

## WHAT WAS THE NAME OF MIMNERMUS' FATHER?

Имя отца Мимнерма сохранилось в биографической справке *Суды* (μ 1077), в которой поэт представляется как Μίμνερμος Λιγυρτυάδου; ни один другой источник имени отца поэта не сохраняет. Несмотря на то, что *a priori* серьезных причин подвергать это имя сомнению нет, его сложно сочетать с солоновским обращением к Мимнерму Λιγυαστάδης (Sol. fr. 20 West = Diog. Laert. 1, 61; cf. Sud. μ 1077) – обращение, которое очевидно представляет комплимент Мимнерму, но, как кажется, обыгрывает имя не самого поэта, а его отца. В статье разбираются сильные и слабые стороны существующих подходов к этому вопросу и предлагается новое решение: имя Λιγυρτυάδης следует интерпретировать не как имя отца Мимнерма, а как архаический патроним на -άδης.

*Ключевые слова.* Мимнерм, Лигиртиад (Λιγυρτυάδης), Солон, патроним, Суда, Диоген Лаэртций, античная филология, ономастика Малой Азии.

The only source to preserve the name of Mimnermus' father is the *Suda* lexicon which mentions it, together with the information on the elegist's birthplace, date and poems, in a short biographical entry<sup>1</sup>:

Μίμνερμος Λιγυρτυάδου, Κολοφώνιος ἢ Σμυρναῖος ἢ Ἀστυπалаεὺς, ἐλεγειοποιός. Γέγονε δ' ἐπὶ τῆς λζ' Ὀλυμπιάδος, ὡς προτερεῦειν τῶν ζ' σοφῶν· τινὲς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ συγχρονεῖν λέγουσιν. Ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Λιγυαστάδης διὰ τὸ ἐμμελὲς καὶ λιγύ. Ἐγραψε βιβλία ἴταῦτα πολλά† (Suda, μ 1077 = III, p. 397, l. 20–24 Adler<sup>2</sup>)

20 Μίμερμος G Μίνερμος F Κολοφῶνος GF 21 γέγονε–24 πολλά om. F 23 ed. pr. cf. Laert. 1, 61 : Λιγειαστάδης GVM Λιγιστιάδης A 24 ταῦτα om. G ; ἐρωτικὰ τὰ conī. Berhardy πάνυ Gutschmid

“Mimnermus, son of Ligyrtiades, from Colophon, or Smyrna, or Astypalaea, an elegiac poet. He lived<sup>3</sup> in the 37<sup>th</sup> Olympiad (i.e.

<sup>1</sup> *Suda*'s entry on Mimnermus is usually placed at the head of the testimonia in editions of Mimnermus, so that this text is also cited as Test. 1 Gentili-Prato, Test. 1 Allen, Test. 1 Gerber, but Test. 77 Szádeczky-Kardoss.

<sup>2</sup> References to manuscripts of *Suda* follow those used by Ada Adler in her edition: G – codex Parisinus 2622, V – codex Vossianus Fol. 2, M – codex Marcianus 448, F – codex Laurentianus 55, 1.

<sup>3</sup> The verb γέγονε could be used to designate broadly the age in which a person lived, and as such is close to, but less pointed than ἤκμασεν (*floruit*). On the ancient estimates of Mimnermus' date, see below.

632–629 BCE), so that he precedes the Seven Sages; however, some say he was their contemporary. He was also called Λιγυραστάδης, because of his melodiousness and clearness (of voice). He wrote books...”

The end of this passage is damaged beyond correction<sup>4</sup>, and there are variant readings for Mimnermus' alternative name (ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Λιγυραστάδης) rendered as Λιγειαστάδης or Λιγιστιάδης in the manuscripts (these variants will be discussed below). The beginning of the entry, on the other hand, is well preserved with only minor divergences in the manuscripts. Thus, according to the *Suda*, Mimnermus' father was called Λιγυρτυάδης. The manuscripts are in perfect accord as to the name, giving no variant readings, and *a priori* there would be little reason to doubt this information: no other source survives to contradict the *Suda*, and the obscurity of the name (as to the inner form) can be used in itself as an argument in favor of the compiler's accuracy<sup>5</sup>. This being said, modern scholars for the most part do not seem to be at ease with the name Ligyrtiyades: it is never mentioned without a pointed reference to *Suda* and as often as not omitted altogether<sup>6</sup>. Neither is this uneasiness dispelled, when Ligyrtiyades is compared with the poetic pseudo-patronym by which Solon addresses Mimnermus, urging him to modify the verse where he expressed his wish to die at sixty (Sol. fr. 20 West = fr. 26 Gentili-Prato):

Ἄλλ' εἴ μοι καὶ νῦν ἔτι πείσειαι, ἔξελε τοῦτο,  
μηδὲ μέγαιρ', ὅτι σέο λῶον ἐπεφρασάμην,  
καὶ μεταποίησον, Λιγυραστάδη, ὧδε δ' ἄειδε·  
“Ὀγδωκονταέτη μοῖρα κίχοι θανάτου”.

1 καὶ νῦν Thiersch : κᾶν νῦν **BPF** τοῦτο **BF**<sup>1</sup> : τοῦτον **PF**<sup>2</sup> 2 σέο West :  
σεῦ **B** σ' εἶ **PF** λῶον Boissonade : τοῖον **BPF** 3 Λιγυραστάδη Diels,  
Λιγυραστάδη Bergk, Λιγιστάδη West : αἰγισταδὴ **B** : αἰγισταδὶ **F** :  
αἰγισταδὶ **P**<sup>1</sup> : ἀγυῖας ταδὶ **P**<sup>x</sup> 7

<sup>4</sup> For a list of corrections proposed for βιβλία ἑταῦτα πολλά, see Allen (1993: 23); for the full discussion of the number of books in the Alexandrian edition of Mimnermus, see Müller (1988).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Allen (1993: 16): “it is more likely that the mock patronymic plays on a real name, and Λιγυρτυάδης has an authentic Anatolian ring to it”.

<sup>6</sup> Thus, the name Ligyrtiyades is mentioned by Szádeczky-Kardoss (1968: 940), Schmid, Stählin (1929: 361 n. 6), Bagordo (2011: 165), but omitted by Barron, Easterling (1984: 133–134), Gerber (1997: 108–109).

<sup>7</sup> References to manuscripts follow those used by Tiziano Dorandi in his edition: **B** – codex Neapolitanus III B 29; **P** – codex Parisinus gr. 1759; **F** – codex Laurentianus 69.13.

“But should you believe me now as well, remove it, and begrudge me not that I surpassed you by my inventiveness, and change it, Λιγυαστάδης ‘ο clear singing one’, and sing thus: ‘Might the fated death overtake me at the age of eighty’”.

