“Anacreon, the Connoisseur of Desires”
An Anacreontic Reading of Menecrates’ Sepulchral Epigram
(*IKyzikos 18, 520 = Merkelbach/Stauber 08/01/47 Kyzikos*)
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1 Introduction

The sepulchral metrical inscription for Menecrates *IKyzikos* 18, 520 (= Merkelbach/Stauber 08/01/47 Kyzikos), which is today likely lost, constitutes a little known case in the reception of Anacreon’s persona. This Hellenistic epigram offers a unique occasion to explore the reception of Anacreon’s persona from the point of view of the inscriptional material and, from there, to look for connections with the reception of Anacreon’s persona in the literary tradition, in particular, that of the Hellenistic epigrams and the *Carmina Anacreontea*. In this paper it is my aim to suggest some improvements for the reading of the inscription on the basis of its squeeze, to provide a commentary of each line and to explore different possibilities of interpretation.

---

* I am grateful to K. Hallof for allowing me to study and publish the squeeze of *IKyzikos* 18, 520. I also want to thank him and his team for their assistance. My grateful thanks are also extended to E. Schwertheim and Ch.V. Crowther for their helpfulness and to Ş. Karagöz for her help in pinpointing the inscription. I also wish to thank F.N. Döner, through whom I was able to contact the Turkish authorities, as well as all the people who read a previous version of this paper for their criticisms and suggestions: W. Burkert, J. Mendez Dosuna, G. Most, C. Viti, the two anonymous peers, the Zürich-Giessen Research Group and the editors of this volume. Last but not least, thanks to K. Hatch and C.A. Maciver for helping me correct my English usage. Part of this research was presented at the *CRS Classics in Progress* 2012 at the Università La Sapienza in Rome.

1 Notwithstanding many efforts, I could not identify where the inscription – if still extant – is kept today.

2 As far as I know, the inscription is cited in relation to Anacreon’s study exclusively by Wilamowitz (1913: 110-111), Campbell (1988: 31 n. 2) and Ridgway (1998: 724). No mention of the inscription, which could be an attestation of a statue of Anacreon, was made by Richter/Smith (1984: 83), Schefold (1943: 64 and 204) or Schefold (1997: 102 and 491).

3 In this paper with the phrase “the reception of Anacreon’s persona” I mean the image of Anacreon as an object of reception. In this case Anacreon’s persona does not coincide (necessarily) with his poetic persona.
Sadly enough, not only was Menecrates’ epigram found in partial form and outside of its original context, but the remains are also extremely difficult to interpret. Only a squeeze and two transcriptions of the text remain, while the relief that accompanied the inscription, and which can be considered as the key of the interpretation of the epigram,⁴ have been lost. Different possibilities for interpretation will be explored in the commentary, drawing upon the reception of Anacreon’s persona in the Hellenistic epigrams and, in particular, in the *Carmina Anacreontea.*⁵ Certainly, such an ‘Anacreontic reading’ can only give limited insight into the interpretation of Menecrates’ epigram and perhaps even result in other important issues being marginalized. Given the defective condition of the text and the lack of information about the context of the inscription, this attempt to find parallels with other texts, where the reception of Anacreon’s persona is also implied, could shed new light on the interpretation of Menecrates’ epigram. In turn, this process could also shed new light on the Anacreontic tradition, whose development is represented later by the *Carmina Anacreontea.*

In the epigram, the poet Anacreon is explicitly named and defined as ὁ πόθων ἱδρις “the connoisseur of desires” (l. 2). Moreover, the text seems to be – at least partially – constructed through a differentiation between Menecrates and Anacreon. If the mention of Anacreon could therefore be an important signal for understanding the epigram, the reception of Anacreon’s persona also acquires significance for the interpretation of the text. As shown by Bing in this volume, the imitation of Anacreon began very early, plausibly when the poet was still alive. Between Anacreon’s lifetime and the composition of the earlier poems among the *Carmina Anacreontea* in the late Hellenistic age,⁶ Anacreon’s persona evolved into a strongly stereotyped character. Literary evidence for such a development comes from some Hellenistic epigrams, whose subject is Anacreon’s statue or tomb. Their portraits of Anacreon anticipate features found later in the *Carmina Anacreontea,* as shown by Gutzwiller in this volume. The epigraphic evidence, to which the next section of this paper is dedicated, has not yet been thoroughly investigated.⁷ As will become apparent, Menecrates’ epigram is noteworthy among the epigraphic material, since there the name of Anacreon is usually no more than a label accompanying the poet’s representation.

---

⁴ On the possible relationship between sepulchral epigrams and reliefs, cf., e.g., Nollé (1985).
⁵ Certainly Menecrates, if he is the author of the epigram, or his poet could also have been influenced by the production of Anacreon himself. Given the fragmentary condition of Anacreon’s work it is very difficult to precisely define such an influence. Where possible, the extant fragments of Anacreon will also be taken into account, even if not systematically.
⁶ The sylloge of the *Carmina Anacreontea* gathers short poems, which were composed by different (anonymous) authors in different periods (e.g. West [*1993: xvi-xviii]*)
⁷ Cf., for a partial analysis of the inscriptive material, Bing in this volume.
2 The Poet Anacreon in the Extant Inscriptional Material

Inscriptions containing the name of the Teian poet can be encountered in different places of the ancient Greek and Roman world. They are usually nothing more than labels accompanying Anacreon’s image. Such inscriptional attestations, therefore, are, for the most part, closely related to Anacreon’s iconographic tradition. In addition to the inscriptions on red-figure vases presented by Bing in this volume, the following attestations are known. Anacreon’s name appears on a headless herm from Athens (Ἀνακρέων, SEG XVI 167, beginning of the 2nd cent. CE). Moreover, on two herms from Rome he is on one occasion qualified as λυρικός “lyrist” (IGUR 1499, date uncertain) and on another as Σκυ[θίνου] Τήι[ος] “son of Skythinos, from Teos” (IG XIV 1133, unknown date). Anacreon was represented together with other Greek poets on lost wall paintings in the cryptoporticus of a Roman villa in Tivoli and his image was accompanied by the label Ἀνακρέων [Τήιος] (SEG LVII 977, D, ca. 125 CE). An image of Anacreon could have also appeared in a mosaic from Gerasa. The label Ἀνακρέων is a conjecture (SEG LIII 1889, D1, ca. 150 CE), just as on another mosaic inscription from Sparta ([Ἀνακρέων, SEG XXIX 388, ca. 300 CE). Anacreon was

---

8 The term ‘inscription’ is intended here in its largest sense. The search for the inscribed material containing Anacreon’s name was conducted using the Searchable Greek Inscriptions (http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions), the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (searchable online at www.brillonline.nl) and The Beazley Archive (www.beazley.ox.ac.uk/index.htm).

9 Anacreon was not a widespread proper name. According to the LGPN, it is attested once in Kition on Cyprus (Michaelidou-Nicolaou [1976: A 32, 3rd cent. BCE]) and at least twice on Delos for a father and his son (IG XI 2, 162A.33, 278 BCE; perhaps the son is the same person who appears in IG XI 2, 287A.184 and IG XI 2, 289A.14, 280 BCE). Another attestation from the region of Cyzicus is uncertain ([Ἀνακρέων Δημοφίλου IMT Kyz Kapı Dağ 1456.96, late Hellenistic).


11 I am referring to the kylix from Vulci by Oltos (ca. 515 BCE, British Museum E 18), the lekythos from Gela by the Gales Painter (ca. 490 BCE, National Museum of Syracuse 26967) and the krater by the Kleophrades Painter (ca. 500 BCE, National Museum of Copenhagen MN 13365). For a photo of the first two inscriptions, cf. Richter (1965: respectively fig. 292 and fig. 291 – where, unfortunately, the inscriptions are not legible), for one of the last, cf. p. 30 in this volume. For a drawing of all the inscriptions, cf. Frontisi-Ducroux/Lissarrague (1990: 237-238). For the representation of Anacreon on these vases, cf. also Yatromanolakos 2001.


13 Ἀνακρέων/λυρικός (= IG XIV 1132). There is a photograph in Moretti’s IGUR and in Richter (1965: 76, n° I.1 with figg. 271-272 and 274).


15 Nothing of the alleged image of Anacreon remains in the mosaic, as the drawing (Joyce 1980: 313) shows very clearly. If the missing image is really that of Anacreon, then it might have been associated with the muse Terpsichore (Joyce [1980: 313]).

so popular that he was even represented on the coins of his hometown, Teos (Ἀνακρέων Τηίων, Roman imperial times). Only in two documents does Anacreon’s name appear without any image accompanying it and there it is part of a longer text. The first document is a chronicle from the surroundings of Rome, in which Anacreon is mentioned together with Ibycus (ἦν δὲ καὶ Ἀνακρέων ὁ μηλοποίος καὶ Ἰβυνος ὁ Ῥηγείνος, SEG XXXIII 802, IIB 21-22, early 1st cent. CE). The second document is the sepulchral metrical inscription from the surroundings of Cyzicus, which is central to this study.

