

PAROS V

PAROS THROUGH THE AGES

FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE 16th CENTURY AD



Edited by
Dora Katsonopoulou

ΑΘΗΝΑ/ATHENS 2021

Cover illustrations

On the front: Relief of young woman from Paroikia, end of 5th century BC.

© Archaeological Museum of Paros, inv. no. A 1290.

On the back: Fresco from the Byzantine church at Protoria of Naousa, 13th century BC.

ΙΝΣΤΙΤΟΥΤΟ ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΚΛΑΔΩΝ
THE INSTITUTE FOR ARCHAEOLOGY OF PAROS AND THE CYCLADES

PAROS V

Η ΠΑΡΟΣ ΑΝΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΩΝΕΣ

ΑΠΟ ΤΗΝ ΠΡΟΪΣΤΟΡΙΚΗ ΕΠΟΧΗ ΣΤΟΝ 16ο ΑΙΩΝΑ μ.Χ.

PAROS THROUGH THE AGES

FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE 16th CENTURY AD

ΣΟΛΩΜΟΥ 58, 106 82 ΑΘΗΝΑ
58 SOLOMΟΥ STREET, 106 82 ATHENS

Άλλα συλλογικά έργα της επιμελήτριας του τόμου:

1998: *Helike II, Ancient Helike and Aigialeia*, εκδ. ΕΦΑΕΛ, Αθήνα.

2000: *Παρία Λίθος*, εκδ. ΙΑΠΚ, Αθήνα.

2005: *Helike III, Archaeological Sites in Geologically Active Regions*, εκδ. ΕΦΑΕΛ, Αθήνα.

2008: *Paros II, Archilochos and his Age*, εκδ. ΙΑΠΚ, Αθήνα.

2011: *Helike IV, Protohellenika- The Southern and Central Greek Mainland*, εκδ. ΕΦΑΕΛ, Αθήνα.

2013: *Paros III, Skopas of Paros and his World*, εκδ. ΙΑΠΚ, Αθήνα.

2016: *ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝ, Essays Presented to Stephen G. Miller*, εκδ. ΕΦΑΕΛ, Αθήνα.

2017: *Helike V, Poseidon, God of Earthquakes and Waters. Cult and Sanctuaries*, εκδ. ΕΦΑΕΛ, Αθήνα.

2018: *Paros IV, Paros and its Colonies*, εκδ. ΙΑΠΚ, Αθήνα.

2019: *Ιερός Ναός Παναγίας Εκατονταπυλιανής Πάρου*, εκδ. Ιερά Μητρόπολις Παροναξίας, Αθήνα.

ISBN: 978-960-89045-4-5

© DORA KATSONOPOULOU

58 Solomou Street

106 82 Athens

email: paros.iapk@gmail.com

PAROS V

Η ΠΑΡΟΣ ΑΝΑ ΤΟΥΣ ΑΙΩΝΕΣ

ΑΠΟ ΤΗΝ ΠΡΟΪΣΤΟΡΙΚΗ ΕΠΟΧΗ ΣΤΟΝ 16ο ΑΙΩΝΑ μ.Χ.

**ΠΡΑΚΤΙΚΑ Ε΄ ΔΙΕΘΝΟΥΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΗΜΟΝΙΚΟΥ ΣΥΝΕΔΡΙΟΥ
ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ ΠΑΡΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΚΥΚΛΑΔΩΝ
ΠΑΡΟΙΚΙΑ ΠΑΡΟΥ, 21-24 ΙΟΥΝΙΟΥ 2019**

Εκδοτική επιμέλεια:
Ντόρα Κατσωνοπούλου

ΑΘΗΝΑ 2021

PAROS V

PAROS THROUGH THE AGES

FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO THE 16th CENTURY AD

PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIFTH INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE
ON THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF PAROS AND THE CYCLADES
PAROIKIA, PAROS, 21-24 JUNE 2019

Edited by
Dora Katsonopoulou

ATHENS 2021

ΠΙΝΑΚΑΣ ΠΕΡΙΕΧΟΜΕΝΩΝ
TABLE OF CONTENTS

Πρόλογος από την Ντόρα Κατσωνοπούλου..... 11
Preface by Dora Katsonopoulou 14

ΜΕΡΟΣ Ι - PART I

Παρία Λίθος και Πάριοι Γλύπτες
Paria Lithos and Parian Sculptors

1. Παρία Λίθος εντός και εκτός Πάρου: Μια Επισκόπηση..... 19
Γιάννος Κουράγιος

2. Expressing *Pathos* in Greek Sculpture: The Leading Role of Paros 43
Dora Katsonopoulou

3. Skopas of Paros: Between Archaistic Revival and Anticipation
of the Hellenistic Form 57
Giuliana Calcani

4. Parians at Pallene and in the Athenian Agora:
Agorakritos, Lokros, and the Post-Pheidian Turn..... 69
Andrew Stewart

5. Επιτύμβιο Ανάγλυφο του 5ου αιώνα π.Χ. από το Νεκροταφείο της Αρχαίας Πάρου.... 83
Φωτεινή Ζαφειροπούλου

6. Classical Greek Statues Made by Important Masters
Described in the Epigrams of Evenos of Paros..... 103
Antonio Corso

7. Parian *Nobilis Opera* in Ancient Rome 109
Gabriella Cirucci

8. The Case for Parian Sculptors in Selinus and Western Sicily
in the Early Classical Period..... 119
Clemente Marconi

9. Parian Marble Sculpture at Akragas: Workshops and Legacy	145
<i>Gianfranco Adornato</i>	
10. The Statue of Apollo <i>Rheginos</i> in the Archaeological Museum of Reggio Calabria.....	161
<i>Daniele Castrizio</i>	
11. Translucent Marble from Naxos and Paros: When and Where Was it Used in Antiquity as Building Material, Especially on Roofs?	171
<i>Aenne Ohnesorg</i>	
12. The Export of Marble in the Sixth Century BC: Paros and its Networks	181
<i>Michael Loy</i>	
13. Networks of Influence: Parian Marble and Parian Soft Power in the Archaic and Classical Periods	197
<i>Richard Phillips</i>	

ΜΕΡΟΣ II - PART II

Η Πάρος και ο Αρχαίος Κόσμος Paros and the Ancient World

14. Herakles at Paros: From Pindar to Apollodoros	223
<i>Alessandra Coppola</i>	
15. Monster on a Tether: An Interpretation of the Depiction of Chimaira on an Archaic Amphora from Paros	231
<i>Ioannis Petropoulos</i>	
16. The Built Chamber Tombs of Koukounaries on Paros: New Evidence	241
<i>Stefanos Spanos</i>	
17. Athenian-Parian Relations, Tenth Century to 264/3 BC: Perusing the Evidence	251
<i>David W. Tandy</i>	
18. The Beginning of the Coinage of Paros: Some Chronological, Economics and Iconographic Questions	263
<i>Daniele Castrizio</i>	
19. Το Κόσμημα στην Παριανή Κεραμική κατά τους Πρώιμους Ιστορικούς Χρόνους	273
<i>Λίντα Τσαμπίρη</i>	

20. Τα Ταφικά Έθιμα της Πάρου με βάση τα Επιτύμβια Σήματα στο Νεκροταφείο της Παροικιάς: Μια Διαχρονική Επισκόπηση.....	291
<i>Δημήτρης Γριμανέλης</i>	
21. Expanding the Necropolis of Paroikia: The Data from the Site of Agios Panteleimon	305
<i>Alexandra Alexandridou and Kornilia Daifa</i>	
22. Figurines in Context: Dedicating Clay Objects at Despotiko and the Delion on Paros	323
<i>Yannos Kourayos and Erica Angliker</i>	
23. Dedications in the Sanctuaries of Asklepios and Eileithyia in Paros	341
<i>Elie Piette</i>	
24. Deities of Paros: Textiles as a Votive Tradition in the Delian Inventories.....	359
<i>Sophia Tsourinaki</i>	
25. Statues of Parion: Evidence from Ancient Sources	381
<i>Vedat Keles and Michael D. Yilmaz</i>	
26. Hygieia of Parion.....	393
<i>Alper Yilmaz and Sadik Tugrul</i>	
27. A Preliminary Assessment on a Possible Murex Workshop in Parion.....	409
<i>Ersin Celikbas</i>	

ΜΕΡΟΣ III - PART III

Βυζαντινή και Μεταβυζαντινή Πάρος Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Paros

28. Paros and the Central Cyclades in the Early Medieval Period.....	423
<i>Konstantinos Roussos</i>	
29. Το Αιγαίο, οι Κυκλάδες και η Θέση της Πάρου στο Διοικητικό Σύστημα κατά τη Βυζαντινή Εποχή	441
<i>Χρήστος Μαλατράς</i>	
30. Νέες Επισημάνσεις σχετικά με την Χρήση του Παριανού Μαρμάρου κατά τον Μεσαίωνα	465
<i>Γιώργος Πάλλης</i>	

31. Sigillographic Evidence for the Island of Paros (with an Unpublished Byzantine Lead Seal from the State Hermitage Museum of St. Petersburg)475
Christos Stavrakos
32. Ο Francesco Lurazzolo και η Πάρος: Ειδήσεις από το Χειρόγραφο της Δημόσιας Ιστορικής Βιβλιοθήκης Χίου 'Κοραής' 483
Νίκος Μερούσης και Χριστίνα Μουσαντάμη

ΜΕΡΟΣ IV - PART IV

Φυσικό και Θαλάσσιο Περιβάλλον Natural and Marine Environment

33. Έρευνα και Ψηφιακή Ανασύσταση του Παλαιοπεριβάλλοντος της Πάρου και των Κυκλάδων497
Λίλιαν Καραλή
34. The Linkage between Innovation and Trade Routes: Examples from the Iron Age Cyclades 507
Doug Forsyth
35. Θαλάσσια Επίκλυση κατά το Ανώτερο Ολόκαινο στις Ακτές της Πάρου (Κυκλάδες, Ελλάδα).....519
Νίκος Μουρτζάς και Ελένη Κολαΐτη
36. Αρχαιολογικοί Δείκτες της Σχετικής Μεταβολής του Επιπέδου της Θάλασσας στην Ακτή της Πάρου (Κυκλάδες, Ελλάδα)553
Ελένη Κολαΐτη και Νίκος Μουρτζάς
37. The Geoswim Coastal Survey of Paros Island, Cyclades (Greece).....599
Stefano Furlani et al.
38. Flooding Scenarios for 2050 and 2100 for Paroikia Bay, Paros Island (Cyclades): A Preliminary Report 611
Eleni Kolaiti et al.
- ΠΑΡΑΡΤΗΜΑ Ι - APPENDIX I: Αφιέρωμα στον Πέτρο Νικολαΐδη621
Ντόρα Κατσωνοπούλου

ΠΡΟΛΟΓΟΣ

Ο παρών τόμος (Paros V) αποτελεί τον πέμπτο στην σειρά τόμο Πρακτικών Διεθνών Συνεδρίων του Ινστιτούτου Αρχαιολογίας Πάρου και Κυκλάδων (ΙΑΠΚ), αφιερωμένων στην αρχαιολογία της Πάρου και των Κυκλάδων, που πραγματοποιούνται στην Παροικία της Πάρου σε τακτά χρονικά διαστήματα. Ο τόμος με τον ειδικότερο τίτλο *Η Πάρος ανά τους Αιώνες - Από την Προϊστορική Εποχή στον 16ο Αιώνα μ.Χ.*, περιλαμβάνει τις επιστημονικές ανακοινώσεις κατά την διάρκεια του Ε' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Αρχαιολογίας Πάρου και Κυκλάδων που πραγματοποιήθηκε σε συνεργασία με τον Δήμο Πάρου και τον Πολιτιστικό Σύλλογο 'Αρχίλοχος' Πάρου, στην Παροικία της Πάρου από 21-24 Ιουνίου 2019.