This fragment (together with Mimnermus’ distich that prompted Solon’s response) is preserved by Diogenes Laertius and is one of the best-known poetic dialogues in ancient literature. As may be seen from the *apparatus criticus*, the transmitted text has prompted a number of emendations<sup>8</sup>: as there are numerous discussions of the text, we will only examine the reconstruction of the apostrophe, as relevant for the needs of this article. The scribes seem to have been confused as to its form, so that the manuscripts read with minor variations ΑΙΓΙΑΣΤΑΔΗ (-Ι)<sup>9</sup>, with one attempt at correcting the unintelligible combination of letters into words (ἀγυιᾶς ταδι). However, early on *Suda*’s information that Mimnermus was also called Λιγειαστάδης or Λιγιστιάδης (ms. reading), was connected with the Solonian fragment and used to reconstruct Solon’s apostrophe to Mimnermus. Thus, Bergk accepted the correction Λιγυαστάδης which had already been proposed for the *Suda* entry μ 1077 by the lexicon’s first editor, Demetrios Chancondylas, as a reconstruction from the compiler’s gloss, διὰ τὸ ἐμμελὲς καὶ λιγύ; Bergk accordingly incorporated the emended form into his edition of the Solonian fragment in the vocative, Λιγυαστάδη<sup>10</sup>. Later Diels introduced a minor correction, Λιγυαστάδη (with the *iota subscriptum*), thereby connecting Solon’s coinage with λιγὺ ἄδειν and establishing a pun between the apostrophe and following

<sup>8</sup> For the discussion of the textual variants and proposed corrections, see Tuomi (1986: *passim*), Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 402–404). More particularly on the much debated question of whether κᾶν νῦν should be modified to καὶ νῦν, add arguments in favour of κᾶν νῦν in Masaracchia (1958: 335) and Perrotta, Gentili (1965: 27), as well as West’s defence of καὶ νῦν (1974: 182). The correction καὶ νῦν is also endorsed by Dovatur (1982), and even becomes an important point in his argument, but the preference is left unexplained.

<sup>9</sup> The reading of ms. **B** is given as ναγιασταδη in Gentili and Prato’s edition (1979: 118); however, it is clearly a dittograph of the ending the previous word, μεταποίησον, and Dorandi (2013: 102) simplifies it to αιγιασταδη in his *apparatus criticus*.

<sup>10</sup> See Bergk (1843: 331) who is followed by Hudson-Williams (1926: 67) and Edmonds (1931: 136). After Edmonds, the reconstruction Λιγυαστάδης has been largely neglected for some decades but was recently defended by Hagen (2007: 94) who suggested that the suffix -άδης in the apostrophe coined by Solon may actually be reinterpreted as a second root associated with the word family ἀνδάνω/ἠδύς.

imperative, ὦδε δ' ἄειδε: this reconstruction is widely accepted and has become the predominant reading in editions of elegiac poets<sup>11</sup>. However, there are obvious risks in relying on a corrected text in order to emend manuscript readings of another text, and M. L. West, in order to escape the trap of a circular argument, reconstructed for Solon's address to Mimnermus (fr. 20, 3 W.) the form Λιγιαστάδη solely on the basis of paleographical data<sup>12</sup>. West is followed by Marcovich (1999: 41), but most editors only mention the proposed variant in their *apparatus*. The implications of West's approach will be discussed below; let us just note, for the moment, that in this case, prudence is counterintuitive, as it neglects *Suda*'s gloss διὰ τὸ ἐμμελὲς καὶ λιγύ and eliminates any idea of wordplay in Solon's apostrophe.

Thus, of the three proposed corrections for Solon's address to Mimnermus, Λιγυαστάδη seems the most probable. However, whichever one chooses to retain, one detail remains unchanged: Solon's address to Mimnermus, leaving aside its probable poetological implications, carried a patronymic suffix -άδης and must have played on the poet's real patronym. But a form of this kind is hard to reconcile with *Suda*'s report that Mimnermus' father was named Λιγυρτυάδης – unless one would be willing to assume that Λιγυρτυάδης could be both the father's personal name and the son's patronymic<sup>13</sup>, which runs counter to the practice observed in ancient texts and documents. As personal names in -άδης and -ίδης became more frequent in Greece, the language took steps to prevent confusion with former adjectival patronyms with the same suffix. Thus, in most dialects, when a father bears a name of this type, the

<sup>11</sup> For the first suggestion, see Diels (1902: 482); the correction was accepted by Diehl (1954: 40), Masaracchia (1958: 335), Gentili and Perrotta (1965: 27), Campbell (1967: 36), Gentili and Prato (1979: 118), Gerber (1995: 140), Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 110; cf. 403–404 with argumentation). Sometimes the apostrophe is printed as a common word, not a name – λιγυαστάδη (cf. Gentili, Perrotta 1965: 27; Diehl 1954: 40).

<sup>12</sup> The form appeared in the first 1972 edition of *Iambi et elegi Graeci*, and was retained by West in his second, reworked edition (West 1992: 152), as well as in his *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis* (West 1980: 172). West explained his editorial decision in the following way: “I have given the patronymic in the form presupposed by the tradition (D.L. + *Suda*). Obviously Λιγυ- is the slightest of changes; but I do not regard the rest of the name as clear. I would be disturbed to meet such a form as ἄστης in early poetry. λίγ' ἰαστί is no more plausible as analysis” (West 1974: 182).

<sup>13</sup> A strand of ancient exegetical tradition which could be used to corroborate of the idea that names in -άδης and -ίδης could occasionally replace patronyms, will be examined in the *Appendix* to this article.

son's parentage can only be expressed by a genitive: e.g. Δεινόστρατος Δεινιάδου "Deinostratos son of Deiniades" (*IG* II<sup>2</sup> 223, line 4); [Ἡρακ]λείδης Χαριδήμου τοῦ Μητροδώρου | [κα]ὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ υἱοῦ Γλαυκίου τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου "Heracleides son of Charidemos, grandson of Metrodoros [contributed], as well as on behalf of his son, Glaucios son of Heracleides" (*CIG* 3141 = *ISmyrn.* 688, lines 10–11). The Thessalian dialect, on the other hand, which used adjectival patronymics, took care to distinguish these forms by a special suffix: thus, [Γ]αυριάδα[ς] Ἀστοκράτει[ος], | [Ἀ]στοκράτης Γαυριάδαιος "Gauriades son of Astocratos, Astocratos son of Gauriades" (*IG* IX.2, 696, col. 6, lines 1–2), [Ἀσ]κλαπιάδας Ἀνδρειμούνειος, Ἀνδρείμουν Ἀσκλαπιάδαιος "Asclepiades son of Adreimon, Adreimon son of Asclepiades" (*IG* IX.2, 517, lines 63–64); in both cases where the names recur in every second generation.