3 Menecrates’ Sepulchral Epigram

Menecrates’ sepulchral epigram was published for the first time in 1880 by Aristarchis. His edition was based on an anonymous transcription (which I will refer to as ‘A’) made by a person who had seen the inscription in the wall of a church. In spite of the negative judgement of Mordtmann (1882: 255), who would shortly afterwards publish another transcription (which I will call ‘M’), the anonymous person transcribed the text accurately, as the comparison with the squeeze reveals. Not only does A correspond for the most part with M, in some cases it also presents a better reading. Unfortunately, Aristarchis did not respect the text of A and introduced arbitrary integrations that contributed to invalidating the reliability of the anonymous transcription. As they stand, both copies are useful for the reconstruction of the epigram’s text. Indeed, among the editors and commentators of the inscription, Mordtmann is the only one who had seen it autoptically. The archaeologist also made a squeeze that was lost for awhile, but has fortunately reappeared at the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. On the basis of Mordtmann’s squeeze (Fig. 1), an improvement of the previous readings will be attempted here.

17 Cf. Richter (1965: 77, n° IIb with fig. 296).
19 In the online version of SEG, the reading ἦν is an error. Nu is clearly legible in the photograph of the stone (cf. Burstein [1984: fig. 1b]).
20 In this chronicle of European and Asian history the mention of the two poets contextualizes the period after the death of Cyrus and the succession of Cambyses.
21 In the mosaic from Autun the name of Anacreon does not appear but the poet is easily identifiable by the presence of lines of two of his poems. For an interpretation, in particular for the connection to the Carmina Anacreontea, cf. Rosenmeyer (1992: 33-36).
22 This anonymous person saw the inscription in the church of the Holy Trinity (ἁγία Τριάς) in Muhania at the Western extremity of the Cyzicus peninsula (Aristarchis [1880: 18], cf. also Mordtmann [1882: 255]). The church was destroyed probably between the end of the 19th century and the beginning of the 20th century. It is not known what happened to the inscription.
23 According to Wilamowitz (1913: 110 n. 1) it was lost.
24 The text edited by Cougny (1927: 594, n° II.367b) is based on Aristarchis’ reading. Wilamowitz based his work on a copy of Mordtmann’s transcription. The text presented by
Inscription on a marble slab, which was found enwalled. Length: 0.59 m (apud Aristarchis). According to the reconstruction of the lines as iambic trimeters (cf. below), three to four letters are missing on the left. This could mean that the stone underwent damage or was purposely reshaped in order to be reused. It is less likely that the text began on another stone.

Lettering: the text presents a stichic disposition and scriptio continua. Dimensions of the letters: ca. 0.9-1.5 cm. The dimension of the letters is not consistent. The letters show apices. According to the transcriptions by the anonymous person and Mordtmann, alpha has a broken internal stroke, but on the squeeze the stroke seems curved rather than broken. Epsilon presents a slightly shorter middle stroke. Theta shows an internal dot. The second vertical stroke of pi is still much shorter than the first one. The round letters are slightly smaller than the other ones (ca. 0.9-1.1 cm).

Dating: on the basis of the letters’ shape, the inscription can be dated to the Hellenistic age. Previous attempts at dating (3rd cent. BCE according to Vollgraff [1951: 359], “aus der Zeit des Aristarch” according to Wilamowitz [1913: 110]) were based on alpha’s shape with a broken internal stroke, which does not appear on the squeeze. Merkelbach/Stauber (08/01/47 Kyzikos) date the inscription to the Hellenistic age on the basis of the metre (about metrics, cf. below).
Fig. 1: Mordtmann’s squeeze, Archiv Inscriptiones Graecae, Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Photograph (retouched) by the author.
Transcription: the following transcription represents what I could read on the squeeze. The squeeze presents some folds and holes.

1. ΦΡΟΔΙΤΑΣΝΑΟΣΕΣΤΙΜΕΥΠΕΛΑΣ
2. ΝΑΝΑΚΡΕΟΝΤΑΤΟΝΠΟΘΩΝΙΔΡΙΝ
3. ΔΕΠΑΙΔΕΡΩΣΙΝΟΥΚΕΤΕΡΠΙΟΜΑΝ
4. ΑΣΠΙΟΝΕΠΙΝΑΦΡΟΔΙΣΙΑ
5. ΝΤΙΜΙΜΟΤΥΜΒΟΣΕΥΧΑΡΤΕΧΕΙ
6. ΚΝΙΣΕΙΜΟΜΟΣΑΝΤΙΣ...TAI
7. ΦΡΟΔΙΤΑΣΝΑΟΣΕΣΤΙΜΕΥΠΕΛΑΣ...ΤΕΠΙ
8. ΜΑΤΡΟΔΩΡΟΥΔΟΥΘΡΙΣ...ΕΝΕΚΡΑΤΗΝ

Description of the transcriptions (Figs. 2 and 3): they differ at ll. 1, 2, 6, 7 and 8.

L. 1: . . . ΦΡΟΔΙ. ΑΣΝΑΟΣ. Σ. ΙΜ. ΥΠΕΛΑΣ Α : ΦΡΟΔΙΑΝΑΟΣΕΣΤΙΜΕΥΠΕΛΑΣ. Sigma at the end of the line is legible on the squeeze.

L. 2: the two copies only differ in the final letter. In the anonymous copy, N is given as legible, while Mordtmann simply wrote I. However, nu is legible on the squeeze.

L. 6: . . . ΝΙΣΕΙΜΟΜΟΣΑΝΤΙ...ΕΤΑΙΑ : ΚΝΙΣΕΙΜΟΜΟΣΑΝΤΙ...ΕΤΑΙA. In this case as well, the two copies only differ in one letter (the third epsilon), which is not seen by Mordtmann. The letter is not visible on the squeeze. After ΑΝΤΙ a letter appears, but it is difficult to define which one.

L. 7: . . . ΕΝΕΝΕΠΩΝΕΠΑΙΝΟΣ...ΔΡΕΠΙ . . . Α : ΕΝΕΝΕΠΩΝΕΠΑΙΝΟΣ...ΔΡΕΠΙ. Once again the two copies only differ in one letter (the second sigma), which is not seen by Mordtmann.
Text and supplements:26

1 [ ? ? Α]φροδίτας ναός ἐστὶ μεν πέλας
2 [3-4.] Ανακρέοντα τὸν πόθον ἱδριν
3 [3-4.] δὲ παιδέρωσιν οὐκ ἐτερπόμαιν
4 [3-4.] ἀσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἁφροδίσια
5 [3-4.] ντίμιμ’ ὁ τύμβος εὐχάρακτ’ ἔχει
6 [3-4.] κνίσει με Μόμος, ἀντι[? ?]ται
7 [3-4.] λ’ ἐννέπων Ἐπαινος [. . .]Α[3-4.]Α’ρεπ[. . .]
8 [3-4.] Ματροδώρου δ’ οὖ θρίε[ει]ς Μενεκράτην.

The supplements: suggestions as supplements for the missing parts of the text were made by Aristarchis (= Ar), Wilamowitz (= W) and Vollgraff (= V). The different possibilities will be discussed in the commentary.


L. 3. [ἐγὼ] Ar, W, V.

L. 4. [τὰ δ’] Ar, V : [ἀλλ'] W.


L. 6. [Αμα κ]νίσει με μόμος, ἀντι[τάσσε]ται Ar : [εἰ δὲ] κνίσει με μόμος, ἀντι[τάξε]ται W : [εἰ δὲ] κνίσει με Μόμος, ἀντι[κείσε]ται (ἀντι[βήσε]ται, ἀντι[λήψε]ται) V. After ΑΝΤΙ it seems possible that something similar to the remains of a sigma could be read. However, this is very uncertain and I could not find a supplement which fits the missing part between ΑΝΤΙΣ and ΕΤΑΙ. A supplement such as ἀντις[τήσ]εται seems too long. Previously suggested supplements such as ἀντιτάξεται27 or ἀντικείσεται are acceptable. Epsilon is not legible on the squeeze before the final letters ΤΑΙ on the line, but Α reported it. Since the transcription of Α usually seems reliable, it is possible that epsilon was legible on the inscription.


27 The present (ἀντι[τάσσε]ται) proposed by Aristarchis does not fit very well.
ἔπαινος, there is space for one or perhaps two letters and then two converging oblique lines (a lambda?) appear. On the squeeze nothing is recognizable before the rho. The anonymous copist read an alpha, while Mordtmann transcribed two converging oblique lines. Perhaps this is a mistake and both put the letter visible after sigma just before the following rho (ΑΡΕΠ instead of - Λ ἌΡΕΠ?). Certainly it sounds strange that both the anonymous person and Mordtmann made the same mistake. However, two converging lines are clearly visible on the squeeze between the final sigma of ἔπαινος and the letter read by the anonymous person and Mordtmann.

L. 8. Ὅ Ματροδώρου [arrêt] θλος Ἐς Μενεκράτην Ar : [τὸν] Ματροδώρου δ’ οὗ θρίς[ε]ς Μενεκράτην. W, V. The anonymous copist read a sigma before the mu of the proper name Menecrates. On the squeeze there is enough space for a supplement such as θρίς[ε]ς.

Translation: “Near to me (there) is the temple of Aphrodite […] (the statue of?) Anacreon, the connoisseur of desires […] but I did not enjoy myself with the love of boys […] stainless pleasures amidst youth […] (my) grave has well-carved imitating (images) […] (if?) Momos will scratch me, Epainos will oppose saying […] «you will not harvest Menecrates, the son of Metrodoros».”

Metre: the verse used in the epigram is iambic trimeter. Up until the Imperial Period the choice of the iambic trimeter is not common for inscriptions.

