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I am not sure I would have made it to the finish-line without the humour and camaraderie of my close friends and fellow postgraduates (past and present). Those particularly responsible for keeping me sane are Dr Sandra Bingham, Louise Clark, Kate Collingridge, Dr Maria Elpiniki-Oikonomou, Dr Alasdair Gibson, Dr Karen Hartnup, Dr Maggie King, Dr Déborah Natansen, Dr Marina Thomatos, Elaine Veitch and Dr Nicki Waugh. In particular, over the last year, I have been extremely grateful for the support of Katherine Liong and Nicolette Pavlidis. As expected, the last months have been the hardest and I am forever indebted to my partner Jim who arrived just in time to ensure I did not fall at the final hurdle.

My most important acknowledgements go to my family for their wholehearted support and unfailing belief in me. Sadly, my grandmother passed away before I could finish; my joy in submitting is diminished as I cannot celebrate with Nan. To Auntie Doreen and Uncle Peter, godparents par excellence, I thank you for always encouraging me to follow my dreams and willing me to succeed.

Finally, let me express that none of this would have been possible without the love and support of my parents (and two wonderful cocker spaniels: Spei and Chelsea). It is quite impossible to put into words the debt I owe them. Mum and Dad have constantly strived to ensure that I have enjoyed every opportunity available to me and I have been thankful for this support each and every day of my life. Consequently this thesis is as much theirs as it is mine. It is therefore dedicated, with all my love, to them.
Abstract

This thesis is an inter-disciplinary study of the evidence for the Greek goddess Artemis in the Southern Italian and Sicilian colonies during the archaic and classical periods. The evidence is reviewed by type and with specific reference to its chronological and geographical context. First, I deal with the myths which feature Artemis in the works of Pindar and Bacchylides. This is followed by a catalogue of sites and epithets which informs a discussion of her worship. Thirdly, a wide range of representations of Artemis is considered; they constitute the largest category of evidence in this thesis. The goddess appears on Attic vases exported to the west as well as vases manufactured in Apulia and Lucania. Terracotta figurines and architectural sculpture are also catalogued and discussed. The final corpus of evidence reviewed is the depiction of the goddess on coins minted in Southern Italy and Sicily. Finally, the key themes to emerge from this inter-disciplinary study are contextualised within the historical realities of the western Greek colonies and compared with the conventional view of the goddess in modern scholarship.
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Introduction

“Deities are shaped by the societies that constitute the worshipping group and develop with them” Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 147)

The aim of this dissertation is to consolidate and analyse the archaic and classical evidence for Artemis cult in Southern Italy and Sicily. The opening quotation from Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood has inspired this research. Authors from Farnell (1896) and Hoenn (1946) through to Kahil (1984) have published wide-reaching surveys of the goddess without a particular focus on her specific role in a certain region. Regional studies do exist: see, for example, Brulotte (2002), but too many focus on Artemis’ Attic cults: see, for example, Kahil (1977, 1981) and Hollinshead (1985). There is a relative dearth of scholarship on the character of Artemis’ cult in the Greek west. However, the diversity of the Greek colonies in the west, from French Massalia to African Cyrene, led me to focus on one specific geographical area: Southern Italy and Sicily.

In this introduction to the main body of the argument I shall provide an outline and explanation for my structure. I shall then discuss the definitions and rationale for the chronological and geographical remit of the thesis. The move of the Greeks to settlements on new shores is generally described as colonisation. This term is fraught with modern connotations following the imperialistic and ideologically justified colonisation of the New World and Africa by the Europeans. It is, however, a term I shall use regularly throughout this thesis. I shall therefore confirm the definition we should apply in this study and review the recent scholarship on this phenomenon. Finally I shall consider the theological issues inherent in this thesis, which brings us back to my opening quotation. Artemis was just one deity of the panhellenic and local pantheons; the construction and development of this goddess in Southern Italy and Sicily did not occur in isolation. It would therefore be amiss

1 Although Sourvinou-Inwood’s work builds on previous sociological studies: see, for example, Durkheim (1911) and Weber (1963), it is particularly relevant here as Sourvinou-Inwood uses the cult of Persephone and Aphrodite at the Southern Italian site of Lokroi to create a model for the study of divine personalities in Greek religion.

2 For other regional studies of Artemis see, for example: Chirassi (1964) (Peloponnese); Sourvinou-Inwood (1988) (Attica); Gentili, Perusino (2002) (Brauron). Ephesos has perhaps attracted most scholars who have produced a regional study of Artemis, see, for example: Falkener (1862); Wood (1877); Picard (1922); Loewy (1932); Strelan (1946); Picón (1983); Schaber (1982); Bammer (1984, 1996); Rigler (1988) and Muss (2001). The trend of one particular site dominating regional studies of Greek deities is illustrated by a further review of the studies on Artemis’ twin, Apollo; see, for example, Herda (2006) (Didyma and Miletos); Fontenrose (1988) (Didyma); Pettersson (1992) (Sparta); Chankowski (2008) (Athens and Delos) and cf., for example: Gaston (1905); Dempsey (1918); Defradas (1972); Roux (1976) and Rousset (2002) on Delphi.
to present Artemis as either an isolated deity or a goddess who retained the same character as the Artemis we know from elsewhere in the Greek world.

I have adopted an inter-disciplinary approach to this thesis in order to illuminate a holistic view of the goddess. Each of the first five chapters considers the representation of the goddess in the literature, archaeology, iconography (two chapters) and numismatics of Southern Italy and Sicily. These individual discussions are based upon the evidence compiled in the appended catalogues. The definitions and scope applied to each type of evidence are discussed at the beginning of the appropriate chapter with a consideration of the difficulties inherent in the treatment of that material. A sixth and final chapter will establish the key themes which emerge from this inter-disciplinary study, contextualise them within the historical realities of Southern Italy and Sicily and review them against the conventional view of the goddess in modern scholarship.

The chronological and geographical framework of this thesis requires an explanation. First, I should confirm that I have understood the archaic and classical periods as the years covering 600 to 323. However, these periods are a modern construct and I have not limited myself to these exact years to the detriment of the argument and include references to slightly earlier or later evidence where appropriate as it can clarify or further support a particular aspect of Artemis’ cult I have identified in the archaic and/or classical period(s). The only category with a significant volume of evidence dating outwith my time-frame is the coins; chapter 5.3 reviews this later evidence but is careful to avoid artificially projecting hellenistic evidence onto an archaic or classical reality. A few other items which post-date the classical period have been included and a smaller number of pre-archaic items; these are included to strengthen my argument and avoid an incomplete conclusion driven by only adhering to the modern definition of archaic and classical. The hellenistic period is witness to the growing power and influence of Rome within our regions as well as the Punic Wars (Shipley 2000, 370-1). Indeed, the later coinage included in this thesis may well result from an increasing number of mercenaries in Sicily as a result of these conflicts. The significant social and political changes in the hellenistic period inevitably impacted upon the cult of Artemis. The focus of this thesis, upon the three centuries before the advent of these changes, is intended to allow a study of the goddess in the context of the Greek colonies before the Romans seriously threatened Southern Italy and Sicily.
This thesis reviews the evidence for Artemis cult from both Sicily and Southern Italy. The definition of Southern Italy, both in terms of nomenclature and geography, requires some initial comment. In antiquity two terms were used to describe Southern Italy and sometimes Sicily: Italia and Megale Hellas; both terms are problematic (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 249-51). The confusion has not been resolved in modern scholarship. Dunbabin (1948, xiv) avoids ‘Italia’ and ‘Magna Graecia’, referring instead to Sicily and South Italy, and the inhabitants of these areas, as the ‘Western Greek’. I also prefer to exclude the term Magna Graecia and have referred throughout this thesis to Southern Italy and Sicily. However, if we discard the label of Magna Graecia it should be remembered that these lands were considered part of Greece in antiquity. Within Southern Italy I have reviewed the evidence by region: Bruttium (Reggio-Calabria), Apulia (Puglia), Lucania (Basilicata) and Campania.3

The last of these regions, Campania, is a controversial inclusion. The region itself defies a straightforward ancient definition (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 251) but includes the first Greek emporion at Pithekoussai on modern Ischia (Boardman 1980, 165-7; Ridgway 1992, 31-42). Pithekoussai was the fore-runner of further Greek settlements around the bay of Naples demonstrating that the Greeks clearly had a significant presence in Campania (Frederiksen 1984, 85-116). However, as the Etruscans also controlled part of this region (Frederiksen 1984, 117-33) it is generally considered a cultural melting-pot which leads some scholars to exclude it from discussions of the Greeks in Southern Italy. However, I have included it here as it sits geographically within the southern half of Italy and was one of the regions in which the Greeks chose to settle; the evidence for Artemis from this region increases our understanding of the goddess’ cult.

Now that I have explained the chronological and geographical remit of this thesis, I shall turn to the phenomenon of colonisation. The first problem is the definition of this term when used by modern scholars of an ancient activity. Colonisation now conjures up images of the imperialistic claiming of vast areas of undeveloped land occupied by a ‘primitive’ and ‘heathen’ population (Hurst and Owen 2005; Owen 2005, 9-18; Tsetskhladze 2006, xxiii-xxviii). For our purposes here, colonisation is the arrival of the Greeks in Southern Italy and Sicily, the founding of a colony and the establishment of institutions familiar to them. It should not be understood as a mission with the purpose of destroying the existing society and culture and forcibly replacing it with their own.

3 These regional names are also problematic, see Isayev (2007).
There is a great variety of scholarship on the ancient Greek colonisation of Southern Italy and Sicily, ranging from historiographies (Dunbabin 1947; Béard 1957; Boardman 1980) to archaeological studies. This earlier archaeological scholarship is interested in presenting evidence other than that recorded in ancient writers (Coldstream 1977, 221-45; Ridgway 1992) while more recent authors are concerned with the social realities of this phenomenon (Tsetskhladze, De Angelis 1994; Shepherd 1995, 1999, 2000; Carter 2006). The interest in the social realities of life in these new settlements continues with studies on the Greeks’ relationships with the indigenous population (Descoeudres 1990; Albanese Procelli 1996; Leighton 2000) and ethnicity; examining the ways in which the Greeks used myths and stories of heroes to mediate encounters and in the creation or assertion of a Greek identity (Malkin 1998, 2001; Antonaccio 2005). While the political landscape of the new colonies is dominated by studies on the role of tyranny, especially in Sicily (Andrewes 1956; McGlew 1993; Luraghi 1994; Lewis 2006), a desire to understand these societies better has also been proposed through specific regional studies (Vallet 1958; Frederiksen 1984; Greco 2002; Carter 2006).

The act of foundation, the associated myth and the role of the oikist are often presented as the ‘vital statistics’ of a colony in the historiographies mentioned above. However, the formulaic nature of these myths and their historical value should be carefully considered. The foundation myth is the product of not only social, political, religious and literary manipulation, but also ongoing cultural negotiations (Dougherty 1993, 3-11). Indeed the record of the foundation, its associated myth and the identity (and ethnicity) of the oikist are more valuable to the generation who documented it than the founding population (Graham 1964, 25-68; Dougherty 1993; Dougherty and Kurke 1993; Giangulio 2001; Hall 2008). For a good example of the confusion generated by the ancient sources over the foundation of Greek poleis review the Southern Italian Achaian colonies: compare, for example, Morgan and Hall (1996) with Kowalzig (2007) and see chapter 1.1.2.

There are three major flaws in the earlier scholarship on ancient Greek colonisation; these have been ably summarised by Sara Owen (2005, 6-9). First, colonisation has traditionally been understood as a historical phenomenon: scholars have subsequently over-valued literary sources in their studies. Secondly, there are problems encountered in studies of ethnicity, for

---

4 The scholarship referred to here is not comprehensive but includes the major works in each field cited. For a discussion of the problematisation of ‘colonisation’ as a term see below and Owen (2005) and Giangulio (2001).
example, even in the archaeological record the discovery of a Greek vase outside a Greek settlement does not constitute evidence of the hellenisation of the indigenous population. Thirdly, analogies with the European colonisation of the New World have confused and complicated our understanding of ancient practices. Hurst and Owen’s (2005) volume directly articulated the problems faced by the student of ancient colonisation; current scholarship is now clearly conscious of these issues in its treatment of this phenomenon see, for example, Tsetskhladze (2006, 2008).

Our particular focus in this thesis is Artemis cult in, or disseminated from, these colonies. The first study fully devoted to the impact of colonisation on religion, and vice-versa, was Irad Malkin’s Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece. Malkin’s (1987) wide-ranging study discussed many aspects of religion in the context of colonisation including, for example, the role of the Delphic Oracle, the cult of the oikist and the worship of Greek gods and heroes in new lands. Here, our focus is more precise: the cult of one Olympian goddess and its manifestation in Southern Italy and Sicily. It will raise questions around links back to the mainland and, in particular, the mother-city as well as the catalysts for change in the goddess’ cult.5 We must avoid analogies with European colonisation and the conversion of the locals to Christianity: the Greeks did not worship or create representations of Artemis to convince the locals of her pre-eminence and convert them to her cult. Moreover, Greek religion was polytheistic (and polyheroic); the Greeks understood the gods of different peoples as the gods of their own pantheon who were simply worshipped under a different name and with different rites (Hdt. 2.137; Malkin 1998, 16-7).

We should approach this study with the understanding that deities are a human construct; this theory was even represented by Herodotus (2.53) who credited Homer and Hesiod with the creation of the Greek pantheon.6 Gods are the manifestation or immortal anthropomorphisation of a power outwith human control. Although anthropomorphic, these figures are not analogous to humans. The difference between goddesses and women is clearly illustrated by the existence of three Olympian parthenoi: Artemis, Athena and Hestia (Loraux 1992, 23-5).7 The gods fit together inextricably as a whole, a pantheon, which can

5 See Marconi (2007, 195-9) for a consideration of the cultic links between Selinus and Megara to better understand the architectural sculpture of this western Greek colony.
be understood as a power grid serving a network of human consumers.\(^8\) Humans then access these powers by means of a specific ritual. Religion should therefore be understood and contextualised as a social phenomenon see, for example, Durkheim (1911, esp. 23-47); Weber (1963); Vernant (1990, 109-10); Davies (1997, 43); Parker (2005, 387-95); Dowden (2007, 41-3).

The human need which led to the creation of the construct, or a particular manifestation of the construct, is a key question in the study of any deity (Seaford 2006, 95). The gods of the Olympian pantheon were worshipped across the Greek world and their nomenclature may sometimes be the only common factor (Dowden 2007, 47). However, these gods were worshipped under a variety of epithets which facilitated the diffraction of a single panhellenic identity and were often explained through a local aetiological myth (Dowden 2007, 41-3). It is important therefore to draw a clear distinction between the panhellenic concept of a deity and the realities of local cult. If we simply compile evidence from a variety of chronological periods and geographical locale we will end up with a collage of data but an image of the goddess which is not rooted in any social reality. Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 147-50) proposed a methodology for the study of local cult: we should examine the realities and needs of the worshipping group and the deity’s role in the (local) pantheon to which they belong.

Following Sourvinou-Inwood, throughout this thesis I shall consider the evidence for Artemis’ cult against the socio-historic realities of the worshipping group. The goddess’ interaction with other divinities will also be noted. There are two non-Greek divinities who will appear in this study: the Etruscan Artumes and the Latin Diana, both of whom are often iconographically indistinguishable from Artemis (Krauskopf 1984; Green 2007, 71-96). Artumes was an Etruscan goddess who does not really come into contact with Artemis in our geographical remit during our periods but who can be confused with our goddess by some authors (Krauskopf 1998). Diana was a Latin goddess who moved from Rome to Aricia c.550 and from there travelled further south to Monte Tifata in Campania where she came into contact with Artemis (Gordon 1932; chapter 2.2). Now that I have explained the parameters, definitions and methodology of this study we can begin to review the evidence for Artemis cult in Southern Italy and Sicily.

\(^8\) Albert Henrichs used this analogy in his paper ‘What is a Greek God’ at the Leventis Conference hosted by Edinburgh University, 1-4 November 2007. Henrichs was contesting Parker’s statement that Greek polytheism is ‘indescribable’ (Parker 2005, 387-8).
Chapter 1

Artemis myth and cult in the victory odes

Archaic and classical literature specifically associating Artemis with Sicily or Southern Italy is limited to six victory odes (epinikia),\(^1\) which were composed for Sicilian or Southern Italian victors in the Greek games.\(^2\) The victor, or his family, selected the ode’s theme, which the poet then manipulated for the purpose of praising the victor; see, for example Kähnchen (1971) and Kurke (1991). During the course of this composition the poet may refer to Artemis, her cult-titles and myths. The flattery of the victor and his victory could be extended to his city, frequently the backdrop of the ode’s performance.\(^3\) It is the association of Artemis with the victor’s city which has determined the structure of this chapter. The first group of odes, section 1.1, explicitly connect the goddess to the victor’s city while the odes in section 1.2 make no such connection.\(^4\)

1.1 Bringing Artemis to the west

1.1.1 Syracuse

Pindar twice describes Artemis as a goddess of Ortygia, the small island just off the coast of Syracuse which was first settled by the Corinthians when they arrived in c.734 (Thuc. 6.3.2;...
Ortygia was both the goddess’ couch (δέμιυνον) (Pind. Nem. 1.3) and abode (Εδώς) (Pind. Pyth. 2.7). I shall first consider the opening reference to Artemis in Pindar’s Nemean 1. This ode was composed sometime after 476 to celebrate the victory of Chromios of Aitna in a chariot race. The invocation of Ortygia is four-fold; this island is the hallowed spout of Alpheios, the offspring of famous Syracuse, the couch of Artemis and a sister of Delos. The second and fourth references can be understood with relative ease. Despite Chromios’ post as the governor of Aitna, Pindar begins by praising and contextualising Ortygia as a district of Syracuse to acknowledge the city’s role as the centre of the widening Sicilian rule of the Deinomenidai. The invocation of Ortygia as the sister of Delos alludes to the birth of Artemis and Apollo and plays upon the confusion of Delos with Ortygia.

However, the invocation opens with a reference to the Alpheios. Ortygia is the hallowed spout (or resting place) (Ἄμπνευμα σεμίυνον) (1) of this major Peloponnesian river which famously passed through the Olympian temenos before flowing into the sea (Paus. 8.54.1-3). The journey of the Greek colonists to Syracuse is mythically echoed by the journey of the Alpheios river from the north-west Peloponnes, under the sea, to emerge in the fresh-water spring on Ortygia. This tradition is recorded in a fragmentary passage of Ibycus (fr. 323 PMGF; Campbell 1982, 305-6; Barron 1984, 22) and Pausanias’ account of the Delphic Oracle, which instructed Archias to found Syracuse at the site where the waters of the Alpheios and Arethousa inter-mingle (Paus. 5.7.3; Parke and Wormell 1956b, no.2). However the authenticity of the oracle’s response is debated (Braswell 1992, 33).

---

5 Pindar describes Syracuse more generally as the sanctuary (temenos) of Ares (Pind. Pyth. 2.2). In his odes for Hieron, Bacchylides includes opening invocations of Demeter as the mistress of fertile Sicily (Bacchyl. 3.1-3) and Apollo as a lover of Syracuse (Bacchyl. 4.1-2); in the latter Bacchylides is alluding to the fact that the victory was obtained at Delphi but it is clear that Artemis is not the only goddess associated with Syracuse in the epinikia.

6 Pindar refers to Aitna, which was founded in 476, and two manuscripts designate the victor as Chromios of Aitna (Wilamowitz 1922, 253-4; Race 1997a, 2). On the actual date of the victory see the debate in, for example, Sandys (1924, 314-5); Carey (1981, 104); Race (1986, 79-80) and Braswell (1992, 25-27). Chromios, the victor, was a powerful general and brother-in-law of Hieron (Schol. Nem. 1 inscr.a, vol. 3, p.6.1.13-21 Drachmann; Schol. Nem. 9 inscr., vol. 3 p.149-50 1.14-3 Drachmann; Race 1996, 79-80; Braswell 1992, 27-8).

7 Gelon had captured Syracuse in 485. Both Gelon and his successor, his brother Hieron, ruled from this city (Diod. Sic. 11.38.7; Serrati 2000, 11-12). Hieron founded Aitna in 476, installing Chromios as governor (Diod. Sic. 11.49; Dougherty 1993, 83-102; Luraghi 1994, 336ff.; Lomas 2006, 110). On Ortygia’s relationship with Syracuse see Wilamowitz (1922, 401 n.1) and Rose (1974, 145 esp. n.53).

8 See Hom. Hymn Apollo 14ff.; Pind. Pae. 5 fr.52e. 39-42 S-M = D5.39-42 Rutherford, Pae. 12 fr. 52m.8-17 S-M = G1.8-17 Rutherford, Pae. 7b fr. 52h.42-52 S-M = C2.42-52 Rutherford; Callim. Hymn 2.59, Epigr. 62.2; Ap. Rhod. 1.149, 537; Verg. Aen. 3.124; Rutherford 2001, 243-52; Kowalzig 2007, 56-128). The name Ortygia may be derived from a common association of these islands with quails (Farnell 1896, 433; Thomson 1936, 215-19; Schmidt 1943, 1519-26; Pollard 1977, 61-2)
reason for the Alpheios’ re-emergence on Ortygia is explained through a myth of erotic pursuit: Alpheios desired either Arethousa (Paus. 5.7.2-4; Ov. Met. 5.572-641) or Artemis (Telesilla fr. 717 PMG; Paus. 6.22.9).\(^9\)

The Arethousa spring on Ortygia was vital to the Greeks’ colonisation of the area; it became synonymous with Syracuse (Pind. Pyth. 3.69; Diod. Sic. 16.18.3) and was famous throughout antiquity (Cic. Verr. 2.4.118). Hirschfeld (1896, 679) has explained its name, and association with the Alpheios, by supposing the existence of an otherwise unknown spring called Arethousa in Elis. However, the Hesiodic tradition (fr. 188a, 244 M-W) records Arethousa as the nymph of a Chalkidian spring (West 1985, 99).\(^10\) Poseidon abducts Arethousa from Boiotia, rapes her and transports her to Chalkis. After giving birth to Poseidon’s son Abas, Arethousa is turned into a spring by Hera (Larson 2001, 144). It is possible that the fresh-water spring on Ortygia was named Arethousa by the Chalkidians who explored Sicily before the colonisation of Syracuse in 734 (Coldstream 1977, 234; Larson 2001, 213-4).

The tradition in which Alpheios pursues Artemis, not Arethousa, is recorded in a fragment attributed to the Argive poetess Telesilla (fr. 717 PMG), who flourished in the middle of the fifth century (Snyder 1989, 59ff.). Telesilla pre-dates the surviving sources for the version in which Alpheios pursues Arethousa. Larson (2001, 213-4, 324 n. 323) has therefore suggested that this tradition is the original version of Alpheios’ journey and that the Arethousan version developed as a variant on account of the growth of the nymph’s cult in Syracuse. Moreover, the subsequent reference to Artemis in line 3 of Nemean 1 has led some scholars to suggest that Pindar is recalling Alpheios’ pursuit of the goddess in this ode (Rose 1974, 164-5; Carey 1981, 104). Rose (1974, 164-5) has even suggested that Pindar’s description of Ortygia as the couch of Artemis implies that Alpheios raped the goddess.

However, a constant feature of Artemis’ mythology is the goddess’ successful rejection of male sexual advances. It has been argued that the Artemisian myths preserved in the literary sources obscure a sexual past for our goddess. The myths of Artemis’ affairs with men were then transposed onto her female companions, who are often nearly identical to the goddess in

---

\(^9\) Pindar’s use of *ampneuma* may refer to Alpheios’ exhaustion after his pursuit; it implies the aftermath of a violent effort and is used elsewhere by Pindar in the context of a victory (Rose 1974, 163). A subtle comparison of Chromios’ victory in the chariot race with Alpheios’ chase of either Arethousa or Artemis may be detected; see Barringer (2001, 70-124, 125-173) on the relationship between the hunt and both *eros* and myth.

\(^10\) Other sources for this spring: Eur. IA 164-70; Strabo 1.3.16; Parke, Wormell (1956a, 82).
other respects; see, for example, Farnell (1896, 446) and Harrison (1963, 502). This theory was successfully refuted by Sale (1965, 11-35) with his detailed analysis of the myth of Kalliote, which is often cited by proponents of this theory of an earlier sexually active Artemis. Greek partheneia, loosely translated as virginity, was not a biological concept (Sissa 1990, 73-123). However, it applies differently to goddesses and mortals. As Olympians Artemis, Athena and Hestia are eternal parthenoi who can continually successfully refuse the advances of men while mortal parthenoi are destined to become wives and mothers (gynaikes) (Loraux 1993, 243-4).

The confusion over the object of Alpheios’ pursuit could suggest that both Artemis and Arethousa had a role in the myth, but that their roles became confused. Artemis was clearly associated with Ortygia, and more specifically the Arethousa fresh-water spring (Soph. Trach. 214; Pind. Pyth. 2.7; Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.12a, vol. 2, p.33-4, 1.17-2 Drachmann; Schol. Nem. 1.3 vol. 3, p.9-10, 14-5 Drachmann). A tradition, preserved in Ovid (Met. 5.572-641), includes Artemis in a failed attempt to rescue Arethousa: the goddess turns Arethousa into a spring and sends her to Syracuse but Alpheios turns into a river and follows her. It has been suggested that the erotic pursuit is a hellenistic innovation (Braswell 1992, 34) but a similar myth is recorded in a Hesiodic source about the Chalkidian Arethousa. Moreover, Artemis’ role as a rescuer of females is an early feature of her myth; see, for example, the Iphigeneia myth recorded in the Cypria ([8] p.74 West) and later by Euripides (IT 1082-3). The pursuit of a nymph by a (river) god to a new colony is an established motif; compare, for example, the myth of Apollo’s abduction of the nymph Cyrene in Pythian 9 (Dougherty 1993, 140-4). Furthermore, the sexual conquest of the nymph is representative of both the fertility of the new land which is now controlled by the colonists and the establishment of a new political foundation (Dougherty 1993, 68-9; Larson 2001, 35-9, 213-12). Artemis’ association with the Arethousa spring recalls her role as a goddess who presided over rites of passage see, for example, Van Gennep (1960, 89-92), Burkert (1985, 77-9) and Cole (1988). Water served as a means of purification and a boundary

---

11 Artemis is often associated with water for example, in Sparta (Dawkins, 1929), at the Piraean (Garland 1987) and at Brauron (Orlandos 1962, 25-8). Pausanias (3.23.10, 7.20.7) records the epithet Limnatis (of the lake); on this cult see Calame (2001, 142-149). Cole (1988) has reviewed the uses of water in Greek sanctuaries; see Cole (1988, 164) and Calame (2001, 143) for water in sanctuaries of Artemis. See also Jones (2005, 19-20) for the relationship of water (rivers) and rites of passage; Artemis presided over these rites for young girls in her sanctuary at Brauron (Eur. IT 1435-74).

12 Cyrene is similar to Artemis and is even called Agrotera (Pind. Pyth. 9.6). However, the imagery of Apollo and Cyrene’s marriage and intercourse in the oke is important for the founding of the colony (Dougherty 1993, 140-4).

13 As noted above, Pindar’s use of amnpeuma could imply exhaustion after sexual activity; Alpheios’ conquest of Arethousa pre-figures the Greeks’ conquest of their new land.
The association of Artemis with Ortygia occurs for a second time in the opening lines of Pindar’s second Pythian for Hieron of Syracuse; the games, date and even the genre of the ode are debated. Hieron crowns Ortygia, the abode (SİΔΩC) of Artemis (7), after his victory in an unspecified chariot-race thus sharing his victory with the goddess (Bell 1984, 5). Artemis is initially invoked as a river-goddess (7): an allusion to Arethousa the fresh-water spring discussed above. An epiphany of Artemis, who is now the virgin archeress (ΙΟΓΧΕΑΙΡΑ ΠΑΡΘΕΝΟΣ), and Hermes follows (9-12) with the gods helping Hieron master his steeds and introducing the ode’s recurring theme of man’s dependence upon the gods (Carey 1981, 27). The characterisation of Artemis as the virgin archeress recalls the formula regularly employed in Homer: ‘Artemis the archeress’ (Hom. II. 5.53, 20.39; Od. 6.102, 15.478), which is reformulated to ‘virgin archeress’ in the Homeric Hymn to Artemis (2); this epithet is suited to the physical activity imagined here. In addition to the direct assistance of Artemis and Hermes, Hieron also calls upon Poseidon for aid (12). This trinity of deities demonstrates divine approval of the tyrant and is reminiscent of the gods’ direct assistance of Homeric heroes (Carey 1981, 26-27, 62-4; Bell 1984, 4).

Artemis’ direct assistance in the yoking of Hieron’s fillies (ΠΩΛΟΥ) is an unusual image. It is one of a small number of references in the ancient literary sources revealing an equine aspect to Artemis’ cult (Hom. Hymn Art. 3-5; Pind. Ol. 3.26, fr. 89a SM; Bacchyl. 11.115; Paus. 8.14.5; Rutherford 2001, 435). It even appeared unusual to the scholiasts who

14 On the location of the ode see Wilamowitz (1922, 285-7); Sandys (1924, 168); Lloyd-Jones (1973, 117-8); Most (1985, 63-5); and Race (1986, 64). Burton (1962, 111-15) provides a useful summary of the issues surrounding the dating of the ode. Wilamowitz (1922, 285-93) originally asserted that Pythian 2 was a ‘poetic epistle’ and not an epinikian; see, for example, Lloyd-Jones (1973, 119) and Carey (1981, 23) for a strong defence of the ode’s epinikian status.
15 See Kurke (1991) and Mann (2001) for the significance of the victor to his oikos and polis.
16 Artemis and Hermes appear together in Attic black-figure vase-paintings of chariots (chapter 4).
17 On the role of victory in the ode see, for example, Crotty (1982, 1-3) and Race (1986, 7); Most (1985, 71-2) has diagrammatised the ‘conceptual structure’ of the ode: here Hieron acknowledges his inferior status by calling on the gods and so becomes superior among his fellow men.
18 These three deities are present in their capacities as a local deity (Artemis), patron of athletics (Hermes), and god of horses (Poseidon). Hermes and Poseidon do not appear to be present on account of any role they played in the Syracusan pantheon.
19 Hieron may have commissioned this ode, with its allusion to the divine approval of his rule, in response to contemporary political tension in his court (Newman and Newman 1984, 234).
20 See Bell (1984) for a discussion of the significance of yoking/binding in the ode.
unconvincingly attributed the references to the location of the Deinomenid stables on Ortygia or even a local practice of worshipping Artemis as a goddess of horses (Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.13, vol. 2, p.34, 1.3-6 Drachmann; Schol. Nem. 1 inscr.b, vol. 3, p.6-7, 1.22-12 Drachmann; Simpson 1969, 461-4; Braswell 1992, 29). If the goddess is simply appearing in her capacity as a local divinity, Athena would have been a more obvious choice. Athena’s equine associations, especially in Corinth, are well-known (Pind. Ol. 13.65-7, 82; Yalouris 1950, 88) and construction of the grand Ortygian Athenasion had begun after the victory at Himera in 480. However, the scene evoked by Pindar may be an allusion to Artemis’ role as a goddess of young females who are often described as fillies in the ancient sources. The goddess’ control over the animals, and in particular the yoking action, is a metaphor for her role presiding over rites of passage for young girls prior to marriage; see, for example, King (1983) and Calame (2001, 238-44). The manifestation of Artemis as a Potnia Hippon is perhaps best demonstrated on a krateriskos published by Kahl (1977, 92): the goddess appears in a ritual scene at one of her Attic sanctuaries, which were concerned with female maturation rites, wearing a tunic with a rearing horse depicted on her torso.

While for Pindar, Sicily had been granted to Persephone (Pind. Nem 1.13-14) and Syracuse is a sanctuary of Ares (Pind. Pyth. 2. 1-2), Ortygia belongs to Artemis. The association of Artemis with the first area to be settled of Syracuse suggests the antiquity of her cult in the polis. Pindar’s language is unsurprisingly ambiguous and we cannot therefore determine whether Artemis had any specific cult building or site on the island. Artemis appears to have been particularly associated with the fresh-water spring Arethousa; the goddess is called potamia (Pind. Pyth. 2.7) and invoked alongside a reference to the Alpheios myth (Pind. Nem. 1.1-3). Artemis’ association with the nymph Arethousa, who I have argued is the object of Alpheios’ pursuit to Ortygia, and the image of the goddess yoking Hieron’s horses characterise her as a goddess of parthenoi. Moreover, the goddess herself is called the virgin archeress (Pind. Pyth. 2.9). The association of Artemis with Ortygia contributes to the image

---

21 See, for example: Hes. Ehoiai fr. 59 M-W; Alcman fr. 1.59 PMGF; Anakreon fr. 417, 346.1 PMG; Eur. Andr. 621, Hec. 142, Hipp. 546, Tro. 669-70; Ar. Lys. 1308-1313; King 1983, 111; Waugh 2000, 134-5, forthcoming. The prologue of Euripides’ lost Melanippe Sophe seems to have told the story of Melanippe’s mother, Hippo, who was turned into a horse by Zeus (Page GLP, no.14).

22 The Potnia Hippon is a particular manifestation of the Potnia Theron (Yalouris 1950, 88-101); see chapter 4 for the iconography of Artemis ‘controlling’ horses and deer in Southern Italy and Sicily. It is interesting to note that Artemis is joined in Pythian 2. 5-12 by Hermes and Poseidon; both of these gods have been associated with the Potnios Theron (Chittenden 1947; Langdon 1989).

23 Note also that Artemis is associated with harbours (Callim. Hymn 3. 38-9, 259; Garland 1987, 113) and that Ortygia was the main harbour at Syracuse.

12
of Syracuse as a city favoured by the Greek gods as indeed Pindar imagines Artemis favouring Hieron as she helps him master his fillyies.

1.1.2 Metapontion

Bacchylides’ eleventh epinikian is the poet’s sole surviving celebration of a Southern Italian victor. The scene is set as Bacchylides invokes Nike and describes the youths of Metapontion filling the city (ὑστερον) while singing the praises of Alexidamos, who has been victorious in the boys’ wrestling contest at the Pythian games.24 Previously Alexidamos had been wrongly denied victory at Olympia. However, Artemis, who is recalled with a plethora of epithets (37-9) - Agrotera, of the golden distaff (χρυσαλάκατωτος), Hemera, and famed for her bow (τοξόκλατωτος) - has ensured his victory at Delphi. Bacchylides shifts from the present to the mythic narrative with this reference to Artemis. The goddess was the recipient of an altar dedicated by Proitos whose daughters, after insulting Hera, were driven mad and left Tiryns to roam the mountains.25 Bacchylides subsequently recalls that it had been ten years since Proitos had left Argos, following a quarrel with his brother, Akrisios, and founded Tiryns. Proitos was devastated by his daughters’ condition, even contemplating suicide, and travelled to Lousoi where he bathed in the river and called upon Artemis to save them in return for a sacrifice of twenty unyoked oxen. Artemis persuaded Hera to end the girls’ frenzy; the Proitids then built a sanctuary and altar to Artemis, drenched it with sheep’s blood and established choruses of women (γυναικείς). Finally Bacchylides describes the war-loving Achaians, who he qualifies as the Homeric heroes returning home from Troy (the Nostoi), bringing Artemis with them from Lousoi to a grove on the river Kasas in Metapontion.26

Artemis is the link between the victor, in the present, and the central mythic narrative, set in the legendary past of the Peloponnesse; this link is emphasised by Bacchylides when Artemis appears again at the end of the ode as her cult is brought to Metapontion by the Achaians. For our purposes here, the report of the transmission of a mainland cult of Artemis to

---

24 The date of the victory is unknown. Bacchylides was born towards the end of the sixth century; his career as an epinikian poet seems to have roughly spanned the first half of the fifth century and this ode could therefore date to any point during this time.
25 On this sudden shift to the past (specifically an aetiology) and the characteristic compositional technique employed by Bacchylides see Kowalzig (2007, 30). Maehler (2004, 136-8) also considers this narrative shift and provides a more general review of the ode’s structure.
26 On the sanctuary at Metapontion see chapter 2; Olbrich (1976) attributed it to Artemis and associated it with the alsos described by Bacchylides. The figurines from the site are discussed in chapter 3.2.3.
Metapontion is of particular interest. It is the third foundation reported in the ode both in chronological order and Bacchylides’ narrative. Proitos set out from Argos to found Tiryns and the Proitids set out from Tiryns in their madness; both father and daughters travel to Lousoi and the latter founded the cult of Artemis there. Therefore the cult of Artemis, which is transferred from Lousoi to Metapontion, boasts an Argive-Tirynthian heritage; its antiquity and association with the mythical heroes of the Peloponnese provided the young colony’s cult with an heroic past. The recounting of the foundation of Metapontion and Artemis’ cult in the last few lines emphasises Artemis’ significance in the ode and to the Southern Italian polis (Maehler 2004, 138; Cairns 2005, 36).

Bacchylides describes Artemis travelling to Metapontion with the Achaians after the sack of Troy; his account fits within the tradition of the nostoi. Strabo (5.2.5, 6.1.15) provides us with a name for these mythical heroes: they were the Pylians under the leadership of Nestor. Strabo (6.1.15) also records four further foundation myths for Metapontion; in one of these, his précis of Antiocchos (FGrH 555 fr. 12), we learn that the Achaians of Sybaris had called for further Achaians to travel west and re-settle the site of Metapontion for the purposes of controlling the territory of Siris and acting as a buffer against Taras. Assuming Strabo quotes Antiocchos faithfully, it was acceptable in the second half of the fifth century, and therefore contemporaneously with or slightly later than Bacchylides’ eleventh ode, to state that Metapontion was a) founded by Peloponnesian Achaians (cf. Ps.-Skymnos 328) and b) settled to act as a bulwark against Taras. Bacchylides is the first author to equate the Peloponnese Achaians with the Homeric Achaians (Maehler 2004, 133); the ambiguity of the term ‘Achaian’ and the identity of the Greeks who colonised Metapontion are much debated.

The issue of these colonists’ identity is further complicated by questions around the date at which the northernmost cities of the Peloponnese developed a regional identity as Achaia, their role in the colonising movement and the evidence for the presence of these regional Achaians in southern Italy. A migration of the Achaians from the southern and eastern Peloponnese was apparently forced by the arrival of the Dorians; the Achaians in turn moved to the northern Peloponnese expelling the Ionians who lived there (Hdt. 1.145, 7.94, 8.73; Paus. 7.1.5-7). This tradition is difficult to date back further than the mid-sixth century when the Spartans re-claimed the bones of Teisamenos, the grandson of Agamemnon, who had

---

27 For this tradition see, for example, Strabo 6.1.3, 6.1.12. For a good general review of the tradition and its place within colonisation myth see Malkin (1998) and Erskine (2001, 131-56).

28 Solinus 2.10 also attributes the foundation of Metapontion to Nestor and the Pylians.
been killed in the battle against the Ionians and buried in Helike (Paus. 7.1.8; Malkin 1994, 26-33; Morgan and Hall 1996, 212-14; Hall 2002, 62-3). However, it is at the root of claims by Greeks, from outwith the historical region of Achaia along the southern shores of the Corinthian gulf, to be Achaian see, for example, Kleomenes protestation of his Achaian heritage in Athens (Hdt. 5.72).

A number of cities, mainly along the southern Italian coast, are commonly called Achaian foundations: Sybaris, Kroton, Kaulonia, Poseidonia and Metapontion; see, for example, Dunbabin (1948, 24-8) and Malkin (1987, 131-2). An exhaustive survey of the Peloponnesian Achaian cities, completed by Morgan and Hall (1996), presents sufficient evidence to demonstrate the evolution of a regional self-identity by the mid-sixth century with the development of a political koinon by the early to mid-fifth century. Morgan (2002) subsequently considered the earlier identity of these cities and could raise a case for a regional ethnic as early as the eighth century. Moreover, Morgan (2002, 109-11) argued for Late Bronze Age contact between Achaia and Italy which was sustained and strengthened during LHIIIC and manifested itself in trading relations during the eighth century (Greco 2006) and entirely feasibly, with the colonisation of southern Italy. If it is therefore possible that Achaia ‘existed’ and served as a base for colonisation, what evidence is there for peoples with this regional identity in southern Italy?

Morgan and Hall (1996, 212-4; cf. Morgan 2002, 101-2) argue for the presence of Achaians in the Southern Italian Achaian colonies on account of the use of Achaian toponyms, hydronymys and script in these poleis and also some limited evidence of cultic connections.29 While there is evidence for a connection with the region of Achaia it is difficult to define precise relationships of mother city and colony (Morgan 2002, 102-3). Hall (2002, 61-3) has argued that the Achaians of Southern Italy were the first to use their regional identity as a means of identifying themselves with the Homeric Achaians; this idea was then transferred back to regional Achaians of the Greek mainland (Paus. 5.25.8-10). When Bacchylides describes the transfer of Artemis’ cult by the Achaians after the sack of Troy he is deliberately equating the regional Achaians who re-settled Metapontion with the Homeric Achaians. The prestige of being an Achaian, through this double meaning, is then clearly

29 Carter (2006, 80-3) discusses the archaeological evidence, largely from the Metapontine necropoleis, for the origins of the colonists and argues for a strong indigenous element in the population.
conferred on both Alexidamos and the audience of the performance, his fellow ‘Achaian’ Metapontines (Morgan 2002, 99).  

This emphasis on Achaian identity is a declaration of ethnicity; such claims are often driven by some oppositional definition (Malkin 1998; Malkin 2001; Morgan 2002, 108-111; Hall 2002, 63-5). This leads us to the second point in Strabo’s summary of Antiochos’ history: the conflict with Taras. In the fifth century, when Antiochos was writing his history, Taras and Metapontion were in dispute over the territory of Siris. It is possible therefore that Antiochos was influenced by this contemporary conflict and transferred it back to the re-founding of the polis c.650; yet there may be some truth in his account as there was no natural barrier in the coastal plain (Dunbabin 1948, 31-4; Bérand 1957, 176; Morgan and Hall 1996, 213). However, Hall (2002, 63-5) and Kowalzig (2007, 314-15) have both suggested that conflict over Siris, not Taras, was at the root of the claim to Achaian identity.

Indeed Barbara Kowlazig (2007, 267-327) has argued extensively against Antiochos’ record of a regional Achaian (re-)foundation of Metapontion on account of a conflict with Taras. Instead, for Kowalzig, an epic Achaian identity emerges from within an Ionian milieu in the context of the destruction of Siris and the growing Athenian presence around Southern Italy in the fifth century. A full refutation of this argument has not yet appeared although Seaford’s (2008) review highlighted the weakness of many links in Kowalzig’s chain of argument. Seaford chose Kowalzig’s discussion of the Argolid as a case-study for his review. Here I shall consider Kowalzig’s main objections to the testimony of Antiochos and the key elements of her alternative explanation for the origins of Metapontion.

Kowalzig (2007, 300) states that it is extremely difficult to prove the existence of the concept of a regional Peloponnesian Achaia before the fifth century. The paucity of evidence is sufficient to dismiss its validity; Kowalzig offers no reason for dismissing the evidence presented by Morgan and Hall. Instead, Kowalzig (2007, 301) offers three factors which, she argues, disprove any relationship between Peloponnesian Achaia and the Achaian colonies of Southern Italy: the lack of evidence for Achaia as a Peloponnesian port-of-call and disparities between Peloponnesian Achaia and the Achaian colonies in urbanisation and

---

30 Machler (2004, 156) suggests that Bacchylides makes this link as there are no obvious points to raise about Alexidamos and his family.

31 The Tarentines were engaged in a conflict with the Iapygians and Peuketians until the late 470s (Paus. 10.13.10; Malkin 1994, 138-9; Kowalzig 2007, 314-6), after which they engaged in hostilities with the Metapontines.
religious topography. Kowalzig (2007, 301) compares the ostentatious evidence for a Metapontine presence at Olympia with the lack of evidence for their presence in Achaian cities. However, the northern coastal cities of Achaia were strategically placed and their location on the Corinthian gulf surely indicates their role as trading ports at which colonists, including the Metapontines, would have stopped. Moreover, excavations in Achaia have not been thorough or widespread, which further complicates Kowalzig’s reliance on this point (Morgan and Hall 1996, 169-181). The further disparities highlighted by Kowalzig had been acknowledged in the work by Morgan and Hall; however they are not sufficient to disprove the relationship. While it is true that the cults of the Achaian colonies have more in common with the Argolid than the region of Achaia, the divinities worshipped can still be understood as promoting a general Achaian, specifically non-Doric identity when related to the concept of the forced Achaian migration (Morgan and Hall 1996, 213; Hall 2002, 61-2).

Instead Kowalzig (2007, 308-10) highlights the mythical origin of the city presented by Euripides in his Captive Melanippe; the plot of the play is restored largely using Hyginus’ testimony. This Euripidean version is the only other remaining literary aetiology for the cult; the story of Melanippe and her eventual marriage to Metapontos, king of Metapontion, shares several motifs with Bacchylides account of the Proitids: hunting, bestial imagery, flight and fear, killing and sacrificial slaughter. Kowalzig (2007, 310-16) interprets this as a competing aetiology for the Metapontine cult of Artemis, tracing the myth to its Aiolian roots and linking these into an Ionian Mediterranean identity. In terms of Siris, Kowalzig (2007, 313-6) argues that this polis was an Ionian foundation with close links with Metapontion and recalls Trogus’ account of the fall of Siris at the dawn of history; excavations confirm an actual destruction date of c.550. Kowalzig (2007, 316) argues that the significance of Trogus’ account is to show the importance of the epic fore-fathers and by placing the polis’ destruction in their period to emphasise local Ionian – epic Achaian rivalry.

However, the emphasis placed by Kowalzig on Euripides’ play should be considered in light of three factors. First, the play was written to entertain an Athenian audience; the difference in genre is matched by the difference in spectators as Bacchylides’ ode had to be suitable for a local Metapontine audience. Second, the plot is largely reconstructed using Hyginus who was writing several centuries later therefore the reliability of the account is debatable. Third,

---

32 Kowalzig is not the first to highlight the significance of the alternative aetiology found in Euripides; see, for example, Dunbabin (1948, 31-4).
the factors which Kowalzig presents as the key components of the myth-ritual nexus which overlap with Bacchylides’ myth (hunting, bestial imagery, flight and fear, killing and sacrificial slaughter) are, in fact, standard elements of Artemisian-Dionysian myth; see, for example, Seaford (1988, 124-8). Moreover, Trogus’ account of the fall of Siris, relied upon by Kowalzig, is preserved only in Justin’s third century AD work. Kowalzig’s arguments are therefore based upon the interpretation of myth either reconstructed from, or recorded in, late authors. We should recall Seaford’s (2008) warning against the weakness in the chain of argument and consider that there is sufficient cause to doubt Kowalzig’s dismissal of the Peloponnesian Achaian origins of Metapontion.

It is reasonable to argue therefore that Peloponnnesian Achaians settled in Metapontion; the archaeological evidence indicates their arrival c.650. In Bacchylides’ ode these Peloponnnesian Achaians are deliberately equated with the heroic Achaians: a deliberate play on the meaning of being ‘Achaian’ for the advantage and glorification of Alexidamos. But a further problem now arises: why are Achaians transporting an Arkadian cult with an altion rooted in Argive dynastic myth to Metapontion?

The myth, as recounted by Bacchylides, includes three foundations: firstly Tiryns, the sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi and finally Metapontion. The journey to Metapontion begins with the setting out of Proitos to found Tiryns; the later founding of Metapontion by the Achaians is the culmination of the ode’s narrative. We are therefore invited to compare Tiryns and Metapontion with the implication that this young Southern Italian colony can be as great as the Mycenaean citadel of Tiryns. The cults of Artemis at Lousoi and S. Biagio are also connected: the colonial cult enjoying a history and significance it could not otherwise have been granted. Through parallels invited by the myth, both Metapontion and Artemis’ cult at Metapontion are celebrated as divinely favoured foundations.

In the same way that comparisons are invited between Metapontion and Tiryns, and Lousoi and S. Biagio, we are invited to compare Alexidamos, the victor, and the Proitids, the protagonists of Bacchylides’ mythic narrative. Alexidamos’ victory is the gift of Artemis (37-9): the goddess rights the previous miscarriage of justice (27-8) in the same way that she restores balance to the minds of the Proitids (107-9). Both Alexidamos and the Proitids thank the goddess with a choros: the Proitids establish choroi of gynaikes at Lousoi (112) while Alexidamos’ family have commissioned this ode which is performed by strong-limbed youths in Metapontion (10-11). Artemis is the goddess of both young women and young
men; the emphasis on her initiatory role is clear as the Proitids establish choroi of gynaikes, not parthenoi, in acknowledgement of their imminent change of status (Dowden 1989, 91; Cairns 2005, 44). The epithets with which Bacchylides describes the goddess underscore this theme.

As Bacchylides uses the recollection of Artemis’ correction of the Olympic judges’ mistake and her gift of victory to Alexidamos as a step to the mythic narrative (37ff.), the goddess is awarded four epithets: Agrotera, of the golden distaff (χρυσαλάκτως), Hemera, and famed for her bow (τοξόκλατος). As Agrotera (huntress) and Hemera (gentle), Artemis represents both the wild and the tame. This juxtaposition introduces a theme which permeates the ode: the madness of the Proitids which is eventually tamed and the contrast of the wilderness they roam with the civilised foundations of Tiryns and Metapontion (Segal 1976, 127-8). The bestial imagery used for the Proitids (55-6) and the lack of specific details around their number and names stress their generic role in the community (Cairns 2005, 45-6). Later in the ode Artemis is the huntress of animals (ἡροσκόπος) (107) immediately before the restoration of the Proitids and their description as bud-garlanded (108); the contrast between wild and tame is again emphasised. Artemis ability to tame and her control over both spheres are stressed in the ode; in particular the myth emphasises her role in yoking and taming parthenoi (Seaford 1988, 118-24). The bud-garlanded Proitids are also of interest on account of the figurines discovered at S. Biagio which appear to have buds on their crowns (chapter 3.2.3). The title Hemera also hints at the myth which is about to be told: it is the goddess’ cult-title at Lousoi (Paus. 8.18.7-8). The epithets can be understood as two pairs of contradictory titles which both complement the power of the goddess expressed through her taming of the Proitids (Burnett 1985, 108).

However, it is perhaps most interesting to consider the version of the Proitid myth related by Bacchylides in comparison with the earlier Hesiodic (fr.129-133 M-W) and contemporary Pherekydian (fr. 114 Fowler) traditions. The manipulation of the myth by Bacchylides may reveal more of his purpose in employing the Proitids for the mythic narrative of an ode celebrating Alexidamos’ victory. The differences between the myth in these authors have been discussed by Burkert (1985, 101-113), Seaford (1988), Dowden (1989, 71-104), Maehler (2004, 134-6), Bernardini (2004a), Dorati (2004) and Cairns (2005). They are numerous, but key for our purposes in understanding Bacchylides’ purpose here are the circumstances of Proitios’ departure from Argos and the absence of both Dionysos and the seer Melampous.
The quarrel between Proitios and his brother, Acrisius, is the catalyst for Proitios' departure from Argos and foundation of Tiryns (59-81). The quarrel is exacerbated in later sources and in Bacchylides a bloody war is avoided by a petition of the people and the support of Zeus. Bacchylides' exclusion of a bloody or incestuous conflict allows a focus on the power of the community who request the calm departure of Proitios (57-70) (Burnett 1985, 109; Cairns 2005, 38-9). Apollodorus' (Bibl. 2.2.1-2) account of the Proitids conflates their myth with that of the women of Argos (Hdt. 9.34; Apollod. Bibl. 1.9.12, 3.5.2; Diod. Sic. 4.68; Paus. 2.18.4; Dowden 1989, 78-80). The myth of the women of Argos follows a similar pattern to that of the Proitids in that the females are driven mad and leave the polis to roam in the chora. Dionysos' power over married women, gynaikes, is demonstrated in the myth; the women are ultimately healed by Melampous. In Bacchylides' version the parthenoi are afflicted by Hera, the goddess whose realm they are about to join, and there are only a couple of possible allusions to a Dionysiac version (Machler 2004, 147; Cairns 2005, 43-4). Bacchylides' purpose in emphasising the importance of the community would not be supported by including a potent symbol of civic disruption, such as Dionysos. However, it is probable that the two myths were conflated at a later date owing to their similarities (Seaford 1988, 130; Jost 1992, 181; Calame 2001, 135-7; Cairns 2005, 42; Kowalzig 2007, 276-7).

However, the most interesting difference for our purposes here between Bacchylides on the one hand and Hesiod and Pherekydes on the other is his exclusion of Melampous, the seer who heals the Proitids. By removing the seer, the Proitids are healed on account of a direct appeal from their father to Artemis, thus awarding the goddess a special prominence in the myth; some later sources follow this amendment (Callim. 3.233-6; Paus. 8.18.7-8). The direct intervention of the goddess on behalf of the Proitids recalls the goddess' intervention on behalf of Alexidamos after his previous injustice at Olympia; the goddess ends the unnatural frenzies of the Proitids and restores equilibrium to Alexidamos. It is also interesting to note that Artemis appeals directly to Hera to cure the Proitids; these two goddesses enjoyed prominent cults in the Metapontine chora: Hera at Tavole Palatine (de Polignac 1995, 100; Carter 2006, 157-163) and Artemis at S. Biagio (chapter 2). The Proitids are about to cross from Artemis' domain into that of Hera as they pass from being parthenoi to gynaikes. Melampous demands the splitting of Proitios' kingdom as his reward for curing the Proitids (Dowden 1989, 94-5). Therefore by excluding Melampous there is no need to split the kingdom and the theme of the civic power of the community is maintained.

33 On the tradition of Melampous see, for example, Jost (1992).
Alexidamos’ homecoming and victory have strengthened the Metapontine community and the ode as a whole emphasises civic power (Seaford 1988, 132-3; Dougherty 1993, 129-35). The marriage of the Proitids is excluded as it traditionally involves the fragmenting of their father’s kingdom but marriage is the inevitable conclusion of the experience of any mortal *parthenos* and this marriage ensures the propagation and future of the community (Cairns 2005, 46-8).

The antiquity and legitimacy of Artemis’ cult is emphasised in the ode through Bacchylides’ equation of the Peloponnesian Achaian, who had re-settled the site c.650, with the Achaian heroes of the Trojan War. The goddess is honoured by choruses of *gynaikes* (Lousoi) and youths (Metapontion). Artemis’ appeal to Hera on the Proitids’ behalf introduces her role as a goddess of *parthenoi* and transitions, which is illustrated through the epithets attributed to her in the ode. Moreover, it recalls the local cultic landscape as both goddesses had early sanctuaries in the Metapontine *chora*. Artemis is omnipresent in the ode: she appears with Alexidamos in the opening sections, as a protagonist in the myth of the Proitids and at the end as the Achaian transfer her cult to Metapontion. The emphasis on the goddess is clear; the reason for this may be suggested by Bacchylides’ account of its performance (8-12). The celebration is taking place in the *asty*, the heart of the *polis*; this is not the grove (*atsos*) described at the end of the ode (118-19) (Cairns 2005, 48). Contemporaneous with this ode is the construction of a new temple in the Metapontine *agora*, temple D, which may have been dedicated to Artemis and part of a move to transfer rural cults into the heart of the *polis* (chapter 2). Bacchylides’ inspiration for this subject matter may have been drawn from this new temple and may therefore mark the end of the cult’s journey which can be traced back to Proitios’ original departure from Argos to the heart of the Metapontine *polis*.

1.2 Other myths of Artemis

1.2.1 Keryneian hind

Pindar’s third Olympian ode celebrates Theron of Akragas’ victory in the Olympian chariot-race of 476.\(^{34}\) In the central mythical narrative Pindar focuses upon Herakles’ journey to the land of the Hyperboreans for the olive trees which he subsequently plants at Olympia (16-34) (Wilamowitz 1922, 237-40). Artemis features briefly on account of a recollection of

\(^{34}\)This sporting victory post-dates Theron’s military victory at Himera by a mere four years; Pindar’s praise of Theron can therefore be understood to allude to both his military and sporting success.
Herakles’ previous journey to the land of the Hyperboreans during his search for the golden-horned hind (25-30).\textsuperscript{35} The goddess is called both Leto’s horse-driving daughter (26), probably simply one of a number of allusions to Theron’s equine victory (4, 19, 24, 37-8, 39; Newman and Newman 1984, 181),\textsuperscript{36} and Orthosia (30); I shall return to the significance of this second title below.

The Hyperborean location for the myth of Herakles’ capture of the golden-horned hind is unique to this ode (Robbins 1982, 299-302).\textsuperscript{37} The Hyperboreans were a remote people,\textsuperscript{38} especially associated with Apollo (Pind. \textit{Ol.} 3.16, \textit{Pyth.} 10.29-36; Diod. Sic. 2.47; Paus. 10.5.7, 9), whose role in Delian myth is recorded later in the fifth century by Herodotus (4.33-5). Artemis’ appearance in a remote environment, one which is especially associated with Apollo, is not surprising. Arguments for this reference revealing some peculiar aspect of the goddess are somewhat laboured, for example, Verdenius’ suggestion (1987, 26) that the passage presents Artemis as a tree-goddess.\textsuperscript{39} The myth of the hind may have already been well known (Schol. Pind. \textit{Ol.} 3.50a, vol.1, p.119, 1.17-25 Drachmann); it is fully recounted in later sources where it is called either the Keryneian (Callim. \textit{Hymn} 3.107-9) or Kerynitian hind (Apollod. \textit{Bibl.} 2.5.3).\textsuperscript{40} Herakles’ capture of the hind may have appeared on an archaic metope at Selinus (Wilson 1995-6, 121); it was also represented by several Etrurian akroteria (Glinister 2000, 59-60).

Taygeta’s association with the hind is explicitly mentioned only by Pindar. The scholiast (Schol. Pind. \textit{Ol.} 3.53 d-e, vol.1, p.121, 1.7-15 Drachmann) records that during her flight

\textsuperscript{35} Mullen (1982, 132-3) discusses this digression from the main mythic narrative in the context of its performance: once the metrical unit of the epode is complete the chorus start to dance again and return to their proper theme.

\textsuperscript{36} Compare Artemis \textit{hipposoa} (Pind. fr. Z7.3 Rutherford). Other scholars have declared the title confusing or proposed more convoluted explanations; see, for example, Farnell (1932, 28), Bowra (1964, 4) and and Verdenius (1987, 26).

\textsuperscript{37} The myth is usually associated with Arkadia; Artemis was a popular goddess in rural Arkadia (Jost 1985, 393-425). However, Pindar possibly includes an allusion to the traditional version by imagining Herakles journeying from Arkadia to the land of the Hyperboreans.

\textsuperscript{38} Here Pindar identifies the land of the Hyperboreans with the Istrian peninsula on the Adriatic coast, this is one of a number of possibilities proposed by ancient authors (Bridgman 2004, 27-8, 37), but compare his treatment of them in \textit{Pythian} 10 (Brown 1992). On the origin of the legend of the Hyperboreans and its association with the amber trade see Harris (1925).

\textsuperscript{39} Some of Artemis’ cult-titles do betray an association with trees (Paus. 3.24.8, 8.13.2). For Artemis’ association with the palm see chapter 3.