Although this discrepancy in the sources is rarely emphasized by scholars, attempts have been made to explain it away. The most popular solution, proposed already by Diels, postulates that by Λιγυαστάδη, "of the clear-voiced singer(s)", Solon is referring to the fact that Mimnermus belonged to a poetic group or a professional guild<sup>14</sup>, as nicknames formed with -άδης suffix of adjectival patronyms are frequent in poetry. Thus, Diels and Noussia-Fantuzzi found resemblance with Aeschylus' apostrophe to Dionysus in the *Frogs*, σὺ δὴ 'μὲ ταῦτ', ὃ στωμυλιοσυλλεκτάδη / καὶ πτωχοποιὲ καὶ ῥακιοσυρραπτάδη; "Is that how you speak of me, you gossip-gleaner, you creator of misers, you rag-stitcher?" (Aristoph. *Ran.* 841–842)<sup>15</sup>; given the mocking tone of the passage, this might not be the ideal parallel for Solon's compliment. Perotta and Gentili (1965: 28), on the other hand, cite a parallel from a fragment of Sophocles' *Inachus* that may seem closer from the point of view of tonality to the affection (albeit tinged with gentle irony) of Solon's apostrophe: πολὺ πολυιδρίδας / ὅτις ὄδε προτέρων / ὄνομ' εὖ σ' ἐθρόει "he was of very very astute stock, whoever it was among our forefathers who

<sup>14</sup> Diels (1902: 482): "Das patronymische Suffix, das an λιγυάστης antritt, soll die Zugehörigkeit zur Zunft der ‚hellen Sänger‘ bezeichnen".

<sup>15</sup> See Diels (1902: 482), Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 402–404). However, when one compares Dover's note on the formation, the stylistic connotations do not seem to match well. Dover (1993: 297–298, on v. 841) explains that "–ίδης, –άδης and –ιάδης, common in proper names, are used to characterize types of people [...] The formation is an inheritance from early iambic poetry [...], and appears in satyr drama".

rightly spoke of your name...”<sup>16</sup>. Finally, Gerber and Allen interpreted the compound as referring to Mimnermus' actual descent from a family of singers<sup>17</sup>. It should be noted, however, that the nicknames in -άδης and -ίδης never actually seem to refer to parentage, but rather to the idea that the person is a worthy representative of his class, group, or profession<sup>18</sup>. Thus, while the parallels explain the dynamics of Solon's wordplay, the reasons why he chose to make the name of Mimnermus' father rather than the poet's own name or patronymic the focus of his pun remain unclear. Indeed, Meyer when commenting on Solon's coinage, does not even mention its resemblance to the name Ligyrtades transmitted by the *Suda*.

With a twist on the previous explanation, M. Noussia-Fantuzzi sees in the apostrophe Λιγυραστάδη an indication that Solon was not actually addressing Mimnermus but replying, in the context of a poetic play at a banquet, to a fellow symposiast who had just quoted Mimnermus' verse, and that his word-play was meant to acknowledge Mimnermus' authorship of the verse, while the apostrophe could be applied to any reciter<sup>19</sup>. While this approach tries to escape the question of whether an actual poetic dialogue could be possible between the two poets (the problem will be discussed below), it also dissociates the apostrophe Λιγυραστάδη from Mimnermus; but even so, the resemblance of the apostrophe to the name of Mimnermus' father, and not to the poet's patronymic remains unexplained.

<sup>16</sup> P. Tebt. 692, lines 16–18: for the text, see Carden (1974: 73), who also identifies the tonality of the fragment and of the use of the -ίδης coinage as “jocular” (cf. Carden 1974: 82). As regards the Solonian fragment, the tone of the apostrophe Λιγυραστάδη has been assessed in very different ways, ranging from “mocking” (thus, Tuomi 1986: 10–14) to “full of reverence” (thus, Steffen 1955: 44).

<sup>17</sup> Thus, “[λιγυραστάδης] is presumably a compound of λιγύς and ἄστης, hence literally ‘son of a clear singer’” (Gerber 1970: 138); cf. “[Solon] addresses Mimnermus, not as the son of a particular father, but as a poet who belongs to a family of clear-voiced singers” (Allen 1993: 15–16).

<sup>18</sup> As Meyer (1923: 116) explains the basic semantic nuance proper to this type of word formations, “die Endung -ίδης (-αδης) gibt dem Kompositum den Wert von etwas Dauerndem weil ,erheblich von Geschlecht zu Geschlecht Weitergegebenem‘; d.h. etwas von Hause aus Angeborenem”.

<sup>19</sup> “In his reference to Λιγυραστάδης [in v. 3] Solon would not have been addressing the real Mimnermus by name (indeed what Solon utters is not Mimnermus' name), but rather he would have been signaling – outside of the fiction – that he was going to introduce a quotation from ‘Mimnermus’” (Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 400–401).

A more radical solution for the problem that the unexpected resemblance of the poetic pseudo-patronym and the name of Mimnermus' father poses is to postulate a corruption in the form Λιγυρτυάδου at the beginning of *Suda*'s entry. This position can be stated explicitly<sup>20</sup>, but more often than not it is implied, as, for example, or when Dihle says, without elaborating, that the apostrophe was based on "a patronym"<sup>21</sup>. This approach has an evident disadvantage, as it gives a simpler, more transparent form preference over a more complex one; moreover, it implies that the name of Mimnermus' father could have been known to the compiler of the *Suda* entry solely from Solon's fragment, which, in our view, should not be taken for granted.

Finally, it has been suggested that the apostrophe in Solon fr. 20, 3 might be Mimnermus' actual patronym. Thus, when West reconstructs Λιγιαστάδη, his editorial choice testifies above all to his doubts as concerns the text transmitted by manuscripts of *Suda* and Diogenes Laertius; however, since he makes no mention whatsoever of the form Λιγυρτυάδου, it is fair to assume that he considered Λιγιαστάδη as the closest we can get to recovering Mimnermus' patronymic. Hudson-Williams was more explicit: he suggested that Λιγυαστάδης (the form he took over from Bergk) might have been Mimnermus' real patronymic, which allowed him to surmise that Mimnermus' father was called Ligyastes<sup>22</sup>. In spite of all their differences, these attempts have two major drawbacks: (a) they are based on the assumption that there is no wordplay in Solon's fr. 20, 3, which runs counter to the spirit of the Solonian fragment; and (b) they ignore *Suda*'s statement ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Λιγυαστάδης that must mean that the nickname Λιγυαστάδης sounded different from Mimnermus' name and patronymic – unless, of course, one is

<sup>20</sup> Thus, e.g., Maas (1932: 1725): “†Λιγυρτυάδου Suid., mißverstanden aus Solon frg. 2 D.”. However, scholars stop short of proposing a correction for *Suda*'s Λιγυρτυάδου.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Dihle (1962: 265 n. 1): “die einem Patronymikon nachgebildete und an seine Stelle stehende, vielleicht ironisch-scherzhafte Anrede λιγυαστάδης, die Solon (fr. 22) gebildet hat”.

<sup>22</sup> Hudson-Williams (1926: 127): “the poet may really have been the son of Ligyastas”. The idea is mentioned critically by Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 404), but ignored by most other scholars. Edmonds (1931: 137) seems to have been the only scholar to have shared Hudson-Williams' approach, as in his Loeb edition, he leaves the apostrophe Λιγυαστάδη without translation, rendering it simply as ‘Ligyastades’; however, in the absence of a note, this is only a guess.

willing to suppress altogether the form Λιγυρτυάδου from the beginning of the *Suda* entry on Mimnermus.