Το Ε' Συνέδριο ακολούθησε τα τέσσερα προηγούμενα Συνέδρια του ΙΑΠΚ που πραγματοποιήθηκαν στην Παροικία της Πάρου το 1997, 2005, 2010, και 2015 αντίστοιχα. Τα Πρακτικά και των τεσσάρων Συνεδρίων έχουν εκδοθεί από το ΙΑΠΚ. Ο 1ος τόμος με τον τίτλο *Παρία Λίθος. Παριανά Λατομεία, Μάρμαρο και Εργαστήρια Γλυπτικής της Πάρου*, με την επιμέλεια των Δημήτρη Σκιδάρντι και Ντόρας Κατσωνοπούλου, εκδόθηκε το 2000 (2η έκδ. 2010), ο 2ος με τον τίτλο *Ο Αρχίλοχος και η Εποχή του (Paros II)*, με την επιμέλεια των Ντόρας Κατσωνοπούλου, Ιωάννη Πετρόπουλου και Στέλλας Κατσαρού το 2008, ο 3ος με τον τίτλο *Ο Σκόπας και ο Κόσμος του (Paros III)*, με την επιμέλεια των Ντόρας Κατσωνοπούλου και Andrew Stewart το 2013, και ο 4ος με τον τίτλο *Η Πάρος και οι Αποικίες της (Paros IV)*, με την επιμέλεια της Ντόρας Κατσωνοπούλου εκδόθηκε το 2018.

Ο παρών τόμος (Paros V), με την επιμέλεια της Ντόρας Κατσωνοπούλου, περιλαμβάνει συνολικά 38 επιστημονικά άρθρα που κατανέμονται σε τέσσερα μέρη. Το Μέρος I, με τίτλο *Παρία Λίθος και Πάριοι Γλύπτες*, περιλαμβάνει 13 εργασίες που αναφέρονται στην χρήση και διάδοση της Παρίας Λίθου, στους Πάριους γλύπτες και τα έργα τους. Το Μέρος II, με τίτλο *Η Πάρος και ο Αρχαίος Κόσμος*, περιέχει 14 άρθρα για την μυθολογία, ιστορία και αρχαιολογία της Πάρου, και ευρύτερα για την θέση της στον αρχαίο κόσμο. Το Μέρος III, με τίτλο *Βυζαντινή και Μεταβυζαντινή Πάρος* περιέχει 5 άρθρα για την ιστορία και αρχαιολογία της Πάρου σε αυτές τις περιόδους και το Μέρος IV, με τίτλο *Φυσικό και Θαλάσσιο Περιβάλλον*, 6 εργασίες για το παλαιότερο περιβάλλον και τις ακτές της Πάρου και των Κυκλάδων.

Το Μέρος I, ξεκινά με μια συνολική επισκόπηση της χρήσης και διάδοσης του παριανού μαρμάρου εντός και εκτός Πάρου και της συμβολής των Παρίων καλλιτεχνών στην ανάπτυξη και εξέλιξη της γλυπτικής, κυρίως κατά την Υστεροαρχαϊκή και Κλασική περίοδο (Κουράγιος). Τη νέα τεχνολογία του πάθους στην ελληνική γλυπτική που βρήκε την υπέρτατη έκφρασή της στο έργο του Σκόπα και τον ρόλο που διαδραμάτισαν στην διαμόρφωσή της τα εργαστήρια γλυπτικής της Πάρου τον 6ο και 5ο αιώνα π.Χ., εξετάζει το ακόλουθο άρθρο μέσα από την παρουσίαση καινοτόμων έργων γλυπτικής από την Πάρο (Katsanourou). Μια άλλη πτυχή της καλλιτεχνικής δημιουργίας του Σκόπα, με αναφορά στην παράδοση και τον αρχαϊσμό, μελετά η επόμενη εργασία σε συνάρτηση με τα διαφορετικά θέματα που ανέδειξε με το έργο του ο γλύπτης (Calcani). Με βάση τα αποτελέσματα πρόσφατης μελέτης ελεύθερων και αρχιτεκτονικών γλυπτών της Κλασικής περιόδου στην Αθηναϊκή Αγορά, στο ακόλουθο άρθρο εξετάζεται η συμβολή των Παρίων γλυπτών Αγοράκριτου και Λοκρού στην μετάβαση από την Φειδιακή τεχνολογία στο «πλούσιο» στυλ των τελευταίων δεκαετιών του 5ου αιώνα π.Χ. (Stewart). Σημαντική επιτύμβια στήλη του ύστερου 5ου αιώνα π.Χ. από το αρχαίο νεκροταφείο της Πάρου, στην

οποία απεικονίζεται ματιοφόρος άνδρας και γυναίκα με βρέφος, αναλύεται και δημοσιεύεται για πρώτη φορά εδώ από την ανασκαφέα (Ζαφειροπούλου). Στην καταλυτική συμβολή του ποιητή Εύηνου της Πάρου στην καθιέρωση του είδους του εκφραστικού επιγράμματος περιγραφής έργων τέχνης, αναφέρεται το ακόλουθο άρθρο (Corso). Οι επόμενες 4 μελέτες αφορούν σε έργα γλυπτικής από πάριο μάρμαρο και στην δράση Παρίων γλυπτών στην Ιταλία, ξεκινώντας με την παρουσίαση γλυπτών από παριανό μάρμαρο του 5ου και 4ου αιώνα π.Χ. που μεταφέρθηκαν στην Ρώμη (Cirucci), συνεχίζοντας με την διερεύνηση της χρήσης παριανού μαρμάρου και την συμβολή Παρίων γλυπτών στην αρχιτεκτονική και γλυπτική στην Δυτική Σικελία κατά την πρώιμη Κλασική περίοδο (Marconi), την επίδραση παριανών εργαστηρίων στην αρχιτεκτονική και γλυπτική του Ακράγαντα κατά την Υστεροαρχαϊκή και πρώιμη Κλασική περίοδο (Adornato) και την ανάλυση του αγάλματος από παριανό μάρμαρο, γνωστού ως «κούρου» του Reggio στην Καλαβρία που πιθανόν αναπαριστά Απόλλωνα (Castrizio). Την χρήση του παριανού και του ναξιακού μαρμάρου στην αρχιτεκτονική κατά την αρχαιότητα, και ιδιαίτερα στις στέγες, εξετάζει η ακόλουθη εργασία (Ohnesorg). Το Μέρος I ολοκληρώνεται με δύο άρθρα που αφορούν στο πάριο μάρμαρο και την εξαγωγή του σε πόλεις και ιερά του ελληνικού κόσμου κατά την διάρκεια του 6ου αιώνα π.Χ. για την κατασκευή γλυπτών (Loy), και την χρήση του για την δημιουργία γλυπτών υψηλής ποιότητας και μνημειακών κτιρίων σε όλο τον αρχαίο ελληνικό κόσμο κατά την Αρχαϊκή και πρώιμη Κλασική περίοδο (Phillips).

Το Μέρος II του τόμου αρχίζει με την διερεύνηση της προέλευσης και του πολιτιστικού υποβάθρου του μύθου του Ηρακλή στην Πάρο (Corròla) και μια πρόταση ερμηνείας αινιγματικής παράστασης Χίμαιρας σε αρχαϊκό αμφορέα από την ανασκαφή του αρχαίου νεκροταφείου της Πάρου (Petrooulos). Ακολουθεί η δημοσίευση νέων στοιχείων από την ανασκαφή τριών κτιστών θαλαμωτών τάφων στις Κουκουναριές της Πάρου (Spanos). Η επόμενη εργασία διερευνά την μακρόχρονη σχέση ανάμεσα στους Αθηναίους και τους Παρίους από τον 10ο έως τον 3ο αιώνα π.Χ. μέσα από την ιστορική, επιγραφική και αρχαιολογική μαρτυρία (Tandy), ενώ τα χρονολογικά όρια και η εικονογραφία της νομισματοκοπίας της Πάρου μεταξύ του 6ου αιώνα π.Χ. και των Ελληνιστικών χρόνων αποτελούν το θέμα του ακόλουθου άρθρου (Castrizio). Τα αρχαϊκά κοσμήματα σημαντικού παριανού εργαστηρίου παρουσιάζονται στην επόμενη μελέτη και εξετάζονται ο ρόλος και η ερμηνεία τους στην καθημερινή ζωή των ανθρώπων (Τσαμπίρη). Οι δύο επόμενες εργασίες αναφέρονται στο αρχαίο νεκροταφείο της Παροικιάς, εξετάζοντας αφενός τα ταφικά έθιμα μέσα από την μελέτη των επιτυμβίων σημάτων του νεκροταφείου στην θέση Βίτζι (Γριμανέλης) και αφετέρου ευρήματα από ταφές και ταφικά μνημεία στην θέση Άγιος Παντελεήμων που πιθανόν αποτελεί επέκταση της αρχαίας νεκρόπολης προς Βορράν (Alexandridou και Daifa). Στις λατρείες της Πάρου και την σημασία των αναθημάτων στα ιερά είναι αφιερωμένες οι επόμενες τρεις εργασίες, μέσα από την παρουσίαση και μελέτη αφιερωμάτων στο ιερό του Απόλλωνα στο Δεσποτικό σε σύγκριση και με το Δήλιον της Πάρου (Kourayos και Angliker), τα αφιερώματα στα ιερά του Ασκληπιού και της Ευλειθυίας στην Πάρο (Piette) και τέλος τις ενδυματολογικές προσφορές στο ιερό της Δήλου ως αφιερωματική πρακτική, όπως προκύπτει από τα επιγραφικά αρχεία της Δήλου (Tsourinaki). Το Μέρος II κλείνει με τρία άρθρα που αφορούν στην πρωιμότερη αποικία της Πάρου, το Πάριον στην Προποντίδα, και επικεντρώνονται στην παρουσίαση αγαλμάτων από διάσημους έλληνες γλύπτες στην κλασική πόλη του Παρίου με βάση την φιλολογική μαρτυρία (Keles και M. Deniz Yilmaz), την περιγραφή και ερμηνεία ενός πρόσφατου ευρήματος γλυπτικής της εποχής των Αντωνίνων, αψίδα

με ανάγλυφη μορφή της θεάς Υγείας από τα ρωμαϊκά λουτρά της πόλης (A. Yılmaz και Tugrul), και τέλος στην παρουσίαση πιθανού εργαστηρίου και εμπορίας πορφύρας στο ρωμαϊκό Πάριον (Celikbas).

