

## Some thoughts on the cult of the Pantheon ('all the gods') in the cities and sanctuaries of Roman Greece

Milena Melfi

A large number of small stone altars, not more than one metre tall and 30 to 40 cm wide, were dedicated in the Sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD. Beyond the size, they had in common the inscription of very short dedicatory formulas and a sparing use of decoration. They were dedicated to Asklepios and his family as much as to the most disparate gods, heroes and personifications. They were distributed in various parts of the sanctuary and there are good reasons to believe that more than 100 specimens could be counted in the sacred area by the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD, when the altars were inventoried and marked with numbers and symbols. The numbers are in a sequence that ends with the high nineties while the symbols seem to identify the divinity to whom the altar was dedicated<sup>1</sup>.

Some of the altars can be safely dated between AD 128 and 355 because they were all dedicated by sacred officials at different stages of their religious careers (mostly *pyrophoroi* and *hiereis*) and adopted very accurate dating formulas, all starting from the year of Hadrian's visit to the sanctuary, in AD 124<sup>2</sup>. References to the life and deeds of the Emperor were so precise that one of the most important pieces of chronology of Hadrian's reign is preserved on one of these altars, dedicated to Epione and Asklepios by the priest Euthyches, dated three years after the dedication of the Temple of Zeus Olympios at Athens and the foundation of the Panhellenion, and ten years after the Emperor's visit to Epidauros<sup>3</sup>. The fact that Hadrianic dating formulas are used until as late as nearly 200 years after their first introduction confirms that the Emperor (and/or his visit) must have played a special role in the inception of the practice.

The great majority of the altars cannot be precisely dated, but certainly belong to the same period. Among them are two unusual dedications to the *Pantheon* both by priests of Asklepios: Hierokles son of Aphrodeisios dedicated after a dream, while a *hiereus* Daos

---

<sup>1</sup> According to Fraenkel the numbering happened between AD 306 and 355, because the last dated inventoried altar is dated to 306, while an altar from 355 does not have any mark (*IG IV.1*, p. 186). The same date is accepted in von Gaetringen's edition of the inscriptions from Epidauros (*IG IV<sup>2</sup>*, index viii and pp. 173-176). Later literature, in general, believes that the numbering was connected to the reign of Julian the Apostate, when the sanctuary is believed to have experienced a revival of sort (Katakis 2002, p. 327). This cannot be proved, and since I believe that the inventory implies that the altars were still in use throughout the sanctuary, a date towards the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century, when the last altar is dated (AD 306) and the sacred space was still preserved in its most defining features, is the most likely.

Although a precise date for the numbering cannot be determined, the last dated inventoried altar is dated to 306, while an altar from 355 does not have any mark.

<sup>2</sup> *IG IV<sup>2</sup>*, 381-392; 394-399; 403-416; 417-427; 430; 432-435; 438.

<sup>3</sup> *IG IV<sup>2</sup>*, 384.

records the setting up of an altar<sup>4</sup>. The recipient of the dedications should be understood as the collective body of all gods, rather than a single syncretic entity under the name of Pantheios. This is suggested by the fact that both altars are marked with the same symbol as a third one bearing the much clearer and more common dedication to *Pasi kai Pasais*. The dedication is dated to AD 166 and the symbol is in itself very clear: a circle connecting 12 points<sup>5</sup>.

The only other dedication to the Pantheon known to me from the Greek world comes from the sanctuary of Demeter at Pergamon, it is once again placed on an altar of similar shape and size, and is dedicated by another cult official, a Marcus Aurelius Menogenes, *hierophantes* and *prytanis*<sup>6</sup>. Its date should be placed between the second half of the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the beginning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD. Here, again, the recipient of the dedication is clearly intended as the collective body of all gods, since, as noted by Fraenkel, the name is preceded by the definite article<sup>7</sup>.

