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Abstract: This paper addresses the issues related to the contribution of archaeology along with other disciplines, mostly history and epigraphy, to the study of the re-structuring of religious life within the confines of post-classical synoecisms. Emphasis is placed on the religious interface of eastern coastal Thessaly, as it was configured after the local communities came together to form a new royal foundation, Demetrias, in 293.

Résumé: Cet article aborde les questions liées à l’apport de l’archéologie avec d’autres disciplines, principalement l’histoire et l’épigraphie, à l’étude de la réorganisation de la vie religieuse au sein de synécismes post-classiques. L’accent est mis sur l’interface religieuse de Thessalie côté de l’Est, tel qu’a été configuré après la réunion des communautés locales, en 293, afin de former Démostrias, nouvelle fondation royale et siège du royaume macédonien.

“Can we talk about an Archaeology of Greek Religion?” From this key question addressed by A. Schnapp in 1999 – in an attempt to re-evaluate the hermeneutical and practical dimension of religious archaeology for ancient Greece – until the establishment of *Kernos*’ *Archaeological Chronicle* in 2001 and its present decennial anniversary celebration, the contribution which archaeology can make to our understanding of Greek religion was more than ever highlighted.

1. Religion and synoecism

New types of political organization – namely the enforced or the voluntary synoecism and the sympolity – emerged in a wide scale at the dawn of the classical world, when the restructuring of the socio-political order dynamically overshadowed the classical *polis*’ saga; this has surely left important traces on the local religious life. The religious inferences of synoecism have been already
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briefly discussed by M.P. Nilsson, but a thorough response to the question of the impact of communities’ coalescence to the local religious life has been recently provided by R. Parker: “every re-structuring of the political order required or potentially required the re-organisation of cults, rewriting of sacrificial calendars, re-assignation of priesthoods … for a community threatened by subjection, aspiring to liberation or contemplating synoecism the future of ancestral cults must have been one very sensitive issue.” And this is by no means a modern assumption, since local inscriptions reflect the Greek attitude towards political unification and cultic realignment: an emotional bewilderment and anticipation followed by further drastic enactment.

The Myconian “sacred law” of the last quarter of the third century inaugu- rates a new era in the creation of the island’s religious life after the synoecism. Furthermore, “no one participate in the rites of Lindos who did not participate in them before” clearly echoes the voice of the Lindians of the late fourth century, after the synoecism of the three Rhodian cities; they clearly approved exclusivity in their own religious affairs and accept no further pan-Rhodian interference or participation in them. Contrary to such efforts to protect traditional identity, elsewhere the new citizens were to participate in the traditional rites or in all affairs of the existing ones. This is how, for example, in the first half of the fourth century, the “Heliswasians are to become like and equal to Mantineans”, while at least some of their own rites will continue to be performed. Furthermore, in the liberal polity of the sympolity agreement between Stiris and Medeon in Phocis, in the second century, “the Medeonians are to participate in all Stirian sacrifices and the Stirians to the Medeonian ones.” These are only some aspects of a wide range of religious impacts of synoecism and sympolity cases included in Parker’s exhaustive case study and appendix, based on diverse forms of a relationship of dependency between communities, with examples of earlier rituals’ exclusion or investment of religious emotion on new deities.

However, political unification for the post-classical world was more than an issue involving direct agreement policy between the implicated parts, since many poleis foundations or re-foundations resulted from the decisions of the
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Hellenistic rulers. In that case, unions’ establishment was depending on instructions codified by the rulers themselves, which in the form of royal letters were dispatched to the local representatives of the royal court, or the magistrates of the implicated cities. Those instructions included also stipulations on the organization and re-establishment of a normal course in the religious life within the newly established communities. In the first mutilated lines of a letter of Antigonus Monophthalmos to Teos in 303, ordering physical synoecism between Teos and Lebedos, it is prescribed that the Lebedian delegate to Panionion should “tent and celebrate” with those coming from Teos and “should be called Tean himself.”

Unfortunately, the fragmentary character of the available documentation often deprives us from those specific instructions on the restructuring of the religious life. This is obviously the case of the fragmentary letter of Antiochos III to the Sardians, in 213, ordering the cutting of wood for the “synoikismos of the city,” as well as of a letter of Attalus I (?) to Mylasa ratifying sympolity with Chalecotor (228-223?). In general, royal correspondence ordering synoecism should be considered as the beginning of a ruler’s usual interference in the local religious affairs following the creation of these post-classical royal foundations. An example is the diagramma ordering proper administration of the incomes of Sarapis in the Serapeion of Thessalonike in Macedonia (187), as well as the royal letter to the epistates of Demetrias in Thessaly prescribing the proper clothing to be worn by the royal hunters of Heracles Kynagidas (221-179), both issued by Philip V.

However, due to the lack of adequate epigraphic documentation establishing the religious affairs of every political union, the decryption of the particular type of local poleis coalescence and ritual life usually requires the combination of additional elements to a simple reading of a literary passage, especially when the literary testimonies usually postdate the union itself, not to mention the overlap between the two terms of synoikismos and sympoliteia.

In Thessaly, for example, although literary evidence demonstrates a certain number of political coalescences, especially following the establishment of the Macedonians in the region during the fourth and third century, only one epigraphic document is known to refer to them: the sympolity agreement
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between Gomphoi and Ithome in NW Thessaly. On the contrary, in eastern Thessaly, there is a lack of documents negotiating this issue and thus complementary information resulting from the local archaeological data comes in assistance.

