WHAT WAS THE NAME OF MIMNERMUS’ FATHER?

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:

Mιμνέρμος Λιγυρτυάδου, Κολοφώνος ἢ Σμύρνηος ἢ Ἀστυπαλαίδης, ἔλεγχος· Γέγονε δ’ ἐπὶ τῆς ᾩδούς Ὀλυμπιάδος, ὡς προτερεύει τῶν θεῶν, καὶ συγχρονεῖν λέγουσιν. Εκάλετο δὲ καὶ Λιγυρτυάδης διὰ τὸ ἐμμελὲς καὶ λιγύ. Ἐγράψε βιβλία ταῦτα πολλά (Suda, μ 1077 = III, p. 397, l. 20–24 Adler 2)

“Mimnermus, son of Ligyryades, from Colophon, or Smyrna, or Astypalae, an elegiac poet. He lived in the 37th Olympiad (i.e.

1 Suda’s entry on Mimnermus is usually placed at the head of the testimonies 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.
3 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.
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632–629 BCE), so that he precedes the Seven Sages; however, some say he was their contemporary. He was also called Λιγυρτυάδης, because of his melodiousness and clearness (of voice). He wrote books…”

The end of this passage is damaged beyond correction⁴, and there are variant readings for Mimnermus’ alternative name (ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ Λιγυᾳστάδης) 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 accuracy⁵. This being said, modern scholars for the most part do not seem to be at ease with the name Ligyrytades: it is never mentioned without a pointed reference to Suda and as often as not omitted altogether⁶. Neither is this uneasiness dispelled, when Ligyrytades 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):

Αλλ’ εἰ μοι καὶ νῦν ἔτι πείσεαι, ἔξελε τοῦτο, μηδὲ μέγαιρ’, ὅτι σέο λῷον ἐπεφρασάμην, καὶ μεταποίησον, Λιγυᾳστάδη, ὥδε δὲ ἀειδέον. “Ογδοκονταετή μοίρα κίχοι θανάτου”.

1 καί νῦν Thiersch : κἂν νῦν ΒΦ τοῦτο BF₁ : τοῦτον PF² 2 σέο West : σεό B σεό εΒ ΠF λόδον Βισσινάδε : τούν ΒΦF 3 Λιγυαστάδη Diels, Λιγυαστάδη Bergk, Λιγιστάδη West: αἰγιαστάδη B: αἰγιασταδί F: αἰγιασταδὶ P¹ : ἀγυιᾶς ταδὶ P²⁷

---

⁴ For a list of corrections proposed for βιβλία ταῦτα πολλά, see Allen (1993: 23); for the full discussion of the number of books in the Alexandrian edition of Mimnermus, see Müller (1988).
⁵ 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”.
⁷ 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 ‘o 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: 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)9, with one attempt at correcting the unintelligible combination of letters into words (ἀγυιᾶς ταδί). 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, Λιγυαστάδη10. Later Diels introduced a minor correction, Λιγυᾳστάδη (with the iota subscriptum), thereby connecting Solon’s coinage with λιγύ ᾄδειν and establishing a pun between the apostrophe and following

---

8 For the discussion of the textual variants and proposed corrections, see Tuomi (1986: passim), Nousia-Fantuzzi (2010: 402–404). More particularly on the much debated question of whether κἂν νῦν should be modified to καὶ νῦν, add arguments in favour of κἂν 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 Dovatour (1982), and even becomes an important point in his argument, but the preference is left unexplained.

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

10 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 -όδης in the apostrophe coined by Solon may actually be reinterpreted as a second root associated with the word family ἀνδάναο/Ηδύς.
imperative, ἄς δὲ ἄειδε: this reconstruction is widely accepted and has become the predominant reading in editions of elegiac poets\textsuperscript{11}. 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\textsuperscript{12}. West is followed by Marcovich (1999: 41), but most editors only mention the proposed variant in their\textsuperscript{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, Λιγυᾳστάδη seems the most probable. However, whichever one chooses to retain, one detail remains unchanged: Solon’s address to Mimnermus, leaving aside its probable poeto-logical 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\textsuperscript{13}, 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


\textsuperscript{12} 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 διὰ τὸ ἐμμελὲς καὶ λιγύ and eliminates any idea of wordplay in Solon’s apostrophe.”