#### The nature of the cult

Both the Pantheon, as an abstraction, or Pantheios, as a single divine personification of all gods refer to a fundamental concept in Greek religion, that of the body of the twelve gods of Olympus or *Dodekatheion*. Yet all studies of the concept to date have failed to describe which deities should be included in the twelve and whether these were ever considered to be a coherent unit. Unsurprisingly, Charlotte Long's most recent research provided a list of 54 divinities which at one time or another were identified as members of the 'twelve'<sup>8</sup>. This further emphasises the difficulty of identifying Dodekatheion and Pantheon as being one the content of the other, and of speaking of a single Pantheon/Dodekatheion applicable to diverse and often distant communities. The pantheon of the Greek cities, or of larger ethnic communities, was in fact the reflection of their history, politics and territorial arrangement. Cults were physically woven into the fabric of the settlements they belonged to, and religion 'embedded' in the life of the community, following the much debated, but still fundamentally valid models proposed by De Polignac and Sourvinou-Inwood<sup>9</sup>. Ultimately every community had its own Pantheon that might have consisted of 12 or more gods, chosen among a vast

<sup>4</sup> IG IV<sup>2</sup>, 549 (89x30x27); IG IV<sup>2</sup>, 550 (90x44x38): the priest (*hiereus*).

<sup>5</sup> IG IV<sup>2</sup>, 390 (AD 166)

<sup>6</sup> MDAI 35, p. 454, no. 38.

<sup>7</sup> IG IV.1, 1038

<sup>8</sup> Long 1987.

<sup>9</sup> De Polignac 1995; Sourvinou-Inwood 1990; Sourvinou-Inwood 2000;

array of divinities, and could be manipulated according to political or social needs. For most of the history of ancient Greek communities the Pantheon was therefore an abstraction, an empty container that could be filled with a much more substantiated, and very flexible, number of gods according to the specific context. This might be the reason why, in front of numerous dedications to ‘all gods’ or to ‘the twelve gods’ throughout the most disparate periods of ancient history, very few dedications to the Pantheon/Pantheion as such survive, and the first appearance of the name in Greece, at Epidauros, is so an extraordinary<sup>10</sup>.

The only time in history when that of the Pantheon develops into a not very common, but well established form of worship is the Hadrianic period, when the most famous monument dedicated to its cult was rebuilt in Rome by the Emperor (AD 118-125). This was originally erected by Agrippa in the 20s BC, possibly, as a dynastic monument to celebrate the gens Iulia and its patron gods on the very site of Romulus’ apotheosis<sup>11</sup>. Only under Hadrian’s impulse, nevertheless, it became a radically innovative cultic building that reflected the Emperor’s choices in monumental architecture and religious speculation. Its large, unprecedented, semicircular dome symbolized the vault of heaven and provided at once the vision of a space harmoniously inhabited by all gods together. Since it is known that under the same dome Hadrian sat to hold court, the cult building must have served at the same time as a way of creating a direct link between the Emperor and all gods of heaven.

The rebuilding of the Pantheon in Rome and the promotion of its cult seem to have triggered a certain diffusion of the cult in the West of the Empire. From Rome itself comes a small number of Latin inscriptions from altars, bearing the dedication *Pantheo Sacro*, and in one instance *Pantheo Augusto Sacro*<sup>12</sup>. They attest the existence of the cult in the years of Emperor Marcus Aurelius, if not a little later. But the most coherent and consistent group of inscriptions comes from Spain. In Hispalis, Munigua and Complutum, altars bear dedications to a *Pantheo Augusto*<sup>13</sup>, while a longer inscription from Astigi records the offering of a bronze statue of Pantheus, possibly as a single syncretic god<sup>14</sup>. These dedications were all dated between the 2<sup>nd</sup> and the 3<sup>rd</sup> century AD, offered in public civic spaces by freedmen, holding various public offices, and have all been interpreted as connected to the figure of the

---

<sup>10</sup> On dedications to ‘all gods’: Ziegler 1949.

11

Coarelli 2004; Marcattili 2005.

<sup>12</sup> *CIL* VI, 557-559.

<sup>13</sup> Hispalis: *CIL* II, 1156; Munigua: *Archivo Español de Arqueología* 1972-1974, 347; Complutum: *CIL* II, 3030.