Neither of these approaches recommends itself: one proposes a largely unwarranted modification to *Suda*'s entry, and the other fails to tackle the resemblance of Solon's Λιγυραστάδη to Λιγυρτυάδης, the name of Mimnermus' father as transmitted by the tradition. We are thus left with the question with which Szádecky-Kardoss ended his brief summary of the problem: "Wie und warum hätte man die Benennung des Sohnes (Λιγυραστάδης) auf den Vater (in entstellter Form) übertragen?" (Szádecky-Kardoss 1968: 940).

There is one solution that has not been hitherto proposed and which would eschew the disadvantages of the approaches outlined above. However, before presenting it, a few words must be said about Mimnermus' biography in the *Suda* (μ 1077) and on the sources used by its compiler. Its contents and structure of this entry are simple and straightforward, incorporating essential data on Mimnermus (father's name, place of birth, date, writings). However, the introduction of an alternative date, and especially the wording, τινὲς δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ συγχρονεῖν λέγουσιν, shows clearly that the compiler relied on two distinct biographical sources on Mimnermus' life. One of these (preferred by the compiler) dated Mimnermus around 40 years (i.e. ten Olympiads) before the Seven Sages<sup>23</sup>, whereas the second made Mimnermus their contemporary: there can be little doubt that the later date stems from Solon's biographical tradition and was invented to account for the impression of a direct dialogue between the two poets that Solon's fr. 20 W. leaves. The same biographical source would have provided the information that Mimnermus was also called Λιγυραστάδης (obviously taken directly from Sol. fr. 20 West<sup>24</sup>). However, other data manifestly come from an independent biographical tradition: thus, the compiler is unsure about Mimnermus' place of birth, giving three possibilities, Κολοφώνιος ἢ Σμυρναῖος ἢ Ἄστουπαλαιεύς, of which the last, as M. L. West has shown, must be a misunderstood periphrastic reference to Smyrna as the old city<sup>25</sup>, and the remaining alternatives probably

<sup>23</sup> On this calculation, see Sanz-Morales (2011: 34–35), who builds on an old idea briefly mentioned by Diels (1902: 482–483).

<sup>24</sup> For the idea that the *Suda* entry on Mimnermus relies on a combination of two traditions, see V. de Marco in della Corte et al. (1971: 23); cf. Wilamowitz (1913: 280, n. 1). Unfortunately, I was not able to consult de Marco (1939/40).

<sup>25</sup> See West (1974: 72), who is followed by Allen (1993: 13 n. 17), Gerber (1997: 109), Bagordo (2011: 165).



reflect Mimnermus' elusive self-identification (as exemplified by Mimn. fr. 9 W.)<sup>26</sup>; the information on the elegist's *œuvre*, despite the corrupt state of the text in this passage, no doubt goes back to the organization of Mimnermus' Alexandrian edition<sup>27</sup>.

Returning to the question of the name of Mimnermus' father, it seems plausible that Λιγυρτυάδης also stems from a biographical tradition on Mimnermus which could have learnt it either from an independent source or directly from the poet's writings. A look at the *testimonia* in modern editions of Mimnermus shows that hardly any of the meager details on the poet's life can be shown to have been preserved independently of Mimnermus' verses; this, as well as the fact that Solon had to know the name in order to create the pun Λιγυραστάδης, makes it much more likely that the name Λιγυρτυάδης can be traced back to Mimnermus' own verses<sup>28</sup>.

There is, in fact, one type of context where Mimnermus could have mentioned the name of his father – in a poetic *sphragis* to a large poem (such as the *Smyrneis*) or a book of poetry<sup>29</sup>. That Mimnermus might have “signed” his work is actually very probable. Pausanias tells us that the elegy on the Smyrneans' battle with the army of Gyges opened with a proem which spoke of two generations of Muses (Paus. 9, 29, 4 = Mimn. fr. 14 Allen = fr. 13 West), a precious testimony which shows that Mimnermus paid attention to the formal framing of his work. A formalized proem of this kind (or, perhaps, an equally formalized closure of the book of poetry or a large poem) would be a perfect opportunity for inserting a *sphragis*.<sup>30</sup> Now, in a context of this kind the name of the father would most certainly have appeared in the genitive form – in other words, we assume that the form Λιγυρτυάδου, transmitted unanimously by the Suda manuscripts, was taken directly from Mimnermus' verses. If we further assume that Mimnermus' own

<sup>26</sup> See West (1974: 72), Allen (1993: 13–14), Gerber (1997: 109).

<sup>27</sup> On the reconstructions of Mimnermus' Alexandrian edition, see Müller (1988: esp. 206–208); Allen (1993: 19–23).

<sup>28</sup> The idea that the name Ligyrtiades could not have been mentioned by Mimnermus himself is sometimes presented as a self-evident premise (thus, Maas 1932: 1725), but, in our view, would need to be argued.

<sup>29</sup> On the *sphragides* in Greek poetry, see the seminal article by Kranz (1961), as well as discussions of seals of particular authors, such as Woodbury (1952), Hubbard (2007), Nisbet, Hubbard (1978: 335) and others.

<sup>30</sup> As Walter Kranz has shown, the form of invocation to the Muses (the κλητικὸς ὕμνος) in particular is associated with the poet's introduction of himself (Kranz 1961: 4–5).

name was in the genitive, as is often the case in seals<sup>31</sup>, the combination of name and patronymic might have sounded as \*Μιμνέρμου – υ Λιγυρτυάδεω (this reconstruction is suited for a pentameter but is not the only possibility). In that case Λιγυρτυάδου would in fact have been an adjectival patronymic in -άδης, which the compiler of the *Suda* or his source had interpreted as the father's name (on the reasons why such an interpretation seemed possible, see the *Appendix* to this article). In that case, Mimnermus' father would have actually been called Λιγυρτύης<sup>32</sup>.

Now, Λιγυρτύης is not transparent as to its inner form, and its ending in -ύης is not typical for Greek names. However, names in -υης / -υας are fairly well attested in Greek inscriptions of Asia Minor<sup>33</sup>, e. g., Τουης (in Cilician and Pamphylian context)<sup>34</sup>, Πακτύης (in Lydian and Carian context; cf. the Pactyes who appears in

<sup>31</sup> The most famous *sphragis* of this kind is, of course, Theognis' seal: ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· “Θεόγνιδός ἐστιν ἔπη / τοῦ Μεγαρέω· πάντα δὲ κατ’ ἀνθρώπους ὀνομαστός” (Theogn. 22–23) “Thus will everyone say: ‘These are the verses of Theognis, the poet from Megara, and his name is known among all men’”. Cf. also καὶ τόδε Φωκυλίδου “this also belongs to Phocylides” at the beginning of fragments 1–5 Gentili-Prato and καὶ τόδε Δημοδόκου “this too belongs to Demodocus” (Demodoc. fr. 2 W.; cf. Hubbard 2007: 203–204). In Hellenistic poetry, particularly close is τοῦ Κυρηναίου τοῦτ’ Ἐρατοσθένεος “this is the work of Eratosthenes of Cyrene” (Eratosthen. fr. 18, 35; cf. Nic. *Ther.* 957–958; cf. *Alex.* 629–630).