2. The synoecism of Demetrias under Macedonian rule

In the beginning of the third century (293), the Macedonian king Demetrius Poliorcetes established a synoecism of the former Thessalian and Magnesian communities situated around the port of the Pagasitic Gulf and in the Magnesian peninsula respectively and created Demetrias at the inlet of the Gulf. According to later literary sources, this powerful city and cosmopolitan harbour was meant to constitute a “seat of the Macedonian kingdom (basileion),” a “naval base” and one of the three “fetters” of Greece, along with Corinth and Chalcis. Following the issues related specifically to the re-organization of the local religious life after this large scale re-structuring of political order in eastern Thessaly at the dawn of the Hellenistic period will be addressed.

2.1. The royal letter

Unfortunately, the assignment to identify the nature of Demetrius’ synoecism is not provided with an explicit royal document, as – for example – the one ordering the synoecism between Lebedos and Teos. However, a relevant – although fragmentary – royal letter was discovered in the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios at Dion and was originally assigned to Philip V. Hatzopoulos has recently re-dated this document to 291 and assigned it to Demetrius Poliorcetes, linking it with the establishment of Demetrias, in 293: “King Demetrius to Ladamas (?), greeting. I have established the delimitation of the territory belonging to the citizens of Demetrias and Pherai, as they have confined it to me.” In this letter Demetrius actually commissions the border and landmarks between the territories of Pherai and the newly established Demetrias, ordering a certain Ladamas to put a landmark near the site called Iolkia.

This document constitutes an important piece of evidence with regards to the local topography, especially after its new dating (291). Although the actual royal order of the “how to do it” towards the foundation of the synoecism is missing,
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Demetrius’ letter delimitates the geo-political framework of the new royal foundation *vis-à-vis* the Thessalian inland and the territory of Pherai, the prominent neighbouring *polis* of the Thessalian *tetrar* Pelasgiots.²⁶

In particular, Pherai’s territorial expansion had for long reached the coastline of the Pagasetic Gulf. It is generally agreed that the *poleis* located around the harbor of the inlet were, at least from the sixth century, subjects to the Thessali-ans,²⁷ whereas there was no community belonging to the Magnesians before the middle of the fourth century.²⁸ Herodotus mentions that Iolkos was already under the control of the Thessalians who offered it to the Athenian tyrant Hippias,²⁹ while other sources acknowledge Pagasai as the port of Pherai.³⁰ However, in the fourth century, Pseudo-Skylax included Iolkos among the Magnesian *poleis*;³¹ it certainly enjoyed at that time a *polis* status, since along with Pagasai, they struck coins bearing the ethnics ΙΩΛΚΙΩΝ and ΠΗΛΑΣΛΙΩΝ respectively.³² In the middle of the fourth century, these coastal *poleis* were handed over to the Macedonians.³³ Philip II fortified the port, Pagasai, and controlled all commercial activities by collecting their taxes, an action that provoked the anger of the Thessalians.³⁴

To sum up, the boundary enacted by Demetrius in the beginning of the third century, between the territories of Demetrias and Pherai, eventually promoted the definitive consolidation of the Macedonian control over the port, pushing Pherai towards the inland.

### 2.2. Evidence from literary sources

Most of the surviving evidence that describes the emergence of Demetrias in the geopolitical scenery of the biggest natural harbour in Thessaly consists of literary sources post-dating the foundation itself. Strabo mentions that “Demetrius founded Demetrias nearby the sea, between Neleia and Pagasai, having synoecized (συνοικίζει) the nearby *poliebhai*, Neleia, Pagasai, Ormenion and also Rhizous, Sepias, Olizon, Boibe and Iolkos, which are now *komai* of Demetrias.”³⁵ Also, Plutarch states that “Demetrias was created from *poliebhai*...”
placed near Iolkos. These most important, though quite enigmatic, passages deliver names of local small communities (polichnai) participating in the synoecism and becoming komai of Demetrias.

However, other important information is to be found in Skylax, predating the synoecism, and in the much later Pliny; besides the polichnai enumerated by Strabo and Plutarch, some local poleis names have been assigned to them in the Magnesian peninsula. Then, were those extra poleis included in the synoecism? And, finally, what is the exact number, the location, the names and the status(es) of the synoecized communities?

Unfortunately, the study of the political geography of the small plain on the bay of the Pagasitic Gulf and the Magnesian peninsula as a whole has not reached safe conclusions regarding the identification and location of these settlements, as most identifications are not corroborated by epigraphic evidence, and often contradict each other; only the fortified city of Demetrias has been securely identified and excavated. In addition, although the later sources mention various names that became komai of Demetrias and even though komai are epigraphically attested for other contemporary royal foundations in Macedonia, there is no epigraphic evidence for post-classical komai in the region of Demetrias. Consequently, the nature of the early synoecism is inadequately understood: was there a physical synoecism involving large/small scale urban relocation and population transfer or a political one? What happened to the cults of the old communities?