\textsuperscript{40} Both names betray the original Arkadian origin of the hind; the Keryneia was an Arcadian hill and the Kerynites an Arcadian river. Later sources for the labour are Diod. Sic. (4.13.1), Ael. (\textit{On Animals} 7.39 - quoting Euripides’ lost \textit{Temenidae} and Pindar) and Hyginus (\textit{Fab.} 30); the consistent details are the creature’s golden horns and Herakles’ capture of it alive. For the iconography of this labour see Gantz (1993, 388-9).
from the amorous Zeus, Taygeta was turned into a hind by Artemis; the metamorphosis was later reversed and Taygeta dedicated a hind to Artemis in thanks.\(^4\) There is a possible allusion to Taygeta’s rape by Zeus in the Hesiodic *Ehoiai* (fr. 169-75 M-W). However, it was certainly depicted on the Amyklai throne in the second half of the sixth century (Paus. 3.18.20; Kourinou-Pikoula 1994, no. 1) and Euripides also appears to allude to Taygeta’s metamorphosis and rape in the *Helen* (381-3; Robinson 2006, 157-9, esp. n. 15). The reversal of the metamorphosis suggested in Pindar’s passage and attested by the scholiast reflects the failure of Artemis’ attempt to rescue Taygeta.\(^2\) Taygeta bore Zeus a son: Lakedaimon (Hellanikos *FGrH* 4 F19a-b; Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.10.3; Paus. 3.1.2, 18.10; Hyg. *Fab.* 155, Ast. 2.21; Ov. *Fast.* 4.169, Nonnus *Dion.* 32.65),\(^3\) who is an important figure in Spartan genealogical myth (Hdt. 6.56.1).

In the passage with which we are concerned here, Taygeta inscribes the hind with the name Orthosia and dedicates it to the goddess. Orthosia is Artemis (Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 3.54b-d, vol.1, p.121-2, 1.21-4 Drachmann; Gildersleeve 1890, 160; Sandys 1922; Calame 1987, 163; Race 1997a); in particular, a Spartan Artemis who was worshipped at a sanctuary on the right bank of the river Eurotas (Dawkins 1929, 285-377).\(^4\) A number of equine votives have been discovered at this site (Dawkins 1929, 142, 217-8, 241-3; Waugh 2000); allowing Bowra (1964, 43) to understand the previous description of Artemis as Leto’s horse-driving daughter as an allusion to this cult too. Pindar’s nomenclature in this passage is significant as it is appears to provide a *terminus ante quem* for the worship of Artemis and assimilation of Artemis with Orthosia (or Orthia) at this site.\(^5\) This reference to a Spartan cult of Artemis

---

\(^{41}\) The hind dedicated may be the one into which Taygeta was transformed, the goddess may have separated her from it (Gantz 1993, 386), or it could be another hind found by Taygeta whose horns she had gilded (Farnell 1932, 28).

\(^{42}\) Zeus probably raped Taygeta while she was the deer (Robinson 2006, 157).

\(^{43}\) Although the sources for the Spartan genealogical mythology are largely hellenistic, the myth probably dates between the second half of the sixth century and the first quarter of the fifth century (Calame 1987, 176-7; Malkin 1994, 20).

\(^{44}\) The meaning of Orthosia, and the later name associated with the site: Orthia, are unclear. See Honigmann, Kruse (1943) and Kruse (1943). Pausanias (3.16.7-11) explains the title as ‘upright,’ which can include a meaning as safe or well. Verdenius (1987, 29-30) understands it here as saving or preserving: a form of Sóteira.

\(^{45}\) There is no epigraphic evidence for Artemis’ worship at the site until the Flavian period (Dawkins 1929, 293). The predominance of lead deer figurines in the archaeological record following the archaic flooding of the sanctuary and the discovery of small lead figurines of Artemis have been understood, although not universally, as evidence for Artemis’ worship at the site (Dawkins 1929, 278; Wace 1929, 283; Nilsson 1950, 505; Boardman 1963; Cavangh and Laxton 1984; Pipili 1987, 44; Alroth 1987, 17-8, 1989, 108-113; Carter 1988). See below pp.45, 79, 93ff; the latter is a detailed discussion of Artemis’ relationship with the Potnia Theron.
operates within the wider Dorian framework of the ode (1-3, 4-9, 38-41),46 which reflects the Dorian ancestry of Akragas, a foundation of Rhodian Gela (Thuc. 6.4; Diod. Sic. 11.48.8, 49.3-4; Robbins 1982, 305).

1.2.2 Koronis

Pindar includes the myths of Koronis (8-46) and Asklepios (47-58) in the first half of his third Pythian ode for Hieron of Syracuse;47 the ode may have been composed as an enkomion because Hieron was ill rather than to celebrate a specific victory.48 The inclusion of Asklepios, Koronis and the references to Cheiron (1, 63) highlight the boundary between mortal and immortal. Currie (2005, 344-405) has argued that the ode is primarily concerned with immortality, in particular Hieron’s preoccupation with immortality on account of his illness and his claim to immortality on account of his role as oikist of Aitna (Diod. Sic. 11.66.4; Malkin 1987, 96-7, 204-40). Artemis’ inclusion in the ode is therefore determined by her role in Koronis’ fate; Pindar’s use of ring-composition in his narrative of Koronis’ fate allows the goddess to feature twice (9-11, 32-6).49 The myth of Koronis is clearly set in Thessaly (33) and there is no explicit recollection of Artemis’ role or character as a Syracusan goddess.

In her initial summary appearance Artemis sends her golden arrows to overcome (9) Koronis in her chamber. Pindar confirms that Artemis is the agent of Apollo (12) and comments upon the wrath of Zeus’ children (12-13).50 The scene is neither violent (Young 1968, 33) nor unusual (Hom. Od. 11.172-3, 18.201-3, 20.56-83).51 Towards the end of Pindar’s mythic narrative of Koronis, Artemis’ role is recounted in more specific detail: Apollo sends Artemis raging with irresistible force (32-3)52 to Thessaly where the goddess kills Koronis and many of her neighbours (34-6). The significance of Artemis’ rage, the fiery image and

46 The ode may have been performed in the temple of the Dioskouroi at the Theoxenia (Farnell 1932, 224; Fränkel 1961, 394-5; Race 1986, 67, Krummen 1990, 219-22; Lehmus 2004, 53).
47 The exact date of the ode is uncertain, but it post-dates the founding of Aitna in 476 (Sandys 1924, 182; Burton 1962, 78-9; Finlay 1996, 90-1; Race 1997, 242).
49 On Pindar’s use of ring composition here see Burton (1962, 81), Young (1968, 33), Lefkowitz (1976, 143) and Race (1986, 53).
50 Gantz (1993, 98) discusses examples of Artemis acting as an agent of the gods including Apollo, Dionysos and Zeus.
51 The golden arrows described here by Pindar are a regular attribute of the goddess in Homer too (II. 16.183, Od. 4.122).
52 Race (1997, 249) follows Schulze’s emendation: θύοισαι. See Lefkowitz (1976, 146) and Young (1968, 38-9) for the meaning here, which is suggestive of Bacchic revenge or ‘burning’.
the apparent cruelty of the slaughter of Koronis’ neighbours has been explained as the onset of temporary rage or madness (Lefkowitz 1976, 146), the goddess’ delivery of a plague (Faraone 2003, 48-9) or a complementary reference to the ode’s overall theme of immortalisation by fire (Currie 2005, 360-3).

1.2.3 Calydonian boar

Bacchylides’ fifth ode probably celebrates Hieron’s victory in the single horse-race at Olympia in 476 (37-40); Pindar’s first Olympian ode probably celebrates the same victory (Burnett 1985, 197 n.1; Maehler 2004, 106-7). The poet’s praise of Hieron’s victory is accompanied by allusions to the recent military victory at Himera (Maehler 2004, 111). The main mythic narrative is provided by Meleager whom Herakles meets in the underworld; Meleager recounts the myth of the Calydonian boar which ended with his death (97-154). The encounter between Herakles and Meleager allows a tragic comparison to be drawn between these two heroes. Bacchylides’ description of Meleager’s death by the burning log pre-figures the fiery death of Herakles. A third parallel was intended for the audience: Herakles’ death was followed by his apotheosis and welcome to Olympos. Hieron too can expect heroisation after his death in his capacity as oikist of Aitna founded in 476 (Lefkowitz 1976, 55-74; Burnett 1985, 141-9; Grossardt 2001, 67-72). Meleager twice mentions Artemis in his narrative (98-107, 122-4) but does not explain the reason for her anger; presumably he expected his audience to be familiar with his father’s failure to offer the goddess the first fruits of his harvest (Hom. Il. 9.534-7).

While the narrative detail concerning Artemis provided by Bacchylides does not differ from the Homeric account, we should consider the initial epithets associated with the goddess: bud-crowned (καλυκοστεφάνος) (98), august (σεμυνός) (99) and white-armed

---

53 The meeting of Meleager and Herakles in this ode recalls the meeting of Odysseus and Teirias in the Odyssey (11.90ff.; Lefkowitz 1976, 75-6). There are strong Homeric allusions throughout the ode; see Lefkowitz (1963). Burnett (1985, 141) has identified other influences in this passage and compares it with the messenger scenes in Athenian tragic plays.

54 Later sources continue with this reason for Artemis’ anger: Callim. Hymn 3, 260-1; Apollod. Bibl. 1.8.2; Diod. Sic. 4.34.2; Paus. 7.18.10. It appears Euripides’ lost play Meleager also included this detail (Page 1937, 179). On Stesichoros’ account of the myth see Garner (1979, 27).

55 Differences in other part of the myth’s narrative do exist, in particular the detail of Meleager’s death; see Burnett (1985, 198-9, n. 11) and Maehler (2004, 108-9). On the development of this myth in general see for example Swain (1988) and Grossardt (2001); Grossardt (2001, 67-72) considers Bacchylides’ treatment of the myth.
(λευκωλένος) (99). Of these three semnos is a common title of deities in epitikia; however only Bacchylides calls Artemis bud-crowned and white-armed. The description of Artemis as bud-crowned recalls the violet-crowned Muses invoked in the opening lines of the ode (3-4). The epithet is also used by Bacchylides of the Proitids in his eleventh ode (108), discussed above, and recalls the figurines of Artemis from the sanctuary at S. Biagio in the Metapontine chora which appear to have buds emerging from the top of their poloi (S 17, 11; chapter 3). The use of white-armed as an epithet of Artemis is less easy to explain; Homer employs it regularly as an epithet of Hera and it also appears associated with this goddess in archaic inscriptions (CRESCAM, no. 2853: Argive Heraion, no. 2854: Perachora). The shared epithet may allude to the characterisation of both Artemis and Hera as vengeful goddesses: Herakles’ labours are driven by Hera’s anger while Artemis’ anger led to the episode related by Meleager (Lefkowitz 1976, 60).

Meleager briefly recalls the continued anger of Artemis in lines 122-4; Artemis is now the fierce (δαίφρον) huntress (ὑγροτέρα). While Artemis is frequently Agrotera, daiphron is later used of Althaia as she plans Meleager’s death (137); Althaia is an agent of Artemis and continues the act of vengeance (Burnett 1985, 143). The implication of Artemis and Althaia burning with anger, manifested in Althaia’s burning of the log (Lefkowitz 1976, 63; Burnett 1985, 143), recall the goddess’ anger and act of vengeance, on behalf of Apollo, in Pythian 3.32-6. The ode closes with Bacchylides’ conviction that Zeus will guard Hieron (200) reflecting a general desire for peace after Himera (Maehler 2004, 129). The brief mention of Artemis allows the audience to consider the bad fortune which befell Oineus for failing to honour Artemis; the inference is that the Syracusans, led by Hieron, will not make this mistake (Burnett 1985, 148-9).

56 Bacchylides’ allusions to Homer in the ode do not include Artemis’ epithet in relation to this myth: Homer calls her golden-throned (Hom. Il. 9.533).
57 Calliope is also ‘white-armed’ in line 176.
58 Homer calls Hera white-armed 22 times in the Iliad (http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu: accessed 7 June 2009); the epithet is not exclusive to Hera in Homer.
Chapter 2

The archaeology of Artemis cult

The archaeological and epigraphical evidence for the worship of Artemis in Southern Italy and Sicily is listed in the archaeology catalogue;\(^1\) the small number of sites attested is immediately evident.\(^2\) Votive deposits exclusively or predominantly filled with figurines of Artemis are a strong indication for her cult. However, the dedication of figurines of Artemis within a votive deposit, which includes a variety of different types of figurines, does not constitute evidence for her worship.\(^3\) Brulotte (2002, 179), in his review of Peloponnesian cults of Artemis, considered the image of the goddess on a coin as evidence for the goddess’ cult somewhere within the territory of the minting city. While this may often be the case, the substantial numismatic evidence from Southern Italy and Sicily deserves its own chapter. I have included a summary below (table 2.1), comparing the evidence from the archaeology catalogue with the evidence from the coin catalogue. A table of epithets is included at the back of the archaeology catalogue. We should note that these epithets are often recorded by authors who are chronologically and geographically removed from the archaic and classical reality of Southern Italy and Sicily; the precise source details are specified in the table of epithets. Before I begin this discussion of the evidence in the catalogue I shall consider the definition of a cult-site, patterns and trends already observed of the temene of Southern Italy and Sicily, and the wider scholarship on Artemis’ temene in the Greek world.\(^4\) This review will provide a useful framework for our study and suggest the details upon which we should focus.

---

\(^1\) The evidence for the catalogue has been compiled following a thorough review of the Archaeological Reports, published by the BSA, and the invaluable editions of the BTCGI. Reports published by the Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, following the annual conferences held in Taranto, have further supported my research. The bibliography for the archaeological exploration of a site and the ancient sources for each epithet are provided in the catalogue; this chapter should be read in conjunction with the catalogue.

\(^2\) There are less than twenty entries in the catalogue; compare these results with Brulotte (2002, 179) who identified 165 cults of Artemis in the Peloponnesse from archaic to Roman times. However, a large number of his sites are attested only by Pausanias, who did not include Southern Italy and Sicily in his writings.

\(^3\) See Alroth (1989, 108-113) on the dedication of a figurine of one god in a sanctuary dedicated to another god. Artemis was one of the most popular ‘visitors’ in other gods’ sanctuaries. See also chapter 3.1 below.

\(^4\) The terminology for a place where a Greek divinity received cult is varied; two of the most common terms are sanctuary and temenos. I will predominately use the latter throughout this chapter; I believe it is
Table 2.1: Comparison of archaeological with numismatic evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sicily</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence</th>
<th>Numismatic evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cefalù</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>C S15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C S16-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zankle-Messana (Mylai)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C S8-11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Italy</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Archaeological evidence</th>
<th>Numismatic evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Possibly</td>
<td>C 13-4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C 111-12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhegion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>C 121-27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A divinity could receive an offering at a variety of locations ranging from something as simple as an altar, herm or natural feature of the landscape to a large temenos with temples, treasuries and ostentatious dedications. Regardless of its physical form, a cult-site facilitated contact between mortal and god (or hero) (Schachter 1992, 56-7). This site could be located anywhere within the territory, from the akropolis or agora of the asty to the wildest and remotest part of the chora. Wherever it is located, it can usually be defined by its relation to the polis (Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 295; Schachter 1992, 9-10). Malkin (1987, 135-186) has reviewed the urban and suburban sanctuaries established by the Greek colonists and observed the clear decisions made about the location of cults in their new poleis. The deliberate placement of sanctuaries in peripheral areas reflects both practical and religious considerations. Furthermore, preferable to sanctuary as this term has colloquially become associated with large-scale cult-sites and can imply a much grander location than some of those we will be considering.

5 On the layout of archaic architectural sanctuaries see Bergquist (1967). The collections by Alcock and Osborne (1994) and Hägg and Marinatos (1993) are fruitful for the student of the Greek sanctuary. Burkert (1985, 84-7) and Parker (1983, 161-3) discuss the concept of ritual pollution and the requirement for the sanctuary to be separated from 'profane' land. More recently, Dignus (2007) has addressed the use of these sites.
the majority of cults first established were imported: they created a physical bond with the deities of their homeland (Malkin 1987, 185).

The origin of Greek *temene*, especially those outside the *asty*, in Southern Italy and Sicily has been the subject of much debate. Ciaceri (1911) and Giannelli (1963, 2nd ed.) originally argued that the Greeks adopted and hellenised existing deities and cult sites. An alternative theory, of which Pugliese Carratelli (1962, 1965) is the most long-standing and notable proponent, is that the Greeks of the eighth and seventh centuries continued to practice cult at *temene* originally established in the west by the Mycenaeans. However, there is little, if indeed any, archaeological evidence for the practice of cult at any of the western Greek *temene* prior to the seventh century (Edlund 1987, 144-5) and this lack of archaeological data is damaging to both theories. Furthermore, Pearson (1974) has refuted Pugliese Carratelli’s use of early myths concerning Homeric heroes, who he envisaged in a Mycenaean reality, landing in the west to support his theory. Vallet (1968) argued that the *temene* used by the Greeks were new foundations and expressions of territorial sovereignty with social significance for the colonists’ identity in their new home. However, this was not virgin territory; Carter’s (2006, 159-61) work in the Metapontine *chora* has suggested that at least some of these sites were places of interaction between Greeks and indigenous populations.

François de Polignac’s (1995) ground-breaking study of the relationship between (especially extra-urban) cult and territory at the beginning of the development of the *polis* remains an influential approach to the understanding of Greek sacred space. Malkin (1996, esp. 79-80) has responded to de Polignac’s thesis and argued that it reflects the historic reality of the established and developed, rather than the emerging, *polis*. The placement of extra-urban *temene*, especially in the colonial foundations, demonstrates the practice of allotting land to the gods as well as the colonists. A piece of land dedicated as an extra-urban sanctuary fulfilled the requirement of the

---

6 Edlund (1987, 41-2) classified these as extra-mural, extra-urban, political, rural and sanctuaries in nature. See de Polignac (1995, 92) for their further distinction as non-monumental. De Polignac (1995, 94) also expresses frustration with the belief that these extra-urban sanctuaries are a peculiarly western-colonial phenomenon.

7 Vallet’s (1968) article represents a significant contribution to this argument. However, he was not the first to consider the possibility that cults outside the *asty* held a territorial and social significance for the newly arrived Greeks; see, for example, Hermann (1965).

8 The 1995 volume cited here is a revised version of the edition originally published in 1984 as *La naissance de la cité grecque*.
colonists to provide the gods with a clearly defined and sizeable temenos. Rather than marking the edge of the territory, which was in the process of being settled, these temene may be an indication of the colonists’ aspirations with regard to the territory outside the asty of their new polis.9

We can therefore expect to see the Greek temene in Southern Italy and Sicily established early in the colony’s life in carefully selected locations. These temene will often be dedicated to gods already familiar from the colonists’ homeland. Extra-urban sanctuaries, demonstrating both the honour due to the gods and territorial ambitions, also await us. But what should we expect specifically for the temene of Artemis? Kallimachos’ hellenistic hymn to the goddess imagines a childish Artemis, resting with her father, discussing which places should belong to her. The goddess asks Zeus for all mountains and any city (expressing no interest in any such place) (Callim. Hymn 3.18ff). Zeus grants her requests but gives her ‘three times ten’ cities (Callim. Hymn 3.33-7) and calls her the guardian of streets and harbours (Callim. Hymn 3.38-9). Artemis cult in the asty (for example: Soph. OT 160-2; Paus. 1.23.7; Rhodes and Dobbins 1979; Thomson 1940, 139) and at harbours (for example: Paus. 1.1.4; Garland 1987, 113) is attested. However, despite Zeus’ insistence that she have some association with the city, rural cult-sites of the goddess, including the mountains, which according to Kallimachos all belonged to Artemis, are the most frequently attested (Hom. Od. 6.102-9; Soph. OT 206-8; Eur. IT 126-7; Eur. Tro. 551-2; Jost 1994, 220; Cole 2004, 178-80). Edlund’s (1987, 124-5) survey of rural temene in Southern Italy reveals that temene dedicated to Artemis were often dedicated in extra-mural locations. This rural nature of Artemis’ cult is regularly reflected in the goddess’ cult-title (Jost 1985, 396; Cole 2004, 191).

Cole (2004, 181-2) begins her chapter on the ‘landscapes of Artemis’ (an updated version of Cole (2000)) by considering the various explanations for the location of the goddess’ cult-sites in rural and remote areas: the physical location of the sanctuary is usually understood as an expression of the goddess’ character or cult. These sites mark her as a goddess of hunting and fertility, a thesis specific to Arkadia but seemingly applicable throughout Greece (Jost 1994,

---

9 Malkin (1996) uses the examples of the Heraion at Foce del Sele and the cults at Cyrene to illustrate his argument. The only fixed ‘boundary’ of the new western colonies was the coast dividing the land from the sea. The land outside the asty was explored over the following centuries as the Greeks pushed further into the hinterland.
The separation from the urban centre allowed the procession of young people to and from the sanctuary to act as a metaphor for the maturation rites in which they participated within the sanctuary (de Polignac 1995, 60-2). Myths of conflict, and even genocide, at these sites emphasise their role as territorial boundaries far away from the civilised centre of the polis (Ellinger 1984; de Polignac 1995, 56-8; cf. Dougherty 1993).

Cole (2004, 184-197) ultimately articulates ‘dangerous or threatened passage’ as a consistent feature of Artemis’ landscape, and follows de Polignac (1995) by recognising many of these sites as political boundaries, arguing that the goddess protected these areas and tied them to the asty. However, as we have seen, Malkin (1996) has demonstrated the problem of calling these sites ‘boundary’ cults when they were established in the early years of the polis before its territory was fully defined. We should understand these sites as remarkable for their natural phenomena, which were initially non-political boundaries; the goddess’ cult on mountains differentiated two types of terrain before they marked two different territories. Artemis cult-sites were natural boundaries between the wild and the cultivated (Frontisi-Ducroux 1981, 49-50; Vernant 1991, 197-8). The range of landscapes in which the goddess was worshipped is unique to Artemis; other deities may have received cult at similar sites but Artemis is the only goddess worshipped in all of these landscapes (mountains, cities, streets, harbours and the chora). This diversity of location reinforces her character as a goddess of transitions and marginal areas (Schachter 1992, 51); it also means we should not be surprised to find Artemis anywhere in Southern Italy or Sicily.

Evidence for the goddess’ cult in Sicily and Southern Italy has already been compiled in early histories, such as Ciaceri (1911) and Giannelli (1963, 2nd ed.), which devoted a small number of pages to Artemis in their overall study of western Greek religion. In more recent years studies of particular areas or phenomena, for example the ‘countryside’ of Magna Graecia (Edlund 1987) or the Adriatic coast (Rossignoli 2004), have incorporated evidence for the goddess’ cult. Cole’s analysis (2000, 2004, 178-197) of the ‘landscapes of Artemis’ incorporates evidence from these areas into her discussion of Artemis cult throughout the Greek world. My purpose here is to compile the current archaeological evidence for Artemis cult, without a particular focus on one specific region or trend, and ultimately to compare it with the evidence from the epinikia, iconography and coins also reviewed in this thesis. I shall consider the evidence for each site with four key questions in mind: (a) how does this evidence compare with any cult of the
goddess in the mother-city? (b) What is Artemis’ epithet? (c) Is the goddess associated with any other divinities? (d) Where is the site physically located within the landscape of Southern Italy and Sicily?

2.1 Sicily

I shall follow the order of the temene listed in the catalogue in this review of the Sicilian evidence. The first Sicilian site listed in the catalogue is Cefalu on the north coast of Sicily which features in the catalogue since the remains on the mountain above the town are known as the ‘Temple of Diana.’ The remains visible today date back to the hellenistic and Roman periods. The mountainous location of the remains, a cave and the water source at the site have reasonably led to the expectation that the remains were used to worship a divinity (Marconi 1929, 294-5; Scully 1962, 64; Hermann 1965, 56). Marconi’s (1929, 295) analysis of the site demonstrates that activity there pre-dated the arrival of the Greeks; it may have been associated with a local nymph. There is certainly no evidence to associate the site with the Greek goddess Artemis, and even its religious function is now questioned (BTCGI s.v. Cefalu (Tullio), 213-14).

Selinus is a site more worthy of our attention. In addition to the possibility that the goddess received cult on the akropolis, which I shall turn to shortly, Artemis probably features in several of the archaic and classical metopes of the city’s temples (AS SI-6, chapter 4) and appears on a coin series of the mid-fifth century (C S15; chapter 5). The temples on the akropolis and the eastern hill are usually referred to by the alphabetical letters attributed to them by the excavators while their attribution to specific deities has preoccupied many scholars. Temple C on the akropolis is generally acknowledged as the temple of Apollo (Marconi 2007, 132-3); Apollo appears to have been an important god at Selinus, which is probably a reflection of his role in Megara (Paus. 1.42.2, 5). In the first half of the fifth century the akropolis temenos underwent some modifications including the construction of two new temples (De Angelis 2003, 138-9). The temples are virtually identical in design, measuring c.40m x 16m; unfortunately little other detail about them survives. Their twin appearance has led to the suggestion that they were dedicated to Apollo and Artemis (Tusa 1967; Bejor 1977). The Olympian twins were not the only twins in Greek mythology; the Dioskouroi, for example, are another possibility here.

On Artemis’ association with mountains see Hom. Od. 6.103-4; Eur. Tro. 553; Paus. 3.20.4-5; Cole (2004, 178-80, 184).
However, the association of these temples with Apollo and Artemis is reasonable when compared with the joint appearance of Apollo and Artemis on earlier metopes from the akropolis (AS S1, 3-4) and contemporary coinage.

Selinus was the most westerly Greek colony in Sicily, founded in c.628/7 (Thuc. 6.4.2) or c.651/0 (Diod. Sic. 13.59.4) by Megara Hyblaea, which was itself a Megarian foundation (Dunbabin 1948, 301-3; Bérard 1957, 244-6; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004a, 221).

Apollo and Artemis received cult together in Megara; Pausanias (1.43.3) confirms the cult titles Apollo Agraios and Artemis Agrotera and describes a statue group of the twins with their mother by Praxiteles (Paus 1.44.2). The construction of these temples comes shortly after the Selinuntines switched allegiance in the power-struggles on Sicily. They had supported Carthage in the Battle of Himera in 480 and, having been on the losing side, were, in 466, supporting the Syracusans in the liberation of their city from the tyrant Thrasybulus (Diod. Sic. 11.68). The rebuilding of their relationship with Syracuse supported the growth of their political power and treasury which is remarked upon by Thucydides (6.20.4) before the Athenian expedition. The dedication of these temples to two gods worshipped in Megara may be a physical representation of their change in policy from supporting the Carthaginians to allying themselves with the other Greeks of Sicily. There was also a cult of Artemis Soteira in ancient Megara; Pausanias (1.40.2-3, 1.44.4) explains the aition for the two temene of this cult: Artemis had saved the people by confusing the general leading enemy forces during the Persian War. A goddess who could save the city would have been a popular choice given the threat of the Carthaginians to this western Greek city that had recently abandoned the Carthaginian cause.

Syracuse was a Corinthian colony founded on the south-east coast of Sicily in 734 by the oikist Archias. It was the second Greek colony to be founded on Sicily, after Naxos, and would become the leading Greek city on the island (Thuc. 6.3.2, Strabo 6.2.4 Bérard 1957, 116ff; Dunbabin 1948, 13-18; Malkin 1987, 41-3; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004a, 225-31; Domínguez 2006, 271-5). There are four entries in the catalogue for Syracuse: Ortygia, Scala Greca, Belvedere and Piazza della Vittoria. Moreover, the majority of the epithets recorded for Artemis’ worship on ancient Sicily are associated with Syracuse: eight out of a total of 13. Pindar’s first Nemean (3) and second Pythian (7) link Artemis to the island of Ortygia in the Syracusan harbour; Ortygia was the first part of Syracuse colonised by the Greeks. Schachter (1992, 50) has compared Artemis’ cult on Ortygia, in the centre of the new polis, to
her cult on Thasos and Kerkyra; although the centre of the asty, this was still uncertain territory over which Artemis would naturally preside. For Artemis cult on coastal and island sites see Cole (2004, 187).

The most famous ruins on Ortygia are the columns of the temple of Athena, which was dedicated following the victory at Himera in 480; the columns are still standing in situ and support the Cathedral of Mary in Piazza Duomo (Gruben 1976, 270-4; Schachter 1992, 39-40; Voza 1999, 14). On the north edge of the island there was another temple which, it is now agreed, was dedicated to Apollo (Loicq-Berger 1967, 81-3). Cicero (Verr. 2.4.53) is the first author to mention a temple of Diana on Ortygia; he reports that the temples of Diana and Minerva are superior on the island. Travellers of the eighteenth century also saw the ruins of a temple of Diana on Ortygia (Riedese 1773, 72; Swinburne 1790, 88). However, Cicero’s temple of Diana is probably the temple of Apollo on the north edge of the island (Braswell 1992, 34-5); it is possible that Artemis was also honoured in the temple dedicated to her brother. The testimony of Riedese and Swinburne is not reliable; the island has always been associated with Artemis since Pindar and local guides could easily have pointed out any ruins, or indeed those of the temple of Apollo, and claimed that they belonged to Artemis.

Archaeologists have been searching for a temple of Artemis on Ortygia for many years. Paolo Orsi’s initial investigations uncovered the foundations of a sixth-century Ionic temple underneath the modern Senate Palace; these remains were more thoroughly investigated in 1960 and attributed to Artemis by Gentili (1967, 80). The temple was never finished since construction efforts focused on the new Athenaion after the victory at Himera. Permission was finally granted to excavate underneath Piazza Duomo, in the centre of the island and directly in front of the Athenaion, in 1990. Voza (1999) published the findings of the excavation which included traces of a building, dating to the arrival of the Greeks, in the middle of the piazza.

---

11 See Drögemüller (1973, 820) for a summary of the debate over the dedication of the temple. On the temple itself see Gruben (1976, 266-9).
12 The construction of a temple to Athena on Ortygia to celebrate the victory, rather than to Artemis, is perhaps explained by the new tyranny in Syracuse and its desire to rival the Athenians. In 485 Gelon had become tyrant of Syracuse and moved to the city (Hdt. 7.156.2). Gelon was originally from Gela, a Rhodian (Hdt. 7.153.1) or Rhodio-Cretan (Thuc. 6.4.3) foundation; Gelon’s construction of the temple of Athena could recall the cult of Athena Lindia on Rhodes. The victory at Himera (Diod. Sic. 11.20-3) was compared to the Athenian-led victory at Salamis (Pind. Pyth. 1.72-80; Dunbabin 1948, 430-2). The construction of an Athenaion on Ortygia emulated the re-building of the temple of Athena on the Athenian Akropolis.
This early building was superseded by a temple with stone foundations of the seventh or sixth century which in turn was totally dismantled in antiquity (Voza 1999, 12). The location of these buildings in the centre of Ortygia and their early construction has influenced the attribution to Artemis. The discovery of an oinochoe (c.670), decorated with an image of the Potnia Theron, in the vicinity of the building under Piazza Duomo has been used to support the identification of this temple with Artemis (Voza 1999, 13; Pelagatti 1999; chapter 3).

There is no physical evidence to associate either structure with Artemis. Both temples were apparently over-shadowed (or replaced) by the later Athenain yet Artemis was still invoked as the goddess of Ortygia after Himera. Artemis’ continued importance on Ortygia, after 480, is demonstrated by the representation of Arethousa on Syracusan coinage and the testimony of later authors (chapter 5; Polyb. 8.37.2; Livy 25.23). It may simply be that Artemis’ cult was associated with the fountain of Arethousa, at which according to the Pindaric scholiast, there was a statue of the goddess (Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.12a, vol. 2, p.33-4, 1.17-2 Drachmann). We should recall that Pindar does not explicitly mention a temple or sanctuary of Artemis. The establishment of cult-sites was a priority for the colonists (Malkin 1987, 138-141; de Polignac 1995, 99-100). They were often acting upon the authority of Apollo (Malkin 1987, 142-3); the Delphic Oracle instructed Archias to found Syracuse at the Arethousa spring (Paus. 5.7.3 = Parke, Wormell 1956b, no.2). Whether genuine or not, the oracle demonstrates the importance of the fountain to the city.

As a fresh-water spring on a small island the Arethousa facilitated human habitation and could easily have been understood as a divine gift; as a natural phenomenon it could quickly be understood as a place where man could communicate with the divine. The gods could be worshipped at natural sites (Larson 2007, 57-8); for example the grove (alsos) dedicated to Artemis and other divinities near Isthmia (IG 4.203). Artemis’ temene often either encompassed or were next to water (Cole 1998, 164; Cole 2004, 186, 192-4); the sanctuary of the goddess at S. Biagio in Southern Italy, which will be discussed below, emphasised the use of water in her cult. On Ortygia offerings to Artemis (and the nymph Arethousa) could have been thrown into the fountain. Pausanias (7.24.3) reports an Achaian tradition in which cakes were

---

13 I disagree with Pelagatti’s (1999) interpretation of the significance of the oinochoe in chapter 3.
14 Offerings could be thrown into bodies of water (Cole 1988). There is even evidence for the drowning of animals as a form of sacrifice (Hom. Il. 21.131-2).
thrown into the sea for Arethousa at Syracuse. The tradition that offerings and blood from sacrifices at Olympia could be seen in the Arethousa fountain (Strabo 6.2.4; Polyb. *NH* 12.4; Pearson 1987, 95-6) may allude to a local tradition of using the fountain as a place to make offerings to Artemis.

The cult of Artemis on Ortygia may have been associated with any of the Syracusan epithets noted in the catalogue. However, three of these are especially linked with the Ortygian cult: Alpheioa, Potamia and So(teira). The first two are explicitly associated with Ortygian Artemis by Pindar (*Pyth.* 2.7) or his scholiast (Schol. Pind. *Nem.* 1.3); in both cases Artemis' cult is connected to the Arethousa spring. Artemis Alpheioa, or slight variations of the epithet but still connecting Artemis with the Alpheios, are attested in Elis (Strabo 8.3.12; Paus. 6.22.8-10). Potamia is unique and may be a description, rather than a specific epithet, of the goddess. Artemis is worshipped with a variety of water-related epithets; some are toponyms while others, for example Limnatis (CRESCAM, nos.7138-41, 1459-63, 1465-7, 1469), indicate a general association with water. So(teira) first appears on Syracusan coins as a legend associated with the head of Arethousa (C S20, chapter 5) and later appears alongside Artemis (C S21, 23, 26). If I am right in attributing this first appearance of the epithet to our goddess, it also links Artemis to the fountain.15

Paolo Orsi excavated two *temene* in the Syracusan *chora* which he associated with Artemis. The first at Scala Greca (Orsi 1900) and the second at Belvedere (Orsi 1915). Neither site has produced an inscription confirming Orsi's theory; as we shall see a number of the epithets associated with Artemis in Syracuse would complement a rural cult. Scala Greca was on the main road north out of the *polis*; in addition to the sanctuary excavated by Orsi there was also a cemetery here. During the later fortification of the *chora*, the Hexapylon gate was built at this point.16 Orsi's (1900, 353-61) excavations focused on a series of caves along the road-side; their use pre-dates the Greeks' colonisation of Syracuse and continues to the Byzantine period. Two

---

15 My attribution of this cult-title to Artemis, on the basis of the numismatic evidence, is explained in chapter 5. Cole (2004, 191-2) has noted that Soteira is one of the cult-titles associated with a civic Artemis, reflecting her role as a protector of the city and its people, it is therefore appropriate for this cult founded at the heart of the early *asty*.

16 Several of Artemis' sanctuaries were located on main roads and at gates (Cole 2004, 185-6). This dedication of road-side cults reflects her role as a goddess of passage and is shared with, among others, Hekate (Johnston 1999, 207-8). Artemis and Hekate are blurred in the iconographic record; especially with regard to the myth of the rape of Persephone (chapter 3).
of the cave interiors reveal evidence of cult activity (Orsi 1900, 357), while there is evidence for a series of statues erected at their entrance (Orsi 1900, 362). The votive deposit associated with the cult produced around 200 heads of figurines mainly of Artemis types and a variety of other fragments (Orsi 1900, 363-75). On the basis of this iconographic evidence Orsi (1900, 377-87) attributed the site to Artemis. The report of the excavations at Belvedere, which took place in 1912-13, is brief. A small rural shrine had been identified through earlier land surveys. In July 1913 Orsi excavated the votive deposit associated with the site. The deposit revealed several hundred fragments of figurines of both Artemis and Persephone; the former were of the same type as those from Scala Greca and led Orsi to suggest this was also an Artemision (Orsi 1915).

The association of Artemis with Persephone, demonstrated by the votive deposit at Belvedere, is also attested in the Syracusan district of Achradina. There was a local sanctuary dedicated to Demeter and Persephone, but a hellenistic dedication shows Artemis Pheraia was also venerated at the site (Voza 1968-9, 363-4). Pherea is a Thessalian epithet of the goddess which spread to Argos, Athens and Sikyon (Paus. 2.10.7, 23.5); Artemis Pheraia even appeared on imperial Sikyonian coinage (Schmidt 1938). The cult’s chthonic nature is demonstrated through its associated with Hekate, Bendis and Persephone (Clement 1932; Kraus 1960, 77-83). Although Artemis’ presence in this sanctuary is clearly associated with the Pheraia epithet, another of her Syracusan epithets, Angelos or Angelike, may be related to the cult of Demeter and Persephone. Ciaceri (1911, 166-7) linked this epithet to Artemis Hekate and recalled Hekate’s role in the myth of the rape of Persephone (Hom. Hymn Dem. 24, 51ff.).

17 Artemis is described as a companion of Persephone when Hades snatches her from the field (Hom. Hymn. Dem. 424) and appears in Apulian and possibly Selinuntine iconography of the myth (VP L47, 68, 74; AS S2; chapter 3). Artemis acts as Propylaea at Eleusis (Paus. 1.38.6) and probably Herakleia (under the epithet Soteira) while Hekate fulfills the same role at Selinus (De Angelis 2003, 139). The tradition of a local setting for the rape of Persephone (Diod. Sic. 5.3.3-4) demonstrates its significance and supports Ciaceri’s hypothesis. Hesychius of Alexandria records Eleusinia as a Sicilian epithet of Artemis. The epithet clearly refers to the Attic cult of Demeter and Persephone at Eleusis and therefore connects these goddesses again; Ciaceri (1911, 166) suggests this may have been a Syracusan epithet of Artemis. Again Ciaceri’s theory is plausible. However, we have so little evidence for Artemis’ worship on Sicily that it is possible

17 See Marconi (1994, 53) for an optimistic reading of a classical fragmentary inscription from Selinus as either Artemis or Hekate Angelos.
the goddesses were associated elsewhere on the island; if they were, there is no need to assume this is a Syracusan epithet.

There are three remaining Syracusan epithets to consider before moving to other Sicilian evidence for the worship of Artemis: Agrotera, Chitone and Lyaia. All three could be associated with the rural sanctuaries at Scala Greca and Belvedere. Agrotera was a popular epithet of the goddess; first used by Homer (II. 21.470) it designates her as the huntress: a goddess of the wild. However, the epithet does not designate the cult as one of purely rural concerns: an Attic festival of Artemis Agrotera celebrated her role as a goddess of war in the Athenian military victory at Marathon (Simon 1983, 81-2,86). The cult of Artemis Chitone is also attested in Attica (CRESCAM, no. 1387) and Ionia (CRESCAM nos. 1388, 4488, 5947). Following the description of the ancient statue of ‘Diana’ (cum stola) from Segesta (Cic. Verr. 2.4.34), Jessen (1899, 2335) suggested this may have been an image of Artemis Chitone. The epithet associates the goddess with clothes which were dedicated to Artemis to mark a successful birth (Anth. Pal. 6.201-2) or after the death of a women in childbirth (Farnell 1896, 444; Cole 2004, 223-30). In Attica the rural cult of Brauron was the centre for these dedications (Eur. IT 1464-7).

A rustic komos at Syracuse in honour of Artemis Lyaia is recorded in the prolegomena of the scholiast on Theokritos 2.5; the festival celebrated Artemis’ role in settling an agrarian dispute (Lawler 1947, 93; Frontisi-Ducroix 1981, 30-1; Montepaone 1984, 94-6). A festival to Artemis, which appears to have preoccupied a large number of the Syracusans is attested by later authors (Polyb. 8.37.2; Livy 25.23); it may have been this festival of Artemis Lyaia or some other celebration of the goddess. Two further sites close to Syracuse have also produced evidence of Artemis’ cult. At Akrai, which was founded by Syracuse in 664 as part of its territorial expansion (Thuc. 6.5.2; Dunbabin 1948, 99-100; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo 2004a, 189-90), an inscription records Artemis’ name alongside Leto’s (IG 14, 217). There is also late evidence for a cult of Artemis Meroessa at the unidentified site of that name; it was apparently close to Syracuse (BTCGI s.v. Meroessa, 9.567).

---

18 The possible association of Artemis Phakelitis with Syracuse will be discussed below.
19 There are 29 instances of ‘Artemis Agrotera’ recorded in CRESCAM.
Artemis’ role as an important divinity in the Syracusan pantheon does not immediately appear to derive from a similar role in Corinth. Pausanias (2.2.5, 2.3.6) reports two statues of the goddess in ancient Corinth: one of Artemis Agrotera at the baths and one of Artemis Ephesos in the agora. However, he tells us that most of his commentary relates to items of a relatively late date (Paus. 2.2.6). The disparity between Artemis’ role in the two poleis has puzzled scholars. Malkin (1987, 93-7) discusses the tradition that the Iamidai were among the initial colonists; the Elean origin of the Iamidai would explain the presence of Arethousa, Artemis Alpheioa and Olympian Zeus in the colony. Whilst finding the tradition attractive for its ability to explain these cults and not necessarily unreasonable, no explicit evidence exists for its basis in any historical fact and so Malkin concluded it must be given up. The disparity between Syracuse and Corinth is further echoed by Kerkyra’s early cult of the goddess; Kerkyra was another western eighth-century Corinthian foundation (Strabo 6.2.4). Schachter (1992, 14-7) has reviewed the archaeology of early Corinth in an attempt to explain this disparity and argued that a cult of Artemis may have existed on the boundary between Corinth and Megara at Lake Gargopis. The location and etymology of the lake, which Schachter associates with the gorgon, are suggestive of an early cult of Artemis. There is one other reference of interest in Pausanias (2.3.2-3); he tells of the myth of the water of Peirene just outside Corinth. The water, which was channelled out of caves into an ornamental spring, was explained through a myth of metamorphosis; Peirene was originally a woman who turned into a spring in sorrow after Artemis accidentally killed her son. Both Kerkyra and Ortygia were islands with excellent natural harbours and Artemis’ cult at Ortygia was associated with a spring; could the water at perhaps Peirene and Lake Gargopis be the factor that led the Corinthians to establish these cults of Artemis?

The final entry in the Sicilian section of the catalogue is Zankle-Messana. A sanctuary of Diana at Mylai, which bordered Zankle-Messana, is attested by Roman historians (App. B. Civ. 5.116; Dio Cass. 48.8.1, 3). Later Roman authors refer to a cult of Diana Phacelinus or Facelina which is thought to be a Roman continuation of a Greek, specifically Messenian, cult of Artemis Phakelitis. This cult is associated with a number of sites in the Greek west: Rhegion, Zankle-
Messana, Mylai, Tyndaris and Syracuse; it also extends outwith our geographical remit to Aricia. The cult is inextricably connected with the Messenian colonising movement and a tradition, preserved only in late grammarians, of Orestes’ journey to the Greek west with Iphigeneia and the statue of Artemis rescued from the land of the Taurians. I shall review the colonising activity and the myth of the Tauric statue on both sides of the straits here; the archaeological evidence for the temenos at Rhegion will be considered in chapter 2.2 below.

Zankle was founded c.730 by a group of ‘pirates’ from Kyme (a Euboean settlement: Ridgway 1992, 32-6) and a group of settlers from Chalkis and other Euboean sites. This joint founding is reflected in the tradition of two oikists: Perieres of Kyme and Krataimenes of Chalkis (Thuc. 6.4.5; Dunbabin 1948, 11-12; Bérard 1957, 92-6; Fisher-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 1994a, 234; Dominguez 2006, 263-6).²² Shortly after the foundation of their own polis, the Zanklaians invited more Chalkidians to come to the west and found Rhegion on the opposite side of the straits of Messina; the Zanklaians provided the oikist: Antimnestos (Dunbabin 1948, 11-13; Bérard 1957, 99-107; Vallet 1958, 66-80; Graham 1964, 17-18; Malkin 1987, 31-41). Strabo (6.1.6) reports that the Chalkidians were suffering a famine and were joined by a group of Messenians who had been expelled from their homeland. The displaced Messenians were those who had wished to compensate the Spartans for the murder of the Spartan king and rape of the maidens at the border sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis (Strabo 8.4.9; Paus. 4.4.1-4).²³ Strabo cites Antiochos (FGrH 555 F9) as his source, but there is the possibility that he was largely relying on the work of Timaios; see, for example, Malkin (1987, 32 n.87).

Zankle, like Rhegion, was founded on a narrow strip of coastal land; it commanded an excellent harbour and strategic site overlooking the straits of Messina. The mountainous landscape behind the polis allowed no space for agriculture so the Zanklaians founded the small polis of Mylai in 716 to serve their agricultural needs (Ps. –Skymnos 287; Dunbabin 1948, 12; Vallet 1958, 83-4; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo 2004a, 216) and from there in 648 founded Himera (Thuc. 6.5.1; Strabo 6.2.6; Bérard 1957, 97-8; Dominguez 2006, 292-8). At the beginning of the fifth century the Zanklaians invited a group of Samians to join them and upon their arrival the

²² Compare the alternative tradition in Ps. –Skymnos (283-6) in which Zankle is a colony of Sicilian Naxos and Pausanias’ (4.23.7) confusion of the two oikists and origins of the colonists. Thucydides account described above is usually accepted.
²³ The exact date of the foundation is unknown but the inclusion of these Messenians suggests a date at the end of the eighth century; the First Messenian War ran from c.736-16.
Samnites were persuaded by Anaxilas, tyrant of Rhegion, to capture the city for themselves. The Zankliaians, whose army was deployed elsewhere in Sicily at the time, appealed to Hippokrates of Gela for aid but he betrayed them and entered into an arrangement with the Samians (Hdt. 6.22-3); the Samian occupation lasted from c.494/3 to c.489/8. Anaxilas, who had been excluded from these negotiations with Hippokrates, drove out the Samians and founded a polis c.488/7 of mixed ethnicity and changed the name of the polis to Messana after his homeland (Thuc. 6.4.6; Diod. Sic. 11.48.2; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Amplo 1994a, 234; Dominguez 2006, 266-8; Luraghi 2008, 149-53).24 Finally, in the early fourth century, Dionysios I of Syracuse, settled (among others) 600 Messenians, who had been expelled from Naupaktos and Zakynthos, in the north west of Sicily between Mylai and Himera; the Messenians named their new home Tyndaris after the Tyndaridai (Diod. Sic. 14.78.5-6; Bérard 1957, 276; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Amplo 1994a, 232-3; Luraghi 2008, 156-7).

Ancient grammarians and Roman authors relate a tradition in which Orestes travelled to Rhegion with his sister Iphigeneia and the Taurians' statue of Artemis.25 Here, Orestes was purified of his matricide and in thanks dedicated a temple to Apollo. He travelled across the straits of Messina and founded a sanctuary of Artemis, probably at Mylai, in which he dedicated the statue. Another branch of the cult appears to have been established at Tyndaris although it may be that the cult at Mylai was in the territory appropriated by Dionysios I in his founding of Tyndaris (Luraghi 2008, 166). A variant tradition recorded by Pompeo Sabino sees Orestes founding a cult of Artemis Phakelitis in Syracuse. The tradition seems strange; Orestes' journey from Rhegion, across the straits of Messina to Mylai follows the pattern of Messenian colonisation in Strabo. It is possible that the cult of Artemis Phakelitis spread from the north-east coast of Sicily to the southern polis of Syracuse. However, the tradition has been explained as a confusion on account of the Syracusean role in the foundation of Tyndaris (Ciaceri 1911, 172; Vallet 1958, 79; Luraghi 1997, 337); this seems a sensible conclusion. In yet another version Orestes takes the statue to the sanctuary of Diana Nemorensis at Aricia (Schmidt 1937; Montepaone 1984, 91-2; Green 2007, 203-4).

24 On the unreliable testimony of Pausanias (4.23.5-10) see Luraghi (2008, 152); Pausanias appears to manipulate Herodotus' and Thucydides' accounts. Zankle-Messana appears to have been understood as Dorian after Anaxilas' re-naming of the polis (Thuc. 3.86.2, 3.90.2).

25 For a detailed review of the sources see Montepaone (1984, 92-104) and Luraghi (2007); a summary of the latter is available in Luraghi (2008, 157-8). On the Oresteia of Stesichoros and its possible association with this version of the legend of the Tauric statue see Vallet (1957, 266-70).
The sanctuary of Artemis, or rather Diana, Phakelitis described by the ancient authors has not been identified despite several archaeological investigations. Roman authors describe its location near a river (Vibius Sequester de fluv. p.16) but the coastal area of north-east Sicily has many rivers. The most probable theories place the sanctuary near Mylai (Vallet 1958, 118-9; Saporetti 1979; BTCGI s.v. Milazzo, 134). The only physical evidence for Artemis’ cult in the north-west of Sicily, in addition to the late coins of Zankle-Messana (C S8-11), is a hellenistic marble relief from Tyndaris depicting a young girl, who is accompanied by her parents, making an offering to Artemis Eupraxia. The epithet appears to be unique (Jessen 1907, 1237), although Aphrodite is associated with Praxia elsewhere (Paus. 1.43.6). The combination of the epithet with the image of the offering suggests it refers to her character as a goddess who presides over young women and childbirth (Farnell 1896, 461-2; Cole 2004, 209-13).

However, returning to the myth of Artemis Phakelitis, we should consider what this myth and its associated cult can tell us about the cult of Artemis in Zankle-Messana and Rhegion. First and most obviously it provides an aetiology for the cult of Apollo in Rhegion and the cult of Artemis Phakelitis at Mylai or Tyndaris (or both). Although all our sources are much later than the archaic and classical periods and the remains of the sanctuary are unknown and therefore cannot be dated, the myth represents a period of close relations between Rhegion and Messana, which is best attested by Anaxilas and his successors (Vallet 1958, 79; Costabile 1979; Luraghi 2008, 166). The transference of Artemis’ cult to the west supports the construction of a Messenian ethnicity in Rhegion and Zankle-Messene. Strabo’s report of a joint foundation (6.1.6) is difficult to date, but it does demonstrate the desire of a western group of Messenians who wished to distance themselves from the Peloponnesian Messenians and their enmity with Sparta (Luraghi 2008, 157-9, 161). The association of these Messenians with the cult of Artemis Limnatis, attested in both Sparta and Messenia (Paus. 4.1.1-4), recalls the murderous founder formula of colonisation myths discussed by Dougherty (1993, 31-45). In fact, the cult of Artemis Phakelitis, and its association with the Tauric statue of Artemis, has been associated with the Spartan cult of Artemis Orthia and the Messenian/Spartan cult of Artemis Limnatis; see for example, Montepaone (1984, 104-7). Pausanias (3.16.11) explains that Artemis was called

---

26 See chapter 4 and Parra (1991-2) for an early classical terracotta pinax from Francavilla di Sicilia (S S2) which may depict the arrival of the statue in the Greek west and therefore support this date; the standard interpretation of the scene is the rape of Helen (BTCGI 7.486 (Spigo)).
Orthia and Lygodesma in Sparta on account of this statue being found help upright in some willows. The apparently Messenian tradition recorded in the late grammarians seems to refer to this Laconian tradition (Schmidt 1937). The Latin epithet Facelitis is apparently derived from the Greek Phakelitis meaning bundle of faggots (LSJ s.v. φάκελος) thus evoking the image of a statue wrapped in wood (Montepaone 1984, 89-90).

The myth of the rape of the Spartan maidens at the border temenos of Artemis Limnatis alludes to its role in the maturation rites of young females (Calame 2001, 142-9). The cult of Artemis Orthia in Sparta appears to have marked a rite of passage for young men (Xen. Lac. 2.8-9; Calame 2001, 165-7). In addition, the cult of Artemis Orthia within the Asklepieion at Messene (Themelis 1994) may allude to a healing or calming role of the goddess as well as maturation rites for young females (Van Straten 1981, 96). The myth of the removal of the statue of Artemis from the Tauric land, where it was worshipped with bloody and barbaric rites, and its establishment in the Greek world is analogous with the integration of foreign elements into Greek society. It represents the safe integration and mixing of social groups, including ‘foreign’ and Greek traditions, which are especially important on the edges of the Greek world (Frontisi-Ducroux 1981, 46; Vernant 1991, 212-3). Artemis presided over these integrations as she herself had been integrated into the western Greek community. This role manifested itself in a number of ways such as at Tyndaris where, under the epithet Eupraxia, the goddess oversaw the integration of the parthenos into the world of the gynē.

Finally there are two inscriptions from Akragas which have been explained as potential epithets of Artemis: Soteira (IG 14, 262) and Eleuthias (Managanaro 1992, 208); neither can be definitely associated with our periods. A cult of Artemis at Akragas is suggested by a hellenistic coin series with an obverse type of the goddess’ head (C SI), but there is no accompanying legend confirming her local epithet. It is possible that Artemis was worshipped as Soteira at Syracuse and the cult may have spread to Akragas. The epithet is certainly associated with the goddess in hellenistic Herakleia. However, as we have no context for the inscription it could be speculatively attributed to any number of deities: Waele (1971, 33) suggest Artemis, Demeter or Persephone. The second inscription from Akragas, Eleuthias, is a version of Eileithyia (LSJ s.v. Ἑλείθυα). Eileithyia is associated with Artemis through her role as a goddess of childbirth (Price 1978; Vernant, 1991, 202); this role is attested for Artemis in Southern Italy (Anth. Pal. 43).
Their relationship can be expressed through Artemis’ adoption of Eileithyia as an epithet.\(^{27}\) However, the inscription could merely attest a cult of Eileithyia. At Sparta the two deities’ *temene* were located near each other but they remained independent (Paus. 3.17.1).

### 2.2 Southern Italy

I shall now review the evidence from Southern Italy starting with Campania, then Apulia, Lucania and finally Bruttium. The sanctuary of Diana Tifatina is the only Southern Italian sanctuary of the Italian goddess in the catalogue. It was one of three early and significant Italian sanctuaries of Diana (Petersen 1919, 322); the others were in Northern Italy: Diana Nemorensis at Aricia (Green 2007) and Diana Aventinensis in Rome (Green 2007, 97-102). The worship of Diana does not indicate an earlier cult of Artemis; Diana was an indigenous deity who became associated with Artemis: she is not simply a Latinised Artemis (Gordon 1932; Green 2007, 71-96). While certainly an indigenous goddess Pugliese Carratelli’s (1965, 25) theory that she was a descendent of a Mycenaean goddess related to Dione at Dodona is far-fetched. Greek deities were often conflated with Latin gods, compare Graf (2001, 139) on Athena and Minerva; this trend of conflation obscures some of the early character of the Latin gods including Diana (Green 2007, 112-14). The native inhabitants of Capua were in contact with the Greeks by the sixth century: the Greeks had settled at Pithekoussai in the eighth century, more an *emporion* than an *apoikia*, and controlled the bay of Naples by the mid-sixth century (Frederiksen 1984, 54ff.). Capua was an early Villanovan site located inland behind the Bay of Naples on an important trade route with northern Etruria (Ridgway 1992, 122-5); although an Etruscan centre it was influenced by the Greeks (Frederiksen 1984, 117-123). Petersen (1919, 61-3) suggested that Artemis was worshipped at Kyme on the Bay of Naples. However, this theory relies on the scholia’s attempts to associate the Sibyl in Virgil’s *Aeneid* (6.118) with Diana-Hekate; there is no evidence to connect Kyme with an actual cult of Artemis in the archaic or classical periods.

The sanctuary in the Tifata mountains is included here on account of the apparent iconographical assimilation of Diana with Artemis at this site in the sixth century and Pausanias’ (5.12.3) later

---

6.273. There are 16 instances of this epithet associated with Artemis on CRESCAM: 1208, 1212, 1214 (Thessaly), 1209 (Phokis), 1210 (Macedonia), 1211, 7081 (Euboea), 1215-6, 7289-93 (Boiotia), 1207, 1213, 1474 (unattributed). Artemis Eileithyia is one of several epithets which emphasise Artemis’ association with childbirth (Pingiatoglou 1981, 163-9).
A sixth-century antefix depicts a female seated side-ways on a galloping horse and holding a bow (AS 17). It is one of two Capuan antefix types, the other being a Potnia Theron (AS 18), which can be associated with Artemis (chapter 4; Lenormant 1881; Lubtchansky 2005, 104-8). However, it should be noted that both of these architectural sculptures were found in the sanctuary at Fondo Patturelli, an extra-mural sanctuary of Capua, and not at the sanctuary of Diana Tifatina (Edlund 1987, 47-8). REGARDLESS OF THEIR LOCATION, THE REPRESENTATIONS DEMONSTRATE, AT THE VERY LEAST, DIANA ADOPTING ARTEMIS’ ICONOGRAPHY. THE EXTRA-URBAN AND MOUNTAINOUS LOCATION OF THE CULT SUGGESTS DIANA SERVED SOME HUNTING FUNCTION HERE; ARTEMIS’ BOW PROBABLY COMPLEMENTED THE CHARACTER OF THE GODDESS (GREEN 2007, 77-82). IT DOES NOT NECESSARILY MEAN THAT ARTEMIS WAS WORSHIPPED AT THE SITE BUT IS AT LEAST THE START OF A TRADITION WHICH SEES TWO THIRD-CENTURY COIN TYPES (C 13-4) DEPICTING ARTEMIS BEFORE PAUSANIAS (5.12.3) ATTRIBUTES THE SITE TO HER. FINALLY, THE EPITHET: TIFATINA. IT IS SIMPLY A TOYONYM; THE GODDESS IS IDENTIFIED WITH THE WILD TIFATA MOUNTAIN RIDGE UPON WHICH SHE IS WORSHIPPED (WEINSTOCK 1937).

28 The identity of the deity worshipped at Fondo Patturelli is unknown; on account of the iconography associated with the site a kourotrophic goddess is usually supposed (Edlund 1987, 48).

29 See Malkin (1994, 139-42) on the role of socially excluded groups in foundation myths and the historical reality behind them. The initial disturbance at the sanctuary of Artemis Limnatis sets in motion a chain of events which culminates, according to Strabo (and his source(s): Antiochos and/or Timaios), in the foundation of two Southern Italian colonies: Rhegion and Taras. On the relationship of these foundation myths see Luraghi (2008, 160), with further references.

Taras was the only Spartan colony in Southern Italy; it was founded in the late eighth century and maintained Doric traditions and cults (Diod. Sic. 8.21.3; Strabo 6.3.2 = Antiochos FGrH 555 fr.13; Dunbabin 1948, 29-31; Bérard 1957, 162-75; Giannelli 1963, 283ff.; Malkin 1987, 47-52; Malkin 1994, 115-142; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 1994b, 299). THE AITION FOR THE COLONY IS RELATED TO THE FIRST MESSENIAN WAR, THE GROUP WHO SET OUT FOR TARAS WERE THE PARTHENIAI, THE SONS BORN TO THE SPARTAN PARNENOI DURING THE WAR. Artemis was a popular goddess in Sparta; her cult was associated with rites for young women (Calame 2001, 141-74). The cult of Orthia, at some point Artemis Orthia, was associated with rites for young men (Xen. Lac. 2.9; Paus. 3.16.7-11; Dawkins 1929; Parker 1989, 151-2). The assimilation of Orthia to Artemis is not epigraphically attested until the Flavian period (Dawkins 1929, 293); most scholars however would date it, on the basis of iconographic evidence, to the late archaic or early classical period (for example: Wace 1929, 283; Nilsson 1950, 505; Pipili 1987, 44), but
this is not certain (Richer 2007, 237-8). If we disregard (Artemis) Orthia, the goddess still entered the lives of men through the sacrifices made to her before battle as Artemis Agrotera (Xen. Hell. 4.2.20, Lac. 13.8) while the Lakedaemonian cult of Artemis Soteira at Boiai reveals the goddess helping the whole polis (Paus. 3.22.12; Wide 1973, 121-2). Again, leaving Orthia out of the equation, Pausanias reports five further epithets of the goddess in Sparta: Issoria, Limnatis, Aiginaia (Paus. 3.14.2), Hegemone (Paus. 3.14.6) and Knagia (Paus. 3.18.4); a further 22 cults are attested in Lakonia (Atsma 2000-2008 s.v. Artemis cult 1).