<sup>32</sup> The idea that *Suda*'s Μίμνερος Λιγυρτυάδου resulted from a misinterpretation of an actual patronymic was already suggested by N. Bach; he used it, however, to argue that Λιγυρτυάδης was no patronymic, but signaled Mimnermus' belonging to a group of singers: “Mimnermus non filius Ligyrtyadae cuiusdam, verum ipse Λιγυρτυάδης sive Λιγυστιάδης appelletur, forma quidem patronymica, illa tamen ad artem referenda, eadem prorsus ratione, qua *Homeridae*, *Daedalidae* aliique dicuntur” (Bach 1826: 8). The same idea also prompted Hudson-Williams' suggestion that Mimnermus' father was called Λιγυάστης (see above); cf. Dihle (1962: 265 n. 1).

<sup>33</sup> The names in -υης were gathered from the reverse index in the *Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, vol. V.B (Frazer, Matthews 2013), but the list can be certainly expanded: cf. a certain Πιλακυας mentioned in a papyrus from Cairo and identified as a Pisidian by Louis Robert (1963: 428). We follow the editors of the *Lexicon* in leaving most of the names unaccented; an exception will be made for Πακτύης, attested in Herodotus.

<sup>34</sup> Fraser, Matthews (2013: 412, s.v. Τουης), Zgusta (1964: 520, 1585–4). The name can be identified with the Hittite name *Duwa* attested in several inscriptions (Laroche 1966: 193, no. 1398; the Hittite does not distinguish between /d/ and /t/), but also as part of compound names in *Duwayalla*, *Tuwakili*, *Tuwastili*, *Tuwattaziti*, etc. (for the list and references, see Laroche 1966: 193–194).

Herodotus, 1, 153–161)<sup>35</sup>, Σαμβακτῆς (in Carian context; cf. Σαμπακτῆς<sup>36</sup>), Παναμῆς (mostly in Carian inscriptions)<sup>37</sup>, Ουφραμῆς (Pamphylian)<sup>38</sup>, etc. Most of these names are compounds, sometimes also attested in inscriptions in Anatolian languages, and the second element (e.g. -τῆς, -μῆς) can be identified with an Anatolian root: the sense and etymology are uncertain for -τῆς, but -μῆς means “descendant of...”<sup>39</sup>.

It should be added that names of a similar kind are also attested in Greek non-epigraphic sources. Thus, we are told that the name of Thales’ father was Examyēs<sup>40</sup>:

Ἦν τοίνυν ὁ Θαλῆς, ὡς μὲν Ἡρόδοτος καὶ Δοῦρις καὶ Δημόκριτός φασι, πατὴρ μὲν Ἐξαμύου, μητὴρ δὲ Κλεοβουλίνης, ἐκ τῶν Θελιδῶν, οἱ εἰσι Φοίνικες, εὐγενέστατοι τῶν ἀπὸ Κάδμου καὶ Ἀγήνορος (Diog. Laert. 1, 22 Dorandi).

“Thales was, according to Herodotus, Douris and Democritus, son of Examyēs and Cleobouline, and belonged to the Thelidae who are Phoenicians and noblest among the descendants of Cadmos and Agenor”

And among the testimonia on Mimnermus’ life a poetic appraisal of the elegist’s life in Hermesianax, another Examyēs is mentioned as Mimnermus’ companion at feasts – piece of information that undoubtedly was taken from Mimnermus’ own writings:

καίετο μὲν Ναννοῦς, πολιῶ δ’ ἐπὶ πολλάκι λωτῶ  
κημωθεὶς κόμους εἶχε σὺν Ἐξαμύῃ  
(Hermesian. fr. 3, 35–40 Lightfoot = Mimn. Test. 4 Allen).

<sup>35</sup> See Zgusta (1964: 403–404, § 1193), Fraser, Matthews (2010: 353, s.v. Πακτύης), Fraser, Matthews (2013: 338, s.v. Πακτῆς).

<sup>36</sup> Fraser, Matthews (2013: 377, s.v. Σαμβακτῆς); on Σαμπακτῆς, see Zgusta (1964: 452, § 1364–2) who connects it with Πακτύης.

<sup>37</sup> Fraser, Matthews (2013: 339, s.v. Παναμῆς), Zgusta (1964: 405, § 1197–6). The name is attested as *Panamuwa* in Hittite (see Laroche 1966: 135, no. 927; cf. *Punamuwa* – Laroche 1996: 158, no. 1050).

<sup>38</sup> See Fraser, Matthews (2013: 335, s.v. Ουφραμῆς); the name resembles Lycian Οπραμοῆς (cf. Fraser, Matthews 2013: 329, s.v. Οπραμοῆς; Zgusta 1964: 378, § 1099–3), perhaps also attested in Cilician as Οπραμουῆς (Fraser, Matthews 2013: 330, s.v. Οπραμουῆς).

<sup>39</sup> Cf. *Armamuwa* “descendant of the Moon”, *Tiwatamuwa* “descendant of the Sun”, etc.; on these names see Laroche (1966: 290); it has been suggested that the literal meaning of *-muwa* seems to be “seed, seminal fluid” (cf. Gamkrelidze, Ivanov 1984: II, 818; Kazansky 2004: 89).

<sup>40</sup> Cf. the name Εκαμῆς attested in a Carian inscription from Labraunda; see Fraser, Matthews (2013: 130, s.v. Εκαμῆς).

“He burned with passion for Nanno and often, muzzled onto his ancient flute, held revels with Examyes”.

Names in -ύης/-ύας thus had a certain degree of diffusion in Greek cities of Asia Minor, and the presence of another person with a name of this kind in Mimnermus' immediate entourage is certainly striking. This being said, the reconstruction of a non-Greek name for Mimnermus' father should not lead us to draw any hasty conclusions as to Mimnermus' family. Onomastic data in general demand careful treatment, and we know too little of the sociographic situation in ancient Smyrna in Mimnermus' lifetime to warrant any unequivocal conclusions. Moreover, it cannot be excluded that Ligyrtyes may already be a partly Hellenized version of an indigenous name, modified to make it resemble the Greek adjective λιγυρός. This type of Hellenization may also be suspected in other cases. The well attested name Παναμύης, also attested as Πυναμυας<sup>41</sup>, finds parallels in the Hittite and other Anatolian languages; however, predominance of the form Παναμύης in the Greek inscriptions suggests that it was preferred because of the resemblance of the first root to Gk. πᾶς, πᾶσα, πᾶν; and the name Κιδραμύας (Κιδραμουας, -ης) seems to have been modified into Κυδραμύας in some inscriptions, possibly to resemble κυδρός<sup>42</sup>.

