα σοι {καὶ} τεκμήριον· |ἔτι γὰρ λέγουσιν οἱ πρεσβύτεροι καθήμενοι, |ὅταν κακῶς τις ἀπολογῆται τὴν δίκην, |"ᾄδεις". <ἐν> συνουσίᾳ χρῶ κατὰ Φρύνιχον.

ᾄδειν ὅμοιον ('to sing the same song'): The construction is very original and expressed in the Attic-way like no other. It means 'to speak in vain', as if one wanted [to say] to sing purposelessly, to no useful purpose. Eupolis in his *Draft-dodgers* (fr. 39) [says]: ὅμοιον ᾄδειν· οὐ γὰρ ἔστ' ἄλλως ἔχων ('to sing the same song, for it cannot be otherwise'). Aristophanes, in his *Farmers* (fr. 101), explaining ᾄδεις, which is intended as 'you speak in vain', presents it as proverbial. He says: '(A) At that time, did they use to sing their pleas? (B) Yes, by Zeus, and I am going to give you great evidence: the elder judges, when someone defends himself poorly against an accusation, still say: "You are singing"'. It can be used in conversation, according to Phrynichus.

Phot. α 1377 (cf. Phryn. *PS* 49.1–2): ἀμφὶ τὰ στρατεύματα δαπανᾶν· καινὸς ὁ λόγος καὶ διεσχηματισμένος· ἦν γὰρ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν εἰπεῖν εἰς τὰ στρατεύματα δαπανᾶν. εἴποις δ' ἂν καὶ οὕτως· περὶ ἀθλητὰς δαπανᾶν, περὶ ἑταίρας <καὶ> πᾶν ὅ τι ὅμοιον. οὕτως Ξενοφῶν καὶ Φρύνιχος.

To spend money ἀμφὶ τὰ στρατεύματα ('on the troops'): The expression is novel and [innovatively] shaped. The natural way for saying it would be 'to spend money εἰς τὰ στρατεύματα'. You could also say so: περὶ ἀθλητὰς δαπανᾶν ('to spend money on champions'), [to spend] περὶ ἑταίρας ('on courtesans') and anything alike. So [say] Xenophon (*An.* 1.1.8) and Phrynichus.

29 Transl. Olson, Seaberg (2018, 78).

30 I propose here a change in punctuation which underlines the opposition between flowing being a typical image for water and the innovative use on the part of Cratinus. The text in Theodoridis (1982–2013 vol. 1, 49) reads: 'ὅπερ ἐστὶ ῥεῖν· ἴδιον δὲ ὕδατος τὸ ῥεῖν. τὸ δὲ γλῶττα [. . .]'.

Phot. α 1488 (cf. Phryn. *PS* 14.6): ἀναιδὲς καὶ θρασὺ βλέπειν· ἀναιδὴς μὲν καὶ θρασὺς καθωμίληται. τὸ δὲ ἀναιδὲς καὶ θρασὺ βλέπειν καινῶς εἴρηκε Κρατῖνος. ἡ λέξις Φρυνίχου.

'To look shamelessly and boldly': Both shameless and bold are current, but Cratinus said, in an original way, 'to look shamelessly and boldly'. This gloss is from Phrynichus.

Σ^{b} α 1351 (= Phot. α 1801, *ex* Σ΄΄), cf. Phryn. *PS* 21.12: ἄνεμος καὶ ὄλεθρος ἄνθρωπος· πάνυ καινῶς εἴρηται καὶ ἐναργῶς. ἔστι δὲ Εὐπόλιδος· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄνεμος δηλοῖ τὸ πανταχοῦ φερόμενον ἀνέμου δίκην καὶ ἀλώμενον καὶ ἀβέβαιον, τὸ δὲ ὄλεθρος ὀλέθρου ἄξιον καὶ ἀπωλείας. χρήσῃ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ, ὥς φησι Φρύνιχος, ἐν συνουσίαις.

A person [who is] wind and ruin: It is said in quite a novel and vivid manner. [The expression] belongs to Eupolis (fr. 406); for the word 'wind' indicates something that goes in every direction, as the wind does, and that wanders about and is unfixed, while [the word] 'ruin' [indicates something] worthy of ruin and destruction. You should use the phrase, says Phrynichus, in conversation'.[31]

Phot. α 1913 (cf. Phryn. *PS* 44.7–10): ἀνήδομαι ἐφ' οἷς ἥσθην ποτέ· οὐκέτι ἥδομαι, ἀλλ' ἐκβάλλω τὴν ἡδονήν. καινὴ ἡ φωνὴ καὶ πολιτικώτερόν τι ἔχουσα. Ἕρμιππος Θεοῖς.