28 Cougny’s translation (1927: 594, n° II.367b): Tuum, Venus, fanum est prope a me / cupiens Anacreontem cupidinum scirentem; / ego autem puere amoribus non delectabar; / inter materaque in juvenes Venerea / tu aemula tumulus bene-notata habet: / simul radet me vituperatio, absistit / pulcra dicens laudatio, qualem decerpsit / Matrodori certamen cum Menecrate.


29 A brevis in longo can be found at the end of line 4 (ἀφροδίσιᾰ). There is no resolution. The poet often uses elision. With the exception of ίδριν (l. 2), plosive + liquid clusters are heterosyllabic. On the structure of the iambic trimeter in Greek inscriptions, cf. Allen (1885-1886: 65-66).
although the use of iambic meters is attested at an early age,\textsuperscript{31} perhaps already in the first line of Nestor’s cup (CEG 454). One reason for the choice of the iambic trimeter could have been the prosodic structure of the proper names Μενεκράτης and, more in particular, Μᾱτρόδωρος, in which the sequence -ός- is unavoidable. Such an explanation is only one of many. This metrical choice may have been suggested to the poet by Anacreon’s iambic production or perhaps be connected to the diffusion of this metre among the Hellenistic epigrammatists.\textsuperscript{32}

Language, style and structure of the text.\textsuperscript{33} in the epigram the literary Ionic forms such as μευ (l. 1) and νέοισιν (l. 3) are balanced by a non-Ionic colouring. All the original long alphas are maintained: Ἀφροδίτᾱ and ναός\textsuperscript{34} (l. 1), ἐτερπόµᾱν (l. 3), Μᾱτρόδωρος (l. 8). This last form is not enough to state a non-Ionic origin of Menecrates’ family, since even the father’s name could have undergone the same process.\textsuperscript{35} The mixing of elements from different dialectal (literary) traditions is not an infrequent feature of metrical inscriptions.\textsuperscript{36}

As regards the vocabulary, the poet chose poetic or rare words, such as respectively ἠδρίς (l. 2) and ἂσπιλός (l. 4). The adjective εὐχάρακτος (l. 5) is only attested in later texts. The adverb πέλας, which is not only characteristic of poetry (Hom. +), but can also appear in prose (Hdt. +), sounds elevated. An aesthetic accuracy may be recognized in the poet’s work, e.g., in his use of alliteration. In line 7 the alliteration underlines the role of Epainos and of his spoken word (ἐννέπων, ἐπαινοῦ l. 7). As will be discussed below, παιδέρως can be understood here as ‘boy’s love’ and not necessarily in the meaning of ‘lover of boys’ given by, e.g., LSJ. The two verbs κνίζω (l. 6) and θρίζω (l. 8), which is usually explained as a poetic syncopated form of θερίζω,\textsuperscript{37} are used metaphorically. The

\textsuperscript{30} West (1982: 183 and 1987: 24). According to the old study of Allen (1885-1886: 44), “a long epitaph in iambic trimeter was not possible before the Macedonian epoch”.
\textsuperscript{32} The iambic trimeter is used in one of the epigrams Leonidas dedicated to a sculpture of Anacreon (AP 16.307 = HE 90). In this very epigram non-Ionic long alphas appear (ἐκ μέθας l. 1, τάν l. 5) accompanied by forms such as θάτερος (l. 4) and μελίσδεται (l. 5). Additionally, Doric features appear in the other epigram Leonidas dedicated to the old and drunk Anacreon (AP 16.306 = HE 31): l. 1 χύδαν, l. 2 θάεο, l. 4 ἀµπεχόναν, ll. 5 and 8 τάν. Gow/Page (1965: 308) put Leonidas’ floruit in the middle of the 3rd cent. BCE or later.
\textsuperscript{33} I do not consider the supplements here since they could be misleading. A thorough analysis of each line is given in the commentary below.
\textsuperscript{34} Ναός could have also been the current form (alongside νεώς) in the Hellenistic age (LSJ s.v.).
\textsuperscript{35} Cf. e.g. CEG 108. In this case the names of both the Aeginetan Mnésitheos and his mother, Timaretē, present an Ionic form.
\textsuperscript{36} In CEG 108 there is a mixing as well. A fitting parallel – probably from Cyzicus and from the Hellenistic age as well – is Merkelbach/Stauber 08/01/53. There is not just one explanation for the use of dialect mixing in the inscriptions, since the reasons could be disparate. Cf. also Sens in this volume.
\textsuperscript{37} Cf. e.g. LSJ s.v. θρίζω.
second one is an amplification (‘harvest’) of the action expressed by the first (‘scratch, gash’).

The first half of the epigram (ll. 1-4) opens and closes with the name of Aphrodite (τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας l. 1 and ἀφροδίσια l. 4). In the second half (ll. 5-8) there is a moment of strong tension when Momos is imagined to attack Menecrates. This is underlined by the *enjambement* between line 6 and line 7, since it delays the name of Menecrates’ helper. In the second half of the epigram the opposition between Momos’ attack and Epainos’ victorious defence (ll. 6-8) is evident. There also seems to be a kind of opposition (or rather differentiation) in the first part of the epigram between Anacreon and Menecrates (cf. l. 3: οὐκ ἐτερπόμαν), but it is not clear on what this opposition could have been based (e.g., Anacreon’s homosexual and Menecrates’ heterosexual love? Or rather an old Anacreon and a young Menecrates?). In the epigram a temporal opposition can also be detected. In the first half the present tense (which could be identified with Menecrates’ condition of being dead and therefore with his grave, ἔστι, l. 1) is opposed to the past tense (that is to Menecrates’ lifetime, οὐκ ἐτερπόμαν, l. 3). In the second half the present tense (ὡς τύμβος […] ἔχει l. 5) is opposed, three times, to the future tense (κνίσει and likely ἀντι […] ἔται l. 6, θρίσεις l. 8). The future here represents the hope that Menecrates’ good reputation will be preserved after his death.

4 Commentary

1. [2-3] Ἀφροδίτας ναός ἐστί μεν πέλας

The epigram begins with the name of Aphrodite. As regards the suggested supplements, Aristarchis’ σὸς surely has to be rejected, because the squeeze after the lacuna shows the genitive Ἀφροδίτας, not a vocative. On the contrary, both supplements [τᾶς Ἀφροδίτας (W) and ὡς Ἀφροδίτας (V) are admissible: “(here) near to me (there) is the temple of Aphrodite”.

It is not possible to ascertain whether a temple of Aphrodite actually existed near Menecrates’ grave or whether its mention in the epigram is a literary device. As far as I know, there are no remains of a temple dedicated to the goddess in Cyzicus or its surroundings. Nevertheless, there is another inscription which possibly mentions a temple of Aphrodite ([ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς] / Ἀφροδείτης IMT Kyz Kapu Dağ 1435, 73, Hamamlı, 2nd quarter of the 1st cent. CE), according to the supplement proposed by Schwertheim (1978: 215). Moreover, there are other inscriptions which attest a cult of Aphrodite. If Menecrates was buried in the

38 Both Anacreon and the paideros – e.g. as a plant (Paus. 2.10.4-6) – are connected with Aphrodite.

39 Aphrodite was worshipped as a maritime goddess with the epithet of Pontia (Ἀφροδείτη Ποντίᾳ IMT Kyz Kapu Dağ 1539.18, Belkiz, 1st cent. BCE) and a priest is mentioned in
sacred area of the temple of Aphrodite, this could mean that he was in some way particularly bound to Aphrodite or to her temple (perhaps as a benefactor?). Vollgraff (1951), who studied the custom of burial in sacred land, defines Menecrates as “un original”. In the absence of the context to which the inscription belonged and given that the text is not explicit about this point, it is not certain that Menecrates was buried in a sacred area. However, the presence of the name of Aphrodite at the beginning of the epigram is certainly significant for the interpretation of the text. Moreover, Aphrodite’s name is echoed some lines further in the adjective ἀφροδίσιος “belonging to the goddess of love” (LSJ).

As far as it is possible to assess from the extant fragments, the goddess of love had a role in Anacreon’s poetic work (cf. fr. eleg. 2.3 West; frs. 1.4.8 (Κύπρις); 1.4.6; 12.3 Page). In the Carmina Anacreontea Aphrodite is a recurring presence. Among these, CA 15 is particularly interesting: a lovely dove says that the goddess (ἡ Κυθήρη, l. 11) has sold it to the poet Anacreon, who is characterized as being the lover of the young Bathylus (l. 8).

2. [3.4.]ν Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν πόθων ἰδρῖν

Among the suggested supplements (ποθῶν “desiring, missing”, τίων “which honours”), that of Wilamowitz (ἐχὼν “which holds”) fits the syntax of the text best. Nevertheless, it implies the – perhaps only fictive – presence of a statue of Anacreon, for which there is no other evidence.

In the Hellenist epigrammatic tradition the description of a statue of Anacreon had become a literary topos (cf. Gutzwiller in this volume). Leonidas (AP 16.306 [= HE 31] and 307 [= HE 90]), Theocritus (AP 9.599 = HE 15) and Eugenes (AP 16.308 = FGE 1, pp. 110-111) wrote at least four epigrams on the subject. There Anacreon’s gesture is described in a vivid way. To the contrary, in Menecrates’ epigram none of the concrete elements which the text mentions (the temple of Aphrodite, the statue of Anacreon nor the images on the grave) are described in a way which suggests their shape to the reader (cf. below). Perhaps this is because the passer-by could see them.