<sup>14</sup> *CIL* II, 1473.

Emperor. This is suggested by the use of the epithet Augustus, and by the fact that at least three of the four dedicants are *Seviri Augustales*, in attendance to the cult of the Emperors<sup>15</sup>.

In the East, the reconstruction of the Roman Pantheon was paralleled by the erection of an equally authoritative sanctuary at Athens dedicated to ‘all gods in common’<sup>16</sup>. Of the building, probably completed at the time of Hadrian’s third visit to the city in 131-132, we know nearly nothing, except from the fact that all Emperor’s benefactions towards Greeks and foreigners alike were inscribed therein<sup>17</sup>. It has been tentatively recognized in a large complex, excavated some 50 metres east of Hadrian’s library and the Roman agora, but many doubts remain on both its identification and date<sup>18</sup>. The fact, nevertheless, that Pausanias mentions the sanctuary when listing the works completed under the Emperor in the area of the river Ilissos has led other scholars to suggest a location of the sanctuary for ‘all gods in common’ in the vicinity of the Olympieion<sup>19</sup>. In the same area, the pseudo-Aristotelian *De Mirabilibus Auscultationibus* (51) reports the existence of a Pantheon, using for the first and only time in ancient literature such name to indicate a sanctuary in Athens. This passage has been mostly ignored in literature and is generally considered an unreliable source, but the most current hypothesis suggests that it is the result of a post-Hadrianic interpolation of the original Hellenistic text<sup>20</sup>. Here, the original sentence mentioning an otherwise unknown Pantheon in Olympia triggers the later juxtaposition of an explanation concerning a much more famous contemporary Pantheon in Athens. It might therefore preserve for us an alternative definition for the *hieron* of ‘all gods in common’, coherent with contemporary developments in the western part of the Empire, as much as a precise hint for the location of the building in the Ilissos valley.

Pausanias’ report might suggest that establishment in Athens of the sanctuary to ‘all gods in common’, possibly known also as Pantheon, triggered the development of a new cult in

<sup>15</sup> Rodríguez Cortés 1991, 85-87, nos. 1-3.

<sup>16</sup> Paus. 1.18.9: “Hadrian constructed other buildings also for the Athenians: a temple of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios, a sanctuary common to all the gods, and, most famous of all, a hundred pillars of Phrygian marble” (transl. W.H.S. Jones).

<sup>17</sup> Paus. 1.5.5: “As for the sanctuaries of the gods that in some cases he built from the beginning, in others adorned with offerings and furniture, and the bounties he gave to Greek cities, and sometimes even to foreigners who asked him, all these acts are inscribed in his honor in the sanctuary at Athens common to all the gods” (transl. W.H.S. Jones).

<sup>18</sup> In favour of an identification of the building with the structure near the Roman Agora: Travlos 1971, 439-443; Kokkou 1970, 159-161; Shear 1981, 375-377; Willers 1990, 21-26 and 60-62; Taliaferro Boatwright 2000, 169-170. Against, with different proposals: Spawforth-Walker 1985, 97-98; Lippolis 1995, 47-51.

<sup>19</sup> Or even an identification of both the sanctuary of ‘all gods in common’ and the unknown seat of the *Panhellenion*, the council of Greek cities established by Hadrian, with the Olympieion (Godfrey, Hemsoll 1986, 207, n. 33).

<sup>20</sup> Vanotti 1981, 84-88; Ead. 2007, 31 and 155.