I renounce my enjoyment of the things I once enjoyed: I do not enjoy [something] anymore, I reject the pleasure. The expression is original, and it has something particularly urban. Hermippus in *Gods* (fr. 28).

Phot. α 1980 (Phryn. *PS* fr. *193): ἄνθρωπος οὐ σεμνός· ἀντὶ τοῦ ὁ ἐπιτυχὼν καὶ εὐτελής. καινῶς πάνυ εἴρηται παρὰ Ἀριστοφάνει.

'A not reverend man': Meaning the first one passing by and a worthless person. It is found, in a novel manner, in Aristophanes (fr. 729).

All these entries are related to Phrynichus' *PS*. In five entries (Σ^{b} α 243 = Phot. α 101 = Phryn. *PS* fr. *5; Phot. α 551 = Phryn. *PS* 20.1–2; Phot. α 1377 = Phryn. *PS* 49.1–2; Phot. α 1488 = Phryn. *PS* 14.6; Σ^{b} α 1351 = Phot. α 1801 = Phryn. *PS* 21.12), Phrynichus is openly mentioned as the source of the doctrine (Φρύνιχος, in Phot. α 1377; φησι Φρύνιχος ['Phrynichus says'] in Σ^{b} α 243 = Phot. α 101 and Σ^{b} α 1351 = Phot. α 1801; κατὰ Φρύνιχον ['according to Phrynichus'] in Phot. α 551; ἡ λέξις Φρυνίχου ['the gloss goes back to Phrynichus'], in Phot. α 1488). In Phot. α 1913, although Phrynichus is not mentioned, a parallel with the *PS* is identifiable with certainty: the gloss derives in fact from *PS* 44.7–10. Moreover, three entries (Phot. α 273 = Phryn. *PS* fr. *66; Phot. α 414 = Phryn. *PS* fr. *91; Phot. α 1980 = Phryn. *PS* fr. *193) have been included among the fragments of the *PS* precisely on the basis of the

31 Transl. Olson (2014, 173).

employment of the evaluative terminology of καινότης, that de Borries has recognised as a peculiar feature of this work.[32]

The above-mentioned items concern two broad linguistic areas. Two entries focus on syntactic constructions: Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101) and Phot. α 1377 (note that in Phot. α 551, instead, σύνταξις does not necessarily imply that the gloss comments upon a syntactic structure[33]), while the others deal with expressions which Phrynichus considered to be *callidae iuncturae*, whose efficacy and elegance he praised. Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101) deals with the syntactic construction of ἀγανακτῶ + genitive, of which it states the admissibility. Its topic, alongside the evaluative vocabulary it employs, suggests a comparison with Phryn. *Ecl.* 330,[34] where Phrynichus condemns the construction of ἀκολουθέω (and *verba sequendi* in general) with the prepositional phrase with the genitive in place of the standard construction with the plain dative. On this matter, the *Eclogue* has a strict view: the construction with the prepositional phrase is presented as not admissible in good Attic and rejected as being alien to Attic (ξένος) and deplorable (παραιτητέος), to the point that Phrynichus speculates whether the use of such construction on the part of Lysias may not be spurious.[35] Interestingly, in *Ecl.* 330 the prepositional construction of *verba sequendi* with the genitive is identified as a καινὸν σχῆμα, a 'novel construction', the same label that in Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101) is applied to the

32 See de Borries (1911, 141, 145, and 157): 'Phrynichi more dicta'; 'verba ἀείνως πάνυ καινὸν καὶ ἐναργῶς εἴρηται Phryn. indicant'; 'verba καινῶς πάνυ Phryn. indicant'. The provenance of these entries from the *PS*, although bound to remain unprovable, appears plausible.