Ἀνακρέων is called σοφός (sc. τὰ ἑρωτικά) already by Plato (Phaedr. 235c), who has a positive attitude towards Anacreon’s love poetry and his knowledge of

40 “Un original a tenu à se faire ensevelir à l’ombre du temple de la divinité dont il avait savouré les bienfaits, Aphrodite” (Vollgraff [1951: 358]).
41 Cf. CA 4 (iii).19, 21 (versus delendus), CA 5.12, CA 15.11, CA 41.8, CA 43.14, CA 44.9, CA 49.9, CA 50.20, CA 52.8, CA 55.8, 22, 31, CA 57.6, 20, CA 60.23, 28.
42 The dove, even though it could be free and no longer Anacreon’s servant (ll. 19-34), prefers – not surprisingly – to stay with him.
love. On the one hand, in the *Carmina Anacreontea*, this feature of Anacreon’s persona has already undergone a strong process of stereotyping. At the very beginning of the *Carmina Anacreontea*, Anacreon\(^{43}\) is described as a handsome, good lover (lit. “fond of bed”): (CA 1.6-7) γέρων μὲν ἦν, καλὸς δὲ, / καλὸς δὲ καὶ φίλευνος. “He was old, but still handsome; / handsome, and a good lover too.”\(^{44}\)

On the other hand, the Anacreontic poet appears to know the different faces of love. In CA 14 a light-hearted poet is looking for someone who could number all the countless loves of his life: (5-6) σὲ τῶν ἐµῶν ἔρωτων / μόνον ποῦ λογιστήν “I will make you alone / the accountant of all my loves”. Love can be a persistent tickle: (CA 6.6-7) καὶ νῦν ἔσω μελῶν μου / πτεροῖσι γαργάλιζε “And now inside my limbs / he (sc. Eros) tickles me with his wings”. But the Anacreontic poet also feels the struggle of love inside his heart: (CA 13.18-20) μάτην δ’ ἔχω βοείην· / τί γὰρ βάλωµεν ἐξω, / μάχης ἐςω μ’ ἐχούσης; “In vain I hold up my shield – / for what use is it to fight outside / when the battle rages within me?”

After the praise of Anacreon as the “connoisseur of the desires of Aphrodite”, the next line of the epigram confronts the reader with the fact that Menecrates refused what is probably the most typical characteristic of the stereotyped image of the poet: Anacreon’s love for young boys.

3. [3.4.] δὲ παιδέρωσιν οὐκ ἐτερπόµαν

The personal pronoun ἔγώ seems to be the best supplement here. It underlines the opposition that the text seems to establish between Anacreon and Menecrates: “(but) I, for my part, did not take pleasure in the love of boys (sc. as Anacreon did instead)”. The common interpretation, which goes back to Wilamowitz, is that Menecrates took pleasure in the love of women (which would be ἀσπίλα ἀφροδίσια, cf. the commentary of the following line), while Anacreon enjoyed the love of boys. This interpretation remains perhaps the most likely, but the relation between Anacreon and Menecrates could have been elaborated in a more complex way. I will come back to this point after having discussed the word παιδέρως.

Above I interpreted the word παιδέρως as an endocentric nominal compound with the meaning “love for the boys” (cf. the type πατράδελφος ‘father’s brother’), while LSJ suggests that παιδέρως is an equivalent of the word παιδεραστής and, therefore, has the meaning ‘who loves boys’.\(^{45}\) Even though παιδέρως is certainly not a verbal compound, παιδέρως could be intended as a possessive (therefore exocentric) nominal compound with the meaning ‘whose

---

\(^{43}\) Anacreon is well present in the *Carmina Anacreontea*: CA 1.1, 13; CA 7.2; CA 15.7, 13, 27; CA 20.1; CA 60.30.

\(^{44}\) All translations of the *Carmina Anacreontea* are by Rosenmeyer (1992: 239-266).

\(^{45}\) This was also Aristarchis’ interpretation of the word. This explanation is accepted by Merkelbach/Stauber.
love is (a) boy’ (cf. the type ῥοδοδάκτυλος ‘rosy-fingered’) and therefore be understood as “who loves boys”. Linguistically, both interpretations are possible in the unclear context of Menecrates’ epigram. Moreover, it should be taken into account that we do not know how the compound was interpreted by the Greeks. This would be a crucial element in order to understand the epigram. In any case, it seems odd that Menecrates stated: “but I, for my part, did not enjoy myself with paederasts (sc. such as Anacreon)”. Even if he died at a younger age than Anacreon, he was probably not an ἐρώμενος (roughly between 12 and 16 years old). In order to better understand the meaning and function of the word παιδέρως in the epigram, it is worthwhile to look more closely at its uses.

Παιδέρως usually refers to non-animate entities, such as plants (holm-oak, acanthus, chervil) or stones (a kind of opal). In Menecrates’ epigram the word is used in its (perhaps merely folk) etymological meaning. Besides Menecrates’ epigram the only other known exception is that of a fragmentary verse attributed to the comic poet Teleclides (fr. 52 KA), on which the explanation of the entry in LSJ is based. Indeed, the 5th cent. comic poet characterizes Zeus as παιδέρως. This use can be easily explained as a pun: more or less ‘Zeus, love-of-boys–tree’. On the one hand, it is clear that Teleclides was referring to Zeus’ passion for young boys and therefore to his being παιδεραστής. On the other hand, this fact does not imply that in Menecrates’ epigram παιδέρως has to be interpreted in the same way. Indeed, there is some evidence that the plant name could be – at least synchronically – interpreted as an endocentric compound. This is revealed by a passage by Nicander, in which the poet separates, for metrical reasons, the name of the plant into two words: παιδὸς ἔρωτες (fr. 74.55 Gow/Scholfield) ‘acanths’.

47 We do not know how the name was primarily interpreted. As the noun παῖς can be used for both boys and girls, παιδέρως could mean “children’s love” as well as “who or that has the love of children”. A thorough study of the compounds in -ερως, which are a small and badly attested category, as well as a study of their relation with the adjectives in -ερος would be useful. Cf. Buck/Peterson (1944: 454).
48 Concerning the age of the ἐρώμενος and that of the ἐραστής, cf. Lear/Cantarella (2008: 2-6).
49 The word does not appear in Strömberg’s collection of plants’ names (1940), which attests the plant names παιδοβάτιον (1940: 35) and φιλόπαις (1940: 119). Carnoy (1959: 203) claims that the oak’s bark was used to cure different problems typical of babies. It could be interesting to note that in Spanish plants of the genus Tradescantia are called ‘amor de hombre’ (‘love of man’).
50 It can also mean ‘rouge’ or ‘dye of purple hue’ (LSJ s.v.).
51 As already noted by Ruck (1975: 16), Zeus was associated with the oak and the word παιδέρως could mean a kind of oak as well.
52 Cf. also fr. 87 Gow/Scholfield: µῆλον ὃ κόκκυγος καλέουσι ‘The fruit they call the cuckoo’s’ (κοκκύμηλον ‘plum’). A similar use is also attested by Theocritus, even though he uses exocentric compounds, e.g, δρυὸς ἄκρα = ἀκρόδρυα ‘fruits with shell or rind’ (15.112).
Certainly to Greek ears the name παιδέρως evoked beauty and delicacy. According to an Orphic text (Orph., Lithica keryg mata 38.2), the opal could be called παιδέρως because of its beauty (διὰ τὴν εὐµορφίαν).\(^{53}\) Pliny (NH 22.76.4-5) attests that there are two types of acanthus: one thorny and crimped, the other smooth. The latter is called paederos. Παιδέρως was used as a proper name as well.\(^{54}\) On the whole the word should have been diffuse. The use of the compound παιδέρως in Menecrates’ epigram is also a subtle way to introduce ἔρως, which (love) or who (the god Eros) is a pervading presence in the Carmina Anacreontea.\(^{55}\) Certainly ἔρως also had an important role in Anacreon’s poetic work.\(^{56}\)

Anacreon is a model for Menecrates since the poet is “the connoisseur of desires”, the authority in matters of any kind of love. Menecrates did not take pleasure in the love of boys, an attitude for which Anacreon was well-known. The statement of Menecrates is not necessarily polemic: Menecrates is perhaps only recognizing his limits rather than stating the superiority of one kind of love over the other.\(^{57}\) Criticism towards Anacreon is particularly implied if the adjective ἄσπιλος “stainless” refers to Menecrates’ (heterosexual) ἄφροδισια in contrast to Anacreon’s (homosexual) ἄφροδισια, but I think there are also other ways to interpret the phrase ἄσπιλα ἄφροδισια (cf. the commentary of the following line). Moreover, the differentiation between Anacreon and Menecrates could have been played also on another ground. Here one should bear in mind that among the stereotypical characteristics of Anacreon there was his old age, as already seen above. There could then have been a differentiation (or perhaps even a process of narrowing the gap) between Anacreon and Menecrates: (1) Anacreon was wiser in matters of love than Menecrates, (as) Menecrates did not know the love of boys, Anacreon died as an old man, while Menecrates was still a young man; (2) Anacreon was wiser in matters of love than Menecrates, (since) Menecrates did not know the love of boys, both Anacreon and Menecrates died as old men, still loving respectively boys and women. What I am trying to suggest here is that a key to understanding the epigram and the relationship between Menecrates and Anacreon is the stereotypical image of Anacreon as an old lover of boys.