Το Μέρος III αρχίζει με επανεξέταση της ιστορικής μαρτυρίας για την Πάρο και την διερεύνηση του ρόλου που μπορεί να διαδραμάτισε το νησί κατά τους πρώιμους Μεσαιωνικούς αιώνες (Roussos), καθώς και την διερεύνηση της διοικητικής κατάστασης στο Αιγαίο κατά τη Μέση Βυζαντινή περίοδο και της θέσης της Πάρου μέσα σε αυτήν (Μαλατράς). Στο επόμενο άρθρο επανεξετάζεται η χρήση του λυχνίτη κατά την Μεσαιωνική περίοδο με βάση στοιχεία από γραπτές πηγές και νέα παραδείγματα χρήσης του παριανού μαρμάρου εκτός των συνόρων της Βυζαντινής αυτοκρατορίας (Πάλλης). Αδημοσίευτη βυζαντινή σφραγίδα του τέλους του 11ου-αρχές του 12ου αιώνα από την συλλογή του Κρατικού Μουσείου Ερμιτάζ της Αγ. Πετρούπολης είναι το αντικείμενο της εργασίας που ακολουθεί (Stavrakos). Το Μέρος III κλείνει με την παρουσίαση ενός χειρογράφου του 17ου αιώνα από την Δημόσια Ιστορική Βιβλιοθήκη Χίου 'Κοραής' και την αναφορά του στις Κυκλάδες και την Πάρο (Μερούσης και Μουστταντάμη).

Το τελευταίο Μέρος IV ξεκινά με την επισκόπηση του παλαιοπεριβάλλοντος της Πάρου και των Κυκλάδων κατά τους προϊστορικούς χρόνους, με βάση τα δεδομένα των μέχρι σήμερα αρχαιοπεριβαλλοντικών ερευνών και μελετών (Καραλή). Τις θαλάσσιες εμπορικές οδούς διαμέσου των Κυκλάδων μεταξύ 800-600 π.Χ., σε σχέση κυρίως με τα νησιά της Πάρου και της Νάξου εξετάζει η επόμενη εργασία (Forsyth). Τα τέσσερα επόμενα άρθρα αναφέρονται στις ακτές της Πάρου, ξεκινώντας με τον καθορισμό έξι θαλασίων επιπέδων και των σχετικών μεταβολών της στάθμης της θάλασσας κατά τα τελευταία 6.300 χρόνια (Μουρτζάς και Κολαϊτή) και την χρονολόγηση αυτών των επιπέδων με βάση αρχαιολογικούς δείκτες από το τέλος της Νεολιθικής περιόδου έως και τα νεότερα χρόνια (Κολαϊτή και Μουρτζάς). Ακολουθεί η παρουσίαση των αποτελεσμάτων της παράκτιας έρευνας στην Πάρο από το πρόγραμμα Geoswim με σκοπό την συλλογή φυσικών, χημικών και οικολογικών δεδομένων (Furlani et al.) και τέλος η παρουσίαση των επιπτώσεων της ανόδου της στάθμης της θάλασσας και της συνεπαγόμενης θαλάσσιας επίκλυσης στον κόλπο της Παροικιάς για τις επόμενες δεκαετίες (Kolaiti et al.).

Ευχαριστώ θερμά το Δημοτικό Συμβούλιο και τον Δήμαρχο Πάρου Μάρκο Κωβαίο για την υποστήριξη του Συνεδρίου, τα μέλη του ΙΑΠΚ και του Πολιτιστικού Συλλόγου 'Αρχίλοχος' Πάρου για την αμέριστη βοήθειά τους. Τέλος, ευχαριστίες απευθύνονται στον αρχαιολόγο Κωνσταντίνο Ρούσσο για την συμβολή του στην επιμέλεια των άρθρων που περιλαμβάνονται στο Μέρος III του τόμου για την Βυζαντινή και Μεταβυζαντινή Πάρο.

Ντόρα Κατσωνοπούλου

*Πρόεδρος Ινστιτούτου Αρχαιολογίας
Πάρου και Κυκλάδων*

PREFACE

The present volume (Paros V) is the fifth in a series of Proceedings of International Conferences dedicated to the history and archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, organized by the Institute for Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades (IAPC) and conducted at Paroikia on Paros at periodic intervals. This volume, entitled *Paros through the Ages - From Prehistoric Times to the 16th Century AD*, contains scholarly papers presented during the Fifth International Congress of Archaeology on Paros and the Cyclades, held in Paroikia of Paros from 21-24 June 2019, in collaboration with the Municipality of Paros and the Cultural Association 'Archilochos' of Paros.

The congress followed four previous ones on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades, held in Paroikia in 1997, 2005, 2010, and 2015 respectively. The Proceedings of all four congresses have been published by the IAPC. The first, entitled *Paria Lithos. Parian Quarries, Marble and Workshops of Sculpture*, edited by Demetrius Schilardi and Dora Katsonopoulou, was published in 2000 and reprinted in 2010; the second, entitled *Archilochos and his Age* (Paros II), edited by Dora Katsonopoulou, John Petropoulos and Stella Katsarou, was published in 2008; the third, entitled *Skopas of Paros and his World* (Paros III), edited by Dora Katsonopoulou and Andrew Stewart, was published in 2013, and the fourth entitled *Paros and its Colonies* (Paros IV), edited by Dora Katsonopoulou, was published in 2018.

The present volume (Paros V), edited by Dora Katsonopoulou, includes a total of thirty eight scholarly papers, divided into four parts. Part I entitled *Paria Lithos and Parian Sculptors*, includes 13 studies on the use and diffusion of Paria Lithos and on works of Parian sculptors. Part II entitled *Paros and the Ancient World* contains 14 articles on the mythology, history and archaeology of Paros, as well as the island's place in the ancient world. Part III entitled *Byzantine and Post-Byzantine Paros*, contains 5 articles on the history and archaeology of Paros during these periods and Part IV entitled *Natural and Marine Environment*, includes 6 papers on the ancient environment and the coasts of Paros and the Cyclades.

Part I begins with an overview about the use of Parian marble in Paros and its diffusion outside the island as well as the contribution of Parian sculptors in the development and evolution of sculpture, especially during the Late Archaic and Classical periods (Κουράγιος). The new style of pathos in Greek sculpture, dynamically expressed by Skopas of Paros, and the role played by the sculpture workshops of Paros of the 6th and 5th centuries BC, is discussed in the following article via the examination of innovative works from Paros (Katsonopoulou). Another aspect of Skopas' artistic creation, with reference to tradition and archaism, is presented in the next work in connection with the different themes undertaken by the sculptor (Calcani). Based on the results of a recent study of Classical sculptures in the Athenian Agora, the following paper examines the contributions of the Parian sculptors Agorakritos and Lokros in the turn from the style of Pheidias to the "rich" style of the last decades of the 5th century BC (Stewart). A significant new grave relief of the late 5th century BC from the ancient cemetery of Paros, depicting a man and a woman with an infant, is analyzed and published for the first time by the excavator (Ζαφειροπούλου). The following article refers to the catalytic contribution of the elegiac poet Evenos of Paros in the establishment of the ekphrastic epigram describing works of art (Corso). The next 4 studies relate to sculpture works of Parian marble and the activity of Parian

sculptors in Italy, starting with the presentation of Parian marble sculptures of the 5th and 4th centuries BC transferred to the city of Rome (Cirucci), continuing with the investigation of the use of Parian marble and the contribution of Parian sculptors in the architecture and sculpture of Western Sicily during the Early Classical period (Marconi), the influence of Parian workshops on the architecture and sculpture of Akragas during the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods (Adornato) and the analysis of the Parian marble statue known as the “kouros” of Reggio in Calabria, probably representing Apollo (Castrizio). The following work examines the use of Parian and Naxian marble in antiquity in architecture, and especially on roofs (Ohnesorg). Part I concludes with two articles on Parian marble and its export to cities and sanctuaries of the Greek world for the construction of sculptures during the 6th century BC (Loy), and its use for the creation of high quality sculptures and monumental buildings throughout the ancient Greek world during the Archaic and Early Classical periods (Phillips).

Part II begins with the investigation of the origins and of the cultural background of the myth of Herakles in Paros (Coppola) and a new interpretation of an enigmatic representation of Chimaira on an archaic amphora from the excavation of the ancient cemetery of Paros (Petropoulos). The publication of new data from the excavation of three built chambered tombs in Koukounaries of Paros follows (Spanos). The next work explores the long-standing relationship between the Athenians and the Parians from the 10th to the 3rd centuries BC through the historical, epigraphic and archaeological evidence (Tandy), while the chronological limits and the iconography of the coinage of Paros between the 6th century BC and the Hellenistic times are discussed in the following article (Castrizio). The jewels depicted on pottery of an important Archaic Parian workshop and the interpretation of their role in daily life of people are presented and discussed in the next study (Τσαμπίρη). The following two works concern the ancient cemetery of Paros at Vitzi of Paroikia. Its burial customs are examined on the basis of the study of its tombstones (Γριμανέλης) and more burials and burial monuments found at the location of Agios Panteleimon are interpreted as a probable extension of the cemetery to the North (Alexandridou and Daifa). The next three works are devoted to the cults of Paros and the importance of votive offerings in the sanctuaries. First, the results of the study of dedications to the sanctuary of Apollo in Despotiko are presented in comparison with the Delion of Paros (Kourayos and Angliker), then the dedications to the sanctuaries of Asklepios and Eilytheia on Paros are discussed (Piette) and finally the costume offerings in the sanctuary of Delos as a dedication practice are analysed based on the epigraphic archives of Delos (Tsourinaki). Part II concludes with three articles on the earliest colony of Paros, Parion in the Propontis, focusing on the presentation of statues by famous Greek sculptors in the Classical city of Parion according to literary evidence (Keles and M. Deniz Yilmaz), the description and interpretation of a recent sculptural find from the Antonine period, an arch with a relief of the goddess Hygeia from the Roman baths of the city (A. Yilmaz and Tugrul), and finally the discovery of a possible murex workshop in the city of Roman Parion (Celikbas).

Part III begins with a review of the historical evidence for Paros and the investigation of the role that the island may have played during the Early Medieval times (Roussos), as well as the investigation of the administration in the Aegean during the Middle Byzantine period and Paros’ role (Μαλατράς). The next article examines the use of the lychnites marble during the Medieval period based on written sources and new examples of the use of Parian marble outside

the borders of the Byzantine Empire (Πάλλης). An unpublished Byzantine seal of the end of the 11th-beginning of the 12th century from the collection of the State Hermitage Museum of St. Petersburg is the subject of the following work (Stavrakos). Part III concludes with the presentation of a 17th century manuscript in the Public Historical Library of Chios 'Korais' and its reference to the Cyclades and the island of Paros (Μερούσης and Μουστταντάμη).