The proposed analysis of the name Λιγυρτυάδης as a proper patronymic, which had been mistakenly taken for the name of the poet's father, has the advantage of introducing minimal change in the tradition, while the more interesting part of the transmitted form Λιγυρτυάδου is preserved. At the same time, it explains Solon's wordplay. In creating Λιγυραστάδης, he was using Mimnermus' actual patronym Λιγυρτυάδης: if our suggestion that the patronym had been mentioned by Mimnermus in his *sphragis* is accepted, the patronym would have been known to at least a part of his audience that would be able to fully appreciate his pun. The first part of the father's name would have been associated with the adjective λιγυρός “clear-voiced”, which permitted Solon to replace it with the λιγύς, the shorter variant, identical from the point of view of the

<sup>41</sup> See Fraser, Matthews (2013: 371, s.v. Πυναμυας); cf. Robert (1963: 515) and Robert, Robert (1953: 179–178, no. 202). It may have helped that *pūna-* in Luwian and Lycian also meant “all”; Laroche viewed *pana-* as a variant of the same form, but this idea is disputed (cf. Adiego 2007: 337–338, § 2.12).

<sup>42</sup> See Robert (1963: 409), with references; cf. Zgusta (1964: 260, § 767–1).

semantics, while the patronymic suffix was transformed into a separate root and linked with the verb ἄδω.

### Appendix

A few words need to be said about the reasons that led to the confusion of patronymic with the father's name in Mimnermus' biographical tradition. On the one hand, a name such as Λιγυρτύης would have sounded strange to a Greek reader, and if it was only attested as part of an adjectival patronymic Λιγυρτυάδης (and especially if, as we suggested, it was used in the genitive), grammarians would have been tempted to treat it as a proper name in -άδης, as the suffix disguised to some extent what was unusual about the name, giving it a form that was closer to Greek. On the other hand, Solon's name for Mimnermus, Λιγυραστάδης, which was probably incorporated into the elegist's biographical tradition no later than early Hellenistic times<sup>43</sup>, would have precluded the elimination of the -άδης suffix from the form Λιγυρτυάδης.

But there was also a much more specific reason why the compiler of Mimnermus' biography would have been comfortable with giving the name of Mimnermus' father as Λιγυρτυάδης. The ancient scholia preserve a strand of exegesis which explained that in poetic language a father's name in -άδης / -ίδης could also be used as his son's patronym. This explanation appears only sporadically and was in all likelihood invented as ad hoc explanation of some of the more problematic forms in -άδης and -ίδης. In particular, this explanation was used, and probably invented, by Aristarchus:

“ἐνθ' ὀλβίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις”: οὐκ ἀπὸ φυλῆς, ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος· τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ὄντος Ἐμμενίδου οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο Ἐμμενίδας· ἡ δὲ ποιητικὴ παρέκτασις καὶ σχηματισμοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κυρίων πατρωνυμικῶν ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτῶν τρεπόμενα ὀνόματα, οἷον Ἡρακλείδης καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ἔστι μὲν σχήματι πατρωνυμικά, κύρια δὲ τινῶν. Εἴ τις οὖν τὸν τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου υἱὸν πατρωνυμικῶς βούλοιο σημῆναι, ὁμωνύμως ἂν πάλιν [πατρὸς] Ἡρακλείδην καλοίη (schol. BDEGQ in Pind. *Pyth.* 6, 5a Drachmann).

<sup>43</sup> Diogenes Laertius writing in the III century AD who preserves Solon's dialogue with Mimnermus is the obvious *terminus ante quem* for the story's entry in the biographical tradition of the two poets. However, the revival of interest in Mimnermus at the beginning of the Hellenistic age renders an earlier date much more probable.

“ ‘There for the fortunate Emmenidai’: [called thus] not from their clan<sup>44</sup>, as Aristarchus [argued]: for the original name being Emmenides, the derivative would not be Emmenides<sup>45</sup>. This is a poetic extension [of usage of the name] to their own names, producing a trope – as well as a formation based on actual patronyms, just as Heracleides and Asclepiades are, by their form, patronymics, but proper names of some people. And thus if someone wanted to designate Heracleides’ son by a patronym, he would call him in his turn Heracleides, homonymously with his father”

Aristarchus considered Pindar’s expression ὀλδίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις problematic because of the general structure of *Pythian* 6. The ode celebrates a chariot victory of Xenocrates of Acragas, brother of Theron, the tyrant of Acragas, but besides the actual *laudandus*, Xenocrates, his son, Thrasybulus, receives an unexpected amount of attention and praise. The expression ὀλδίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις at the very beginning of the ode (*Pyth.* 6, 5) has to be understood as referring to the three family members. The origins of the family name Ἐμμενίδαι were explained in different ways in Antiquity<sup>46</sup>, but Aristarchus obviously preferred the genealogy according to Theron’s and Xenocrates’ grandfather was called Emmenides. The fact that the descendants of an Ἐμμενίδης Emmenides were themselves called Ἐμμενίδαι went contrary to the accepted usage and had to be explained: thus, according to Aristarchus, the transfer of a name that was patronymic in form from the father to the son was a kind of poetic trope. The wording of the scholium shows that the homonymy of this kind could in no way be considered normal and suggests that the idea of ποιητικὴ παρέκτασις may have been an exegetical subterfuge invented for this passage in particular (or a limited number of uncomfortable cases). There is one other case where it figures prominently – in Theocritus’ short biography transmitted in the scholia:

Θεόκριτος ὁ τῶν βουκολικῶν ποιητῆς Συρακούσιος ἦν τὸ γένος, πατρὸς Σιμιχίδου, ὡς αὐτὸς φησι· ‘Σιμιχίδα, πᾶ δὴ τὸ μεσαμέριον

<sup>44</sup> Given the scholiast’s brevity, it is difficult to be sure of the exact meaning of φυλή in this context: Miller translates it as “tribe (?)”, considering that “it should mean [Aristarchus] denied it was the name of any kind of descent or kinship group” (Miller 1970: 54). The remark οὐκ ἀπὸ φυλῆς was probably polemic in nature, rejecting the explanation that the Emmenids were a φράτρια (schol. in Pind. Ol. 3, 67b, 68b Drachmann).

<sup>45</sup> Ἐμμενίδας in the text of the scholium is manifestly a Doric form which we have rendered as the more regular form Emmenides in our translation.

<sup>46</sup> For a list and analysis of the ancient sources on the origins of the name Ἐμμενίδαι, see Miller (1970: 53–55).

πόδας ἔλκεις;’ ἔνιοι δὲ τὸ ‘Σιμιχίδα’ ἐπώνυμον εἶναι λέγουσι – δοκεῖ γὰρ σιμὸς εἶναι τὴν πρόσοψιν, – πατέρα δ’ ἐσχηκέναι Πραξαγόραν καὶ μητέρα Φιλίναν (schol. in Theocr. p. 1, l. 4–9 Wendel<sup>47</sup>).