\(^{53}\) Cf. also Plinius NH 37.84.2.
\(^{54}\) There are at least 37 attestations in inscriptions and a further attestation appears in Socrates Scholasticus, Historia ecclesiastica 1.13.177 (LGPN).
\(^{55}\) CA 1.10, 17, CA 4 (i).21, (iii).18, 21 (versus delendus), CA 6.2, CA 11.1, 11, 14, CA 13.11, CA 14.5, 8, 11, 17, 23, 27, CA 18.8, CA 19.1, 6, CA 20.8, CA 23.4, 9, 12, CA 25.6, 13, 19, CA 28.3, 7, 10, 11, 17, CA 29A.1, CA 30.3, 8, CA 31.2, 9, CA 32.4, 16, CA 33.6, 10, CA 35.1, 16, CA 38.5, CA 43.12, CA 44.1, 9, CA 55.7, 15, CA 58.12 (ἐρωτικός), 24, CA 59.20; CA fr. 1.1.
\(^{57}\) About the polemic on the two kinds of love, cf., e.g., Hubbard (2003: 271, 443-447). Cf. also Most in this volume.
The stereotypical image of Anacreon as the lover of boys is well-known from Anacreon’s own work, from the Hellenistic epigrams and from the Carmina Anacreontea, as well as from other sources. From the Hellenistic epigrams dedicated to Anacreon, Theocritus’ verses can be recalled here: προσθεὶς δὲ χῶρι τοῖς νέοσιν ἁδετο, / ἔρεις ἄτρεκέως ὅλον τὸν ἄνδρα “and if you add that he took delight in young men, / you will have exactly described the whole man” (AP 9.599.5-6 = HE 15). Furthermore, in another epigram an adjective used to describe Anacreon’s lyre is φιλόσπας “loving boys” (Ps.-Simonides AP 7.24.6). In the Carmina Anacreontea the love for young boys is characteristic of both Anacreon and the Anacreontic poet. In particular, this love is represented by Bathyllus: cf. CA 4 (i).21 (“Ερωτα καὶ Βάθυλλον “Eros and Bathyllus”), CA 10.10 (ἀφήρπασας Βάθυλλον; “(why) have you snatched away Bathyllus?”), CA 18.10 (παρὰ τὴν σκιῆν Βαθύλλου “by the shade of Bathyllus”) or the already mentioned carmen 15 (l. 8: πρὸς παῖδα, πρὸς Βάθυλλον “to his beloved boy, to Bathyllus”), as well as CA 17.1-2, 44, 46, where the Anacreontic poet asks an artist to represent the young boy. However, in Anacreon’s poetic work as well as in the Carmina Anacreontea and in the Hellenistic epigrams, there are also references to heterosexual love.

Above I hinted at the possibility that in Menecrates’ epigram the differentiation between Anacreon and Menecrates could also be based on the difference between their ages. While nothing is explicitly stated about Anacreon being old, there could be a clue to the opposite case in the phrase ἐν νέοσιν ‘among youth’. This phrase, which appears on the following line, seems to give some importance to the fact of being young, especially if this is a condition for the ἀφροδίσια being (considered as) ἀσπίλα. Therefore it seems possible that Menecrates could have counted himself among the young, even though this is only one of the possibilities for interpreting the epigram. Perhaps Anacreon and Menecrates were both (imagined as) old men and to be among youth could be understood as an Anacreontic precept (cf. the commentary below).

As regards old age, Anacreon’s poetic persona is already represented as old in Anacreon’s work: (fr. 13.6-7 Page) τὴν μὲν ἑµὴν κόµην, / λευκὴ γάρ, καταµέµφεται “(she) finds fault with my hair because it is white”, (fr. 50.1-6 Page) τολµ意见反馈 µὲν ἤµιν ἱδη / κρόταφοι κάρη τε λευκόν, / χαρίεσσα δ’ οὐκέτ’ ἡβη / πάρα, γηραλέοι δ’ ὀθόντες, / γλυκεροῦ δ’ οὐκέτι πολλὸς / βιότου χρόνος

58 Cf. Frr. 2,1; 12; 14; 15; 29; 57c; 62 Page.
60 Translation by Rosenmeyer (1992: 24).
61 Moreover, similar to παιδέρως, φιλόσπας could be the name of a plant (horehound, Marrubium vulgare).
62 Concerning Anacreon and the Anacreontic poet as lovers of boys, cf. also Most’s paper in this volume.
63 Cf. also Baumann in this volume.
64 Cf. fr. eleg. 5 West; frr. 28, 72 Page.
65 Translation by Campbell (1988).
Anacreon, the Connoisseur of Desires

λέλειπται. “My temples are already grey and my head is white; graceful youth is no more with me, my teeth are old, and no long span of sweet life remains now”. Anacreon’s old age also became a topos in the reception of his persona, which could have influenced Menecrates (or his poet). We have already seen this, e.g., in one of the two epigrams Leonidas dedicated to the old Anacreon (AP 16.307). Both epigrams AP 16.306 and 16.307 open with the image of the πρέσβυς Ἀνακρέων (l. 1), who is drunk and sings on his lyre about the boys Bathyllus and Megistes. It is interesting that in AP 16.306, l. 8, Anacreon’s lyre is said to be δυσέρως “love-sick”, an adjective which is – like παιδέρως – built on ἔρως. As seen above, in the Carmina Anacreontea the first poem is dedicated to the old but still handsome Anacreon. In CA 7.2 the women address Anacreon saying Ἄνακρεον, γέρων εἶ “Anacreon, you are old”. The Anacreontic poet himself is old: cf. (CA 51.2) τὰν πολιὰν ἔθειραν “my white hair”, (52A.1) πολιὰι στέφοι κάραν “Grey hair wreathes my head”, (CA 53.4) ὁ γέρων ἔγω “I, an old man”, (l. 7) πολιὸν δὲ γῆρας ἐκδύς “shedding my white old age”, (l. 11) γέροντος ἀλκὴν “the strength of an old man”. Old age can also be represented by flowers: cf. (again CA 51.6-8) ὡς, κἀν στεφάνοισιν / ὅπως πρέπει τὰ λευκὰ / ρόδους κρίνα “Look, even in garlands, / how the white flowers shine forth, / lilies woven in with roses” and (CA 55.27-28) χαρίεν ῥόδων δὲ γῆρας / νεότητος ἔσχεν ὀδὴν “For the graceful old age of the rose / has the smell of youth”.

With his supplement [ἄσπιλον ἐν νέοισιν ἀφροδίσια] Wilamowitz suggests a neat opposition between the third and the fourth lines, i.e., – according to his interpretation – between Anacreon’s homosexual and Menecrates’ heterosexual attitude to love. On the contrary, the supplement [τὰ δ’] suggested by Aristarchis and Vollgraff allows one to read the fourth verse without necessarily implying a syntactic connection with the previous line or at least a neat opposition between line 3 and line 4: [ἐγὼ] δὲ παιδέρωσιν ὡς ἐτερπόμαν. / [τὰ δ’] ἄσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἀφροδίσια / [ὁ τύμβος εὐχάρακτ’ ἔχει (or perhaps [ἐγὼ] δὲ παιδέρωσιν ὡς ἐτερπόμαν, / [τὰ δ’] ἄσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἀφροδίσια / [ . . . ἀντίκμιμ’ ὁ τύμβος εὐχάρακτ’ ἔχει). Moreover, the neuter plural ἀφροδίσια is usually encountered with the article (LSJ s.v.). Line 4 and line 5 could, therefore, belong to the same period and constitute the center of the epigram: the description of the grave-monument between Menecrates’ desires during life and Menecrates’ hope of a good reputation after his death.

66 Translation by Campbell (1988). Cf. also fr. 73 Page. The poetic persona is not yet old in fr. 75 Page.
67 Cf. n. 32 above. Cf. also AP 16.308 (by Eugenes) and AP 16.309 (anonymous).
68 Perhaps [τοῖο] “such/so very (perfect pleasures amidst youth)” (LSJ s.v. τοῖος I.1 and III) could also be a possible conjecture here.
The rare adjective ἄσπιλος is formed with *alpha privativum* on the noun σπίλος which means “spot, fleck, blemish” as well as “stain (of impurity or vice)” (LSJ s.v. σπίλος B). It is important to note that the first attestations are with concrete objects such as stones⁶⁹ and an apple.⁷⁰ A metaphorical and moral connotation appears in the Christian authors (LSJ s.v., Lampe [1961, s.v.]). Ἀσπιλα refers to the neuter plural ἀφροδίσια on the same line. The interpretation of ἀφροδίσια as “sexual pleasures” is triggered by the mention of Anacreon as ὁ πόθων ἱδρις (l. 2) and by the phrase παιδέρωσιν ὑκ ἐτερπόμαν (l. 3). In the term ἀφροδίσια there is no distinction between hetero- or homosexual intercourse,⁷¹ so ἀφροδίσια is not necessarily in opposition to the phrase παιδέρωσιν ἔτερπόμαν of the third line. Explaining why ἄσπιλα is related to ἀφροδίσια is likely the key to the interpretation of this epigram. It is likely that ἄσπιλος not only has a metaphorical and moral connotation in the epigram, but also a concrete meaning and it refers to both the images of the ἀφροδίσια, just as ἀντίμιμος and εὐχάρακτος on the following line (concrete meaning [1]), and the ἀφροδίσια themselves (metaphorical meaning [2]). As regards the metaphorical and moral connotation of the adjective (2), the lack of knowledge about the original context of the inscription, the defective condition of the text, and perhaps the loss of the relief make it very difficult to suggest a precise reason why ἀφροδίσια are ἅσπιλα. Moreover, the arrival of Momos is difficult to explain if it has to be seen in relation to the ἅσπιλα ἀφροδίσια or to their images (cf. below). Generally speaking, we could say that the ἅσπιλα ἀφροδίσια are ἀφροδίσια which do not cause reproach (2a).⁷²

According to the interpretation given by Wilamowitz, ἅσπιλα ἀφροδίσια would refer to heterosexual intercourse as opposed to homosexual (2b), but perhaps it is not – once again – a matter of a neat opposition.