3. Archaeology, religion and synoecism in Demetrias

Since most of the settlements involved in the synoecism are not located or securely identified, neither are most of their cult places; this fact deprives us from appreciating the interface of religious life before and within the
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synoecism. In addition, even for the securely identified polis of Demetrias itself there are significant problems regarding the identification and the attribution of its cult places. Firstly, the diachronic and continuous habitation in the small plain of the head of the Pagasetic Gulf made the transportation and re-use of its stone material an extremely widespread practice; consequently, epigraphic material related to cults is usually found out of context. Secondly, the votive landscape is shrouded in mist, since most of the material remains unpublished, thus undated and even currently unidentifiable.

3.1. . . . the Thessalian background

A first overview of the archaeological evidence related to settlement ruins that were brought to light in the area of the future polis of Demetrias strongly indicates that at the end of the fourth/beginning of the third century BC almost all settlements and their cult places are abandoned. On the SW edge of the inlet, the suburban sanctuary, along with the archaic and classical city located on the hill Soros (ancient Amphanai? Pagasai?), contain no finds postdating the early third century. Fourth-century artefacts were found scattered in the sanctuary’s pronaos and the two lateral rooms, both closed permanently ever since (Table 1, 2-3). This sanctuary has been tentatively attributed to Apollo (Pagasaios?) (Table 1, 1 and 5-6); fourth-century coins issued by Pagasai bear the head of the poliadic divinity Apollo Pagasaios (Table 1, 4). Furthermore, on the western part of the inlet, the remains of a Doric temple that is situated under the modern church of Ag. Theodoroi (Table 1, 12-14) on the hill Palia/Kastro of Volos, has been attributed to Artemis Iolkia, the poliadic divinity depicted on the fourth-century coins of classical Iolkos (Table 1, 15). The city has been tentatively identified with the Classical deposits at Palia that can be associated with contemporary graves of the neighboring cemetery at Nea Ionia. The Geometric and Classical finds discovered within the ruins of the temple combined with the lack of posterior evidence suggest the abandonment of both sanctuary and settlement in the early third century. Furthermore, on the NE edge of the inlet, the late Classical/early Hellenistic fortified settlement on the hill of Goritsa (ancient Methone?), where a cave dedicated to Zeus Melichios has been excavated (Table 1, 44), was also abandoned at the same time. Finally, besides the ruins on the hill Soros, two more sites with classical deposits have been put forward as Pagasai. They are both situated beneath later Demetrias, thus, their stone material was either destroyed or re-used and consequently the
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identification of cult places is seriously obstructed. However, traces of two sanctuaries that seem to antedate the synoecism were excavated in the area, by Arvanitopoulos, and were attributed to Herakles and Hera respectively (Table 1, 25 and 28). Also, traces of an altar/exedra (?) to a prothyraia divinity – probably Ennodia, the great Pheraian Goddess – was located on the main road leading from Pagasai to Pherai (Table 1, 23); also, a votive stele to Ennodia Patroa belongs to the same classical deposits beneath Demetrias (Table 1, 24). Pherai’s presence on the inlet had surely influenced the local cult landscape; Theopompus mentions the cult of Dionysus Pelekys at Pagasai (Table 1, 22), with strong relations to Pherai, while Hermes Chthonios (Table 1, 30), the prominent Thessalian divinity, is depicted on funerary monuments and connected with the afterlife voyage of the dead.

In addition, an archaic and classical sanctuary was recently discovered at the locality Spartias, situated also along the classical road between Pherai and Pagasai; a votive inscription to Herakles, a divinity strongly related to the fifth century foundation myths of Pherai, was uncovered from the ruins (Table 1, 26-27). This critical road of communication, exchange and commercial activities between inner Thessaly and the Aegean would have hosted more peri-urban and rural sanctuaries, whose fate might have been modified after the enactment of the border polity between Demetrias and Pherai by Demetrius; in the absence of excavated material, this issue remains subject to future investigation.

Furthermore, outside the area of the inlet of the Gulf, an early sanctuary dedicated to Zeus Akraios and most probably a cave of Chiron were unearthed on the summit of Mount Pelion (Table 1, 42-43), as well as an archaic and a classical layer of the sanctuary of Apollo Koropaios at modern Korope (Ancient Korope?) (Table 1, 7-10). As far as the rest of the peninsula is concerned, due to the absence of systematic excavations most of the settlements – whose presence is attested in the ancient sources- are not yet located or securely identified. Consequently, eventual population transfer from this area or cult relocation in terms of the synoecism cannot be identified for the moment. A classical sanctuary – Artemis Tisaia (?) – has been partially uncovered at Theotokou (Table 1, 16-18), while a strong presence of heroic and other poliadic cults is indicated by fourth-century coins issued by the Magnesian communities, which bear representations of them (Table 1, 11, 20-21, 32-33, 41).

To sum up, since the early settlements in the area of the future polis of Demetrias – except of that/those beneath its ruins – were abandoned at the beginning of the third century, we conclude that Demetrius’ synoecism might have involved – at least for the area of the inlet of the Gulf – physical
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Synoecism and religious interface in Demetrias

3.2. … cultic background and royal foundation

Although archaeological research in the polis of Demetrias is ongoing and the entire city has not yet been investigated, there is important evidence implying a certain degree of re-appraisal of local traditional religious patterns, which have actually found a place, after 293, in the urban tissue and the newly established religious landscape of the royal foundation.