\textsuperscript{13} 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 223, line 4); Ἡρακλείδης Χαριδήμου τοῦ Μητροδώρου καὶ 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, Γαυριάδας Ἀστοκράτειος, Ἀστοκράτης Γαυριάδαιος “Gauriades son of Astocratos, Astocrates son of Gauriades” (IG IX.2, 696, col. 6, lines 1–2), Ἀσκλαπιάδας Ἀνδρειμούνειος, Ἀνδρείμου Ἀσκλαπιάδαιος “Asclepiades son of Adreimon, Andreimon 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, 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’, ὦ στωμυλιοσ υλλεκτάδη / καὶ πτωχοποιὲ καὶ ρακιοσυρραπτάδη; “Is that how you speak of me, you gossip-gleaner, you creator of misers, you rag-stitcher?” (Aristoph. Ran. 841–842); 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 ὅδε προτέρων / ὄνομ’ εὖ σ’ ἐθρόει “he was of very very astute stock, whoever it was among our forefathers who

---

14 Diels (1902: 482): “Das patronymische Suffix, das an λιγυαστάδη antritt, soll die Zugehörigkeit zur Zunft der ‚hellen Sänger‘ bezeichnen”.
15 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...” 16. Finally, Gerber and Allen interpreted the compound as referring to Mimnermus’ actual descent from a family of singers 17. 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 18. 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 Λιγυᾳστάδη 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 19. 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 Λιγυᾳστάδη 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.

16 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 Λιγυᾳστάδη has been assessed in very different ways, ranging from “mocking” (thus, Tuomi 1986: 10–14) to “full of reverence” (thus, Steffen 1955: 44).

17 Thus, “[λιγυᾳστάδης] is presumably a compound of λιγύς and ᾄστης, 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).

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

19 “In his reference to Λιγυᾳστάδης [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\textsuperscript{20}, 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”\textsuperscript{21}. 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 Λιγυᾳστάδης (the form he took over from Bergk) might have been Mimnermus’ real patronymic, which allowed him to surmise that Mimnermus’ father was called Ligyastes\textsuperscript{22}. 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 Λιγυᾳστάδη that must mean that the nickname Λιγυᾳστάδης sounded different from Mimnermus’ name and patronymic – unless, of course, one is

\textsuperscript{20} 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.

\textsuperscript{21} Cf. Dihle (1962: 265 n. 1): “die einem Patronymikon nachgebildete und an seine Stelle stehende, vielleicht ironisch-scherzhafte Anrede λιγυᾳστάδης, die Solon (fr. 22) gebildet hat”.

\textsuperscript{22} Hudson-Williams (1926: 127): “the poet may really have been the son of Ligyastas”. The idea is mentioned critically by Nousia-Fantuzzi (2010: 404), but ignored by most other scholars. Edmonds (1931: 137) seems to have been the only scholar to have shared Hudson-William’s approach, as in his Loeb edition, he leaves the apostrophe Λιγυᾳστάδη 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 Λιγυστάδη 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 (Λιγυστάδης) 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 Sages23, 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 Solons’ fr. 20 West leaves. The same biographical source would have provided the information that Mimnermus was also called Λιγυςτάδης (obviously taken directly from Sol. fr. 20 West24). However, other data manifestly come from an independent biographical tradition: thus, the compiler is unsure about Mimnermus’ place of birth, giving three possibilities, Κολοφόνιος ἢ Σμύρναιος ἢ Ἀστυπαλαιεύς, of which the last, as M. L. West has shown, must be a misunderstood periphrastic reference to Smyrna as the old city25, and the remaining alternatives probably

---

24 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).
reflect Mimnermus’ elusive self-identification (as exemplified by
Mimn. fr. 9 W.)\(^{26}\); 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\(^ {27}\).

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 Λιγυᾳστάδης, makes it much more likely that the name
Λιγυρτυάδης can be traced back to Mimnermus’ own verses\(^ {28}\).

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\(^ {29}\). 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 payed 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.\(^ {30}\) 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

---


\(^{27}\) On the reconstructions of Mimnermus’ Alexandrian edition, see Müller

\(^{28}\) The idea that the name Ligyrtyades 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.

\(^{29}\) 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.