It is therefore somewhat surprising that there is no cult of Artemis attested in the Tarentine asty. A hellenistic inscription from the vicinity of the modern naval hospital records the Doric form of the goddess’ name: Artamiti (Lippolis, Garraffo and Nafissi 1995, 175). Ancient authors record a Via Soteira in Taras (Polyb. 8.35.6; Livy 25.11.16); Artemis is often called Soteira but both Zeus and the Dioskouroi were worshipped in Taras as Soter(es) (Stazio 1967, 292; Lippolis, Garraffo and Nafissi 1995, 209-10). An eighteenth-century traveller recorded a tradition that the city’s monastery was built on top of a temple of Diana (Riedese 1773, 175). The Greek anthology records Leonidas, a Tarentine poet, marking a dedication to Artemis (Anth. Pal. 6.286). Moreover, Hesychius mentions a cult of Artemis Korythalia in Italy; I shall look at this epithet shortly as I agree with those who conjecture its association with Taras. The iconographic record for Artemis in Taras is far richer than our literary or archaeological sources. Figurines of the so-called Artemis Bendis type, which I shall discuss in chapter 3, spread across Apulia and into Lucania. The description of this figure as Artemis Bendis on account of the combination of Artemis’ iconography with Bendis’ Phrygian cap topped with a lion-skin (S 119-21) is generally accepted by modern scholars (chapter 3). However, we are not certain this is the epithet applied to the figure by the Greeks in Southern Italy; indeed the attested examples of this epithet are from Thrace and Athens (CRESCAM 1166-8, 1206). Finally, Artemis’ cult may be alluded to in a hellenistic variant of the coin type of the city in which Taras, astride his dolphin, carries a bow and arrow (C O3).

30 On the dating of the site, and in particular the lead deer figurines, see Dawkins (1929, 251-2) revised by Boardman (1963). For a possible terminus ante quem for the assimilation of Artemis and Orthia see chapter 1.2.1 above.
31 Richer (2007, 243-5) reviews Artemis cult in Sparta and highlights the cult of Issoria which is attested in both the Spartan asty and in the Lakedaemonian chora (Paus. 3.14.2, 3.25.4); the cult reflects the idea of Artemis connecting the wild to the centre and facilitating safe passage.
32 See, for example, Wuilleumier’s (1939, 483-5) survey of Artemis’ cult in Taras which is based on the iconographic evidence.
Moving on from this suggestive, but ultimately inconclusive, evidence from the asty of Taras, there are two sites in the Tarentine chora which were probably used for the worship of Artemis. The first was discovered underneath a Roman villa at Torricella during excavations in 1971-2. Foundations of archaic structures were accompanied by an inscription: Ἀρτάμιτος ἀγρατέρας. The Doric form of both the goddess’ name and her epithet has been noted and compared with the hellenistic inscription found in Taras (Lo Porto 1987, 46-50; Lippolis, Garraffo and Nafissi 1995, 175; Arena 1998, 32). The second site at Maruggio, on the promontory at Campomarino, has been attributed to Artemis on account of the predominance of Artemis Bendis figurines discovered there (Lippolis, Garraffo, Nafissi 1995, 88; chapter 3). As discussed above, the label Artemis Bendis is a modern construct for these pieces so we cannot apply the epithet Bendis to our goddess at this site. Although Torricella and Maruggio are over 5km apart, it is possible that the inscription recording Artemis Agratera, discovered at Toricella, was originally associated with this site and only moved later for re-use in the Roman villa (Lo Porto 1987, 50 n.74). As noted above the Spartans sacrificed to Artemis Agrotera before battle recognising her role both as a goddess of the wild in which warfare happened (Richer 2007, 242) and as a goddess of transition: the sacrifice represents the inversion of cultural norms about to occur (Lloyd-Jones 1983; Vernant 1991, 250-7). Both Torricella and Maruggio were remote sites at some distance from the asty, which easily explains Artemis’ epithet here. However we could also conjecture that these sites were in areas where there was some hostility between the Spartan colonists and the native Apulians; Artemis Agrotera could be worshipped here in recognition of a local threat of violence.

Before turning to Lucania, I shall briefly consider the epithet reported by a fifth-century AD lexicographer, Korythalia. The cult of Artemis Korythalia is attested in ancient Sparta (CRESCAM, no. 1422). The goddess was celebrated in the Tithenidia festival which appears to have been a kourotrophic celebration particularly for young males (Ath. 4.139a-b); a similar cult seems to have existed in Messene where Artemis was called Paidotrophos (Paus. 4.34.6; Farnell 1896, 463-4; Wide 1973, 97-133; Calame 2001, 169-74; Richer 2007, 237). It is entirely reasonable to suppose that the cult of Artemis Korythalia in Southern Italy was associated with Taras (Lippolis, Garraffo, Nafissi 1995, 203) or at least was transmitted to the Greeks of Southern Italy via Taras.
There are four entries in the archaeology catalogue for Lucania: evidence for the worship of Artemis is found at Herakleia, S. Maria di Anglona and Metapontion. First, I should observe the absence of any firm evidence from Poseidonia. The Greek colony of Poseidonia, the Roman Paestum, was a secondary colony founded by Sybaris, which the sources tell us was an Achaian colony (Antiochos FGrH 555 fr.12; Ps.-Skymnos 249; Dunbabin 1948, 24-6; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 287). The mythology of Artemis is a dominant theme in the sculptural decoration of the temple of Hera at Foce del Sele: the Proitids, Niobids and Tityos arguably all feature in the temple's iconographic programme (chapter 4). Moreover, Diodorus Siculus (4.22.3) records a myth of Artemis being offended by a hunter in the Poseidonian chora. I share Giangulio’s (2004, 291) thought that these two facts are suggestive of a local cult of Artemis. However, surveys of the chora have produced no trace of the goddess (Edlund 1987, 102-5; Skele 2002), while Ammerman (2002, 154, no. 1866) identified a single figurine of Artemis, dating to the hellenistic period and possibly an import from central Italy, from the excavations at Santa Venera. Hera was the dominant goddess of Poseidonia; the iconography of Hera here, cradling a horse in her arms, resembles the iconography of Artemis, with a deer instead of a horse, in Taras (chapter 3). However, Hera’s role in the Poseidonian pantheon, which has similarities to that of Artemis elsewhere in Southern Italy, does not exclude the possibility of a local cult of Artemis somewhere in the chora, but if such a temenos existed we are yet to find it.

Herakleia was a joint foundation of Taras and Thuri c.433/2; the Tarentine element was predominant in the city and some authors consider it a solely Tarentine foundation (Diod. Sic. 12.36.4; Strabo 6.1.14 = Antiochos FGrH 555 F11; Strabo 6.3.4; Bérard 1957, 174-5; BTCGI 7.204-5 (Adamasteau); Malkin 1994, 61-2; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 259).33 Artemis received cult, alongside Demeter, on the south slope of the hill upon which Herakleia was founded and at S. Maria d’Anglona which formed a natural, hilly border to the Herakleian territory. The discovery of figurines of the Artemis Bendis type (chapter 3), which originated in Taras, at both sites we are considering here underlines the relationship of Herakleia with Taras. On the slopes of the city the temenos of Demeter appears to date back to the Siris phase of the site (Edlund 1987, 112); it is one of several temene located in this area (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 260). The evidence for Artemis at the site dates to the

33 See Malkin (1994, 216-7) on the use of the name Herakleia by the Spartans and Tarentines for new foundations.
fourth and third centuries (Lo Porto 1961, 138). The figurines of the Artemis Bendis type appear in the fourth century, although it is noteworthy that these figurines are themselves a development of the late fifth century. The inscription confirming that these figurines were not simply offered to Demeter but to Artemis Soteira dates to the third century. As with the inscriptions we have seen from Taras and Torricella and as we would expect in this Tarentine foundation the dialect is Doric: 'Αρτάμιτι Σωτήραι.

At the edge of Heraklea’s territory there was another sanctuary where both Artemis and Demeter were apparently worshipped: S. Maria d’Anglona. The ancient site, which should probably be identified as ancient Pandosia (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 259), is at the western edge of Heraklea’s territory; it was an indigenous site hellenised during the archaic period. The Herakleian chora was sacred, at least in part, to Dionysos and Athena Polias (IG 14.645). However, a votive deposit filled with figurines of Demeter and Artemis Bendis at S. Maria di Anglona, in front of the entrance to the small sanctuary associated with Demeter, has been interpreted as evidence for the worship of both goddesses in this temenos (Rüdiger 1967, 341; Osanna 2002, 110). The dedication of figurines of Artemis at the entrance to both Herakleian temene is characteristic of her cult when she shares a temenos with another deity; see, for example, Cole (2004, 185) on Artemis’ cults at Eleusis, Epidaurus and Lykosoura.

We have already observed the association of Artemis and Demeter in Syracuse at the sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone at Achradina and through the cult-titles Pheraia, Angelos-Angelike and Eleusinia. At that time we recalled Artemis’ appearance in the myth of the rape of Persephone, Eleusinian iconography and the cult of Artemis Propylaea at Eleusis. The association of the two goddesses suggests a chthonian role for Artemis, especially as iconographically she can become blurred with Hekate in scenes with Persephone in the underworld (chapter 3). Naturally, therefore, a chthonian aspect to the goddess’ cult in Heraklea has been proposed (Bergamasco 2006, 146). The cult of Demeter on the slopes of the asty of Heraklea may have been a healing cult (Bergamasco 2006, 147), while Artemis’ epithet, Soteira, and the discovery of iron slave restraints has been interpreted as evidence for her worship as goddess of asylia who presided over the transition from servitude to freedom (Curti
There is, however, disagreement over the cult at S. Maria di Anglona. Its marginal location has suggested to some that it may have been used for maturation rites (Bergamasco 2007, 147). However, it seems probable that the two cults were linked on a couple of levels, which include the nature of the deities worshipped in them (Curti 1989, 29). The figurines of Artemis Bendis begin to appear at the entrance to the temenos of Artemis on the slopes of Herakleia in the fourth century. Elsewhere these figurines only appear in the late fifth century; their production at Taras appears to have revitalised Artemis' cult in the area (Bergamasco 2006, 148-9). Their dedication at Herakleia may have been a stimulus for this cult leading to the establishment of a second temenos in the fourth century at S. Maria d'Anglona. The discovery of the figurines of Artemis Bendis at the entrance to both temene and the association of both sites with Demeter suggests that these sites were connected. The connection of two cults, one in the asty and one in the chora, is known from elsewhere in the Greek world; these two sites could have shared a common mythology, set of rites and/or festivals.

Between Taras and Herakleia was the colony of Metapontion. There are two catalogue entries for this polis: the rural temenos of Artemis at S. Biagio della Venella and Temple D in the urban temenos. The foundation of the cult at S. Biagio is the culmination of the mythic narrative in Bacchylides' eleventh ode which was reviewed in chapter 1.1.2. I shall review the archaeological evidence for the goddess' cult in this chapter and consider the iconography of the dedications at the site in chapter 3.2. A number of rural sanctuaries established in the late seventh or early sixth centuries have been discovered along the banks of the Bradano and Basento rivers; these temene occur at regular intervals at springs (Carter 2006, 115). At least two of these spring temene appear to have been adjacent to cemeteries: Pantanello and S. Biagio (Carter 1994, 186). The temene, which were probably established or at least controlled by aristocratic families, were localised centres of power, self-advertisement and cult, perhaps also serving an administrative function (Osanna 1992, 56-72; Carter 1994, 180-3; De Siena 1999, 229-31; Carter 2006, 161-2). The sanctuary at S. Biagio della Venella, on the bank of the

---

34 Curti (1989, 28) reviews evidence from elsewhere in the Greek world for the association of Artemis (and Bendis) with slaves; convincing evidence for this association (for Artemis) comes from hellenistic Delos (cf. Siebert 1966).

35 Kowalzig (2007, 294-6) argues that S. Biagio does not fit into this pattern; I shall discuss this point further below.
Basento and c.6 km from the asty, has been identified as the grove (alsos) of Artemis, on the Kasas, mentioned by Bacchylides (11.117-20).\textsuperscript{36}

The site was used before the Greeks settled in the region as is shown by early finds of largely indigenous pottery. However, there is no evidence that these either had a cultic function or constitute evidence for Mycenaean worship at the site as argued by Pugliese Carratelli (1962). They do suggest that natives and Greeks met, and perhaps even worshipped together, at the site (de Polignac 1995, 112; Carter 2006, 160-1). The cult-site at S. Biagio centred, as did the other local sites, around the spring; the water was channelled into a basin: compare Bacchylides' (11.117-20) description of the site as a grove (Carter 2004, 169). The importance of the spring to the cult is demonstrated by the ornate vessels and their stands, which were discovered at the site and used to store and carry the water from the spring (Olbrich 1976, 404-5; Edlund 1987, 99). These ritual containers are found elsewhere in Southern Italy in both cultic and burial contexts (Ugolini 1983, 464; Edlund 1987, 122). At S. Biagio they probably stored water for purification, a relief on one of the vessels suggests that this could have been for young women in pre-marital rites (Ugolini 1983, 471-2; Cole 1988, 164; Morizot 1994, 213). It is not necessary to assume that this is the only purification offered at the site (Ugolini 1983, 471-2); other types of ritual purification could have been practised and preserved in the later dedication of the site to San Biagio (St. Blaise), a Christian healing saint (Kirsch 1907). In the seventh century a small building was erected beside the spring; terracotta architectural remains, including a frieze with chariots drawn by winged horses, have been associated with this structure (Mertens-Horn 1992; Carter 2006, 75).\textsuperscript{37} In the early fifth century a number of the temene in the chora, including S. Biagio, underwent renovation; new terracotta revetments date to this time (Carter 1994, 177-8; Carter 2006, 216). The temenos remained in use throughout the fourth century; cultic activity ceased in the third century.

\textsuperscript{36} The association of the site with Artemis is generally accepted; see, for example, Olbrich (1976) and Carter (2006, 158). The early attribution to Athena by Zancani-Montuoro (1975, 125ff.) is no longer accepted.

\textsuperscript{37} The frieze is one of several discussed by Mertens-Horn (1992); a similar frieze dating to c.600 has been discovered in the urban temenos; it appears to depict a procession in honour of Athena (Mertens-Horn 1992, 103-4). The similarity of these friezes to the sculpture of Incoronata's pre-Greek phase raises questions of Greek-indigenous contact in the vicinity of Metapontion and specifically at S. Biagio (Carter 2006, 76).
There are no inscriptions confirming Artemis’ worship at the site. However, the popular local figurines, which were dedicated here from an early date, are usually identified as the Potnia Theron and linked to Artemis (chapter 3.2). Bacchylides’ hails Artemis as Hemera (39) and Agrotera (37) in his ode which is associated with this site. The former title is part of Bacchylides’ association of this site with the cult of Artemis Hemera at Lousoi, which was discussed in chapter 1. The second title, Agrotera, denotes Artemis as a goddess of the wild and is paired with the description of her as Potnia Theron by Homer (Il. 21.470). The rural location of this site suits Artemis Agrotera and as we have already seen the cult of Artemis ‘Agratera’ was practised in the Tarentine chora. However, we cannot definitely attribute either epithet to this cult.

It appears that the goddess was worshipped here with Zeus Aglaios; a sixth century boundary marker with an inscription to the god was discovered nearby (CRESCAM, no.4680; Adamesteanu 1974, 65). It had been re-used to cover a Roman burial, but there is no reason to consider it had been moved any great distance for this purpose (Carter 2006, 190 n. 86). Moreover, there is no evidence of another temenos nearby, although some have tried to suggest Zeus was worshipped in an adjacent temenos (Olbrich 1976, 400-1). Conversely, Mertens-Horn (1992, 41, pl.124-5) has suggested that a figurine discovered at S. Biagio, which may hold a spear or rein in one of its hands, actually represents Zeus; the identification is uncertain; see, for example, Frederiksen (1975, 54).

Zeus’ epithet is usually interpreted as ‘shining’ or ‘brilliant’ (CRESCAM, no.4680; Edlund 1987, 99); it would then complement his other light-related epithets which often recall his lightening and thunderbolts which he wielded as weapons (Parisinou 2000, 89-91, 105-8; Dowden 2006, 54-7). The choice of Zeus, alongside Artemis, is unusual. S. Biagio is not the only sanctuary in the Metapontine chora to be dedicated jointly to a god and goddess: Pantanello appears to have been dedicated to Persephone and Dionysos-Hades (Carter 1994, 194-5). On the mainland Pausanias sometimes describes a statue of Zeus or Artemis in the sanctuary of the other, but no jointly dedicated sanctuaries. Zeus seems to have usurped Apollo’s usual place here, father over brother. The reason for their association is unclear Edlund (1987, 99) has suggested that Zeus’ control over nature, probably specifically the weather, could have

38 Giacometti (1999, 420 5) has argued that Dionysos, not Zeus, was Artemis’ partner at this temenos; the inscription to Zeus probably originated from the agora. While Dionysos does appear in some versions of the myth of the Proitids, this is probably a result of a later conflation of traditions (chapter 1.1.2). There is no evidence to associate Dionysos with this site.
reinforced the fertility aspect of the goddess. If we follow the theory that S. Biagio was one of a number of cults associated with a local aristocratic family, we could suppose that Zeus (Aglaia) had some special significance for them. This significance may have derived from a possible association of Aglaia, who appears in Hesiod (Theog. 945) as one of the Graces, with victories (Bacchyl. 3.6).

The sanctuaries in the Metapontine chora are generally associated with Greek female deities who can represent some aspect of fertility whether vegetative, animal or human (Carter 2006, 169). The site of S. Biagio, although apparently dedicated to Artemis and Zeus, has yielded traces of a number of other deities (Olbrich 1976: Athena, Aphrodite, Demeter; Carter 1994, 181: Aphrodite, Eileithyia, Athena, Hera, Persephone). Essentially, any Greek female divinity could be associated with these sites in some respect or other. This means that when we study sites without any discerning features or inscriptions, the majority of those known in the Metapontine chora, their attribution becomes guesswork; see, for example, Edlund (1987, 98) on the spring sanctuary at Pizzica. The fertility of the chora is reflected on Metapontine coinage which featured an incuse ear of barley, minted on the Achaian standard, until the end of the fifth-century when a type of an ear of barley was paired with other designs including a head of Demeter (Rutter 1997, 27-8, 51). The Demeter type outlived the ear of barley design and was paired with other designs in the fourth and third centuries (Rutter 1997, 95-6). Artemis features as a symbol alongside the head of Demeter (C II1) and becomes a type in her own right in the late third or early second century (C II2). Both coin types post-date the end of the sanctuary at S. Biagio.

The large urban temenos of Metapontion was located next to the agora, the civic centre of the polis. A number of temples and altars were dedicated within the temenos. The temples are designated by alphabetical letters; the latest interpretation is A to Hera, B to Apollo and C to Athena (Barberis 2005, 60; Carter 2006, 200). Figurines of the Potnia Theron type found at S. Biagio are found throughout the urban temenos from early times (Barberis 2005, 60). In the early fifth century the urban temenos underwent a number of changes including the construction of a new Ionic temple (D) which may have been dedicated to Artemis (Adamesteaneu, Mertens and De Siena 1975; De Siena 1998, 168; Mertens 2001, 60-1). The construction of the temple is contemporaneous with a fragment of an Attic black-figure lekythos with the graffito APTEMIAI (Naples, Nat. Mus., Coll. Santangelo 99; Machler 2004, 134). These changes
may reflect a shift in the political realities of Metapontion; they coincide with a period of increasing agricultural wealth indicating a move to a more democratic period of government (Carter 2006, 215). Other contemporary changes include the dedication of a new temenos to Zeus Aglaios next to the archaic temenos of Zeus Agoraios in the north-west corner of the agora (CRESCAM, no.4679). The establishment of the cult of Zeus Aglaios, which we have already noted in the Metapontine chora, has been identified as the integration of the cult of an important aristocratic family from their local area to the civic heart of the city which further illustrates a tension between the aristocracy and the wider population (De Siena 1998, 151-6, 168-70). The transfer of Zeus’ cult, Bacchylides’ epinikian for Alexidamos, the expansion of the S. Biagio temenos and the construction of Temple D all date to the first half of the fifth century. The contemporaneous activity may demonstrate an aristocratic concern with the promotion of not just the cult of Zeus Aglaios as argued by De Siena, but the cult of Artemis from S. Biagio too and a desire to incorporate both into the asty.

If we accept that Metapontion was re-founded by Peloponnesian Achaians (chapter 1.1.2) then we should consider the possibility of influence by Achaian cults. Brulotte (2002, 181-2) identified 11 cults of Artemis in Achaia from archaic to Roman times; nine of which are recorded by Pausanias (Atsma 2000-8, s.v. Artemis cult 2). Two of these are violent cults: Laphria at Patras with its annual holocaust (Paus. 4.31.7, 7.18.8-13) and Triklaria (Paus. 7.19-20.1), neither of which appears to have anything obvious in common with S. Biagio. Artemis’ cult was associated with water at two Achaian temene where she was worshipped as Limnatis (Paus. 7.22.11) and Agrotera (Paus. 7.26.11). Our goddess is once associated with Apollo - not Zeus (Paus. 7.24.1) and once has an aition connecting her worship with goats at Aigeira (Paus. 7.26.3; chapter 3.2). There is no obvious connection between any of these cults and the temenos at S. Biagio. However, there is archaeological evidence from the small village of Ano Mazaraki, Mt Panachaikos, for a sanctuary of Artemis Aontia epigraphically attested in the second half of sixth century with remains dating to the late Geometric period (Petropoulos 2002). The sanctuary is located in the middle of Achaia, accessible from east and west and on a major route while the finds indicate that it functioned as a pan-Achaian ritual centre (Gadolou 2002, 172). Moreover the site appears to have been linked to the temenos of Artemis Hemera at Lousoi by a road which continued down to the port at Aigion (fig. 2.13; Petropoulos 2002, 157). The

39 Evidence for an archaic tyranny and the political organisation of the polis is collated in Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo (2004b, 279-80).
Achaians who visited Ano Mazaraki could therefore have been aware of the temenos at Lousoi; their proximity to a major Achaian port suggests that they may have been involved in the Achaian colonising movement and taken the memory of both Artemisian cults with them (Giangulio 2002, 298-306).

The final Southern Italian region to consider here is Bruttium. Figurines of Artemis have been discovered at several sites in Bruttium; their discovery at springs sometimes lead to relatively unfounded suggestions of Artemis cult.\(^{40}\) In contrast, the sanctuary of Artemis included in the catalogue is attested by Thucydides (6.44.3) who, in his account of the Athenian expedition to Sicily, describes the Athenians drawing up their boats on the shore at Rhegion and pitching their tents in the land, outside the city-walls, which was sacred (hieros) to Artemis. The archaeological search for the temenos has proved inconclusive. Discussions of the site focus on two opposing theories of its location; the arguments for each are presented by Georges Vallet and Federica Cordano. Vallet (1958) dismissed the possibility of the site at Leukopetra, one of the most south-westerly promontories of Italy; one of his reasons for dismissing the site was a local sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone: he considered it unlikely that two major sanctuaries would be located so closely together. Instead Vallet (1958, 130-1) proposed that the Annunziata river, to the north of Rhegion, could have been the location where the Athenians left their boats and identified the sanctuary with some archaic foundations nearby. Cordano (1974, 90) disagreed with Vallet’s dismissal of Leukopetra and argued that the archaeological remains and the geographical significance of the promontory better suit the landing site and ‘camp’ of the Athenians. Since the theories of Vallet and Cordano, most scholars, while bemoaning the lack of detail in Thucydides, simply acknowledge the uncertainty of its location; see, for example, Edlund (1987, 128), Carando (2000, 214) and Mercuri (2004, 251-6).

Thucydides does not describe the temenos with an epithet although its dedication to Artemis Phakelitis is usually assumed; one late author refers to a cult of Diana Fascelitis which has been discussed above (Vallet 1958, 79). The standard tradition however includes the establishment of a temple of Apollo, not Artemis, by Orestes: most likely by the Metauros river (Berard 1957, 40).

\(^{40}\) See, for example, de Polignac (1995, 93), Genovese (1999, 76-82) and Giangulio (2002, 291) for differing views on the association of S. Anna, in the chora of Croton, with Artemis. A marble statue of Artemis, apparently discovered locally and now on display in the Rhegion museum, dates to the Roman period (Denti 1959, 38).
381; Costabile 1979). Even if we accept that Orestes’ bathing of the cult statue was known here in the late fifth century and a sanctuary of Artemis Phakelitis existed, it does not have to be the same temenos referred to by Thucydides. As we have seen there were four sites at which the goddess received cult in Syracuse. Moreover, Strabo’s (6.1.6) description of the founding of Rhegion records the Delphic Oracle instructing the Messenians to be grateful to Artemis for saving their lives. These Messenians are associated with the cult of Artemis Limnatis and so a temenos may have been dedicated to Artemis as Limnatis, perhaps in addition to Artemis Phakelitis. Artemis also featured in the Euboean pantheon (Artemision: Hdt. 7.175-6; Geraistos: Procopius De Bellus 8.22.27-9; Schumacher 1993, 77; Karystos: Knoepfler 1972); the Euboeans among the colonists may well have established their own temenos of the goddess too.

2.3 Sicilian and Southern Italian trends in the archaeology of Artemis cult

Following this review of the evidence for the worship of Artemis in Southern Italy and Sicily, we can now draw some preliminary conclusions about the goddess’ cult. Before returning to the four questions I raised at the beginning of this chapter, we should note that not all of the cults and epithets recorded in the catalogue and discussed above are certainly associated with Artemis. At least one site can certainly be dismissed from our study: the so-called Temple of Diana at Cefalú. Moreover, I have often had to draw upon Pausanias as a source for comparative evidence from the Greek mainland; archaeology demonstrates that his testimony can be applicable for the archaic and classical periods but we must always bear in mind his chronological distance from our timeframe.

The first point to assess is the connection of the cults in Southern Italy and Sicily with the cults of the mother-city. Four cults of Artemis are attested at Syracuse, but there is no obvious analogy with the mother-city of Corinth. The early and central nature of the cults on Ortygia and Kerkyra suggest Artemis held some special significance for the colonising Corinthians but this cannot be associated with any specific, historic cult. At Selinus the early classical temple of Artemis on the akropolis and the contemporary coin type could be references to Megarian cults of the goddess. The ‘twin’ temples (A and O) and the appearance of both Artemis and Apollo on the coins probably allude to the Megarian cult of Apollo Agraios and Artemis Agrotera. The cults at Zankle-Messana and Rhegion, either side of the straits of Messina, are explained by later sources as Messenian foundations of the Tauric Artemis; these cults are probably connected to
the Lakedaimonian and Messenian cults of Artemis Orthia and Artemis Limnatis. Lakedaimonian, or Dorian, influence presumably inspired the foundations in the Tarentine *chora* at Torricella and Maruggio; the Spartan cult of Artemis Korythalia may also have been transferred to the colony. The Tarentine production of Artemis Bendis figurines appears to have revitalised the cult of the goddess at the Lucanian *temene* of Demeter at Herakleia itself and the site of S. Maria d’Anglona. Taras, as the mother-city of Herakleia, therefore appears to have had a direct influence on its cults of Artemis. The Metapontine cult of Artemis at S. Biagio, which may have been transferred to the urban *temenos*, is explicitly linked to the Peloponnese but to an Arkadian, not Achaian, cult. However, as we should expect, it is possible in most cases to trace some connection between the cults in the colony and the mother-city albeit using Pausanias’ later testimony for the Greek mainland cults.

There are 21 epithets recorded for the worship of the goddess in Southern Italy and Sicily; these epithets are attested in inscriptions, ancient authors, scholia and lexicographers over several centuries. Not all of the epithets can be associated with a specific set of remains or even specific *polis*, although the majority of the Sicilian epithets are from Syracuse complementing the relatively large number of entries for this *polis* in the catalogue of sites. Regardless of the contextual data available, the epithets can help us understand which aspect of the goddess was invoked and serve as supporting evidence for the transfer of cults from the mother-city to the colony. Indeed some of Artemis’ epithets in Southern Italy and Sicily are popular throughout the Greek world, for example, Agrotera and Soteira. Others, although less well-known, are also attested elsewhere in the Greek world, for example Alpheioa and Pheraia. Finally there are a number of epithets which are attested only in Southern Italy or Sicily. Some of this latter category are simply toponyms (Meroessa, Tifatina) while others appear to be derived from a myth with local significance (Phakelitis, Angelos-Angelike). The impression of Artemis which emerges from these epithets is a goddess of the wild (Agrotera/Agratera, Lyaia), who is associated with particular natural phenomena (mountains: Tifatina; springs/rivers: Alpheioa, Potamia). A connection with Demeter and Persephone (Angelos-Angelike, Eleusinia) which manifests itself in a chthonian cult (Pheraia) is also suggested. Finally, several of the epithets are suggestive of a kourotrophic role as a goddess usually associated with *parthenoi* (Alpheioa, Chitone, Eupraxia, Eleuthias, Hemera, Korythalia, Potamia).
Artemis appears to receive cult with Demeter/Persephone in four temene, two each at Syracuse and Herakleia, and once each with Diana (Capua), Zeus (S. Biagio), and Apollo (Selinus). The lone association with Apollo at Selinus is perhaps surprising, although there is one further instance of their association as their cults at Rhexion and Zankle-Messana were related since they were both founded by Orestes. The importance of the Delphic Oracle to the colonising movement assured Apollo a prominent place in the pantheon of the Greek west and it is reasonable to suppose that his sister would join him in his temene; statues of the goddess may have been set-up in his temene but we have very little evidence to suggest a joint cult. Also surprising is Artemis’ association with Zeus at S. Biagio; the unusual nature of this joint temenos does not mean we should try to construct ways to dissociate Zeus from the site. Other temene in the Metapontine chora were shared by a pair of divinities and Artemis and Zeus appear to have had their cults transferred into the asty of Metapontion at the same time. Zeus Aglaios complemented Artemis in some fashion at this site; he may have had some special significance for the local aristocracy. The association of Artemis and Diana is to be expected; Diana is the goddess of the Italic pantheon who had most in common with Artemis. The location of this sole association is unsurprisingly in an area where the Greeks of Southern Italy came into contact with the Etruscans from the north. Demeter and Persephone were popular goddesses in Sicily and Southern Italy; their association with Artemis on the Greek mainland is already known and its recurrence in the Greek west, while noteworthy for its predominance in the admittedly small number of cults in our review, is not unusual.

Finally we should make some observations about the physical location of Artemis’ temene in the Southern Italian and Sicilian landscape. The temene of Artemis are associated with a variety of natural landscapes: springs (Ortygia, S. Biagio), rivers (Zankle-Messana), caves (Scala Greca), promontories (Maruggio, Rhexion?) and mountains (Tifata ridge). Artemis is worshipped throughout the politically defined landscape of the polis: in the asty and the chora; in the latter she receives cult at both extra-mural and extra-urban sites. The politics of the polis are responsible for the spread of the goddess’ cult; for example, Artemis’ importance at Syracuse probably influenced the establishment of her cult at Akrai and Meressa. It is interesting to note that there may be a few instances of cultic doublets in the catalogue; this phenomenon of establishing two branches of a cult, one in the centre and one on the periphery, serves to connect the chora ritually with the asty (Sourvinou-Inwood 1990, 310). The practice is attested on mainland Greece; one of the most famous examples is the cult of Artemis Brauronia which is
found in the Attic *chora* and on the Athenian Akropolis (Paus. 1.23.7). The cults of Artemis at Syracuse are split: two in the centre and two in the periphery. The association of Artemis and Demeter/Persephone in the *temene* at Achraina and Belvedere suggests the cults could be connected. The connection of Artemis with Ortigia and Scala Greca on the two poles of the Syracusan *polis* could also suggest a link between these two cults. The cult on Ortigia may have been associated with the epithet So(t)eria; the extension of this cult to the caves at the edge of the *chora* could indicate Artemis’ protection of the whole *polis*. At Herakleia, another urban cult of Artemis Soteira may have been associated with a cult at the edge of the *chora* at S. Maria di Anglona. At Metapontion, it appears that the cult of the *chora* was transported into the *asty* at a time of socio-political tension; on the reproduction of rural cults in the city and their role as a ‘reminder’ rather than ‘rival’ foundation see Cole (2004, 195-6). We may therefore conclude that the landscape of Artemis in Southern Italy and Sicily is one of infinite variety.
Chapter 3

The iconographical evidence and images of Artemis

3.1 The iconographical evidence

The iconographical evidence for Artemis in Southern Italy and Sicily will be discussed in three categories: Artemis (chapter 3.2), Artemis with Apollo (chapter 4.1) and Artemis’ mythology (chapter 4.2). These categories will be defined and the images explained in more detail below but first we should consider the various presentational media. There are two catalogues informing the discussion in this chapter: the sculpture catalogue and the vase-painting catalogue. I shall begin the discussion by reviewing the issues inherent in the study of sculpture and vase-painting and discuss the impact these have upon this thesis.

The sculpture catalogue differentiates between architectural and non-architectural sculpture as well as between items found in Southern Italy and Sicily. The architectural sculpture, while included in the catalogue as isolated images, originally formed part of a sculptural, decorative scheme for an ancient edifice. In most instances the building concerned is a temple and an understanding of the deity to whom it was dedicated and of its physical location is required to contextualise the image. The role of figural decoration in the Greek world, with particular reference to Sicily, has been recently discussed by Marconi (2007, 1-60). The images carved upon temples served to transport the visitor from the mortal world to a world of myth, heroes and gods and therefore played an important part in the creation of a psychological concept of sacred space (Marconi 2007, 28). A consideration of the temple’s overall iconographical scheme is crucial for an interpretation of these sculptures in their original context.

The non-architectural sculpture is a less homogeneous group. The predominant media in the catalogue are terracotta figurines although examples of pinakes, a terracotta thymiaterion, a

---

1 The non-architectural sculpture entries (S Sicily S Italy) are examples of types as the large quantities of terracotta figurines found in Southern Italy and Sicily make a comprehensive catalogue unfeasible within the scope of this study. The architectural sculpture entries represent all known examples, from Southern Italy (AS I) or Sicily (AS S), with an image of either Artemis or her specific mythology.

2 The physical location of the temple within Southern Italy or Sicily is important; for example Selinus and Poseidonia, both of which have provided architectural material for our study, were founded on the edge of the Greek sphere. Also, the location of the temple within its community, urban, sub-urban or extra-urban, can inform us about the cult practised there (chapter 2).
marble statue, an ivory relief, an ivory fibula, a bronze hydria decoration and a bronze mirror are also included. It may initially be considered remarkable that there is only one (cult) statue in the sculpture catalogue.\(^3\) The cult statue is generally considered an important part of a cult’s repertoire; it had a special place within the temenos, was the recipient of cult as a usually anthropomorphic substitute for the deity and was a ‘participant’ in ritual and festivals (Romano 1988; Schnapp 1988). The literary sources mention local ancient statues of the goddess, for example an ancient bronze statue of ‘Diana’ at Segesta (Cic. Verr. 2.5.72), and there are representations of cult statues of Artemis on an Apulian vase (VP L64) and in locally produced sculpture (S 119-22, AS I11). Furthermore, there are hellenistic and Roman examples of statues of the goddess from Southern Italy, some of which are archaising in style.\(^4\)

The absence of evidence for cult statues in archaic and classical Southern Italy and Sicily is not necessarily unexpected. Contemporary statues from the Greek mainland are known, but often Pausanias’ later testimony supports their identification and reconstruction: for example, the Lykosoura group (Paus. 8.37.4-5; Dickens 1906-7, 357-400, pl.12-13). There is no such support from a periegetic author for our geographical remit. Furthermore, the continuous occupation of many sites has not helped. A lot of the evidence for architectural sculptural decoration comes from Poseidonia and Selinus, both of which have been subject to significant archaeological investigation on account of the absence of a corresponding modern settlement.\(^5\) It is also possible that cult statues were uncovered in early foraging of the ancient sites; Naples was certainly a major trading point in antiquities. It is therefore likely that some Greek statues, or indeed Roman copies of Greek originals, in modern museum or private collections come from Southern Italy or Sicily.

\(^3\) S 123 is the sole statue in the sculpture catalogue and we cannot be certain that it is a cult statue: statues others than those revered as the specific manifestation of the deity were carved and dedicated in the ancient Greek world. This sculpture will be discussed below, but it should be noted that Kahil (1984, no. 697) describes it as a statuette. However, having seen the remaining fragments in the Correale Museum in Sorrento, I am confident that it should be recorded as a statue. Furthermore, some of the terracotta types of a Potnia Theron from the San Biagio temenos in the Metapontine chorak (S 17-13) are up to 40cm tall (Olbrich 1976, 381).

\(^4\) The Artemis of Naples (Naples, Mus. Naz. 6008) from Pompeii, which presents the goddess as a huntress, is now recognised as an archaising Roman sculpture (Parslow 1995, 200-205; Donohue 2005, 44 n.70).

\(^5\) Cult statues were usually associated with temples and so sites such as these, from which architectural sculpture has survived, would be expected to produce a statue. Some of the more rural sites where large quantities of terracotta figurines of Artemis have been found, such as Scala Greca at Syracuse, have produced little evidence for the associated buildings other than foundations which makes the survival of any original cult statue far less likely.
One other possibility is that the colonists did not set up (many) cult statues of the type we expect. The absence of cult statue bases in Southern Italian temples has been noted elsewhere (Miller 1997, 345). The images of cult statues preserved in other media, in particular the Artemis Bendis types (S 119-21), the Lokroi terracotta figurines (S I22) and the frieze from a Tarentine naiskos6 (AS I11), suggest a local taste for smaller statues. Terracotta figurines may have been influenced in some way by a cult image but they were not copies (Alroth 1989, 106-8) and so we cannot use them to reconstruct a statue. Similarly, coin designs provide inconclusive evidence for statues.7

In direct contrast to the relatively few cult statues discovered, Southern Italian and Sicilian excavations have produced thousands of terracotta figurines. Concentrations of images of the Potnia Theron are found in Southern Italy at Artemis’ temenos at San Biagio in the Metapontine chora. Another interesting type appears in fourth century Taras: Artemis Bendis.8 Artemis is also popular in late classical Sicily with a range of figurines, which originated in Syracuse and spread to a number of sites including Morgantina, Gela and Butera, which represented the goddess as the huntress. The types listed above are easily recognisable and generally accepted as images of the goddess.9 The dating of these figurines is not always straightforward. As popular mould-made objects a series of identical figurines can cover a wide chronological period (Nicholls 1952, 226). Moreover, the frequent burial of these figurines in votive deposits, with no clear stratigraphy, can leave stylistic analysis (ultimately of the mould) as our only means of dating the pieces (Ammerman 2002, 145).

The identification of female terracotta figurines apart from these easily recognisable types is complicated. I have identified figurines as Artemis where either the female is depicted with a common attribute, carrying a hunting tool or is associated with an animal or the identification has been attributed elsewhere. This definition requires some refinement to

---

6 The locally manufactured images of Artemis’ cult statue in scenes with Iphigeneia, which appear on both local ceramic and coroplastic art, are not as reliable as the examples listed in the text. The cult statue in the Iphigeneia myth was stolen from the Tauric land and so the artist was not required to depict a cult statue manufactured in the local tradition.
7 See chapter 5 below.
8 The figurines from Taras are now popularly called Artemis Bendis. However, their identity as simply Artemis or Bendis has also been argued. I shall discuss these images further in section 3.2 where I will argue that they represent Artemis Bendis.
9 I follow Nicholls’ (1952, 218) definition of a type: “a number of pieces bearing a strong resemblance to one another in no more than general appearance and shape”. Nicholls (1952, 218-25) further subdivisions of ‘group’ and ‘series’ provide another level of analysis searching for an individual artist and the re-use of moulds. The occurrence of some of our types at more than one site naturally raises questions about ‘groups’ and ‘series’: are the figurines identical and if so were they produced in one polis and sold in another or are they copies?
allow for the rejection of females carrying a pig, generally accepted to be Demeter or Persephone (Edlund 1987, 136), or a dove which is similarly accepted to be Aphrodite (Sourvinou-Inwood 1978, 119). Moreover, females grasping or controlling animals should be understood as the Potnia Theron: a figure associated with, but not equal to, Artemis.

The issue of differentiating between goddesses is further complicated by the need to differentiate between a goddess and her female devotee (Whitehouse 1996, 19ff). On account of the sheer volume of particularly Sicilian terracotta figurines, Zuntz (1971, 95) has argued that unless a goddess' attributes are clearly visible we should understand all of these female figurines as human votaries. I think this approach may be a little excessive. I certainly share Alroth's scepticism (1989, 66 n. 390) over the status of figurines carrying flowers, wreaths or fruit. While the possibility remains that these females are goddesses, I do not identify any of them as Artemis even if they were discovered at an Artemis cult site. Sculptors and coroplasts took care, even with roughly modelled images of the goddess, to include some easily identifiable aspect for the viewer even if this was a simple quiver strap across the torso. Moreover, Alroth (1987, 17-8; 1989, 108-113) has clearly demonstrated that representations of one deity can be dedicated in another deity's temenos. Female figurines discovered in a temenos of Artemis need not, therefore, represent Artemis.

Moving beyond the issue of identity, we face the question of their meaning to the ancient dedicator. Terracotta figurines were largely produced as votive objects. They were a relatively cheap and easily produced form of offering; as such they proved an accessible and popular form of votive offering. As an anthropomorphic representation of the deity they recall a cult statue. However, they were not considered to be the manifestation of the deity and therefore a recipient of cult (Schnapp 1988, 573). The exact placement of these figurines within temene is unclear (Alroth 1988) and many of those discovered in Southern

---

10 This issue is much debated in the context of the Attic and East Greek archaic korai whose exact identity (mortal, deceased mortal/substitute, heroine, goddess) cannot be definitely known but is much debated; see, for example, Martinez (2000, 20-2); Steiner (2001, 13-4, 151-6, 234-8, 257-9); Stieber (2004, 114-40 esp. 135-40) and Meyer and Brüggemann (2007, 121-9).

11 While flowers, wreaths and fruit often constitute offerings for a deity, they may still be depicted as a deity's attribute. See the discussion of AS S2 below for the rationale of potentially identifying a figure carrying a flower as Artemis.

12 Against this approach see Kahil (1984, nos.540-4, 545-50) for the identification of figurines carrying either fruit or flowers as Artemis.

13 However, their status as a cheap and accessible offering should not undermine their value to us. Indeed, there was a greater emphasis on terracotta production in Southern Italy and Sicily than elsewhere in the Greek world (Carter 1975, 28).
Italy or Sicily are buried in votive deposits.\textsuperscript{14} The dedication of a votive figurine differed from the two other main means of sustaining a positive relationship with the gods, prayer and sacrifice, for the figurine remained as a “tangible memento” of the act (Van Straten 1981, 65-69). The reason for dedication can usually only be surmised: none of the figurines of Artemis discovered in Southern Italy or Sicily bears a commemorative inscription recording such details. Votive offerings were generally made in supplication, to mark a ritual occasion such as initiation or in recognition and thanks for the deity’s intervention (Van Straten 1981, 81ff.). Each figurine represents an individual act of faith while en masse they represent the repeated performance of a particular rite (Ammerman 2002, 7).

It remains for us to consider what we can learn from these terracotta figurines. The evolution of a type and trends of dedication may reveal contemporary perceptions of the recipient deity (Ammerman 2002, 23). The relative popularity of certain types can further inform our understanding of the deity depicted. However, we must remain conscious of the accident of survival. There are undoubtedly many more votive deposits as yet undiscovered which could introduce different types or a large number of a currently poorly attested type. The dedication of terracotta figurines of Artemis in the temenos of another deity, or the dedication of terracotta figurines of another deity in a temenos of Artemis, may indicate a link in either character or mythology between the two (Alroth 1987, 17-8). Furthermore the occurrence of a type at a number of sites may be a cultic reflection of political and economics (Bell 1981, 4).

The remaining media in the sculpture catalogue for discussion here are an ivory fibula, an ornate bronze hydria decoration, a bronze mirror, an ivory relief, a terracotta thymiaterion and a number of pinakes. The first three were clearly prestigious items on account of the expensive fabric and they were all buried as grave goods, while the thymiaterion was erected in the Tarentine necropolis. The fibula (S S1) was found in a Syracusan grave; the burial of a valuable imported item as a ‘grave good’ highlights the emergence of a tradition of using burial as a demonstration of status in seventh-century Syracuse (Shepherd 1995, 52-6).\textsuperscript{15} The ornate bronze hydria decoration (S I2) from the Grächwil hydria, which accompanied a

\textsuperscript{14} The figurines may have been on show in the temenos for a period of time before their collective burial in a votive deposit. A large number of figurines are found in votive deposits in the late classical and early hellenistic periods suggesting a local custom for collective burial or storage within a temenos (Ammerman 2002, 22-3).

\textsuperscript{15} The contemporaneous burial practices on the Greek mainland exhibit a reduction in the volume and ostentation of grave goods (Osborne 1996, 81-8). However, Shepherd (1995) has demonstrated that burial practices in Greek Sicily were being driven by different factors.
chiefetain’s burial in what is now modern Switzerland, reflects the same concept but is a more ostentatious demonstration of wealth. The hydria was one of a number of items discovered in the Celtic world, now Switzerland, demonstrating an extensive trade and exchange network (Wells 1995, 231-4); the hydria’s burial alongside the chiefetain must surely be an indication of status. It is interesting to note that the fibula, bronze decoration and thymiaterion (S 118) all depict a female in the Potnia Theron pose. The bronze mirror (S 15), with an image of Aktaion, dating at least 150 years after the fibula and bronze decoration belongs to a different tradition and may be part of an Orphic initiate’s burial (Carter 2006, 177-184). The pinakes are small reliefs which were probably hung up as votive offerings (Van Straten 1992, 250-1). They provided a small surface area, but one large enough to convey a narrative scene. The ivory relief, although of a more expensive material, is similar to the pinakes in this respect; its exact context is unknown.

Representations of Artemis, or a scene or character from a myth commonly associated with the goddess, in vase-painting are listed in the vase-painting catalogue.\(^\text{16}\) The vases are presented in three groups: those manufactured in Attica and exported to Sicily,\(^\text{17}\) those manufactured in Attica and exported to Italy and those manufactured in Sicily or Southern Italy.\(^\text{18}\) The distinction between the vases manufactured in Attica and those produced locally is clearly important in any iconographical discussion. The comparison between Attic vases discovered on Sicily and those excavated in Italy may also identify some interesting patterns.

I have included all Attic vases, with an image of Artemis or her mythology, discovered in Italy in the catalogue including those outwith Southern Italy. It is possible that an Attic vase excavated in Etruria had been imported via another part of Italy. It will also be interesting to note whether there is a significant difference between those Attic vases found in Etruria and northern Italy and those in the Greek south. I have not included Etruscan manufactured vases in the catalogue, but they are noted in the discussion when relevant for comparative purposes.

\(^\text{16}\) I am indebted to the CVA project for its digitisation of CVA fascicules which provided an easily accessible starting point for my review of the Attic evidence. Similarly, Trendall’s tireless cataloguing and publication of vases manufactured in Southern Italy and Sicily was invaluable as a source of data. The catalogue was updated with further entries identified from secondary reading and the BSA’s AR reports. However, there will inevitably be vases I have missed. The CVA vase number, as recorded in the online archive, is given for all Attic vases. For vases of local manufacture I have provided the museum and inventory details if available. If these are unknown, I have provided the publication reference: for Trendall this follows the standard citation method of chapter number/vase number.

\(^\text{17}\) One vase of Chalkidian manufacture found on Sicily falls within our chronological remit (VP S43). The referencing system employed in the catalogue reflects the three groupings: VP S(icy) for Attic vases found on Sicily, VP L(ocal fabric) for Attic vases found in Italy, and VP L(ocal fabric) for vases manufactured on Sicily or in Italy.
The details recorded in the catalogue are those which may inform our understanding of Artemis. Technical details of shape and technique\textsuperscript{19} allow the contextualisation of the image.\textsuperscript{20} It is now generally acknowledged that the analysis of a vase’s image against the type of vase on which it appears can only be of limited assistance (Sparkes 1996, 117-19). Furthermore, Scheffer’s survey of divinities on Attic vases (2001, 133) could not identify a clear pattern for representing a specific god on a specific shape. Indeed several scholars, for example Boardman (1979), have highlighted the popularity of certain shapes at specific sites and periods as a more productive avenue of research than attempting to identify a direct correlation between vase shape and image.\textsuperscript{21} A high-level analysis of the various vase shapes, further differentiated by period, is provided at the end of the catalogue.\textsuperscript{22} The results, which correspond with Scheffer’s (2001, 134-6) wider survey, demonstrate a decline in the amphora’s popularity and an increase in the popularity of vessels associated with women between the archaic and classical periods.\textsuperscript{23} I shall review the shapes throughout this chapter to identify any correlation of particular scenes on particular vases: individual instances of association remain an interesting possibility.\textsuperscript{24}

The vases date largely to the archaic and classical periods. Imported Attic pottery is more popular in the archaic period while the vast majority of the locally manufactured pottery dates to the classical period. There are a few early hellenistic examples of locally manufactured wares which mark the end of the red-figure tradition (Trendall 1989, 16) and I have included them in the catalogue. For the purposes of the analyses attached to the catalogue, the earliest possible date of a vase has been used to determine its historic period.

\textsuperscript{19} See Trendall (1989, 14-5) on techniques of southern Italian vase-painters.
\textsuperscript{20} These technical details are recorded in my catalogue as they were in the original place of publication. In some cases a later discussion of the vase can describe its shape as something other than initially recorded. For example, VP L31 is recorded by Trendall in LCS 2/389 as a calyx krater. However, when later discussing the same vase, Trendall (1989, 21) refers to it as a volute krater.
\textsuperscript{21} See Trendall and Cambitoglou (1978, xlix-li) on the trend to monumental vases in Apulian red-figure and Apulian innovations such as the variant of the loutrophoros and the nestoris which may have been introduced to cater to native tastes.
\textsuperscript{22} See Sparkes (1991, 80ff) for definitions and functions of the majority of the vase shapes listed.
\textsuperscript{23} Scheffer (2001, 135-6) connects the popularity of smaller ‘female’ shapes, such as oinochoai which were not suitable for the representation of large mythical scenes, with a growing rejection of the old myths at the end of the archaic period, citing Herodotos’ (1.60) disbelief that the Athenians could have believed Phye was Athena. In those difficult times, Scheffer suggests representations of these myths would have seemed more suited to women and their perceived pre-occupation with tales of love and marriage.
\textsuperscript{24} A well-known example of this type of correlation is tomb scenes on Attic white-ground lekythoi.
The provenance of all the Attic vases is recorded. By definition, they must have been found in either Italy or Sicily to qualify for inclusion in the catalogue.\textsuperscript{25} The provenance details recorded in the CVA’s archives rarely provide any indication of context: cultic, funerary or domestic. The vases manufactured locally do not usually have a provenance associated with them. However, very few southern Italian vases have been discovered outside Italy (Trendall 1989, 9); by 1978 only c.1\% of Apulian vases had been excavated outside Apulia (Trendall and Cambitoglou 1978, xlvii). The state of the Apulian evidence suggests that many Attic vases which do not have a provenance may have been found in Southern Italy or Sicily. Furthermore, as several vases are known to us only from auction catalogues, there may be even more vases which were obtained through illicit excavation and now reside in private collections.

Finally the catalogue records both a synopsis of the vase’s image and a more detailed description of the scene. The former is my categorisation of the image and forms a key driver for my research; the catalogue has therefore been ordered alphabetically by the synopsis. The detailed description reproduces the detail given in the place of publication.

The 178 Attic vases in the catalogue are just a small fraction of the total number of Attic vases exported to Southern Italy and Sicily.\textsuperscript{26} The general increase in the export of pottery coincides with an increase in the number of Athenian potters’ workshops (Boardman 1975, 179), a decline in the export of olive oil (Shapiro 1989, 10-11) and a decline in exports to Etruria; after c.460 Southern Italy and Sicily were the primary focus of Athens’ pottery export market (Lewis 2003, 175). The evidence suggests an increased demand for pottery as a commodity in its own right and not merely as a vehicle for transporting goods: as Shapiro (1989, 10-11) has argued the variety of shapes exported and the use of some of the vases as grave goods indicate that they were imported as items of aesthetic value.\textsuperscript{27} Furthermore, as early as the third quarter of the fourth century, Athenian potters and painters were moving to Southern Italy and Sicily to create new workshops: this migration of workers is a clear sign of local demand by the western Greeks and the native inhabitants of Southern Italy and Sicily (Sparkes 1996, 21).

\textsuperscript{25} I have not included Attic vases without a formal provenance which are currently in Italian or Sicilian museums. Although their current location may be indicative of a local find-spot, such a connection is purely speculative. This approach has been used elsewhere, see Giudice (1999, 281).

\textsuperscript{26} See Mugione (2000, 7-52) for a detailed analysis of the distribution of Attic painters’ ware in the west from the beginning of the archaic period into the fourth century.

\textsuperscript{27} Pindar alludes to the aesthetic value of Athenian drinking cups in his encomium for Thrasyboulos, Deinomenid tyrant of Syracuse (fr. 124.4 S-M).
What does this mean for the images painted on the vases? The Athenian vase-painters were drawing upon a number of sources for their images: literary texts, common myths, large scale painting and their own inspiration (Boardman 1989, 222-3; Snodgrass 1998, 151-63; Scheffer 2001, 127). Lewis (2003, 183) highlights the change in the vase-painter’s repertoire c.450 and its coincidence with the shift in the export market from Etruria to Southern Italy and Sicily. The change implies that the potters and painters of Athens were manufacturing vases with a clear view of their market’s tastes. It is hardly surprising that the manufacturer would make his wares as appealing as possible to the purchaser in a competitive environment with an increasing number of workshops in Athens and the west. If this hypothesis is correct, we should expect to see some similarity between the scenes on vases manufactured in Athens and those produced in the west for the local market.

The Attic painters’ representations of the gods have been analysed by Scheffer (2001, 129-32) who identified six broad categories of representations of the gods on Attic vases in the late archaic and early classical periods. Scheffer (2001, 132) detected a general shift from scenes where the gods take an active protective or violent role to scenes where they appear as uninterested bystanders. By examining the various scenes in which Artemis appears and their frequency in both Attic and local fabric, it may be possible to understand any influence the Southern Italian and Sicilian markets had on these changes. Regardless of the motivation behind the Attic painter’s choice of scene (and the influence of the purchaser’s taste upon it), the Attic vases in the catalogue must have, in some way, informed the western purchaser’s view of Artemis.

The transmission of Attic vases in the Greek west and their significance in this context is the subject of much debate. For our purposes Giudice’s (1999) analysis of the production of certain Attic scenes and their popularity as export items for Magna Graecia is particularly pertinent. Giudice (1999, 274-5, fig. 8a-b) tracks the sharp increase in the general popularity and export of Artemis scenes from 500-475, peaking in 475-450, and convincingly identifies the impetus as the Athenian victory at the cape of Artemision (Hdt. 7.176.1-2; Plut. Them. 8). Following an extensive survey of Attic pottery, Giudice (1999, 280) can conclude that

---

28 Scheffer’s six broad categories are (1) gods conversing with each other, (2) gods with suite, (3) mythical activity, (4) chariot scenes, (5) acting towards a figure of myth who is not a god and (6) with humans in ‘daily life’. The representations of Artemis in the catalogue cover most of these categories.

29 See, for example, Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia (1997), Massa-Pairault (1999) and Mugione (1999).
the Athenians produced and actively exported scenes alluding to their military victories in ‘real time’, presumably as propaganda, to the western Greek world.

In 1989 Arthur Dale Trendall (1989, 7) was able to confirm the existence of c.20,000 red figure vases produced in southern Italy and Sicily and in the two decades since then countless others will have been discovered. Many of these are simple patterned pieces with no figurative design, yet the 116 vases in the catalogue represent a very small percentage of the overall corpus. These locally manufactured vases can be divided into five categories: Apulian, Lucanian, Campanian, Paestan and Sicilian. Apulian production was significantly greater than any of the others: 111 of the 116 entries in the catalogue are Apulian and four of the five fabrics are represented, see table 3.1 below.

A few popular themes in the local fabrics have been identified: Dionysos, drama, scenes from mythology; especially noteworthy are representations of unusual myths such as the daughters of Anios or Kallisto and females preparing for their weddings or going about their daily lives (Trendall and Cambitoglou 1978, 11; Trendall 1967, 580-1; 1989, 12-13). The Dionysiac scenes reflect the importance of the god’s cult in Southern Italy; Tzannes (1997, 150-2) highlights a volute krater in Naples which represents the many facets of the god’s

![Table 3.1: Vases of local fabric](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of vases</th>
<th>Archaic period</th>
<th>Classical period</th>
<th>Hell. Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sicilian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

30 I do not mean to imply that Artemis is under-represented, relative to the appearance of other Olympian deities, on locally manufactured vases. A survey of the indices of Trendall’s catalogues of vases from southern Italy and Sicily reveals that the representations of the goddess are comparable with those of her peers. However, Herakles and the Amazons appear more frequently than several of the Olympian deities. Scheffer’s (2001, 132) review of the gods on Attic vases in the archaic period and early fourth century demonstrated that Artemis was a relatively popular goddess in vase-painting design, but still featured on only 4% of all the vases painted during that time.

31 For these fabrics see Trendall and Cambitoglou (1978), Trendall (1967) and Trendall (1989). Trendall (1989, 7) recorded the approximate numbers of known vases as follows: 10,000 Apulian, 1,500 Lucanian, 4,000 Campanian, 2,000 Paestan and 1,000 Sicilian.

32 Although there are no Paestan entries in the catalogue, Trendall (1936, 89) refers to an engraving of a lost vase with the punishment of Marsyas. From the detail in the engraving Trendall provisionally assigns the vase to the transition period of the Paestan school, c.330-310. Trendall’s uncertainty over the vase has led me to exclude it from my catalogue.

33 The interest of southern Italian painters in dramatic scenes represents an important difference between Attic and local vases (Carpenter 1991, 11; Sparkes 1996, 130).
When the gods appear they are on the periphery: frequently in an upper register (Trendall 1989, 12).

Before I begin my discussion of these images I should briefly explain my methodology. There are three established methods for the study of ancient images: connoisseurship, iconology and iconography. Following scholars such as Sparkes (1996, 134-9) and Lewis (2003, 190) I have adopted the third. Although this is primarily a study of the scenes on the vases, I have included chronological, technical and archaeological details in the catalogue and shall refer to these in the discussion. I do not intend to treat the images as illustrations of ancient literary texts: they are an individual source in their own right (Sparkes 1996, 120-4; cf. Taplin 2007). Nor can these images be relied upon as a ‘still’ of a single moment: many of them may be synoptic (Shapiro 1994, 8-9) combining several different episodes into one scene. Furthermore, as Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 11) has argued, the signs incorporated in the images, and therefore the images themselves, are polysemic. Signs and images could be read in a number of ways depending upon the context or even in the same context. Therefore, a painter and purchaser could read the same image in different ways or just one of these individuals could read the image in several different ways.