The figure of Hermes Chthonios, the most prominent divinity of the “proper Thessalian background”, which was associated with post-mortem popular beliefs, is still present; surprisingly, he is depicted in almost all funerary stelai of Demetrias beside or below the painted scene with the deceased (Table 2, 44). In a new funerary context characterized by the multicultural identity of the dead and where the typology of the stelai is not of Thessalian origin, Hermes Chthonios, slightly modified, finds his place as a painted herm, while his name is never written on the stelai.53

Furthermore, two more cults of the Thessalian sub-stratum were adapted in Demetrias. The Pheraian Goddess Ennodia, along with Artemis Ennodia and Ennodia Hecate (Table 2, 11-12, 37), are amalgamated with new feminine Hellenistic deities, like Pasikrata and the Mother of the Gods (Table 2, 29, 31, 50)54 Also, there are traces of Heracles’ cult (Table 2, 40).

In addition, a temple of Artemis Iolkia, the poliadic divinity of Iolkos, in the agora of the new polis adjacent to the palace attests that this early prominent cult was relocated in the new city (Table 2, 13). The popularity of the Iolkian Artemis, praised by the contemporary Apollonius of Rhodes55 and represented on third-century coins issued by Demetrios (Table 2, 14), made it an ideal vehicle for promoting the new polis identity and the naval plans of Demetrias.

55 Apollonius of Rhodes, Argonautica I, 570-572; III, 312.
by forging a bond with the remote Greek legendary past: the panhellenic nautical expedition of the Argonauts.

Finally, archaeological evidence suggests that the sanctuary of Zeus Akraios and Chiron on the summit of Mount Pelion (Table 2, 58, 60) and the oracular sanctuary of Apollo Koropaios at Korope (Table 2, 4-6) continued to exist throughout the Hellenistic period until late antiquity, as extra-urban sanctuaries of Demetrias. The city organised yearly processions to them during the festival days of the Gods; foreigners are also attested as visitors of the famous oracle of Apollo at Korope.  

3.3. New Cults and royal foundation

Although the aforementioned evidence clearly indicates the continuation of cults from the early religious sub-stratum of the region into the new city, we should not forget that Demetrias was a Macedonian city and basileion,57 founded to serve as royal residence from its creation until the decline of the Macedonian presence in the region and the advent of the Romans in 168. Thus, we would normally expect traces of the Macedonian presence on a cultic level.

An edict of Philip V attests the existence of the cult of Heracles Kynagidas, with parallels in Macedonia relating to local social institutions (Table 2, 43); kynegoi, according to Hatzopoulos, were the royal ephens in charge of the forests and the royal hunts.58 Thus, this cult conforms to the presence of the basileion and the basilike ebora, in Demetrias.59

Furthermore, an amalgamation of old and new motifs, in order to construct a new religious and political identity in the newly founded Demetrias, is perfectly attested by two third-century resolutions from Iolkos and Glaphyrai, mentioning the presence of a new common cult of the archgetai kai ktistai (Table 2, 8) into Demetrias and its ebora, as well as of an archgeteion – the official cult seat. Marzolff identified it with the so-called “heroon/mausoleum” of Demetrias, an important building with fine sculpted architectural decoration of Ionic style, located at a prominent position above the theatre within the walls of Demetrias (Table 2, 9). However, the lack of epigraphic corroboration and the fact that it was left unfinished allow for the moment only speculation regarding its character. The presence of the archgeteion in Demetrias, along with eventual celebrations commemorating the synoecism’s foundation, are perfectly justified by the politics of the synoecism (cf. the Synoikia in Athens), although this does not exclude the possibility of cult celebration on the minor synoecized

56 IG IX 2, 1109a.
57 Strabo, IX, 4, 15.
communities. Obviously, the heroic cults of these former poleis commemorating the progenitors of their proper genealogy were now replaced by this new common cult in honour of old heroes and new royal founders of Demetrias.

The ruler’s cult, being the best mode of post-classical religious expression among Greek communities, has surely left important traces on Demetrias’ ritual landscape. Thus, the cult scene described by the Glaphyrai degree delivers a prestigious ritual performed by more than one priests and a board of magistrates. However, the opisthographic degree of the demos of Iolkos, dated to the reign of Antigonus, claims restoration of the local heroes’ cults, and it was generally considered as proof of the local discontentment towards the Macedonian domination. As I have recently argued elsewhere, this hypothesis seems unlikely because it opposites the general structure and the language of the inscription, which attests Hellenistic negotiation patterns between poleis and Macedonian kings. Side A follows the euergetism model, praising the kings for their goodwill towards Iolkos’ ancestral cults, while side B negotiates with them – obviously during an internal lack of ‘resources’ – the financing of local rituals traditionally undertaken by the demos itself. Furthermore, as I have also proposed, in the time of the Iolkos inscription this royal cult included the two Macedonian kings, Antigonus and Demetrius together. This is indicated by the fact that both kings are praised together in the honorary decree of side A, while side B relates to the sacrifices for the ‘archegetai and ktistai’. Also the term ktistai is used in plural form indicating cult for more than one founder; finally, although Demetrius Poliorcetes founded the synoecism of Demetrias, the study of the urban development of the city indicated that the long peaceful reign of Antigonos Gonatas was instrumental for the dynamic development of the city and its public and private sectors. In this respect, it would be appropriate for Demetrias to bestow honours upon both kings. Moreover, almost fifty years later, a statue base for Antigonus Doson and Philip V attests the dynamic development of the royal cult in Demetrias (Table 2, 1).