33 σύνταξις can simply indicate a phrasing as a 'combination' of words, in this case ὅμοιον with the verb ᾄδω, which can be metaphorically used meaning 'to repeat', 'to speak in vain' alone. It is hard to identify to what syntactical construction Phrynichus would refer. ᾄδειν has sometimes been interpreted as a jussive infinitive (Olson 2017, 164), but this appears slightly strained in Eupolis' text (fr. 39); the infinite could be exclamatory as well, but ᾄδειν is not necessarily an independent infinitive and could easily depend upon a not transmitted clause. A further possibility is that the syntactical construction which is commented upon is the cognate object, but this would be a quite weak example. See Gerbi (2024b).

34 Phryn. *Ecl.* 330: τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ' αὐτοῦ· Λυσίας ἐν τῷ Κατ' Αὐτοκράτους οὕτω τῇ συντάξει χρῆται, ἐχρῆν δὲ οὕτως εἰπεῖν· τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα αὐτῷ. τί ἂν οὖν φαίη τις, ἁμαρτεῖν τὸν Λυσίαν, ἢ νοθεύειν καινοῦ σχήματος χρῆσιν; ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ξένη ἡ σύνταξις, πάντῃ παραιτητέα, ῥητέον δὲ ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ ('τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα μετ' αὐτοῦ: Lysias in his *Against Autocrates* [fr. 61 Carey] uses the syntax in this way; but he should have said it like this: τὸν ἀκολουθοῦντα αὐτῷ ('[the boy] following him'). What should one say, that Lysias is wrong, or that this use of an uncommon construction is spurious? But since the syntax is unusual, to be rejected in every way, one must say ἀκολουθεῖν αὐτῷ instead').

35 See Gerbi (2023c). Phrynichus does not suggest that Lysias' oration is spurious, but that its text is corrupted, as proven by the use of such non-Attic construction. On the use of νοθεύω ('to render spurious', 'to consider spurious') in this passage and its potential ambiguity see Kim (2023, 132–3).

construction of ἀγανακτέω with the genitive. In this entry of the *Eclogue*, the rarity of such syntax – which is in fact very scarcely attested in Classical Greek[36] – is rightly stressed: καινός is matched by σπάνιος ('rare') and opposed to καθωμίληται.[37] The most remarkable thing, however, is that in Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101) Phrynichus is said to have recommended the use of such construction precisely for its originality and rarity: the gloss leaves no room for doubt about the positive connotation of καινότης. The fact that καινὸν σχῆμα applies to two constructions whose status ends up being diametrically opposed – the former, in *Ecl.* 330, is proscribed, while the other, in Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101), is recommended[38] – shows that καινότης does not have a predetermined sense, but can be intended positively or negatively depending on each case. If many times καινός positively describes words or phrases that have some potential and are worthy of praise for their being refined and effective, it might instead also criticise abstruse and inefficient phrasings that would be better avoided. The criterion of καινότης, which is applicable *per se* to words and expressions whose novelty is remarkable, is thus useful for enforcing the stylistic evaluation of words, expressions, and constructions. For this reason, the presence of other evaluative terms complementing the καινότης terminology proves to be particularly advantageous for understanding this category. Whereas in the *PS* καινότης stands almost always alone, in its indirect tradition it is often accompanied by further evaluative terminology which clarifies its sense. From this, it is reasonable to infer that some complementing evaluative vocabulary originally in the *PS* was suppressed during the epitomisation, maybe because novelty was considered the most prominent feature of such expressions (see below, Section 5). In the entries of the *Synagoge* and Photius' lexicon, novelty takes on a positive value, as it is confirmed by the cases in which καινότης is reinforced by other praising terms as Ἀττικῶς ('in the Attic way') and ἐναργῶς ('vividly'); the category of πολιτικός too, with which novelty is matched

36 In Classical Greek, the only occurrence of ἀγανακτέω constructed with the genitive appears to be in Lys. 14.39: τῶν τειχῶν καθηρημένων ἀγανακτεῖ ('[any of you] is outraged about the walls that were destroyed').

37 The rarity of the construction of ἀγανακτέω with the genitive is contrasted with the more common construction with the genitive of θαυμάζω and ἄγαμαι ('to admire'). As we have seen, the same opposition (καινόν vs. καθωμιλημένον) occurs in Phryn. *PS* 65.20.