Greece as it had happened in the West. The writer uses, in fact, a special wording for defining the *hieron* founded by Hadrian: ‘all gods in common’ (θεοῖς πᾶσιν ἱερὸν κοινόν) not just the widespread and well known ‘all gods’ (θεοῖς πᾶσι). Interestingly, this expression is never attested before in literary and documentary sources and recurs only four times in the *Description of Greece* suggesting that in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD it was endowed with a very specific meaning. In Olympia and Lykosoura, altars were dedicated to ‘all gods in common’; at Orneai (near Argos), in the sanctuary of Artemis, and at Marios (Laconia) temples ‘dedicated to all gods in common’ or ‘common to all gods’ were located<sup>21</sup>. In Olympia, in particular, Pausanias clearly distinguished the altar for ‘all gods in common’ from otherwise mentioned altars ‘to all gods’ for ritual reasons that will be described below. The question of whether the cult of the Pantheon corresponds to that of ‘all gods in common’ is intriguing and cannot be easily answered, but the appearance of both, in Greece, seems to be contemporary. Should we decide to give credit to the testimony of the pseudo-Aristotle, the fact that the Athenian cult building reported by Pausanias as dedicated to ‘all gods in common’ was also known as Pantheon will confirm the identification of the two cults.

### The ritual

The Epidaurian altars dedicated to the Pantheon bear symbols and numbers; they were therefore included in the inventory of altars described at the beginning of this paper. This was clearly aimed at counting and classifying the altars in a later phase of the cult, at keeping a record of numbers and sequence of gods, at a time when this was likely to be forgotten, possibly at the beginning of the 4<sup>th</sup> century AD<sup>22</sup>. The numbering must have been done following a topographical sequence since altars that were found next to one another, although dedicated to different deities, bore either the same numbers or numbers in close succession. It is therefore very likely that the sequence of altars marked a route throughout the sanctuary, possibly following the performance of a precise ritual, where offerings were presented to the various deities in a fixed order. The inventory was clearly a way of preserving the memory of the original ritual. The sequence of the gods, as it is preserved, does not appear to me particularly telling: gods and goddess are mixed without an obvious order, although Asklepios, Apollo and the healing family seem to occupy prime positions (in order of appearance and by number of altars). The altar to the Pantheon dedicated by Hierokles was

<sup>21</sup> Olympia: 5.15.1; Lykosoura: 8.37.10; Orneiai: 2.25.6; Marios: 3.22.8.

<sup>22</sup> See footnote 1.

number twelve in the sequence, followed by that to *Pasi kai Pasai* at number thirteen, while the altar dedicated by Daos was number eighty-seven.

This situation finds an unexpected comparison in Pausanias' description of the altars at Olympia, among which was one altar for 'all gods in common'<sup>23</sup>. Beyond the main altar of Zeus, Pausanias lists, in fact, around 70 altars, dedicated to the most disparate divinities, often coinciding with those of Epidauros. He also specifies that 'his narrative will follow in dealing with them the order in which the Eleans are used to sacrifice on the altars'. As a result he gives us an extraordinary account of the ritual route that from the Altis, to the slopes of the hill of Chronos and out of the sanctuary, around the hippodrome and the gymnasium, marked the worship of a number of gods, heroes and personifications. Towards this description, it has been suggested that he was helped by a catalogue or inventory of altars, possibly not dissimilar to the one that later must have existed in Epidauros<sup>24</sup>. At the end of his description, Pausanias also specifies that the ceremony took place once a month, and that the religious officers called to perform the sacrifice on all altars in one single day were a *theokolos*, the *manteis*, the *spondophoroi*, an *exegetes* and a flutist (all independently attested in inscriptions of the imperial period from the sanctuary). We have therefore the precise account of a monthly ritual performed at the sanctuary of Olympia by the main cult officials that can help us to understand better the ritual practice at Epidauros. Here it similarly appears that libations and offerings were placed on all altars in a topographical sequence during one single ceremony and that the main sacred officials were responsible for the performance of the ritual, since all altars were dedicated by *pyrophoroi* and *hiereis*. Maybe a similar situation can also be also hypothesized in Lykosoura, where the altar to 'all gods in common' was also part of a series, according to the description of Pausanias.

Pausanias, in his account of the altars at Olympia, also highlights an important ritual detail concerning the altar of 'all gods in common'. He specifies that while the Eleans 'burn on the altars incense with wheat that has been kneaded with honey, placing also on the altars twigs of olive, and using wine for libation', only to the Nymphs, the Mistresses and 'all gods in common' they do not pour wine<sup>25</sup>. These are specific libations, known in Greek religion as *Nephalia*, normally offered to chthonian gods, the dead, deities of the earth, special categories of divine beings and rites of purification<sup>26</sup>. It is not clear, in this context, why 'all gods in

<sup>23</sup> Paus. 5.14.4-15.10.