**5** Σιμιχίδα K Σιμιχίδου **cett.** : Σιμίχου Ahrens ex Sud. (θ 161) et schol. in Theocr. 3, 8–9a Σιμιχίδα–ἔλκεις om. **P** **6** τὸ μεσαμέριον codd. plerique: σὺ μεσαμέριον **T** **8** πατέρα–Φιλίναν codd. plerique ; ἄλλοι δὲ αὐτὸν υἱὸν Πραξαγόρου καὶ Φιλίνας εἶναι **E<sup>b</sup>**

“Theocritus, writer of bucolic poetry was Syracusian by his descent, son of Simichidas, as he says himself: ‘Simichidas, where are you steering your steps this noon?’ (Theocr. 7, 21). Others say that ‘Simichidas’ was his surname – for he seemed snub-nosed in his appearance, – whereas his father was Praxagoras and his mother Philinna”.

We know from other ancient sources on Theocritus’ life that the poet’s parents were Praxagoras and Philinna<sup>48</sup>, but the compiler of this biography preferred the alternative version that stemmed from the equation of the narrator of *Idyll 7*, Simichidas, with Theocritus (as is evident from his quotation of Lycidas’ address to him, *Id. 7*, 21). However, he failed to notice, or rather deliberately ignored, the contradiction between his own words πατὴρ Σιμιχίδου and the use of Σιμιχίδα as a patronymic in the quotation he uses to argue his version of Theocritus’ parentage. Ahrens, suspecting an error in the manuscript reading Σιμιχίδου under the influence of the apostrophe Σιμιχίδα, corrected it to Σιμίχου, based on Theocritus’ biography in the *Suda* (θ 166 = II, p. 697, l. 18–19 Adler) and one of the scholia where the assumed father’s name appears as Σίμυχος<sup>49</sup>. However, Σιμιχίδου is visibly more than a *lapsus calami* (and, incidentally, should not perhaps be eliminated from the main text, if only for the interest that it has for the history of ancient literary criticism) – later on a scholiast goes out of his way (in his note on *Id. 7*, 21) to

<sup>47</sup> The abbreviation of manuscripts follows that used by C. Wendel in his edition: **K** – codex Ambrosianus 886; **P** – codex Laurentianus XXXII 37; **T** – codex Vaticanus 38; **E** – codex Vaticanus 42. The text and the *apparatus criticus* quoted above differ slightly from Wendel’s edition: in particular, we reintroduced the ms. reading Σιμιχίδου in the main text and relegated Ahrens’ correction Σιμίχου to the *apparatus*.

<sup>48</sup> See Gow (1965: I, XVI and II, 128). The names of Praxagoras and Philinna appear in Theocritus’ sphragis-epigram: υἱὸς Πραξαγόραο περικλειτᾶς τε Φιλίνας (Theocr. *Ep.* 27, 3), and there is no reason to disbelieve this tradition.

<sup>49</sup> Schol. in Theocr. Ahrens (1859: 1); this reading is accepted by Wendel (1914: 1) and Gow (1965: I, xv).

explain that there is nothing awkward in having the same name appear as the father's name and the son's patronymic:

εἰσὶ καὶ πατρωνυμικὰ οὕτως ἀπαραλλάκτως λεγόμενα καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν υἱῶν ὡς καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πατέρων. ὥσπερ ὁ Θεόκριτος Σιμιχίδα υἱὸς ὄν Σιμιχίδαν ἑαυτὸν ὀνομάζει πατρωνυμικῶς· καὶ τὸν Ἀσκληπιάδην τὸν Σάμιον ποιητὴν Σικελίδα καὶ αὐτὸν καλεῖ παῖδά τινος Σικελίδα λεγομένου τυγχάνοντα (schol. PT in Theocr. 7, 21b Wendel).

“There exist patronyms that are used thus without modification of form both of the sons and of the fathers. Even as Theocritus, being the son of Simichidas, calls himself Simichidas in a patronymic way; and calls Asclepiades, poet from Samos, ‘Sicelides’, as it happened to be the son of a certain Sicelides”.

This scholium uses one and the same approach to explain Σιμιχίδας (which the scholiast wanted to stand for Theocritus) and Σικελίδας (for Asclepiades of Samos; cf. schol. in Theocr. 7, 40b). In neither case is his explanation a lucky one: the suggestion that Theocritus' father's name could be reconstructed as Σιμιχίδας was obviously questioned already in Antiquity; as for Σικελίδας – the form with the patronymic suffix was a fairly common designation of Asclepiades, but not as a patronym, but as a nickname<sup>50</sup>.

The existence of the idea that names in -άδης and -ίδης could be used both as father's names and their son's patronymic seems to have allowed the compiler of the *Suda* entry on Mimnermus (or his source) to reconstruct the name of Mimnermus' father as Λιγυρτυάδης, with the understanding that this name could also be applied, as part of a ποιητικὴ παρέκτασις in the words of Aristarchus, to Mimnermus himself. In that case there would have been no contradiction, in the eyes of the compiler of the *Suda* entry (or of an earlier biographer on whom the compiler relied), between the name Λιγυρτυάδης and the witty apostrophe Λιγυραστάδης in Solon.

### References

- Adler, A. (ed.) 1928–1938: *Suidae Lexicon*, vol. I–V. Stuttgart.  
 Ahrens, H. L. (ed.) 1859: *Bucolicorum Graecorum Theocriti Bionis Moschi reliquiae accedentibus incertorum idylliis*, Vol. II: *Scholia*. Lipsiae.  
 Allen, A. (ed., comm.) 1993: *The Fragments of Mimnermus, Text and Commentary*. Stuttgart.

<sup>50</sup> See Sens (2011: XXIX–XXXI) for the references and a detailed discussion of the probable biographical reasons behind Asclepiades' nickname Sicelides.