38 Possibly, Phrynichus judged the replacement of the dative with the plain genitive less severely than the replacement of the dative with the prepositional phrase. Moreover, the fact that the construction with the genitive of both θαυμάζω and ἄγαμαι was accepted and even recommended by Atticist scholarship (Moer. θ 17; Moer. α 1) could easily have played a part in leading Phrynichus to extend the acceptance of the same construction for ἀγανακτέω by means of analogy (see further in Gerbi 2024a, with bibliography).

in Phot. α 1913, has a positive connotation, being a desirable quality for a well-trained rhetor.[39]

In Phot. α 551, the phrase ᾄδειν ὅμοιον is said to be 'very original and expressed in an Attic fashion like no other': the statement of the Attic pedigree ensures that καινότης is seen as a value.[40] That Phrynichus, explicitly mentioned as the source of the doctrine, is said to recommend its use in conversation (ἐν συνουσίᾳ), is further proof of the positive sense of καινός: Phrynichus considered indeed the expression to be brilliant and particularly suitable in a conversation between learned people.[41] According to Σ^{b} α 1351 (= Phot. α 1801), another expression which Phrynichus viewed as suitable for conversation is ἄνεμος καὶ ὄλεθρος ἄνθρωπος,[42] a phrasing that is said to be innovative and vivid (ἐναργῶς). ἐνάργεια ('vividness'), denoting expressive means having a strong visual impact, is a key-concept of ancient rhetoric.[43] Its use as an evaluative criterion is noteworthy as proof that Phrynichus' interest was not limited to linguistic purism but extended to stylistic efficacy and rhetorical strength. To some extent, some considerations made for καινότης can also be applied to the criterion of ἐνάργεια. This category is employed once by Phrynichus in *PS* 12.9–10 (where the expression αἴρεσθαι τιμαῖς, 'being lifted by honours', is described as ἐναργής, 'vivid') and features more widely in the indirect tradition of the lexicon. It is found in three entries which have been attributed to the *PS* by de Borries and Theodoridis: Phot. α 2058 (= Phryn. *PS* fr. *23), on ἀνταυγὲς κάλλος ('sparkling beauty');[44] Σ^{b} α 1350 (= Phot. α 1784 = Phryn. *PS* fr. 185), on ἀνεγείρει καὶ ῥιπίζει τὸν ὄχλον ἢ τὴν πόλιν ('s/he rouses and blows up the mob or the city'); and Σ^{b} α 404 (= Phot. α 414 = Phryn.

39 On πολιτικός as 'the very quality that the language of the aspiring skilled rhetor should possess', see the article of O. Tribulato in this volume.

40 Scholia provide some parallel for the match of καινός and Ἀττικῶς: see schol. [Aesch.] *Pr*. 118.3 Herington; schol. Aesch. *Th*. 400–400b Smith. As Jacopo Cavarzeran kindly informs me, the same match is also to be found in an unpublished scholium by Thomas Magister (schol. rec. Eur. *Hec*. 38 [cod. Vat. gr. 51]), where a σχῆμα is said to be 'καινοπρεπὲς καὶ Ἀττικῶς ‹λεγόμενον›' ('novel and shaped in an Attic fashion').

41 On the expression ᾄδειν ὅμοιον, its semantics and its ties with a metaphorical meaning of ᾄδω (standing for 'to speak in vain') see Gerbi (2024b), with bibliography.

42 On this expression, which plays on the abusing sense of ὄλεθρος, see Gerbi (2024c), with bibliography. On Phrynichus' interest in collecting abusing expressions see Pellettieri, in this volume.

43 On the notion of ἐνάργεια and its importance in the rhetorical tradition, see at least Nünlist (2009, 194–8); Togni (2013–2014); Berardi (2017, 143–7).

44 Whereas Σ^{b} α 1350 (= Phot. α 1784) and Σ^{b} α 404 (= Phot. α 414) are attributed to the *PS* based on the evaluative terminology they show, Phot. α 2058 openly mentions Phrynichus as the source of the doctrine.

PS fr. *91), on ἀείνως γλῶσσα ('everlasting tongue') and analogous expressions.[45] As it is the case for καινότης, ἐνάργεια appears otherwise to be absent in Atticist lexica.[46] Vividness thus seems to be another criterion that was given value in Phrynichus' *PS* in the frame of a stylistic theory which promoted, among other rhetorical strategies, potential *callidae iuncturae*.