<sup>24</sup> Weniger 1909, 291-293 and 1920, 1-15; Robert 1888, 429.

<sup>25</sup> Paus. 5.15.10

<sup>26</sup> Ziehen 1935.

common’ should be the recipients of such offers, but it is clear that their altar, together with a few others, is clearly distinguished from the rest (including the one to ‘all gods’--θεῶν πάντων) and singled out by the performance of special rites.

### A ‘new’ cult?

It is undeniable that a modest, and possibly selective, diffusion of the cult of the Pantheon/Pantheion can be followed in both the West and the East of the empire starting during Hadrian’s reign, and in particular after the reconstruction of the Pantheon in Rome and the foundation of the cult place for ‘all gods in common’ in Athens. The insertion of the cult in the ritual workings of the Asklepieion at Epidauros might have been directly connected to the Emperor, especially in consideration of the consistent interventions of Hadrian in the life of the sanctuary. After his visit to Epidauros in AD 124, the Emperor seems to have enforced a new dating system and new regulations concerning both the annual rota of religious officials and the recurrence of the games<sup>27</sup>. The fact that these changes started at the very time of Hadrian’s visit and that the adjectives *soter* and *oikistes* were attached to his name in inscriptions in his honour suggest that a sort of refoundation of the Asklepieion took place under the Emperor<sup>28</sup>. From the point of view of the cult, besides the dedications to the Pantheon discussed above, there are at least three other votive inscriptions that appear conceptually related to the religious world of the Hadrianic period: two for to Zeus Panhellenios and Zeus Olympios respectively, and one to Antinoos<sup>29</sup>.

Similarly connected to the same visit of the Emperor to the Peloponnese, in the Autumn of AD 124, might be the testimonies of a cult of ‘all gods in common’ in Orneai, Marios, Lykosoura and Olympia. After visiting Megara, and passing over the Isthmus to Epidauros, the imperial party probably moved from Troezen, along the opposite coast, to Argos. From Argos to the following stop of Mantinea, the road must have passed by Orneiai, as it is confirmed by Pausanias description of the area: ‘from the gate at the ridge of the city of Argos’ (2.25.1) to ‘Lyrkea at about sixty *stadia*, and from Lyrkea to Orneae at the same distance’ (2.25.5). The trip would have continued south, through Tegea, to Sparta, where the Emperor arrived by January 125, and spent a considerable period of time. To trace back to this period the origins of the sanctuary of ‘all gods in common’ at Marios remains pure

<sup>27</sup> Melfi 2010, 331-333.

<sup>28</sup> *IG* IV<sup>2</sup>, 606.

<sup>29</sup> Zeus Panhellenion: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 525; Zeus Olympios: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 524; Antinoos: *IG* IV<sup>2</sup> 492.



speculation. From Sparta onwards Hadrian's route is not very clear, but he is generally believed to have visited Olympia, possibly passing by Megalopolis, and Lykosoura<sup>30</sup>.

A similar pattern of diffusion of the cult, strongly connected to Hadrian's personality and his travels, has been suggested also for the dedications from Spain. These should also be placed in the years following the Emperor's trip to Spain of 123 AD and might represent a direct consequence of his presence in the area<sup>31</sup>. The evidence from Spain appears, nevertheless, more coherent and probably slightly earlier than that from Greece, and presents one fundamental difference: the idea of a direct and explicit association of the cult with the Emperor. All Spanish dedications, in fact, bear the epithet Augustus, and are offered in public civic spaces by officers of the imperial cult. This offers a precise connection with the way Hadrian crafted the religious concept of the Pantheon and expressed it in architectural forms in Rome. The Roman Pantheon was at the same time a place of worship of all gods in heavens and a place of cult of past emperors, where the living Emperor sat alone among the immortals<sup>32</sup>. The concept of the Pantheon in Spain and Rome could therefore not be easily disjointed from that of the divinity of the emperor.