In line 4 the phrase ἐν νέοισιν is placed between ἅσπιλα and ἀφροδίσια. If such wording has to be considered as significant, then we can hypothesize that ἀφροδίσια are ἅσπιλα as they are among youth (2c). If we look at the *Carmina Anacreontea* the presence of young boys and girls, even if Anacreon or the Anacreontic poet are already old, is a fundamental element of the Anacreontic

---

⁶⁹ Cf. IG II2 1066, A1.35, 49, 65, 83, 97-98, B1.5, 19, 25 (Attica, 356/355-353/352 BCE). The adjective ἄσπιλος could have been a technical term from Greek architecture (cf. Hellmann [1988: 244]). This fact strengthens my hypothesis that ἅσπιλα should be understood in the first instance as having a concrete meaning just as ἀντίμιμος and εὐχάρακτος. Cf. below.

⁷⁰ Cf. AP 6.252 = GPh 2 (Antiphilus).


⁷² If this interpretation is correct, i.e., if the ἀφροδίσια can be defined as ἅσπιλα, are there ἀφροδίσια which could cause blemish (σπίλος)? This is attested in Ps.-Lucian, *Erotes*, 15-16, a passage which tells the story of a youth who fell in love with the statue of Aphrodite at Cnidus and tried to have sexual intercourse with it. Cf., in particular, 16.27-28: καὶ τὸν σπίλον ἐίχεν ἡ θεός ὅν ἐπαθεν ἔλεγχον “and the goddess had that blemish to prove what she’d suffered” (Translation by Macleod [1967]). Also here both a concrete and a metaphorical meaning are present.
symposium. In CA 53, it is enough for the old Anacreontic poet to see a group of young people to gain back his own youth: ὅτ’ ἐγὼ ’ς νέοιον ὰμυλον / ἐσορῶ, πάρεστιν ἤβα “whenever I look upon a crowd of young boys, / my youth returns” (ll. 1-2) and then (l. 8) νέος ἐν νέοις χορεύσω “I shall dance, a youth among youths”. Either Menecrates died young or old, this verse ([τὰ δ’] ἄσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἄφροδισία) with its clear reference to the necessary presence of youth would have certainly met the approval of Anacreon and of the Anacreontic poet.73

In the second part of the epigram Menecrates speaks explicitly about the (perhaps only) possible arrival of Reproach and the help Menecrates will receive by Praise. At the end of the poem we know that Praise is victorious and Menecrates is therefore beyond reproach. Does this have something to do with the differentiation he had constructed between himself and Anacreon in the first part of the poem (i.e., would Anacreon reproach him because Menecrates did not follow the poet of love entirely)? Or does this necessity to defend himself rather have something to do with the images Menecrates (or someone else) wanted for his tomb (i.e., will people reproach Menecrates for his lifestyle)? This question brings us to the analysis of the following line.

5. [34.]ντίµιµ’ ὁ τύµβος εὐχάρακτ’ ἔχει

Aristarchis’ conjecture [Σεῦ ἄ] is not admissible for the same reason given for line 1 for σός, i.e., Menecrates is not speaking to Aphrodite. The supplement [ὦν ἄ] suggested by Wilamowitz makes it likely that line 4 is syntactically related to line 3, i.e., the accusative phrase ἄσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἄφροδισία depends on ἐτερπόμαν like the dative παιδέρωσιν. Through a predicative deictic construction, ὅδε (…) ὁ τύµβος “this tomb here”, Vollgraff restores a syntactically simpler text and gives vivacity to Menecrates’ speech.

Menecrates’ grave bore images, which were “closely imitating” (ἀντίµιµα), “well-carved” (εὐχάρακτα) and also, if our interpretation of ἄσπιλα as having both a concrete (1) and a metaphorical meaning (2c) is correct, “perfect”. The use of the adjective εὐχάρακτος is uncommon. Except for Menecrates’ epigram, it is known from a papyrus of the 4th cent. CE (PLips. 13.10), where it refers to “clearly stamped” (LSJ) coins, and from late authors, such as Proclus (Homilia in Crucifixionem 6.29.2, 5th cent. CE),74 where it also refers to a coin.75 According to

73 Another hypothesis (2d), which I find less likely, is that the phrase ἄσπιλα ἄφροδισία refers to non-sexual intercourse. Cf. for a later (possible) parallel the novel of Daphnis and Chloe. Their love could be considered as a model of pure, unstained love. I do not think that this is the case for Menecrates. If he states that he did not take pleasure in the love of boys, this does not mean that he did not take (sexual) pleasure at all. Isn’t Menecrates in his epigram rather like Dorkon, one “who knew both the name and the deeds of love” (1.15.1, translation by Morgan [2004])?
74 Cf. also Ps.-Dion. Areopagita (De divinis nominibus 129.16, 5th-6th cent. CE).
75 However, other compounds in χαρακτος are attested earlier.
Karos (1962: 122), the adjective εὐχάρακτος can refer both to ‘carved’ and ‘painted images’. However, the other attestations of the adjective hint at the action of minting and the verb χαράσσω, from which the adjective is derived, contains the ideas of ‘sharpening, cutting, carving’ and even that of ‘sketching, drawing’ (LSJ, cf., e.g., CA 57.5: ἀπαλὰν χάραξε Κύπριν “etched the delicate Cypris [on a cup]”), but not properly that of “painting”. Such being the case, it seems likelier that Menecrates is referring to carved images, i.e., to a relief.

Exactly as the marble stone on which the inscription was carved was later employed to construct the wall of a church, the relief could also have undergone the same fate and have subsequently been reused in some (other) construction. At some point the inscription and the images were separated. Their subject seems to have been the ἄσπιλ᾽ ἐν νέοισιν ἀφροδίσια, with which the adjectives ἀντίµιµα and εὐχάρακτα agree. There are also two other possibilities – which I personally find less likely. The first one is that the fifth line was syntactically isolated and that there were no hints at all to the content of the images in the epigram, as these could readily be seen by passers-by. The second one is that the images represented the fight between Momos and Epainos, as described in the last lines of the epigram (cf. the commentary on the last three lines).

Although the representation of sexual pleasures in a sepulchral context does not remain unattested (cf. below), I could not find a parallel that fits with Menecrates’ epigram for both its Asiatic origin and its Hellenistic dating. An aspect that should be taken into consideration is that we do not know the attitude through which the ἀφροδίσια were approached in the relief: should we think of sensual images or rather of more explicit scenes? I do not think that the introduction of Momos’ attack in the following lines is a sufficient reason to imagine very explicit scenes.

Wilamowitz (1913: 110) suggested that a parallel could be found in the relief from Naples known as “Alcibiades among hetaeræ”, but Karos (1962: 122-123) dismissed this hypothesis, even if unconvincingly. He claimed to have found a parallel in a relief from Kos of the late Archaic Age (ca. 510 BCE), which

---

76 Adaptation of Rosenmeyer’s translation.
77 There is also another hypothesis which is not possible to dismiss entirely: the carved images could have been – as perhaps Anacreon’s statue and Aphrodite’s temple – simply literary imagination. I find this hypothesis unlikely.
78 It could be interesting to recall that an epigram from the Anthologia Latina (Shackleton Bailey 314) attacks a certain Balbus, who had erotic images made for his grave. Another problem which remains unsolved is the context in which the ἀφροδίσια were collocated: an Anacreontic context would surely have been the symposium. The interpretation of the epigram is too uncertain to make any definitive statement.
bears symposiastic love scenes dominated by frenzied disorder. That this relief belonged to a grave was already hypothesized by the first editor (Laurenzi [1938: 73]). Nevertheless, the relief on Menecrates’ monument needs not to have represented orgiastic scenes to be reproached. Even more ‘modest’ love scenes could have triggered reproach in some parts of the society (e.g., politicians, philosophers). Another – perhaps better – parallel adduced by Karusos (1962: 124) is that of a gravestone relief representing sensual female dancers (Contoleón [1947]), a scene in the symposium. The relief is accompanied by a fragmentary epigram (πολλὰ ἐ[-—] / χλιδῆς [— τ?] / ἀφον ἐ[—]), in which the word χλιδή ‘delicacy’ stands out. Vollgraff (1951: 363 n. 1) also refers to this relief, as well as to a Greek tombstone with obscene reliefs and inscriptions seen by Cumont (1940 = IGUR III 1341) in Rome. Although the immodest tombstone was conceived and realized in Rome, the dead person came from the city of Germe Hiera, which was located – as was Cyzicus – in Mysia. Since Menecrates’ epigram was found outside of its original context and the tombstone from Rome is lost and, moreover, was never dated, it is not possible to establish a solid parallel between the two works. The reliefs on this monument could not be more explicit: five rows of feminine pudenda and what Cumont (1940: 5), who never published a photograph or a drawing of such a monument, describes as “une scène érotique, dont l’acteur fait preuve d’une virilité démesurée”. Such images illustrated the accompanying inscriptions. Above the erotic scene the following was written: τοῦτο μόνον ζῶν ἐκέρδησα “During my life this was the only gain!” The other inscription said: Γέρµης ἔξ Ιερῆς Τελεσίστρατος ἐν Μακάρων νῆσος κεῖµαι· ἔτι τῶνδε χρέος ποθέω “From Germe Hiera I, Telesistratos, repose in the Isles of the Blessed; I want to use these things again!” It is not difficult to see that in the works mentioned one can find interesting as well as misleading possible parallels.