Furthermore, the royal polity over the annual religious year of Demetrias included reform of the calendar month names. A new calendar with twelve months named after the twelve Gods, known also from other Macedonian
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royal foundations, was introduced in Demetrias. Hatzopoulos assigned it to the Platonist influence exercised in the Macedonian court. Since month names relate to festivals in honor of divinities acting in the local legendary past, calendars were always a vehicle of historical remembrance and collective identity; thus, by introducing theophoric month names, the normal course of local collective memory was strongly deviated.

Also, more innovations in cultic life are also attested. A sanctuary excavated by Arvanitopoulos in the eastern sector of the city was identified with the Thesmophorion, mainly due to a third-century inscription attesting repair-work “on the sanctuary of Demeter, Kore and Plouton, where the Thesmophorion stood in the past” (Table 2, 32). Also, votive deposits outside the southern gates of the polis’ fortification attest to the presence of the cult of Pasikrata, related to Artemis Hecate, Ennodia and Aphrodite (Table 2, 50-51). All these feminine deities share an abundant votive record that is currently, in its major part, unpublished. Future studies will demonstrate if eventually some of these votive objects were dedicated to those divinities in order to commemorate the end of the period of girls’ service in the sanctuaries of feminine deities’, as it happens with their counterparts in Macedonia and even elsewhere in Thessaly, already from the Classical period.

3.4. Foreign cults

Close to the Thesmophorion stands another building tentatively identified with the Metoon of the city, the official cult seat of the Phrygian goddess Cybele (Table 2, 29-30), while Arvanitopoulos reports the presence of a ‘small temple of Cybele’ at Pagasai (Table 2, 31). Also, the cosmopolitan landscape of Demetrias hosted many Egyptian divinities; their official cult seat, the Serapeion, is currently unlocated (Table 2, 49, 54-56). Their cults survived down to the Roman period. The presence of an Egyptian priest of Isis and a Phoenician one (Table 2, 36, 47) indicate that – in a multicultural political environment – priesthood in foreign cults was equally undertaken by foreigners. In addition, in Roman times, there is evidence for the cult of the Syrian goddess Atargatis (Table 2, 25), while A. Arvanitopoulos reported also an inatri-muros sanctuary of Harpokrates (Table 2, 38).
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4. The Magnesian Koinon: cults and politics

After the Flamininian intervention in the Greek affairs, Macedonians left Demetrias which received a Roman garrison until 191, when the city became the capital of the first Magnesian Koinon. Macedonians returned briefly in 191, before releasing permanent control to the second Koinon and to the Romans, after the battle of Pydna.69 Thus, after the Macedonians, the political landscape is reformed once again, since independent communities, called poleis, as well as various demotic names,70 are now epigraphically attested. Naturally, another restructuring of the religious life followed the new socio-political landscape.

Besides the cults of foreign divinities that survived down to the Roman period (Table 2, 56), old Poliaic cults (Aphrodite Neleia, Artemis Pagasitais, etc.) revive in a nostalgic atmosphere for the traditional cults of the region (Table 2, 2-3, 7, 17). In that context, the old Artemis Iolkia, Zeus Akraios and Apollon Koropaioi now become the tutelary deities of the Koinon (Table 2, 6, 15-16, 59-60), while Zeus Akraios, Chiron and the Argoship are depicted on its coins (Table 2, 27, 61). Priestly authorities of the tutelary cults are seated in Demetrias, while yearly processions to the extra-urban sanctuaries of Akraios and Koropaioi at the extremities of the ibora of Demetrias, point to the necessity for symbolic demarcation of the limitrophe areas, just before the final decline and dwindling of the polis.

Furthermore, during the 1st cent., the cult of the ruling powers in Demetrias finds other destinators: the powerful and divine Roman emperors, who – besides the old poliaic deities – receive the interest and the honours of the Magnesian Koinon (Table 2, 64-72). “Gaius Julius Cesar Emperor God” and “God, son of God, Titus Cesar, New Apollo, Benefactor” are some of the Emperors who joined the divine sphere and received honors in Demetrias. A votive inscription to the “Olympian Gods and Major Savior Emperor Lucius Septimus Severus Pertinakis” testifies the inclusion of the imperial cult in the sphere of the cult of the Olympian Gods. Honorific statues and votive inscriptions were also erected in honor of other emperors, who probably enjoyed themselves the same divine status, at least until the coming of the Christian God.

Conclusion

This preliminary study of the religious interface of Hellenistic Demetrias strongly indicates re-organization of the local cult activities after the establishment of the local synoecism. The inevitable presence of Macedonian cults –

69 INTZESILOGLOU (1996).
70 IG IX.2 1101; 1102; 1103; IG IX.2 1108; 1133; SEG 12, 306 (poleis). SEG 3, 405; IG IX.2 1109, l. 2-8; SEG XXXIV 553 (demotika: Iolkios, Glaphyrus, Spalathres, Andeus, Pagasitai, Kompaioi, Demetriaus).
including cult of the ruling powers – seals the political identity of this *basileion*,
which in addition used a new calendar of month-names, proper to other royal
foundations. However, an overview of the available archaeological evidence
demonstrates that at least some of the cults of the old local “Thessalian
background” were incorporated into the new *polis*. In detail, the presence of the
prominent Iolkian Artemis in the *agora* of Demetrias suggests a certain re-
appraisal of old motifs by the *polis* royal administration. Also, the presence of
Hermes Chthonios on the funerary *stelai* attests that this re-appraisal operated
also on a wide popular basis; and, surely, on a multicultural one,71 since Hermes is
depicted on funerary *stelai* belonging also to foreigners.72 This fact, along with the
presence of the organised cult of foreign deities, point out that, besides a
synoecism of old Thessalian communities and a Macedonian seat, Demetrias was
during the Hellenistic period a cosmopolitan city and an international harbor. In
Roman times, the emotional bewilderment of Greek reality in front of new
political powers reflects on the religious attitude of the Magnesian *Koinon*,
wavering between traditional deities and divinized Emperors.