This situation is very different from that attested in Greece. In the Asklepieion at Epidauros the altars dedicated to the Pantheon appear no different from the altars dedicated to the other gods, heroes, group of divinities and are likely to have shared the same ritual. Similarly, in Pergamon, where one single altar to the Pantheon was found, this was one of many others for the most disparate divinities, dedicated in the Sanctuary of Demeter by cult officials. The same can be inferred from Pausanias' description for the altars to 'all gods in common' in Olympia and Lykosoura. In all these sanctuaries of different titular deities the new cult of the Pantheon and 'all gods in common' is therefore made to entirely fit the regular workings of religious life: the altars are inserted in a pre-existing religious system and are dedicated by religious officers of the local cult. The Epidaurian altar dedicated by Hierokles even bears the formula *kat'onar*, after a dream, implying that the new divine entity, the Pantheon, shared a form of oneiric divination with the titular god of the sanctuary, Asklepios. Only the peculiar nature of the wineless offer attested in the sanctuary at Olympia might betray the foreign/external origin of the cult.

---

<sup>30</sup> Birley 1997, 177-182.

<sup>31</sup> Rodríguez Cortés 1991, 85-87. Although it is commonly denied that Hadrian visited the provinces of Lusitania and Baetica (Birley 1997, 149).

<sup>32</sup> On the Pantheon as seat of imperial cult, see in particular Coarelli 1983 and Id. 2014.



All in all, the cult of the Pantheon in the East seems never to have directly included the worship of the emperor as a god, and even though it came from the outside it swiftly blended with pre-existing cults and rituals. The case of Pergamon, where Le Glay has attempted to reconstruct a cult of Hadrian as Zeus Pantheios on the basis of the dedication above, has to be discredited—mainly on the basis of the find-spot of the dedication, in the sanctuary of Demeter<sup>33</sup>. Similarly, in Athens, instances of the divinization of the living Emperor are lacking in connection with the building for ‘all gods in common’, although they appear much clearer elsewhere—for example in the proliferation of altars dedicated to Hadrian<sup>34</sup>. It is possible that in the Greek world the traditional association of sanctuaries for all gods and the twelve gods with the cult of the ruler, known from the Hellenistic period onwards, had made unnecessary an explicit reference to the Emperor<sup>35</sup>. The night-time procession at Aigai, where the statues of the twelve gods were displayed together with a thirteenth image of king Philip of Macedon<sup>36</sup> and the Dodekatheion at Delos, where images of the twelve gods and a colossal portrait statue of a Hellenistic ruler (maybe Antigonos Monophthalmos) were worshipped<sup>37</sup>, would have represented well-known predecessors. Alternatively it is also possible that the qualification of the Pantheon was purposefully left unclear in the East. If the Pantheon and ‘all the gods’ of the Greek cities were traditionally identifiable as the reflection of their history, their politics and territorial arrangement, and therefore contained all the deities that were precisely relevant for each community, the ‘new’ Pantheon of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century AD might have been much more flexible: it blurred the original individual meanings of the gods in assembly into a generality and abstraction; it could be ‘all things to all men’ at a time of rapid religious diversification. In view of this, it could be more easily adapted to different contexts and constituted a strong reminder of the figure—not necessarily the divinity—of Emperor Hadrian, who was the first to fully develop the concept of a Pantheon in both architecture and religion in the Capital city of the Empire.

---

<sup>33</sup> Le Glay 1976, 368.

<sup>34</sup> Camia 2011, 36-39.

<sup>35</sup> Ziegler 1949, 697-747; Thomas 2004, 15-16.

<sup>36</sup> D.S. 16.92.5.

<sup>37</sup> Will 1955; Bruneau 1970, 438-41.