\(^{30}\) 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).
What Was the Name of Mimnermus’ Father?

name was in the genitive, as is often the case in seals,\(^{31}\) the combination of name and patronymic might have sounded as *Μιμνέρμου – 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.\(^{32}\)

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,\(^{33}\) e.g., Τουης (in Cilician and Pamphylian context)\(^{34}\), Πακτύης (in Lydian and Carian context; cf. the Pactyes who appears in

---

\(^{31}\) The most famous sphragis of this kind is, of course, Theognis’ seal: ὧδε δὲ πᾶς τις ἐρεῖ· ‘Θεόγνιδος ἐστιν ἔπη / τοῦ Μεγαρέως: πάντας δὲ κατ’ ἄνθρωπους 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 τὸ δὲ Φωκυλίδου “this also belongs to Phocylides” at the beginning of fragments 1–5 Gentili-Prato and καὶ τὸ δὲ Δημοδόκου “this too belongs to Demodocus” (Demodoc. fr. 2 W.; cf. Hubbard 2007: 203–204). In Hellenistic poetry, particularly close is τοῦ Κυρηναίου τοῦ Έρατοσθένεος “this is the work of Eratosthenes of Cyrene” (Eratosthen. fr. 18, 35; cf. Nic. Ther. 957–958; cf. Alex. 629–630).

\(^{32}\) The idea that *Suda*’s Μίμνερμος 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 Ligyrtiadae sed ipse Λιγυστιάδης appelletur, forma quidem patronymica, illa tamen ad artem referenda, eadem prorsus ratione, qua *Homeridae, Daedalidae* alique 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).

\(^{33}\) The names in -ης 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.\(^{34}\)

\(^{34}\) 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)\textsuperscript{35}, Σαμβακτυης (in Carian context; cf. Σαμπακτυης\textsuperscript{36}, Παναμυης (mostly in Carian inscriptions)\textsuperscript{37}, Ουϝραμυας (Pamphylian)\textsuperscript{38}, etc. Most of these names are compounds, sometimes also attested in inscriptions in Anatolian languages, and the second element (e.g. -τυης, -μυης) can be identified with an Anatolian root: the sense and etymology are uncertain for -τυης, but -μυης means “descendant of…”\textsuperscript{39}.

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 Examyes\textsuperscript{40}:

```
'Ἡν τοίνυν ὁ Θαλῆς, ὡς μὲν Ἡρωδοτος καὶ Δοῦρις καὶ Δημόκριτός φασι, πατρὸς μὲν Ἐξαμύου, μητρὸς δὲ Κλεοβούλινης, ἐκ τῶν Ἡμιλδὸν, οἷς εἰσὶ Φοίνικες, εὐγενέστατοι τῶν ἀπὸ Κάδμου καὶ Ἀγήνορος (Diog. Laert. 1, 22 Dorandi).
```

“Thales was, according to Herodotus, Douris and Democritus, son of Examyes 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 Examyes is mentioned as Mimnermus’ companion at feasts – piece of information that undoubtedly was taken from Mimnermus’ own writings:

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

\textsuperscript{35} See Zgusta (1964: 403–404, § 1193), Fraser, Matthews (2010: 353, s.v. Πακτυης), Fraser, Matthews (2013: 338, s.v. Πακτυης).
\textsuperscript{36} Fraser, Matthews (2013: 377, s.v. Σαμβακτυης); on Σαμβακτυης, see Zgusta (1964: 452, § 1364–2) who connects it with Πακτυης.
\textsuperscript{38} See Fraser, Matthews (2013: 335, s.v. Ουϝραμυας); the name resembles Lycian Οψάρμος (cf. Frazer, Matthews 2013: 329, s.v. Οψάρμος; Zgusta 1964: 378, § 1099–3), perhaps also attested in Cilician as Οψάρμος (Frazer, Matthews 2013: 330, s.v. Οψάρμος).
\textsuperscript{39} 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).
\textsuperscript{40} Cf. the name Εκαιμυης attested in a Carian inscription from Labraunda; see Fraser, Matthews (2013: 130, s.v. Εκαιμυης).
“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 Ligyrytyes may already be a partly Hellenized version of a 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,41 finds parallels in the Hittite and other Anatolian languages; however, predominance of the form Παναμύης in the Greek inscriptions suggests that is 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 κυδρός42.

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 Λιγυᾳστάδης, 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 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

---

41 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 πīna- 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).
semantics, while the patronymic suffix was transformed into a separate root and linked with the verb ἀδω.