5 The evaluative terminology of καινότης in the frame of the epitomising process

Arguing on the basis of a comparison between the extant text of the *PS* in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 and the entries of its indirect tradition, one can reasonably conclude that, originally, the *PS* was very much likely characterised by a more substantial presence of evaluative terminology than what is now extant. If some evaluative vocabulary does surface in the lexicon, many times it is scarcely visible, while the indirect tradition is rich in evaluative terminology and preserves information on register, style, and rhetorical efficacy which would be otherwise lost.[47] Indeed, as we have seen, whereas Phryn. *PS* 20.1–2 only provides information on the semantics of the phrase ᾄδειν ὅμοιον, Phot. α 551 preserves an extended version of the doctrine, including the citation of two *loci*[48] and the evaluation of the expression with regard to register and style. Analogously, Phryn. *PS* 21.12 consists only in the ascription to Eupolis of the use of both ἄνεμος and ὄλεθρος in an abusive sense, whereas the *Synagoge* and Photius' lexicon (Σ^{b} α 1351 = Phot. α 1801) also include the explanation of the metaphors' meaning and a stylistic evaluation. The same applies to *PS* 49.1–2, which limits itself to citing analogous phrasings, whereas Phot. α 1377 preserves the evaluative vocabulary and makes the original focus on syntax clear.[49]

45 Note that this entry combines both the criteria of καινότης and ἐνάργεια, like Σ^{b} α 1351 (= Phot. α 1801, on ἄνεμος καὶ ὄλεθρος ἄνθρωπος) does, and, remarkably, it adopts a quasi-identical formulation.

46 Moeris' lexicon, Pollux's *Onomasticon*, the *Antiatticist,* and the *Philetaerus* do not bear traces neither of ἐνάργεια nor of ἐναργής or ἐναργῶς.

47 Some examples are in de Borries (1911, xxxi–xxxii).

48 Eup. fr. 39 and Ar. fr. 101 (on which see Bagordo 2022, 11–2). Note that this entry is the only source for both fragments.

49 According to Phot. α 1377, Phrynichus' entry notes as remarkable the use of ἀμφί instead of εἰς in a passage by Xenophon (*An.* 1.1.8): ἀμφὶ τὰ στρατεύματα δαπανᾶν ('to spend money on the troops').

It is remarkable that, conversely, the entries of the *PS* which still preserve the καινότης terminology are not paralleled in the *Synagoge* nor in Photius' lexicon and, when a parallel can be found, the evaluative vocabulary is not preserved. For instance, the entry of the *PS* on πολιτοκοπεῖν (99.14–9) is quite ample and includes remarks on style, while the tradition of the *Synagoge* confines itself to the information that the verb occurs in Diphilus.[50] The third expansion of the *Synagoge*, substantially confined to α,[51] played a major role in the transmission of doctrines of the *PS* commenting on style. It follows from this that the indirect tradition preserves the καινότης terminology otherwise lost in the epitome only in glosses in α, whereas for entries in letters other than α the text in cod. Par. Coisl. 345 stands alone, as regards the evaluative terminology.

The relationship between the *PS* and its indirect tradition is not of immediate understanding; moreover, this case study has the limit of being based on a very small group of items. Nevertheless, some observations can be made. As we have seen, while four items, ascribable to the third expansion of the *Synagoge*, are shared by both the *Synagoge* B and Photius' lexicon – Σ^{b} α 243 (= Phot. α 101); Σ^{b} α 304 (= Phot. α 273); Σ^{b} α 404 (= Phot. α 414); Σ^{b} α 1351 (= Phot. α 1801), the remaining ones – Phot. α 551; Phot. α 1377; Phot. α 1488; Phot. α 1913; Phot. α 1980 – only occur in Photius.

The items occurring only in Photius' lexicon and those it shares with the *Synagoge* B are analogously structured and treated: this may suggest their common origin from the third expansion of the *Synagoge*. On the other hand, several entries in Photius' lexicon are absent from the *Synagoge* B: this can be explained by a different choice of the items on the lexicographers' part or by the fact that Photius could have access, compared to the compiler of the *Synagoge* B, to a more expanded text of Phrynichus' materials, perhaps through a more complete redaction of the third expansion of the *Synagoge*. In any case, back then a version of the *PS* was available which, whether it was non-epitomised or, most likely, less epitomised, was significantly more extensive than the epitome we possess. This reconstruction, although limited, is in line with what we know on the transmission of such material.[52]

50 Phot. π 1022 = *Su.* π 1919: πολιτοκοπεῖν· Δίφιλος. ('πολιτοκοπεῖν: Diphilus [used it] [fr. 132]'). Note that Diphilus' mention does not occur in the doctrine of the *PS*, where the *locus classicus* which is adduced is Pl. Com. fr. 113.