- Bach, N. (ed.) 1826: *Mimnermi Colophonii carminum quae supersunt*. Leipzig.
- Bagordo, A. 2011: Lyrik. In: B. Zimmermann (Hrsg.) *Handbuch der griechischen Literatur der Antike*, Bd. I: *Die Literatur der archaischen und klassischen Zeit*. München, 124–249.
- Barron, J. P. Easterling, P. E. 1985: Early Greek Elegy: Callinus, Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus. In: B. M. W. Knox, P. E. Easterling (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. I: *Greek Literature*. Cambridge, 128–136.
- Bergk, Th. (ed.) 1843. *Poetae lyrici Graeci*. Lipsiae.
- Campbell, D. A. 1967: *Greek Lyric Poetry, A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. New York.
- Carden, R. (ed., comm.) 1974: *The Papyrus Fragments of Sophocles, an edition with prolegomena and commentary*, with a contribution by W. S. Barrett. Berlin, New York.
- Diehl, E. (ed.) 1954. *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*. Fasc. I: *Poetae elegiaci*. Leipzig.
- Diels, H. 1902: Onomatologisches. *Hermes* 37, 480–483.
- Dorandi, T. (ed.) 2013: *Diogenes Laertius, Lives of Eminent Philosophers, edited with introduction*. Cambridge; New York.
- Dovatour, A. I. 1982: Solon i Mimnerm, poeticheskaya polemika po povodu raznogo vospriyatiya zhizni [Solon and Mimnermus: Poetic Polemic on Different Views on Life]. *Philologia classica* 2, 55–62.  
Доватур, А. И. 1982: Солон и Мимнерм, поэтическая полемика по поводу разного восприятия жизни. *Philologia classica* 2, 55–62.
- Drachmann, A. B. (ed.) 1910: *Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina*, vol. I–III. Leipzig.
- Edmonds, J. M. (ed., transl.) 1931: *Elegy and Iambus, being the remains of all the Greek elegiac and iambic poets from Callinus to Crates*. Vol. I. Cambridge Mass., London.
- Ford, A. 2004: *Origins of Criticism: Literary Culture and Poetic Theory in Classical Greece*. Princeton NJ; Oxford.
- Fraser, P. M. Matthews, E. (eds.) 2010: *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vol. V.A: *Coastal Asia Minor, Pontos to Ionia* / ed. T. Corsten. Oxford.
- Fraser, P. M. Matthews, E. (eds.) 2013: *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*. Vol. V.B: *Coastal Asia Minor, Caria to Cilicia* / ed. J.-S. Balzat, R. W. V. Catling, É. Chiricat, F. Marchand, associate editor T. Corsten. Oxford.
- Gamkrelidze, T.V. Ivanov, V.V. 1984: *Indoevropskiy yazyk i indoevropytsy* [The Indo-European Language and Indo-Europeans]. Tbilisi.  
Гамкрелидзе, Т. В. Иванов, В. В. 1984: *Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы*. Тбилиси.
- Gentili, B., Prato, C. (eds.) 1979: *Poetarum elegiacorum testimonia et fragmenta*. Pars I. Leipzig.
- Gerber, D. E. 1970: *Euterpe. An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry, edited with introductory remarks and commentary*. Amsterdam.

- Gow, A. S. F. (ed., comm.) 1965: *Theocritus, edited with a translation and commentary*. Vol. I–II. Cambridge.
- Hagen, H. 2007: Zur Form Λίγνα(ι)στάδη bei Solon fr. 22, 3 D. (= Diog. Laert. 1, 61). *Glotta* 83, 89–94.
- Hubbard, Th. 2007: Theognis' *Sphrêgis*: Aristocratic Speech and the Paradoxes of Writing. In: C. Cooper (ed.) *Politics of Orality*. Leiden, Boston. 193–215.
- Hudson-Williams, Th. (ed., comm.) 1926: *Early Greek Elegy: The Elegiac Fragments of Callinus, Archilochus, Mimnermus, Tyrtaeus, Solon, Xenophanes & others*. Cardiff.
- Kazansky, N. N. 2004: [Hippocrates' corpus and its Significance for Modern Humanities]. *Trudy Otdeleniya istoriko-filologicheskikh nauk RAN* 2, 88–91.
- Казанский, Н. Н. 2004: Гиппократов корпус и его значение для современного гуманитарного знания. *Труды Отделения историко-филологических наук РАН*, вып. 2. 2004 г., 88–91.
- Kranz, W. 1961: Sphragis. Ichform und Namensiegel als Eingangs- und Schlußmotif antiker Dichtung. *Rheinisches Museum* 104.1, 3–46; *Rheinisches Museum* 104.2, 97–124.
- Laroche, E. 1966: *Les noms des hittites (Études linguistiques IV)*. Paris.
- Maas, P. 1932: s.v. Mimnermos. In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Bd. 15.2. Stuttgart, 1725–1727.
- Marcovich, M. (ed.) 1999. *Diogenes Laertius, Vitae philosophum*. Vol. I: *libri I–X*. Stuttgart, Leipzig.
- Masaracchia, A. 1958: *Solone*. Firenze.
- Meyer, G. 1923: *Die stilistische Verwendung der Nominalkomposition im Griechischen (Philologus Supplementband 16.3)*. Leipzig.
- Miller, M. 1970: *The Sicilian Colony Dates. Studies in Chronography*, I. Albany.
- Müller, C. W. 1988: Die antike Buchausgabe des Mimnermos. *Rheinisches Museum* 131, 197–211.
- Nisbet, R. G. M. Hubbard, M. 1978: *A Commentary on Horace. Odes, book II*. Oxford.
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (ed., comm.) 2010: *Solon the Athenian, the Poetic Fragments*. Leiden, Boston.
- Perrotta, G., Gentili, B. (ed., comm.) 1965: *Polinnia, poesia greca arcaica*. Mesina, Firenze.
- Robert, J. Robert, L. 1953: Bulletin épigraphique. *Revue des études grecques* 66 (fascicule 309–310), 113–212.
- Robert, L. 1963: *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie Mineure gréco-romaine*, Part I. Paris.
- Sanz Morales, M. 2011: La cronología de Mimnermo. *Eikasmos* 11, 29–52.
- Schmid, W. Stählin, O. 1929: *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Bd. I.1. München.
- Sens, A. (ed., comm.) 2011: *Asclepiades of Samos, Epigrams and Fragments, edited with translation and commentary*. Oxford, New York.
- Steffen, V. 1955: *Quaestiones lyricae*. Poznań.

- Szádeczky-Kardoss, S. 1968: s.v. Mimnermos. In: *Paulys Realencyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, Suppl. Bd. 11. Stuttgart, 935–951.
- Tuomi, R. 1986: *Kaì vōv, Solons Gedicht an Mimnermos im Lichte der Tradition*. Turku.
- Wendel, C. (ed.) 1914: *Scholia in Theocritum vetera*. Stuttgart.
- West, M. L. (ed.) 1980: *Delectus ex iambis et elegis Graecis*. Oxford.
- West, M. L. (ed.) 1992: *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. Vol. II. Oxford (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.).
- West, M. L. 1974: *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin, New York.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1913: *Sappho und Simonides. Untersuchungen über griechische Lyriker*. Berlin.
- Woodbury, L. 1952: The Seal of Theognis. In: M. E. White (ed.) *Studies in Honour of Gilbert Norwood (Phoenix Supplementary Volume 1)*. Toronto, 20–41.
- Zgusta, L. 1964: *Kleinasiatische Personennamen*. Prag.

**Summary.** The name of Mimnermus' father is transmitted by the *Suda* in a biographical entry (μ 1077) that introduces the poet as Μίμνερος Λιγυρτιάδου; the name of the poet's father is preserved by no other source. Although *a priori* there is little reason to doubt the transmitted form, it is difficult to reconcile it with Solon's address to Mimnermus as Λιγυρτιάδης (Sol. fr. 20 West = Diog. Laert. 1, 61; cf. Sud. μ 1077), which manifestly is a compliment to Mimnermus but seems to make the name of Mimnermus' father rather than the poet's own name the object of the pun. The article examines the advantages and the disadvantages of existing approaches to this problem and proposes a different solution, arguing that the transmitted form Λιγυρτιάδης must be an adjectival patronymic, not the actual name of Mimnermus' father.

**Key words.** Mimnermus, Ligyrtiades (Λιγυρτιάδης), Solon, patronymic, *Suda*, Diogenes Laertius, ancient scholarship, onomastics of Asia Minor.