Sofia KRAVARITOU

Archaeological Institute for Thessalian Studies
Gamveta, 74-76
GR – 382 21 VOLOS
E-mail: skravaritou@gmail.com

71 On multiculturalism and the sacred space in Demetrias, see KRAVARITOU (in preparation).
72 Personal communication with Maria Stamatopoulou; cf. STAMATOPOULOU (in preparation).
Catalogue of Cults

Table 1. Archaic-Classical period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cult</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Apollo Pagasaios(^\text{75})</td>
<td>Altar</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Pagasai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Apollo Pagasaios?(^\text{74})</td>
<td>Suburban sanctuary. Votive objects</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Soros (ancient Amphanai? Pagasai?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. id(^\text{75})</td>
<td>id</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Apollo Pagasaios?(^\text{76})</td>
<td>Coins</td>
<td>4(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Apollo?(^\text{77})</td>
<td>Votive column</td>
<td>5(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Apollo?(^\text{78})</td>
<td>Votive base</td>
<td>4(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Apollo Koropaios?(^\text{79})</td>
<td>Architectural material</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Korope (ancient Korope?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. id(^\text{80})</td>
<td>“Sacred law”</td>
<td>6(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Apollo Koropaios?(^\text{81})</td>
<td>Architectural material and finds</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. id(^\text{82})</td>
<td>“Sacred law”</td>
<td>5(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Artemis(^\text{83})</td>
<td>Head on coins</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Rhizous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Artemis Iolkia(^\text{84})</td>
<td>Sanctuary</td>
<td>Geometric</td>
<td>Pala/Kastro of Volos (ancient Iolkos?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. id</td>
<td>id</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. id</td>
<td>id</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Artemis Iolkia(^\text{85})</td>
<td>Head of Artemis on coins</td>
<td>4(^{th}) cent.</td>
<td>Iolkos (legend ΩΛΑΚΘΩΝ)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{73}\) Hesiod, *Apis*, 70.
\(^{75}\) MAZARAKIS (2009), p. 273-278; *ibid.*
\(^{76}\) LIAMPI (2005), p. 30-35, plate 3 (3).
\(^{79}\) PAPACHATZIS (1960), fig. 6.
\(^{80}\) IG IX 2, 1202.
\(^{81}\) PAPACHATZIS (1960), p. 4-14.
\(^{82}\) IG IX 2, 1203.
\(^{84}\) ARVANITOPoulos (1909a), p. 157-158.
\(^{85}\) LIAMPI (2005), p. 23-30, pl. 3 (1-2).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Site/Divinity</th>
<th>Notable Features</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Location/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Artemis Tisaia</td>
<td>Poros architectural material and finds</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Near Palaiokastro at Theotokou (ancient Sepias?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Artemis Tisaia</td>
<td>Temple</td>
<td>Roman reference</td>
<td>Coastal Pelion, opposite Skiathos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Aselepios</td>
<td>Stone relief</td>
<td>Classical?</td>
<td>Palaiokastro at Theotokou (Ancient Sepias?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Dionysos</td>
<td>Coins</td>
<td>400-344</td>
<td>Meliboa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Erymenai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Dionysos Pelekys</td>
<td>Festival</td>
<td>4th cent.</td>
<td>Pagassai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Ennodia / prothyraia</td>
<td>Altar? Exedra? Cavities for stele’s bases</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>Bourboulithra, on the road to Pherai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Ennodia Patroa</td>
<td>Stone stele with votive inscription</td>
<td>4th cent.</td>
<td>Beneath Demetrias (Ancient Pagasai?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Hera</td>
<td>Boundary stele</td>
<td>Archaic</td>
<td>Aibaliotika (ancient Pagasai?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Heracles</td>
<td>Architectural material (altar) and votive deposits</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Spartias (on the ancient road to Pherai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Classical</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Hermes</td>
<td>Votive base</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Soros’ region (Ancient Amphanaid?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Hermes Chthonios</td>
<td>Funerary stele</td>
<td>Late Classical /</td>
<td>Beneath Demetrias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