Ἀφροδίσια among youths would not have caused the reproach of Anacreon nor of the Anacreontic poet. Life’s pleasures have to be enjoyed before death. This is, amongst others, a motto of the Anacreontic poet: τοῦτο δ’ οἶδα, / ὡς τοι γέροντι μᾶλλον / πρέπει τὸ τερπνὰ παίζειν / ὥσωι πέλας τὰ Μοίρης. “This I do know: / that for an old man, / it is even more appropriate / to enjoy life’s pleasures / the closer one is to Fate” (CA 7.8-11). If Menecrates followed a lifestyle similar to that attributed to Anacreon and, therefore, similar to that of the Anacreontic poet, we could perhaps even read some passages from the Carmina Anacreontea as describing his attitude during his lifetime. Particularly significant is CA 36.10-16: θανεῖν γὰρ εἰ πέπρωται / τί χρυσὸς ὡφελεῖ με; / ἐμοὶ γένοιτο πίνειν, / πιόντι δ’ οἴνον ἴδιον / ἐμοῖς φίλοις συνεῖναι, / ἐν δ’ ἀπαλαϊσί κοίταις / τελεῖ τὰν Ἀφροδίταν. “for if I am doomed to die, / what use to me is gold? / Let me drink / and then drinking down sweet wine, / let me be with my friends / and then on soft couches, / let me accomplish the rites of Aphrodites.”

80 Cf. also: (CA 40.7-9) πρὶν ἐμὲ φθάσῃ τὸ τέλος. / παίξω, γελάσω, χορέωσο / μετά τοῦ καλοῦ Λυαίου. “before the end overtakes me, / I will play, laugh, and dance, / along with
the poet is together with his friends. He is drinking wine and fulfilling the rites of Aphrodite. It is also interesting that this attitude is triggered by the inevitable presence of death. The effect of him being with youths is that the poet goes crazy and revels in it: (CA 53.5) παραμαίνω, κυβηβῶ. It is then very interesting that the Anacreontic poet at the end of the poem defends his own skillfulness and gracefulness against a possible reproach:81 (ll. 11-14) ἵν’ ἵδη γέροντος ἀλκήν / δεδαηκότος μὲν εἰπέν, / δεδαηκότος δὲ πίνειν / χαριέντως τε μανήναι “in order that he may see the strength of an old man, / one who knows how to speak, / and who knows how to drink, / and gracefully to be mad”.82

6. [3-4.] κνίσει με Μῶµος, ἀντὶ [...]

Wilamowitz and Vollgraff suggest beginning line 6 as a protasis: [εἰ δὲ]. [ἀμα] suggested by Aristarchis underlines the rapid intervention of Epainos to protect Menecrates: “No sooner will Momos scratch me than Epainos oppose (ἀντὶ[τάσσεται])”.83 For the last verb many supplements have been suggested – such as ἀντιτάξεται (Wilamowitz) and ἀντικείσεται (Vollgraff, also ἀντὶ[βήσεται], ἀντὶ[λήψεται]) – which evoke the battlefield.

If Momos attacks Menecrates because of the ἀφροδίσια represented on his gravestone or because he did not accept the love of boys, the choice of the verb κνίζω would be even more interesting since the verb could have an erotic beautiful Lyaios”; (CA 48.9-10) μεθύοντα γάρ με κεῖσθαι / πολὺ κρέσσον ἢ θανόντα. “for it is a much better thing / for me to lie here drunk than dead”; (CA 50.25-28) ὁτ’ ἐγὼ πιὸ τὸν οἶνον, / τούτ’ ἐμοὶ μὸνον τὸ κέρδος, / τούτ’ ἐγὼ λαβὼν ἀπόσω- / τὸ θανεῖν γὰρ μετὰ πάντων. “When I drink my wine, / this to me alone is a profit; / taking this, I will carry it off with me, / for death comes along with everything”; (CA 52A) Πολιαὶ στέφουσι κάραν· / δὸς ὑδῶρ, βάλ’ οἶνον οἶκ’ / τὴν ψυχήν µου κάρωσον. / ὁ θανὼν οὐκ ἔπιθυμεῖ. “Grey hair wreathes my head; / Bring water, bring wine, boy. / Plunge my soul into slumber. / You cover me while I still live for a short time; / but the dead man has no desires.”

81 Cf. also Anacreon’s fragment 11b Page: ἄγε δηὖτε µηκέτ’ οὕτῳ / πατάγωι τε κἀλαλητῶι / Σκυθικὴν πόσιν παρ’ οἴνῳ / μελετῶµεν, ἀλλὰ καλός / υποπίνοντες ἐν ὑµῶς “Come again, let us no longer practise Scythian drinking with clatter and shouting over our wine, but drink moderately amid beautiful songs of praise” (translation by Campbell [1988]); and fr. eleg. 2 West: οὐ φιλέω, ὡς κρήτηρ παρὰ πλέωι οἴνοποτάζων / νείκα καὶ πόλεμον διακρινέω λέγει, / ἄλλ’ ἀστίς Μουσέων τε καὶ ἀγάλα δόρ’ Ἀφροδίτης / συμμίσγεται ἐρατῆς μνήσκεται εὐφροσύνης. “I do not like the man who while drinking his wine beside the full mixing-bowl talks of strife and tearful war: I like him who by mingling the splendid gifts of the Muses and Aphrodite remembers the loveliness of the feast” (translation by Campbell [1988]).

82 On the contrary, in CA 9 no adverb alleviates the µανία of the Anacreontic poet: (ll. 1-3) Ἀφές µε, τοὺς θεοὺς σοι, πιεῖν, πιεῖν ἀυριστή θέλω, θέλω µανίναι. “Allow me, by the gods, I ask you, / to drink, to drink without stopping for breath. / I want, I want to be mad.”

83 Another possible supplement could be [μάτην], which would emphasize that Momos’ action is in vain.
connotation (LSJ). The verb can also refer to abstract entities, such as ἔρως or κόρος, which seize a person’s mind or body.

Μῶµος means “blame, reproach, disgrace” (LSJ). It has been attested since the Odyssey (β 86) and the Theogony (214), although it is not a frequently used term. Μῶµος being an abstract concept, its presence and action can be explained by a personification: cf., e.g., Semon. 7.84: κείνη γὰρ οὐ̂ ὁ µῶµος οὐ̂ προσιζάναι “to that (woman) to whom the blame does not sit by”. The characterization of the concept of μῶµος appears to have been seen in a negative light very early and μῶµος was connected with φθόνος ‘envy’ early: cf., e.g., Pl. O. 6.74 μῶµος ἐξ ἄλλων κρέµαται φθονεόντων “But blame coming from others who are envious hangs over.” or Bakchyl. 13.162-165: [Ε]ἰ μὴ τίνα θερσιπῆς φθόνος βιάται, αἰνεῖτο σοφὸν ἄνδρα σὺν δίκᾳ. Βροτῶν δὲ μῶµος πάντεσσι μὲν ἔστιν ἐπ᾽ ἐργοίς τοιοῦτον “If a man is not over-mastered by envy, bold of tongue, let him justly praise the man of skill. Mortal men find fault with all achievement.”

As a god, Momos is one of the children of Nyx (Hes. Theog. 214) and is the deified personification of censoriousness. Even as a god, he does not seem to have been (seen as) a positive character. According to a D-scholion to Iliad A 5, in the Cypria Momos is the one who suggests to Zeus (how) to start the Trojan War. The sentence attested in Pl. R. 6.487a, οὐδ’ ἄν ὁ Μῶµος[,] τό γε τοιοῦτον μέµψαιτο “Momus himself could find no flaw in it”, looks like an ancient saying, which well illustrates the proclivity of the god to find fault.

Momos’ figure is better attested since the Hellenistic age. He is the malicious fault-finder and Callimachus identifies his poetic enemies with him (Ap. 2.113; fr. 393 Pfeiffer). A characteristic element of his description are the teeth in his open mouth: he is grinding them.

84 Cf., e.g., Theoc. 4.59: τήναν τῶν κυάνοφρυν ἔρωτίδα τὰς ποκ’ ἐκνίσθη “that dark-browed sweetie for whom he once had the itch” (translation by Hunter [1999]).
85 Translation by Race (1997).
86 Translation by McDevitt (2009).
89 Translation by MacDonald Cornford (1941).
90 Tümpel (1897: 3118), followed by Simon (1992: 649).
91 According to Aelius Aristides (Or. 49, Jebb page 397), since Momos cannot find anything to reproach Aphrodite with, he finds fault with her shoe (cf. also Iulianus, Ep. 82.121-124). In the Deorum Concilium of Lucian Momos and his skill in speaking play a relevant role.
92 Among the epigrams of the Anthologia Palatina in which Momos appears (AP 1.103, 9.356, 613, 11.321, 16.7, 262, 265, 266), 16.265 and 266 might describe real statues of him. Simon (1992) could identify only one relatively certain representation of Momus on a vase.
The instrument Epainos uses to win over Momos is his speech (cf. below). He will say beautiful κάλα (Aristarchis, Vollgraff) or many πολλά (Wilamowitz) words. πολλά seems a better supplement at the beginning of the line, since κάλα is too short in comparison with the supplements of the other lines. It could well be that there are many reasons why Epainos should praise Menecrates. As regards the second part of the line, all suggested supplements seem to rely on a wrong transcription. Moreover, Aristarchis’ supplement is based upon a false reading of the following line (cf. below). Vollgraff’s supplement ἄνθεδρπ[ον] “the flowers which I plucked (in my life)” could be fitting if the transcription previously suggested is correct. As regards the supplement suggested by Wilamowitz, the conjecture of the adjective παρήορος appears highly speculative.