The vases in the catalogue have been divided into three sections which provide a useful framework for the discussion of all the iconographical evidence. Each section addresses a particular theme or group of representations while reviewing both ceramic and sculptural evidence. The first section (3.2) includes the non-narrative vase-painting scenes of Artemis; terracotta figurines of Artemis as the huntress (Agrotera) and the evidence, both ceramic and sculptural, for Artemis association with other females namely the Potnia Theron, Bendis and Hekate. Other images which do not fit into the second or third section are also included here: scenes at a cult site of Artemis or at Eleusis and one image of the Trojan War. The discussion of these images constitutes the remainder of chapter three of this thesis.

In chapter four I shall discuss representations of Artemis with Apollo but not necessarily interacting with him (4.1); myths of the two deities, for example the Niobids, are included here. The third section (4.2) includes scenes which appear to be from well-known myths of Artemis in which Apollo does not appear. The latter two sections rely primarily on the vase-paintings and architectural sculpture which depict narrative scenes. The analysis by scene in

35 The vase is in the Museo Nazionale (H2411 inv. 82922) and includes in its imagery masks, wine, music, goat sacrifice, dancing and initiation/purification. The god reclines in the midst of these images of his sphere.
the vase-painting catalogue records the frequency of these scenes by historic period and fabric. I have provided a summary of these results below in table 3.2 with further detail on both the existence of sculptural examples of the scene and its location in the discussion below.

Table 3.2: Popularity of scenes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scene</th>
<th>Frequency (%)</th>
<th>Sculpture</th>
<th>Chapter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artemis with Apollo</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis (other)</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis in/mounting chariot</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphigeneia myth</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niobids</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis Bendis</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippiolytos</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigantomachy</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallisto</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herakles and deer</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potnia Theron</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proitids</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusis</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tityos</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trojan War</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Artemis

3.2.1 General images of the goddess

The struggle for the tripod features on a metope from the Heraion at Foce del Sele, but Artemis is excluded from the scene. Scenes excluding the goddess are only included in the catalogues if they clearly belong to her own, personal mythology (for example, Aktaion) and not that of her brother.
I shall first consider the images identified in the vase-painting catalogue synopsis as Artemis (or Artemis?)\(^{37}\), Eleusis, Trojan War and Artemis cult site. The first group of images generally represent the goddess holding an attribute or accompanied by an animal and have been grouped together as Artemis (other) in table 2 above. The Artemis (other) category is the second largest in the catalogue. A total of 48 vases, 14% of the Attic vases and just under a fifth of those locally produced, depict Artemis in these scenes. The corresponding sculptural evidence for Artemis will also be discussed; in particular the series of late classical terracotta figurines from Sicily. Finally the representations of the Potnia Theron and Artemis Bendis in both the ceramic and coroplastic media will be reviewed.\(^{38}\)

First, I shall consider the iconography of the goddess on the vases before turning to the action she engages in or observes. The Attic vases of this type found on Sicily form a homogeneous group (VP S22-32, 35): the vases all date to the late archaic or early classical period and ten of the twelve recorded are lekythoi.\(^{39}\) These are all non-narrative scenes in which the goddess usually appears holding an attribute appropriate to her role as the huntress.\(^{40}\) The Attic vases found in Italy are a slightly more disparate group (VP I78, 84-8, 94-9). Eight of the vases were discovered in Southern Italy while four were found in Etruria. On these vases with an Italian provenance the goddess usually holds an attribute defining her as the huntress.\(^{41}\) Five of the scenes appear on large vases\(^{42}\) while the remaining seven scenes appear on a variety of smaller vases.\(^{43}\) The lekythoi found on Sicily and the seven smaller vases from Italy with the goddess conform to the increase of ‘female’ shapes in the late archaic and early classical periods: images of Artemis, among other mythical scenes, were considered more appropriate, although not exclusively, for vessels more likely to be

\(^{37}\) See Carpenter (1991, 35-68) on portraits of the gods and difficulties with identifying them. Also, Scheffer (2001, 132) on the passivity of goddesses as a factor that contributes to the difficulty.

\(^{38}\) The images of Artemis driving a chariot or riding an animal can be associated with the representations of the Potnia Theron as they depict a form of control over the animals. However, these images will be discussed in 4.1 below as many of the chariot scenes feature Artemis alongside Apollo.

\(^{39}\) VP S24 and VP S26 are neck amphorae.

\(^{40}\) On VP S23-31 Artemis holds a bow and/or arrow and on VP S32 a spear. VP S22 has a quiver suspended in the field. There is no symbol of Artemis’ role as a huntress on VP S35. However, the identification of the goddess is uncertain in this scene.

\(^{41}\) On VP I84-7, 96 the goddess holds a bow, arrow and/or quiver, and on VP I97 spears. On VP I78 and 88 the goddess carries an oinochoe and torches respectively; the significance of these scenes will be discussed below. On VP I98 only the goddess’ head is depicted in the centre of the tondo.

\(^{42}\) Namely a column krater (VP I96), three neck amphorae (VP I84-5, 95) and a pelike (VP I86).

\(^{43}\) Namely cups (VP I78, 94), oinochoe (VP I87, 97, 99), a lekythos (VP I88) and a plate (VP I98).
used by women in a domestic context. Apart from VP 194, which could be early archaic, the vases fit within the same period as the Sicilian finds.  

Corresponding scenes on locally manufactured vases (VP L44-5, 47-52, 54-6, 65, 67-76) appear on a wide range of vase shapes: 22 scenes appear on 13 different types of vase of which the krater is the most frequent with six entries in the catalogue. All the vases date to the classical period and, reflecting the general fabric ratio in the catalogue, are predominantly Apulian. Again the goddess appears with her hunting attributes: bows, quivers and spears. Artemis is accompanied by an animal on a number of scenes: mainly on vases exported to, or manufactured in, Italy. The deer (VP S31, VP I87, 94, 99, VP L72, 76) and hound (VP 195, 97, VP L44, 69, 71) can be easily explained as companions of the huntress. The horse which appears alongside Artemis on an Apulian hydria (VP L73) recalls the iconography of the goddess either in or alongside chariots which will be discussed below; the significance of the sole instance of Artemis with a bird (VP L74) is not obvious.  

There are a number of representations of Artemis carrying a torch on both the Attic and local manufactured vases; these images are predominantly from the classical period. It should also be noted that the torch is a popular attribute among the terracotta figurine types; examples are found among the late classical Sicilian types (S S8, 13-4), at Taras (S 117) and at Metapontion (S 113). There are four main ways of representing the torch as an attribute: a single torch (VP S53, 30; VP 11, 4, 16, 17, 19, 31, 110; VP L73, 88; S S13-4; S 113), two  

---

44 VP 194 is one of the vases discovered in Etruria; it was probably never intended for the Southern Italian market.  
45 On VP L65, 67-72 the goddess is carrying a bow, quiver and/or spear. The goddess appears less frequently with her hunting attributes on locally manufactured vases when compared with the Attic imported vases.  
46 Vase painters regularly included deer in their designs or as a decorative motif; depicting Artemis with a deer was imitated by the Etruscan vase-painters (Beazley 1947, 108, 251).  
47 The Potnia Theron, with whom Artemis was associated, was often depicted grasping birds; see below for the relationship of Artemis and the Potnia Theron. For the association of birds and the Olympian gods, especially the Delian gods, see Bevan (1989). The bird, considering the context of the scene in Hades, could be an allusion to Hades’ sceptre (‘Hades’ LIMC 128, 132, 134) and therefore not have any specific meaning for Artemis.  
48 Only VP 166 and S 113 are (possibly) archaic. VP 166 is a black-figure amphora from Etruria upon which a female (Artemis?), probably identified as Artemis by the CVA on account of Apollo’s presence in the scene, carrying two torches accompanies a chariot. S 113 is a fragment of one of the figurines from Artemis’ temenos at S. Biagio; these archaic figurines are produced at the site for over two centuries and we cannot be certain that this design is definitely archaic.  
49 Figurines carrying two torches are also found at S. Biagio in the fifth century (Olbrich 1976, 399).  
50 Bieber (1977, fig.326-7) includes a classical bronze figurine of a female from Sicily wearing a peplos and holding a torch held out in her left hand. The figurine’s right hand is extended to the right with the palm held up.
torches (VP S17; VP I66, 88; VP L74-5), a cross torch (S 117) or a single large-scale torch. Although there are no examples of the last type in the catalogue, a terracotta relief from the acropolis at Selinus and dating from before 249 (Kahil 1984, no. 424) depicts the goddess carrying this type of torch with a dog at her feet. Artemis can hold the torch in conjunction with one of her hunting attributes: a bow and sometimes an arrow (VP S30; VP II, 17) and a deer (VP II6) appear on the Attic vases here. This combination of attributes is not contradictory: the torch could be used in the hunt, especially by Artemis (Parisinou 2000, 101-105), while it is brandished by the goddess as a weapon on VP II8, against a deer and on VP L88 in a scene with Hippolytos.

A number of different epithets are associated with Artemis carrying torches; for example: Dadophore, Pyrsophore, Phosphoros and Hekate (Kahil 1984, 606). The iconography of the goddess as a torch-carrier is not only associated with cult epithets explicitly invoking her as a goddess of illumination; Artemis Soteira on Delos, for example, was depicted carrying two torches (Siebert 1966, 454-5). Parisinou (2002, 81-3) has compiled and presented the evidence for these epithets and for representations of the goddess carrying torches in mainland Greece. The bronze figurines from Lousoi holding a poppy and a torch, which may be copies of the cult statue of Artemis Hemera (Paus. 8.18.8; Kahil 1984, 633, nos.104-9), are of particular interest here on account of this cult’s association with Artemis’ temenos at S. Biagio. Furthermore, Cicero (Verr. 2.5.72) describes an ancient bronze statue of ‘Diana’ from Segesta which had been taken by the Carthaginians when they sacked Segesta but was eventually returned; Artemis held a bow and a torch.

The role of light in rites of passage has been comprehensively discussed by Parisinou (2000, 45-72). Artemis’ nature as a goddess responsible for rites of passage, especially of young

---

51 Callimachus (Hymn 3.116-18) describes the goddess with two pine torches which she lights on Mystian Olympus from the fires originally started by Zeus’ lightening. For the holding of two torches as an indicator of a chthonic figure see Themelis (1996, 174).
52 Artemis does not carry a cross torch on any of the locally manufactured vases. Rather, Persephone carries this torch on VP L68 and 74 in Artemis’ company. The terracotta figurines carrying the cross torch can hold a number of other attributes including piglets, deer and baskets; when the cross torch is combined with the deer the figurine probably represents Artemis (Schneider-Herrmann 1959, 57). The cross torch was a Lucanian phenomenon which is especially associated with Demeter/Persephone and Artemis (Olbrich 1976, 394).
53 Parisinou (2000, 97) compares the large single torch to a sceptre and suggests that as such it increases or emphasises the carrier’s status.
54 Artemis attacking the deer on VP II8 will be discussed below with a similar scene, where she carries a knife rather than a torch, on S S12. The Hippolytos scene will be discussed in 4.2 below.
females, has been much discussed elsewhere.\textsuperscript{55} Parisinou (2000, 45-49) connects the torch Artemis (and Eileithyia) carries with the burning pain and death of women in childbirth. On two of the vases here (VP S30; VP 188) Artemis holds a torch in a scene which recalls her role as goddess of \textit{parthenoi}. On the former she runs to an altar carrying torches, perhaps as a divine archetype of the \textit{parthenoi} celebrating her rites; on the latter she holds a torch as a woman unties her girdle. The celebration of Artemis by Attic \textit{parthenoi} at Brauron is well known; images of girls apparently running, but perhaps dancing, with torches have been found on krateriskoi from Artemis' Attic \textit{temene} (Parisinou 2000, 51-4).\textsuperscript{56} Iphigeneia who, according to Euripides (\textit{IT} 1435-74), served as priestess and was buried at Brauron, is thought in one tradition to have become Hekate. Hekate was another torch-carrying goddess, who we shall consider below. The connection of Iphigeneia and Hekate alludes to the role of the torch, or torch-carrying goddess, at Brauron. It is also interesting to note that the painting of the Iphigeneia myth from Pompeii (Naples Arch. Mus. inv. 9112) includes a statue of Artemis holding two torches and flanked by stags.\textsuperscript{57} Torches also seem to have been employed in rites of passage associated with Artemis at Messene: a dedication refers to a young girl holding up a torch before the goddess' altar (Van Straten 1981, 96). Moreover, lamps were also dedicated to Artemis at a number of sites, although Parisinou (2002, 151-6) does not list any from the few archaeologically attested \textit{temene} of the goddess in Southern Italy or Sicily.\textsuperscript{58}

The difficulty of differentiating between Artemis' various light-related epithets, referred to above, is further complicated by the potential confusion of these aspects of Artemis with Hekate. Hekate, a Carian goddess, was associated (like Artemis) with rites of passage, boundaries, women and children (Johnston 1999, 203-49). These two figures are genealogically connected as early as Hesiod (\textit{Theog.} 404) in the so-called Hymn to Hekate (Hes. \textit{Theog.} 404-52; West 1997, 276-90). By the fifth century their association is more explicit (Aesch. \textit{Supp.} 676; Eur. \textit{Phoen.} 110) and their distinction is frequently blurred in the iconographic record (Christou 1953-4; Kraus 1960, 77-83; Graf 1985, 228-236; Sarian 1992,


\textsuperscript{56} The appearance of Artemis in wedding processions, alongside the chariot carrying the bride and groom and usually carrying a torch, will be discussed below (chapter 4.1).

\textsuperscript{57} The scene of Iphigeneia's sacrifice, which the statue stands over, is usually set at Aulis (Eur. \textit{IA}). However, the statue of Artemis holding torches could easily be an allusion to her rites at Brauron which were well known; there was even a \textit{temenos} of Artemis Brauronia on the Athenian Akropolis.

\textsuperscript{58} Two fragments of Graeco-Roman lamps were reported by Orsi (1900, 376) after his excavation of the Artemision at Scala Greca.
However, the two goddesses do remain distinct entities on two Apulian vases in the catalogue (VP L33, 66) where they appear in the same scene: Artemis dressed as a huntress and Hekate holding two torches.

However, the torch was not exclusive to Artemis and Hekate: a number of different divinities can carry a torch or be worshipped with a ‘light’-related cult title; especially Demeter and Persephone (Parisinou 2000, 85-8). Hekate plays an important role in the myth of Persephone’s abduction by Hades and subsequent return from the underworld (Hom. Hymn Dem. 24, 51ff, 438-440). Two of the vases in the catalogue represent Artemis alongside Persephone: on VP L74 Artemis carries two torches while on VP L68 she does not hold a torch. The goddess on VP L74 is recorded as Artemis-Hekate but we cannot be certain exactly who the artist meant to depict. The iconography of the Eleusinian myth confuses the two goddesses (Sarian 1992, 1013). Artemis was worshipped as Propylaea: Pausanias (1.38.6) describes the temple of Artemis Propylaea at Eleusis. However, Hekate was worshipped, presumably in a similar capacity, at the entrance to the temenos of Demeter Malophoros at Selinus (De Angelis 2003, 139). Moreover, Hekate appears to adopt some of Bendis’ iconography (Sarian 1992, no.8); Artemis association with Bendis is well-known and a series of Apulian terracottas of this goddess will be discussed below. Torches played a role in Bendis cult (Pl. Rep. 327a, 328a; Tsiafakis 2000, 386-7) and a torch even appears in a variant of the Apulian Artemis Bendis figurines (Lippolis et al. 1995, pl. 19.3). The Apulian painters’ depiction of Artemis or Hekate, or indeed Artemis-Hekate, in the Eleusinian myth and other scenes is confusing. However, it may be that the identity of the figure was secondary in importance to her role as torch-bearer and it is that role, with its implications for the figure as a goddess of parthenoi and transition, we should focus upon while accepting that these two figures are, at least iconographically, inter-changeable.

The last ‘attribute’ to be considered here is the palm tree which features on three of the vases (VP S23, 27, 32). The palm tree, in association with either Artemis or Apollo, is generally

59 The ancient playwrights further betray this confusion; compare Soph. OT 206-7 and Ar. Frogs 1361ff.
60 Both Hekate and Bendis were associated with the Thracian cult of Artemis Pheraia (Kraus 1960, 77-83).
61 Plato (Rep. 327a, 328a) describes a race at night with men on horseback at the Piraeus passing a torch between them, while Tsiafakis (2000, 386-7) reports on a late classical marble relief, also from the Piraeus, with a procession led by a bearded man approaching Bendis.
62 Artemis and Hekate shared a further association through the figure of Selene. Artemis’ association with Selene will be discussed in chapters 4.1 and 5.1. For Hekate and Selene see Hopfner (1939, 145) and Johnston (1990, 31).
understood as an allusion to their birth and/or their Delian *temenos*. Odysseus describes a palm tree he saw on Delos by the altar of Apollo (Hom. *Od*. 6.162-3). A bronze palm tree was dedicated on Delos in the last quarter of the fifth century (Plut. *Vit. Nic*. 3.6); the dedication recalls the Homeric hymn's account of the twin gods' birth, after which Leto rested against a palm tree on the island (*Hom. Hymn Ap*. 18). Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 121-2) has demonstrated that a palm tree when combined with an altar designates Artemis in her Attic role as a goddess of *parthenoi*; a palm tree, without an altar, remains symbolic of Artemis' Attic cult and persona. The Delian *temenos* of Artemis and Apollo was a well-known site in the ancient Greek world: it is reasonable to assume that the myth of their birth which served, in a sense, as an *aition* for the *temenos* was also well known. A Greek recipient of an Attic pot in Sicily could be expected to understand the allusion to Delos. They may also have understood an implicit reference to Artemis' Attic cults at Brauron and Mounychia; the former was made famous through Peisistratos' establishment of a branch of the cult on the Athenian Acropolis and Euripides' *IT* 1435-74.

These elements of Artemis' iconography: hunting equipment, animals, torches (Kahil 1984, 740, 744; Parisinou 2002, 55-6) and palm trees (Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 99-143) are all standard attributes of the goddess. Indeed, their inclusion in scenes which are difficult for the modern viewer, at least, to understand completely, is sometimes used to suggest a possible identification of a female as Artemis. Another means of identifying the goddess is the short *chiton* which has become her predominant outfit by the mid-fifth century; it is especially popular on the locally manufactured vases (Parisinou 2002, 58). It is important to note the goddess' iconography in those scenes where she usually appears as a central figure and is often the focus of the scene. In later sections below, Artemis will appear as a bystander or companion of Apollo. The images here are the closest we shall come to an 'honest' representation of the goddess: the vase-painter chose to paint the goddess Artemis to decorate the vase.

Turning from the goddess' iconography in these scenes, I shall now review the 'action' she engages in or observes. The Attic vases found in Sicily differ from those with an Italian

---

63 H.F. Miller's unpublished thesis (1979) demonstrates that the palm becomes an attribute of Apollo and Artemis and can designate Delos or Delphi.

64 For example the female accompanying a chariot on VP 195 and 99 is tentatively identified as Artemis due to the depiction of either a dog (95) or deer (99) near the female.

65 The classical development of expressing a divinity's character through both attributes and dress is noted by Llewellyn-Jones (2001, 238).
provenance: on the former Artemis predominantly appears alone and in a static pose. In two of the Sicilian scenes (VP S22, 25), however, the goddess is running towards an altar. Running females in ancient Greek art are often fleeing the unwanted amorous attentions of men. The fact that Artemis is running towards an altar suggests she is running to a place of safety. Races held at certain temene as part of initiation rites, as attested for example on the krateriskoi from Brauron (Kahil 1981), can be compared with the erotic pursuit of females in Greek myth: the races are symbolic of the start of the girls’ sexual lives (Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 65-6; Zajko 1993, 178). Like the palm tree, the motif of the goddess running towards the altar could refer to her role as goddess of parthenoi as frequently depicted in Attic sources.

Three of the Attic vases found in Italy also represent Artemis running (VP 184, 88) or striding (VP 185). These vases differ from those found on Sicily: only one shows the goddess moving towards an altar (VP 188) and, in that scene, she carries torches rather than her hunting attributes. VP 184 and 88, however, do appear to belong to the same iconographical scheme as observed on VP S22 and 25; VP 185, in which the goddess is pulling an arrow from her quiver, is more likely to be a simple hunting scene. Scenes of Artemis in her Attic guise as goddess of parthenoi were therefore exported to both Italy and Sicily. The scenes were produced by Attic vase-painters and therefore probably allude to Artemis as a goddess of parthenoi among the people of Attica (Vikela 2008, 82-7). However, Artemis’ association with parthenoi is known throughout the Greek world, but the issue of local interpretation remains. A western Greek recipient, as discussed above, would probably have been familiar with Artemis’ association with parthenoi in Attica and general mythology. In the hands of a native Italian or Sicilian the vase may have been read differently. Artemis appears with the tools of the huntress on VP S22, 25 and VP 184; a viewer may then have seen only a female hunting. The altar towards which she runs could then be a symbol of her divinity and a reminder to the mortal hunter to offer a proportion of his catch to Artemis (Xen. Cyn. 6.13; Verg. Ecl. 7.29-30).

66 Although the scenes are largely non-narrative, the painter of VP S24 may have intended the viewer to associate Artemis with the myth on the other side of the amphora: the death of Orion (Horn. Od. 5.121-4; Apollod. Bibl. 1.4.3-5). Conversely, only three of the twelve Attic vases discovered in Italy, catalogued as Artemis alone and inactive (VP 194, 97, 98).

67 See Zajko (1993, 60-136) for a catalogue of myths in which parthenoi are pursued by males, often gods.

68 For altars and temene as a place of refuge see Burkert (1985, 59).

69 For heterosexual erotic pursuit as a hunt see, for example, Ibycus fr.287 PMGF; Pl. Soph. 222d-e; Burkert (1983, 59-60); Schnapp (1997, 325) and Barringer (2001, 138-72).
Two Athenian vases by the Dutuit Painter with the same design have been found at Camarina (VP S31) and Campanian Nola (VP I87). Artemis stands in profile with her arms extended: in her left hand she holds a bow and arrow while her right hand gestures, affectionately it seems, to a deer. The goddess is winged; the artist has represented her wings fully extended and, probably on account of difficulty with three-dimensional effects, as though the goddess was facing the viewer. The scene captures the ambiguity of Artemis' role as a huntress: with one hand she makes an affectionate gesture towards the deer and in the other she carries the weapon with which she could kill it.\textsuperscript{70} The two vases date to the first half of the sixth century and remind us of Artemis' association with the Potnia Theron (Boardman 1975, 226). The goddess' gesture to the deer, although not quite making contact, is reminiscent of the Potnia Theron grasping, or flanked by, an animal. Furthermore the painter's decision to depict Artemis as a winged figure may well have been inspired by the iconographic type of the Potnia Theron. The iconographical fusion of the Potnia Theron and Artemis has been noted during the archaic period at several sites including Artemis' temene in Sparta (Pipili 1987, 41-4), Attica and Corfu (Marinatos 2000, 97).\textsuperscript{71}

A red-figure cup from Capua (VP 1128) includes Artemis in a scene with Greek and Trojan heroes. Representations of the Trojan War were popular in the archaic and classical periods; the Southern Italians and Etruscans adopted these scenes and reproduced them in their own workshops (Mehren 2002, 51; Lowenstam 2008). Artemis is not a figure one would expect to be included in these scenes: the goddess plays a small role in Homer's \textit{Iliad}.\textsuperscript{72} The vase in question is decorated with several scenes of the Trojan War (Kauffmann-Samaras 2002, cat. no. 133 = Louvre G115). Artemis appears on side B flanking the action with Aphrodite. The design is reminiscent of the scenes in which Artemis and Athena flank the struggle of Apollo and Herakles for the Delphic tripod: the artist may have been influenced to include Artemis by her iconography in these scenes.

Two of the remaining scenes may indicate the honouring of the gods. On VP S30 a woman appears facing Artemis; she is holding a fillet. Identifying the woman is difficult as she carries no attributes and there is no inscription. As Van Straten (1981, 90-1) has observed

\textsuperscript{70} Artemis is regularly called huntress, \textit{Agrotera}. The earliest instance is in Homer (Il. 21.470) where she is also addressed as Potnia Theron. The ambiguity seen in this scene is then expressed by Aischylos' chorus (Ag. 141-4) who appeal to the goddess who is gracious and tender to wild creatures.

\textsuperscript{71} The Potnia Theron is discussed in more detail below. For the contradiction inherent in the hunter/huntress see generally Cartmill (1993).

\textsuperscript{72} Artemis features 10 times in the \textit{Iliad}: 5.48-58, 6.205, 6.428, 9.529ff, 16.180-8, 19-59-60, 20.39, 20.70-1, 21.470ff., 24.602-17; the most famous of these scenes is Hera's berating of the goddess during the battle of the gods in book 21.
the female appears to be untying her girdle; she is probably about to dedicate it to Artemis in recognition of a pre-nuptial rite of passage. On VP 178 it is Artemis who is about to make an offering: the goddess holds an oinochoe and a sprig. The scene is reminiscent of those where the goddess honours her brother. Three further scenes (VP S35; VP 195, 99) potentially represent Artemis alongside a chariot; Artemis’ association with chariots, especially as the goddess mounting or driving the vehicle, will be discussed below. Finally there are two scenes on Attic vases with an Italian provenance where it is not clear whether a specific incident is represented and, if so, what that is. On VP 186 the goddess is interacting with a youth: the male is not identifiable and the goddess gestures towards him unthreateningly. On VP 196 Artemis and a youth flank the central scene in which a woman pursues another youth; the goddess turns away from the main action but looks back in interest.

Artemis also features in non-narrative scenes on locally manufactured vases, twice alone (VP L65, 69) but more regularly accompanied by another god: Athena (VP L51, 73), Iris (VP L67) or Hermes (VP L71) and in a Lucanian example by a musician and dancer (VP L55). The running Artemis observed in Attic vase-painting is perhaps the inspiration for a possible representation of Artemis on an Apulian patera (VP L76; Schneider-Herrmann 1977, no. 57): the female holds a phiale which implies she is running towards a sacred spot and my identification of the figure as ‘Artemis(?)’ is based on the deer running with her.

As we have already seen the Apulian vase-painters often represented the gods in an upper register observing the action below; Apollo and Artemis were regularly included in this upper scene (Trendall 1989: 255). There are five vases here where Artemis appears in the upper register, or above the action as an onlooker, without her brother (VP L44-5, 48-50). The goddess is positioned above two Amazonomachies (VP L48, 50), a scene in Hades (VP L44) (Trendall and Cambitoglou 1978, 41), youths, women and Erotes (VP L49) and finally Andromeda (VP L45). Since the gods regularly appear in upper registers above scenes from Greek tragedies (or Amazonomachies), the scene in Hades may well have been a dramatic reconstruction (Trendall 1989, 256). Artemis appears alone above the action on VP L45: Andromeda is bound to the rock and surrounded by her family and Perseus. The myth of Andromeda is not a popular subject on Apulian wares (Mugione 2000, 94-5); the solitary

73 Artemis carries a torch as she watches the female; the torch may be interpreted as an allusion to the female’s forthcoming wedding (Parisinou 2000, 54). Euripides’ (IT 1464-7) Athena demands that the clothes of women who die in childbirth are dedicated at Artemis’ Brauronian temenos; cf. Linders (1972). For the dedication of a girdle after marriage and the birth of children see Anth. Pal. 6.59.
appearance of Artemis associated with this rare scene is interesting. Artemis is not explicitly involved in the myth; is it possible that the Apulian painter included her as a goddess of ἀρρήνοι? In the scene Andromeda’s fate is apparently sealed: the end of her life as a ἀρρήν is approaching as the sea monster will either kill her or Perseus will rescue and marry her.

Artemis accompanies chariots on two further vases. On VP L54 a chariot drawn by fantastic animals is surrounded by Eros, Nike, a seated woman and Artemis while on VP L75 Artemis appears with two chariots: a quadriga carrying Zeus and Hermes and a panther-drawn biga carrying Dionysos. Marsyas appears several times on the locally manufactured vases (Carpenter 1981, 81); there are more instances with both Artemis and Apollo but on a Lucanian skyphos (VP L52) Artemis appears with Athena and Hera alone. Finally there are two vases on which the event depicted or its meaning is obscure: Artemis crowning Herakles (VP L70; Vollkommer 1988, 53) and a gathering including the goddess, Poseidon and satyrs (VP L56).

Artemis appears engaged in, or closely connected to, the action of some narrative scenes. An Attic hydria from Kyme (VP 1120) shows Artemis, holding a torch, as one of several spectators, including other Olympian deities, at the departure of Triptolemos. The presence of Artemis emphasises the importance of Triptolemos’ mission and recalls her cult of Artemis Propylaea at the Eleusinian temenos (Paus. 1.38.6). The scene could also allude to Artemis’ association with Hekate as discussed above; Hekate was also a goddess of gateways and Artemis-Hekate often carries torches in scenes of Persephone’s return from the underworld.

Artemis is joined by two other Olympian females, Athena and Aphrodite with Eros, next to the rape of Persephone on an Apulian loutrophoros (VP L47). On two further contemporary Apulian vases, Artemis stands next to Persephone in Hades (VP L74) and follows her in a chariot (VP L68). In the Homeric Hymn (Dem. 424) Artemis and Athena are with Persephone when she is stolen by Hades and in Euripides’ Helen 1315-7 they help Demeter search for her daughter. In the scene in Hades’ palace Artemis is carrying torches and then appears as the huntress when accompanying Persephone’s chariot. The variety of the scenes

74 The latter recalls a Pindaric dithyramb (fr. 70b, 19-20 S-M) in which Artemis yokes lions for Dionysos’ chariot. The association of Artemis with horses and riding and driving chariots will be discussed below in chapter 4.1.
75 For a possible representation of Marsyas with Artemis on a Paestan vase see n. 32 above.
reflects the popularity of Persephone and Hades in Apulian vase-painting (Trendall 1989, 268) rather than any specific interest in Artemis.

Artemis may also appear with Athena and Persephone on a sixth-century metope from Selinus (AS S2). The metope is one of a group of smaller metopes associated with the akropolis, but which cannot be assigned to a specific temple with any certainty (Marconi 2007, 88). Three females, presumably goddesses, stand together holding flowers. The absence of any other attribute or indication of narrative action complicates the identification of the scene. It is probable that one of the three figures is Persephone. In some versions of the myth the goddess is picking flowers at the time of her abduction. Moreover, flowers are often carried in scenes of erotic pursuit (Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 65).

Demeter, like Apollo, was an important deity in Megara. Both Olympians’ cults were transferred to the colony at Selinus and enjoyed popularity in this new setting; the occurrence of these deities and their myths in the temple programme and sculptural decoration of Selinus demonstrates the cultic connection of the two cities (Marconi 2007, 196-9). Demeter’s main temenos outside the centre of the polis, at which she was worshipped as Malophoros, dates back to the seventh century (De Angelis 2003, 131). A different episode of the myth, Persephone’s actual abduction by Hades, appears on a metope dating to the late sixth century from the temenos of Demeter Malophoros. Later authors, following the possible allusion in Pindar’s first Nemean (1.13; scholia ad loc., vol 3 p.13 l. 16a-b, 17 Drachmann) even describe the abduction of the goddess taking place on Sicily (Diod. Sic. 5.3.3-4). However, even if the general subject of the metope can be recognised as an episode from the rape of Persephone, Artemis’ presence is still subject to debate. Indeed, Tusa (1984, 109) interprets the scene as Demeter, Persephone and Hekate. Marconi’s (2007, 97-9) survey of scholarship on this metope and his suggestion of the possibility of recognising Athena and Artemis demonstrates the wide range of possibilities.

Finally, before turning to the terracotta figurine types, I shall briefly review the evidence for representations of a cult site of Artemis. There are four classical Attic vases, three of which were found in Campania (VP 179, 80, 82) and one in Umbria (VP 181), with scenes I have catalogued as depicting a cult site of Artemis. In addition, two classical Apulian vases present a scene with figures gathered around a statue of the goddess (VP L64, 115) while a

---

76 Three other metopes share its dimensions and frame; their scenes are easily recognisable as a Sphinx, the rape of Europa and the Delian Triad.
series of terracotta figurines from Lokroi (S 122) and a *naiskos* frieze from Taras (AS II1) also include an image of the goddess' statue. The vases with scenes of the Iphigeneia myth depict Artemis' *temenos* at Tauris; these images will be discussed below in chapter 4.2. The naming of this category in the catalogue as 'Artemis cult site' may be misleading. The design in the tondo of the dish discovered at Nola (VP 179) is the only one of these images which clearly represents the goddess receiving cult: a woman carrying offerings is at an altar; an inscription identifies the goddess as receiving divinity.

The five other vase-painting scenes include a statue of Artemis. The goddess' statue may also appear on a pinax from Francavilla di Sicilia; however, it is the Tauric statue and so will be discussed in chapter 4.2 below. A statue does not necessitate the existence of a clearly defined *temenos* to Artemis since statues of one god could be dedicated in *temene* of another and at least one of the vases shows a statue of Artemis in the Olympic *temenos* dedicated to Zeus (VP 182).\(^\text{77}\) However, a vase-painter's decision to include a statue of Artemis rather than a simple epiphany must have had some significance (Shapiro 1989, 51).\(^\text{78}\) In particular on VP 181 the vase-painter includes a number of other Olympians as onlookers, clearly differentiating between them and Artemis who is present in the form of a statue. A statue is reminiscent of a formal cultic setting: it evokes a place where an offering may be made to the goddess or where the goddess had some special significance.

The series of unusual terracotta figurines from Lokroi (S 122) presents a female with arms raised to support a small statue of a goddess upon her head. The statue is depicted with a bow and deer; it clearly represents Artemis. The small scale of the statue is interesting and may testify to a local taste for smaller statues. I am not aware of any parallels from the iconography of Artemis cult. However, a series of figurines associated with the cult of Athena Lindia on Rhodes carry an item, possibly a thymiaterion, on their heads which has been clearly decorated with an image of Athena carrying a shield (Alroth 1989, 56, fig.24a-b). The Rhodians co-founded Gela (689) which in turn founded Akragas (582), and Shepherd (2000, 64-7) has argued for the transferral of terracotta figurine types, albeit specifically the Artemis Lindia type, from Rhodes to these two western colonies. The

\(^\text{77}\) Pausanias (5.14.6, 5.15.6) records altars of Artemis at Olympia. See also Gropengiesser (1988). Robertson (1992, 278-9) discusses this vase and notes that Artemis is out of place in the scene; Zeus would be a more appropriate figure. However, Zeus, in an epiphany, watches the action from above and as we shall see it may be that the statue of Artemis is representative of her role as a goddess of *parthenoi*.

\(^\text{78}\) The cult statue was a substitute for the deity: they were positioned in sanctuaries to observe the sacrifices at the altar (Romano 1988, 127-8).
iconographic concept of depicting a female devotee carrying an item on her head may also have been transferred to the west via these two colonies. Moreover, it is customary in Greek art for the mortal figure to be imagined as smaller than the immortal. The reversal of that scale here suggests that this is an actual representation of a ritual in which the cult statue of the goddess was carried in a procession.

In five, or possibly six, of these scenes Artemis' cult statue may be present as a symbol of her role as a goddess of parthenoi. The rapes of Oreithyia (VP I81) and Io (VP L64) and Pelops and Hippodameia's marriage (VP I82) all capture a key moment in the transition from parthenos to gyne. For the two Attic vases this is a continuation of the trend of depicting Artemis in the context of her Brauronian and Mounychian cults. The Apulian hydria (VP L64) is certainly later than VP I81 and may well be later than VP I82. It is one of seven vases, of Attic or local ware, depicting Io discovered in Southern Italy and Sicily and is the only one to include Artemis (Mugione 2000, nos.664-670; no.669=VP L64). We cannot be sure if the Apulian painter was copying either the design or the meaning of these Attic vases. However, the representation of a different, mythological parthenos near a statue of Artemis suggests an understanding of the image type.

The scene of the Proitids' purification on a Lucanian nestoris (VP L115) depicts a rural site with a statue of the goddess wearing a polos, holding a spear in her right hand and a small object (possibly a bud or fruit) in her left hand. According to Bacchylides (11.37-42) the purification of the Proitids takes place at Lousoi; on this tradition see Cairns (2005, 40-2). While the statue at Lousoi has not been discovered and Pausanias (8.18.8) did not describe it when he visited the site, it probably held a torch rather than a spear (Kahl 1984, 633, nos. 104-9). It is possible that the Apulian vase-painter included the statue of the goddess from the temenos at S.Biagio as the two cults were linked in the first half of the fifth century by Bacchylides' victory ode for Alexidamos of Metapontion (Bacchyl. 11.113-126; Sinn 1993, 89; chapter 1). However, no statue has been found at S. Biagio and none of the figurines

---

79 For example, a plaque from Brauron with a sacrificial procession approaching the goddess (LIMC 1984, no. 1127) and the terracotta pinax from the Metapontine choros discussed below (S 114).
80 Note Anth. Pal. 6.273: Artemis is called to Lokroi to aid Alkestis with her birth-pangs; Artemis assisted the women of hellenistic Lokroi in childbirth.
81 Although on VP L82 a Peloponnesian myth is employed to emphasise this nature of the goddess' character.
82 The Apulian painter was not copying any known Attic design exported to Southern Italy. Of the seven scenes featuring Io, both on Attic and local manufactured vases, this vase (VP L64) is unique for the assembly of gods and presence of Artemis' statue (Mugione 2000, nos. 664-670: 669=VP L64).
from the site bear any relation to this design. The inspiration for the artist’s statue of Artemis is unclear; the Attic vases with similar scenes found in Southern Italy show the goddess with a bow (VP 181-2) rather than a spear.

The Pyrrhic dance outside a building with a statue of Artemis and altar is unusual; on account of the statue and altar the building has been identified as a temple of Artemis (VP 180). Artemis was the archetypal parthenos and is described leading the dance (Hom. Hymn 3.182ff, 27.14ff); mortal parthenoi are described dancing in her honour (Hom. Iliad 16.180-8; Hom. Hymn 5.117ff) and a ceramic fragment from Brauron may reveal the presence of professional dancers at this site (Stafford 2005, 99-100). The Pyrrhic dance, depicted here, is usually associated with Athena (Burkert 1985, 102). However, it could allude to the honouring of Artemis Agrotera following the victory at Marathon; the specific celebrations occurred at her cult-site at Mounychia (Simon 1983, 81-2, 86).

The naïskos frieze from Taras (AS 111) is an early hellenistic sculpture; Carter (1975, no.222) dates it before 275. It has been variously identified as the rape of Kassandra, a Dionysiac scene or the myth of Orion (Carter 1975, 75-6; Lippolis 1990, 123). In the latter interpretation Carter (1975, 75-6) argues that the scene represents Orion’s attempted rape of Opis for which he was killed by Artemis (Apollod. Bibl. 1.4.5). After his death Orion was set among the stars (Hes. fr. 244 Most): the frieze may therefore allude to his death and subsequent katasterism perhaps with the aim of offering hope to the deceased and their family. The action of the parthenoi as they flee to the statues, possibly depicting Artemis, is reminiscent of the scenes on the vases discussed above. The threat posed by the male is obvious in their flight, but the artist also makes the female nearest him raise her clothing to veil herself. The statues of the goddess are small but set high on half columns and are clearly perceived as offering the parthenoi some protection as one of the females is encircling the statue with her hand. The scene is reminiscent of the frieze on the temple of Apollo on Mount Kotilion: the Lapith women run to the statue of Artemis and one even embraces it. Sinn (2002, 193) associates the scene with the nearby cult of Artemis Soteria in Phigalia (Paus 8.40.5): the Lapith women invoke Artemis Soteira to save them from the centaurs.

3.2.2 Terracotta figurines

---

83 For females veiling themselves at times of distress and shame see Llewellyn-Jones (2003, 155-88).
We must now consider the terracotta figurines from Sicily and Southern Italy. The nature of these items as votives has been discussed above (section 3.1). My review of these figurines will incorporate a consideration of the iconography of the goddess and a discussion of their context: their date, the original centre of production and possible catalyst for their creation. The vast majority of the terracotta figurines in the sculpture catalogue fall into the category of a solitary, or non-narrative, Artemis. The figurines can be separated into three groups: Artemis as a huntress with a weapon or accompanied by an animal, the Potnia Theron - including the so-called Potnia Theron series from Artemis’ temenos at S. Biagio - and Artemis Bendis.

Artemis does not feature in the Sicilian coroplasts’ repertoire until the late classical period. The only archaic figurine in the Sicilian half of the catalogue is a Corinthian import (S S11). The fourth century heralds a series of locally produced Artemis figurines which, after Bell, I shall call the Artemis Group (Higgins 1967, 85-7; Bell 1981, 4-6; Kahil 1984, nos.942-965). Artemis and Persephone are the only deities to have their image modelled in large numbers of terracotta figurines in late classical Sicily (Bell 1981, 34). The sudden appearance of these figurines in votive deposits is a relatively widespread phenomenon. Most of the examples of the various types used in the catalogue are from the site identified as an Artemision at Scala Greca; it was the discovery of a large number of these figurine types which persuaded Orsi (1900, 378) that the temenos was dedicated to Artemis (chapter 2). A few types are included from other sites where a better preserved specimen or illustration is available; however, where possible, I have used Orsi’s excavation report to facilitate consistency. References to other examples of a certain type will be provided in the discussion below; these will focus on the figurines found at Gela, Fontana Calda at Butera and Morgantina.

The figurines are mainly fragmentary, but sufficient evidence remains to reconstruct a small-scale, frontal figure dressed in a loosely belted short chiton and hunting boots with her hair pulled back into a lampadion knot (Orsi 1900, 373-5; Bell 1981, 34). Orsi (1900, 363) discovered around 200 terracotta heads at Scala Greca; the vast majority sport this lampadion knot hair-style (S S3, 7). A further sixteen heads wear a Phrygian cap (S S9) which Orsi

\[84\] The sole exception is S S15 which, as a representation of the goddess riding an animal, will be discussed in chapter 4.1.

\[85\] A classical bronze figurine of Artemis was also found on Sicily. It is of the Artemis of Lousoi type (Kahil 1984, no.104-9) but is published by Bieber (1977, fig. 326-7). These types are not limited to Lousoi; Kowalzig (2007, fig.6.2) includes an example from Tegea.

\[86\] The figurines generally measure between 12 and 20cm tall.
(1900, 363-4) suggested represented Attis; similar heads have been found at Butera (Adamesteanu 1958, fig. 250). However, the Phrygian cap is worn by figurines of Artemis from Sicily (Kekulé 1884, pl. 11.6, 13.1.4), perhaps in her guise as Artemis Bendis which was popular in contemporary Apulia.87

Artemis carries her standard attributes of a bow (S S4),88 a spear (S S3) and a torch (S S8)89 and appears alongside palm trees (S S14; Orsi 1900, fig. 7.7). One further, unidentified, attribute is held by Artemis in S S10. The figurine appears to be part of the Artemis Group: her dress and lampadion knot mark are standard characteristics of the series. Bell (1981, no.206) highlights the quiver strap running left to right down the goddess' torso as further evidence that this is the goddess. There is a band running across the torso, but the chiton is represented falling into folds and a number of diagonal markings, although less pronounced, are visible. The marking could therefore indicate the cross-band worn externally by parthenoi (Stafford 2005, 105) rather than a quiver strap. Assuming the figure is Artemis, the attribute appears initially confusing. Bell’s (1981, no.206) examination concluded that it is not a vase as neither a neck nor foot is indicated; if it is, as appears, a ball it may be a votive offering dedicated by a young female to the goddess to mark a rite of passage (Anth. Pal. 6.280; Sourvinou-Inwood 1991, 159, 166-7).

The goddess is also accompanied by animals:90 dogs (S S5),91 deer (S S7, 12),92 panthers (S S6)93 and lions (S S14).94 The fragmentary Geloan pinax (S S14) depicts the goddess

---

87 Although these figures do not wear a lion-skin over the cap which is characteristic of the Apulian Artemis Bendis type.
88 In S S4 the goddess turns her arm in at the elbow to hold the bow in front of her body. Six fragments of figurines in these poses were found by Orsi (1900, 366) at Scala Greca. The pose is found at Butera (Adamesteanu 1958, 277-8). Comparable types exist among the Kerkyran terracottas (Lechat 1891, fig. 6). However, there are also examples of Artemis holding a bow, with her arm fully lowered, against her body in the Sicilian Artemis Group (Adamesteanu 1958, fig. 275-6); this pose is also seen in the Artemis Bendis figurines (S 119-21).
89 A large number of torches, which are fragments of terracotta figurines, were discovered at Scala Greca (Orsi 1900, 368). More complete examples of Artemis carrying a torch have been discovered at Butera (Adamesteanu 1958, fig. 279-80, 282-3). Compare also the classical bronze figurine of the Artemis Lousoi type discovered on Sicily and now in the British Museum (Bieber 1977, fig. 326-7).
90 The main types are listed here although a few other animals are represented in much smaller numbers: five fragments of hares, a bird's beak in a female's hand, a pig and two horses (Orsi 1900, 371).
91 Dogs appear at the goddess' feet and alongside her; in the latter pose the dog often looks up towards Artemis as she lowers her hand to touch its head (Orsi 1900, 369-70): the gesture appears affectionate or reassuring rather than controlling.
92 Orsi (1900, 370) discovered 15 fragments of a figurine with a deer at Scala Greca. A number of fragmentary figurines from Butera show the goddess with a torch in her right hand and either a deer or dog at her left side (Adamesteanu 1958, fig. 282-3). It is interesting to note that the deer from Scala Greca have antlers: the gender of the animal therefore differs from that of the deity. Figurines of
standing next to a palm tree with a lion at her right and holding a torch in her extended right hand. Artemis is associated with the lion as early as Homer (Il. 21.482-4); the goddess appears nurturing lion cubs (Aesch. Ag. 141), yoking Dionysos’ lions in a Pindaric dithyramb (fr. 70b SM 19-20) and grasping a lion (presumably in her guise as Potnia Theron) on the chest of Kypselos (Paus. 5.19.5). A reference to a procession in honour of Artemis, which included a ‘lioness,’ by the Syracusan poet Theokritos (Id. 2.66-8) may allude to a contemporary Sicilian association of the goddess with the lion. A number of interpretations exist; I agree with Lawler (1947, 97) that the passage should not be taken literally and that the ‘lioness’ is actually a parthenos.98

Young, unmarried women, parthenoi, were often understood as wild animals who required taming; rituals, often in honour of Artemis, served to facilitate this process of taming. Kowalzig (2007, 204) understands that the figurines of Artemis with a deer and a bow are the manifestation of this aspect of her nature as the tamer of parthenoi. Moreover, as discussed above, the palm tree and torch which form part of Artemis’ iconography on the plaque from Gela are also associated with her role as a goddess of parthenoi and their rites of passage. The plaque may therefore have alluded to a Syracusan festival in which young

Artemis holding a bow in her left hand and touching a deer standing at her right side were found at Kerkyra (Lechat 1891, pi. 2.1).

93 The felines accompanying the goddess adopt the same pose as the dogs noted above in n.90 (Orsi 1900, 370). An example from Gela depicts the goddess with a panther at her left side and a deer on her right (Orlandini 1957, pl.14.1) while a figurine from Butera has the goddess hold a bow while a panther sits at her left side (Adamesteanu 1958, fig. 277). Artemis’ iconography from elsewhere in the Greek world includes panthers; for example the Kerkyran terracottas (Lechat 1891, 62-3 no.57) and a statue from Delos (Carpenter 1986, 65ff.).

94 For Artemis with a lion from Akrai see Kekulé (1884 pl. 24.2-3)

95 This association with the lion is not unique to Artemis; see Hermay (2000).

96 Lions also appear with the goddess in the Kerkyran terracottas (Lechat 1891, 82-3) and at the temenos of Artemis Orthia (Dawkins 1929, pl.32.1-3).

97 Despite being a Syracusan, Theokritos may have set his second Idyll in Syracuse, Kos or Rhodes (Lawler 1947, 88). However, see Webster (1964, 82-3) for Sicilian and especially Syracusan influences in his work.

98 Lawler (1947, 89) presents some of the other interpretations put forward including a literal reading of a real lioness being included in the procession. Subsequent scholars have continued to endorse this theory; see, for example, Gow (1950, 49) and Bell (1981, 36).

99 Although this is the only example I am aware of where a parthenos is imagined as a lion, there is evidence for bears (Brauron: Ar. Lys. 645) and deer (IG IX 2.1123). On the parthenos as a wild animal see, for example, King (1983, 109-127), Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 66) and Calame (2001, 238-44).

100 A terracotta figurine from Kerkyra may be an extension of this iconographic manifestation of the goddess as tamer of parthenoi; the goddess appears with a smaller figure (indicated in relief upon her skirt) dancing in front of her and a deer at her side (Lechat 1891, pl. 7.2). On parthenoi dancing for Artemis see Hom. Il. 16.180-8; Hom. Hymn Aph. 118; for Artemis as the model choregos see Hom. Hymn Ap. 180-206; Hom. Hymn Art. (27) 15-20.
Girls, perceived as lions, processed in honour of the goddess, presumably to one of her temene.

A female figurine raising her hand to her forehead has been found at a number of sites: Morgantina (S S13), Scala Greca (Orsi 1900, fig. 7.5, 7.7) and Butera (Adamesteanu 1958, fig. 284). Orsi (1900, 363) identifies the action as veiling, but still identifies the figurine as Artemis on account of the palm tree which appears with the figure in his fig. 7.7. The palm tree strongly suggests a Delian context; the figurine could therefore be Leto rather than Artemis. Bell (1981, 155) identifies the figurine as demonstrating an aposkopein gesture; he suggests that this indication of an intense gaze may depict Artemis looking for quarry or allude to her role helping Demeter look for Persephone. It is unclear, if Artemis were imagined searching for Persephone, why the palm would be included in the design. I suggest therefore that the figurine should be understood as either Leto veiling or Artemis searching for her next victim in the hunt.

Finally in this discussion of the Artemis Group terracottas, I should mention an unusual Syracusan mould found at Morgantina (S S12). I am not aware of the discovery of any figures produced from this mould. Artemis appears kneeling on the back of a deer; she grasps its antlers and brandishes a knife in her left hand. This pose recalls the iconography of Nike sacrificing a bull (Bell 1981, 36). The mould is one of an unusual, small group of representations of Artemis killing an animal (Kahil 1984, no. 396-403a; S S12=397a). Remarkably, one of the few other examples is a red-figure pelike found in Campania (VP I18 = Kahil 1984, no. 396) which is the only image of its type on a vase. The goddess’ victim is another deer which she grasps by its ear with her left hand and forces to its knees; in her right hand she raises a torch with which she is about to strike the animal. Apollo and a draped man, probably Zeus (Arafat 1990, 145; Parisinou 2002, 101), frame the action while Nike hovers above the deer.

---

101 The Artemis Group originated from Syracuse, see below, and this plaque may have been inspired by a Syracusan design or even be an item of Syracusan manufacture.

102 I described the figurine to Dr. Llewellyn-Jones who suggested the possibility of identifying it as Leto. For images of Leto veiling see Llewellyn-Jones (2003, 108, 169-70). Note, in particular, Louvre G42 on which Leto raises her veil at the hybris of Tityos; cf. Cairns (1996, 152-8).

103 On the aposkopein gesture see Jucker (1956).
The iconography of these two scenes has been associated with Artemis' epithet Elaphebolos: Soph. Trach. 214; Paus. 6.22.10; Strabo 8.3.12 (Bell 1981, 35, Parisinou 2002, 101). The use of the torch, or rather fire, as a mortal weapon on VP 118 may allude to the act of sacrifice (Parisinou 2002, 102). It is tempting to assign some significance to these scenes, especially given their uniqueness, and to identify the deer as symbolic of a parthenos. Two mythological parthenoi are explicitly associated with deer and Artemis: Iphigeneia (Eur. IT 783-7) and Taygete (schol. Pind. Ol. 3.53). However, in both myths, the goddess is protecting the female. The scene should, therefore, simply be understood as a representation of the conclusion of Artemis' hunt; the Nike on VP 118 appears to emphasise Artemis' prowess and success. It further highlights the inherent contradiction of a hunting divinity as both nurturer and destroyer; see the discussion of VP S31 and VP I18 below. If there were some other meaning intended by the ancient painter, and understood by the ancient viewer, it now eludes us.

The figurines of the Artemis Group conform to the iconography of Artemis identified on the Attic and locally manufactured vases reviewed so far. The goddess appears as a huntress but there appears to be an underlying message regarding her role as a goddess of parthenoi. The figurines have been reviewed by Bell (1981, 35) and dated, on stylistic grounds, to the fourth century; their manufacture begins at the start of this century. The Artemis Group originated in Syracuse (Bell 1991, 35) and their early distribution reflects the dissemination of the type to nearby sites. The figurines have been discovered at a number of sites: Scala Greca (Orsi 1900) and Belvedere (Orsi 1915) at Syracuse, Butera (Adamesteanu 1958), Morgantina (Bell 1981) and Gela (Orlandini 1957). The evidence from these sites is now

---

104 Sophocles (Trach. 214) combines two epithets of the goddess: Elaphebolos and amphipuros (with a torch in either hand: Easterling 1982, 106) which define the image of the goddess on the Attic pelike (VP 118).

105 Deer were usually hunted with the nets and traps; the killing blow was usually made with a javelin (Xen. Cyn. 9). The torch has therefore been substituted for the javelin: it is roughly the same shape but is clearly a divine attribute and marks Artemis as something other than the ordinary hunter.

106 The representation of a Fury attacking the horses drawing Hippolytos' chariot (VP L91) is reminiscent of this depiction of Artemis.

107 Orsi (1900, 386) had originally dated the figurines from Scala Greca to the end of the sixth and start of the fifth century. Bell (1981, 35) has comprehensively reviewed the figurines against contemporary coroplastic activity in Sicily and influences from the rest of the Greek world.

108 The two Syracusan sites are associated with Artemis: Orsi's (1915) page long report on the Artemision at Belvedere confirms the discovery of figurines from the Artemis Group but provides no specific details. The figurines from the votive deposit at Fontana Calda (Butera) could have been associated with a temenos of Demeter and Persephone or a local nymph whose name probably appears inscribed on a vase in the deposit (Adamesteanu 1958, 590, 611-2). The figurines of Artemis from Morgantina were discovered in votive deposits along with figurines of Persephone and other deities related to the latter's cult (Bell 1981, 102-3).
being supplemented by discoveries from further west on Sicily (Bell 1981, 34).\textsuperscript{109} The discovery of a Syracusan mould (S S12) at Morgantina demonstrates that at least some of the figurines were produced outside Syracuse. These types of Artemis as huntress and associated with animals are relatively common in the ancient Greek world. However, as we have seen, there are several parallels with the figurines found on Kerkyra, in particular with the animal types (Lechat 1891, 82-3). Kerkyra and Syracuse were both early Corinthian colonies (Graham 1964, 142-149; Shepherd 2000, 57-8) and it appears that Kerkyra had a general influence on western Greek art (Antonetti 2006). It is possible therefore, that the Kerkyran terracottas exerted some influence on these new Syracusan designs.

The question for us to consider now is what prompted the Syracusan coroplasts to start producing these figurines at the end of the fifth century? Giudice (1999) has demonstrated, in a survey of Attic vases exported to the Greek west, the propagandistic celebration of military victories in ‘real time’ in the iconographic record. In 413, roughly contemporaneous with the inception of these new figurines, the Syracusans defeated the Athenians’ Sicilian expedition (Thuc. 7). Their victory included the infliction of a devastating defeat on the Athenian fleet in the harbour at Syracuse (Diod. Sic. 13.14-17). Artemis' role in combat is known from elsewhere in the Greek world; for example at Athens (Xen. An. 3.2.12; Plut. Them. 22.1-2; Simon 1983, 81-2, 86), Eretria (Strabo 10.1.10), Megara (Paus. 1.40.2-3) and Sparta (Xen. Hell. 4.2.20, Lac. 13.8). Vernant (1991, 244-250, 250-7) has differentiated between the role of Artemis who guides and rescues, as Soteira or Hegemone, in situations where a city is menaced by the threat of absolute destruction,\textsuperscript{110} and the goddess who is invoked before battle. It is the former aspect which should be associated with the Syracusans' victory over the Athenians. The Syracusans prevented the Athenians gaining a foot-hold in Sicily and, with their victory, marked the beginning of the end for the Athenians in the Peloponnesian war (Thuc. 7.87.5-6).

Furthermore, Ortygia, located within the ancient harbour at Syracuse, was important as the first area colonised by the Corinthians in the eighth century and for its fresh water supply associated with the nymph Arethousa. Arethousa, who was rescued from Alpheios by Artemis and who is even replaced by Artemis in one version of the erotic pursuit myth

\textsuperscript{109} It is interesting to note that five of the eight sites at which figurines from the Artemis Group have been discovered also minted coins with an image of the goddess; they are Syracuse, Morgantina, Akragas, Selinus and Kentoripa. 

\textsuperscript{110} See Ellinger (1984) for a discussion of this aspect of Artemis; especially p.56-61 for the cult titles associated with this aspect of the goddess. Also, see Mikalson (2003, 127) for the special association of Artemis with the Persian Wars.
(chapter 1.1.1), appeared on Syracusan coinage for several centuries. Shortly after the Syracusan victory a new legend appeared alongside the floating locks of Arethousa on some of these coins: So. The coinage of Syracuse and the appearance of this legend, an abbreviation of Soteira, will be discussed in chapter 5. However, I include this detail here as it adds to the probability that the Syracusans associated their victory with Artemis, in her capacity as Soteira and produced terracotta figurines and a new legend on their coinage as an act of thanksgiving.

There are four further types from the sculpture catalogue which should be reviewed here. All four were found in Southern Italy and present a female figure accompanied by an animal. On the Metapontine plaque (S 114) a goddess is accompanied by a supplicant, who carries a sheep over her shoulders; their relative status is clearly portrayed in the larger size of the goddess. Carter (2006, 138-40) identifies the goddess as Artemis, on account of the proximity of the isolated rural dwelling in which it was found, to the temenos at S. Biagio. However, the goddess has no identifying attributes, although the left hand may have originally been closed around a flower; this is not a pose or attribute attested elsewhere in Artemis' Southern Italian or Sicilian iconography. Carter (2006, 158) has noted that there are a number of cult sites in the Metapontine chora which are associated with female fertility deities; see also Edlund’s (1987, 94-102) survey of the rural temene in this area. The proximity of the find-spot to the temenos of Artemis at S. Biagio is not sufficient to associate the plaque with the goddess, especially since, as we shall see below, it differs significantly from the iconography of the figurines at the site.

In the three remaining types the female, who may be Artemis, holds an animal herself. In the first of the two figurines from Taras (S 115), the female has a clearly defined quiver strap running diagonally across her torso. In her left arm she holds a small deer which rests its rump on her hand and raises its front legs as though in rapid motion. Kahil (1984, no.572, 575) includes these as types of Artemis and I agree that the figurine’s identity is clear. The metaphorical expression of parthenoi as wild animals, including deer, has been discussed above and may also be alluded to in this figure. Similar figures, holding a small deer, have been found on Kerkyra (Lechat 1981, fig. 8) and at Lousoi (Sinn 1992, 183 fig. 5); the design is later used in the Tarentine iconography of Artemis Bendis (S 119-21). The motif of holding a small animal, now a horse, to the chest is found at Poseidonia too. This type has been identified as Hera Hippia and its occurrence linked to the importance of chariot racing
to the western Greeks (Zancani Montuoro 1961, 37) or the existence of a local cavalry unit (Baumbach 2004, 120-2).