87 Valerius Flaccus, Argonautica II, 7.
91 Theopompus in Scholia in Hom. Il. XXIV, 428.
92 ARVANITOPoulos (1915), p. 182-183
93 IG IX 2, 338.
94 ARVANITOPoulos (1915), p. 159.
95 ARVANITOPoulos (1911a), p. 300-301; INTZESILOGLOU (1999), p. 405; also in Ethnos, 7.9. 2007.
97 ARVANITOPoulos (1909a), p. 164.
| 31. | Nymphs\(^99\) | Votive stelai, pottery, terracotta figurines, bronze jewellery | Late Classical / Early Hellenistic | Mount Ossa |
| 32. | Nymphs or Maenads\(^100\) | Coins | 400-344 | Euryai and Meliboia |
| 33. | Philoctetes\(^101\) | Head of Ph. depicted on coins | 350 or earlier | Homilion |
| 34. | Poseidon\(^2\) | Votive | 5th cent. | Soros (ancient Amphanai? Pagasaï?) |
| 35. | id\(^103\) | Votive stele | 5th cent. | Aligarorema (ancient Pagasaï?) |
| 36. | id\(^104\) | id. | id. | Walled in the Monastery of Saint Demetrius (Stomion. Mount Ossa) |
| 37. | Themis\(^105\) | Sacred property | Classical | Kokkino Nero (ancient Eurymenai?) |
| 38. | Themis Agoria\(^106\) | Votive stele | id. | Chorto (ancient Spalauthra?) |
| 40. | Zeus\(^108\) | Temple and pottery | Classical | Lapschori on Mount Ossa (ancient Homilion? Eurymenai?) |
| 41. | id\(^109\) | Coins | 4th cent. | Rhizous |
| 42. | Zeus Akraiós\(^110\) | Sanctuary, inscriptions, pottery, finds | Classical | Summit of Mount Pelion |

\(^100\) Rogers (1932), 210, 211a, 391-393. Helly 2004, pl. 1-2.  
\(^102\) Cf. l.c. (n. 73).  
\(^103\) Giannopoulos (1933), p. 4, 12.  
\(^104\) Intzesiloglou (2000), tabl. 80-81.  
\(^105\) SEG 37, 491  
\(^106\) Arvanitopoulos (1909b), p. 300-301.  
\(^107\) Giannopoulos (1932), p. 19, 2-4  
\(^109\) Rogers (1932), nos. 357-358; Helly (2004), pl. 3, 18.  
\(^110\) Arvanitopoulos (1911a), p. 305-315.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Cult</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Zeus Akraios and Chiron</td>
<td>Sanctuary, precinct/cave</td>
<td>4th cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Zeus Milichios</td>
<td>Cave, votive inscription</td>
<td>4th/3rd cent.</td>
<td>Goritsa (Ancient Methone?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Sacred law&quot;</td>
<td>5th cent.</td>
<td>Palaiotrikery (Ancient Kikynerbos)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Hellenistic-Roman period

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cult</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Site</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Antigonus Doson and Philip V</td>
<td>Votive base</td>
<td>227-221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Aphrodite Neleia</td>
<td>Votive stele (priestess)</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Aphrodite Neleia</td>
<td>Coins of the Magnesian Koinon</td>
<td>Imperial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Apollo Koropaios</td>
<td>Finds nearby archaic architectural elements</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Apollo Koropaios</td>
<td>Decree on the function of the oracle</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>id</td>
<td>Public decrees</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Apollo Koropeites</td>
<td>Votive stele</td>
<td>Roman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Archegetai and ktistai</td>
<td>Public resolutions</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>id</td>
<td>Heroon/Mausoleum?</td>
<td>4th/3rd cent.?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>Marble statuettes</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

111 Herakleides, in Pseudo-Dichaearchus 2,8 (GGM I, 107, ed. Müller).  
112 SEG 41, 533.  
113 IG IX 2, 1222.  
114 SEG 22, 308.  
115 IG IX 2, 1125.  
117 PAPACHATZIS (1960), p. 3-24  
118 IG IX 2, 1109a  
119 IG IX 2, 1110; 1202.  
120 IG IX 2, 1204  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>11. Artemis Ennodia 124</th>
<th>id.</th>
<th>id.</th>
<th>Demetrias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Artemis Ennodia 125</td>
<td>Stone altar with votive inscription</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>id. 127</td>
<td>Head on coins</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
<td>Demetrias (legend ΔΗΜΗΤΡΙΔΩΝ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>id. 128</td>
<td>Public decrees</td>
<td>2nd cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>id. 129</td>
<td>(Priestess)</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Artemis Pagassita 130</td>
<td>Votive stele</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Artemis Soteira 131</td>
<td>Sanctuary in the agora of Spalatha</td>
<td>130-126</td>
<td>Chorto (Ancient Spalatha?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Asclepios 132</td>
<td>Public decree</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Demetrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>id. 133</td>
<td>Votive stele (priest)</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>id. 134</td>
<td>Head on coins</td>
<td>197/146</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>id. 135</td>
<td>Small votive altar</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>id. 136</td>
<td>Coins of the Magnesian Koinon</td>
<td>46-27</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Asclepios and Hygeia 137</td>
<td>Votive stele</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Atargates 138</td>
<td>Votive relief (priestess)</td>
<td>3rd/4th cent. AD</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Athena 139</td>
<td>Priestess</td>
<td>Late Hellenistic</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