The last Part IV begins with an overview of the ancient environment of Paros and the Cyclades in prehistoric times based on the data of archaeological research and studies to date (Καραλή). The sea trade routes through the Cyclades between 800-600 BC in relation to the islands of Paros and Naxos is the subject of the following work (Forsyth). The next four articles concern the coasts of Paros, beginning with the definition of six sea levels and the relative changes in sea level over the last 6300 years (Μουρτζάς and Κολαΐτη) and the dating of these levels based on archaeological indicators from the end of the Neolithic period until recent years (Κολαΐτη and Μουρτζάς). In the next article the results of the coastal research in Paros by the Geoswim program aiming at the collection of physical, chemical and ecological data, are presented (Furlani et al.), and finally the effects of sea level rise and the resulting impact of marine flooding in the Gulf of Paroikia for the next decades are discussed (Kolaiti et al.).

I warmly thank the Municipal Council and the Mayor of Paros Mr. Markos Kovaïos for the support of the Conference, the Board of Directors of the Institute for Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades and the members of the Cultural Association 'Archilochos' of Paros for their invaluable assistance. Finally, thanks are due to the archaeologist Konstantinos Roussos for his contribution to the editing of the articles included in Part III of the volume on Byzantine and post-Byzantine Paros.

Dora Katsonopoulou

*President, The Institute for Archaeology
of Paros and the Cyclades*

ΜΕΡΟΣ II - PART II

Η ΠΑΡΟΣ ΚΑΙ Ο ΑΡΧΑΙΟΣ ΚΟΣΜΟΣ

PAROS AND THE ANCIENT WORLD

Dedications in the Sanctuaries of Asklepios and Eileithya in Paros

Elie Piette

University of Liège

Among the practices that enabled the ancient Greeks to come into contact with their gods is the dedication of votive offerings.¹ Worshippers used to make votive offerings in sanctuaries either in the hope of receiving a gift from the gods or to express gratitude to them after receiving such a gift. Although the analysis of the physical votive objects themselves is significant for learning more about cultic practices in specific sanctuaries,² the interpretation of these offerings as well as the identification of their author and divine recipient generally remains complicated. As such, offerings with inscriptions which record the dedication turn out to be a valuable source of information by explicitly providing the identities of the dedicators and the deities and, sometimes, by specifying the nature and the context of the dedication.

On the island of Paros, dedicatory evidence is found primarily in two main sanctuaries: the Asklepieion on terraces southeast of Paroikia and the shrine of Eileithya, the goddess in charge of childbirth, on Kounados Hill. The first part of this paper aims to discern common practices in each sanctuary by paying particular attention to the terminology and the support chosen by the dedicator(s). The second compares the evidence relative to both sanctuaries in order to identify Parian peculiarities in the evidence and to point out the reasons why worshippers went to one or the other.³

DEDICATORY PRACTICES IN THE ASKLEPIEION

Asklepios was worshipped in an extra-urban sanctuary located on terraces southwest of modern Paroikia from the 4th century BC at least;⁴ the sanctuary was still widely frequented during the 3rd century AD. Among the epigraphical evidence, twenty-eight inscriptions record dedications to the god, mostly with his daughter Hygieia (Table 1).⁵ Most of them date from Roman times and were inscribed on three kinds of support: statue bases, marble plaques with anatomical reliefs and *tabulae ansatae* on marble blocks. For each group, we will consider the terminology employed by the dedicator(s) before examining any variances.

The first group includes two statue bases, both belonging to the Imperial period. The first, now lost, was dedicated by a man for the city of the Parians: Τὸν σωτήρα Ἀσκληπιὸν | Κλαύ. Ἀγησίλοχος | τῆι Παρίων πόλει. (1)

According to Cyriac of Ancona who recorded the monument, the base carried a colossal statue of Asklepios.⁶ Following an oracle prescription, the Parians themselves dedicated another statue (2), smaller than the one seen by Cyriac. The deity is in both cases called Asklepios Soter, referenced in the accusative. This cult-title underlines the perception of Asklepios as a saving god, whom citizens honored with a statue, either after a specific event or more generally due to his long-term protection of the city.⁷

The second group (3-7) records dedications made by worshippers from Roman times and is comprised of five marble plaques: Αὐωνία Ζωσίμη | Ἀσκληπιῶ | εὐχὴν. (4)

These plaques depict feet and hands (or arms), to which four uninscribed reliefs with one or two hands can be added (Fig. 1).⁸ This votive practice recurs in sanctuaries of healing gods throughout the Greek world: worshippers offer a representation of the injured part of the body and can also specify on the object their name, that of the deity addressed and any additional information.⁹

The terminology employed in this small group is variable: the dedicator, a man or a woman, can choose to specify the votive aspect (εὐχὴν, εὐχαριστήριον) of the dedication, or not. Asklepios appears alone (4) or with Hygieia (3, 5), in one case as Hypa[taios] (3), and perhaps also as Theos (6). The only constant characteristic of these offerings is thus the parts of the body represented, which are always hands (or arms) and feet. It thus appears that Parians with complaints or injuries to their hands or feet used to dedicate anatomical reliefs to the god as a vow or a thanksgiving offering. Yet, it is far from certain that these finds form a representative selection: just as in other sanctuaries of Asklepios, replicas of other diseased parts of the body were likely also dedicated to Asklepios by the Parians.¹⁰

Let us now consider the third group, which is the largest (8-39). M. Melfi describes the support of these inscriptions as large wall blocks containing *tabulae ansatae*: these dedications were inscribed in embossed frames of analogous dimensions on the white marble walls of the temple (Fig. 2):¹¹ Σωκράτης Ἀντιγόνου καὶ | Νίκη Ἀλεξάνδρου ὑπὲρ τοῦ | υἱοῦ Θεοτέλους Ἀσκληπιῶι | καὶ Ὑγείαι (12).

The main formulaic difference between these inscriptions and those of the previous groups is the regular addition of a third actor: while dedications usually show a bidirectional relation between the dedicator(s) and the god(s) following a gift/counter-gift dynamic, in the *tabulae ansatae* the divine benevolence is explicitly oriented towards a beneficiary distinct from the author of the dedication, generally a son.¹² This third-party is introduced by the preposition ὑπὲρ, “on behalf of”, “for the sake of”, “in the interest of” or, more vaguely “for”.¹³ The general pattern of these dedications is the following: parents, in some cases the father alone, make an offering for their son to Asklepios and Hygieia together, without mention of a vow.

Eight lost dedications probably belong to this group (8-11, 14, 19-21). Cyriac of Ancona describes these as “bases”, but this identification of the support is dubious for several reasons. First of all, the traveler’s identification of other bases was wrong.¹⁴ Second, in other manuscripts, some inscriptions (9-10) are surrounded by embossed frames like the *tabulae ansatae*. Finally, their formulation is highly similar: Κτήσων Ἀριστοφῶντος καὶ Φρυ|νίς{α} Κλεοδάμαντος ὑπὲρ τοῦ | υἱοῦ Κλεοδάμαντος Ἀσκληπιῶι καὶ | Ὑγείαι (8). Consequently, we can assume that these lost stones belong to the third group of dedications on marble blocks.¹⁵

This group therefore attests to a widespread practice of inscribing dedications for a son, especially in Imperial times. Beside this general pattern, some variations imply different familiar



Figure 1. Archaeological Museum of Paros. Relief depicting two hands. Photo: E. Piette.



Figure 2. Dedications 29-30 on *tabulae ansatae*. Photo: E. Piette.

situations: in 20, the patronyms and the word *θεραπτός* show that the boy was probably adopted;¹⁶ in 17, the *τρόφιμος* for whom a couple makes a thanksgiving (*εὐχαριστήριον*) offering could be the young brother of the woman or a grandson of the couple.¹⁷ The terminology, albeit codified, could thus be adjusted to peculiar familial schemes.

A singular dedication, however, seems to cumulate variances from the general pattern: [Δ] ημή[τρ]ιος Λατ[ί]μο<u> ὑπὲρ τοῦ πε[δ]ί[ου] Δημυνᾶ Ἀσκλη|[π]ιῶ Ὑπατέω¹⁸ | [εὐ]χὴν (22). The beneficiary is described as a child (πε[δ]ί[ου]), the recipient deity is Asklepios Hypateos without Hygieia and the dedicator specifies that it is a vow. Moreover, the support, described as an oblong stone, is uncertain. Although many reasons could explain this peculiar dedication, the significant concentration of deviations suggests a conscious act, an intended attempt to stand out and deviate from common practice.

Among these dedications on *tabulae ansatae*, four 3rd-century-AD dedications present an unusual and less codified formulation referring to the offering of hair (25, 29-31), sometimes cut for the first time (25, 30):¹⁹ Τὴν πρωτόμητον τρίχα | τὴν ἐφηβίην κείρας ἔθηκε Στρα|τονεΐζικος Ἀσκληπιάδου Ἀσ|κληπιῶ Ὑγεία τε δῶρον αὐτὸς ὑπὲρ | τοῦ υἱοῦ Στρατονεΐκου χάριν (30, Fig. 2).

According to O. Rubensohn and M. Melfi, dedications with hair-cutting reflect the performance of a “rite of passage” occurring in the Asklepieion; this offering would be made in an exclusively male environment during public festivals such as the *Apatouria*, according to the presence of magistrates in the dedications.²⁰ This would suggest that *tabulae ansatae* could accordingly be divided into two categories: private dedications with a simple typology (8-24) and public hair-cutting offerings (25-37).

However, the analysis of the corpus does not corroborate this distinction. The practice of hair-cutting is not restricted to the male sphere, since a woman dedicates the hair of her son in company of her father (31), while the dedicator in 29 is likely a woman.²¹ Second, the fact that this offering could happen at different times of life (παιδικήν/παίδιον and ἔφηβήν) does not necessarily fit the pattern of an initiation rite providing access to adulthood.²² Finally, the interpretation that the inscriptions had an exclusively “public” character results from a confusion between dedications mentioning hair-cutting (25, 29-31) and those recording magistrates (26-29, 31-33, 35-37): both categories only partially overlap.

Therefore, hair-cutting offerings in the Parian Asklepieion are restricted neither to a so-called “public” sphere, nor to the male part of the community. On the contrary, hair-cutting rituals seem to have been primarily family events, taking place in various contexts and at different times (childhood, adolescence) without being necessarily connected to the acquisition of citizenship.²³ In Paros, parents made a hair offering at different stages of the child’s growth “with a wish for good” (μετὰ εὐχῆς ἐπ’ ἀγαθῶ, 31) or as a gift (δῶρον) in gratitude (χάριν, 30), involving officials or not. Rather than a codified ritual strictly controlled by the city, the variable terminology of these hair offerings suggests that there was a large number of circumstances in which this ritual was performed.

The situation during the 3rd century AD is thus far more complex than a division between “public” and “private”, whose validity for studying Greek polytheism is disputed.²⁴ Alongside usual dedications of parents for a son, this type of support recorded the performance of a ritual (hair offering) closely connected to the familial and maturation spheres. In addition, *tabulae ansatae* were used by officials without involving a third-party beneficiary:²⁵ ἄρχοντος Ἀφθονήτου | τοῦ Συνφόρου, νεοποιοῦ | Αὐρ. Διδύμου τοῦ Ἐλευθέ|ρου, λαμπάδαρχος Αὐρ. | Νεικήφορος Νεικηφόρου | Ἀσκληπιῶ καὶ Ὑγείᾳ (30).