The inclusion of the second Tarentine figurine (S 116) here requires justification. Schenider-Herrmann (1959, 55-7) identifies the figure as a Potnia Theron but acknowledges its relation to Artemis. The Potnia Theron usually grasps animals to demonstrate her control over them. However, the female figure here holds a small deer in her right arm, in a pose reminiscent of S 115 above, and touches a feline on her left side. Although the feline stands on its back legs, similar to representations of felines with the Potnia Theron, the goddess reaches down and only places her hand upon its lower head: this is reminiscent of the figurines of the Artemis Group (S S5-6). The combination of feline and deer, and in particular the cradling of the deer on the female’s arm, is suggestive of Artemis.

Finally, we should briefly consider the figure from Campania, carrying a small animal in her right hand, identified by Kahil (1984, no. 614) as Artemis (S 124). The female wears a peplos, with the cross-band worn by parthenoi visible over the top (Stafford 205, 105); her hair falls forward, in two plaits, over her shoulders. This dress and hair-style are unusual for Artemis. If the goddess does not have her hair pulled back into a bun, or the lampadion knot style popular in late classical Sicily, she often wears a polos as a symbol of her divinity.111 The attribution, I assume, was made on account of the small animal carried in the female’s lowered right hand. Not only is the pose different, but the animal is much smaller than those held, usually on the divinity’s forearm and sometimes clutched to the chest, and discussed above. The animal, possibly a horse or deer, shows no sign of animation; I would suggest therefore that this is a representation of a human votary carrying an animal figurine for dedication at a temenos.

3.2.3 Potnia Theron

Artemis is invoked as Potnia Theron in Homer (II. 21.470). Literally translated as ‘mistress of wild beasts’, the title is now commonly translated and understood as ‘mistress of the animals’. Studniczka (1890, 153-165) attributed this title to the motif of a female in a formal, usually frontal and sometimes symmetrical, standing pose who is flanked by two

111 For the polos as an indicator of status, usually divinity, see Carter (1988, 95) and Ammerman (1991, 204).
animals; sometimes she grasps the animals.\(^{112}\) In its strictest sense the pose requires a demonstration of power or control over wild animals (lions, bulls or fantastic creatures). However, it is now attributed to various combinations that include a goddess holding, but not necessarily controlling, any animal (Barclay 2001, 373). I have not absolutely enforced the distinction between the Potnia Theron proper and Artemis accompanied by an animal. In this section the three vase-paintings (VP 177, II118-9), the fibula from Syracuse (S S1), the decoration from the Grächwil hydria (S I2) and the Campanian akroterion (AS I8) largely comply with this strict definition of the Potnia Theron. The unique figurines from Artemis' *temenos* at S. Biagio are often called the Potnia Theron; an early type from the site (S I6) is definitely recognisable as this figure, but a definition of the further figurines included in the catalogue is elusive (S I7-13).

The distinction between a figure demonstrating control or power over animals and a figure accompanied by animals who serve as an attribute or standard part of that figure's iconography is not always apparent. The former is generally called a Potnia or Potnos Theron and the latter Artemis although, as noted above, certain animals are particularly associated with other female deities: for example, the pig with Demeter and the dove with Aphrodite. Artemis is regularly associated with the Potnia Theron; scholars cite Homer's (*Il.* 21.470) invocation of Artemis as Potnia Theron which he follows with 'Agrotera' (huntress) (Burkert 1985, 151-2). Moreover, Pausanias (5.19.5) seems to 'read' an image of the Potnia Theron as Artemis on the Chest of Kypselos, but comments that he does not understand why Artemis is winged.\(^{113}\) It may be true that Artemis, among the Greek Olympian goddesses, inherited most of the Potnia Theron (Christou 1968, 199; Kahil 1984, 739-40), but this association was not exclusive to Artemis (Icard-Gianolio 1997, 1021-2; Barclay 2001, 373).\(^{114}\) It is therefore not accurate to identify the early figure of the Potnia Theron as the Greek goddess Artemis. The Potnia Theron motif is found in earlier periods all over the Mediterranean (Icard-Gianolio 1997, 1026-7), including Iron Age Italy (Marinatos 2000, 26),\(^{115}\) and so was not introduced to (Southern) Italy and Sicily as Artemis. Nor does the Potnia Theron serve as the origin of the goddess Artemis, for she is listed in the Linear B tablets as a goddess in her own right (PY Es 650.5). Westenholz (1998, 63-5) used the

\(^{112}\) Icard-Gianolio (1997, 1026) describes the iconographical development of the Potnia Theron design from the seventh century B.C. to the second century A.D. See also Christou (1968, 154ff.).

\(^{113}\) See, for example, Thomson (1909); Boardman (1974, 219); Carpenter (1991, 47) and Marinatos (2000, 92) for pre-archaic and archaic images of the Potnia Theron identified as Artemis.

\(^{114}\) Kahil (1984, 737) describes the Potnia Theron's iconography as 'foreshadowing' Artemis.

\(^{115}\) The Potnia Theron is just one manifestation of a multi-faceted Potnia figure (Thomas, Wedde 2001, 12-13).
analogy of a kaleidoscope when explaining the blurring of individual gods within a pantheon. The concept works well for our purposes here: the Potnia Theron largely overlaps with Artemis but her character can also be discerned mingling with the nature/patterns of other goddesses.

All three examples in the vase-painting catalogue were found in Etruria (VP 177, 118-9) and date to the early archaic period. The Potnia Theron was a popular figurine in Etruria from early times until the hellenistic period (Icard-Gianolio 1997, 1026, no.28). However, despite the evidence for the interaction between Etruscan and Southern Italian artisans (Del Chiari 1984, 126-8), the figure is noticeably absent from the ceramic evidence from Southern Italy and Sicily in the archaic and classical periods. The antefix (AS 18), which was found in the temenos at Fondo Patturelli, probably dedicated to a female deity and physically located just outside the walls of ancient Capua (Lubtchansky 2005, 104-6), may be a result of the already recognised Etruscan artistic influence in Campania (Frederiksen 1984, 122). The design matches the traditional Potnia Theron motif: a central female figure grasps the necks of two water birds symmetrically placed either side of her.

Before we turn to the other images of the Potnia Theron in the sculpture catalogue, a proto-Corinthian oinochoe recently discovered on the small Syracusan island of Ortygia and published by Paola Pelagatti (1999), should be mentioned here. This small vase is dated c.670 and was excluded from the catalogue as it precedes my chronological timeframe by over half a century (Pelagatti 1999, 29-31). The Potnia Theron stands below the spout in a frontal pose; her arms are extended, she grasps a lion in each hand and is flanked by sphinxes. On either side of this central scene is a frieze of animals: a lion and bull on the viewer’s left and a panther and wild boar on the right; a racing biga can be seen behind the wild boar (Pelagatti 1999, 29, fig. 2-4, p.30). The fantastic creatures which appear with the Potnia Theron, such as the sphinxes on this oinochoe, could indicate a chthonian nature

116 See also Andrén (1939, pl. 53.170; 1940, 137, II.2b) for a hellenistic terracotta temple decoration from Falerii and a hellenistic terracotta antefix (Andrén 1939, pl. 97.154; 1940, 295, D8).
117 Birds were added to the iconographic repertoire of the Potnia Theron in the late Aegean Bronze Age (Barclay 2001, 379). Krauskopf (1984, no.8) includes this figure as Artumes; an Etruscan hunting deity, similar to Artemis, who is associated with the Potnia Theron in Etruria.
118 A contemporary vase with the Potnia Theron has been discovered at Megara Hyblaea: a large vase of Megarian manufacture has two areas of figural decoration. On one side there are two rearing, symmetrically positioned horses; on the other a female in profile holding a deer by its hind legs (École Française de Rome 1966, 282).
119 In contrast to the three examples in the catalogue, the Potnia Theron on this oinochoe is the focus of the entire scene. The goddess has varying degrees of prominence on the three Attic vases found in Etruria from a small decorative role on a handle (VP 177) to occupying the tondo of a cup (VP 1118) but is never the central focus of the vase.
Lions or large felines are predominant on the three vases found in Etruria and this oinochoe.\textsuperscript{120} This leonine association is part of the Potnia Theron’s iconography inherited by Artemis (Hom. Il. 21.482-4; Aesch. Ag. 141)\textsuperscript{121} and shared with Apollo (Shapiro 1989, 59).

The oinochoe was discovered in an ancient deposit under Piazza Duomo on Ortygia: the earliest area of Syracuse settled by the Corinthians in 734. Pelagatti (1999, 31) has argued that the vase itself is evidence of the elusive Ortygian cult of Artemis and provides us with an image of the goddess worshipped on the island. The vase may well have been associated with Artemis cult. However, for the reasons discussed above, it cannot be presented as either absolute evidence of Artemis’ cult or a definite image of the goddess receiving cult on Ortygia. It would have been an appropriate gift to the hunting goddess whom Homer calls the Potnia Theron but there can be no certainty beyond that.

A second representation of the Potnia Theron from Syracuse on an ivory fibula (S S1) was discovered during the excavation of the Fusco necropolis. The Potnia Theron is winged and appears with just one animal, a goat, which stands behind her; the female’s left hand reaches down to rest on the goat’s back. The fibula is a unique find; it may have been imported from Crete or Sparta (Palermo 1992, 30-4). The goat is popular in early representations of the Potnia Theron (Barclay 2001, 382-5) and this fibula is part of a general return to the imagery of the ‘mistress of the goats’ who is generally associated with Artemis (Hiller 2001, 298).\textsuperscript{122} The goat appears in the iconography of the figurines from S. Biagio which will be discussed below.

The early archaic bronze ornate decoration from the Grächwil hydria (S 12) and the figurative design of the late classical thymiaterion (S 118) are both related to Taras. The Grächwil hydria is famous for its discovery in a chieftain’s grave in modern Switzerland. The general acceptance of its production in a Tarentine workshop (Kahil 1984, no.47) has been challenged by Shefton (2004, 41) who argues for its production in Laconia and subsequent export via the Adriatic. Aside from the especial circumstances of its discovery, the hydria is remarkable simply for the sculpting of a full female figure for the decorative

\textsuperscript{120} On the proto-Corinthian oinochoe and VP II118 the Potnia Theron grasps lions, on VP II119 she holds a lion and a deer and on VP I177 a panther and a deer.
\textsuperscript{121} See the discussion of S S14 above for Artemis’ association with lions.
\textsuperscript{122} Hiller (2001, 298) cites the altar of goat horns at Dreros and the sacrifice of goats to Artemis; for the latter see Xen. An. 3.2.12., Hell. 4.2.20, Lac. 13.8.
piece attached to the rim which is included in the sculpture catalogue. A winged female is flanked by hares which she grasps and lions; a bird stands on the top of her polos and two snakes pass behind her head along the rim of the hydria. The hares and lions are creatures of the wild; although admittedly hares are small prey for the hunter. The bird is unusual; water-birds feature regularly in the Potnia Theron motif but this bird appears more like a bird of prey. The snakes serve to support the upper lions and possibly act as a practical device in the attachment of the female’s head to the hydria; the use of snakes to frame Potnia Theron compositions is known from earlier Aegean examples (Barclay 2001, 379).

The thymiaterion (S 118), discovered in the Tarentine necropolis, is an archaising piece from the late classical period. A female appears in the ‘kniefel’ pose carrying a deer while a large bird sits on the top of her polos. Although not strictly a Potnia Theron, the type fits into the discussion here on account of the combination of animal types: bird and beast and the similar placement of the bird to S 12 above. The deer held in the female’s arms recalls the small deer held in the hand of S 115 and the slightly larger deer carried on the forearm of S 116, 19-21, all of which are either Tarentine or models of a Tarentine type. The pose, however, recalls the figurines from S. Biagio with their arms held out from the elbow and an animal, larger than the deer of S 115-16, 19-21, held across their chest. The female of the thymiaterion actually wraps her arms around the deer but the influence of these other local types is clear. It is interesting to note that both the ivory fibula from Syracuse (S S1) and Grächwil hydria (S 12) were buried as grave goods; while a figure reminiscent of the Potnia Theron stood in the Tarentine necropolis (S 118).

Finally, in our discussion of the Potnia Theron, we should consider the range of types in the catalogue from the temenos of S. Biagio in the Metapontine chora (S 16-13; Kahil 1984, 740). The unusual type of a sometimes winged figure holding an animal in her arms and/or supporting an animal on her torso has been found at a few other local sites: Sybaris, Croton, Policoro, Incoronata Greca and the urban temenos at Metapontion (Olbrich 1976, 382, 392; Barberis, 2005, 55-6; Carter 2006, 76). However, the vast majority of figurines of this type were dedicated at the S. Biagio temenos. The figurines were therefore considered

---

123 Hoffmann (1964) and Rolley (1982) discuss similar pieces which are simply female heads or busts sometimes flanked by animals.
124 Olbrich (1976, 381) suggests the coroplasts may have been inspired by the François vase (VP 177) and Grächwil hydria (S 12) as well as the figurines manufactured in Sparta and dedicated at the temenos of Artemis Orthia (Dawkins 1929, pl. 195.4). A fragment (head and torso) of a figurine, dating to c.700, from Brauron recalls this type (Kahil 1984, 631, no.85).
appropriate offerings for Artemis; some measure 40cm high and so represent a substantial offering, clearly for display, in the temenos (Olbrich 1976, 381).

The earliest type of the series is a traditional Potnia Theron figure (S 16), who grasps the necks of two symmetrically placed water-birds, following Barclay’s (2001, 373) definition. The series then develops to include the characteristic type of a female with large disc ornaments on her shoulders (S 17-8, 12). The female is sometimes winged (S 17-8, 12) and wears a polos decorated with objects (S 17, 11), tentatively identified here as flower-buds, which is alternated with a conical hat (S 112). A wide range of animals are associated with the figure: water-birds (S 16, 9), goats (S 17-8), lions (S 110) and snakes (S 111); reflecting her control over all of nature (Giacometti 1999, 418; 2005, 63-6). The animals can appear supported by the female’s shoulder or held in their arms; both poses appear protective rather than controlling. A type carrying a torch appears among the series in the fifth century; this recalls the types of Hekate and Artemis carrying torches which become popular at this time.

An unusual type holding a spear with a snake visible on the left shoulder appears to blur the iconography of the Potnia Theron with Athena (S 111). Olbrich (1976, 391-2) and Solima (1998, 392-402) identify the figure as Artemis and cite examples of her associations with war; for Osanna (1992, 51) this is a chthonic version of Artemis. However, Giacometti (1999, 419) disagrees; she refers to Vernant’s discussion (1991, 244-50) of Artemis’ role as Soteira and Hegemone, which is removed from the actual battlefield, and cites the discovery of similar figurines near Temple C, probably an Athenaion, in the urban temenos at Metapontion to identify this figure as Athena. It should be acknowledged that, as we have already seen, the spear is an attribute of Artemis as a huntress. However, it is rare for Artemis to brandish a spear in this particular fashion. Moreover, the earliest instances of Artemis attacking or killing an animal with a raised weapon date to the late classical period. The snake visible at the female’s left shoulder is more suited to Athena than Artemis. This association of Athena and the snake, well-known through the Athenian myth

125 Both the Potnia Theron and Artemis appear winged in archaic art; see Kahil (1984, nos. 706-13) for a winged Artemis and VP S37 and VP 181 for a winged Artemis with a deer here.
126 On the especial relationship of Artemis and goats see the discussion of S 11 above; Olbrich (1976, 384-5) also reviews the evidence for this.
127 The association of lions has been referred to above; see especially the discussion of the Geloan plaque (S S14).
128 See my general discussion of the goddess’ association with war in relation to the Sicilian Artemis Group terracottas above.
129 See Kahil (1984, nos. 396-403a); VP 118 and S S12 here.
of Erichthonios (Apollod. Bibl. 3.14.6; cf. CVA 376), appears more generally in the goddess’ archaic iconography: a contemporaneous Attic vase from Etruria shows a snake device on the goddess’ shield. Furthermore, instead of the large circular disc ornaments adorning many of the figurines’ shoulders, the spear brandishing figure has markings on the shoulders which may be meant to indicate armour. The dedication of the figurine in a *temenos* dedicated to Artemis does not necessitate its identification as Artemis; Alroth’s (1987, 17-8; 1989, 108-113) concept of ‘visiting gods’ has already been discussed in 3.1 above. This review of the figurine suggests its identification as Athena who is adopting the snake of the Potnia Theron into her own iconography.

Now that we have established the identity of S 16 as the Potnia Theron and S 111 as Athena, I shall consider the interpretation of the remaining figures (S 17-10, 12-13). While I have argued above that the traditional Potnia Theron motif represents a figure distinct from, but clearly associated with, Artemis the identity of these figurines is more problematic. They do not grasp or exert control over the animals as seen in the representations of the Potnia Theron elsewhere; for example on the Attic vases in Etruria (VP 177, 1118-9) or the Grächwil hydria (S 12). Nor do they appear accompanied by an animal, as though an attribute or standard part of their iconography as, for example, in some types of the Sicilian Artemis Group (S S5). Scholars generally agree that these figurines are representations of Artemis in her guise as the Potnia Theron (Olbrich 1976, 381; Edlund 1987, 36; Giacometti 1999, 418; Kowalzig 2007, 291-4). In terms of the iconographic record, I would suggest that they sit between the two figures: they are not clearly defined as either the Potnia Theron or Artemis. If we recall Westenholz’s (1998, 63-5) kaleidoscope image, we are in the blurred stage between one (loosely) fixed pattern and another.

Bacchylides (11.37-9) calls the goddess Agrotera, ‘of the golden distaff’, ‘renowned with the bow’ and Hemera. The latter is the cult title of Artemis at Lousoi (Paus. 8.18.8) and identifies the goddess as the soother; a reference to her healing of the Proitids. The iconography of the figurines could be associated with both Hemera and Agrotera. The female holding the animals in her arms could be interpreted as soothing them. Goats were liminal creatures: neither fully wild nor fully domesticated (Vernant 1991, 256); is this figure soothing these creatures in the same way as Artemis ‘soothed’ the Proitids? Unlike Hemera, Agrotera\(^{130}\) (huntress) was a popular epithet of Artemis: it is found elsewhere in Greek Sicily.

\(^{130}\) Artemis is invoked as Potnia Theron and Agrotera in Homer (*II*. 21.470-1). See Olbrich (1976, 383) for the dedication of hunting tools at the site.
Metapontion was founded by Achaians, probably in the latter half of the seventh century (chapter 1.1.2). Antiochos of Syracuse (FGrHist 555 fr.12) explains that the Achaians of Sybaris had sent for help in their on-going struggle against Taras; Metapontion was founded between these two poleis. The motives of Antiochos have been questioned, but while the identity of the hostile neighbours is under debate it is likely that the settlers of Metapontion intended to create an Achaian base on the plain; see chapter 1.1.2. Bacaulydes' eleventh epinikian attributes the founding of the temenos to the Homeric Achaians and associates it with the cult of Artemis Hemera at Lousoi (11.113). However, the frequent appearance of goats either in the arms or on the shoulders of the figurines when combined with the epithet Agrotera suggests the Achaians may have been recalling their newly founded cult of Artemis Agrotera at Aigeira when making these offerings. The arrival of the Achaians to support Sybaris against Taras also recalls Artemis Agrotera as the goddess who saved Aigeira; these dedications could represent a plea for safety or thanksgiving for their perceived strength against Taras.

131 A search for Artemis Agrotera in CRESCAM's Banque de Donnees des Epileses Grecques produced 29 examples. See also Giacometti (1999, 418) on the occurrence of this epithet at Torricella and Aigeira.

132 This is included in CRESCAM's database as no. 1084.

133 The northern coastal region of Achaia was known as Aigialeia which can be roughly translated as 'sea-shore' but is probably a play on the Greek for goat (Morgan and Hall 1996, 174; Hall 2002, 63); note also the forepart of a goat on the coinage of Argai in this region c.500 (Head 1911, 412).

134 Antiochos (FGrHist 555 fr.12) also records a subsequent war between Metapontion and Taras. However, this has been dated to the fifth century (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo 2004b, 280) and so post-dates the first dedications of the figurines at S. Biagio.

135 On the traditions of the Achaian founding of Metapontion and the establishment of the Argive cult of Artemis from Lousoi see Cairns (2005, 36-8). The cult of Artemis at Lousoi is discussed by Jost (1985, 46-51). Although Artemis' sanctuaries at Lousoi and S. Biagio may share a mythology, there is no obvious connection in the iconography of the goddess at these two sites.

136 Olbrich (1976, 392) has suggested that Artemis was also venerated as Soteira at S. Biagio on account of the dedication of similar figurines at Herakleia where Artemis was worshipped as Soteira with Demeter and Persephone.
3.2.4 Artemis Bendis

The final type to consider in this chapter is the so-called Artemis Bendis who appears in a variety of media: terracotta figurines, akroteria and Apulian vase-painting at the end of the fifth century. I have included three variants of the Artemis Bendis terracotta figurines in the sculpture catalogue (S 119-21; Higgins 1967, 90-1). The goddess wears a short chiton, with an animal skin tied over-top, a long cloak and high boots. On her head she wears a Phrygian cap; a lion-skin is tied over the cap and her shoulders. In her right hand a bow is held against her lower body while her left forearm supports a deer (S 119). In the first variant I have included the goddess' left arm rests on a small statue of a female figure wearing a polos which itself stands on a pedestal (S 120). In the second variant the female's left arm rests on a short column, rather than a statue, and a small animal sits at her left foot (S 121).

The figurines appear at the end of the fifth century and are found at a number of sites predominantly Taras (Harden 1929),137 Metapontion (Calabria 2005, 73-81; Bergamasco 2006, 145),138 Herakleia (Hänse1973, 457; Curti 1989; Otto 2005, 16), S. Maria d’Anglona (Rüdiger 1967) and Maruggio (Lippolis, Garraffo, Nafissi 1995, 88).139 The heads with a Phrygian cap but no covering lion skin, found with the Sicilian Artemis Group terracottas (S S9), could be either Bendis or Artemis Bendis. Two further sites on the Ionian coast provide evidence of Artemis Bendis akroteria. Four akroteria of this type (AS 110), dating to the second half of the fourth century, have been found at Crotone (Lattanzi 1997, 511-2).140 A mould for the akroterion type was found in the Metapontine chora, at S. Angelo Vecchio, associated with a kiln with a range of fragments of types known from Taras, Metapontion and Herakleia (Carter 1979).

Foreign cults, such as those of Bendis, Adonis and Sabazios, started to appear on Attic red figure vases in the classical period (Roller 1988, 510-13; Boardman 1989, 221). No exported Attic vases with scenes of Bendis are known from Southern Italy. However, an Attic figure vase of the first half of the fifth century, depicting a female holding an

137 The majority of the figurines have been discovered at Taras in the urban cult centre and the necropolis (Bergamasco 2006, 143-4). For a number of heads from figurines of this type from Taras see Schürmann (1989, nos.140-7, 157-67, 176-82).
138 Bergamasco (2006, 143) reviews the range of discoveries across Metapontion including some from a votive deposit at S. Biagio.
139 Examples of this type are found at other sites; for example Grumento (Bottini 2005, 190) and San Chirico Nuovo (Tagliente 2005, 120-3).
140 For an example of an Artemis Bendis antefix from Metapontion see Lo Porto (1966, 149, fig. 4).
alabastron in front of Bendis, has been found in northern Italy (CVA 209748). Bendis wears her alopekis and is comparable to the Attic vases recorded in the LIMC (Goceva, Popov 1986, nos. 1-2). The seven examples in the vase-painting catalogue here are all the products of Apulian work-shops and date to the fourth century; four are the produce of the Bendis painter: VP L58-60, 63 (Trendall, Cambitoglou 1978, 87-9). Five of the scenes feature on bell kraters (VP L58-61, 63); however, this is not necessarily significant as bell kraters were a popular shape among the South Italian potters (Trendall 1989, 9).

The debate over the identity of this female huntress has largely focused on the terracotta figurines: the cases for both Bendis and Artemis were argued, but now scholars generally accept that they depict Artemis Bendis. The difficulty arises from the similarity of these two figures. Bendis was a Thracian deity whose cult was officially introduced to Athens in 430/29 (Knaack 1899, 269-71; Curti 1989, 24; Tsiafakis 2000, 386; Bergamasco 2006, 136-9). Like Artemis, she was a goddess of the hunt and wore a short chiton with an animal skin

---

141 The export of such vases introduced Bendis to the Etruscans; Krauskopf (1984, no. 61) includes local copies of Bendis' iconography as representations of Artumes.

142 See below. After Bendis' arrival in Athens the goddesses are associated with each other. While Artemis can appear wearing Bendis' cap, she does not wear the alopekis.

143 Note also VP L46: an Apulian scene with Artemis driving a chariot and wearing a Phrygian cap.

144 For the arguments in favour of Bendis see Lunsingh Scheurleer (1932), and for Artemis see Harden (1927; Letta 1968). Artemis Bendis was finally recognised by Lo Porto (1961) and Schauenburg (1974) and has remained the accepted identification since; Kahl (1984, nos. 915-934) includes these figures as Artemis Bendis.
over-top and a pair of boots; she regularly carries spears and is accompanied by animals.\textsuperscript{145} It is probably easier to consider the differences between their iconography in the last third of the fifth century: Bendis regularly wears a Phrygian cap or \textit{alopéckis} and does not count a bow among her attributes (Goceva, Popov 1986). Bendis was worshipped at the Piraeus (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 2.4.11; Pl. Rep. 327-8); a late classical marble plaque found at the Piraeus shows a bearded man carrying a torch and leading a procession of nude youths to the goddess (Goceva, Popov 1986, no.3). Artemis was also worshipped at the Piraeus as Mounychia (Xen. \textit{Hell.} 2.4.11; Paus. 1.1.4; Threpsiades 1935) and Horaia (Garland 1987, 229).

Artemis can adopt an aspect of or be associated with another deity; this is then expressed through her adoption of that deity’s name as an epithet. Despite this subordination of the second figure, the two can still remain individual entities as we saw with the case of Hekate above. Artemis and Bendis were associated (Hdt. 4.33; CRESCAM nos. 1166-8, 1206) and started to adopt elements of each other’s iconography resulting in the Artemis Bendis type. However, the two remained distinct. A skyphos of unknown provenance (\textit{CVA} 214330 = Goceva, Popov 1986, no. 2) from the fifth century demonstrates the similarity of the two figures but clearly demonstrates their individual existence.\textsuperscript{146} On one side Themis and Bendis stand facing each other; Themis holds a torch and basket while Bendis holds two spears and is accompanied by a deer. On the other side Artemis faces Kephalos; both hold two spears and Kephalos is about to pour a libation at a herm.\textsuperscript{147} The name of each figure is inscribed. Tsiafakis (2000, 388) interprets the scene with Themis and Bendis as the welcoming of the Thracian deity to Athens; the torch in Themis’ hand is an allusion to the torch races held in Bendis’ honour at the Piraeus (Pl. Rep. 327a, 328a).

The Artemis Bendis figurines were extremely popular and only a few other types of Artemis are known in late classical or hellenistic Southern Italy. The distinct iconography certainly proved effective in distinguishing the goddess from other mortal or immortal \textit{parthenoi}. The traditional iconography of Bendis is adapted for these figurines; most notably the lion-skin appears tied over the Phrygian cap. The addition of the bow is part of Bendis’ assimilation with Artemis and the carrying of the fawn on the forearm continues a local tradition discussed above (S 115). We have already noted Artemis’ association with lions which is

\textsuperscript{145} For Artemis wearing an animal skin see Kahil (1984, nos. 353-86).
\textsuperscript{146} The exact date of the skyphos is unclear: c.475-425 (\textit{CVA}), c.425-400 (Curti 1989, 26), end of the fifth century (Goceva, Popov 1986, no. 2)
\textsuperscript{147} Kephalos was the son of Hermes (Geisau 1969, 189). The carrying of two spears in this manner is part of Bendis’ iconography as \textit{dilonchos} and is adopted by Artemis (Curti 1989, 26; Tsiafakis 2000, 387).
also evident in the Sicilian Artemis Group: Aischylos (Ag. 141) describes the goddess nurturing cubs and in a Pindaric dithyramb she yokes Bromios’ lions (fr. 70b SM 19-20). Lions are among the beasts dominated by the Potnia Theron (VP 1118-9). While, in Syracuse, parthenoi may have been imagined as lions in a ritual in honour of Artemis (Theoc. Id. 2.66-8). The lion-skin may therefore have been a symbol of Artemis Bendis’ role as a goddess responsible for the nurturing of, and rites of passage for, parthenoi. Four of the Apulian vases depicting Artemis Bendis showed her alongside nude youths who carried weapons of war and the hunt; perhaps this role of the goddess was extended to young men too. Bendis’ cult in Athens was certainly celebrated by men; this, in addition to Artemis’ role in combat,\textsuperscript{148} may have led to the extension of those perceived under care from young women to all young people.

The arrival of Artemis Bendis in Southern Italy appears to have revitalised Artemis’ cult and perhaps extended its cult-base (Bergamasco 2006, 149). Several of the find-spots for these terracottas are associated with Demeter and Persephone: S. Maria d’Anglona (Rüdiger 1967, 340), Herakleia (Bergamasco 2006, 146) and Metapontion (Calabria 2005, 73-81). An inscription recording the cult of Artemis Soteira was found just outside the temenos of Demeter and Persephone at Herakleia (Lo Porto 1961, 138); inside the temenos dedications of iron restraints suggest the worship of Artemis Soteira as a goddess who over-saw the passage from servitude to freedom (Curti 1989, 28-9; Bergamasco 2006, 147). The votive deposit at S. Maria d’Anglona was also located in front of the entrance to the temenos. The association of Artemis with the boundary of the temenos of Demeter and Persephone recalls her role as Propylaea at Eleusis (Paus. 1.38.6) and Hekate’s similar role at Selinus (De Angelis 2003, 139). The physical location of these cult sites for Artemis reflects her role as a goddess who marks passage: Curti (1989, 29) has argued that the cult of Soteira attested at Herakleia can be understood at S. Maria d’Anglona too. Moreover, several Artemis Bendis figurines were found in the Tarentine necropolis perhaps betraying a chthonian role for the goddess over-seeing the passage from death to after-life (Lippolis 2001, 237-8).

The final issue to address is how the iconography of Artemis Bendis arrived in the Greek west. All of the vases in the catalogue are Apulian; the work-shops of the Apulian potters and painters were probably in Taras (Trendall 1989, 23ff). The terracotta figurines also appear to be of Tarentine workmanship; the design subsequently spreads along the Ionian

\textsuperscript{148} See above; in particular the discussion of the Sicilian Artemis Group terracottas for Artemis’ role as a goddess associated with war.
coast. Taras was a Spartan colony but Bendis enters the Greek world via Athens where she becomes associated with Artemis. Curti (1989, 30) argued for the propagation of the type at Thurii, a panhellenic site with a number of Athenian colonists, founded in 444. Lippolis (2005, 95) reasonably argued against Curti as none of the figurines have been found in Thurii and on account of their Tarrentine style. However, the role of Thurii, and the Athenians among its colonists, in bringing Artemis Bendis to Southern Italy is now widely accepted (Lippolis 2005, 95; Bergamasco 2006, 149). As such, the concept and cult of Artemis Bendis probably arrived in Southern Italy as a consequence of the Athenians arriving in Thurii: it does not necessarily follow that the figurines had to be crafted in that polis.
In chapter 3 we considered the complexities of the iconographical evidence (3.1) and in particular the issues posed by the different types of media and the means by which we should interpret the images upon them. We then reviewed the general images of Artemis (3.2.1) which included non-narrative scenes of the goddess, most frequently, in her guise as the huntress: Agrotera. The goddess’ attributes and the actions in which she engages were noted and discussed. We then focussed on the terracotta figurines, usually locally produced pieces, of the goddess (3.2.2). The specific types of Potnia Theron (3.2.3) and Artemis Bendis (3.2.4) were then reviewed in detail. Moving forward we will now consider two further main categories of Artemis’ Southern Italian and Sicilian iconography: Artemis with Apollo (4.1) and Artemis’ mythology (4.2).

4.1 Artemis with Apollo

The vases with scenes which include both Artemis and Apollo comprise over half of the entries in the catalogue. Artemis appears more often in the company of her brother than she does with any other god and more often than she does alone. While this is not necessarily surprising, since Artemis and Apollo are the twins of the Olympic pantheon, it does raise the question of Artemis’ significance. Is Artemis important as a goddess in her own right or is her role as the sister of Apollo more significant? The images cannot answer this question but a close examination of the types of scene in which they appear together, specifically reviewing their interaction and the context of their appearance, can help us better understand Artemis’ relative importance.

A wide range of vases have been included in this section; they appear in the catalogue and associated analyses as Artemis with Apollo (and sometimes Leto), Artemis in/mounting chariot, Gigantomachy, Herakles and deer, Niobids, Struggle for the tripod and also Tityos. I shall start
with the largest category: the generically titled Artemis with Apollo (and sometimes Leto), which on its own constitutes 45% of all the vases in this study.\footnote{Except VP S7, VP 18, 41, 56, 63, 65, 66, 70 and VP L27, 33 and 66, which depict Artemis accompanying a chariot and will therefore be discussed with scenes of Artemis in/mounting a chariot.}

The vast majority of these vases are non-narrative, Attic representations of Apollo accompanied by Artemis and sometimes joined by Leto.\footnote{Catalogue numbers: VP S4-6, 8, 10-3, 15-8, 20-1; VP 16, 9-11, 13-4, 22-31, 33, 35-6, 39-40, 42, 44-6, 48-50, 52, 54-5, 57-9, 61-2, 64, 69, 74-6. Owing to the large number of vases concerned, where I give examples of attributes or settings in the following discussion one or two examples are given rather than a comprehensive list.} Apollo usually holds his lyre and/or a phiale; sometimes he holds a laurel sprig (VP I30). Artemis' most common attributes in the scene are her hunting tools and/or an oinochoe; she is also depicted holding a lyre (VP S11), pipes (VP S16), a branch (VP I6), a kerykeion (VP S17), a torch (VP I31) and flowers (VP I54). When Leto accompanies her children she can hold an arrow (VP I27), a sceptre (VP I31) or a phiale (VP I48). The group can be seated (VP S13, VP I29, 42, 55) or by an altar (VP S6, VP 110, 13, 28) and are regularly accompanied by a deer (VP S8, 12, VP 19, 22, 23, 27, 44) and once by a panther (VP I46). Other indications of setting, which may simply be decorative motifs included by the painter, are plants and birds (VP S8), flowers (VP I30), a column (VP S11), a palm tree (VP S15, VP I23), a vine (VP S21, VP I49) and a tree (VP I69).

The identification of Artemis, and sometimes even of Apollo, in these scenes can be uncertain and is reflected by a question mark in the catalogue. It is generally acknowledged, however, that a young male playing the lyre is Apollo and that one or two women with him are Artemis and Leto (Boardman 1975, 225); if the women are more numerous they are usually identified as the Muses (Scheffer 2001, 128). If Artemis does not carry her usual hunting equipment it can be difficult to differentiate between the goddess and her mother as the latter has no easily identifiable attributes (Carpenter 1991, 37).\footnote{On the difficulties with identifying Leto see Kahl, Icard-Gianolio (1992, 263).} Apollo is the constant, central figure of the scene; Artemis and Leto appear as his companions constituting the Delian triad (Shapiro 1989, 58).

The oinochoe frequently carried by Artemis suggests she is about to make a libation to him. Indeed, in some scenes Artemis is an archetypal performer, pouring an offering from her oinochoe into Apollo's phiale (VP S4). Scenes of the gods (Boardman 1975, 224; Arafat 1990, 89) and specifically Artemis (Kahl 1984, 695ff, 749) libating are not unusual in the archaic
period; Artemis’ libation to Apollo also serves to demonstrate their relative status. I am not aware of any scenes where Apollo libates to Artemis.4

These non-narrative Attic scenes of the Delian triad, or just Apollo and Artemis, appear on a wide range of vases from the sixth century to the end of the fifth century; they are, however, most popular in the late archaic and early classical periods (Kahil 1984, 749-50).5 The popularity of the scene appears to have been driven by Attic politics, specifically the Peisistratid purification of Delos, the re-establishment of the Delian festival and the contemporary circulation of the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (Shapiro 1989, 56-8; Deacy 2008, 108-10). The inclusion of the palm tree in some of the designs can then be understood as a reference to Delos; the Homeric Hymn to Apollo (18) describes Leto resting against a palm tree after her labour.6

Artemis’ role in these scenes is clearly of secondary importance. It has been noted elsewhere that Artemis can appear “almost as an attribute of her brother” (Shapiro 1989, 80). It seems that this is especially true of the images on these vases whose scenes could not exist without Apollo. Leto often carries the same attributes as Artemis (Kahil, Icard-Gianolio 1992, 264) and appears often to be dispensable. Furthermore, neither Artemis nor Leto is clearly identifiable in many of them. The sister and mother of Apollo blur into his retinue and appear as archetypal companions libating or honouring the god; either the Muses or mortal attendants easily displace them.

The large numbers of vases with these scenes of the Delian triad, or just Artemis and Apollo, found in Southern Italy and Sicily reflect the significant number of scenes of this nature painted in Athens. The western Greeks were probably not greatly concerned with Athenian politics. The scenes often appear on vases with more than one field of decoration; the designs frequently paired with these scenes are Dionysiac (VP S12, 21, VP II10, 28, 45, 62), youths (VP S18, VP I58-9, 74-5) and warriors/war (VP I22-5, 35, 42, 64). Dionysiac scenes were popular in southern Italy but, as they only pair with six of those with which we are concerned here, they cannot account for the export of the vases. Rather, the centrality of Apollo in the scene may have

4 The scenes of Artemis holding an oinochoe appear on a range of vases and not just those appropriate for use in a libation ritual: libations are depicted on oinochoai (VP I76) and lekythoi (VP S4) but also on, for example, volute kraters (VP S11) and neck amphorae (VP I74).
5 Approximately half of the vases with this scene discovered in Italy are from Etruria or the north.
6 The palm tree as an ‘attribute’ of Artemis is discussed above in 3.2.1.
appealed to the western Greeks: the permission to colonise was granted by Apollo’s oracle at Delphi.

Southern Italian painters did copy the design, albeit in nothing like the numbers produced by the Attic potters. Four vases, three Apulian (VP L25, 39, 41) and one Lucanian (VP L43), depict Apollo accompanied by Artemis in a non-narrative scene. One of the Apulian scenes is slightly unusual: the vase painter has included an actual temple of Apollo (VP L41). It may be that the setting is meant to be Delos or Delphi and the vase painter chose not to include a palm tree or tripod as iconographic shorthand. However, it is also possible that another, potentially western, site is being indicated. These locally manufactured vases repeat the popular Attic pairings: Dionysiac scenes (VP L41) and youths (VP L25, 39, 43).

The Delian triad also appear on a sixth century metope from Selinus (AS S1); it belongs to a series of four small metopes from an unknown building one of which we have already noted above (AS S1, chapter 3.2.1; Marconi 2007, 88). Apollo is clearly identified by the kithara he holds up in his right hand, Leto is in the centre turning to face Apollo and holding a wreath while Artemis stands to the left and holds a bow in her right hand. The metope is the only archaic representation of the Delian triad with Apollo as Kitharodos produced outside Athens; the placing of Apollo to the right of the scene and the wings on his ankles suggest this could be an arrival scene, probably at Delos or Delphi (Marconi 2007, 100-2). None of the Attic vases with scenes of the Delian triad was found at Selinus; instead it has been suggested that the metope could be a copy of a statue group from Megara with reference in particular to the unusual placement of Apollo to the side of the scene (Paus. 8.8.9; Tusa 1984, 111).

Variations on this scene appear in both the Attic and local painters’ repertoire. Apollo and Artemis feature in all of the variations; Leto appears on several too (VP S9, S14; VP I32, 34, 37-8, 47, 51, 53, 73). The scenes depart from the standard iconography described above due to the inclusion of further figures. Hermes is the most popular addition to the scene: he appears on a number of vases as the only additional figure present (VP S14, VP I4, 12, 15, 32, 47, VP L31, 42). Further vases include Hermes and another figure alongside Apollo and Artemis: Ganymede (VP S9), Aphrodite (VP I5), Delos (VP I34), Poseidon (VP I37, 53), a draped man or god (VP

---

7 Beazley (1947, 44, 84-5) records two instances of a similar design by Etruscan painters.
I38), a youth (VP 151, 73) and also Demeter (VP 171). Dionysos appears alongside Apollo and Artemis on two vases (VP S19, VP 17). On a late archaic lekythos Apollo plays the lyre between Artemis and Athena (VP I21); the latter assumes Leto’s traditional position. Finally, two Apulian vases include a satyr alongside Apollo and Artemis (VP L 11, 29). It is only natural for an artist to adjust a design or motif, attempting to assign a specific meaning to each variation is to over-complicate the issue. However, the predominance of Hermes in these variations does suggest some significance for the god in this context. Apollo regularly appears as Kitharoidos in these and other popular scenes (Shapiro 1989, 54-6); Hermes’ presence may therefore be an allusion to his invention of the lyre (Hom. Hymn Herm. 25).

There are a small number of other Attic vases with scenes which include both Artemis and Apollo. Two archaic black-figure amphorae and the François vase (VP I60), all found in Etruria, present a procession of the gods (VP I67-8) and a contemporary pyxis from Orvieto shows Herakles surrounded by the seated gods on Olympos (VP I72). Artemis is probably one of the indistinguishable goddesses alongside Apollo in all three scenes (Shapiro 1989, 64); her inclusion in the scene on Olympos probably reflects the growth in importance of her cult under the Peisistratids (Shapiro 1989, 54-6). A number of the gods appear on a damaged krater now in Bologna (VP I17); Artemis stands next to Apollo and, like all the figures in the scene, they turn and look to the right: the significance of the scene is uncertain. Artemis also appears in scenes from Apollo’s mythology: Marpessa (VP S2), Marysas (VP S3, VP 16) and Orestes’ purification at Delphi (VP I19-20).

The local artists included the last two myths, with Artemis, in their own repertoire: we have already seen that Artemis appeared on a Lucanian skyphos with Hera, Athena and Marysas (VP L52).⁸ A Campanian bell krater, which dates at least half a century after the Lucanian skyphos, depicts Artemis seated next to Apollo and Marysas (VP L35). Orestes is a popular figure in South Italian vase-painting: the examples in my catalogue are only those where Artemis appears with him. There are two Apulian vases which present Orestes at Delphi (VP L116-7). The bell krater, now in the Louvre, appears to recreate a scene from Aischylos’ Eumenides (284): Apollo is holding a pig over Orestes’ head as described in the play. The Apulian painters are known for

---

⁸ On Marysas in vase-painting see Mugione (2000, 89, 92-4). On VP I16 Athena and Hera are also included in the scene alongside Artemis; this may have influenced the Lucanian skyphos painter’s inclusion of them in his scene (VP L52).
their reproduction of theatrical scenes; the inclusion of Artemis in this scene is a variation from the play but testimony to the Apulian painters' originality in design (Shapiro 1994, 144-8; Kauffmann-Samaras 2002, no. 151). The Orestes myth also seems to have had some significance at Rhegion; see chapter 2 and Edlund (1987, 117).

There is a clear dichotomy between the Attic representations of Artemis and Apollo and those produced by the vase-painters of Southern Italy and Sicily. As we have seen above there are a few local vases which repeat the Delian triad motif, its variations and myths of Apollo where Artemis is also represented. However, the vast majority of representations of the two gods together on local vases are in the Apulian tradition of an upper register of the gods (Trendall 1989, 255). We noted a few examples of this tradition in chapter 3.2.1 where Artemis appeared in the company of other gods. The standard iconography employed by the Apulian painters included the goddess with her brother and a number of other divinities. There are 22 examples of this type in the catalogue (VP L12-24, 26, 28, 30, 32, 34, 36-8, 40). The upper registers appear predominantly on kraters.9 All of these vases date to the second half of the fourth century.

In addition to Apollo, Artemis appears in the company of a total of 14 other divinities in these upper register scenes. The most popular among these divinities are Athena (14 appearances), Pan (11 appearances), Aphrodite and Eros (8 appearances),10 Hermes (8 appearances) and Zeus (7 appearances).11 The images, which Artemis presides over, are varied and interesting as examples of myths the Apulian vase-painters may have associated with the goddess. The gods often appeared in registers above an Amazonomachy (Trendall 1989, 256); there are five examples in the catalogue with Apollo and Artemis (VP L13, 15, 21, 23, 26) and two with Artemis alone which we noted above (VP L48, 50).12 The battle of the Greeks and Persians on VP L28 conforms to the same type of confrontation or fight motif. Scenes of youths alone (VP L14) or with women (VP L17, 24) also appear to be simple stock images; one of the registers in which Artemis appears without Apollo is above a similar scene (VP L49). The apotheosis of
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9 The exceptions are one hydria (VP L17) and one amphora (VP L24). On the hydria the gods appear on the shoulder rather than directly above the action.

10 Peitho appears alongside Aphrodite and Eros once on VP L32.

11 The others are Nike (2), Iris (1), Herakles (1), Hera (3), Paniskos (2), Poseidon (2), and Helios (1).

12 The gods who appeared with Artemis on VP L48 and 50 all appear in at least one of the upper registers above an Amazonomachy on the vases with both Apollo and Artemis.
Heraclès on an Apulian volute krater recalls the archaic pyxis from Orvieto (VP 172); however, the Attic significance of the gods surrounding the hero is not relevant here.

The gods often observed theatrical scenes from the upper register. The heroic scenes of the ambush of Troilos (VP L20), departure of Amphiaras (VP L27) and Adrastos with Aigisthos (VP L36) may fit into this dramatic category. Similarly the scene with Rhodope, Heraclès, Antiope and the infant Hippolytos, on an Apulian calyx-krater in Basel, could possibly allude to a dramatic performance as the infant Hippolytus grew up to become the eponymous hero in a Euripidean tragedy (VP L38). Both Aphrodite and Artemis, who feature as opposing forces in the play, appear in the register above this scene.

Although the gods do not generally interact with the figures in the scene below, it does appear that the viewer was intended, in at least some instances, to connect the two groups of figures. On an Apulian volute krater in Berlin (VP L37) five Olympian gods are joined by Pan, who as we have seen above is regularly included in the upper register of gods, and Nephele. The nymph Nephele’s inclusion in the register is directly related to the scene below in which Phrixos appears with a ram (Eratosth. [Cat.] 19.124; Apollod. Bibl. 1.9.1). According to Apollodorus, Hermes gave Nephele the ram which she then passed to Phrixos and Helle. Phrixos later sacrificed the ram to Zeus; both Hermes and Zeus also appear in the upper register too. Furthermore, Apollodorus describes how Helle, Phrixos’ sister, fell from the ram and died: the death of the parthenos in the myth may have influenced the decision to include Artemis in the upper register.13

Four further vases include Artemis and Apollo in the upper register above a myth of parthenoi (VP L18-9, 32, 40); some of these may have been inspired by episodes in the epic cycle or plays since lost. The scene on VP L18 is a rare depiction of the myth of the daughters of Anios (Woodford 2003, 215-7): these parthenoi were saved by Dionysos who turned them into doves (Ov. Met. 13.650-74). Anios was the king of Delos: Artemis and Apollo are therefore included as the Delian gods and Artemis, in particular, as the goddess of parthenoi. Melanippe, who appears on VP L19, was the subject of two lost plays by Euripides, one of which connected her

13 Although Apollodorus is a considerably later source than the Apulian volute krater with these images, Eratosthenes records some brief details which he advises were originally reported by both the author of the Hesiodic Astronomy and Pherecydes.
with the *polis* of Metpontion in Southern Italy (chapter 1.1.2). Gantz (1993, 734-5) discusses the evidence for reconstructing these plays and the role of the Melanippe myth in the foundation of Metapontion and its relationship to the sanctuary of Artemis at S. Biagio in the Metapontine *chora* (chapter 2.2). According to Kallimachos Melanippe was a nymph who offended Artemis; the goddess turned Melanippe into a horse (Hyg. *Ast.* 2.18). The offence may have been a sexual transgression as is often the case in Artemis myth. The gods in the upper register could then be explained through this tradition: Poseidon as god of horses, Aphrodite and Eros referring to a sexual encounter and Artemis as both a protagonist in the myth and goddess of *parthenoi*.

The Danaides appear on two vases: directly below the register of gods on VP L32 and in two scenes below the register of gods on VP L30. On both vases the upper register of gods includes Artemis, Apollo, Aphrodite and Eros. The Danaides' aversion to the traditional progression from *parthenos* to *gyne* through marriage to childbirth explains the presence of Artemis and their crime on their wedding night the presence of Aphrodite (Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.1.5). Artemis and Apollo also sit alongside Zeus, Hera, Athena, Hermes and Pan as Oinomaos and Pelops take their oath before the chariot race in which they are contesting Pelops' desire to marry Hippodameia (VP L43; Pind. *Ol.* 1.86-99). Artemis could appear in recognition of the prize: the *parthenos* Hippodameia. A statue of Artemis appears on an Attic vase found in Campania on which Pelops and Hippodameia appear in a chariot together (VP I82). I argued above that the goddess' statue was depicted, rather than as an epiphany, but as an indication of her role as goddess of *parthenoi* (chapter 3.2.1). Artemis' appearance in the upper registers above these four scenes, disengaged from the actual action, and on VP L45 above Andromeda as discussed above suggests that she retained that role for the Greeks of Apulia.

On two further Apulian volute kraters, Artemis and Apollo appear in a register above the rape of Persephone (VP L12) and a scene with Persephone and Hades in the underworld (VP L30). These are reminiscent of the scenes in which Artemis appears without Apollo (VP L44, 47 and 74) discussed above in 3.3.2. The addition of Apollo to the upper register does not change the significance of Artemis, or indeed Athena, here. Hermes has been added in VP L12 in reference to his role as Psychopompos (Burkert 1985, 157-8) while Aphrodite and Eros, in both VP L12 and 30, probably represent Hades' desire for Persephone. Finally, Artemis appears in an upper register above Dionysos and Ariadne in a chariot (VP L34); the scene is reminiscent of VP L75.
discussed in 3.3.2 above. The chariot is drawn by lions recalling Artemis’ yoking of Bromios’ lions in a Pindaric dithyramb. A large number of gods are present; Artemis’ presence may allude to a different version of Ariadne’s fate in Homer (Od. 11.324-6) where Artemis, on Dionysos’ witness, kills Ariadne (Webster 1966, 23-6). Alternatively, Artemis may simply be present as the goddess of parthenoi in celebration of the mortal with whom Dionysos fell in love and married (Hes. Theog. 947-8).

Nineteen vases show Artemis either in or mounting a chariot. The individual catalogue entries distinguish between these two types, but for ease of reference here, they will be discussed as Artemis as charioteer. A further group of vases show Artemis alongside a chariot or rider; these have not been allocated their own category in the catalogue but will be discussed together here. In total these scenes constitute approximately one sixth of the catalogue. Apollo features in all except one of the Attic scenes of Artemis as charioteer hence their inclusion in this section; the locally manufactured vases exclude him from these scenes. Two archaic Attic black-figure hydriai (VP S33-4) were found in Sicilian Gela and are the work of the Rycroft painter. The CVA identifies the female mounting the chariot as either Artemis or Leto; other figures present are Apollo playing a lyre, Hermes and an unidentified woman. The only real difference between the vases is the peripheral image above the chariot scene. A fragment from a contemporaneous Chalkidian vase (VP S43), discovered at Leontini, shows Artemis in a chariot with Leto.

A further eight Attic examples of this type of scene have been found in Italy: four in the north (VP I60, 89, 91-2), three in the south (Poseidonia: VP I93; Lokroi: VP I90; Apulia: VP I83) and one with no specific region (VP I109). The scenes mainly occur on large vessels: kraters and amphorae, which, like the hydriai and krater discovered in Sicily, provide a large field for decoration. As with the Attic vases discovered in Sicily, the Attic scenes from Italy date to the archaic period. In four of the scenes Artemis is standing in a chariot (VP I60, 83, 89-90), while in the other four the goddess is in the act of mounting the chariot (VP I91-3, 109). On seven of the vases found in Italy Artemis is accompanied by Apollo (VP I60, 83, 89-91, 93, 109). Hermes appears three times (VP I83, 89, 91) and Dionysos once (VP I109), while two female
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14 On Ariadne in Dionysiac myth see Lyons (1997, 124-8).
15 See discussion in 3.2.2 concerning the relationship between Artemis and the Potnia Theron.
16 There are a total of 19 vases with Artemis either mounting or in a chariot and a further 30 vases with Artemis alongside a chariot or rider: approximately 6.5% and 10% of the catalogue respectively.
figures on the krater from Poseidonia (VP 193) are tentatively identified in the CVA as Hera and Leto; an unidentified female figure stands with Apollo and Hermes on VP 191.

While there are no contemporaneous locally manufactured vases with Artemis riding in a chariot, the goddess probably appears on two archaic metopes from Selinus riding in a chariot with Apollo and Leto (AS S3-4). These two metopes date to the middle of the sixth century but are from different edifices. The first (AS S3) is from an unknown building but is grouped, on account of size and frame, with a metope of Herakles (Marconi 2007, 88, 110). Two frontal figures stand in a quadriga. The outer two horses stand on their hind legs and face inwards while the figure on the right reaches out to touch the forehead of the nearest horse. The identification of the figures is much debated; Tusa (1984, 110) identifies them as Demeter and Kore, Scheffer (1994, 113) considers this possibility but argues that Hera and a companion are more likely while Holloway (2000, 78) suggests the charioteers are Poseidon and Amphitrite. Marconi (2007, 108-9) considers both figures to be females and agrees with Zancani Montuoro (1984, 227-9) that they could be Athena and Hera (Hom. II. 5.719ff., 8.381ff.). There are no distinguishing features or attributes to aid in the figures' identification; theories are therefore based on the iconography of the chariot, our current knowledge of the Selinuntine and Megarian pantheons and on comparisons to Homer. I would suggest that the figures could be Artemis and Apollo on the grounds that Artemis as Potnia Theron could extend control to horses and Artemis and Apollo appear on a Selinuntine coin c.440 which could have been partly inspired by this metope.

The second metope (AS S4) is associated with the East side of Temple C, dedicated to Apollo, on the Selinuntine akropolis (Tusa 1984, 115; Marconi 2007, 132-8). The fragmentary remains of three figures in the quadriga have been identified as Apollo, Artemis and Leto (Tusa 1984, 114-5); one of the females holds a wreath like Leto on AS S1 above and it has been suggested that this too could be an arrival scene (Marconi 2007, 140-2). It makes sense that the east side of this large Temple C to Apollo on the Selinuntine akropolis would depict the arrival of the Delian triad; it may even have been meant to represent their arrival in this new colony.

The motif of a god or goddess riding in a chariot starts to appear on Attic black figure pottery in the mid-sixth century and remains popular into the fifth century. One of the earliest representations is the Francois vase (VP 160) on which Artemis appears alongside Apollo in the
wedding procession of Peleus and Thetis. These scenes with numerous gods appear riding in chariots in a procession (VP S43, I60), either to the wedding of Peleus and Thetis or an 'Olympian council' (Boardman 1974, 219), evolve into representations of individual deities or mythical figures as charioteer. Herakles is initially most popular in scenes of his apotheosis; the figure in the chariot is regularly accompanied by Apollo playing the lyre, Dionysos, Hermes as proegetes and also 'unidentified' women (Carpenter 1986, 106ff; Shapiro 1989, 54-6). Artemis appears in these scenes as both the charioteer and a divine spectator alongside or behind the chariot.

Other goddesses appear as charioteers on Attic vases including those exported to Southern Italy and Sicily. A number of the Attic vases exported to Southern Italy and Sicily, c.30 and c.20 respectively, depict a female figure, with no obvious attributes, as charioteer. It is tempting to include these here as potential images of Artemis. However, a number of females have been positively identified, in either black or red figure representations, as charioteers. This includes: the goddesses Athena, Aphrodite, Demeter, Persephone, Leto, Nike, Selene, Nyx and Eos and also mythological females such as Hippodameia, Ariadne and Amazons (Raschke 1994, 167; Tuukkanen 2001, 140). Chariot scenes of this nature constitute 6.2% of the gods' appearance on archaic and classical Attic vases and present complex identification issues (Scheffer 2001, 130-1). The sheer number of possible identifications of these females renders it unreasonable for me to include them in my catalogue. The presence of Apollo alongside the chariot is part of the standard iconography of the scene and not a reason to identify the charioteer as his sister. Rather, it should be noted that these unidentifiable women are probably goddesses or mythical females but beyond that we cannot be certain.18

But how do we interpret the image of an individual deity as charioteer on an Attic vase, especially when that charioteer is Artemis? In contrast to the early black-figure chariot processions, several of which depict the gods in the wedding procession of Peleus and Thetis, Carpenter (1986, 109) has identified these as non-narrative scenes perhaps indicative of an

---

17 The identity of the female riding alongside Apollo is interpreted by the CVA as Artemis. However, Oakley and Sinos (1993, 24) identify this female as Leto and place Artemis in the chariot behind alongside Athena.
18 Raschke (1994, 170 3) has compiled the evidence for the association of women and chariots in ancient Greece. There is no evidence that women actually drove chariots. The female charioteers on the Attic vases should therefore be understood as goddesses or fantastical, mythological figures.
especial relationship between the deity depicted and Athens. Carpenter (1986, 109 n.44) illustrates his argument with Herodotos’ (1.60) account of Peisistratos’ entry into Athens alongside Phye-Athena. If vases were ‘exported to order’ to the western cities, can we extend this theory to postulate a relationship between the deity depicted and the recipient city? While it cannot be proved, and is indeed unlikely, that western Greek consumers had sufficient influence to dictate the identity of a deity mounting a chariot painted by an artist in Athens, the relative number of vases with a female mounting a chariot discovered at Selinus may hint at that polis’ partiality to this type of scene.

A total of eight black figure vases with an unidentified female mounting a chariot have been discovered in the Selinuntine necropolis of Manicalunga (CVA 17572, 17573, 17574, 17575, 17577, 17581, 20276, 21214). This is more than discovered at any other individual site. All of these vases date to the last quarter of the sixth and first half of the fifth centuries. As we have already noted above Artemis and Apollo appeared together in a chariot on two archaic metopes from Selinus as well as a classical coin series (Head 1911, 167). Although none of the certain representations of Artemis as charioteer on vase-painting are from Selinus, it is possible that the number of vases discovered at Selinus reflects a local preference for the scene. As the female is unidentifiable, the receiver of the vase could interpret the female as he desired. However, something led the Selinuntines to purchase a relatively large number of vases with a female driving a chariot from traders, include chariot iconography probably with Artemis and Apollo in their temples’ sculptural programmes and mint a coin series with an image of Artemis and Apollo riding in a chariot. It is possible that the metopes, coin and potentially these vases could refer to a local cult of the gods on the Selinuntine acropolis; but the reason for this iconography remains unclear.

Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 85-7) has demonstrated, using the motif of erotic pursuit, how an iconographical theme can reflect and express certain perceptions of and for contemporary artists, viewers and their institutions. If we approach these chariot scenes as a theme, to better understand them, we should consider the one consistent element: the chariot. Raschke (1994, 163ff.) has reviewed the role of chariots in archaic and classical Greece: from their appearance

CVA 17576, noticeable by its absence from the series of CVA numbers, does depict a female mounting a chariot. However, the CVA project suggests the female may be Ariadne probably due to the satyr accompanying the chariot.
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in Homer they are further associated with war, racing and ritual: nuptial and funerary. The procession of the newly married couple through Athens to the groom’s house is captured on several black figure vases; it was the most conspicuous and public part of the ceremony and consequently the most frequently represented part of the ceremony on vases (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 26-28). However, descriptions in the ancient sources often refer to the bride and groom’s journey in a cart: the substitution of chariot for cart on contemporary vases and deities for mortal companions serve to add heroic elements to the scene (Oakley and Sinos 1993, 29-30). Chariots also appear in abduction scenes. One of the most famous abduction myths in the ancient world is Hades’ rape of Persephone which appears on Attic pottery (CVA 7863, 7971), Apulian vases (London BM F 277) and in the surviving wall paintings from the tombs at Vergina.\textsuperscript{20} The chariot is quite literally a vehicle which carries the nympha from Artemis’ domain into that of Hera and their new status as a gyne.