If Μῶµος is not a well-attested mythological character, Έπαινος does not seem to be attested as such. Nevertheless, personifications of Epainos are known from other metrical inscriptions, such as IG II² 10998 (Attica, from the 4th cent. BCE) and IG XII 9, 1195 (Euboea, Oreus, not before the 3rd cent. BCE), both sepulchral epitaphs: (l. 1) “Ares as well as Epainos loved the good”, (l. 1) “Epainos glorified you very much in the flower of your youth”.

In Menecrates’ epigram Epainos und Momos do not exclude one another. They could cooperate in a kind of discussion of Menecrates’ grave (with its relief) and life. The existence of aspects, which can be considered as both positive and negative, at the same time and in the same person recall Anacreon himself and his reception. The reader of Menecrates’ epigram is invited to choose between praise
and reproach towards Menecrates, his gravestone and his life. To him is suggested the example of Anacreon, who not only during his lifetime but even more so during the time of his enduring reception garnered both praise and reproach (cf. also below). 96 In the last line the epigram suggests which one the reader should favor. Indeed, in the case of Menecrates’ epigram it is not just a metaphor to say that Epainos has the last word.

8. [3-4.] Ματροδώρου δ’ οὐ θρίσ[ει]ξ Μενεκράτην

The conjectures of Aristarchis are surely wrong since his reading is based upon a wrong reading of the anonymous person who simplified the sequence ΟΥΔΟΥ to ΟΥ. The independent conjectures of Wilamowiz and Vollgraff [τὸν] Ματροδώρου δ’ οὐ θρίσ[ει] Μενεκράτην seem to be the most likely. Since the anonymous person read a sigma before the mu of Menecrates and there is enough place in the lacuna, it would be better to read the second person θρίσ[ει]ξ instead of the third person θρίσ[ει]. 97

In the last line of the epigram Epainos then speaks directly to Momos. He has the final, victorious word against him: Momos’ action against Menecrates will be unsuccessful.

The epigram reveals the name of the person for whom the epigram was written (or who wrote the epigram) only at the end of the composition: Menecrates the son of Metrodoros.

5 Conclusion

Having discussed the text and meaning of the lines of the epigram, I suggest restoring the following text, even though there remains some uncertainty.

1 [τὰς Ά] or [ὠδ’ Ά]φροδίτας ναός ἐστι μεν πέλας
2 [ἔχω]ν Ἀνακρέοντα τὸν πόθον ἱδρυν.
3 [ἔγω] δὲ παιδέρωσιν οὐκ ἐπέτρόμαν.
4 [τά δ’] ἄσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἀφροδίσια
5 [ὠδ’ ἀντίμιμ’ ὁ τύμβος εὐχάρακτ’ ἔχει.
6 [εἰ δὲ] κυίσει με Μῶμος, ἀντι . [. .]έται
7 [πολ’]α’ ἐννέαν Ἐπαινος [. .]Ἀ[. .]ρέπ[. .]:
8 “[τὸν] Ματροδώρου δ’ οὐ θρίσ[ει]ξ Μενεκράτην.”

“Near to me (there) is the temple of Aphrodite with a statue of Anacreon, the connoisseur of desires, but I did not enjoy myself with the love of boys! (My)

97 For the meaning of the verb, cf., e.g, Aischyl. Supp. 637.
grave has well-carved, imitating, perfect images of pleasures amidst youth. If Momos will scratch me, Epainos will oppose saying many (words of praise) (?) [...] «You will not harvest Menecrates, the son of Metrodoros».

In the commentary possible lines of interpretation of the epigram have been suggested, in particular, in light of the reception of Anacreon’s persona as it is represented in the Carmina Anacreontea. The Carmina Anacreontea, along with the Hellenistic epigrams on Anacreon, confirm the image of Anacreon as a connoisseur of desires (l. 2) and as one fond of young boys (l. 3), even though not exclusively. Moreover, the Anacreontic poet is a devotee of Aphrodite and Eros like Menecrates in the epigram (l. 1 and l. 4). Both appreciate youth or at least the company of young people (l. 4). Other characteristics of Anacreon or of the Anacreontic poet have been used to explore different interpretative hypotheses. Even though Anacreon’s old age is not mentioned in the epigram, in Anacreon’s own work his poetic persona is already described as an old man and this characteristic is echoed in the Hellenistic epigrams as well as in the Carmina Anacreontea for both Anacreon and the Anacreontic poet. Perhaps such an image of Anacreon is also implied in Menecrates’ epigram. Moreover, the Anacreontic poet knows that life’s pleasures have to be enjoyed before death and this knowledge could perhaps also be applied to Menecrates’ attitude to life.

In the conclusion of this paper, I would like to stress that it is not necessary to see a neat opposition between Anacreon (as the lover of boys) and Menecrates (as the lover of women) in the epigram. Rather than a polemic opposition to homosexual love, the epigram seems to suggest a complex and multifaceted interpretation of the relationship between Menecrates and Anacreon: Anacreon is the best connoisseur of any kind of love (Ἀνακρέων ὁ πόθων ἱδρίς), while Menecrates is not so wise in matters of love, because he didn’t know the love of young boys (ἐγὼ δὲ παιδέρωσιν οὐκ ἐτερπόμαν). Even though he is not as wise as Anacreon, he is also an expert in love: like Anacreon and the Anacreontic poet he knows that love is perfect only among – and perhaps even only for – young people (τὰ δ’ ἃσπιλ’ ἐν νέοισιν ἀφροδίσια). Menecrates’ lifestyle together with the images on his grave are likely to cause reproach and Menecrates feels the need to defend himself. If Momos comes, Epainos will defend Menecrates and be victorious.

Many questions still await an answer. Who are the people against whom Menecrates has to defend himself? The people who knew his life and everyone who looked at the images on his grave? Or Anacreon himself? Anacreon could reproach Menecrates for not having accepted the love of young boys.98 In other words, Anacreon could reproach him for having refused to gain knowledge of this kind of love. Indeed, without this knowledge Menecrates is not the perfect Anacreontic poet. In any case, Menecrates knows perfect pleasures among youth and the passer-by knows that, in the end, Epainos will win against Momos.

98 On the importance of loving boys for the Anacreontic poet, cf. Most in this volume.
At first sight it seems that Menecrates or his poet chose the image of Anacreon as the perfect lover. While this is true, I think that there is also another reason for this, which can bring us to a better understanding of the epigram. Menecrates and Anacreon were both people who could trigger reproach. For Menecrates the only attestation is the epigram itself with the explicit arrival of Momos in line 6. As regards Anacreon, it is necessary to recall that the attitude towards, e.g., the homosexual characteristics of Anacreon’s persona and of his poetry was not always positive and the poems that celebrated paederastic love were condemned (cf., e.g., the attitude of the Stoics, who thought that this kind of poetry could damage and corrupt the youth). More generally, there are also other aspects in Anacreon’s persona which could have been seen as problematic in given contexts. Shapiro (2012) recently discussed some in relation to the representation of the poet: in addition to his connotation as the “model erastes”, his connection with the institution of tyranny (Polycrates in Samos, Peisistratos in Athens) and his Eastern-Greek origins could have been seen as problematic in the context of democratic Athens. Perhaps the fact that the Anacreontic poet claims to be able to behave with skillfulness and grace during the symposium should be seen as a defensive reaction: (ll. 11-14) ἵν’ ἵθη γέροντος ἀλκήν / δεδαηκότος μὲν εἰπεῖν, / δεδαηκότος δὲ πίνειν / χαριέντως τε μανῆαι “in order that he may see the strength of an old man, one who knows how to speak, and knows how to drink, and gracefully to be mad”. For the Anacreontic poet, to be old means to be skillful and graceful. If such a problematic persona such as that of Anacreon could still garner both praise and reproach centuries after his death, who better to be a symbol of the condition of Menecrates than Anacreon himself? And if, in the end, Anacreon continued to be not only praised, but even imitated – as we can see in the late Carmina Anacreontea –, why should Menecrates, who did not reach so vast a knowledge of love, not be praised?

In conclusion, Menecrates’ epigram is not only an interesting attestation of the widespread fame reached by Anacreon as an expert in matters of love, but also one of the problematic nature of his persona throughout the centuries. Therefore, this text is a worthy ‘missing link’ in the reception of Anacreon’s persona between the Hellenistic age and the later time of the Carmina Anacreontea.

Cf., in particular, Shapiro (2012: 20-21). It is irrelevant for the goal of the present study to establish whether the so-called Anacreon Borghese (Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek 491) is a copy of Anacreon’s statue on the Athenian acropolis or not. Shapiro describes in a very vivid way the problematic nature of Anacreon’s persona. It is clear that the problems connected with Anacreon’s reception change according to the different circumstances, but still it remains a fact that there could have been problematic aspects in the reception of Anacreon’s persona.