Formerly restricted to parents concerned about the health of their child, the codified practice of inscribing dedications on *tabulae ansatae* thus expanded during the 3rd century AD, being used in other circumstances and thereby acquiring at the same time more variety in formulation.

In short, inscribed offerings in the Asklepieion display various grades of codification, depending on the type of support used and the time period. The two bases do not feature formulaic peculiarities, except in the cultic-epithet (Soter) given to the deity. The terminology in the anatomical reliefs is variable and depends on the circumstances. The only recurrent feature is the representation of feet and hands, but the finds do not necessarily form a representative selection. On the contrary, the quite large number of dedications for sons inserted in *tabulae ansatae* seem to attest to a widespread and highly codified practice on Paros. Variations from the general pattern appear then during the 3rd century AD when the support began to be used in other contexts.

DEDICATIONS IN THE SANCTUARY OF EILEITHYIA

Eileithyia, a goddess closely linked to childbirth and children, was worshipped on the southwest slope of Kounados Hill. Excavations in this open-air sanctuary, active at least from the 6th century BC, have brought to light votive offerings, including terracotta busts and statuettes of women.²⁶ The corpus of inscriptions is smaller than in the Asklepieion, but is better distributed

between Hellenistic and Roman times (Table 2).²⁷ If we put aside the few uncertain stones, dedicatory inscriptions are principally found on marble plaques or statuette bases. As done above with the dedications to Asklepios, each group here is analyzed separately by paying attention to the connections between formulation and support.

The first group consists of five dedications (39-43) made by women, inscribed on marble plaques in the Imperial period: Ἀφροδεισία Ἄντι|φάνου Εἰλειθυία | εὐχὴν (41).

Three plaques (39-40, 42) were hung on a wall using nails, as suggested by the presence of two holes, and two of them (39-40) also feature the representation of breasts.²⁸ The formulation always follows the same pattern: the name of the woman making the dedication (with or without a patronym), the deity in the dative, and then the word εὐχὴν.²⁹

The terminology on marble bases (45-51) generally differs from that on plaques, through the absence of εὐχὴν and the integration of a third-party beneficiary introduced by ὑπέρ, as also found in the Asklepieion: Ἀπάλη Ἐρασ[ιφ]ώντος | ὑπέρ Φειδίου Ἐλευθίη (45).

Unlike dedications to Asklepios and Hygieia for a son, the identity of the beneficiary is generally not specified by a common noun, except in 47 (παιδίων) and perhaps in 49 ([θρε]πτοῦ?). This formulaic difference between both sanctuaries could imply that the identity of the beneficiary was obvious, due to the prerogatives of Eileithyia – the implicit suggestion would be a newborn child – and/or the presence of the statuette, now lost, which provided information on the age of the beneficiary. Yet, the male gender of the beneficiary can be deduced from the name recorded in 45-46, probably also in 48-49.³⁰ The dedicator, however, is generally a woman (45, probably 47-48, 49, 51, two women in 46), in one case with her husband (50), in another perhaps with her children (49). The general pattern of this small group, attested from the 4th century BC to the 3rd century AD, appears to be the following: a dedication by a woman to Eileithyia for a boy, probably the son of the female dedicator.

Among the dedications on bases, two distinctive inscriptions deserve further analysis. One is a bluish marble base which, as mentioned, records the presence of a man in the sanctuary, next to his wife: Γάϊος Ἰούλιος [Μνησικλείδου υἱὸς Ἐπιάναξ καὶ] | Ἐλικωνιάς οἱ μαῖοι τὸν θρεπτόν Ἐπιάνακ[τα] | Δεξικράτους, καθ' ὑθεσίαν δὲ Γαίου | Ἰουλίου Μνησικλείδου υἱοῦ Ἐπιάνακτος, | Ἰλειθυίη (50).

The couple, Gaius Julius Epianax and Helikonias, dedicate their adoptive son (θρεπτόν, καθ' ὑθεσίαν), who appears to be their nephew. D. Leitao interpreted this dedication as the legitimization of an adoption: though explicitly describing themselves as adoptive parents (μαῖοι), the couple consciously dedicate their new son to the goddess of childbirth, like “natural” parents. Through this variant dedicatory practice, they become the birth parents of the boy and “naturalize” him.³¹

Another dedication is exceptional both for its terminology and choice of support:³² Βλαυθία Ἀλεξάνδρου | ὑπέρ ἑαυτῆς Εἰλειθυίη | Σωζούση, Ἐπισωζούση | εὐχὴν (51, Fig. 3).

Blauthia offers a female statue with a triple deviation from the usual formula: she calls the goddess Eileithyia Σωζούση, Ἐπισωζούση, specifies that her gesture is a vow (εὐχὴν), as we find in the bipartite dedications on plaques, and apparently defines herself as the beneficiary of the dedication (ὑπέρ ἑαυτῆς). One possibility, considering the date (3rd century AD), would be to suppose that the dedicatory practice has changed.³³ However, as in the case of the adoptive parents, we can also consider the matter differently, namely as an intentional distancing from the usual practice.

In a simple bipartite dedication, the dedicator makes an offering to the deity in the hope of a benefit in return (or as a thanksgiving), following a gift/counter-gift dynamic. Consequently, they



Figure 3. Athens, Epigraphical Museum (EM 5291). Dedication 51 on marble base. Photo: Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

implicitly consider themselves as the beneficiary. On the other hand, the preposition ὑπέρ allows one to integrate a third actor, to whom divine benevolence is explicitly directed. In the case of Blauthia, however, the situation is quite different, since the dedicator and the beneficiary are the same person.³⁴ The formula ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῆς would therefore appear to be semantically superfluous. Why did Blauthia choose this peculiar formulation? Taking into account the local use of supports in the sanctuary, as well as the related terminology, could give us a clue.

As we have seen, two distinct customs are epigraphically attested in the Parian sanctuary of Eileithyia: if the woman wishes to ensure an uncomplicated pregnancy and labor, she mentions her name, identifies the goddess and describes it as a vow (εὐχήν) on a marble plaque; if her objective is to thank the goddess after the birth of a child or to explicitly attract the benevolence of the goddess to him/her, she offers to the goddess a small statue, specifying on the base her name as well as those of the goddess and the child in question. Even if the term εὐχήν is ambiguous and can describe the action of thanksgiving, we can suggest that Blauthia made this offering in the expectation of a future successful birth. Like women dedicating marble plaques, Blauthia was thus seeking Eileithyia's protection. However, the dedication of a marble statuette in the Parian sanctuary of Eileithyia requires an additional piece of information: the name of the beneficiary introduced by the preposition ὑπέρ. Since the expected beneficiary was not born yet, Blauthia made this offering ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῆς, "for herself". This unique combination between the support (the marble statue generally offered after labor) and the situation (a vow before childbirth) led to an unusual and, at first glance, superfluous expression.

Blauthia's act seems to show both a consciousness of dedicatory habits and a desire to stand out from this general pattern.³⁵ An argument in favor of this interpretation is the goddess' de-

nomination. By calling Eileithyia Σωζούση, Ἐπισωζούση, while no epithet is attested for her in Paros, Blauthia personalized her request and provided additional information about her wish: that Eileithyia keep her safe during the forthcoming labor and even after. Moreover, the use of participles is uncommon and their combination is unique. By using an unusual formulation to describe Eileithyia's intervention, Blauthia enhanced the uniqueness of her offering.³⁶ Hence, Blauthia's outstanding dedication shows a conscious choice of support and terminology in a specific context in order to distinguish herself from the other dedicants.

Even considering the random nature of the discoveries, the analysis of both corpora reveals a strong connection between terminology and support as well as a codification of practices in both sanctuaries. The variances attest to worshippers' creativity, who took into account the norms in these sanctuaries to strengthen their own communication with the gods and sometimes to make their actions stand out from the crowd. Beside those formulaic observations, dedications to Asklepios and to Eileithyia present similarities regarding the identity of the dedicators and beneficiaries as well as their wishes. For what reasons did worshippers go to the southwest terraces or to the slope of Kounados Hill? Let us now consider the two divine profiles concerned.

ASKLEPIOS OR EILEITHYIA?

The dedicatory *corpora* to Asklepios and to Eileithyia are quite similar: both deities received anatomical reliefs and a large number of them concern children, primarily sons. This Parian singularity has led to the description of the two deities as *kourotrophoi*: deities whose almost exclusive function is to accompany children into adulthood.³⁷ To this kourotrophic function was added an interpretation of Asklepios and Eileithyia as similar healing gods.³⁸ Nevertheless, how would a Parian family choose between the cults, if their functions were so alike? A first way of seeking explanation for this would be to examine whether there is a gender opposition between a male cult to Asklepios and a female cult to Eileithyia.³⁹ However, the epigraphical evidence in Paros explicitly denies this distinction: Eileithyia's worshippers were almost exclusively women, but a large number of female dedicators, with or without their husband, also went to the Asklepieion; the dedications to both gods primarily concerned sons, usually not daughters. Moreover, time and space cannot explain away the apparent overlap between these two deities, since these cults coexisted and were both located outside the walls of the city. The choice of a specific god should rather originate from its divine profile, which requires that we question this shared description of Asklepios and Eileithyia as "healing and kourotrophic deities".

Both archaeological and epigraphical sources firmly attest to the healing aspect of the Parian Asklepios: the sanctuary had water facilities and likely hosted incubation practices, while anatomical reliefs refer to injuries and diseases. The god's designation as Soter also takes place in this field: the aim of the Parians was to seek protection against diseases or to thank the god for a specific intervention on behalf of the community as a whole. As a result, one cannot consider that the god was exclusively a kourotrophic deity.

On the contrary, the healing function of Eileithyia is only deduced from the presence of anatomical reliefs in her sanctuary. If such offerings readily refer to the idea of injury or disease in sanctuaries of healing deities,⁴⁰ they can also take on a more symbolic meaning; the dedicator does not represent a diseased member, but a part of the body linked to the benefit that he wishes to obtain: at Daphni in Attica, for instance, reliefs depicting female genitals were offered

in the sanctuary of Aphrodite and Peitho as goddesses in charge of sexuality.⁴¹ The use of this kind of votive offering is thus not restricted to the healing sphere. In the case of Eileithyia, in charge of labor, breasts are a particularly suitable image for nursing, which implies and requires the survival of both the mother and the child. The choice of the represented part of the body clarifies thus the desire of the dedicator. Rather than a healing goddess, then, Eileithyia was worshipped in order to ensure a successful birth and the viability of the child, according to her well-known prerogatives.⁴²

Both deities are thus distinguished by their core competence, Asklepios as a healing god, Eileithyia as the goddess in charge of childbirth. Hence, they cannot be described as equivalent “kourotropic deities”. Besides, the notion has become almost a “catch-all term”, so broad that it ends up being irrelevant to a detailed analysis of divine figures.⁴³ Since placing them inside that vast category is not sufficiently helpful, it is necessary to reconsider this special concern of Asklepios and Eileithyia for children in Paros.