Furthermore, Artemis can appear alongside a chariot within a wedding scene (VP 170), sometimes carrying the torches (Carpenter 1991, 47) (VP 166), which were usually carried by the mothers of the bride and groom (Eur. IA 732; Med. 1025-7; Oakley and Sinos 1993, 26). Artemis cannot be appearing as a substitute for these mortal figures as she is not a maternal goddess. The torch allows Artemis to light the way for the nympha reflecting her role as a goddess of passage, as celebrated at Brauron and through her association with Hekate.\textsuperscript{21} Marriage marked the ‘death’ of the parthenos as she embarked on her journey to gyne which would culminate with the birth of her first child.

The close connections of ancient Greek perceptions of marriage and death and their iconographical significance have been discussed most recently by Barringer (1991, 662ff.); the chariot is one element in the iconography of both rituals. As with the wedding, the ‘average’ funeral procession may have been conducted with a lesser vehicle than a chariot. However, the depiction of chariots on vases served to liken the funerary ritual to those of heroes (Shapiro 1991, 631-644).

\textsuperscript{20} CVA 7863 is a late archaic black figure oinochoe and 7971 a red figure skyphos; the identification of the abduction scene on 7863 is tentative: it could also depict Helen’s abduction by Theseus. The Apulian krater in the British Museum dates c.350 BC as does the Vergina wall painting. The evidence attests to the popularity of this myth across the Greek world.

\textsuperscript{21} See the discussion of their relationship in chapter 3.2.1.
The funerary nature of the scenes appearing on black-figure lekythoi has been stressed by Tuukkanen (2001, 144ff.) who concluded that the female charioteer is Semele or Ariadne in a Dionysiac procession representing a ‘hopeful’ view of death. Only one of the images in my catalogue occurs on an Attic lekythos (VP I83), but six of the eight vases discovered in the Selinuntine cemetery discussed above feature on lekythoi (CVA 17572, 17573, 17574, 17575, 17577, 17581). The interpretation is intriguing set against the growth of the Eleusinian Mysteries in Attica. However, this particular meaning can only suit a small number of vases with unidentified females; the same motif with an identifiable goddess does not work with this interpretation. It also seems strange that the figure carrying a kithara would be Dionysiac on lekythoi but Apollo on other vases. The interpretation is also peculiarly Attic: the significance of the Eleusinian Mysteries to, for example, the western Greeks in Selinus is questionable. Rather, the appearance of the scene on lekythoi indicates a possible association with the funeral and the horse drawn chariot could appear in ‘heroised’ representations of the funeral.

Artemis appears on a number of Attic vases alongside a chariot or rider. We have already noted two examples which have a nuptial theme (VP I66, 70). Two further examples found in Southern Italy have a mythological nuptial theme with Artemis accompanying Pelops and Hippodamia (VP I82) and Poseidon and Amphitrite (VP I95). However, Artemis most frequently accompanies a chariot driven by another god or hero: Leto (VP I129-130), Apollo (VP I41,22 131),23 Athena (VP I8, 132), Demeter (VP I133) or a warrior/hero (VP S44, I134). In some cases the identity of the charioteer is unclear (VP S35, I56, I63, I65, I99), but as we have seen this figure can be assumed to be fantastical: either a goddess or mythological character.

Artemis serves, as an immortal bystander, to endorse the significance of the scene. The artist’s choice to include her may have been related to fact that Apollo and Hermes are standard figures in these scenes; we have observed above that Hermes is the most regular addition to the Delian triad. The close association of Artemis and Apollo in these scenes is emphasised on two vases: on one Artemis is tending Apollo’s kithara as he mounts a chariot (VP I131) and on the other Apollo is absent but she plays the lyre (VP I95).24 On two further vases Artemis assumes

22 VP I41 = Kahil 1984, no. 1235: Kahil suggests the charioteer is Admetos rather than Apollo.
23 Artemis, Leto and Hermes accompany Apollo riding a griffin on an Attic bell krater from Akragas (VP S7).
24 By playing the lyre Artemis is a kind of substitute for Apollo. However, it is possible that the figure should be identified as a Muse rather than the goddess.
Hermes' role as proegetes and stands in front of the horses (VP 1129-130); it is interesting that in both examples Leto is the charioteer. Artemis' position on these vases may allude to her control over animals, most often associated with her role as Potnia Theron. Artemis' control over all wild beasts may also be alluded to in her presence alongside Apollo as he rides a griffin (VP S7; Strabo 8.343) and a chariot drawn by lions, panthers and boars (VP 141). There are three further scenes in which a chariot and Artemis are featured but Artemis is not the charioteer (VP 1106-8). All three scenes depict a gigantomachy: this type of scene will be fully discussed below. Artemis' presence is incidental: she forms part of the battle by default as an Olympian deity and the use of chariots in battle is known from Homer.

As charioteer the status of Artemis and the other goddesses and mythical females is emphasised; they are also in control of the animals. This is particularly pertinent for Artemis and could be understood as another manifestation of her control over animals as Potnia Theron. All of the Attic examples with Artemis as charioteer or alongside a chariot depict horses drawing the chariot; is she then a Potnia Hippon? Artemis' association with horses and her role as Potnia Hippon has been discussed above (chapter 1.1.1): there is little literary evidence (Hom. Hymn Arr. 3-5; Pind. Ol. 3.26, Pyth. 2.5-12, fr. 89a S-M; Bacchyl. 11.115; Paus. 8.14.5) although Artemis' role as a goddess of young women is well-known and these females are often described as fillies in the ancient sources. Furthermore, the dedication of equine votive figurines in Peloponnesian sanctuaries may indicate an especial relationship between the goddess of the hunt and the horse (Bevan 1986, 198-215; Voyatzis 1992; Scheffer 1994; Waugh 2000, 148-88).

The Southern Italian vase painters continue this motif, albeit with some interesting differences. In all of these scenes Artemis is in, rather than mounting, the chariot. There are three certain Apulian identifications of Artemis in a chariot (VP L46, 53, 109)25 and six tentative identifications of the goddess: five on Apulian paterae (VP L77-81) and one on a Lucanian krater (VP L83). All of these vases date to the fourth century. Artemis wears a Phrygian cap, recalling her association with Bendis, and is named on the Apulian fragment now in Melbourne (VP L46). A star appears to the right of the goddess. Stars appear above Artemis on two Hellenistic Italian coins (C 14, 17) while she appears alongside crescents on three further coins (C S29, 19, 18). These celestial associations, especially when coupled with the imagery of

25 VP L109 is categorised as 'myth of Niobids' in the catalogue.
Artemis in a chariot, recall another goddess, Selene. Indeed, their iconography is so similar that the female on Capua’s coinage has been identified as either Artemis or Selene (SNG UK VII 42).26

The literary evidence for Artemis’ association with the moon is generally late (Plut. Mor. 922a, Quaest. conv. 659a; Strabo 14.1.6; Ovid Fast. 2.155), but Aischylos may have been aware of it (Aesch. Xan. fr. 170 TrGF vol. 3). Selene was associated with a number of goddesses including both Artemis and Hekate (Gury 1994, 706); Artemis’ association with Hekate influenced the association of Hekate and Selene (Johnston 1990, 31). Selene’s iconography includes the goddess driving a chariot led by horses, bulls and deer (Gury 1994, 710-12: nos. 47-57 (horses), 58-66 (bulls), 67 (deer)). The images of Artemis riding in a chariot are reminiscent of Selene most famously on the east pediment of the Parthenon (Gury 1994, no.49) and the inclusion of a star on the Apulian fragment suggests the Southern Italians had also made this connection.

On the second vase with a certain depiction of Artemis, the goddess is driving a chariot which is drawn by two stags (VP L53). The front legs of the stags are raised high, indicative of rapid motion. The goddess holds a spear in her right hand which she aims at a fallen warrior (Trendall, Cambitoglou 1982, 977) or giant (Kahil 1984, no. 1334) who is about to be trampled by the stags. The violence of the scene is echoed on another volute krater from Ruvo (VP L109) on which Artemis shoots the Niobids from a moving chariot drawn by two deer. The most interesting aspect of these two kraters is the pair of animals drawing the chariot. On the neck of a Lucanian volute krater (VP L83), now in the Vatican, a woman drives a chariot drawn by two deer. Trendall (1953, 14-15) suggests the woman may be Artemis. The suggestion seems likely: Artemis is often associated with deer and the scene below the chariot is of Orestes at Delphi (cf. p.112). On the Apulian and Lucanian kraters (VP L53, 83, 109) with deer drawing the chariot, the animals appear to be bridled in the same way as we would expect for a domesticated horse or donkey. An unusual fourth century Tarentine rhyton is fashioned in the shape of a bridled deer’s head (Hoffmann 1966, 112, pl. 39.1-3); it is possible this alluded to Artemis as the driver of the deer-drawn chariot.

26 On the association of Artemis and the moon see chapter 5; on Diana and the moon see Green (2007, 121-5).
The evolution of the iconography of Artemis in a chariot drawn by horses to one drawn by deer may be reflected in the ancient sources: by the third century Kallimachos' (Hymn 3.98-113) deer have replaced the horses drawing her chariot in the earlier Homeric Hymn (Hom. Hymn Art. 3-5). Kallimachos describes the deer which are unique on account of their golden horns: this may explain why both hinds and stags are depicted drawing Artemis' chariot. Kahil (1984, 748-9) reviews the classical examples of Artemis in a chariot drawn by deer and counts them as representations of Artemis the huntress and possible survivals of the Potnia. A Boiotian krater, an Attic red-figure vase by the Painter of the woolly satyrs, and possibly a marble relief from Brauron (Kahil 1984, nos. 1196, 1399, 1225) can be compared with the Southern Italian examples noted above. We should also recall Artemis in a chariot drawn by deer on the frieze of the temple of Apollo at Bassai (Richter 1930, fig. 146). The chariot iconography is not limited to vase-painting. An unusual series of terracottas from Kanoni on Corfu depict the goddess in a chariot drawn by panthers and deer (Lechat 1891, 72ff; Kahil 1984 nos. 1204-5); the figurines recall her early character as Potnia Theron (Morizot 2002, 383-8).

The fashion of representing Artemis in a chariot drawn by deer appears to have spread to northern Italy potentially as a result of the migration of Southern Italian potters and painters to this Etruscan trading area (Del Chiaro 1974, 126-8). Two Caeretan red-figure oinochoai from the last half of the fourth century depict a female, probably Artumes, driving a chariot drawn by stags (Del Chiaro 1974, 41 no. 61, 50 no. 85; Krauskopf 1984, no. 24). The indication of rocky terrain in the background on the oinochoe by the American Academy Painter further supports the identification of the goddess of the wild (Del Chiaro 1974, 50 no. 85).

The five remaining images of Artemis in a chariot occur on fourth century Apulian paterae (VP L77-81) on which horses draw the chariots. On all five the identification of Artemis relies on the accompanying animals which have been understood as an allusion to her role as Potnia Theron (Schneider-Herrmann 1977, 32): deer (VP L77, 79, 80), hound (VP L81) or hare (VP L78). One of the paterae (VP L77) was found at Ruvo. The Apulian volute krater (VP L53) on which Artemis is charging down a fallen combatant was also found at Ruvo while a further Apulian volute krater on which Artemis shoots the Niobids from a chariot is now in the Ruvo

27 The Homeric Hymns appear to have been composed by rhapsodists working in the seventh and sixth centuries, who performed the works of Homer and Hesiod, combining the traditions of oral epic with new ideas stimulated by the advent of literacy (Crudden 2001, xi-xii).
museum suggesting a local find spot. A third of the vases therefore are probably from Ruvo, which may reflect some local partiality for the design.

The tradition of depicting Artemis alongside or near a chariot also continues on the locally manufactured vases from the late fourth century, of which seven are Apulian (VP L27, 33-4, 66, 68, 73, 75) and one Campanian (VP L54). A nuptial theme is predominant (VP L27, 33, 34, 54, 68) while two further vases show Artemis alongside chariots of other gods (Athena: VP L66; Zeus, Hermes and Dionysos: VP L75) and the goddess stands beside a white horse on an Apulian hydria (VP L73). It is interesting to note that both Artemis and Hekate appear on two of these vases (VP L33, 66); clearly differentiating the two figures. Also of note is Dionysos and Aridne’s appearance in a lion drawn chariot on an Apulian volute krater from Arpi (VP L34).28

Artemis is one of the gods in an upper register, however the lions recall a Pindaric dithyramb (fr. 70b, 19-20 S-M) in which the goddess yokes lions for Bromios. Panthers are usually yoked to Dionysos’ chariot29 while the Potnia Theron and Artemis, as discussed above, are associated with lions (Hom. Il. 21.482-4; Aesch. Ag. 141; Paus. 5.19.5; Pelagatti 1999; VP 1118-9).

Finally in our discussion of the local manufactured iconography of Artemis as charioteer, I should include a slight variant: Artemis riding (cf. chapter 1.1.1 esp. p.11-12; chapter 3.2.3). The goddess is still demonstrating control over the animal and using it as a means of transport but in a more direct fashion; the medium of the chariot has been removed. The relationship with the animal is clearly emphasised. On a calyx krater in the British Museum (VP L72) a woman holding two spears rides a deer and is flanked by a woman carrying a torch and a satyr. Trendall and Cambitogou (1978, 250) suggested the woman on the deer was Artemis and I agree with their interpretation: the woman carries Artemis’ standard attribute, rides a deer and is accompanied by a woman carrying a torch.30 The scene is particularly interesting as it implies Artemis’ control over the deer and is possibly an extension of the iconography of Artemis as the Potnia Theron.31

28 According to Homer (Od. 11.321-5), Ariadne was abandoned by Theseus on Delos and on Dionysos’ witness Artemis slew her. Other variants exist in which Dionysos rescued Ariadne from her desertion (Plut. Thes. 20) and married her: this variant is alluded to here as they appear together in a chariot.
29 See VP 1106-7 and VP L75.
30 Beazley (1947, 108) records an Etruscan vase with Artemis riding on a fawn and accompanied by Eros.
31 Voyatzis (1992) discusses figurines of a female seated side saddle early examples of which were found at Artemis Hemera at Lousoi (1992, 259-72, esp fig. 1 and 2 p.61). Other examples were found in the sanctuaries of Artemis Limnatis at Elis and Artemis Orthia at Sparta (Voyatzis 1992, 272-7). Voyatzis
Three further representations of Artemis riding are recorded in the sculpture catalogue: an archaic antefix from Capua (AS I7), a classical statue from Sorrento (S I23) and a classical figurine from Gela (S S15). The Capuan antefix was discovered in the temenos at Fondo Patturelli, which was probably dedicated to a female deity, just outside the walls of ancient Capua (Lubtchansky 2005, 104-6). The antefix depicts a female seated side-ways on a galloping horse; the female holds a bow and a water-bird is included under the horse. The female has long been recognised as Diana (or Artemis) Tifatana (Lenormant 1881, 84-5; Daremberg 1892, 155) despite being discovered some distance from Diana’s sanctuary on Mount Tifata. The bow is part of Artemis’ iconography and is a visible sign of the assimilation of Diana and Artemis at the site which could be as early as sixth century (Edlund 1987, 48; Lubtchansky 2005, 105; chapter 2.2). The water-bird recalls Artemis’ role as Potnia Theron and the other antefix associated with the site (AS I8; chapter 3.2.3). The remains of a marble statue of a female riding a deer (S I23), dating approximately two hundred years after this antefix, has been discovered in Sorrento just around the Bay of Naples from Capua. The head is missing and the female has no attributes but the animal is clearly a deer and the figure a female from its dress; consequently the statue is usually identified as Artemis (Levi 1926, 376; Kahil 1984, no. 697).32 Finally there is a series of terracotta figurines of Artemis riding a deer from Sicily; I have included a classical example from Gela in the sculpture catalogue (S S15).33 The iconography of the goddess fits within the genre of the Artemis Group discussed in chapter 3.2.1 and compares especially with Artemis accompanied by a deer (S S7). Like the Artemis Group the type appears to be geographically limited to Sicily; a similar figurine has been discovered at Kentoripa (Orlandini 1957, 55). Artemis riding side-ways is not unknown on the Greek mainland; a series of figurines found in the Peloponnese show the goddess riding on a horse (Voyatzis 1992; Waugh 2000, 177-83).34

(1992, 277) concludes that the early examples reflect an Arcadian survival of the Mycenaean Potnia Theron with whom Artemis is associated in Homer (21.470). Beazley (1947, 108) records an Etruscan vase with Artemis riding on a fawn and accompanied by Eros.

32 A second statue displayed next to S I23 in the Museo Correale in Sorrento has also been identified as Artemis (Levi 1926, 376-7; fig. 2). However, the figure does not ride bare-back as with the representations of Artemis: there is a formal seat on the animal’s back. Furthermore, the animal appears to be a bull which is not appropriate for Artemis cult. The statues may have been established as a pair, but I do not believe they both represent our goddess.

33 It is interesting to note that the ‘horse and rider’ akroteria type, popular in Sicily, seems to have originated in Gela (Goldberg 1982, 198-200).

34 Compare also the bronze mirror from Orvieto with Artumes (name inscribed) riding sideways on a stag (Del Chiaro 1974, 41).
If the Attic vases with Artemis as charioteer reflect themes of marriage or death, as discussed above, can we extend this meaning to the Southern Italian images? Trendall (1989, 13) has observed that nuptial and funerary themes are popular in Southern Italian painting. It is possible therefore that the Southern Italian and Sicilian vase-painters and sculptors understood these themes and intended to replicate them in their work. The chariot probably still carried the same meaning: an elaborate carriage adding prestige to ordinary journeys undertaken in a cart. The transition from horse to deer extends the goddess’ control over animals in line with her guise as Potnia Theron. The few images of riding change the nature of control and underscore the immediacy of the relationship between goddess and animal; this was not something for Artemis alone as demonstrated by the second statue, possibly of Selene (Gury 1994, nos. 58-66), noted above.

The next group of images either represent Artemis in an actively violent role or seem to represent a myth in which she can have such a role; Apollo is present in all of the images. They are categorised in the catalogue as Gigantomachy, Niobids and Tityos. Constituting c.6% of the total catalogue, these fifteen vases and six sculptural representations will be briefly reviewed below.

The six instances of Artemis and Apollo in the gigantomachy (VP 1104-8; AS S5) form part of a large corpus of images, in a variety of media, which was probably popularised following the reorganisation of the Panathenaia in 566 (Shapiro 1989, 38-40; Schefold 1992, 55). The earliest possible representation of Artemis in the gigantomachy is an archaic metope from Temple F at Selinus (AS S5); the temple may have been dedicated to Athena, Dionysos or Artemis (De Angelis 2003, 138). Only the lower half of the metope remains; it is generally agreed that the action represents an episode from the gigantomachy but the identity of the deity is unclear. Kahil (1984, no. 1336) includes the metope in her Artemisian catalogue. However, the figure could be any goddess or even god; for example, Tusa (1984, 118) suggests the deity should be identified as Dionysos.

Returning to the vase-painting catalogue, the four classical examples all appear on large storage vessels: the gigantomachy was typically a busy scene and required a large field for decoration. Two of the vases were found in the north (VP 1104, 108) and two in Apulia (VP 1105, 107) while the exact provenance for the remaining vase (VP 1106) is unknown. Apulian vase painters
copied the design; Arafat (1990, 27) counts roughly a dozen Apulian, and one Campanian, examples of this scene. However, I am not aware of any southern Italian vase painters including Artemis in their representations of the Gigantomachy. Neither Artemis nor Apollo was essential to the scene. Any combination of Olympian gods could be employed; red-figure vase-painters of classical Athens often included Artemis and Apollo fighting together (Boardman 1989, 226), but their popularity was restricted to Attic vases. The motif of a god fighting a giant outlived its initial association with Athena Parthenos for the Attic vase painters and came to represent the assertion of order which could be relevant in any number of contexts (Carpenter 1991, 74-5; Woodford 2002, 122-6).

Conversely, the myth of the Niobids is specifically associated with Artemis and Apollo. The revengeful action of Artemis and Apollo, in response to Niobe’s slight on their mother, is attested in several ancient authors (Hom. II. 24.596-620; Apollod. Bibl. 3.5.6; Paus. 1.21.3, 2.2.9-10, 5.11.2; Lyons 1997, 220) and is relatively popular in the iconographical record (Kahil 1984, nos. 1346-61). Attic painters started to produce these scenes in the archaic period: these active images of Artemis and Apollo complement the familial theme in the contemporary passive scenes of the Delian triad (Shapiro 1989, 52-4). Artemis’ role as a goddess who brings death to women is explicit in Homer (e.g. Hom. II. 6.205, Od. 18.201-3): Hera even calls her a ‘lion to women’ as Zeus has granted her leave to kill women as she chooses (Hom. II. 21.483-4). The idea that death is delivered by Apollo and Artemis according to gender is not unique to the Niobids’ myth (Hom. Od. 15.410-1).

The earliest example of this myth in the iconographical record of Southern Italy and Sicily is three metopes from the Heraion on Foce del Sele near Poseidonia dating to the middle of the sixth century (AS 14-6). The archaic sculptural programme of this Heraion probably includes three myths of Artemis (AS 11-6) which reflect, along with the other myths, the struggle for this border territory (Masseria, Torelli 1999). The three metopes with which we are concerned here form a small narrative: two male Niobids fleeing (AS 14), two female Niobids fleeing (AS 15) and Apollo firing his bow with Niobe reacting (AS 16). There have been various theories for the

35 Sophocles and Aischylus also reportedly used the myth for a tragedy. Although the precise details of the number of Niobe’s children and whether Apollo and Artemis kill them all or leave two alive varies in the ancient sources, the key features of the plot remain: Niobe boasts of her superiority to Leto and Artemis and Apollo avenge their mother by killing the Niobids.
identification of these figures (*BTCGI* 7.468-9 (Badoni)), but Masseria and Torelli (1999, 232-4) convincingly argue for the combined reading of these metopes and, in particular, the women with upraised arms as Niobe.

One calyx krater (VP 1116) and two fragments (VP 1115, 117) in the catalogue represent the Attic exports of vases with this scene to Italy. All three date to the classical period and were discovered in northern Italy. The two fragments do not include Artemis but appear to allude to the myth of the Niobids. The calyx krater from Orvieto is a famous vase: it is the name vase of the Niobid painter and shows Artemis in the centre of the action drawing a bow from her quiver with her bow held out, presumably from her last shot; it is generally considered to be a copy of a large scale wall painting (Robinson 1992, 180ff; Mugione 2000, no. 128; Kauffmann-Samaras 2002 no.140 = Louvre G341).

Of the six Apulian vases in the catalogue, only two depict Artemis and Apollo actively hunting the Niobids (VP L109, 112). Rather, the focus is on the mourning Niobe (VP L108) sometimes with Artemis and Apollo as passive bystanders (VP L107, 110-1). The Apulian vases do not appear to have been particularly influenced by the Attic exports. Instead, following the general trend to dramatic scenes in Apulian vase-painting, they may well have been influenced by Aischylos’ lost play, *Niobe* (Trendall 1985, 136; Mazzei 1999, 476-7). The sadness of Niobe in these scenes may be heightened in light of a fragment of Sappho (fr. 142 LP) which suggests that Leto and Niobe had been close companions (Lyons 1997, 135-6). Despite the focus on the *pathos* of the aftermath of the killing, Artemis and Apollo are present as a reminder of the origin of Niobe’s sorrow. Artemis’ role as a goddess who causes death to women and her vengeful nature are recalled by her presence in these scenes. Two of the representations of the mourning Niobe, which include Artemis and Apollo, appear on loutrophoroi. The depiction of a myth in which *parthenoi* died at the hand of Artemis before marriage on vessels associated with bridal preparation may have been intentional: the end of one phase of the bride’s life is symbolically represented as she prepares to enter her new husband’s *oikos*.

Tityos’ fate, like the Niobids, is a violent myth directly associated with Artemis and Apollo. Representations of Tityos’ attempted rape of Leto and his subsequent fate appear on a variety of media; a handful of archaic vase-paintings start this tradition (Shapiro 1989, 52-4; Schefold 1992, 68-72). The myth is well attested in the ancient sources: Leto was on her way to Delphi
(Hom. *Od.* 11.576-81) when Tityos attempted to rape her. Leto was rescued and Tityos killed by either Artemis (Pind. *Pyth.* 4.90-2), Apollo and Artemis (Pherekydes fr. 56 Fowler; Apollod. *Bibl.* 1.4.1; Paus. 3.18.5-6, 10.11.1; Vollkommer *LIMC* 2-15) or Apollo alone (Strabo 9.3.12; Apollod. *Rhod.* 1.759-62; QS 3.392-8). The myth asserts the Olympian order over would be transgressors of this order: Tityos is reminiscent of a satyr on one vase indicating his nature and disruption (Boardman 1974, 217). The unity of Apollo, Artemis and Leto as a family group, the Delian triad, is also emphasised.

Tityos' rape of Leto and the pursuit undertaken by Apollo and Artemis is probably represented on two metopes from the Heraion at Foce del Sele (AS II-2). The two metopes should be read together, like the Niobid metopes discussed above (AS I4-6): the identification is generally accepted (Masseria, Torelli 1999, 224). On the first metope Tityos carries Leto as he runs across the metope (AS S1); one of the divine twins has successfully shot him as an arrow protrudes from his eye. Apollo and Artemis pursue Tityos on the second metope (AS I2); their pose and stride are matched, but Artemis is largely obscured by Apollo.

The one uncertain example in the vase-painting catalogue is a late archaic or early classical Attic vase found in Apulia (VP II27). The vase is one of only a few known red-figure examples of this scene (Carpenter 1991, 37). The action takes place at Delphi as can be seen from the tripod while Apollo is clearly identifiable by his laurel staff. The fleeing woman can be tentatively identified as Leto while the warrior pursuing her is understood to be Tityos. Artemis is not present on the vase. However, as we have seen, contemporary literary sources associate the goddess with the myth. Furthermore, a Tyrrhenian amphora, now in the Louvre (E 864; Scheffer 1992, 69 fig. 78), represents both Apollo and Artemis attacking Tityos.

---

36 In Kallimachos (3.110) Artemis is the slayer of Tityos but it is not clear if she acted alone or with Apollo.
37 On the sources for the myth see Fontenrose (1959, 22-4) and Gantz (1993, 39).
38 As we have seen Leto was on her way to Delphi when Tityos attacked (Hom. *Od.* 11.576-81). Pausanias continues the association of the myth with Delphi: Tityos' tomb was located in Phokis (10.4.5) and a fifth century painting by Polygnotos at Delphi included a representation of Tityos' punishment in Hades (10.29.3). It is not surprising that the myth would be associated with Delphi as it was an important sanctuary to Apollo.
39 The quiver suspended in the field may allude to the death of Tityos.
The last group of images to be discussed in this section are those in which Artemis appears supporting Apollo as he confronts Herakles over either the Delphic tripod or the Keryneian (Callim. Hymn 3.107-9) or Kerynitian (Apollod. Bibl. 2.5.3) hind. Attic scenes exist of both confrontations without Artemis, but I have included only Attic scenes with Artemis in my catalogue (VP S38-42, VP I21-26). In all but one (VP S39) of the Attic tripod scenes in the catalogue the presence of Artemis balances Athena; the goddesses are present in support of Apollo and Herakles respectively. The struggle for the tripod is a popular narrative scene in the archaic and early classical periods; all of the examples including Artemis discovered in either Southern Italy or Sicily are archaic. The myth is not well attested in the early sources: Pindar (Ol. 9.43) may be the earliest source if he is alluding to this particular struggle (Luce 1930, 315-6). Its popularity on Attic vases has been attributed to the influence of Athenian politics on local vase production although the exact significance of the scene is still debated (Shapiro 1989, 61-4; Schefold 1992, 153-8; Sparkes 1996, 131; Boardman 2001, 203). Artemis does not appear in Southern Italian or Sicilian vase-painters’ representations of this scene (Von Bothmer 1977, 62) nor its incidence on an archaic metope from Poseidonia (Carpenter 1991, 43-4; Masseria, Torelli 1999, 213).

Apollo’s confrontation with Herakles over a deer is regularly associated with the struggle for the tripod (Boardman 1974, 224; Schefold 1992, 106-109). Artemis is more regularly included in scenes of the tripod than the hind (Kahl 1984, nos. 1291-1313 (tripod), 1314-7 (hind)). The three examples in the catalogue (VP S36; VP I110-I11) all differ from the standard tripod motif of Artemis and Athena flanking Apollo and Herakles struggle over the tripod. Athena is absent from VP S36 and VP I110, while Artemis and Athena flank Herakles and the deer without Apollo in VP I111. In contrast to the struggle for the tripod, Artemis is linked to the main action: the deer Herakles is capturing is sacred to (Pind. Ol. 3.25-30), or at least associated with (Eur. Hel. 381-3; Callim. Hymn 3.98-109), the goddess. Therefore it could be argued that, even in those scenes where Artemis is not actually depicted, her cult is at least recalled. It is a peculiarly Attic scene on vases (Carpenter 1991, 122) perhaps originally with some

---

40 On an archaic Attic amphora from Gela (VP S39), a woman, possibly Artemis, appears on the other side of the vase.
41 Hermes also appears on one vase in the catalogue (VP S40).
42 Later authors also record this association: Apollod. Bibl. 2.5.3; Diod. Sic. 4.13.1; Ael. NA 7.39; Hyg. Fab. 30. A variation perhaps combining the hind myth with elements from the Calydonian boar, in which the hind ravages the land prompting Herakles’ pursuit and capture, is preserved in Eur. Hf 375-9 and Quint. Smyrn. 6.223.
propagandistic Peisistratid agenda (Boardman 2001, 203-8). Five fifth century Apulian black-glazed gutti\textsuperscript{43} depict Herakles either clubbing or grasping the deer (Vollkommer 1988, 6-7), albeit the small surface available for decoration meant the exclusion of Apollo, Artemis and Athena from these scenes. Apollo fighting Herakles for the deer also featured in Etruscan sculpture; see Glinister (2000, 59) for a series of terracotta akroteria from Veii.

4.2 Artemis’ mythology

The final group of images to consider here are those representing a myth which is regularly associated with Artemis but not Apollo; they appear in the vase-painting catalogue as Aktaion, Calydonian boar, Hippolytos, Iphigeneia myth, Kallisto and Proitids. Artemis does not always appear in the scene but the myth is clearly one from her canon on account of the other protagonists or environment (Woodford 2003, 199). The goddess can appear as an epiphany with the attributes we noted in chapter 3.2.1 or as a statue. The images are regularly compared to myths recorded in ancient literary sources. However, we must be aware that they could represent episodes that did not survive in the traditions preserved by ancient authors but remain a valid source of evidence for Artemis’ mythology in their own right (Sparkes 1996, 120-4).

The most popular of the myths in the iconographical record is that of Aktaion, a hunter who offended Artemis by attempting to woo Semele (Hes. fr. 217A M-W; Stesichoros fr. 236 PMG), by boasting he was a better hunter than Artemis (Eur. Bacch. 337-40) or by seeing her bathing (Callim. Hymn 5.107-116; Apollod. Bibl. 3.4.4; Ovid Met. 3.138-252; Hyg. Fab. 181).\textsuperscript{44} Aischylos wrote a play, the Toxotides, about Aktaion and the fragmentary remains suggest that the plot followed the hunter’s passion for Semele (Gantz 1993, 479), but this is not certain. The myth certainly leant itself to tragedy with its dramatic reversal as Aktaion changes from hunter to hunted (Lacy 1980, 26). The majority of the representations are of the death of Aktaion; an

\textsuperscript{43} Paris, Cab. Méd. Oppermann 127; Rome, Villa Giulia 50567; Paris, Louvre Cp 3539; Turin 537 (4174); Vollkommer 1988, no. 58.

\textsuperscript{44} The two later accounts could have been influenced by other myths. The Euripidean account could be an invention modelled on, for example, the myth of Orion (Forbes Irving 1990, 18-19). While the hellenistic motif with Artemis bathing could have been influenced by the myth of the blinding of Teiresias by Athena (Lloyd-Jones 1983, 99).
easily recognisable scene from the myth.\textsuperscript{45} Stesichoros (236 PMG) reports that the goddess threw a deer skin over Aktaion so that his hounds confused him with their quarry and turned on him. Several of the scenes therefore include Aktaion sprouting horns as he turns into a stag (VP S1; VP L4, 6). A man being attacked by dogs or turning into a stag, frequently in the company of Artemis, are the key to identifying this myth (Guimond 1981, 468; Kahil 1984, nos. 1394-1412; Woodford 2003, 168).

The Attic vase-painters start to produce scenes with Aktaion from c.560 (Boardman 1974, 219). It remains a popular subject in the classical period which is when scenes of the metamorphosis start to appear (Boardman 1989, 226; Carpenter 1991, 80; Robertson 1992, 145; Mugione 2000, 82-4). Four imported Attic vases show the death of Aktaion (VP S1; VP II-3); the three found on Sicily and in Southern Italy date to the early classical period (VP S1; VP II, 3) while the one vase found in central Italy (VP II) is archaic. Three of the vases are straightforward representations of Aktaion’s fate with (VP S1; VP I3) or without Artemis (VP II). However, the bell krater discovered at Vico Equense (VP II) is remarkable for the addition of Zeus and Lyssa, the latter wearing an animal skin and dog-head cap, to the regular protagonists: Artemis, Aktaion and his dogs (Boardman 1989, fig. 152; Arafat 1990 144 fig. 7). Arafat (1990, 143-4) has suggested this particular scene may have been inspired by Aischylos’ play or another unknown tragedy. Furthermore, the presence of Lyssa and her dog nature recalls Artemis’ association with Hekate and the way in which the goddess turns the dogs onto Aktaion (Arafat 1990, 144).

The death of Aktaion remained a popular subject in the fourth century on a variety of locally manufactured wares: Apulian (VP L1, 3-5, 7, 9-10, 87), Lucanian (VP L2, 8) and Campanian (VP L6). The majority of the vases date to the end of the classical period c.350 or later (VP L1, 3, 4, 6-10). However, not all of the vases represent his death; on VP L5 Aktaion slays a stag in front of a group which includes Artemis and on VP L4 there is no indication of violence: Aktaion is seated playing with an affectionate hound, but he has sprouted horns and the inevitable is clear as Artemis watches. Of the scenes which generally capture his death, one vase (VP L3) depicts Artemis appearing to direct the action from above while seated side-saddle on a panther. On a late classical bell krater there is a scene which recalls VP II above: Aktaion is

\textsuperscript{45} Compare an Etruscan calyx krater from Vulci now in London (BM F 480; Beazley 1947, 136, pl. 32.1); Aktaion is naked and defending himself from his dogs who leap up at him. Aktaion wields a lagobolon in an attempt to defend himself.
assailed by Lyssa and three hounds; Artemis and Pan are also present. Finally, it is interesting to note that the fifth-century vase from Gravina (VP L87) was discovered in a grave (Muglione 2000, 83).

The myth also features on a metope from Selinus (AS S6), two terracotta pinakes (S 13-4) and a bronze mirror (S 15). The Selinuntine metope is an early classical carving from Temple E, probably dedicated to Hera (De Angelis 2003, 131), on the Eastern Hill of the polis; Artemis stands watching and apparently directing as three dogs attack Aktion (Tusa 1984, 121-2). It is one of five metopes surviving from the third and last phase of Temple E, c.470-60; all of the metopes represent two individuals with either an amorous or hostile theme (De Angelis 2003, 139). The two pinakes are contemporaneous and almost identical in design: the goddess advances over Aktation who is forced to the ground by a number of hounds. One of the pinakes (S 13) may have been imported from Melos, in which case it is likely the pinax discovered at Lokroi was inspired by this or a similar imported piece (S 14). The key difference between the two is that while the Melian coroplast represented Aktation as fully human, the Lokrian coroplast shows him with the head of a stag. Finally the early classical mirror discovered in a grave in the Pantanello necropolis at Metapontion: Artemis does not feature in the composition but there was limited room for the artist to work. Aktion has sprouted antlers and is forced back by biting dogs which fill the circular sphere. In light of the significance of the mirror in Orphic myth Carter has proposed that the piece may have some Orphic significance (Carter 2006, 179-181).

A similar myth where an unfortunate mortal invokes the wrath of Artemis, is the story of Oineus. The earliest source is Homer where we learn that Oineus did not offer Artemis the first-fruits of his harvest and so the goddess sent a boar to ravage Calydon (Hom. Il. 9.534-7; chapter 1.2.3). It also featured in Bacchylides’ fifth ode (97-154) which celebrated a victory of Hieron of Syracuse c.476 (chapter 1.2.3). The iconography of the Calydonian boar hunt usually excludes Artemis from the scene; the images focus on the mortals especially Meleager and sometimes Atalanta (Schefold 1992, 195-8). This hunt is represented on four Attic vases exported to Italy in the archaic period (VP L100-103) and two classical Apulian vases (VP L82, 86). The imported vases are of roughly the same date as the Amyklai throne described by Pausanias (3.18.5); the hunt appears to have been a popular subject and is distinguishable from other hunts (mortal or heroic) as the participants are usually named (Pipili 1987, 22-4). It usually appears as
a space-filler on a small surface of a large vase, although the cup found at Poseidonia is an exception to this general rule (VP L100).

The final myth with a male protagonist to consider here is that of Hippolytos. Euripides’ <i>Hippolytos</i>, produced in 428, is our earliest complete source for the myth. However, Sophocles also wrote a <i>Phaidra</i> and Euripides’ play is actually his second attempt at a tragedy of this myth (Barrett 1964, 10-15; cf. Gibert 1997). The eponymous hero was a devotee of Artemis to the exclusion of the other gods; Aphrodite took offence and orchestrated his downfall, continuing a theme in Greek myth of a miserable end for male companions of Artemis: it seems her cult is not compatible with mature male sexuality (Lyons 1997, 91-2). The six Apulian vases included here are the only Greek vases to represent the death of Hippolytos; they probably influenced the production of the Etruscan alabaster urns from Chiusi (Linant de Bellefonds 1990 nos. 107-114). Given the existence of three tragedies on this theme it is likely that the vases drew on them as inspiration, especially as they do not deviate from literary sources (Gantz 1993, 288). Hippolytos is usually depicted in his quadriga being menaced by a Fury who is often brandishing a torch; on VP L88 this threatening figure is identified as Artemis but is probably intended as a Fury. The iconography of Artemis and the Furies is similar; moreover, monstrous females often adopt the dress of a huntress (Parisinou 2002, 102). The brandishing of the torch by the Furies recalls Artemis; as we noted in chapter 3.2.1, the torch is a common attribute of the goddess.

I shall now consider the mythology of Artemis with female protagonists: Kallisto, the Proitids and Iphigeneia. The earliest source for the myth of Kallisto has her as a companion of Artemis who is seduced by Zeus and transformed into a bear by Artemis (Hes. fr. 163 M-W; Eur. <i>Hel.</i> 375-85). Later versions exist in which Hera or Zeus orchestrate her transformation and subsequent catasterisation (Apollod. <i>Bibl.</i> 3.8.2; Ovid. <i>Met.</i> 2.476-84). Aischylos wrote a <i>Kallistō</i>, which has not survived, so we cannot know which version he recorded; on this myth generally see Forbes Irving (1990, 45-7), McPhee (1990, 940), Gantz (1993, 725-7) and Lyons (1997, 205). The myth is not popular in Attic art: there is only one possible early classical Attic example discovered in Etruria (VP I114) in the catalogue; this is not surprising as Kallisto is a Peloponnesian protagonist (McPhee 1990, 943-4). There are only two complete examples in locally manufactured vase-painting: VP L103 and 104. The understanding of the Malibu oinochoe (VP L104) led to the identification of a fragment (VP L105) as Kallisto; the design is repeated again on VP L106. Kallisto is in the process of transforming: her ears are pointed and
her hand is changing into a paw. The Malibu oinochoe (VP L104) is the only complete example of this scene; Kallisto is seated on a mound, which may be representative of her tomb, in an appropriate posture for childbirth (Paus. 8.35.8; Trendall, Cambitoglou 1978, 165-6; McPhee 1990, 944). The extant scene on the calyx krater (VP L103) varies from the above: Artemis and Apollo are to the right of a scene with Hermes holding Arkas and Lyssa stood next to a seated Kallisto. There is no sign of transformation: the presence of Lyssa suggests that Kallisto may be about to commit suicide; the scene may have been inspired by a tragedy (Trendall, Cambitoglou 1978, 165; McPhee 1990, 944). This brief series of images represent the only real interest in the iconography of this myth until the time of the Roman Empire; they may have been inspired by the formation of the Arkadian league in 371 (Trendall 1977, 101).

We have already noted the myth of the Proitids in Bacchylides’ eleventh ode, dating to the first half of the fourth century, celebrating the victory of Alexidamos of Metapontion (chapter 1.1.2). The earliest evidence for the myth in southern Italy is an ivory relief from Taras (S II) which dates to the seventh century (Kahil 1994, no. 7). The partial nudity of the females is understood as a visual representation of their madness and a possible preparation for their healing bath in the river (Hes. fr. 133 M-W; Bacchyl. 11.53-8, 92-5; Gantz 1993, 312; Masseria, Torelli 1999, 237-8). Chronologically the relief is followed by the metope from Poseidonia (AS 13) with two figures moving across the field. The identification of the figures as the Proitids is not certain; see, for example, Pontrandolfo (1997, 108-9) for the difficulties of interpreting the scene. However, Masseria and Torelli (1999, 237), following Apollodorus’ (Bibl. 2.2.2) account of the death of Iphinoe, have argued that the females are Lysippae and Iphianassa; the circular object carried by the figure on the right is identified as a patera. Poseidonia was an Achaian colony (Ps. –Skymnos 249; Strabo 6.1.1) and the metope recalled a myth associated with the sanctuary of Artemis at S. Biagio at Metapontion; both Hera and Artemis, the divine protagonists of the myth in Bacchylides’ eleventh ode, were important deities in the Metapontine chora (Masseria, Torelli 1999, 237-8). The metope pre-dates Bacchylides’ ode by at least 50 years; this identification therefore depends on the existence of this tradition in Metapontion before Bacchylides’ manipulation of the myth in his ode praising Alexidamos. Furthermore, beyond Bacchylides there is only slight evidence for the Proitid myth in Southern Italy this early (Cairns 2005, 36-7).
The three examples included in the vase-painting catalogue (VP LI 13-15 = Kahil 1994, nos. 2, 4, 5) all date to the late classical period. It should be noted that VP LI 13 is actually a bronze rhyton but included in the vase-painting catalogue as it fits best here. The bronze rhyton has been fashioned to evoke the appearance of a standard ceramic rhyton; on this practice of skeuomorphism see Vickers and Gill (1994, 106-53). Hoffmann (1966, 123-4) suggests the three females represent two of the Proitids and a retreating figure, probably Mania or Lyssa, who has just induced the girls' madness which is indicated by their partial nudity and the dazed appearance of one of the Proitids. The remaining two scenes probably depict the Proitids with Melampous, the seer who heals them in some versions but who is excluded from Bacchylides' account (chapter 1.1.2); they are both therefore presumably set in the sanctuary of Artemis at Lousoi. The Sicilian vase (VP LI 115) is remarkable not only because it is one a few Sicilian manufactured vases in our catalogue but is well known as the Canicattini Krater after its discovery in a tomb in the town of that name. The scene is clearly a purification ritual: Trendall (1967, 602-3) and Kahil (1994, no. 5) reasonably identify the figures as Melampous and the Proitids; the scene is comprehensively discussed with comparative evidence in De Cesare (2001).

Finally in this section on Artemis' mythology we should consider Iphigeneia. Lyons (1997, 137) presents Iphigeneia as a 'double' of Artemis; Iphigeneia's status is certainly confused: in various sources she is a mortal priestess who receives honours at Brauron after her death (Eur. IT 1435-74), an epithet of Artemis (Paus. 2.35.1) and Hekate (Paus. 1.43.1). I have grouped together the various images of Iphigeneia as 'Iphigeneia myth'; the category is ambiguously labelled in this way to incorporate scenes of both the attempted sacrifice of Iphigeneia (VP S37; VP I113; VP L102) and her role as priestess in Tauris (VP I112; VP L94-101; S S2). These two episodes of her life are enacted respectively in Euripides' plays Iphigeneia at Aulis and Iphigeneia among the Tauris.46

There are three images of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia in the vase-painting catalogue. Artemis demanded that Agamemnon sacrifice his daughter as a necessary preliminary to the Trojan War (Lloyd-Jones 1983, 101-2; Gantz 1993, 582-8). The two Attic imported vases are roughly a

46 Lyons (1997, 137-168, 203) discusses the myth of Iphigeneia beyond these Euripidean plays and provides a list of the key sources. However, as we shall see, these two plays appear to have been the inspiration for the majority of the images in the vase-painting catalogue.
century earlier, dating to the first half of the fifth century, than the Apulian scene and therefore pre-date Euripides' *Iphigenia at Aulis* (c.408-6). The fragmentary white-ground lekythos (VP S37) discovered in the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros at Selinus depicts Iphigeneia being led to an altar by a warrior named as Eukros; Artemis is not present but is recalled by the palm tree. The presence of the fully armed warrior may indicate the army's support for the sacrifice (Gantz 1993, 584). Marconi (1994, 52-3) has argued that the vase may indicate the existence of a chthonic cult of Iphigeneia-Hekate in the sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros. This is supported by the facts that a Hekataion is already attested at the sanctuary; Iphigeneia's relationship with Hekate apparently dates back to Stesichoros and Iphigeneia received cult in Megara which is a mother-city of Selinus (Paus. 1.43.1). There are more figures present at the scene on the Attic volute krater from Gravina (VP II13); the sacrifice of Iphigencia is one of several mythical scenes on the vase. The classical Apulian vase (VP L102) presents the myth in some detail: Artemis and Apollo observe from an upper register as Iphigeneia is brought to the altar. The figure of Iphigeneia is superimposed over a rearing deer: their heads are level; the scene is a clear allusion to the substitution described in Euripides *Iphigenia at Aulis* (1584-89).47

The majority of the vases in the catalogue and the terracotta pinax from Francavilla di Sicilia depict an episode from Iphigeneia's time in Tauris: on which see Gantz (1993, 686-7). The one Attic example found in Southern Italy (VP II12) has been noted by other authors; in particular for its apparent derivation from Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* (Alroth 1992, 26, fig. 27; Robertson 1992, 227-9, fig. 271; Shapiro 1994, 167-71, fig. 118-20). Iphigeneia is passing a letter to one of the males which recalls a dramatic and easily recognisable scene in Euripides' play (766-87); it is the moment at which Iphigeneia reveals her identity to Orestes. The central statue of Artemis, around which the action occurs, is housed in a naiskos and the goddess herself may be seated to the upper left of the scene.

The Apulian (VP L95-9, 101) and Campanian (VP L94, 100) scenes are similar to this fourth century Attic scene.48 They all appear to be influenced by Euripides play and usually include a statue of the goddess in or in front of a naiskos and sometimes show an epiphany of Artemis

---

47 See Woodford (2003, 506, fig. 3) and Lyons (1997, 144, fig. 7). Lyons (1997, 144-149) continues to discuss the significance of ritual substitution in the Iphigeneia myth and at Artemis' Attic sanctuaries.
48 The two Campanian produced vases are interesting as there is evidence the Iphigeneia myth remained popular in this region with the painting of the sacrifice of Iphigeneia from the House of the Tragic Poet in Pompeii (Naples Arch. Mus. Inv. 9112).
watching too (Kahil 1990, 716-8). The motif with the letter appears again on VP L94 and 96 while on VP L97 Orestes is brought before Iphigeneia, probably an allusion to their imminent recognition of each other. An alternative episode is painted on a Campanian amphora from Capua where the flight of the three protagonists is depicted. This moment is probably also depicted on a terracotta pinax (S S2) in which a male and female stand next to the prow of a boat upon which a statue, apparently Artemis, can be seen (Parra 1991-2). The representation of the statue of Artemis in these scenes has been discussed by Alroth (1992, 26); the naiskos is a common feature and the statues themselves vary in size. I have already noted above that vase-painting scenes including a statue of Artemis appear to allude to her role as a goddess of parthenoi (for example: AS 111, VP 181; chapter 3.2.1); the myth of Iphigeneia is no exception to this observation.

4.3 Iconography of Artemis in Sicily and Southern Italy

On account of the vast amount of images in a number of different media which we have reviewed in chapters 3 and 4 it is beneficial to consider the key points which have emerged from this iconographical study. Artemis is identifiable on both the exported Attic wares and locally produced vases and sculpture by a number of attributes: her hunting tools, animals, torches and palm trees (3.2.1). The goddess is often dressed in a short chiton to complement her physical lifestyle. Some of these attributes can be associated with Artemis’ role as a goddess of parthenoi; this is also true of the action depicted; for examples, scenes which show the goddess running towards an altar or images which include the goddess’ cult statue. On Apulian vases Artemis often appears in an upper register above a scene of a mythological parthenos. The Sicilian Artemis Group terracottas (Bell 1981, 4-6) represent the goddess with the same range of attributes (3.2.2). The initial motivation for the production of these figures may have been the Syracusan victory over the Athenian fleet in 413 (Diod. Sic. 13.14-17). Artemis’ relationship with animals is emphasised in the images of the Potnia Theron associated with her cult at Syracuse and, in particular, at S. Biagio in the Metapontine chora (3.2.3); the figurines dedicated at Metapontion can potentially be traced back to a cult of Artemis Agrotera on the north coast of Achaia. Finally in chapter 3 we noted a popular type of Artemis assimilated with Bendis which appears at the end of fifth century (3.2.4); the iconography of Artemis Bendis probably arrived in the Greek west via Thurii and appears to have revitalised the cult of Artemis in Southern Italy.
The images of Artemis in chapter 4 were split into two clear categories: Artemis with Apollo (4.1) and Artemis’ mythology (4.2). Scenes of the Delian triad or Artemis simply accompanying her brother are popular on both the Attic vases and locally produced vases and sculpture. On the locally manufactured vases the twins often appear together in an upper register above a mythological parthenos. The next series of scenes we reviewed can be categorised as Artemis as charioteer, Artemis and Apollo as charioteers, Artemis and Apollo accompanying a chariot or Artemis riding. The chariot has both nuptial and funerary connotations. The association of Artemis with horses and deer recalls her association with the Potnia Theron; the control of the animals echoing her control over parthenoi. Artemis and Apollo also appear together in scenes of violence as they avenge some act against the divine order: the Gigantomachy, Niobids and Tityos. Finally the goddess appears in support of her brother in his contests with Heralcles over the tripod and deer. The scenes of Artemis’ own mythology involve the goddess punishing those who offend her: Aktaion, Oineus and Kallisto. Artemis is also recalled in myths where she helps, or tries to help, the protagonists: Hippolytos and the Proitids. The final myth included from her personal repertoire is that of Iphigeneia which recalls both themes; Artemis is punishing Agamemnon who has offended her but ultimately saves Iphigeneia.

This review of Artemis’ iconography in Southern Italy and Sicily has not significantly deviated from our general understanding of the goddess’ iconography. Lily Kahil’s (1984, 624ff.) review of Artemis’ iconography identified a constantly evolving figure beginning with the imagery of the Potnia Theron, which develops into a female actively engaged in scenes with other gods, especially Apollo. All of the key elements identified by Kahil are recognisable in the iconography of Southern Italy and Sicily. There are some exceptions, of course, for example the local Attic ware dubbed krateriskoi are not found outside Attica and therefore do not make it to the Greek west; the vases and the scenes on them were peculiar to Artemis’ Attic cults (Shapiro 1989, 65-6). One recurring theme across the three categories we have reviewed (3.2.1-4.2) is Artemis’ role as a goddess of parthenoi. Admittedly this is more prominent in the general images of Artemis (3.2.1), but this is to be expected. When accompanying Apollo, Artemis is sometimes placed in a secondary role either as an attendant indistinguishable from her mother or supporting Apollo as in the struggle for the tripod. However, Artemis and Apollo appear together in upper registers observing mythological parthenoi and their iconography in chariot scenes may well allude to Artemis over-seeing the inevitable transition of a parthenos to gyne or death.
A more interesting way of considering the trends in Southern Italy and Sicily is to compare the imported iconography with the images produced locally either on vases or in sculpture. There are three types of scenes in this respect: those imported but not reproduced locally, those imported and reproduced locally and those only produced locally. In the first category are scenes of the Potnia Theron; these images fade out in the mainland by the time the Southern Italian and Sicilian vase-painters begin to manufacture in large quantities. Other scenes in this category are the struggles for the tripod and the deer; the former is probably an Attic politically motivated scene. This meaning would either have been lost on or not relevant to the Greeks in the west.

The myths of Aktaion, the Niobids and the chariot scenes were popular on both imported Attic wares and local vases and sculpture. The myth of Aktaion probably appealed to the painters and sculptors of Southern Italy and Sicily as it was an easily recognisable scene due to the attacking dogs and the metamorphosing Aktaion. Moreover, it was also apparently the subject of a lost tragedy and their partiality to dramatic scenes as has already been noted. The Niobids myth and chariot scenes were also reproduced but were subject to local amendments. The majority of the Attic scenes of the Niobids focus on the slaughter of the Niobids; one of two local images reproduce this scene but there is a greater interest in the pathos of Niobe. The preoccupation with the figure of Niobe may again be due to dramatic influence of Aischylos' play. Artemis appears as a charioteer on media from the mainland and the Greek west. However, the images from Southern Italy and Sicily usually show the goddess in a chariot drawn by deer rather than horses. This need not necessarily reflect any local partiality for deer over horses as an early image of Artemis riding a horse has been found at Capua; the difference may be the chronology of the scenes and the evolution from horses to deer reflected in the ancient literary sources (Hom. Hymn. Art. 3-5; Callim. Hymn 3.98-113).

Finally we should consider the images of Artemis and her mythology which are not imported and are only produced locally. On vases, scenes of Hippolytos, the Proitids and Kallisto fall into this category. An immediate caveat is that images of these myths may have been imported from Attica but none have been discovered or if any were discovered they were sold without provenance. The scenes of Hippolytos can be explained through the local vase-painters' partiality for dramatic scenes, while the fate of Kallisto is a Peloponnesian myth which we
would not expect the Attic vase-painters to be producing and exporting. However, the myth of the Proitids is harder to explain; it was not extremely popular but a number of scenes survive. It may have appealed to the local sculptors and vase-painters on account of its themes discussed in chapter 1.1.2. The last example to include here are the figurines of Artemis Bendis which are unique to Southern Italy. These figurines were probably inspired by the arrival of Bendis’ cult in Attica and the arrival of Athenians at Thurii in 444; the iconography proved instantly popular and revitalised Artemis’ cult as there was no popular coroplastic iconography of the goddess in this region at that time. The Artemis Bendis figurines became the classical face of Artemis in terracottas in Southern Italy; they became the equivalent of the Sicilian Artemis Group.
Chapter 5

Artemis on coins

In this chapter I will focus on the coins dating to the archaic and classical periods and conclude with a brief review of the numismatic evidence from the hellenistic period. My sole interest is in the designs on the coins, not matters to do with production or commercial significance. There are two key issues for consideration: how can we identify Artemis on these coins and what do we learn about the goddess from them.

A coin’s flan, and the die with which it was struck, offer a small surface area for decoration. The most common designs for ancient Greek coin types were an Olympian or patron deity, a figure of local mythological significance, a local product or a pun (Kraay 1966, 13-15). The small size of these representations can make recognition of the type difficult, but there are some key criteria which can be applied to help identify Artemis. The goddess’ profile head is most easily recognisable by three characteristics: the top of a quiver at her shoulder, a lack of head-wear and the hair normally gathered into a bun at the back of her head. If the full figure of the goddess is depicted some elements of her standard iconography are usually included to confirm her identity; for example, she may carry a bow or be accompanied by a dog (chapter 3.2.1).

Artemis’ appearance on coin types from Sicily and Southern Italy is not unexpected: as an Olympian goddess she formed part of the die-engraver’s standard repertoire. The choice of legend, symbol, and the die with which the type is paired can sometimes inform us about the goddess. The legend can assist with dating the coin, sometimes the name of an historical figure appears, or confirm an epithet of the goddess. The symbol, a secondary object in the field or exergue not necessarily associated with the main type (Head 1911, lx-lxi; Kraay 1976, 5), can emphasise an aspect of her myth or cult. Similarly a coin’s types can have an obvious connection and like the legend and symbol can highlight a particular aspect of the goddess’ cult.

It is interesting to note that, while coins were a means of expressing a polis’ identity throughout the Greek world see, for example, Pretzler (2003), Sicilian coinage reveals the strongest interest in locality through its choice of types (Rutter 2000, 82-3). This suggests that when any deity is chosen it is likely that they received cult locally or had some special...
significance for the polis. It is not unreasonable to assume therefore that any polis minting a series with a type of Artemis may have had some local cult site for the goddess.

5.1 Sicily in the archaic and classical periods

The Syracusans began minting coins in the last decade of the sixth century. Among their earliest coin types is a tetradrachm with a quadriga on the obverse and a small stylised female head in the centre of an incuse square on the reverse (C S16). Subject to a number of stylistic developments (Head 1911, 171-178; Rutter 1997, 123-132), this coin type continued to be minted by the Syracusans throughout the archaic and classical periods. The obverse quadriga, which recalls the competitive nature of the Syracusan aristocrats in the Greek games (Head 1911, 171-2; Kraay 1966, 15; Kraay 1976, 209), develops stylistically into a freer form and a flying Nike is added, crowning either the charioteer or the horses (C S17-18).

The reverse female head initially has no identifying attributes. This type however develops within a few decades where the head becomes less stylised and expands to fill the field. Four dolphins are added around the head and a legend, displaced from the obverse by the Nike, is included (C S17-18). The dolphins represent the sea surrounding the small island of Ortygia which boasted a freshwater spring: a remarkable geological feature which became an identifying landmark of Syracuse (Kraay 1976, 210; Larson 2001, 213). One of the most famous types of this series was struck around a hundred years after the appearance of the first Syracusan coins. The female head moves to the obverse and faces out with loose, floating locks while the four dolphins remain. The type is represented by two dies, one of which incorporates three legends into the design: Arethosa above the head, Kimon - the die-engraver’s signature across the female’s headband and So in between the female’s loose locks on the lower left side of the flan (C S20).

---

1 This possibility only applies to Greek cities, or poleis. Non-Greek settlements, which copied Greek designs, may not have even understood the reference to the deity and so we cannot make any inference about their local cults.
2 In his review of the Peloponnesian cults of Artemis, Brulotte (2002, 179) accepted a coin with an image of Artemis as evidence for the worship of the goddess somewhere within the territory of the minting centre. See table 2.1 in chapter 2 for a comparison of the attested temenoi of Artemis with mints producing coins with an image of the goddess.
3 The coinage of Rhegion is included in the discussion of South Italian coinage. Numismatists generally discuss Rhegion’s coins alongside Sicilian coins due to the city’s geographical proximity to, and close relationship with, Messana-Zankle on the Sicilian side of the straits of Messina. The coins of Rhegion were also struck on the Sicilian weight system. I have however separated Rhegion from the Sicilian coins here to ensure consistency with my review of the other types of evidence where Rhegion is included as a South Italian polis.
Most numismatists now accept the legend above the head as confirmation of the female’s identity as Arethousa, eponymous nymph of the fresh water fountain on Ortygia and extend this identification to the female head on the series’ earlier coins (Jenkins 1966, 15; Kraay 1976, 209; Cahn 1984, 582-4; Rutter 2000, 78-80). The possibility that the earlier head could represent Artemis has been unpopular since the early twentieth century when its exponents included Head (1911, 171-2) and Boehringer (1929, 95-102). Boehringer argued that the cult of Artemis Alpheioa was transplanted from the Peloponnese to Syracuse by the original colonists. He understood that contemporary myth related Alpheios’ pursuit of Artemis to Syracuse and subsequent consummation of his relationship with her on Ortygia citing Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.12a (vol. 2, p.33-4, 1.17-2 Drachmann) and the language of Pindar’s Nem. 1.1 to support his argument. Boehringer concluded that Kimon named the female on his die to differentiate from the earlier representations of Artemis.