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 extant what was unusual about the name, giving it a form that was closer to Greek. On the other hand, Solon’s name for Mimnermus, Λιγυᾳστάδης, which was probably incorporated into the elegist’s biographical tradition no later than early Hellenistic times, 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:

“ἔνθ’ ὀλϐίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις”: οὐκ ἀπὸ φυλῆς, ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος· τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ὄντος Ἐμμενίδου οὐκ ἄν γένοιτο Ἐμμενίδας· ἢ δὲ ποιητικὴ παρέκτασις καὶ σχηματισμοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κυρίων πατρωνυμικῶν ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτῶν τρεπόμενα ὀνόματα, οἶν Ἡρακλείδης καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ἔστι μὲν σχήματι πατρωνυμικὰ, κύρια δὲ τινῶν. Εἴ τις οὖν τὸν τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου υἱὸν πατρωνυμικῶς βούλοιτο σημῆναι, ὁμονύμως ἄν πάλιν [πατρός] Ἡρακλείδην καλοίη (schol. BDEGQ in Pind. Pyth. 6, 5a Drachmann).

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:

“ἔνθ’ ὀλϐίοισιν Ἐμμενίδαις”: οὐκ ἀπὸ φυλῆς, ὁ Ἀρίσταρχος· τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ὄντος Ἐμμενίδου οὐκ ἄν γένοιτο Ἐμμενίδας· ἢ δὲ ποιητικὴ παρέκτασις καὶ σχηματισμοὶ ἐπὶ τῶν κυρίων πατρωνυμικῶν ἐπὶ τὰ αὐτῶν τρεπόμενα ὀνόματα, οἶν Ἡρακλείδης καὶ Ἀσκληπιάδης ἔστι μὲν σχήματι πατρωνυμικὰ, κύρια δὲ τινῶν. Εἴ τις οὖν τὸν τοῦ Ἡρακλείδου υἱὸν πατρωνυμικῶς βούλοιτο σημῆναι, ὁμονύμως ἄν πάλιν [πατρός] Ἡρακλείδην καλοίη (schol. BDEGQ in Pind. Pyth. 6, 5a Drachmann).

Diogenes Laertius writing in the III century AD who preserves Solon’s dialogue with Mimnermus is the obvious terminus ant 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, as Aristarchus [argued]; for the original name being Emmenides, the derivative would not be Emmenides. 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 ὀλϐίοισιν 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 ὀλϐίοισιν 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, but Aristarchus obviously preferred the genealogy according to Theron’s and Xenocrates’ grandfather was called Emmanides. The fact that the descendants of an Ἐμμενίδης Emmanides 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 ποιητὴς Συρακούσιος ἦν τὸ γένος, πατρὸς Σιμιχίδου, ὡς αὐτὸς φησι· Ἡμμενίδαι, πᾶ δῆ τὸ μεσαμέριον

44 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 Emnenids were a φράτρια (schol. in Pind. Ol. 3, 67b, 68b Drachmann).

45 Ἐμμενίδαις in the text of the scholium is manifestly a Doric form which we have rendered as the more regular form Emmenides in our translation.

46 For a list and analysis of the ancient sources on the origins of the name Ἐμμενίδαι, see Miller (1970: 53–55).
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 Philinna⁴⁸, 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 πατρὸς 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 Σίμιχος⁴⁹. 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

---

⁴⁷ 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.

⁴⁸ See Gow (1965: I, xvi and II, 128). The names of Praxagoras and Philinna appear in Theocritus’ sphaigris-epigram: υἱὸς Πραξαγόραο περικλειτᾶς τε Φιλίννας (Theocr. Ep. 27, 3), and there is no reason to disbelieve this tradition.

⁴⁹ 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. Ὅσπερ ὁ Θεόκριτος Σιμιχίδα υἱὸς ὁν Σιμιχίδαν έαυτὸν ὀνομάζει πατρωνυμικῶς καὶ τὸν Ἀσκληπιάδην τὸν Σάμιον ποιητὴν Σικελίδαν καὶ αὐτὸν καλεῖ παῖδα 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 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.

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 Λιγυᾳστάδης in Solon.
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What Was the Name of Mimnermus’ Father?


M. N. Kazanskaya


**Summary.** The name of Mimnermus’ father is transmitted by the *Suda* in a biographical entry (μ 1077) that introduces the poet as Μίμνερμος Λιγυρτυάδου; 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 Λιγυρτυάδης (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 Λιγυρτυάδης must be an adjectival patronymic, not the actual name of Mimnermus’ father.

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