### Bibliography

- Birley, A. R. 1997: *Hadrian. The restless emperor*, London and New York.
- Bruneau, P. 1970: *Recherches sur le cultes de Délos à l'époque Hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris.
- Camia, F. 2011: *Theoi Sebastoi. Il culto degli imperatori romani in Grecia (Provincia Achaia) nel secondo secolo D.C.*, Athens
- Coarelli, F. 1983: 'Il Pantheon, l'apoteosi di Augusto e l'apoteosi di Romolo', *Analecta Romana Instituti Danici*. Suppl. 10, 41-46.
- Coarelli, F. 2014: 'Il Pantheon e il tempio di Adriano', in L. Abbondanza, F. Coarelli and E. Lo Sardo (eds.), *Apoteosi. Da uomini a dei. Il Mausoleo di Adriano*, Rome, 231-243.
- De Polignac, F. 1995: *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*, Chicago and London.
- Godfrey P. and D. Hemsoll 1986: 'The Pantheon: temple or rotunda?' in M. Henig and A. King (eds.), *Pagan Gods and Shrines of the Roman Empire*, 195-209.
- Katakis, S. 2002: *Τα γλυπτά των ρωμαϊκών χρόνων από το ιερό του Απόλλωνος Μαλεάτα και του Ασκληπιού*, Athens.
- Kokkou, A. 1970: 'Αδριάνεια έργα εις τας Αθήνας', *AD 25, Melet.*, 150-173
- Le Glay, M. 1976: 'Hadrien et l'Asklépieion de Pergamon', *BCH* 100, 347-72.
- Lippolis, E. 1995: 'Tra il ginnasio di Tolomeo e il Serapeion. La ricostruzione topografica di un quartiere monumentale di Atene', *Ostraka* 4, 43-67.
- Long, C. R. 1987: *The twelve gods of Greece and Rome*, Leiden.
- Marcattili, F. 2005: s.v. 'Pantheum', *ThesCRA* iv.
- Melfi, M. 2010: 'Rebuilding the myth of Asklepios at the sanctuary of Epidauros in the Roman period' in A.D. Rizakis and C. Lepenioti (eds.), *Roman Peloponnese III. Society, economy and culture under the Roman Empire. Continuity and innovation*, Athens.
- Robert, C. 1888: 'Olympische Glossen', *Hermes* 23, 424-53.
- Rodríguez Cortés, J. 1991: *Sociedad y religión clásica en la Bética romana*, Salamanca.
- Shear, L. 1981: 'Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town', *Hesperia* 50, 356-377.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 1990: 'What is polis religion?' in O. Murray and S. Price (eds.), *The Greek City: from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford, 195-222.

- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. 2000: 'What is polis religion?' in R.G.A. Buxton (ed.) *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion*, Oxford , 13-37.
- Spawforth A. J. S. and S. Walker 1985: 'The world of the Panhellenion I. Athens and Eleusis', *JRS* 75, 78-104.
- Taliaferro Boatwright, M. 2000: *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton.
- Thomas, E. 2004: 'From the Pantheon of the gods to the Pantheon of Rome', in R. Wrigley and M. Craske (eds.), *Pantheons. Transformations of a Monumental Idea*, Aldershot, 11-33.
- Travlos, J. 1971: *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, New York.
- Vanotti, G. 1981: 'Appunti sul *De mirabilibus auscultationibus*', *Giornale Filologico Ferrarese*, 84-88.
- Vanotti, G. 2007: *Aristotele, Racconti Meravigliosi*, Milan.
- Weniger, L. 1909: 'Die monatliche Opferung in Olympia.1. Die Opferordnung', *Klio* 9, 291-303.
- Weniger, L. 1920: 'Die monatliche Opferung in Olympia. 3. Die heilige Handlung', *Klio* 16, 1-39.
- Will, E. 1955: *Le Dôdékathéon*. EAD 22, Paris.
- Willers, D. 1990: *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm. Archäologische Beiträge zur Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian*, Basel.
- Ziegler, K. 1949: s.v. 'Pantheon', *RE* xviii.3, 697-747.
- Ziehen, L. 1935: s.v. 'Nephelia', *RE* xvi, 2481-9