51 The expansions of the *Synagoge* as we can reconstruct them are mainly limited to α: on them, see Cunningham (2003, 49–57; 57–8). Nevertheless, expansions of the *Synagoge* were made for all letters: on expansions after α, see Cunningham (2003, 57–8).

52 On the textual vicissitudes of the *PS*, see Cavarzeran (this volume), with two proposals of its stemma, and Favi (this volume).

Given the uncertainty on the dynamics of its transmission, a staple can be found in the role played by the indirect tradition in the understanding of the aims of the *PS* as a work meant for an all-round linguistic and rhetorical education, sensible to stylistic issues, to register, and to context. With respect to the theory of style, the diffuse employment of the criterion of καινότης has proven to be an interesting and – you will pardon the pun – *original* feature of the *PS*, which distinguishes it from other Atticist lexica and the *Eclogue* itself for the attention it pays to style. As we have seen, moreover, the meaning of καινός is not predetermined, but nuanced and tailored case by case: this suggests that the theory of style of the *PS* was much more articulated and multifaceted than what we can gather from the materials preserved in the epitome.

Bibliography

Bagordo, A. (2018). 'κομψευριπικῶς. Tracce di Euripide socratico-sofistico nella commedia attica'. In: Bigliazzi, S.; Lupi, F.; Ugolini, G. (eds.), *Συναγωνίζεσθαι. Studies in Honour of Guido Avezzù*. Verona, 457–90.

Bagordo, A. (2022). *Aristophanes fr. 101–204. Übersetzung und Kommentar*. Göttingen.

Blaydes, F. H. M. (1855). *Aristophanis Comoediae. Adnotatione critica, commentario exegetico, et scholiis Graecis instruxit Federicus H. M. Blaydes*. Pars XII: *Fragmenta*. Halle.

de Borries, I. (1911). *Phrynichi Sophistae Praeparatio sophistica*. Leipzig.

Borsoni Ciccolungo, E. (2011). 'La novità poetica come principio compositivo: ipotesi di un'evoluzione da Pindaro a Callimaco'. *ARF* 12, 41–58.

Borsoni Ciccolungo, E. (2016). *Dichiarazioni di novità poetica nei contesti letterari della Grecia arcaica e classica*. [PhD dissertation] University of Bologna.

Burstein, S. M. (2012). 'Agatharchides of Knidos (86)'. Worthington, I. (ed.), *Jacoby Online. Brill's New Jacoby. Part II*. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/1873-5363_bnj_a86.

Ceccarelli, S. (2019). *Commedia antica e campagna attica. I* Contadini *e le* Navi mercantili *di Aristofane*. [PhD dissertation] University of Rome.

Crönert, W. (1907). 'Animadversiones in Photii fragmentum Berolinense'. *RhM* 62, 479–82.

Cunningham, I. C. (2003). *Synagoge*. Συναγωγὴ λέξεων χρησίμων. *Texts of the Original Version and of MS. B*. Berlin, New York.

D'Angour, A. (2011). *The Greeks and the New. Novelty in Ancient Greek Imagination and Experience*. Cambridge.

De Jonge, C. C. (2008). *Between Grammar and Rhetoric. Dionysius of Halicarnassus on Language, Linguistics and Literature*. Leiden, Boston.

Del Corno, D. (1985). *Aristofane. Le Rane*. Milano.

De Martin, S. (2025). *Proclide – Timoteo. Introduzione, traduzione e commento*. Göttingen.

Dover, K. (1993). *Aristophanes. Frogs. Edited with Introduction and Commentary*. Oxford.

Erbse, E. (1950). *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika*. Berlin.

Franchini, E. (2020). *Ferecrate. Krapataloi – Pseudherakles (frr. 85–163). Introduzione, traduzione, commento*. Heidelberg.

Gentili, B. *et al*. (2013). *Pindaro. Le Olimpiche*. Milan.