In the Asklepieion, offering a dedication for a son became widespread in the Imperial period. Do these dedications belong to a different field than the offered anatomical reliefs? While Hygieia, literally “Health”, is rarely included in dedications on plaques, where the healing context is evident, parents do not omit her when they request care for their son. Their concern is clearly connected to health, the common purview of Asklepios. More than a kourotropic god, Asklepios remains the healing god to whom parents ask that he look after their children.⁴⁴ The particularity of his cult in Paros is quantitative rather than qualitative: the god of medicine, albeit worshipped by the whole city, cares especially for young people’s health. The kourotropic aspect should be considered as a “specialization” within Asklepios’ cluster of powers.

The interpretation of Eileithyia as a kourotropic goddess comes from the marble statue bases mentioning a boy. Unfortunately, the lack of precision about the beneficiaries of these dedications and the disappearance of the statuettes prevent us from knowing the age of these boys. These dedications could have been made either as a thanksgiving offering on behalf of a newborn or in order to attract divine benevolence to a child. The latter interpretation is more suitable in the case of at least one dedication (47), made “for children” (ὕπὲρ παιδίων). Eileithyia’s care for children is readily intelligible: women who became mothers and benefited from the benevolence of the goddess could keep relying on her for the protection of their newborn children. Rather than a “specialization” as in the case of Asklepios, the kourotropic aspect is here an “extension” of Eileithyia’s competences after successful childbirth. To support this idea of extended prerogatives directly connected to childbirth in the Parian cult of Eileithyia, let us consider again the epithets used by Blauthia (51) to describe the goddess: Eileithyia saves, preserves (Σωζούση) during the labor and she keeps protecting (Ἐπισωζούση) even after the birth. This unique juxtaposition of the simple verb and its derivative underscores the nuance expressed by the prefix ἐπι-, which insists on the continuity of the goddess’ action.⁴⁵ Eileithyia’s care for children can be seen in a continuum, a durative process finding its origin in the protection during pregnancy.⁴⁶

Considering Asklepios and Eileithyia as kourotropic deities is not unfounded. Because of the vagueness of the label, however, it prevents us from defining more precisely the specificities of these divine figures. The Parians needed the help of these gods for various reasons, notably but not exclusively for the protection of children, which led them to turn to the Asklepieion or to the sanctuary of Eileithyia, as the case required.

CONCLUSION

Among the rich cults of Paros, this paper has focused on dedicatory practices in the sanctuaries of Asklepios and Eileithya. A study of the corpus of these inscribed offerings shows a regular terminology, at least for some kinds of offerings, and makes it possible to highlight meaningful variations in the practices of the worshippers inside a specific sanctuary, such as in the choice of support and the text's formulation. Dedicatory practices should always be considered in relation to the community wherein they take place. The intention behind the act is often difficult to discern, for instance in the case of hair offerings to Asklepios and Hygieia. Yet, we can learn from these dedications more about the cultic peculiarities of the island, among which are the specialization of Asklepios in the protection of a specific group, children, and the manifest extension of Eileithya's prerogatives after childbirth.

The analysis of a dedicatory corpus is also a way of discerning what the Greeks expected from their gods and how a pantheon works. Far from being some chaotic aggregate of interchangeable deities, a local pantheon can be seen as a network composed of interacting divine figures, in which each god possesses a complex and often versatile set of powers. As a result, each local pantheon is unique and articulated according to the specific needs of the community. Yet, even though their fields of competence might be close and can sometimes overlap, gods nevertheless remain discrete. Thus, each in their own way, and in a manner exceptionally developed on Paros, Asklepios and Eileithya answered to the concerns of men and women about their children. That is why studying Greek polytheism provides us with information not only about supra-human figures, but also about human beings and the problems and uncertainties with which they were confronted. The dedicatory practices to Asklepios and Eileithya on Paros remind us of the importance, for the family and the entire city, of birth and childhood.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper has been greatly improved by comments from Jan-Mathieu Carbon and Vinciane Pirenne-Delforge. I would like to thank Rebecca Van Hove for reviewing the English text of this article. Finally, thanks are due to Erica Angliker for encouragement and to Dr. Dora Katsonopoulou for accepting my paper.

Elie Piette

N.	Reference	Support	Date	Author	Benef.	Deity	Anatomical relief	Hair-cut offering	Magistrates	Additional information
1	IG XII 5, 154	Statue base	1 st - 2 nd AD	♂	την Παρίων πόλιν	των σοφίτρα Ασκληπιών	X	X	X	X
2	IG XII 5, 155	Statue base	Late 2 nd - early 3 rd AD	/	X	[Ασκληπιό]ν σοφίτρα	X	X	X	[κατά] χρη]σίμων του [Πυθίου (?) θ]εού
3	IG XII 5, 156	Marble plaque	1 st BC - 1 st AD	♂	X	Ασκληπιῶ Ἰπια[ταῖο] κ[αὶ] Ὑγείαι	Foot	X	X	εὐχα[ριστήρι]ον
4	IG XII 5, 157	Marble plaque	1 st AD	♀	X	Ασκληπιῶ	Left foot	X	X	εὐχὴν
5	IG XII 5, 158	Marble plaque	1 st - 2 nd AD	♀?	X	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγεία	Female arms	X	X	X
6	SEG 41, 691	Marble plaque	2 nd - 3 rd AD	?	X	Οεφ	Right foot	X	X	εὐχ[ή]ν
7	SEG 41, 692	Marble plaque	2 nd - 3 rd AD	?	? ΠΙΕΡ[- -]JOY	?	Left (?) foot	X	X	?
8	IG XII 5, 166	[Tabula ansata]	2 nd BC	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι.	X	X	X	X
9	IG XII 5, 167	[Tabula ansata]	Imperial period	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και(ὶ) Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
10	IG XII 5, 165	[Tabula ansata]	Imperial period	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
11	IG XII 5, 172	[Tabula ansata]	Imperial period	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
12	IG XII 5, 168	Tabula ansata	Imperial period	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
13	IG XII 5, 164	Tabula ansata	1 st AD	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
14	IG XII 5, 160	[Tabula ansata]	2 nd AD	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
15	IG XII 5, 170	Tabula ansata	1 st AD	∞	νιόν	Ασκληπιῶν και [Ὑγείαι]	X	X	X	X
16	IG XII 5, 1021	?	Imperial period	∞	νιόν	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
17	IG XII 5, 161	Tabula ansata	2 nd AD	∞	τροφιμου	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	εὐχαριστήριον
18				∞?	?	?	X	?	?	?
19	IG XII 5, 171	[Tabula ansata]	2 nd - 3 rd AD	∞	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
♂				θρεπτιού						
21	IG XII 5, 163	[Tabula ansata]	Imperial period	♂	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
22	IG XII 5, 162	Oblong stone	Imperial period	♂	πε[δ]ίου	Ασκλη[πι]ῶ Ὑπατέρο	X	X	X	[εὐ]χὴν
23	SEG 63, 691	Tabula ansata	Late 2 nd - early 1 st BC	♂ - ♂ - ♀?	νιού	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	X	X	X
24	IG XII 5, 169	Tabula ansata	Imperial period?	?	?	Ασκληπιῶν [και] Ὑγείαι	X	?	?	?
25	IG XII 5, 175	Tabula ansata	3 rd AD	?	?	Ασκλη[πι]ῶν και Ὑγείαι	X	[τὴν] προσιόμηνον] τρήα	?	?
26		I II col I		?	?	?	X	?	[ἐπὶ ἀρχ]οντος	?
27				X	X	[Ασ]κληπιῶ και Ὑγείαι.	X	X	[ἐπὶ] ναποού - λανπα[δ]άρχου	X
28				X	X	Ασκληπιῶν και Ὑγείαι.	X	X	ἐπὶ ναποού - λανπαδάρχησαντος	X

Dedications in the Sanctuaries of Paros

N.	Reference	Support	Date	Author	Benef.	Deity	Anatomical relief	Hair-cut offering	Magistrates	Additional information	
29	IG XII 5, 173	III	3 rd AD	♂?	παιδίου	Υγία και Ασκληπιῶ	X	τὴν παιδικὴν τρίχα	ἄρχοντος	X	
30		IV		♂	ὑοῦ	Ασκληπιῶ Ὑγεία τε	X	τὴν πρωτόμητον τρίχα τὴν ἐφηβικὴν κείρας ἔθηκε	X	δῶρον αὐτῶς; χάριν	
31		V		♀	μετὰ τοῦ πατρῶς	νιού μου	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγεία	X	τὴν παιδιὸν τρίχα	ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος; ἐπιμελητοῦ τῶν [ἀ]ργόνων	ἀγαθὴ τύχη; μετὰ εὐχῆς; ἀνέθεσαν ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ.
32		VI		?	?	?	?	X	?	ἄρχοντος; ναοῦ	ἀγαθὴ τύχη
33	IG XII 5, 174	Tabula ansata	3 rd AD	λ[αμμάδα ρχος]?	?	[Ασκληπιῶ] [και Ὑγεία]	X	?	ἄρχοντος; [νεοκοῦ]	?	
34	IG XII 5, 176	I	3 rd AD	∞	υ[ί]ων	[Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγεία]	X	X	X	ἀγαθὴ τύχη	
35		II		λαμμάδα ρχος	X	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγεία	X	X	ἄρχοντος; νεοκοῦ		
36	IG XIII 203	a	3 rd AD	X	X	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγεία	X	X	ἄρχοντος; λανταδαρχήσα ντος	ἀγαθὴ τύχη; εὐτυχῶς	
37		b		X	X	Ασκληπιῶ και Ὑγεία	X	X	ἄρχοντος; λανταδαρχήσα ντος	ἀγαθὴ τύχη; εὐτυχῶς	
38	IG XII 5, 159	Fragmentary	Imperial period	?	?	θεοῖς Ασκληπιῶδι [Ὑγεία] [τε]	X	?	?	?	

Table 1. Dedicatory inscriptions to Asklepios and Hygieia.

N.	Reference	Support	Date	Author	Benef.	Anatomical relief	Additional data
39	IG XII 5, 193	White marble plaque	Imperial period	♀	/	Breasts	εὐχὴν
40	IG XII 5, 198	White marble plaque	1 st BC - 1 st AD	♀	/	Breasts	εὐχὴν
41	IG XII 5, 190	White marble plaque	1 st BC - 1 st AD	♀	/	X	εὐχὴν
42	IG XII 5, 192	White marble plaque	Imperial period	♀	/	X	εὐχὴν
43	IG XII 5, 194	White marble plaque	Imperial period	♀	/	X	εὐχὴν
44	IG XII 5, 197	Unknown	1 st BC - 1 st AD	♀	/	X	εὐχὴν
45	IG XII 5, 187	Oblong white marble base	3 rd BC	♀	♂	X	X
46	IG XII 5, 189	Oblong white marble base	3 rd BC	♀ + ♀	♂	X	X
47	IG XII 5, 195	White marble base	1 st BC - 1 st AD	♀?	παιδίων	X	X
48	IG XII 5, 196	White marble base	4 th - 3 rd BC	♀?	♂?	X	?
49	IG XII 5, 191	Oblong white marble base	1 st BC	♀ και τὰ [τέκνα αὐτῆς]	θρε[μ]τοῦ?	X	?
50	IG XII 5, 199	Oblong bluish marble base	41-54 AD	∞ (μαῖοι)	θρεπτόν	X	καθ' ὄθεσιαν
51	IG XII 5, 1022	Marble base	3 rd AD	♀	ἑαντις	X	εὐχὴν - Εἰλεῖθυη Σφισσοση, Ἐπισφισσοση
52	IG XII 5, 1023	Stele	2 nd AD	♀	ἀδελφῆς	X	εὐχὴν

Table 2. Dedicatory inscriptions to Eileithyia.