126 SEG 48, 658.  
129 IG IX 2, 1109.  
130 IG IX 2, 1122.  
131 IG IX 2, 1123.  
132 IG IX 2, 1111.  
133 IG IX 2, 1126.  
134 Theocharis, Chourmouziadis (1968), p. 269.  
135 Mitropoulou (1994), 488, fig. 2.  
136 Rogers (1932), no. 355a-b, fig. 180.  
137 Rogers (1932), fig. 177-178.  
138 SEG 26, 646.  
139 SEG 37, 461.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Early Roman</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Chiron(^{140})</td>
<td>Coin of the Magnesian Koinon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Chiron and Zeus Akraios(^{141})</td>
<td>Cave of Chiron and sanctuary of Zeus Akraios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Cybele?(^{142})</td>
<td>Metroon?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Cybele, Aphrodite Epitragia, Ennodia, Hecate and Zeus Milichius(^{143})</td>
<td>Clay figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Cybele?(^{144})</td>
<td>'Small temple' and clay figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Demeter, Kore, Plouton(^{145})</td>
<td>Public decree (Thesmophorion and temenos of Demeter)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Dionysos(^{146})</td>
<td>Votive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>id.(^{147})</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>id.(^{148})</td>
<td>Priest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Egyptian divinities</td>
<td>Funerary stele of priest Asklaapiadas of Sidon(^{149})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>Ennodia? Hecate?(^{20})</td>
<td>Hekataion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{140}\) Moustaka (1983), no. 20, fig. 6.

\(^{141}\) Cf. o.c. (n. 107).

\(^{142}\) Batziou (2002), p. 30-32, fig. 33-36.


\(^{144}\) Arvanitopoulos (1916), p. 31. This material, still unpublished, has been recently identified at the National Museum of Athens and is under publication by Maria Stamatopoulou, whom I thank for this personal communication.

\(^{145}\) Arvanitopoulos (1929), p. 32, no. 420.

\(^{146}\) IG IX 2, 411.

\(^{147}\) IG IX 2, 1198.

\(^{148}\) McDevitt (1970), 679.

\(^{149}\) SEG 25, 681.

\(^{150}\) Chrysostomou (1998), fig. 21a-b.
### Synoecism and religious interface in Demetrias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>Hera</td>
<td>Small votive altar</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Heracles</td>
<td>Votive stele</td>
<td>3rd-2nd cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hellenistic?</td>
<td>Chorto (Ancient Spalatha?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1st/1st cent. AD</td>
<td>Palaiokastro of Argalaste (Ancient Olizon?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Heracles Kynagidas</td>
<td>Edict of Philip V</td>
<td>221-179</td>
<td>Demetrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Hermes Chthonios</td>
<td>Painted herms on funerary stelai</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>Demetrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Household cults</td>
<td>Incense burners, clay figurines of gods</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Bronze incense burners, bronze figurines of Gods (Poseidon, Athena, etc)</td>
<td>Roman</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>Isis</td>
<td>Priest</td>
<td>3rd cent.</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Graffito</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>Isis, Serapis, Anubis</td>
<td>Votive inscription</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Pagasai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>Pasikrata</td>
<td>Votive altars, marble head, clay figurines, lamps, etc.</td>
<td>3rd / 2nd cent.</td>
<td>Demetrias. Outside the southern fortification gate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Priestess</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Demetrias</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

152 Unpublished (Museum of Volos).
153 IG IX 2, 359a.
154 IG IX 2, 1210.
155 IG IX 2, 1217.
157 BATZIOU (2002), p. 43, fig. 54-55.
158 Ibid, p. 36.
159 SKAFIDA, TRAIAVANTOFYLOPOULOU (forthcoming).
161 SEG 43, 525.
162 IG IX 2, 360.
163 SEG 3, 481-2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Pasikrata</td>
<td>Roman id.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Private heroizatio id.</td>
<td>Totenmahl reliefs, etc</td>
<td>Hellenistic id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Serapis id.</td>
<td>Serapieion</td>
<td>2nd cent. id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>id id.</td>
<td>Priests id.</td>
<td>Makrynitsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Sarapis and Isis id.</td>
<td>Votive inscription</td>
<td>Roman Demetrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Zeus id.</td>
<td>Votive relief with winged thunderbol</td>
<td>Late Hellenistic? Chorto (ancient Spalauthra?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Zeus Akraios id.</td>
<td>Architectural elements and miscellaneous finds.</td>
<td>Hellenistic Summit of Mount Pelion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>id id.</td>
<td>Cult regulation</td>
<td>2nd / 1st cent. Korope. (Ancient Korope?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Public decrees (priest)</td>
<td>2nd cent. Demetrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Zeus Akraios id.</td>
<td>Head on coins</td>
<td>Imperial id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Zeus Milichios id.</td>
<td>Votive</td>
<td>2nd cent. id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Zeus Sabazios id.</td>
<td>Votive relief</td>
<td>Roman Trikeri</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Roman Imperial cult

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Time Period</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Julius Cesar id.</td>
<td>Honorific statue</td>
<td>48 Demetrias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tiberius id.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>1-50 AD id.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Titus Cesar id.</td>
<td>id. (honored by the Magnetes)</td>
<td>71-81 AD id.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Synoecism and religious interface in Demetrias

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>Olympian Gods and Lucius Septimus Severus</td>
<td>Votive altar</td>
<td>Late 2nd cent. AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68.</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>Honorific statue</td>
<td>193-211 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>Marcus Aurelius Severus Antoninus</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>212-217 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>“Major and Pius Master Cesar Marcus Aurelius Carus”</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>282 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>“Emperor ... Pius ... Sermatikos”</td>
<td>id.</td>
<td>308-324 AD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.</td>
<td>Sebastoi</td>
<td>Stele (Priests)</td>
<td>Late Imperial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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