Gerbi, G. (2023a). ‘ἀκροφύσιον, ἀπ’ ἀκροφυσίων λόγους ἐπιδεικνύναι (Phryn. *PS* fr. *236)’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/003.

Gerbi, G. (2023b). ‘ἔξηβος (Phryn. *PS* 65.20–1)’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/024.

Gerbi, G. (2023c). ‘ἀκολουθεῖν μετ’ αὐτοῦ (*Antiatt*. α 122, Phryn. *Ecl*. 330, Σ^{b} α 747 [= Phot. α 789])’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2022/01/021.

Gerbi, G. (2024a). ‘ἀγανακτῶ σου (Phryn. *PS* fr. *5 [= Σ^{b} α 243, Phot. α 101])’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2024/01/004.

Gerbi, G. (2024b). ‘ᾄδειν ὅμοιον (Phryn. *PS* 20.1–2, Phot. α 551)’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/012.

Gerbi, G. (2024c). ‘ἄνεμος καὶ ὅλεθρος ἄνθρωπος (Phryn. *PS* 21.12)’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E. N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/029.

Gerbi, G. (2024d). ‘πολιτοκοπέω (Phryn. *PS* 99.14–9, Poll. 9.26)’. In: Tribulato, O. (ed.), *Digital Encyclopedia of Atticism*. With the Assistance of E.N. Merisio. DOI: https://doi.org/10.30687/DEA/2974-8240/2023/02/014.

Halliwell, S. (2006). ‘An Aristotelian Perspective on Plato’s Dialogues’. In: Herrmann, F. G. (ed.), *New Essays on Plato*. Swansea, 189–211.

Hansen, D. U. (1998). *Das attizistische Lexicon des Moeris. Quellenkritische Untersuchung und Edition*. Berlin, New York.

Heubeck, A.; West, S.; Hainsworth, J. B. (1988). *A Commentary on Homer’s* Odyssey. Vol. 1: *Introduction and Books 1–8*. Oxford.

Kim, L. (2023). ‘Imperial Greek Atticism. A Culture of Forgery? Phrynichus and the Terminology of ‘Authenticity”. In: Hopkins, J. N.; McGill, S. (eds.), *Forgery Beyond Deceit. Fabrication, Value, and the Desire for Ancient Rome*. Oxford, 121–44.

Mattusch, C. C. (1975). ‘Pollux on Bronze Casting. A New Look at κάναβος’. *GRBS* 16, 309–16.

Murray, A. T. (1919). *Homer. Odyssey*. Vol. 1: *Books 1–12*. Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. Cambridge, MA.

North Fowler, H. (1914). *Plato*. Vol. 1: *Euthyphro. Apology. Crito. Phaedo. Phaedrus*. Translated by H. North Fowler. Introduction by W. M. R. Lamb. Cambridge, MA.

Nünlist, R. (2009). *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge.

Olson, S. D. (2014). *Eupolis frr. 326–497. Translation and Commentary*. Heidelberg.

Olson, S. D. (2017). *Eupolis, Testimonia and Aiges – Demoi (frr. 1–146). Introduction, Translation, Commentary*. Heidelberg.

Olson, S. D.; Seaberg, R. (2018). *Kratinos frr. 299–514. Translation and Commentary*. Göttingen.

Swain, S. (1996). *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford, New York.

Pellegrino, M. (2015). *Aristofane. Frammenti*. Lecce, Rovato.

Theodoridis, C. (1982–2013). *Photii Patriarchae Lexicon*. 3 vols. Berlin, New York.

Togni, P. (2013–2014). ‘*Enargeia* e *Phantasia* nel capitolo 15 del trattato *Sul sublime*. Le fonti dello Pseudo Longino’. *IFC* 13, 217–38.

Valente, S. (2013). 'Osservazioni su συνήθεια e χρῆσις nell'Onomastico di Polluce'. In: Mauduit, C. (ed.), *L'*Onomasticon *de Pollux. Aspects culturels, rhétoriques et lexicographiques*. Lyon, 147–63.

West, M. L. (1998). *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Vol. 1: *Archilochus. Hipponax. Theognidea*. 2nd edition. Oxford.

Wiater, N. (2011). *The Ideology of Classicism. Language, History, and Identity in Dionysus of Halicarnassus*. Göttingen.

Zimmermann, B. (2008). *Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung*. 2nd edition. Berlin.