NOTES

1. The only comprehensive survey of Greek offerings remains Rouse 1902. Since this outdated study several works focused on aspects of votive practices have appeared, among which Prêtre 2009.
2. See Prêtre 2018, 345-51 for an interpretation of the abundant material found in the Artemision of Thasos, a Parian colony.
3. Other deities received dedications on the island, among which Artemis (*IG XII 5*, 211; 215-18; 229; 478; Suppl. 202, 205), Demeter (*IG XII 5*, 226-28; *SEG 33*, 684) and Aphrodite (*IG XII 5*, 219 (?); 220-24; *SEG 26*, 980; 48, 1137). However, the generally uncertain provenance and the low quantity of the documents prevent a comparison of their formulary with a corpus like that of the dedications to Asklepios and Eileithyia.
4. A fragmentary volute (*IG XII Suppl.* 204) attests to the presence of Asklepios on the site in the 4th century BC. See Melfi 2002, 327-36; reproduced in Melfi 2007, 433-55 for an analysis of the archaeological evidence and the successive phases of the sanctuary, which probably superseded a former sanctuary of Apollo.
5. Some inscriptions have been set aside given their fragmentary state or their unknown origin (*IG XII 5*, 149-53; 177-82; 209; 261; 428). Parians also made offerings to Asklepios in Epidaurus (*IG IV² 1*, 264, 4th century BC). Apart from dedications, several decrees were displayed in the sanctuary (*IG XII 5*, 113-14; 117-19; 123-24). A decree from the 2nd century BC forbids lighting a fire in order to protect the sanctuary and the offerings it contains (*IG XII 5*, 126).
6. Cyriac's text in folio 42a-b is reproduced by Berranger-Auserve 1992, 349-50 and Rubensohn 1900, 350-54. On this statue, which could reach eight meters high, see Berranger-Auserve 1992, 35. A head belonging to a statue and dated around the middle of the 4th century was found in the Ekatonapyliani church (Katsonopoulou 2019, 45-53).
7. This cultic epithet is attested for many deities, including Asklepios in numerous places. See *BDEG*, s.v. "Soter". A fragmentary inscription found near the castle of Paroikia refers to *theoi soterēs* (*IG XII 5*, 237, late 3rd century BC).
8. See Forsén 1996, 100-102 for the three uninscribed reliefs with one hand. A relief with two hands (fig. 1) is in room 3 of the Archaeological Museum of Paroikia. Since these four reliefs as well as dedications 6-7 do not mention Asklepios, their provenance remains uncertain. See Forsén and Sironen 1991, 180.
9. Van Straten 1981, 105-51; Forsén 1996.
10. Van Straten 1981, 149-50.
11. Melfi 2002, 333, 350, 356-57. However, their identification as wall blocks is sometimes unclear (16, 22, 34-38).
12. The dedicatory act can also be considered as drawing a "votive triangle" between the dedicator, the deity, and the "groupe témoin" (de Polignac 2009). This orientation underlines the significance of the community in the formulation and the perception of the offering.
13. Jim 2014, 631. This use of the *ὑπέρ* preposition in dedications only appears in the Asklepieion and in the sanctuary of Eileithyia. Forsén 1996, 102 restores a third-party beneficiary in the fragmentary dedication 7, whose provenance is uncertain.
14. *IG XII 5*, 464, described by Cyriac as *ad magnam statuarum basim epigrammata*, belongs to a Doric architrave (*SEG 28*, 706).
15. Rubensohn 1900, 353. Melfi 2002, 357 includes a ninth lost inscription (16) transcribed by Covell and Lucas near Constantinople. Unfortunately, no information is given about its support.
16. On the word *θρεπτός*, see Riel 2009. The patronyms in 14 also suggest an adoption (Berranger-Auserve 2000, 146).

17. Berranger-Auserve 2000, 180; Bielman Sánchez 2004, 200. On the three dedicators of 23, see Παπαδόπουλος 2013, 23 and ΒÉ 2014, 523 n. 378.
18. The form Ὑπατέω corresponds to Ὑπα[ταίω] in 3, as does πεδίου to παιδίου. This late cultic epithet is attested in Epidauros for Apollo (*IG* IV², 451, 3rd century AD) and in Thera for the *theoi megaloi epekooi Asklepioi* (*IG* XII 3, 1330, 2nd century AD). Its meaning remains unclear: it could be related to an unknown sanctuary of Apollo and Asklepios at the hot springs of Hypata in Thessaly (Rubensohn 1902, 237; *BDEG* s.v. “upateos”) or be considered as a development of Hypatos (RE 9:241, s.v. “Hypataios”), attested for Asklepios in Epidauros (*IG* IV², 479, Imperial period). In Paros, a boundary stone of Hypatos found on the top of Kounados hill forbids access to the uninitiated and to women (*IG* XII 5, 183, 5th century BC).
19. Thiersch’s restitution (πα[ιδικὴν τρίχα]) in 24 was rightly put aside in the *IG* edition. A dedication to Asklepios and Hygieia for a son in the accusative with a hair offering has been found in Thouria (*SEG* 61, 309, Hellenistic period).
20. Rubensohn 1902, 227-29; Melfi 2002, 349-53. Parians certainly celebrated the *Apatouria* (*SEG* 33, 679, line 52, 175-150 BC), but the main god of this festival in Paros and Thasos is Zeus (Salviat 1958, 220).
21. On the genre of Epaphroditon in 29, see Leitao (2003, 115) and *LGPN*, s.v. “Ἐπαφρόδιτος”. Leitao (2003, 115) suggests several explanations for the presence of the mother in 31.
22. Melfi 2002, 352 considers these expressions as equal, but Leitao 2003, 115 rightly underscores the difference between them.
23. Leitao 2003, 115. For a wide-ranging study of the meanings of hair in the Greek world, see Brulé 2015.
24. On the relevance of such concepts as “state”, “public” and “private” cult and of the opposition between “private” and “public” spheres, see Aleshire 1994 and the papers edited by Schmitt-Pantel and de Polignac 1998; Dasen and Piérart 2005.
25. Yet, the reason for their presence remains unclear: the mention of the archon probably dated the inscription, while the *nepoios* and the *lampadarchos* likely refer to a specific ritual involving a torchlight procession. A fragmentary decree from the 4th century BC (*IG* XII 5, 119, line 3-4) perhaps attests to sacrifices to Asklepios organized by the city. See also supra p. 341 the two statues of Asklepios Soter.
26. The documentation has been collected by Pingiatoglou 1981, 52-53, 120-34. Among the twenty-five terracotta statuettes, twenty-one depict females, three represent a boy, and the last is a Silenus.
27. Some fragments have been set aside (*IG* XII 5, 188; 200-209). Apart from dedications, an inscription (*IG* XII 5, 186, late 2nd century BC) perhaps attests to a restoration, but the attribution to the sanctuary of Eileithyia is uncertain (Berranger-Auserve 1992, 84; 2000, 178).
28. Forsén 1996, 98-100 n. 31.3-6 adds four uninscribed reliefs depicting breasts found in the sanctuary, as well as a representation of the lower part of a female torso, whose provenance is unknown. A representation of breasts, found in the region of Phloga, is dedicated to the Nymphs (*IG* XII 5, 246, 1st century AD). This kind of offering was thus widespread on Paros, which preserves the largest number of anatomical dedications on marble reliefs after Attica (Forsén, Sironen 1991, 180).
29. 44, whose support is unknown, could belong to this group given the identical formulation (except the presence of a matronym).
30. Therefore, Leitao 2007, 256 considers that these lost statuettes depicted children and mostly sons. In the peculiar dedication 51, the lower part of the statuette indicates a female representation. In 47, the gender of the παιδία is unknown.
31. Leitao 2007, 262-72. Pirenne-Delforge and Pironti (2013, 85) insist on the symbolic and social aspect of this “birth”. The presence of a *threptos* in 49, dedicated by a woman and possibly her children, remains uncertain.
32. On the removal of this stone currently in the Epigraphic Museum of Athens, see *IG* II/III³ 4, 1152. We would like to thank Klaus Hallof for sending us this picture.

33. A century earlier, another woman decides to dedicate a stele to Eileithyia as a vow for her sister (52). This dedication for a third-party beneficiary differs thus through the support and the identity of the beneficiary.
34. Jim 2014, 619. Dedicators usually use the reflexive pronoun after the preposition ὑπὲρ to add themselves to the group of beneficiaries, especially in offerings for the wellbeing of the family. This formulation is attested from Classical times in many cities, especially in Delos (*ID* 2368). Mentions of ὑπὲρ ἑαυτῆς without any other beneficiary are attested in dedications from Asia Minor (*SEG* 33, 1007; 35, 1177; 35, 1179; 49, 1805; 57, 1334), perhaps also from Delos (*ID* 2278).
35. Prêtre 2009, 10. See supra p. 343, the case of dedication 22 to Asklepios.
36. Chaniotis 2009, 62. Sozouse is uncommon in comparison to the recurrent adjective Soter/Soteira (Jim 2015, 70-71) and Episozouse is a unicum.
37. *RE* 18:1848; Pingiatoglou 1981, 89-90; Melfi 2002, 353. On the wide category of *kourotrophos*, which embraces the whole process of formation of human beings from fertilization to adulthood, see Pirenne-Delforge 2004.
38. *RE* 18:1848; Pingiatoglou 1981, 58-59.
39. Geagan 1994, 167.
40. Representations of breasts appear in healing contexts, for example in sanctuaries of Asklepios, but they are usually mixed up with dedications representing other limbs or parts of the body. See Van Straten 1981, 109 (Athens), 123 (Corinth), 129 (Kos).
41. Forsén 1996, 78-82. In the same way, eyes on reliefs in Eleusis express the result of a mysteric experience rather than a cure (Bérard 2008, 92-93).
42. Forsén 1996, 135; Leitao 2007, 257. In the same way, the breasts relief dedicated to the nymphs (supra n. 27) should refer to their role alongside maidens and women rather than considered as evidence of a healing function.
43. Pirenne-Delforge and Pironti 2013, 72.
44. Similarly, babies and children are introduced to Asklepios in Attica. See Geagan 1994; Lawton 2007.
45. *LSJ*, s.v. “ἐπί”; *LSJ*, addenda, s.v. “ἐπισώζω”: “continue to save”.
46. The dedication of Gaius Julius Epianax and Helikonias (50, see supra n. 30) could confirm that the cult of the Parian Eileithyia was birth-oriented rather than properly kourotrophic: the choice of the adoptive parents to address Eileithyia in order to “naturalize” the boy and to legalize the adoption makes sense only if the goddess is conceived of as the deity in charge of childbirth. This dedication also attests to an extension of Eileithyia’s prerogatives in connection with childbirth: in this case, Eileithyia’s functions extend to the ideas of legitimation and integration and bring her closer to the figure of her mother Hera (Pirenne-Delforge and Pironti 2013, 85).