Boehringer (1929, 100) builds his argument on the now discredited understanding of Artemis as a goddess who embodies characteristics of an earlier, sexually active goddess of vegetation. Moreover the case for the identification of the female head on these Syracusan issues as Artemis relies upon Boehringer’s review of the cult of Artemis Alpheioa and the myth of Alpheios’ pursuit of Artemis: both are based on post-classical sources. Confirmed numismatic representations of Artemis’ profile head often include the top of the goddess’ quiver, but it is absent from these coins. It should be noted that in the first one hundred years the die-engravers included small variations in the design of the profile head, for example adding a wreath to the head. Consequently there was scope and opportunity for a die-engraver to include a small detail which would be entirely relevant to the type, if the head represented Artemis, yet such a feature was never added. There is, it must be concluded, insufficient evidence to identify the female head of the first one hundred years of the series as Artemis.

Yet one key question remains. If the female head on the reverse of earlier Syracusan coins is Arethousa why did Kimon name his facing head at the end of the fifth century? The change in design, from profile to facing head, and orientation, from reverse to obverse type, may

---

4 A third identification of Artemis-Arethousa (or Arethousa-Artemis) is included in some authors and several coin catalogues see Seltman (1949, 49) and various SNG entries, for example, SNG Lockett 3508.

5 Farnell (1896, 446) and Harrison (1963, 502) are among proponents of the now discredited theory, against which see, for example, Sale’s case study of the Kallisto myth (1965, 11-35).
have been considered sufficient modification to merit confirmation that the head was still Arethousa.⁶ Other fifth century Syracusan coins had featured a female head with dolphins on the obverse (C S19), although the dolphins sometimes numbered less than four, and so the dolphin motif alone may not been sufficient to identify Arethousa.⁷ The possibility also exists that Kimon was responding to alternative traditions of a fundamental myth for the Syracusans and their mythical association with the Greek mainland and, in particular, Olympia. Variations of the myth of Arethousa’s passage to Ortygia were apparently in circulation by the fifth century (Telesilla PMG 717)⁸ and may have prompted Kimon to clarify the protagonist of his die. The coin series continues in the fourth century, with the female head returning to its profile design, although it is no longer permanently confined to the reverse type (C S22). Subsequent die engravers did not rename the figure to differentiate from Kimon’s designation of Arethousa.

The identification of the female head as Arethousa is consistent with the western, and especially Sicilian, Greek employment of river gods and nymphs as topographical motifs (Rutter 2000). Although I have argued that the series’ type does not, at any point, include a representation of Artemis, it can inform us about the goddess. The significance of the Arethousa-Alpheios myth, and the fountain on Ortygia, in the archaic and classical periods is demonstrated by both Pindar’s allusion to the myth in the opening line of Nemean 1 and its domination of Syracusan coinage design. Artemis received cult on Ortygia (Pind. Pyth. 2.7, Nem. 1.3; chapter 2) and was specifically associated with Arethousa: a statue of the goddess was erected at the fountain (Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2.12a, vol. 2, p.33-4, I.17-2 Drachmann) which according to Diodorus (5.3.5) the nymphs had created for Artemis’ pleasure. It is therefore reasonable to presume that, on account of her association with the fountain and its eponymous nymph, Artemis’ cult enjoyed a prominent status on Ortygia.

Returning to Kimon’s remarkable die of the last decade of the fifth century, there is one legend which we have not yet considered: So(teira) located within the female’s floating locks. Arethousa, on the coin’s obverse, is truly the water nymph in Kimon’s design, her

---

⁶ Holloway (2000, 132) suggests that the head was moved to the obverse to protect it from damage.
⁷ The identity of the obverse female head which appears flanked by dolphins and with a number of reverse types is unclear. Some, however, have labelled this figure as Arethousa (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004a, 230). Rutter (1997, 147) simply describes the type as depicting a female head and this seems the most logical approach. The iconography of the head differs from the ‘Arethousa’ of the contemporaneous reverse type and has no other defining attributes; it could represent any mythological female of local importance.
⁸ Telesilla PMG 717 = Hephaest. ench. Xi.2, p.35 Consbr. For a discussion of the myth and its implications for Artemis in Syracuse see chapter 1.1.1.
floating locks indicate her submersion and emphasise her embodiment of the fresh water source by the harbour on Ortygia. The abbreviated epithet seems to have been overlooked until Herbert Cahn’s brief article addressing its significance. Cahn (1993, 5) makes two key assertions about the epithet: he attributes it to Arethousa and contextualises its occurrence against the destruction of the Athenian fleet in the harbour at Syracuse in 413 (Diod. Sic. 13.14-17).9

Cahn’s attribution of the epithet to Arethousa assumes that Kimon intended the name of the nymph, included above her head, to be directly linked with the abbreviated epithet on the lower left hand side of the design. However the name of the nymph appears in the unlimited space above the beaded border. Nor does there appear to be any aesthetic reason for the legend’s actual positioning: die engravers employed legends and symbols to balance their designs but this does not appear to be the rationale behind the design on this coin. It seems that a conscious choice was made to not include the letters So alongside the nymph’s name despite it being the only obvious space for them within the design. The full epithet appears on Syracusan coinage of the third century which is discussed in chapter 5.3 below.

Although Cahn (1993, 6) noted the popularity of the epithet across Sicily, the numismatic evidence indicates it was specifically associated with Artemis at Syracuse. Furthermore the epithet Soteira is regularly associated with Artemis elsewhere in the Greek world: over half of the instances recorded in the Banque de Données des Epitèleses Grecques are associated with Artemis.10 The evidence for Artemis’ association with the military, in particular in her capacity as Artemis Soteira, has been discussed above in chapter 3.2.2 where I argued that the Artemis Group terracottas were inspired by the Syracusans’ naval victory over the Athenians in 413. Kimon’s coin may also recall this victory, especially as the epithet appears alongside the personified Arethousa whose fountain was located on Ortygia in the Syracusan harbour. However, the coins series begins approximately eight years after this in c.405: the same year that Dionysius, tyrant of the Syracusans, negotiated with Hamilcar to ensure the safety of Syracuse from the Carthaginians who were attacking the Greek polis of Sicily (Diod. Sic. 13.109-114). The direct inspiration for the coin series was probably therefore the contemporary relief from fear of a Carthaginian attack, which was divinely

---

9 In his discussion of the victory symbolism of the coin Cahn (1993, 6) notes the possibility, raised in previous scholarship, that Arethousa also features on the reverse type driving the chariot.

attributed to Artemis Soteira, the goddess who had rescued the city only eight years earlier from the Athenians.

We have already observed Artemis' role in the Alpheios-Arethousa myth and directly above her cultic association with the Arethousa fountain. The version of the myth recorded by Ovid (Met. 5.572-641) casts Artemis as the saviour of Arethousa: responding to the nymph's plea for rescue from the hunter Alpheios, Artemis directs Arethousa's metamorphosis and escape to Syracuse.\(^\text{11}\) Ovid's account is far later than Kimon's coin, but Artemis' role as a defender of virginity appears in earlier sources\(^\text{12}\) and it is therefore possible that this is an early version of the myth which was discarded by other mythographers (chapter 1.1.1). Artemis’ role as the saviour of Arethousa would therefore be extended to being the saviour of the people of Syracuse.

From Syracuse we move to Selinus, on the south-west coast of the island, where, after a couple of decades of inactivity, a new series of coins was minted after the middle of the fifth century. A reverse type of a local river god sacrificing was common to both the tetradrachm and didrachm; with Artemis and Apollo in a chariot and Herakles subduing the Cretan bull as respective obverse types. Both issues appear c.440 and continue for a further 40 years (Head 1911, 167). On the tetradrachm's obverse type Artemis holds the reins of the biga which advances slowly and Apollo draws his bow (CSI5); the polis' name appears as a legend around the border of the coin (Kahil 1984, no. 1214a). The reverse type is rich in imagery: Selinus, the eponymous river god identified by a small protruding horn,\(^\text{13}\) pours a libation at an altar from his right hand, in his left hand he holds a branch. Furthermore a cock stands below the altar while behind him a bull appears on a plinth and a celery, selinon, leaf is located in the field (Jenkins 1966, 18; Kraay 1976, 219-20; Rutter 1997, 138-9).

In 1576 Hubert Goltzius connected these die-matched types to the story of Empedocles’ rescuing the Selinuntines from a plague. Empedocles, according to his third century AD biographer (Diog. Laert. 8.70) had connected two local rivers, the Selinus and Hypsas, (represented on the two reverse coin types) to rid the area of the infection inherent in the local marshes. Goltzius’ theory, in which Apollo and Artemis appear as gods who influence

11 Ovid's account may have been commemorated by the ritual described by Pausanias (7.24.3) when visiting Aegium: the local people threw offerings into the sea from their local sanctuary of Soteira saying that they were for Arethousa at Syracuse.

12 For example Artemis expels Callisto from her band of nymphs on learning of her pregnancy (Eur. Hipp. 375-85).

plague and the death of men and women respectively (Head 1911, 167-8),\(^{14}\) was generally accepted until Lloyd (1935, 78-79) comprehensively argued against it employing issues of geography, chronology and politics to support his view suggesting instead that the local importance of Apollo had influenced the die-design (Lloyd 1935, 85).\(^{15}\) Lacroix (1965, 30-1, 35) further discusses this issue and suggests the obverse type represents Apollo Agraios and Artemis Agrotera’s (Paus. 1.41.3) arrival from Megara to support the polis; this theory is now generally accepted (Kraay 1976, 219-20; Rutter 1997, 138-9).

The archaeology of the city and its cult have suffered from the Carthaginian destruction of the city in the middle of the third century. The temples are generally labelled by alphabetical letter as it cannot be certain to whom any of them were dedicated. It is likely, however, that Temple C, one of the first monumental temples on the akropolis was dedicated to Apollo (De Angelis 2003, 135-6) while two early classical temples (A and O), also on the akropolis, may have been dedicated to Artemis and Apollo (chapter 2.1). If we accept these potential designations there were two temples of Apollo and one of Artemis on the Selinuntine akropolis when this coin type was first minted.

The Selinuntines had supported Carthage in the Battle of Himera in 480 and having been on the losing side were, in 466, supporting the Syracusans in the liberation of their city from the tyrant Thrasybulus (Diod. Sic. 11.68). The rebuilding of their relationship with Syracuse supported the growth of their political power and treasury which is remarked upon by Thucydides (6.20.4) before the Athenian expedition. The choice of a theme from their mother-city on the Greek mainland may mark their change in policy from supporting the Carthaginians to allying themselves with the other Greeks of Sicily.

Artemis’ appearance in a chariot recalls the description of the goddess driving her golden chariot to Apollo at Claros (Hom. Hymn. Art. 3-5). The goddess’ control over animals is manifested in chariot imagery in one of Pindar’s contemporary epinikian odes (Pyth. 2-5-12); the image is also recalled in later literature (Callim. Hymn 3. 98; Ap. Rhod. Argon. 3.879; Nonnus Dion. 11.344, 48.375). Furthermore, the die-designer may have been

\(^{14}\) Farnell (1932, 138) and Faraone (2003, 48-9) discuss Artemis’ association with plague; Pindar (Pyth. 3.32-6) may also allude to the goddess in this context.

\(^{15}\) According to Lloyd (1935, 78-9) there is no mark of this change on the landscape, the distance between the rivers makes the feat implausible, Empedocles would have been very young to finance and co-ordinate this undertaking and he was unlikely to have aided a polis which was an enemy of his own polis, Akragas. Lloyd (1935, 92-3) concludes that if the story has an historical basis it is likely that it relates to Akragas and was attributed to Selinus in error by Goltzius.
influenced by a number of contemporary vases, found at Syracuse, which represent a
goddess mounting a chariot (chapter 4.1). Following Lacroix’s argument, the coin type may
attest to the presence of the cult of Artemis Agrotera, transferred from the mother city, and
the joint worship of the goddess with Apollo at Selinus.

At approximately the same time as Selinus began to mint the unique type of Artemis and
Apollo in their chariot, Hieron, tyrant of Syracuse, was extending his control over the east of
Sicily. In 476 he moved the populations of Naxos and Catane to Leontini (Diod. Sic. 2.49.2)
and a decade later, c.466, the people of Leontini began to mint their own coins. The obverse
type of their first series copied the Syracusan type of quadriga and victory; the political
domination of Leontini by Syracuse was clearly reflected in the coin’s design. This obverse
type was usually paired with a reverse head of Apollo surrounded by three laurel leaves
however an alternative type was a female profile head surrounded by four grains of barley (C
S6). The female head recalls the Arethousa of Syracuse, the dolphins having been replaced
by the grains of barley (Rutter 1997, 130). The female cannot be definitively identified, but
she is probably Artemis or Demeter (Kraay 1976, 211-2; Fischer Hansen, Nielsen and
Ampolo 2004a, 210). Kraay (1976, 211-2) considers Demeter more likely due to the
inclusion of the grain, but the fact that the goddess substitutes for Apollo and her association
with Arethousa, whose design is the inspiration for the type, means we should not discount
Artemis as a possibility.

At the end of the fifth century, the survivors of the Carthaginian sack of Himera, established
a new home, Thermae Himerenses (Cic. 2 Verr. 2 35). They began to mint their own coins
including a bronze series with an obverse profile head of Artemis, with crescent symbol
behind, and the city’s name as a legend on the reverse (C 529). The crescent symbol may
allude to an association of Artemis with Selene or Phoebe. As we noted in chapter 4.1,
Artemis’ identification with the moon is most popular in Latin literature although there are
allusions to this association in earlier Greek authors. This association evolves into an
Artemis Selene of the Roman period who is easily identified by the crescent on her head¬
dress (Farnell 1896, 531).

A Carthaginian mint of the second half of the fourth century began to mint a series of silver
tetradrachms which were heavily influenced by the Syracusans’ coins. The obverse quadriga

16 Fischer Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo (2004a, 210) even include the possibility that this is an
effeminate, long-haired Apollo.
and Nike was paired with a reverse female profile head surrounded by dolphins (C S14); the mint added a Punic legend RŠMLQRT, Rash Melqart, which allows us to differentiate between these coins and those of Syracuse. The location of the mint cannot be established with any certainty (Kraay 1976, 234; Mildenberg 1993, 7-8; Rutter 1997, 163), but it is clear that the Carthaginians were copying the Syracusan types without an understanding of their original meaning. The reverse type cannot be identified as Arethousa, with her allusion to the cult of Artemis, as on the Syracusan designs.

The last representation of Artemis in the classical period comes from Morgantina; at this time the city was controlled by the Syracusans.17 Artemis' head features on the obverse alongside the city's name and is paired with a reverse naked horseman carrying a spear (C S12). Head (1911, 157) names the female as Artemis, but Fischer Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo (2004a, 216) suggest Persephone and Apollo as other possibilities. All three deities received cult at Syracuse and the terracotta votives of Artemis discovered at Morgantina were within the sanctuary of Persephone (Bell 1981, 91-2); for our purposes Artemis, at best, remains a possible identification perhaps hinting at some local importance in the city while under Syracusan domination.

One immediate observation is that Artemis appears on a very small number of series in this period. There are only two definite and uncontested representations of the goddess (C S15, S29). It should also be stated that all of the coins discussed above, except the bronze Syracusan female head die-matched with an octopus (C S19) and the bronze series from Thermæ Himerenses (C S29), are silver issues which means they probably enjoyed a wide circulation across the Greek world. The significance of the coins of Syracuse and Selinus for our understanding of Artemis have already been discussed above. However, we can also learn from the last four series included: those from Leontini, Thermæ Himerenses, Rash Melqart and Morgantina. Thermæ Himerenses (C S29) is the most interesting as the crescent symbol in the field behind Artemis may suggest a local and earlier than expected association of Artemis with the moon. The series from Leontini, Rash Melqart and Morgantina reveal more about the domination of Syracuse than they do about the goddess Artemis. Rash Melqart's Carthaginian mint was merely copying a design. However, if Syracuse had influenced the Greek mints at Leontini and Morgantina into representing the

---

17 Fischer Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo (2004a, 216) follow the dating of the Morgantinian coins set down after the excavations at the site led by Princeton university and assign this series to c.344-317, but note Rutter (1997, 140) on the difficulty of dating issues from west Greek Sikel cities.
goddess on their coins it is also possible that the Syracusans’ influence had led to some transfer of her cult to these Greek poleis.

5.2 Southern Italy in the archaic and classical periods

The archaic and classical coinages of Southern Italy have generally received less attention than those of Sicily on account of their inferior size and design as well as the relative complexity of their chronology (Kraay 1976, 161-2, 201). The catalogue extends beyond the boundaries of Southern Italy to incorporate all Italian coins, from their first appearance to the end of the hellenistic period, which include a depiction of Artemis. None of the 27 coins included date to the archaic period and only five date to the classical period.

Two Apulian issues, one from Arpi (C 118) and one from an un-located polis called Neapolis (C II10), feature a profile head of Artemis; the latter die-matched the goddess with a bow and quiver. The issue from Metapontion only includes Artemis as a symbol (C II11); the symbol is almost an exact copy from the contemporary Rhodian and Corinthian coins (C O1-2). The employment of the goddess’ image as a symbol implies some local significance; her cult is attested both in the polis and Metapontine chora (Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo 2004b, 280-1; chapter 2).

The final two coins for discussion here are both from Bruttium, modern Calabria, the most southerly part of Italy separated from Sicily only by the Straits of Messina. A bronze issue of Consentia has an obverse type with a profile head of Artemis and a reverse type with a bow and three crescents (C 118). The reverse type recalls the contemporaneous coin from Thermae Himerenses (C S29) upon which a crescent symbol appeared in a type with a profile head of the goddess. The bow is a clearly recognisable attribute of Artemis while the crescents, as discussed above, may refer to her association with the moon.

From Rhexion there is the first of a long running series of coins with the profile head of Artemis on the obverse (C 1121); the series continues with a variety of die combinations in the hellenistic period (C 122-24, 26). In this classical example Artemis is die-paired with a facing lion’s head on the reverse; the latter was a common type at Rhhexion from the middle of the fifth century (Rutter 1997, 135).
What should we learn from these five coins about Artemis? There is nothing unusual about the iconography of the goddess’ profile head on the Apulian issues. However the die-pairing from Consentia is interesting as it repeats an association noted on a coin from Thermae Himerenses. Two numismatic associations of Artemis with crescents cannot be presented as definitive evidence of Artemis’ worship as a moon goddess. If, however, we accept these two coins as more than a coincidence of design they may indicate an association of Artemis with the moon which is not explicit in the literary sources until much later.

Only the Metapontine issue (C I11) is silver; the other four coins are bronze in direct contrast to the predominance of silver as a material for the archaic and classical Sicilian issues discussed above. Therefore none of the classical Southern Italian issues which featured Artemis as a type were minted in silver; the use of bronze indicates a coin intended for a more local use. The location of two of these mints in Bruttium is also interesting. Little is known of Consentia, but Thucydides (6.44.3) refers to a sanctuary of Artemis outside Rhegion (chapter 2.2). Both poleis’ proximity to Sicily has already been noted and it is worth recalling that numismatic tradition would locate Rhegion’s coins within a Sicilian discussion. Syracuse’s influence did cross the straits to Bruttium: Dionysios I captured Rhegion in 386 (Diod. Sic. 14.111). The appearance of Artemis on these two classical coins of Bruttium may therefore be a consequence of the extent of Syracusan domination in the classical period.

5.3 Later coinage from Sicily and Southern Italy

Artemis continued to appear on Syracusan coinage after the end of the classical period. The Syracusan series with an obverse quadriga and reverse head of Arethousa (C S16-18) continued with one key change: the quadriga becomes reverse and the head of Arethousa obverse (C S22). In total Artemis features as either the main obverse or reverse type of a further six Syracusan series (C S21, S23-S27) which were minted until the end of the third century. On five of the series the goddess’ profile head appears; the die-pairings for these types allude to other cults of the polis: Zeus (C S23), Nike and Zeus (C S24), Athena (C S25) and Apollo (C S21, S27). The first series which die-matches Artemis with Apollo includes the epithet Soteira (C S21); both types feature a symbol, a tripod, behind the head of the deity. The tripod recalls Delphic Apollo’s role in the colonisation process, which is also alluded to on earlier vases found in Sicily and Southern Italy on which Artemis is shown supporting Apollo in his battle for the tripod (chapter 4.1). Artemis’ significance as the
sister of the god of colonisation is apparent. A contemporaneous issue which die-matches Artemis with Zeus (C S23) also includes this epithet.18

The sixth series combines an obverse head of Athena with a reverse Artemis; the goddess draws her bow as a dog rushes behind her towards the unseen prey (C S26). Artemis is also accompanied by two legends on this late third century issue: Syrakosion and So. Artemis Soteira’s combination with Athena could be understood as a statement of the Syracusans’ military might: the temple of Athena on Ortygia was dedicated in thanks for the Greeks’ victory in the battle of Himera (480) while, as noted above, the epithet Soteira may link Artemis to the Syracusan victory in 413 or the removal of the Carthaginian threat in 405. These later coin types attest to the continued popularity of Artemis in Syracuse and provide further evidence for the local epithet Soteira.

Elsewhere in Sicily, Syracusan influence was responsible for an early third century series from Akragas with an obverse head of Artemis and a reverse boar (C S1); the boar complements the goddess of the hunt. However, it has also been connected to a dream of Phintias, whose name is recorded beneath the boar. According to Diodorus (22.7.1) Phintias dreamed that he was attacked by a boar whilst hunting. Zambron (2004, 468-9) has argued that the coin series preceded the dream-myth; the inclusion of the epithet Soteria on the last two issues indicate the connection of the coin series to the dream (cf. Head 1911, 13; Waele 1971, 25). Leontini, whose early classical coinage was strongly influenced by Syracuse as discussed above, produced a late third century coin with jugate heads of Apollo and Artemis (C S7).

Artemis also features on four series from Messana during its control by the Mamertini, Samnite/Campanian mercenaries, which began in 288 (C S8-11). A little after the middle of the third century, contemporaneous with the end of the First Punic War, a number of non-Greek foundations began to mint coins with a type of Artemis (C S2-5, S28). The die-pairings of these types generally conform to her standard iconography: a bow and quiver (C S2), Apollo (C S3), and his tripod (C S4). The identification of Artemis on the coin from Tauromenion is disputed (C S28) with Head (1911, 189) suggesting that the figure is accompanied by a panther, not a dog, and is therefore Dionysos. Finally, from Sicily, Artemis appears on an issue from Morgantina (C S13), dating to the second half of the

18 Both issues with Artemis Soteira may be further examples of Syracusan propaganda commemorating the failed siege of their city by the Carthaginians in 405 (Diod. Sic. 13.109-114) and Agathocles peace with Carthage in 307 (Diod. Sic. 20.79).
second century (Erim 1958, 85-6); the obverse head of the goddess is paired with a reverse Nike.

Turning to Italy there are two coins, which fall outwith the geographical remit of Southern Italy, which on account of their date and mint’s geographical proximity to Southern Italy merit inclusion. From Etruria a coin, dating to the first half of the second century, has, according to Head’s review (1911, 12), an obverse type of Artemis (C I1).\textsuperscript{19} The second coin comes from Larinum on the corresponding, western half of Central Italy to Etruria and dates to the period after the Romans’ defeat of Hannibal (C I2). Artemis is one of several major gods who feature as an obverse type and is paired with a reverse hound; above the hound is a torch.

Campania, to the south of Etruria, boasted two mints which produced coins with a type of Artemis: Capua and Neapolis. Capua issued a coin, at the end of the third century, with an obverse profile head of Artemis die-paired with a reverse boar (C I3); the reverse recalls the earlier Akragantine coin (C S1). A contemporaneous Capuan issues features an obverse head of Zeus and a reverse female driving a biga beneath two stars (C I4). The female has been identified by SNG as either Artemis or Selene, presumably on account of the two stars above the horses, while Thomson (1961, 387) calls her Luna. The female’s head, in particular her hair style, recalls other numismatic representations of Artemis in the catalogue (C S1, S15, S21, S25-26, 113, 116, I20, I24). Artemis appears driving a chariot in the archaic series of Selinus (C S15) and on vases excavated in Sicily and Southern Italy (chapter 4.1). The head probably represents Artemis as it closely resembles her numismatic iconography. Furthermore Artemis was worshipped near Capua on the Tifata ridge; Pausanias (5.12.3) refers to the sanctuary where he had seen an elephant skull dedicated to the goddess (chapter 2.2).

Neapolis, modern Naples, produced a series from c.300 upon which Artemis features as a symbol, holding a torch in each hand, behind the neck of a female head on the obverse type (C I5). Underneath the head a series of letters are included, for example Artemi on the example in the catalogue. The legend Artemi and the Artemis symbol are not mutually exclusive: for example, the Artemis symbol appears with the legend Parme (SNG Copenhagen 418) and the legend Artemi appears with a helmet symbol (SNG Copenhagen

\textsuperscript{19} The reverse running dog of C I1 may have influenced Head’s identification of the female head on the obverse as Artemis.
Artemis appears, carrying a torch, as a symbol on coinage from elsewhere in the Greek world, see C 01-2 in the catalogue; this is not a regional peculiarity. Symbols can convey a variety of meanings (Head 1911, Ix-lxi; Kraay 1976, 5). Rutter (1997, 86) has suggested the legends on these coins are the abbreviated names of mint officials while the symbols serve as a mark of control. The function of the symbol was therefore an expression of state authority, but the question of why this particular image was chosen remains. The symbol may have been copied from contemporaneous Rhodian (C 01) or Corinthian (C O2) coinage, but it is not an exact replica as Artemis appears facing and carrying two torches on the Neapolitan coins. It may also have had some local meaning; it presents the possibility of a local cult of Artemis from which this variant iconography was copied. Finally and also from Neapolis is an obverse head of Artemis, dating to the last quarter of the third century, with a reverse type cornucopia (C I6).

West of Campania, in third century northern Apulia, Grumum (C I7) and Luceria (C I9) were minting coins with Artemis’ profile head as an obverse type; on the latter’s obverse type a crescent appeared both above her head and on the coin’s reverse type. Finally from Apulia, a variation in the dominating dolphin-rider type of Tarentine coinage should be noted here. The dolphin rider characterised the polis’ coinage for three centuries (Rutter 1997, 53ff.) and appears holding a great variety of attributes, one of which is a bow and arrow (C O3). The bow and arrow is unmistakably an attribute of Apollo and Artemis; the inclusion of their attribute in the polis’ dominant coin type could allude to a local cult.

Moving east to Lucania, the poleis of Metapontion, Paestum (formerly Poseidonia) and Thurium minted coins featuring Artemis. Artemis features on a Metapontine series of the Hannibalic period: the goddess appears as an obverse profile head (C I12). At Paestum the goddess appears as an obverse profile head die-paired with an ear of corn (C I13), recalling the Metapontine issue (C I12), and a boar (C I14), recalling the Akragantine (C S1) and Capuan (C I3) coins discussed above. The latter type may be intended to complement Artemis in her guise as Agrotera; Artemis received cult near the polis and this may have been her epithet (Diod. Sic. 4.22.3). Thurium, located next to the Lucanian boundary with Bruttium and apparently under the Bruttians control (Diod. Sic. 16.15.2), produced two series with Artemis. On both series the goddess is die-paired with Apollo (C I15-16); the

---

20 For Roman evidence for the worship of Artemis in Neapolis, including a second-century AD inscription, see Petersen (1919, 170, 202).
reverse type of one series (C 116) recalls the contemporary die-designs of Messana (C S8, S11): the goddess advances, carrying a torch and two spears, and is accompanied by a dog.

Finally we move to Bruttium, modern Calabria, closest to Sicily of all the regions discussed and where we might expect to see most similarity between Sicilian and Southern Italian coins. A Bruttian coin bears a strong resemblance to the Thurium issue (C 116) mentioned directly above: Apollo’s obverse head is die-paired with a figure of Artemis holding a torch and arrow; a star is located above the goddess and the legend Brettion features on the right side of the coin (C 117). The goddess also appears carrying a torch on the reverse of a late third century coin, on the obverse of which is a profile head of Apollo, from Petelia (C 120). Later still, Artemis holds a bow and a torch and is accompanied by a dog on a second century series from Rhegion (C 127). A number of third century issues from the region, predominantly from Rhegion, feature a profile head of Artemis with a running dog (C 119), a lyre (C 122), Asklepios holding a bird (C 123), a lion (C 124) and Apollo seated on the omphalos (C 126) while one series presents the jugate heads of Apollo and Artemis die-paired with a tripod (C 125) which is possibly a forerunner of the series from Kentoripa (C S4).

The most immediate observation regarding the hellenistic coinage from Sicily and Southern Italy is the increased frequency of Artemis among the work of die-engravers when compared with the earlier periods. There are also two gold issues in the hellenistic period: one from Etruria (C 11) and one from Syracuse (C S24). The Syracusan coins from this period are particularly interesting when compared to the otherwise hellenistic bronze Sicilian record in the catalogue. The hellenistic Syracusans mint a mix of bronze (C S23, 27), electrum (C S21), silver (C S22, 25-6) and gold (C S24) issues featuring Artemis. The Syracusans’ coinage was therefore circulating more widely than that of the other Sicilian poleis and it clearly boasted of Artemis’ importance in the polis. Similarly, the hellenistic coinage of Southern Italy is largely bronze. As we have already noted the one Italian gold issue featuring Artemis was minted outwith our geographical remit (C 11) and there are only two silver issues to note: the Neapolitan coin featuring Artemis as a symbol and the issue minted by the Brettii featuring a reverse figure of the goddess (C 117).

In the archaic and classical periods we noted the influence of Syracusan coinage on Sicilian and Bruttian coins depicting Artemis. This trend continues, in Sicily at least, with the issues from Akragas (C S1) and Leontini (C S7). In addition Artemis’ epithet, Soteira, continues to
appear on Syracusan coins (C S21, S23, S26). The fact that this epithet only appears on Syracusan coinage suggests it is a local cult title commemorating the Syracusans' military victories noted above. No further epithet of Artemis is recorded on coins from either Sicily or Southern Italy. The association of Artemis with lunar symbols also continues: the goddess appears with stars (C I4, I17) and crescents (C I9) which further support the possibility of a cultic association with the moon. Finally the connection between Bruttian numismatic representations of Artemis and those of Sicily continues; the figure of the standing huntress was minted on coins from both sides of the straits of Messina (C S8, S11, I16, I17).

Hellenistic developments in the numismatic iconography and associations of Artemis include a peculiarly Syracusan trend of die-pairing the goddess, her appearance as a symbol and a reverse type of a standing Artemis. The mint at Syracuse produced a number of coins die-pairing Artemis with other gods, or symbols representative of their cults. Zeus' thunderbolt (C S23-4), Athena's owl (C S25), Apollo (C S21, S27) and Nike (C S24) all feature as the reverse type to her obverse profile head while one series die-pairs a standing Artemis with an obverse profile head of Athena (C S26). Elsewhere Artemis is rarely associated with major gods other than Apollo; single examples exist from Tauromenium (Dionysos: C S28), Capua (Zeus: C I4) and Rhegion (Asklepios: C I27). These Syracusan series attest to Artemis' importance as a local goddess and her status within the polis' pantheon.

The inclusion of the goddess as a symbol on the coins of Neapolis (C I5) and the late classical Metapontion issue of c.330 (C I11) recalls contemporary coinage from elsewhere in the Greek world (C O1-2). The choice of Artemis as a symbol to represent either state approval or a particular die-engraver, or mint, betrays some partiality for the goddess which, in turn, suggests some local cult. Both examples of Artemis as a symbol depict the goddess carrying one or two torches. The addition of torches to the goddess' iconography is a numismatic development of the late classical and hellenistic periods. Other examples usually occur with a standing reverse type of Artemis, sometimes with just a torch (C I20) but more frequently with an attribute indicative of her status as a hunting goddess: a dog (C S8, I16-7, I27), a stag (C S11), spears (C I16), an arrow (C I17), a bow (C I27) and in one instance a star (C I17). On the series from Larinum (C I2) Artemis is die-matched with a reverse hound, above which is a torch. One later Syracusan series alone represents a standing reverse type of Artemis without a torch (C S26). The torch therefore appears to be
most popular as an additional attribute of Artemis in her guise as a hunting goddess (cf. chapter 3.2.1).

The standing reverse type of Artemis the huntress is a new development in the hellenistic period; apart from the inclusion of the torch the type is reminiscent of vase painting and could represent contemporary statues.\textsuperscript{21} The reverse type of Artemis as a standing huntress does appear elsewhere in the Greek world (for example, \textit{SNG Lockett} 1076, 1133), but its frequency on hellenistic Sicilian and Southern Italian coinage, in particular on either side of the straits of Messina, is remarkable and suggests the popularity of her cult, as Agrotera, in this region. Outwith the continuing notable trends and hellenistic developments, Artemis appears as an obverse profile head die-matched as we would expect with types appropriate to the hunting goddess: a boar (C S1, I3, I14), a bow and quiver (C S2, I10) and a hound (C II, I2, I19), as well as with reverse types of Apollo or his attributes (C S3, S4, S9, S27, I15-17, I20, I22, I26).

\textsuperscript{21} For the reproduction of archaic and classical statues on Greek coinage see Lacroix (1949).
Chapter 6

Artemis cult in Southern Italy and Sicily

In my introduction I stated that my intention was to review the cult of Artemis within the clear geographical and chronological frameworks of Southern Italy and Sicily in the archaic and classical periods. I adopted this approach as a contrast to more general reviews of the goddess which compile evidence from a variety of sites and periods and result in a portrait of the goddess with no basis in socio-historic realities. In this concluding chapter I shall first note some broad general observations about the cult of Artemis in Sicily and Southern Italy. Next, I shall identify the key cults of Agrotera and Soteira and then the themes of Artemis' role in war, the hunt and her relationship with *parthenoi*. I shall then consider Artemis' relationship with other deities in Sicily and Southern Italy. Finally I shall consider these cults, themes and relationships against the conventional view of the goddess in modern scholarship.

6.1 Sicily and Southern Italy

The reason why I restricted my survey to Southern Italy and Sicily was because I considered a survey of the whole of the Greek west too diverse and fractured for a study of this kind. My initial rationale had been based on geographical proximity and clear instances of association and interaction such as the Syracusans' role in the battle of Kyme against the Etruscans in 474 (Diod. Sic. 11.51.1-2) and the close political relationship of Zankle-Messana and Rhegion across the straits of Messina manifested in coinage (Rutter 1997, 4). However, what we have discovered throughout this thesis is the independence of cult in the two regions given their separate socio-historic circumstances.

It is immediately clear that, in respect of Sicily, the evidence from Syracuse frequently dominates the discussion: two odes, four cults within the *polis*, the vast majority of attested Sicilian epithets and a dominant coin type which alludes to her cult. Only one of the 44 exported vases recorded in the vase-painting catalogue was discovered in Syracuse while only one of the locally manufactured vases was discovered there. However, there are only two Sicilian manufactured vases in the whole catalogue and the Sicilian Artemis Group terracottas, which originated in Syracuse, make up for the dearth of ceramic evidence. The evidence as a whole reveals several different aspects to Artemis cult in Syracuse, but her
earliest role is probably as goddess of Ortygia, a cult established soon after the Corinthians arrived in 734. Subsequent conflict, or threatened conflict, with the Athenians and Carthaginians stimulated the production of the Artemis Group terracottas and the addition of the goddess' epithet to the polis' coinage. Artemis is invoked as Soteira; the Syracusans' actions were both pious and propagandistic celebrations of their strength (cf. Giudice 1999, 274-5, 280) since both terracottas and coins were created for circulation.

Not only does the Syracusan evidence dominate the discussion, but it appears to have influenced the goddess' cult elsewhere on the island; for example the design of Morgantina's coinage and the spread of the Artemis Group terracottas. However, in other poleis, cults of Artemis developed without any influence from Syracuse. Selinus, for example, worshipped the goddess alongside Apollo with their relationship echoed in their 'twin' temples, the architectural sculpture and fifth-century coinage. The catalyst for the goddess' popularity may well have been the Selinuntines' desire to stress their Greek heritage, after supporting the Carthaginians in the Battle of Himera in 480, by instituting cults of their Peloponnesian mother-city.

There is a more disparate view of Artemis cult in Southern Italy; no polis or region dominates the discussion in the same way as Syracuse does for Sicily. However, Artemis cult does, at least, feature across the surviving media associated with the Lucanian polis of Metapontion. Bacchylides' eleventh ode is pivotal since it describes a sanctuary of Artemis on the Kasas which has been identified with the small sanctuary at S. Biagio. The figurines discovered at the site seem to show an iconographical transition from the Potnia Theron into Artemis of the Olympian pantheon, while Artemis features as a symbol on late classical coinage. The anomaly in the corpus of evidence is again the ceramic ware: only three of the 134 exported vases featuring Artemis discovered in Southern Italy were found in Metapontion.

The sanctuary at S. Biagio was in use before the Greeks colonised the area; the series of figurines of the Potnia Theron type date from the early archaic period. However, the promotion of the cult by Bacchylides in his eleventh ode may have been influenced by the construction of a new temple, Temple D in the Metapontine agora, which may also have been dedicated to Artemis. The Metapontine cult does not appear to have influenced other Southern Italian cults of Artemis. In neighbouring Apulia there was no standard terracotta representation of the goddess, despite the large number of mythological scenes involving the
goddess on Apulian ceramics, until the development of the Artemis Bendis type which was probably heavily influenced by Athenians among the colonists of Thurii, established in 444.

While it has been interesting to note the sites for which there is a range of evidence across the various media compiled in the catalogues, I shall now turn to the main issue which concerns me: the trends which are attested by more than one medium and site. As we have just noted, Southern Italy and Sicily are responding to differing socio-historical events and conflicts. However trends do occur, not least because the groups of people we are following are all part of the move to the west and therefore experienced a similar transition. While the groups of colonists leave the mainland separately they do experience a shared reaction to the colonising movement which can impact their approach to cult. There are, for example, three instances of myths around Artemis’ cult in Southern Italy and Sicily concerned with the transportation of the cult to the Greek west: at Syracuse, Zankle-Messana and Metapontion. The value of this tradition is more significant to the generation which recorded it than the generation to which it refers; a caution again about properly contextualising the themes which we shall note below. The trends which I shall highlight below have all been discussed in the preceding chapters; it is not my intention to re-present all of the evidence but rather to consider the trend across all the media and its significance to our study.

6.2 Agrotera and Soteira

I shall start with the cults of Artemis Agrotera and Artemis Soteira. Both epithets represent a local diffraction of the goddess’ character and are also known from elsewhere in the Greek world. Artemis is Agrotera in Syracuse and at Torricella in the Tarentine chora, while Bacchylides invokes the goddess as Agrotera in his ode for Alexidamos of Metapontion. Little is known about the context of this cult in Syracuse, but at Torricella it was a chora cult and could have been related to skirmishes with the indigenous population. The cult of Artemis at S. Biagio may also have been dedicated to Artemis Agrotera after the cult at Achaian Aigeira; the dedications at the site certainly recall the nature of Artemis as a goddess of the wild.

Artemis Soteira is attested in Syracuse with the full version of the epithet first appearing alongside the goddess on coin series of the hellenistic period. However, I have also argued that the So which appears on Kimon’s type of c.405 is an abbreviation of Artemis’ epithet. This Syracusan cult could be associated with the Syracusans’ resistance to both the
Athenians and the Carthaginians at the end of the fifth century; the Artemis Group terracottas represent a manifestation of the promotion of the goddess’ cult in response to these successes. Moreover, it could allude to the Arethousa myth and Artemis’ role as the rescuer of Arethousa, though our literary sources for this tradition are Roman. It is possible that the epithet Soteira attested at Akragas was associated with Artemis. Moreover, in Southern Italy a Doric inscription to Artemis Soteira was discovered at Hekaleia and it has been suggested that the goddess served some asylia function at the site. This is a further manifestation of her role as a goddess of boundaries, physical and metaphorical.

6.3 Artemis and war

These two epithets, Agrotera and Soteira, are associated here and elsewhere in the Greek world, although not exclusively, with Artemis’ role as a goddess associated with warfare. The Spartans sacrificed to Artemis Agrotera before battle and the Spartan colony at Taras worshipped Artemis Agratera on the boundary of their chora. We have already noted above the propagandistic value of the Syracusan coin series featuring So and later Artemis Soteira, as well as the Artemis Group terracottas in the face of their prowess against the Athenians and Carthaginians. Indeed several of the later coins featuring Artemis were minted by groups of mercenaries, for example the Brettii, but the epithet for the goddess is unknown.

6.4 Artemis and the hunt

The epithet Agrotera is regularly associated with Artemis in her guise as goddess of the hunt, perhaps her most common and widespread manifestation. Pindar and Bacchylides both recall this aspect of the goddess: Artemis is the virgin archeress (Pind. Pyth. 2.9), the huntress of animals (Bacchyl. 11.107) and the goddess who sends a ferocious boar to ravage Calydon (Bacchyl. 5. 97-154). Several of the goddess’ cult sites are located in the chora, for example S. Biagio at Metapontion, while a rustic komos is attested in honour of Artemis Lyaia at Syracuse. The Artemis Group terracottas discovered at the Syracusans’ temene of Scala Greca and Belvedere as well as elsewhere on Sicily depict Artemis as the goddess of the wild with hunting tools and animals. This iconography of the goddess is also found on imported and locally manufactured vases and is employed in the depiction of Artemis Bendis, whom we shall consider below. On occasion a torch is carried by Artemis as goddess of the hunt and is even used as a weapon. Scenes of Artemis’ hunting mythology appear in the iconographical record; the death of Aktaion, sometimes with his
transformation, is popular in a variety of media. The death of Hippolytos is also popular among Apulian vase-painters, probably as a result of the influence of drama. On coinage Artemis can appear with the tip of her quiver showing at the back of her neck: the tools of the hunt aid in the identification of the goddess while a standing huntress type starts in the hellenistic period.

6.5 Artemis and animals

The complexity of the inherent duality of a hunting divinity has already been remarked upon in this thesis. It is apparent in the scenes where Artemis appears, dressed as a huntress, in a non-threatening context with animals. On vases, imported and locally manufactured, Artemis is regularly accompanied by hounds or deer. In the coroplastic record Artemis appears with dogs, deer, panthers and lions and cradles a goat in the figurines from S. Biagio or sometimes it rides on her shoulder, while a deer is incorporated into the iconography of the figurines from Taras and the Artemis Bendis types. The dual conflict of her role as protectress and destroyer is clear in these Artemis Bendis figurines since in her other hand she wields a spear. These figurines were the dominant representation of the goddess in late classical Southern Italy, having been inspired by the arrival of Athenians and their cult of Bendis/Artemis Bendis in Thurii in 444.

Artemis also appears driving a chariot or riding an animal: the relationship is non-threatening but her control over the animal domain is clear. In Pindar Artemis is the horse-driving daughter of Leto (Pind. Ol. 3.26) and one of a trio of divinities who helps Hieron control his horses (Pind. Pyth. 2.9-12). Artemis appears mounting or driving chariots in Athenian vase-painting and probably on two metopes from Selinus; in addition Artemis drives a chariot accompanied by Apollo on a Selinuntine coin series of the mid-fifth century which may be intended to illustrate the arrival of Apollo Agraios and Artemis Agrotera from Megara as the Selinuntines assert their Hellenic heritage. The chariot imagery itself has nuptial and funerary significance; it continues on Apulian vases with one change: the horses which drew the chariot in earlier iconography are now replaced by deer. The transition from horses to deer is also marked in the literary record as we noted earlier by comparing the Homeric Hymn to Artemis (27) with Kallimachos’ later hymn. There are also representations of Artemis actually riding a horse (on a Capuan antefix) and a deer (on a Sorrentine statue and a Geloan terracotta). These scenes underscore the immediacy of the goddess’ relationship with the animal and her control over it. Essentially these images represent an evolution of
the goddess’ role as Potnia Theron, or indeed Potnia Hippon: the goddess no longer physically (and symmetrically) grasps the animals but they physically touch her and submit to her power.

6.6 Artemis and parthenoi

The images of Artemis riding animals may allude to the goddess’ control of parthenoi who can be referred to as ‘fillies’ in the ancient sources. Indeed young women, parthenoi, are considered liminal and are often identified with animals, perhaps most famously as the bears at Brauron (Ar. Lys. 645). The myth of Taygete in Pindar’s third Olympian ode alludes to this idea and even the Proitids in Bacchylides’ eleventh ode discussed above are imagined as wild animals roaming the chora (55-6). Artemis restores sanity to the Proitids, mythological parthenoi, in Bacchylides’ ode. The goddess’ role is also emphasised by the exclusion of Melampous, the seer, who appears in other contemporary traditions. In thanks the Proitids institute choruses of women in the goddess’ honour at Lousoi while a chorus of young men perform for Alexidamos’ victory, and presumably the goddess, in Metapontion. The metamorphosis of parthenoi, reflecting their wildness or their resistance to the inevitability of adult sexual relations with men, may also be part of Artemis’ cult in Syracuse through the myth of Alpheios and Arethousa referenced in Pindar’s Nemean 1.1. The goddess was also worshipped as Artemis Chitone at Syracuse, recalling the dedication of clothes to Artemis known from elsewhere in the Greek world (Linders 1972), while at Tyndaris parthenoi made dedications to Artemis Eupraxia.

The iconographic scheme of Artemis with an altar and palm tree, alluding to her role as a goddess of parthenoi on Athenian vases, has already been noted by Sourvinou-Inwood (1991, 99-143). Artemis features as a goddess of parthenoi on locally manufactured vases, regularly appearing in an upper register above mythological parthenoi, for example the daughters of Anios, Melanippe and Persephone. Representations of cult-sites of Artemis often show parthenoi; especially interesting is the early hellenistic naiskos relief from Taras of females fleeing from a warrior. Artemis is responsible for the death of parthenoi, sometimes acting with Apollo, who dispatches males with equal ease. The myth of Koronis is recalled by Pindar in his third Pythian ode (8-46) while the divine twins jointly avenge their mother in vase-painting scenes of the Niobids and probably on the metopes from the Heraion at Foce del Sele. Representations of Artemis’ own mythology noted above include Kallisto, the Proitids and Iphigenia; all of whom are all mythological parthenoi. Similarly,
two of the three myths with male protagonists, those of Hippolytos and Aktaion, emphasise the goddess’ own status as a *parthenos*.

### 6.7 Artemis and other deities

Now that we have noted the key cults (Agrotera, Soteira) and themes (military, hunting, animals and *parthenoi*) which have been identified by this study, it is time to consider Artemis’ relationship with other deities and mythological figures in the Southern Italian and Sicilian pantheons. There is a distinction to be made between those with whom Artemis overlaps, or to whom she is partly assimilated, and those with whom she appears regularly. In the first category we shall consider Hekate, Selene/Luna, Bendis and Diana. Artemis and Hekate are regularly blurred in the iconographical record in both Southern Italy and Sicily and the wider Greek world; they share a common attribute in the torch. However, they also can appear as two separate divinities on some vases: this blurring, or assimilation, is not total. Another blurring known from elsewhere in the Greek world is that of Artemis with Selene; Artemis incorporates stars and crescents into her iconography on vases and coins from Southern Italy and Sicily as an indication of this association. Indeed the Sicilian coins constitute some of the earliest evidence for the association of Artemis with Selene, while the hellenistic Capuan coins even depict Artemis in a chariot like Selene. Solely in Southern Italy, Artemis is assimilated with two further figures. At Capua an antefix of the mid-sixth century depicts the local goddess Diana Tifatina incorporating some of Artemis’ iconography; the sanctuary is later attributed to Artemis. Artemis’ standard coroplastic representation in mid to late classical Apulia is the Artemis Bendis type which also appears in akroteria and Apulian vase-painting; the figurines are a clear way of differentiating Artemis from other female divinities and mark a revival of her cult.

Artemis is regularly associated with Apollo, and sometimes Leto, in Southern Italy and Sicily. Their sibling relationship is celebrated throughout the Greek world. Apollo, as the god of colonisation, is regularly the mainstay and Artemis with Leto acts as his companion. Pindar recounts the myth of Koronis in his third *Pythian* ode (8-46) for Hieron of Syracuse. As Artemis avenges her brother in Pindar so the twin gods avenge or protect their mother in several locally manufactured vase-painting scenes and the metopes from the Heraion at Foce del Sele. Calmer scenes are depicted on the archaic metopes from Selinus; on one of which the siblings are joined by Leto. Similarly they appear riding together in a chariot on a classical coin series from Selinus while they are also die-matched on a hellenistic coin series.
from Syracuse. The images recorded in the vase-painting catalogue more regularly portray Artemis with Apollo than without him. The majority of these are non-narrative scenes; on Athenian vases the Delian triad appear as part of the Peisistratids’ political agenda while the Apulian tradition includes them together in an upper register watching the action below like spectators at a play.

In terms of shared cult the twin temples on the Selinuntine akropolis were probably dedicated to Artemis and Apollo. There was also a tradition linking the cults of Artemis and Apollo on either side of the straits of Messina. However, there is no clear evidence for their joint worship in a temenos in either Sicily or Southern Italy. In direct contrast there are four sites at which Artemis appears to have received cult with Demeter and/or Persephone: Syracuse, at Achradina and Belvedere, Herakleia and S. Maria di Anglona. Artemis was famously revered in the Eleusinian sanctuary as Artemis Propylaea. The dedications to Artemis at Herakleia and S. Maria di Anglona were found at the entrance to the temenos suggesting a similar function: Artemis seems to act as a goddess of passage at these sites. It is not clear whether Artemis served this function in Syracuse; at Achradina she was worshipped as Pheraia, suggesting a chthonian connection, while the epithet from Belvedere is unknown. Angelos or Angelike and Eleusinia are attested epithets of the goddess in Syracuse and suggest a sustained association with Demeter and Persephone here. Elsewhere Artemis and Athena may stand in front of Persephone on a sixth-century metope from Selinus recalling the Homeric Hymn to Demeter in which Artemis was one of Persephone’s companions at the time of the rape by Hades. Finally it appears that Artemis shared a temenos with Zeus Aglaios at S. Biagio in the Metapontine chora. The association is apparently unique and probably related to local clan connections; the die-matching of Artemis with Zeus’ thunderbolt on Syracusan coinage simply represents the promotion of two important but separate cults of the polis.

6.8 Modern scholarship

It remains for us to compare these key cults, themes and assimilations and associations with the conventional view of Artemis in modern scholarship, much of which has been constructed using evidence from a variety of periods and geographies. I must clarify that it has not been my intention to review critically every piece written on Artemis, but rather to assess the picture we have observed against general perceptions. General works on the goddess have referred to her relationship with the Potnia Theron, her role as leader of the

The image we have drawn of Artemis in Southern Italy and Sicily is not vastly different from that which is presented in modern scholarship. The goddess is associated with the Potnia Theron, or a Potnia Theron type figure, at S. Biagio; the incorporation of the goat into the iconographic design possibly reflects the influence of Achaian colonists. Artemis continues to be associated with animals and the images of the goddess driving her chariot, and in particular riding, from both Southern Italy and Sicily are clear indications of her control over the animal kingdom. The standard characterisation of Artemis as the goddess of the hunt is expected and the cults which appear to invoke Artemis in a military capacity reflect the uncertainty and conflict in the Greeks' new environment. The epithets associated with Artemis as a goddess of the hunt and of war, Agrotera and Soteira, are known in both contexts from elsewhere in the Greek world (Ellinger 1984, 56-61; Brulotte 1994, 182). The worship of Artemis in Syracuse, which is remarkably well attested across the various media reviewed in this thesis as well as the promotion of her cult resemble the Athenians' use of her cult earlier in the fifth century. Essentially the Athenian and Carthaginian threats had, for Syracuse, the same effect as the Persian threat to Athens. Moreover, the promotion of the goddess' cult, which was celebrated on Ortygia as well as at least three other sites in the Syracusan polis, challenges the view that Artemis' role as a city goddess was a purely East Greek phenomenon (cf. Dowden 2007, 51-2). Athenian influence, via Thurii, appears to have stimulated the production of the Artemis Bendis figurines which dominate the Apulian and Lucanian iconographical record for our goddess in the late classical period. We have already noted the association of Artemis with parthenoi in Southern Italy and Sicily as a
common aspect of the goddess in modern scholarship; there is no specific evidence for Artemis’ role as a goddess of childbirth although this could be inferred from her general role as a goddess of parthenoi. Bacchylides’ eleventh ode may allude to the goddess’ concern for male youths which is attested elsewhere in the Greek world (Calame 2001, 141-74).

Finally the association of Artemis with Apollo in our study is not unusual. However, it is interesting to note the different stimuli for this association. The imported vases of the Delian triad were the product of Athenian propaganda. In contrast the archaic metopes and classical coin featuring the triad, or just Artemis and Apollo, from Selinus and Foce del Sele were erected on buildings on the edges of the new Greek lands of Southern Italy and Sicily. The images represent the gods arriving or in a show of strength against transgressors. Apollo is the god of colonisation legitimising the Greeks presence and Artemis the goddess of boundaries; together they will defend and support the colonists. This is just one further example of the importance of consolidating and analysing the evidence to facilitate an understanding of the individual reasons behind the adoption and promotion of Artemis cult in Southern Italy and Sicily in the archaic and classical periods.
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APPENDIX 1: Archaeology catalogue

Introduction

This archaeology catalogue is split into three sections. There are two catalogues of sites: one for Sicily and one for Southern Italy. Each entry includes a brief description of the evidence and a short bibliography. The bibliography refers to the evidence for the site; references for the interpretation of the evidence will be included and considered in chapter 2. The entries are ordered alphabetically; for Sicily by site, and for Italy by region. The third section of this catalogue is a table of epithets.

The figures listed below can be found at the back of the catalogue.

Fig. 2.1 Map of Sicily (Rutter 1997, fig. 2)
Fig. 2.2 Plan of Temples A and O, Selinus (De Angelis 2003, fig. 44)
Fig. 2.3 Plan of Syracuse (Loicq-Berger 1967, pl. 21)
Fig. 2.4 Plan of Syracuse: Ortygia and Acradina (Loicq-Berger 1967, pl. 21)
Fig. 2.5 Plan of Syracuse: Scala Greca and Belvedere (Loicq-Berger 1967, pl. 21)
Fig. 2.6 Inscriptions from Akragas (Manganaro 1992, fig. 1-2)
Fig. 2.7 Map of Italy (Rutter 1997, fig. 1)
Fig. 2.8 Aerial view of Capua (Frederiksen 1984, pl. 6)
Fig. 2.9 Tarentine chora (Burgers 1998, fig. 99)
Fig. 2.10 Inscription from Herakleia (Lo Porto 1961, fig. 14)
Fig. 2.11 Plan of Siris-Herakleia and territory (Edlund 1987, fig. 12)
Fig. 2.12 Map of extramural sanctuaries in the Metapontion chora (Carter 1994, ill. 7.1)
Fig. 2.13 Plan of the ancient road from Arkadia to Aigion (Petropoulos 2002, fig. 14)
Fig. 2.14 Urban sanctuary, Metaponto (Carter 2006, fig. 5.2)
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Catalogue of sites

Sicily

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Cefalu</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography  BTCGI 5.212; Marconi (1929)

The so-called 'temple of Diana' on the mountain at Cefalu is near a natural water supply and cistern. The current architectural remains date to the hellenistic and Roman periods. However, the use of the site may pre-date these remains. The religious function of the site and its attribution to Diana are uncertain.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Selinus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography  Tusa (1967); Bejor (1977)

Temples A and O on the Selinuntine akropolis may have been dedicated to Apollo and Artemis. The temples are virtually identical in design and date to the first half of the fifth century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Syracuse, Ortygia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Various; see table of epithets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography  BTCGI 19.151-64; Gentili (1967); Voza (1999)

The foundations of two structures on Ortygia have been proposed as a temple of Artemis. Gentili (1967) identified the remains of a sixth century Ionic temple, under the Senate Palace, as sacred to Artemis. The temple was never completed; its construction may have been abandoned in favour of the adjacent Athenaion. The other possibility, proposed by Voza (1999), are the foundations of a building discovered under Piazza Duomo. Stone foundations of a temple, c.16.2 x 10.5m, dating to the later seventh century or early sixth century were constructed over a building from the end of eighth century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Syracuse, Scala Greca</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Various; see table of epithets</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bibliography  Orsi (1900)

Orsi (1900) discovered evidence of cultic activity in two of the caves at Scala Greca. The caves were alongside the main road north out of Syracuse at the site of the later Hexapylon gate. The predominance of late classical figurines of Artemis discovered at the site influenced Orsi's attribution of the site to Artemis.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Syracuse, Belvedere</th>
<th>Figs. 2.3, 2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Various; see table of epithets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliography**  Orsi (1915)

A small rural shrine and votive deposit were identified following a land survey. Orsi (1915) subsequently investigated the site and excavated the small votive deposit (3x4m. and 0.7m. deep) in 1912-13. Fragments of several hundred figurines of the same late classical types of Artemis found at Scala Greca and of Persephone were discovered.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Syracuse, Piazza della Vittoria</th>
<th>Figs. 2.3, 2.4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Pheraia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliography**  BTCGI 19.167-8; Voza (1968-9)

In the ancient Achradina district of Syracuse, modern Piazza della Vittoria, there was an important sanctuary of Demeter and Persephone (Diod. Sic. 11.26.7, 14.70.4). A votive deposit associated with the sanctuary included figurines of Demeter, Persephone and Artemis. A fourth century dedication to Artemis Pheraia has been discovered at the site.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Zankle-Messana</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Phakelitis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bibliography**  App. B Civ. 5.116; Dio Cass. 48.8.1, 3; BTCGI 10.116, 134

An Artemision is mentioned in the accounts of Octavian’s victory in 36 B.C. Later Roman authors refer to a cult of Diana Facelina. The sanctuary has not been identified; it may have been located in the territory of Mylai.
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Italy

| Region | Campania |
| Site | Capua, Tifata mountain |
| Epithet | (Diana) Tifatina |

Bibliography

Paus. 5.12.3; BTCGI 4.457; Petersen (1919, 322-8); Edlund (1987, 47-8)

The sanctuary of Diana Tifata (or Tifatina) was located on the slopes of mount Tifata in a wooded area with springs; there was a lake below the site. Architectural remains date to the fourth century although sixth century tiles suggest an earlier edifice. An antefix of Diana, carrying Artemis’ bow, is associated with the sanctuary although it was discovered in the sanctuary at Fondo Patturelli just outside the walls of Capua. Pausanias (5.12.3) associates the sanctuary with Artemis, not Diana.

| Region | Apulia |
| Site | Torricella |
| Epithet | Agratera |

Bibliography

SEG 38, 1015; Lo Porto (1987, 46-50); Lippolis, Garraffo, Nafissi (1995, 87)

An archaic or early classical inscription to Artamitos Agratera was found among the remains of a late Roman villa at Torricella. There is evidence for an archaic sanctuary beneath the villa.

| Region | Apulia |
| Site | Maruggio |
| Epithet | Unknown |

Bibliography

Lippolis, Garraffo, Nafissi (1995, 88)

A cult site has been identified on a small promontory at Campomarino, 5km from Torricella. The figurines found at the site are almost exclusively of the Artemis Bendis type. A few architectural remains and ceramic finds date to the fourth century and hellenistic period. The excavation report has not been fully published.

| Region | Lucania |
| Site | Herakleia |
| Epithet | Soteira |

Bibliography

BTCGI 7.205; Lo Porto (1961, 138)

On the south slope of the hill, upon which Herakleia was founded, a sanctuary of Demeter which dates back to the archaic period has been excavated. The votive deposit associated with the sanctuary has produced figurines of the Artemis Bendis type and an inscription:
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Artamiti Soterai. The figurines have been dated to the fourth and third centuries, and the inscription dates to the third century.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Lucania</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Santa Maria d'Anglona</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>Rüdiger (1967); Osanna (1992, 109-10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A votive deposit with figurines of Demeter and Artemis Bendis, dating from the fourth to third centuries, was found at the entrance to a small sanctuary of Demeter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Lucania</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>S. Biagio della Venella</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Agroté? Hemera?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>Bacchyl. 11.117-20; BTCGI 17.263-7; Adamesteanu (1974, 55-65); Osanna (1992, 48-52)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remains of a sanctuary at S. Biagio della Venella have been identified with the grove of Artemis described in Bacchylides eleventh epinikian. The site is established around a spring which was channelled into a basin; a number of vessels to carry and store water have been discovered. The first temple dates to the seventh century; the temenos underwent significant renovations in the fifth century. A number of figurines of a Potnia Theron type have been found at the sanctuary; the first dedications date to the seventh century. An inscription discovered nearby suggests that Artemis was worshipped here with Zeus Aglaios.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Lucania</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Metapontion, urban temenos, Temple D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>BTCGI 9.79; Adamesteanu, Mertens, De Siena (1975)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An Ionic temple, which was built in the early fifth century and is known as Temple D (15.7m. x 39.26 m.), in the urban temenos at Metapontion may have been dedicated to Artemis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Bruttium</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Rhegion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Epithet</td>
<td>Phakelitís?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>Thuc. 6.44.3; BTCGI 16.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Thucydides records the Athenians camping in a sanctuary of Artemis just outside the walls of Rhegion in 415. The identification of the sanctuary is uncertain.
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Table of epithets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Sicily</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agrotera</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Schol. Hom. II. 21.471b; CRESCAM, no. 1101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alpheioa</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Schol. Pind. Nem. 1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angelos-Angelike</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Heschy. s.v. angelos ; Ath. 14.27 (Angelike); CRESCAM, no. 1140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chitone</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Ath. 14.629e; Steph. Byz. s.v. chitone; CRESCAM, no. 1389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleusinia</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Heschy. s.v. eleusinia; CRESCAM, no. 1228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eleuthias</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Manganaro (1992, fig.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eupraxia</td>
<td>Tyndaris</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>IG 14, 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyaia</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Diam. 3 p.486 Keil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meroessa</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Steph. Byz. s.v. ‘Meroessa’; CRESCAM, no. 1494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phakelitis</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>North-east Sicily</td>
<td>Vib. Seq. de font. s.v. Phacelinus; Lucil. 3.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Facelina</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>(Mylai or Tyndaris)</td>
<td>(Facelina); Silio Italico 14.260 (Facelina)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Diana Facelitis)</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Prob. Verg. Ecl. præf., p.325 Hagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheraia</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>G. Voza (1968-9, 363); CRESCAM, no. 1584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potamia</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Pind. Pyth. 2.7; CRESCAM, no. 1604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So(teira)</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Coin catalogue (C S20-21, 23, 26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Southern Italy</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agratera</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Taras</td>
<td>SEG 38, 1015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agrotera</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Bacchyl. 11.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemera</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Bacchyl. 11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korythalia</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Heschy. s.v. kurittoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phakelitis</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Rhegion</td>
<td>Pomp. Sab., Schol. in Theocr. proleg., ad Aen., 2, 117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Diana Fascelitis)</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Herakleia</td>
<td>Lo Porto (1961, 138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soteira</td>
<td>Southern Italy</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>CIL 10. 3795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Fig. 2.3
Fig. 2.12
APPENDIX 2: Iconography Catalogue - vase painting

The vases in this catalogue are decorated with either an image of Artemis or a scene or character from a myth commonly associated with the goddess. The vases are presented in three groups: vases manufactured in Attica and exported to Sicily (VP S), vases manufactured in Attica and exported to Italy (VP I), and vases manufactured in Sicily or Italy (VP L). Two analyses, one by vase shape and one by scene, are located at the back of the catalogue.