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aleshire, S. 1994. "Towards a Definition of 'State Cult' for Ancient Athens." In *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence*, edited by R. Hägg, 9-16. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet.
- Bérard, C. 2008. "Éleusis : contempler les mystères." In *Image et religion*, edited by S. Estienne, D. Jaillard, N. Lubtchansky and C. Pouzadoux, 85-93. Collection du Centre Jean Bérard. Naples: Publications du Centre Jean Bérard.
- Berranger-Auserve, D. 1992. *Recherches sur l'histoire et la prosopographie de Paros à l'époque archaïque*. Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de l'Université Blaise-Pascal. Nouvelle série 36. Clermont-Ferrand: Faculté des lettres et sciences humaines de l'Université Blaise-Pascal.
- . 2000. *Paros II : prosopographie générale et étude historique du début de la période classique jusqu'à la fin de la période romaine*. Collection Erga 1. Clermont-Ferrand: Presses Universitaires Blaise Pascal.
- Bielman Sánchez, A. 2004. "Égéries égéennes : les femmes dans les inscriptions hellénistiques et impériales des Cyclades." In *L'hellénisme d'époque romaine : nouveaux documents, nouvelles approches (Ier s. à C.-IIIe s. p. C.)*. Actes du colloque international à la mémoire de Louis Robert, Paris, 7-8 juillet 2000 organisé par l'Année épigraphique (USR 710 du CNRS), l'Université de Paris IV (UFR de grec et d'histoire), edited by S. Follet, 195-213. De l'Archéologie à l'Histoire. Paris: De Boccard.
- Brulé, P. 2015. *Les sens du poil (grec)*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Chaniotis, A. 2009. "From Woman to Woman: Female Voices and Emotions in Dedications to Goddesses." In *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse. Systèmes votifs dans les sanctuaires de déesses du monde grec*, edited by C. Prêtre, 51-68. Kernos Supplément 23. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège.
- Dasen, V. and M. Piérart (eds.) 2005. *Ἱδία καὶ δημοσία : les cadres "privés" et "publics" de la religion grecque antique*. Kernos Supplément 15. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège.
- Forsén, B. 1996. *Griechische Gliederweihungen: eine Untersuchung zu ihrer Typologie und ihrer religions- und sozialgeschichtlichen Bedeutung*. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 4. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- Forsén, B. and E. Sironen 1991. "Parische Gliederweihungen." *ZPE* 87:176-80.
- Geagan, D. 1994. "Children in Athenian Dedicatory Monuments." In *Boeotia Antiqua 4: Proceedings of the 7th International Congress on Boiotian Antiquities*, edited by J. M. Fossey and J. Morin, 163-73. MacGill University Monographs in Classical Archaeology and History 15. Amsterdam: Gieben.
- Grandjean, Y. and F. Salviat 2000. *Guide de Thasos*. 2nd. ed. Sites et monuments 3. Athens: École Française d'Athènes.
- Jim, T.S.F. 2014. "On Greek Dedicatory Practices: the Problem of «hyper»." *GRBS* 54:617-38.
- . 2015. "Can Soteira Be Named? The Problem of the Bare Trans-Divine Epithet." *ZPE* 195:63-74.
- Κατσωνοπούλου, Ντ. 2019. "Μαρμάρινη Κεφαλή Ασκληπιού από την Εκατοντυλιανή της Πάρου." In *Ἱερός Ναός Παναγίας Εκατοντυλιανής Πάρου. 50 χρόνια από την αποκατάστασή του από τον Αναστάσιο Ορλάνδο. Πρακτικά επιστημονικού συνεδρίου, Παροικία Πάρου, 11-14 Σεπτεμβρίου 2015*, edited by Ντ. Κατσωνοπούλου, 45-53. Athens.
- Lawton, C.L. 2007. "Children in Classical Attic Votive Reliefs." *Hesperia Supplements* 41:41-60.
- Leitao, D.D. 2003. "Adolescent Hair-Growing and Hair-Cutting Rituals in Ancient Greece: a Sociological Approach." In *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives. New Critical Perspectives*, edited by D.D. Dodd and C.A. Faraone, 109-29. London: Routledge.
- . 2007. "Male Improvisation in the «Women»s Cult of Eileithyia on Paros." In *Finding Persephone: Women's Rituals in the Ancient Mediterranean*, edited by M.G. Parca and A. Tzanetou, 252-76. Studies in Ancient Folklore and Popular Culture. Bloomington (Ind.): Indiana University Press.
- Melfi, M. 2002. "Il complesso del « Pythion-Asklepieion » a Paro." *ASAtene* 80:327-60.

- Melfi, M. 2007. *I santuari di Asclepio in Grecia*. Studia archaeologica 157. Rome: "Erma" di Bretschneider.
- Παπαδόπουλος, Ι.Κ. 2013. "Επιγραφές Πάρου." *Γραμματεῖον* 2:17-26.
- Pingiatoglou, S. 1981. *Eileithyia*. Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. 2004. "Qui est la Kourotrophos athénienne ?" In *Naissance et petite enfance dans l'Antiquité : actes du colloque de Fribourg, 28 novembre-1er décembre 2001*, edited by V. Dasen and S. Ducaté-Paarmann, 171-85. Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis 203. Fribourg: Academic Press Fribourg.
- Pirenne-Delforge, V. and G. Pironti 2013. "Ilithyie au travail : de la mère à l'enfant." *Mètis* N.S. 11:71-91.
- Polignac, F. de. 2009. "Quelques réflexions sur les échanges symboliques autour de l'offrande." In *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse : Systèmes votifs des sanctuaires de déesses dans le monde grec*, edited by C. Prêtre, 29-37. Kernos Supplément 23. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège.
- Prêtre, C. 2009. "La donatrice, l'offrande et la déesse : actions, interactions et réactions." In *Le donateur, l'offrande et la déesse : Systèmes votifs des sanctuaires de déesses dans le monde grec*, edited by C. Prêtre, 7-27. Kernos Supplément 23. Liège: Presses universitaires de Liège.
- . 2018. "Από την πόρπη στο φυλακτό: Η αμφιθυμία της Αρτέμιδος της Θάσου μέσω των αναθημάτων της." In *Paros IV, Paros and its Colonies: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference on the Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades. Paroikia, Paros, 1-14 June 2015*, edited by D. Katsonopoulou, 345-51. Athens: The Institute for Archaeology of Paros and the Cyclades.
- Ricl, M. 2009. "Legal and Social Status of «Threptoi» and Related Categories in Narrative and Documentary Sources." In *From Hellenism to Islam: Cultural and Linguistic Change in the Roman Near East.*, edited by H.M. Cotton, 93-114. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rubensohn, O. 1900. "Paros. Geschichte der wissenschaftlichen Erforschung von Paros." *MDAI(A)* 25:341-72.
- . 1902. "Paros III. Pythion und Asklepieion." *MDAI(A)* 27:189-238.
- Rouse, W.H.D. 1902. *Greek Votive Offerings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Schmitt-Pantel, P. and F. de Polignac (eds.) 1998. *Public et privé en Grèce ancienne : lieux, conduites, pratiques. Actes du colloque international "Entre public et privé en Grèce ancienne, lieux, objets, pratiques", organisé à Paris les 15-17 mars 1995*. Ktéma 23. Strasbourg: Université March Bloch, Centre de recherches sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce antiques.
- Van Straten, F.T. 1981. "Gifts for the Gods." In *Faith, Hope and Worship. Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, edited by H.S. Versnel, 65-151. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion 2. Leiden: Brill.

ABSTRACT

DEDICATIONS IN THE SANCTUARIES OF ASKLEPIOS AND EILEITHYIA IN PAROS

One of the practices that enabled the ancient Greeks to come into contact with their gods is the dedication of votive offerings. On Paros, the epigraphical evidence is primarily comprised of two groups: dedications to Asklepios southeast of Paroikia and those to Eileithyia on Kounados Hill. The analysis of both epigraphical corpora reveals a strong connection between terminology and support as well as a codification of practices in both sanctuaries. Variations to this general pattern seem to be deliberate, though the motivations of the dedicators remain mostly hypothetical.

Besides this codified aspect, however, the cults of Asklepios and Eileithyia should not be viewed as interchangeable; rather, as parallel yet distinct. Though they are sometimes grouped together under labels such as “healing” or “kourotrophic”, differences in dedicatory practices reveal that the two cults were discrete options available to the worshippers. The Parians needed the help of these gods for various reasons, notably but not exclusively for the protection of children, which led them to turn to a sanctuary or the other, as the case required. Such epigraphical evidence thus enables us to better understand how the Parian pantheon works.

ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

ΑΦΙΕΡΩΜΑΤΑ ΣΤΑ ΙΕΡΑ ΤΟΥ ΑΣΚΛΗΠΙΟΥ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΕΙΛΕΙΘΥΙΑΣ ΣΤΗΝ ΠΑΡΟ

Μία από τις πρακτικές που επέτρεψαν στους αρχαίους Έλληνες να έρθουν σε επαφή με τους θεούς τους είναι η αφιέρωση αναθημάτων. Στην Πάρο, η επιγραφική μαρτυρία αποτελείται κυρίως από δύο ομάδες: αναθήματα στον Ασκληπιό νοτιοανατολικά της Παροικίας και στην Ειλείθυια στον λόφο Κούναδος. Η ανάλυση των δύο επιγραφικών συλλογών αποκαλύπτει μια ισχυρή σχέση μεταξύ της ορολογίας και του αντικειμένου, καθώς και μια κωδικοποίηση των πρακτικών στα δύο ιερά. Οι παραλλαγές σε αυτό το γενικό πρότυπο φαίνεται να είναι εκ προθέσεως, αν και οι λόγοι για τους οποίους οι αναθέτες πρόσφεραν τέτοια αναθήματα παραμένουν γενικά υποθετικοί.

Εκτός από αυτήν την κωδικοποιημένη πτυχή, ωστόσο, οι λατρείες του Ασκληπιού και της Ειλείθυιας δεν πρέπει να θεωρούνται ως εναλλάξιμες, μάλλον ως παράλληλες αλλά και διακριτές. Αν και αυτές οι θεότητες μερικές φορές ομαδοποιούνται ως «θεραπευτές» ή «κουροτρόφοι», οι διαφορές στις πρακτικές αφιέρωσης αποκαλύπτουν ότι οι δύο λατρείες ήταν διακριτές επιλογές διαθέσιμες στους πιστούς. Οι Πάριοι χρειάζονταν τη βοήθεια από τους θεούς για διαφορετικούς λόγους, κυρίως αλλά όχι αποκλειστικά για την προστασία των παιδιών τους, γεγονός που τους οδήγησε να στραφούν στο ένα ή στο άλλο ιερό, ανάλογα με την περίπτωση. Έτσι, τέτοια επιγραφική μαρτυρία, μας επιτρέπει να κατανοήσουμε καλύτερα την λειτουργία του πανθέου των Παρίων.