The following abbreviations are used:
CVA - Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum
LIMC - (1981-) Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicæ Zürich and Munich: Artemis
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>CVA Vase No./Mus or pub. ref.</th>
<th>Vase Shape</th>
<th>Technique Date</th>
<th>Provenance 1</th>
<th>Provenance 2</th>
<th>Provenance 3</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th>Detailed description, after CVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP S1</td>
<td>213566</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Akanthos</td>
<td>Apollo with bow and quiver, Artemis, Marsyas, idas, with bow and quiver, Hermes, draped men, one with staff (?) (NB: there’s also a deer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S2</td>
<td>206344</td>
<td>Pyxide</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo with laurel and Marsyas with kithara seated on rocks, Artemis with kithara, Athena, Aphrodite with fan, karyatides and quiver suspended, tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S3</td>
<td>215662</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Kamenna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo with lyre and phiale, Artemis with oinochoe, quiver and bow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S4</td>
<td>206360</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo with lyre and phiale, Artemis with oinochoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S5</td>
<td>207631</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo with lyre and phiale, Artemis with oinochoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S6</td>
<td>207339</td>
<td>Pelleke</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo with kithara and phiale, at altar, Artemis with oinochoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S7</td>
<td>215308</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
<td>Apollo with laurel staff on griffin, Artemis, Leto seated, Hermes, spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S8</td>
<td>303017</td>
<td>Amphora, A</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between Artemis and Leto and plants with birds, deer A: Athena pouring chalit, Apollo playing kithara, goddess, Hermes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S9</td>
<td>213661</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
<td>Leto with crown and sceptre, Apollo with kithara and phiale, deer, Ganymede with hoop, stick and phiale, Artemis with quiver, bow and wreath, Hermes with kerykeion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S10</td>
<td>301780</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-520</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Syracuse</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
<td>Apollo with kithara, between women (Artemis and Leto)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S11</td>
<td>207120</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Lisaila, near</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
<td>Apollo with phiale, bow and laurel spring, Artemis with oinochoe and lyre, Leto with wreath, column, bird (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S12</td>
<td>302187</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>555-560</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto?</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between Leto and Artemis(?) with branches and flower, deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S13</td>
<td>165164</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Megara Hyblaea</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto?</td>
<td>Apollo (?) with lyre between women, seated, deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S14</td>
<td>184620</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
<td>Apollo (?) with laurel, woman, seated on rock, holding necklace, Hermes, plant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S15</td>
<td>317288</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Apollo with lyre, Artemis with wreath (?), both seated on stools, deer, palm tree, column</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S16</td>
<td>220226</td>
<td>Amphora, B</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Man (Apollo?) with lyre and woman with pipes (Artemis?) at altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S17</td>
<td>207404</td>
<td>Pelleke</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Apollo with kithara and phiale, Iris or Nike (winged woman) with kerykeion and oinochoe, deer B: Nike (winged woman) with torches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S18</td>
<td>214521</td>
<td>Pelleke</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Apollo seated, woman (goddess)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S19</td>
<td>282900</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Montele lato</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Anios (Apollo?)? with laurel, Artemis with karyatides, Artemis with kithara and goddess (Artemis?), both seated on stools, vine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S20</td>
<td>355568</td>
<td>Hydra</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Apollo and goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S21</td>
<td>306016</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Apollo with kithara and goddess (Artemis?), both seated on stools, vine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S22</td>
<td>208184</td>
<td>Lekythos, squat</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>Artemis running towards altar, quiver suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S23</td>
<td>215840</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding arrow</td>
<td>Artemis with bow, bow suspended, palm tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S24</td>
<td>202979</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
<td>A: Apollo with palm tree, Eros or Club, fallen B: Artemis with bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S25</td>
<td>207949</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
<td>Artemis running to altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S26</td>
<td>201673</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S27</td>
<td>215841</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
<td>Winged Artemis with bow, palm tree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S28</td>
<td>469414</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Sellinus</td>
<td>Maniakulunga</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S29</td>
<td>242861</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela (?)</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow and arrow</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow and arrow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Iconography catalogue - Sicilian provenance, imported vases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Vase Shape</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenance 1</th>
<th>Provenance 2</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th>Detailed description, after CVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP S30</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow and arrow and torch</td>
<td>Artemis with bow, arrows and torch, woman with fillet.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S31</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Kamarina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow and arrow and deer</td>
<td>Artemis in boots and leopard skin with spear, bow suspended, palm tree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S32</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding spears</td>
<td>Goddess (Leto or Artemis?) mounting chariot, Apollo playing kithara, Hermes, woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S33</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis mounting chariot?</td>
<td>Goddess (Leto or Artemis?) mounting chariot, Apollo playing kithara, Hermes, woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S34</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis mounting chariot?</td>
<td>Goddess (Leto or Artemis?) mounting chariot, Apollo playing kithara, Hermes, woman.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S35</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Pezzino</td>
<td>Artemis?</td>
<td>Women, one Artemis(?), chariot, draped man seated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S36</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Vassallaggi</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Herakles and deer</td>
<td>Herakles and deer, Artemis, Apollo (all named)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S37</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Iphigeneia myth</td>
<td>Warrior at altar, leading woman (named Iphigeneia, Eufrates), sacrifice of Iphigeneia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S38</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Akragas</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>A: Struggle for the tripod, Herakles and Apollo B: Woman (Artemis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S39</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>Herakles and Apollo, struggle for the tripod, Hermes, Athena, shield device, tripod, Artemis, goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S40</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>Herakles and Apollo, struggle for the tripod, Hermes, Athena, shield device, tripod, Artemis, goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S41</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Megara Hypbaea</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>Herakles and Apollo, struggle for the tripod, between Athena and Artemis, deer, ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S42</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Selinus</td>
<td>Manicalunga</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>Herakles and Apollo, struggle for the tripod, Athena and Artemis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S43</td>
<td>Krater, fragment</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>540-520</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Leontini</td>
<td>Chalkidean</td>
<td>Artemis in chariot</td>
<td>Artemis and Leto standing in a chariot, both holding reins, Artemis wearing a quiver. The goddesses appear to be part of a procession. Names inscribed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP S44</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Gela</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Hero in a chariot; Hermes; Apollo Kitharaidos; Artemis with a bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>CVA Vase No. /Mum or pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
<td>Fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 10</td>
<td>206874 Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 11</td>
<td>208875 Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 12</td>
<td>207012 Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 13</td>
<td>213883 Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 14</td>
<td>214164 Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 15</td>
<td>215429 Krater, column</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>480-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 16</td>
<td>215689 Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>460-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ruvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 17</td>
<td>215693 Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 18</td>
<td>220383 Peitlo</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>400-300</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>S. Agata de' Gobi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 19</td>
<td>207635 Krater, column</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 20</td>
<td>214854 Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 21</td>
<td>7891 Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Egnatia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 22</td>
<td>45116 Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 23</td>
<td>7866 Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Eretria</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 24</td>
<td>19564 Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Buceo or Pompeii(?)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 25</td>
<td>209174 Amphora, A</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>CVA Vase No./Mus pub. ref.</td>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
<td>Fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 26</td>
<td>206762</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lokroi</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 27</td>
<td>206925</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 28</td>
<td>206988</td>
<td>Peleke</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Boalsena</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 29</td>
<td>207213</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 30</td>
<td>213784</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 31</td>
<td>214590</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 32</td>
<td>215310</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 33</td>
<td>215687</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 34</td>
<td>216209</td>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 35</td>
<td>302143</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between Artemis and Leto and Leto seated on block, deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 36</td>
<td>303016</td>
<td>Amphora, A</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between Artemis and Leto and Leto seated on block, deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 37</td>
<td>901824</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between Artemis and Leto and Leto seated on block, deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 38</td>
<td>320216</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Onioelo</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between goddesses, draped man (god), Hermonisa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 39</td>
<td>320464</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Onioelo</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between goddesses, all seated on stools, ivy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 40</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis(?),? and Leto(?),?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 41</td>
<td>3200</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara between goddesses (Artemis and Leto(?))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 42</td>
<td>7827</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 43</td>
<td>7828</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 44</td>
<td>130793</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 45</td>
<td>130813</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 46</td>
<td>13085</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Veii(?</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 47</td>
<td>130090</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 48</td>
<td>14190</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Boalsena</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 49</td>
<td>319077</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Metapontum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 50</td>
<td>437631</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>VCA Vase No.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
<td>Fabric 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 151</td>
<td>214761</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 152</td>
<td>302910</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 153</td>
<td>306612</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Calus</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 154</td>
<td>361006</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>526-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 155</td>
<td>3610006</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>526-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Tarentum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo between goddesses sealed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 156</td>
<td>8481</td>
<td>Stemless cup</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Siphonum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 157</td>
<td>207148</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 158</td>
<td>216969</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 159</td>
<td>217071</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 160</td>
<td>306000</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>600-550</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Chiusi</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis in chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 161</td>
<td>217127</td>
<td>Cup stemless</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 162</td>
<td>303436</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Tarentum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis or Leto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 163</td>
<td>200052</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Goddess mounting chariot, Apollo playing kithara, Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 164</td>
<td>3169</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>526-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo and goddess</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 165</td>
<td>7897</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo playing kithara, goddess (Artemis?), Hermes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 166</td>
<td>10712</td>
<td>Amphora, B</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 167</td>
<td>10713</td>
<td>Amphora, B</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 168</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 169</td>
<td>15107</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>600-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Peutodri</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 170</td>
<td>24355</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Pompaei</td>
<td>Temple of Apollo</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 171</td>
<td>24795</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Monteisarchio</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 172</td>
<td>201951</td>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 173</td>
<td>205597</td>
<td>Pelike</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nebra, near</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 174</td>
<td>212276</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 175</td>
<td>214517</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>South</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 176</td>
<td>215510</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 177</td>
<td>300030</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>600-550</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Chiusi</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Polyx Theron</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 178</td>
<td>206911</td>
<td>Stemless cup</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lokros</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis with oinochoe and spig, at altar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>CVA Vase No./Mus or pub ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
<td>Fabric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 179</td>
<td>209984</td>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 180</td>
<td>3831</td>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 181</td>
<td>45584</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>425-375</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Gubbio</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 182</td>
<td>218098</td>
<td>Krater, bell</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>400-300</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>S. Agata de' Gotti</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 183</td>
<td>Lecce, Mus. Prot. 565</td>
<td>Lykothos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>490-480</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>Lecce</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 184</td>
<td>206317</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 185</td>
<td>207358</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 186</td>
<td>212474</td>
<td>Pelike</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 187</td>
<td>203163</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding bow and arrow with deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 188</td>
<td>207920</td>
<td>Lykothos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lukanon</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis holding torches</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 189</td>
<td>205738</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis in chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 190</td>
<td>205739</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Lukanon</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis in chariot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 191</td>
<td>301778</td>
<td>Amphora, A</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Chiusi</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis mounting chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 192</td>
<td>301780</td>
<td>Amphora, B</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Fratte</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis mounting chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 193</td>
<td>205739</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis mounting chariot?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 194</td>
<td>302646</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Falernum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis with deer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 195</td>
<td>6094</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 196</td>
<td>14792</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 197</td>
<td>207027</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 198</td>
<td>216851</td>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>480-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 199</td>
<td>351670</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 200</td>
<td>306521</td>
<td>Cup, siana</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>600-550</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 201</td>
<td>310018</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 202</td>
<td>320398</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 203</td>
<td>300009</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>600-550</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Chiusi</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>GVA Vase No.</td>
<td>Mus or pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1104</td>
<td>209566</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1105</td>
<td>207137</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Altamura</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1106</td>
<td>217568</td>
<td></td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>425-375</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Gigantomachy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1107</td>
<td>217584</td>
<td></td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>425-375</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1108</td>
<td>320002</td>
<td>Master band</td>
<td>Cup little</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Bologna</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1109</td>
<td>Athen. Mus. Nat. 569</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>550-500</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis mounting chariot</td>
<td>VP 1110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1111</td>
<td>310342</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1112</td>
<td>218096</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>400-300</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Spina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Igphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1113</td>
<td>239199</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Gravina</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Igphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1114</td>
<td>281729</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Populonia</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Kalisto?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1115</td>
<td>175698</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>450-400</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Populonia</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Nobos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1116</td>
<td>206554</td>
<td>Krater, calyx</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Nobios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1117</td>
<td>15111</td>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>475-425</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Nobios?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1118</td>
<td>12587</td>
<td>Master band</td>
<td>Cup little</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1119</td>
<td>310441</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>575-525</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Potnia Tharon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1120</td>
<td>30214</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>400-300</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Cumae</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Scene at Eleusis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1121</td>
<td>7811</td>
<td>Amphora, neck</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Nola</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1122</td>
<td>7820</td>
<td>Krater, column</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1123</td>
<td>25007</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>WG</td>
<td>Not given</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1124</td>
<td>45134</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>500-450</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Metapontion</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>CVA Vase No.</td>
<td>Mus or pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1125</td>
<td>200203</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Amphora, A</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>525-475 Italy</td>
<td>Orvieto</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1126</td>
<td>361028</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-475 Italy</td>
<td>Etruria</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1127</td>
<td>32034</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Krater, volute</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-490 Italy</td>
<td>Apulia</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Tityos?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1128</td>
<td>265119</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>500-490 Italy</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Trojan War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1129</td>
<td>Oxford, Ash. Mum. 1965.118</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-500 Italy</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1130</td>
<td>LIMC s.v. Artemis 1230</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>480-450 Italy</td>
<td>Pompeii?</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1131</td>
<td>Paris, Louvre F 297</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>525-500 Italy</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis and Leto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1132</td>
<td>London, British Museum B 203</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>520-510 Italy</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1133</td>
<td>Wurzburg, Martin von Wagner Mus. HA 38 (L308)</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>c.520 Italy</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP 1134</td>
<td>Munich, Staatl. Antikensammld. 1635 (J180)</td>
<td>Vase No. Mus</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>BF</td>
<td>520-510 Italy</td>
<td>Vulci</td>
<td>Athenian</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>Mus./pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
<td>Fabric 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L1</td>
<td>Taranto 8694</td>
<td>Plate</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-355</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L2</td>
<td>B. M. F 176</td>
<td>Nektoris</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-360</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lucanian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Death of Aktaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L3</td>
<td>RVAg II 763</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Taranto</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L4</td>
<td>Naples Sig. 940</td>
<td>Stamnos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L5</td>
<td>Naples Sig. 31</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L6</td>
<td>LCS 7/738</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Death of Aktaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L7</td>
<td>Gothenburg, Röhsska Konstnödmuseum</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-325</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L8</td>
<td>Cambridge (Max. L.), Fogg Art Museum 1960.367</td>
<td>Nektoris</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Lucanian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Death of Aktaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L9</td>
<td>Bloomington, Indiana University Art Museum 70.87.1</td>
<td>Slag</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.340</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L10</td>
<td>Berlin F 3239</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-355</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>Death of Aktaion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L11</td>
<td>Vatican T5 (inv. 17364)</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-350</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L12</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 28/117a</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L13</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 27/14d</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L14</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 27/17c</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L15</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 27/17b</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L16</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 18/287a</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L17</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. II 225/17-3</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-320</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L18</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. II 18/65a</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**
- **VP L1:** Pan with Lydian kithara, Artemis on panther surrounded by nimbus, Aktaion attacked by three hounds, Apollo with laurel branch riding on white swan, papposilen and hound.
- **VP L4:** Aktaion (small bronze) bows, playing with a hound, between Pan, with syrinx and branch, and Artemis leaning on pillar; below I, woman bending forward over raised feet, flowering plants in the field.
- **VP L5:** Aktaion attacked by three hounds, Apollo with laurel branch, and Hermes with branch, between Pan, with syrinx and branch, and Artemis leaning on pillar; below I, woman bending forward over raised feet, flowering plants in the field.
- **VP L6:** Aktaion slaying in presence of Pan, Hermes, Artemis and Ajax.
- **VP L7:** Aktaion with tree trunk and three hounds beneath a rocky profile, to l, of which is seated Ajax, with pedum and syrinx, and woman with palm branch, to r, Artemis and Pan.
- **VP L8:** Aktaion with palm branch, to l, of which is seated Ajax, with pedum and syrinx, and woman with palm branch, to r, Artemis and Pan.
- **VP L9:** Aktaion with palm branch, to l, of which is seated Ajax, with pedum and syrinx, and woman with palm branch, to r, Artemis and Pan.
- **VP L10:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L11:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L12:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L13:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L14:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L15:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L16:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L17:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
- **VP L18:** Aktaion with panther, Artemis and hound.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Mus./pub. ref.</th>
<th>Vase Shape</th>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenance 1</th>
<th>Provenance 2</th>
<th>Provenance 3</th>
<th>Fabric 1</th>
<th>Synopsis</th>
<th>Detailed description after Trendall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP19</td>
<td>RVAp Suppl. II.1 18/283d</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above - Artemis, Apollo, Athena, Eros, Aphrodite, Poseidon, below - Melanippe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP20</td>
<td>RVAp Suppl. II.1 17/89</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above: Pan, Artemis, Apollo and Athena below: Ambush of Trecoss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP22</td>
<td>RVAp II 18/41</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-325</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Departure of Amphioros - above: white-haired nurse, Artemis, Apollo, Athena and Pan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP23</td>
<td>Richmand (Va.) 181.81</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Amazonomachy, with Artemis, Apollo, Iris and Athena above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP24</td>
<td>Creye, Derwa coll., inv. 173</td>
<td>Aepheira</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>(i) Assembly of gods - Artemis, Apollo, Athena, Zeus, Hera; (ii) youth and woman with offerings on either side of a stele (574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP25</td>
<td>Newcastle-upon-Tyne, University - Greek Museum, 66</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-325</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Artemis and Apollo, with hand between them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP26</td>
<td>New York 56.171.63</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.320</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above - Assembly of gods (Apollo, Artemis, Hermes) with Herakles; below - Amazonomachy (574)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP27</td>
<td>Naples Sq. 662</td>
<td>Petike</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Body: (i) Apollo, Artemis and Hermes, (ii) youth and woman, each in a quadriga, r. with Eros above, (iii) couple on couch crowned by Eros and surrounded by youths and women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP28</td>
<td>Naples 3256 (inv. 81667)</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-325</td>
<td>Italy - Ruvo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>A row of divinities including Poseidon, Aphrodite, Eros, Pan, Athena in a quadriga, Hermes, Helias (?), crowned by Nike, Zeus, Artemis and Apollo: below battle between Greeks and Persians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP29</td>
<td>Melbourne, Geddes coll. A E 6.6</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Artemis with spear and bow, Apollo seated on altar, holding laurel branch with l. hand, and phiale in r. Pan-satyrs with thyrsoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP30</td>
<td>Lenormand inv. 1717</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Persiphone, Pluto and Hermes in a palace; above, to l. Apollo and Artemis, r. Aphrodite, Eros and Pan: below, the Danaids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP31</td>
<td>LCS 2/389</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.420-400</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucaniam</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis, Leto and Hermes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP32</td>
<td>Geneva 24892</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above: Artemis, Apollo, Aphrodite, Eros and Pelion; below - mythological subject - perhaps the Danaids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP33</td>
<td>Foggia 132733</td>
<td>Hydrae</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Italy - Arpi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Couple in quadriga with gods on either side - to l. Artemis and Apollo; above: Hekato with two torches, seated Athena and Hermes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP34</td>
<td>Foggia 132724</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Italy - Arpi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above: Assembly of gods (Pan, Artemis, Apollo, Hera, Zeus, Hermes, Eros and Aphrodite), below: Dionysos and Ariadne in lion-clawed chariot with saria and maenads</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP35</td>
<td>Copenhagen 3757</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.360-330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Campanian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo and Marsyas, with Artemis seated above to l., and Nike with wreath in r.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP36</td>
<td>Boston 1887.53</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above: Artemis, Pantheke with horn-shell, lagobolon and quiver, seated Apollo, with sword in lap and panther beside him, holding branch in r. hand, Furry, youth (Isyno) seated on stone capital; below: Adrastos and the infant Aigisios (575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP37</td>
<td>Berlin 1894.41</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above: Assembly of gods - Pan, Artemis, Zeus, Athena, Apollo, Nephile standing; Hermes below - Phileus and the ram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP38</td>
<td>Basel, Antikennuseum S 34</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Above: Pan with lagobolon and syrinx, seated Apollo with lyre, Artemis seated on altar with auburn; beside a statue on a plinth, seated: Aphrodite with Eros and Eros; below: youth with spear and sheathed sword, Rhytoido, Olympics, Anthe and the infant Hippolytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP39</td>
<td>Bari, Ricchioni coll. 6</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Artemis seated on rock, holding bow in r. hand, with l. hand on fawn's head, Apollo holding Laurel branch: Doric column to l.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP40</td>
<td>B.M. F. 278</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>(i) Assembly of gods - Athena, Apollo, Artemis, Pan, Zeus seated on a throne. Hera and Hermes. (ii) Petos and Olonmaos taking the oath before the chariot race</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP41</td>
<td>Amsterdam 2579</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Italy - Taranto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis</td>
<td>Apollo and Artemis beside a temple in which is a statue of Apollo (575)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP42</td>
<td>LCS Suppl., III Pt. 7.1.340</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-360</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lucanian</td>
<td>Apollo with Artemis?</td>
<td>Apollo (? with palm-branch. Artemis with bow, Hermes with caduceus and sick</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cat. No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>sammen</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Provenance 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VP 44, 45</td>
<td>Taranto, 6940</td>
<td>L44</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>6940</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L45</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L46</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L47</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L48</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L49</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L50</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L51</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L52</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L53</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L54</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L55</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L56</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L57</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L58</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L59</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L60</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L61</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L62</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L63</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L64</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L65</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L66</td>
<td>RV Ap 3.5, 77</td>
<td>VP</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>Mun./Pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L68</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 27/67b</td>
<td>Dish</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L69</td>
<td>Bari, Macina grossa coll. 55</td>
<td>Kantharos</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L70</td>
<td>Leningrad inv. 350</td>
<td>Peleke</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L71</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. II 1 18/102a</td>
<td>Stemless cup</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L72</td>
<td>B.M. F. 274</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L73</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. I 27/65a</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L74</td>
<td>RVAg Suppl. II 2 27/22a3</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L75</td>
<td>RVAg F. 18/49</td>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L76</td>
<td>Vienna Inv. 451</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-300</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L77</td>
<td>Naples 3337 inv. 82/241</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-300</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ruvo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L78</td>
<td>Monopoli, Coll. Meo-Evoli 221</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-300</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L79</td>
<td>Leningrad 1689</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-300</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L80</td>
<td>Leccio 855</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-300</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L81</td>
<td>B.M. F. 258</td>
<td>Patera</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-300</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L82</td>
<td>RVAg F. 2/1</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.480-410</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ustavina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L83</td>
<td>Vatican W1 (VIE. pl. III)</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.550-375</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L84</td>
<td>Naples H3253</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.340-320</td>
<td>Campanian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L85</td>
<td>Naples H3249</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.390-370</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>Mus./pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L87</td>
<td>AVA Suppl. 1 18/63c</td>
<td>Hydra</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.320</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Calydonian Boar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L97</td>
<td>AVAp i 2/1</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.420-440</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Gravina</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L88</td>
<td>AVAp Suppl. 1 18/293a</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-340</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L99</td>
<td>AVAp Suppl. ii 2/ 27/27</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-340</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L90</td>
<td>Lipart inv. 340 bis</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.325-330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Sicilian</td>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L91</td>
<td>B.M.F 239</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-325</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L92</td>
<td>AVAp Suppl. 1 18/200a</td>
<td>Leotrophora</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-325</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L93</td>
<td>Basel, Cath coll. 237</td>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.490-375</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unknw</td>
<td>Unknw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L100</td>
<td>Lentingr inv. 2080</td>
<td>Neck amphora</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.320-340</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Capua</td>
<td>Campanian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L101</td>
<td>Lentingr inv. 1715</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-340</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L102</td>
<td>B.M.T 189</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L94</td>
<td>Sydney 51.17</td>
<td>Neck amphora</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350-320</td>
<td>Unknw</td>
<td>Unknw</td>
<td>Unknw</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L95</td>
<td>AVAp Suppl. ii 1/14/126b</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L96</td>
<td>AVAp Suppl. ii 1/10/144a</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L97</td>
<td>AVAp i 5/265</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-375</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L98</td>
<td>Naples 3223 (inv. 62/113)</td>
<td>Volute krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L99</td>
<td>Moscow 504</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.360-326</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
<td>Iphigenia myth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L103</td>
<td>AVAp i 10/27a</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.375-350</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Ruv?</td>
<td>Apulian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cat. No.</td>
<td>Mus./pub. ref.</td>
<td>Vase Shape</td>
<td>Technique</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Provenance 1</td>
<td>Provenance 2</td>
<td>Provenance 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L104</td>
<td>Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum 72 AE 128</td>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-375</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L105</td>
<td>Boston 13.206</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L106</td>
<td>RVAp Suppl. / 18/11a</td>
<td>Fragment</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.400-375</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L107</td>
<td>RVAp Suppl. 11.1</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L108</td>
<td>RVAp Suppl. / 11.1</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330-310</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L111</td>
<td>Naples 3246 (inv. 82267)</td>
<td>Laoutrophoros</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.350</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L112</td>
<td>Foggia 132720</td>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.325-360</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Arpi</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L113</td>
<td>Besançon, Staatliche 30492</td>
<td>Rhynia</td>
<td>Bronze</td>
<td>350-300</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L114</td>
<td>Syracuse 47038</td>
<td>Calyx krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.330</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
<td>Cancatastis (Syracuse)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L115</td>
<td>Naples 1760 (inv. 87725)</td>
<td>Nektoris</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.380-360</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VP L116</td>
<td>Paris, Louvre K710</td>
<td>Bell krater</td>
<td>RF</td>
<td>c.380-360</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analysis by vase shape

**Sicily or Italian provenance:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Italy (archaic)</th>
<th>Italy (classical)</th>
<th>Italy (total)</th>
<th>Sicily (archaic)</th>
<th>Sicily (classical)</th>
<th>Sicily (total)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure vase</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment (uncertain)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutrophor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestoris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithoi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pyxis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomatos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 78

Note: Historic period determined by beginning of date range specified by CVA.

**Sicilian or Italian fabric:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Italy (archaic)</th>
<th>Italy (classical)</th>
<th>Italy (total)</th>
<th>Sicily (archaic)</th>
<th>Sicily (classical)</th>
<th>Sicily (total)</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphora</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cup</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure vase</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragment (uncertain)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Krater</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lekythos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutrophor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nestoris</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinochoe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pale</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithoi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pithoi</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skyphos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomatos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total:** 78

Note: Historic period determined by beginning of date range in publication (usually VAR, LCS or VAp)
### Analysis by scene

Sicilian or Italian provenance, imported fabric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scene</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(archaic)</td>
<td>(classical)</td>
<td>(total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis with Apollo, and sometimes Lato</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis in/mounting chariot</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elysus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigantomachy</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracles and deer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphigeneia myth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallisto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potnia Theron</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proteus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydias</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trojan War</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Historic period determined by beginning of date range specified by CVA.

### Sicilian or Italian fabric:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Scene</th>
<th>Fabric</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Italian</td>
<td>Sicily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(archaic)</td>
<td>(classical)</td>
<td>(total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aktaion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis with Apollo, and sometimes Lato</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis Bonds</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis in/mounting chariot</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemis cult site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calydonian boar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elysus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gigantomachy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heracles and deer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hippolytos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iphigeneia myth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kallisto</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Numbs</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potnia Theron</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proteus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Struggle for the tripod</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tydias</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trojan War</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Historic period determined by beginning of date range specified in publication (usually RVAP or LCS).
APPENDIX 3: Sculpture catalogue

This sculpture catalogue presents the figurines, statues, reliefs, ornaments and architectural sculpture depicting Artemis, or her mythology, from Southern Italy and Sicily. The vase paintings have been catalogued separately. The large quantity of terracotta figurines found in Southern Italy and Sicily makes a comprehensive catalogue unfeasible within the scope of this study. Instead, examples of each type are presented in the catalogue below. All instances of architectural sculpture, of which I am aware, have been included.

Each entry follows the same format: catalogue number (in bold), summary of image, material and media, provenance, date and publication details. A more detailed description of the image is then provided; the directions given (left or right) are always from the perspective of the viewer. A star (*) confirms that an illustration of the image is available at the end of the catalogue.

**Summary of Types**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S S</td>
<td>Sicilian non-architectural sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS S</td>
<td>Architectural sculpture from a Sicilian building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S I</td>
<td>Southern Italian non-architectural sculpture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS I</td>
<td>Architectural sculpture from a Southern Italian building</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Catalogue of Types**

**Sicily**

**S S1**  
A winged female stands in a Potnia Theron pose with her head turned to the right. The female’s left hand rests on the back of a goat which stands, in profile and facing to the right, behind her.

**S S2**  
A man and woman stand facing each other on the left side of the pinax. The man’s body and lower part of the woman’s body are missing. The prow of a ship is visible on the right side of the pinax. A figure (statue?), partly missing, stands on the ship with an object (bow?) in her right hand.

**S S3**  
* Artemis holding a spear. Terracotta figurine. Scala Greca, Syracuse. Fourth century. Orsi (1900, fig. 7.6).  
The head of a female figure with her hair pulled back into a lampadian knot. A spear head is visible at the side of the female’s head.

**S S4**  
* Artemis holding a bow. Terracotta figurine. Scala Greca, Syracuse. Fourth century. Orsi (1900, fig. 9).  
The right side of the torso of a female figure. A quiver strap is visible running diagonally across the body. The figure’s lower right arm is turned inwards and holds a bow.

**S S5**  
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Several fragments of a female figure with a dog at her left side. The dog looks up at the
female as she reaches down to touch its head.

SS6  * Artemis with a deer and a panther. Terracotta figurine. Scala Greca, Syracuse. 
Fourth century. Orsi (1900, fig. 17).

Several fragments of a female figure with a panther at her left side. The female’s hand 
rests upon the panther’s head.

Orsi (1900, fig. 19).

The head of a female figurine, with her hair pulled back into a lampadion knot, and the 
head of a deer with antlers to the left. The female’s left hand is visible on the deer’s head.

SS8  * Torch. Terracotta fragment. Scala Greca, Syracuse. Fourth century. Orsi (1900, 
fig. 12).

The flame of a torch which has been broken from a larger terracotta sculpture.

(1900, fig. 8.1).

The head of a female wearing a Phrygian cap.

(1981, no. 206).

The head, torso and left arm of a female figure whose hair is pulled back into a lampadion 
knot. A strap running diagonally across the chest may be a quiver strap. The female’s left 
arm is raised to hold a ball-like object at her shoulder.


Corinthian import. A female in a long *chiton* with upper torso and head missing. The end of 
a bow is just visible at her left side.

SS12 * Artemis with a hind and a dog. Terracotta mould. Morgantina. c.400-350. Bell 
(1981, no. 203).

Syracusan mould; the bottom of the mould is missing. Artemis kneels on the hind’s back 
and grasps its antlers with her right hand. The hind is being pulled back: it turns its head to 
look at the goddess and raises its front legs. A dog alongside the hind directly beneath the 
goddess. Artemis wears a short *chiton* and mantle with a light cuirass over her abdomen; 
she carries a knife in her left hand. The goddess also wears a low *polos* decorated with 
rosettes.

SS13 * Artemis with a torch and a dog? Terracotta figurine. Morgantina. Fourth 

Standing female figure with left hand raised to her head. The top of a dog’s head may be 
visible just above the break at the goddess’ left side. The right hand is lowered and holds a 
double torch. The figure wears a *chiton* and her hair is pulled back into a lampadion knot.

SS14 * Artemis with a torch and a lion. Terracotta pinax. Gela. Fourth century? 
Orlandini (1957, pl. 14.2).
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The lower part of a terracotta pinax with Artemis in the centre wearing a chiton over which is wrapped a feline (panther?) skin. The goddess extends her left arm and holds a torch. A lion stands on Artemis' right and there is a palm tree on her left.

The upper half of a figurine of Artemis riding on a deer or fawn. The goddess is seated sideways and holds a water-bird in her right hand; her hair is pulled back into a lampadion knot.

Marconi (2007, SM4, fig. 43).
Apollo is on the left approaching Leto, who stands in the centre, with Artemis on the right. Apollo’s head is turned to face the viewer and he holds a kithara up in his right hand. The god wears a short chiton and has a wing on each ankle. Leto turns to face Apollo and holds a wreath in her left hand. Artemis also faces Apollo and holds a bow in her right hand, she may also have held an arrow in her left hand. The heads of Leto and Artemis are missing; both goddesses wear a long tunic.

Three standing female figures in profile: the two on the left turn to face the one on the right. The females wear long tunics. The two figures on the left wear a polos; the figure on the right may have worn a polos but damage to the metope makes this uncertain. All three figures hold an object in their inside hand by a cylindrical section below a larger conical body; it may be some kind of flower, fruit or vegetation.

Two figures face the viewer from a quadriga. The two middle horses are depicted in a frontal pose but with their heads facing outwards. The two end horses stand on their hind legs in an heraldic pose. All four horses are harnessed. The central, probably female, figure reaches out with their left hand to touch the forehead of the horse rearing on the left side of the metope while holding the reins with their right hand. The second figure, who stands slightly behind and to the right of the central figure, is placing their right hand on the forehead of the horse rearing on the right side of the metope.

Three figures stand in a quadriga. The four horses stand in a frontal pose, but the two outer horses turn their heads outwards. The head of a frontal, central male charioteer remains. Fragments of two female figures, flanking the male, can be seen. The left hand of the female on the right (Leto?) is held up and seems to be grasping something; possibly the hem of a cloak. The female on the left (Artemis?) holds up her right hand in which part of a circular object, probably a wreath, is visible.

Tusa (1984, no.10).
The bottom half of a metope with a barefoot female on the left leaning or striding over a male figure who is falling to the ground. The female’s left leg is revealed through the fabric of her tunic on account of her vigorous motion.
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Artemis stands on the left side of the metope. The goddess turns towards the action on the right of the metope and extends her right hand as though directing the dogs. Aktaion raises a sword in his left hand with which he is about to attack the two dogs on his lower left side. A further dog has leapt onto his right torso and Aktaion grasps this dog by the neck with his right hand in an attempt to throttle it. Aktaion is nude apart from his boots and a deer skin which is draped around his shoulders. The goddess’ skin is carved from marble.

Italy

Two standing females who are partially draped and baring their breasts. The right figure places her right hand on one of her bare breasts and appears to be attempting to pull her clothing over it with her left hand. The head and left arm of the left figure are missing; she grasps her belt with her right hand.

Bronze, probably Tarrentine, hydria with an ornate, openwork panel attached to its neck. The panel consists of a frontal winged female, wearing a long tunic and a polos, in a Potnia Theron pose: she is flanked by two hares which rest their front or back legs on her waist. A pair of lions flanks the hares. The lions appear, like the hares, in profile but turn their head towards the viewer; they raise their inside paw to touch the female’s upper legs. Two snakes are stretched out behind the female’s head along the level at which her head is attached to the rim of the hydria. The snake’s heads are turned outwards towards the viewer. Above the snakes, a bird (of prey?) is perched upon the goddess’ polos. Two further lions flank this bird. The lions sit upon the snakes with their backs to the bird and turn their head out towards the viewer.

Artemis strides toward Aktaion with a bow in her right hand and her left arm extended as though directing the action. Aktaion has been forced to his knees on the left side of the pinax. One dog stands with its back legs on his head and its front legs on his right arm which is extended; the dog is biting this arm. Aktaion holds a dagger in this extended arm and is about to plunge it into the back of a second dog which is biting his leg. There is another dagger in his left hand.

Artemis is on the left side of the pinax. The goddess is in an active pose; she carries a small deer in her left arm and places her right hand upon the back of one of the dogs. Aktaion lies on the ground with three dogs attacking him: biting his knee, chest and head. Aktaion’s body is clearly human, but he has the head of a stag complete with antlers. The upper part of the plaque, including Artemis’ head, is missing.
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A female caryatid wearing a peplos supports the mirror. The back of the mirror is incised with a scene of the death of Aktaion: three dogs have forced Aktaion to the ground and are biting both of his shoulders and his head. Aktaion wears only a hunting cloak and boots; two large antlers have sprouted from his head. A small bird sits within a ring on the top of the mirror.

S16  * Female with two water-birds. Terracotta figurine. San Biagio sanctuary, Metapontion. c.700-600. Olbrich (1976, fig. 1).
The female figure modelled in low relief. The female grasps the necks of two water birds, who stand in front of her, in a Potnia Theron pose.

The head and upper torso of a winged female holding a kid across her torso. The female wears a peplos, which has two flower buds (?) emerging from its top, and has a large disc ornament on each shoulder.

S18  * Winged female with an animal and a kid. Terracotta figurine. San Biagio sanctuary, Metapontion. c.600-400. Olbrich (1976, fig. 5).
The head and torso of a winged female. The female’s arms are extended out from the elbow to support an animal which is now missing. The torso of a small horned kid is supported by the figure’s left shoulder. The female wears a peplos and has a large disc ornament on each shoulder.

S19  * Female with an animal and a water bird. Terracotta figurine. San Biagio sanctuary, Metapontion. c.600-400. Olbrich (1976, fig. 6).
The head, upper torso and left arm of a female. The female’s left arm is extended out from the elbow to support an animal which is now missing. A water bird is perched, in profile and facing the female, on the female’s left shoulder. The female wears a head-dress composed of five disc shaped objects.

S10  * Female with a lion. Terracotta figurine. San Biagio sanctuary, Metapontion. c.600-400. Olbrich (1976, fig. 14).
The upper torso of a female figure; the head is missing. The female has a lion’s head on her right shoulder.

The head and torso of a female figure. The female’s left arm is raised to throw a spear. There is a hole for a spear in the balled fist of her left hand, but the spear is now missing. A snake rises from her left shoulder. The right arm is missing but enough of the shoulder remains to indicate that the upper arm, at least, was not extended. There are small discs on her upper shoulders and further protrusions which may represent armour attachments. The female wears a peplos which has a flower bud (?) emerging from its top.

The head and torso of a winged female figure. The female’s arms are extended to support an animal. The female has a large disc ornament on each shoulder and wears a tall, conical hat.
The fragmentary torso of a female figure. The female’s left arm is extended to support an animal. The right arm is missing. A torch rests upon her left arm and extends up alongside her left torso.

The fragmentary remains of a pinax with a central female figure in a long tunic whose hair is gathered into a knot on the top of her head. Her left arm is turned in at the elbow and she holds her left hand below her breast. There may have been a small item held (or painted) in the left hand but this is now unclear. A small figure, probably a mortal female, stands to the right carrying an animal over her shoulders.

The upper half of a figurine of Artemis wearing a chiton and polos. A quiver strap runs diagonally across the goddess’ torso. Artemis’ left arm is turned in at the elbow and she holds a small deer in her hand; her right arm is missing below the elbow.

S I16  * Artemis with a feline and a deer. Terracotta figurine. Taras. c.400-300. Schneider-Herrmann (1959, fig. 1).
A feline (panther?) stands on its hind legs on the left side of the female and rests its front paws on the female’s waist. The female’s left arm holds the animal by its lower head. In her right arm she carries a deer. The female wears a peplos, a mantle, which is attached with round discs on the shoulders and a low polos.

S I17  * Artemis holding a cross torch? Terracotta figurine. Taras. Classical period. Schneider-Herrmann (1959, fig. 3).
The head and shoulders of a female wearing a polos. The female carries a cross torch at her right side.

A figure of the goddess serves as the body of the thymiaterion. Artemis is depicted in a ‘knielauf’ pose and carries a deer in her arms. The goddess wears a long tunic with part of another layer of clothing, possibly an animal skin, coming over her shoulder and hanging down the front of her body. Artemis also wears a head-dress composed of discs and buds (?) upon which a large bird is perched. The thymiaterion’s basin rests upon the bird.

Artemis Bendis wearing a Phrygian cap with a lion skin tied over her torso and cap. The goddess wears a knee-length belted chiton with an animal skin tied over the top, a long cloak and a pair of high boots. A bow is held in the right hand against the lower body. The left forearm is extended, from the elbow, to support a fawn. The goddess’ feet are missing.
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A fragment of an Artemis Bendis type with the upper torso and head missing. The goddess wears a knee-length belted chiton with an animal skin tied over the top, a long cloak and a pair of high boots. A bow is held in her right arm against the lower body. The left forearm is extended, from the elbow, to support a fawn. The arm rests upon a small statue of a female wearing a polos (or large figurine) which stands on a small pillar. The figurine itself stands on a small base.

Artemis Bendis wearing a Phrygian cap and belted chiton with a lion skin tied over her torso and cap. The female also wears a long cloak and a pair of high boots. A small animal is seated at the left foot of the goddess. A bow is held in her right arm against the lower body. The left forearm is extended, from the elbow, to support a fawn; this arm rests upon a pillar. The figurine itself stands on a small base.

A female figure wearing a peplos raises her arms to hold a statue of Artemis on her head. The goddess wears a long tunic; she holds a bow in her right hand and a deer in her left hand. The figurine stands on a small base.

Statue of Artemis riding on a doe. The statue is mounted on a pedestal carved in the fashion of a tree trunk. The head, arms and lower legs of the goddess are missing. The front and rear ends of the deer are also missing. Part of a Greek inscription remains: [-]údoas áνέθηκε.

A female figure, wearing a peplos but no head-dress, holds both arms against her sides. In her right hand she grasps a small animal; her left hand is missing.

Tityos appears in the ‘knielauf’ pose moving left to right across the metope. He carries Leto in his right arm and turns his head back to the left to watch the pursuit of Apollo and Artemis on metope AS I 2. He grasps an arrow, which has penetrated his eye, with his left hand. Leto is carved on a smaller scale than Tityos; she also looks back to metope AS I 2 and gestures to her children.

Apollo and Artemis appear in profile with arrows strung to their raised bows; they move left to right across the metope as they pursue Tityos and Leto on AS I 1. Apollo appears in high relief nearest the viewer. Artemis strides alongside him in lower relief and is largely obscured although the bottom of a knee length tunic is visible.
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Two figures move left to right across the metope. The middle of the metope is damaged obscuring their torsos and most of their lower bodies. The figure on the right, who turns back to look at the figure on the left, holds up a circular object in their right hand which is decorated with concentric circles.


The fragmentary remains of a metope with two young males running left to right across the metope. The figures are depicted in profile and over-lap. The head of the figure furthest from the viewer is missing.


The right side of a metope with two young females running left to right across the metope. The figures are depicted in profile and over-lap. The figure on the left turns her head to look back.


The upper left part of a metope with two figures. The figure on the left (Niobe) is in a frontal pose with their head turned to the right and their arms raised. The figure on the right (Apollo) stands in front of them and kneels, in profile, raising a bow with an arrow pulled back ready for firing.


Artemis is seated side-ways on a galloping horse. The goddess holds a bow in her left hand and the horse’s reins in her right hand. A long necked water-bird is included under the horse.


A female in a short-sleeved long tunic stands in a Potnia Theron pose grasping two water-birds by their necks. The birds’ backs flank the female but they turn their heads back to look at her.

AS 19 * Artemis Bendis. Terracotta antefix mould (left) and modern cast (right). S. Angelo Vecchio, Metapontion. c.400-300. Department of Classics, University of Texas at Austin (1979, fig. 36).

Left side of a mould with Artemis Bendis’ head; the goddess is wearing a lion’s skin.


Artemis Bendis’ head; the goddess is wearing a lion’s skin.


Two small identical statues, archaic in appearance and wearing a peplos and a polos, are erected on small columns. Four young females in total appear in the scene; the frieze is broken and only the hand of the female on the far right remains. The females run towards
the statues effectively flanking them. In the middle of the frieze is a young man who is also in rapid motion; his cloak billows out and he carries a lagobolon. The two females nearest him look back as though in fright; he appears to be the instigator of the chaos. The girl nearest him on the right is raising her clothing in a veiling gesture. The girl nearest him on the left is throwing her arm around the statue as she reaches it. The frieze may have been mounted on an architrave over the front of a naikos.
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Images
La figura 9 mostra una parte della testa e della gola.
Fig. 36 – Hermonon alla foce del Sele, metopa n. 33, disegno: *Le Preti et al.* (da Hermonon 1954).
Fig. 13 – Herakles alla foce del Sele, metop a n. 18, disegno: "Nobilissimo giovanile" (da Borroni 1954).
4 - Heraion alla foce del Sele, metopa n. 10, disegno: "Apollo e (da Heraion 1954)."
APPENDIX 4: Coin Catalogue

Introduction

The catalogue is divided into two parts: Sicily and Italy. The coins are arranged alphabetically by mint (Sicily) or region (Italy). Each catalogue number is pre-fixed with a C S (Sicily), C I (Italy) or C O (other); the 'other' category represents coins which are discussed in the text for comparative purposes. The catalogue is not an exhaustive list of every coin type with Artemis; rather, I have included a representative type for each Sicilian or Italian series which features Artemis. Illustrations are provided where available.

Two references are usually given for each coin:


The second reference is to a volume of Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum (=SNG), Särström (1940) A Study in the Coinage of the Mamertines (Lund: C.W.K. Gleerups) (=Särström), or to R.S. Poole (ed.) (1876) A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum. Sicily. (London: British Museum) (=BMC). The following abbreviations are used for the volumes of the SNG:


Catalogue of Types

Sicily

CS1
Mint: Akragas, AE
Date: 300-275
Obv: Head of Artemis I.; quiver at shoulder
Rev: Boar running I.; above, ΒΑΣΙΛΕΩΣ; below, ΦΙΝΤΙΑ
Ref: HN2, p.123; SNG ANS III 1119-1121

CS2
Mint: Alaesa, AE
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Date: after 241
Obv.: Head of Artemis I.
Rev.: Quiver and bow; ΆΡΧ ΆΛΑΙΣΑΣ
Ref.: HN2, p.126; SNG ANS III 1191

C S3
Mint: Amestratus, AE
Date: 241-10 (or earlier)
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Apollo standing with lyre; ΑΜΗΣΤΡΑΤΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN2, p.127; SNG Copenhagen 149

C S4
Mint: Kentoripa, AE
Date: 212-150
Obv.: Head of Artemis r., quiver over shoulder
Rev.: Tripod; ΚΕΝΤΟΡΙΠΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN2, p.135; SNG ANS III 1320-1

C S5
Mint: laetia, AE
Date: after 241
Obv.: Head of Artemis r., quiver over shoulder
Rev.: Standing figure leaning on spear surmounted by Phrygian helmet; ΙΑΙΤΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN2, p.148; BMC 3

C S6
Mint: Leontini, AR tetradrachm
Date: c.466
Obv.: Quadriga and Nike r.
Rev.: Female head (Artemis? or Demeter?); ΑΕΟΝ
Ref.: HN2, p.149; BMC 9
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CS7
Mint: Leontini, AE
Date: 210
Obv.: Jugate heads of Apollo and Artemis r.
Rev.: Two ears of corn; \( \text{AEONTIN} \)\( \text{ΩN} \)
Ref.: \( \text{HN}^2 \), p.150; \( \text{SNG} \) Copenhagen 367

CS8
Mint: Mamertini (at Messana), AE
Date: c.220-200
Obv.: Head of Herakles r.
Rev.: Artemis advancing r., carrying torch; at feet, dog; \( \text{MAMEPTIN} \)\( \text{ΩN} \)
Ref.: \( \text{HN}^2 \), p.156; Särström, series XVII, Group A

CS9
Mint: Mamertini (at Messana), AE
Date: c.220-200
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Omphalos; \( \text{MAMEPTIN} \)\( \text{ΩN} \)
Ref.: \( \text{HN}^2 \), p.156; Särström, series XIV, Group D

CS10
Mint: Mamertini (at Messana), AE
Date: after 210
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Dog l.
Ref.: \( \text{HN}^2 \), p.156; Särström, series XV, Group F

CS11
Mint: Mamertini (at Messana), AE
Date: after 210
Obv.: Head of young Herakles r., in lion skin
Rev.: Artemis running with long torch; stag beside her
Ref.: \( \text{HN}^2 \), p.156; Särström, series XVII, Group A
APPENDIX 4: Coin Catalogue

CS12
Mint: Morgantina, AR litra
Date: 344-317
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.; MOPGTANTINΩN
Rev.: Horseman galloping l., holding spear
Ref.: HN², p.157; SNG Copenhagen 472

CS13
Mint: Morgantina, AE
Date: 150-100
Obv.: Head of Artemis l., bow and quiver at shoulder
Rev.: Nike standing holding wreath and palm branch; HISPANORUM
Ref.: SNG ANS IV 481-2

CS14
Mint: Rash Melqart, AR tetradrachm
Date: 325-300
Obv.: Quadriga galloping guided by charioteer in long chiton; above, Nike flying to crown charioteer; RSMLQRT
Rev.: Female head r., surrounded by dolphins
Ref.: SNG ANS IV 721-734
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CS15
Mint: Selinus, AR tetradrachm
Date: 440-420
Obv.: Apollo and Artemis in chariot, Artemis holding reins and Apollo shooting with bow and arrow; ΣΕΛΙΝΟΝΤΙΟΝ
Rev.: Selinus naked, with phiale in r., and lustral branch in l., pouring libation at altar below which a cock; to r. bull on pedestal, above which, selinon leaf; ΣΕΛΙΝΟΣ
Ref.: HN2, p.168; SNG ANS IV 688-92

CS16
Mint: Syracuse, AR tetradrachm
Date: 510-485
Obv.: Quadriga; ΣΥΡΑΦΟΣΙΟΝ
Rev.: Female head l., in centre of square incuse of swastika design
Ref.: HN2, p.171; SNG ANS V 1-5

CS17
Mint: Syracuse, AR tetradrachm
Date: 500-475
Obv.: Quadriga l.; above, Nike crowning charioteer; SURA
Rev.: Female head r.; around, four dolphins; ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΝ
Ref.: HN2, p.172; SNG Lockett 3508
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CS18
Mint: Syracuse, AR tetradrachm
Date: 450-425
Obv.: Quadriga r.; above, Nike crowning horses
Rev.: Female head r.; around, four dolphins; ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΝ
Ref.: HN², pp.173-4; SNG Salting 7

CS19
Mint: Syracuse, AE
Date: c.435-415
Obv.: Female head r.; to l. and r., dolphins; ΣΥΡΑ
Rev.: Octopus
Ref.: HN², p.178; SNG Morcom 676
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CS20
Mint: Syracuse, AR tetradrachm
Date: c.405
Obv.: Facing head of Arethusa; on headband, ΚΙΜΩΝ; to l. and r., dolphins; all in dotted circle, above which, ΑΡΕΘΟΣΑ; to lower left, ΣΩ
Rev.: Quadriga l.; above, Nike flying to crown charioteer; in exergue, barley ear; linear border
Ref.: HN², p.177; SNG ANS V 288-9

CS21
Mint: Syracuse, Electrum
Date: c.300-275
Obv.: Head of Apollo l.; to r., tripod; ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ
Rev.: Head of Artemis r., quiver at shoulder; to l., tripod; ΣΩΤΕΙΠΑ
Ref.: HN², p.178; SNG Lockett 992

CS22
Mint: Syracuse, AR tetradrachm
Date: 310-305
Obv.: Female head l.; around, three dolphins
Rev.: Quadriga l.; in exergue, ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ
Ref.: HN², p.181; SNG ANS V 632-43
C S23
Mint: Syracuse, AE
Date: 300-275
Obv.: Head of Artemis r., quiver over shoulder; ΣΩΤΕΙΡΑ
Rev.: Thunderbolt; ΑΓΑΘΟΚΛΕΟΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΟΣ
Ref.: HN², p.182; SNG ANS V 708-31

C S24
Mint: Syracuse, AV
Date: 295-272
Obv.: Head of Artemis, quiver at shoulder; to l., thunderbolt
Rev.: Nike walking l., carrying trophy and wreath; above, crescent; below, thunderbolt;
PΥΡΡΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΟΩΣ
Ref.: SNG ANS V 826-7

C S25
Mint: Syracuse, AR
Date: 225-216
Obv.: Head of Artemis with quiver at shoulder
Rev.: Owl r., head frontal; ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΟΙ
Ref.: HN², p.186; SNG ANS V 906
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CS26
Mint: Syracuse, AR
Date: 214-212
Obv.: Head of Athena l., wearing Corinthian helmet
Rev.: Artemis as huntress with hound and shooting bow; ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ; at l., ΣΩ
Ref.: HN², p.186; SNG ANS V 1040-3

CS27
Mint: Syracuse, AE
Date: after 212
Obv.: Head of Artemis r., radiate
Rev.: Apollo standing, holding branch and wreath; ΣΥΡΑΚΟΣΙΩΝ
Ref.: HN², p.187; SNG ANS V 1104-6

CS28
Mint: Tauromenium, AE
Date: 230-170
Obv.: Head of Dionysos r., crowned with ivy
Rev.: Artemis standing, holding patera and spear; at her feet, hound; ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ
Ref.: HN², p.189; SNG ANS V 1161

CS29
Mint: Thermae Himerenses, AE
Date: 405-350(?)
Obv.: Head of Artemis; behind, crescent
Rev.: Head of Herakles r.; ΘΕΠΜΙΤΑΝ
Ref.: HN², pp.146-7; BMC 4
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Italy

Etruria

C I1
Mint: Uncertain, AV
Date: c.300
Obv.: Female head (Artemis?) r.
Rev.: Dog running r.; in exergue, velsa (Etruscan)
Ref.: HN³ 222

Frentani

C I2
Mint: Larinum, AE
Date: c.210-175
Obv.: Head of Artemis r., bow and quiver at shoulder
Rev.: Greyhound running r.; above, torch
Ref.: HN³ 630; SNG Copenhagen 275

Campania

C I3
Mint: Capua, AE
Date: 216-211
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.; at shoulder quiver and bow
Rev.: Running boar r.; in exergue, ΚΑΠΥ
Ref.: HN³ 492; SNG ANS l 210-1
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C 14
Mint: Capua, AE
Date: 216-211
Obv.: Head of Zeus r., laureate
Rev.: Artemis or Selene driving biga r.; above, two stars; ΚΑΠΥ
Ref.: HN² 488; SNG ANS I 206

C 15
Mint: Neapolis, AR didrachm
Date: c.300-275
Obv.: Head of nymph (Parthenope?) r.; to l., Artemis holding torches; below, ΑΡΤΕΜΙ[ΟΣ]
Rev.: Man faced bull r., crowned by Nike; ΝΕΟΠΟΛΙΤΩΝ
Ref.: HN³ 579; SNG Lockett 86

C 16
Mint: Neapolis, AE
Date: 250-225
Obv.: Head of Artemis r., quiver at shoulder
Rev.: Cornucopiae
Ref.: HN³ 594; SNG Morcom 181
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Apulia

CI7
Mint: Grumum, AE
Date: 300-250
Obv.: Head of Artemis (?) r.
Rev.: Horse prancing r.; above, ΠΡΥ
Ref.: HN3 784

C I8
Mint: Arpi, AE
Date: c.325-275
Obv.: Bust of Artemis r., quiver at shoulder
Rev.: Thunderbolt; on either side, ΕΙΗ-ΜΑΝ
Ref.: HN3 640

C I9
Mint: Luceria, AE
Date: c.217-212
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.; above, crescent
Rev.: Crescent; LOUCERI
Ref.: HN3 683; SNG Copenhagen 665

Cl10
Mint: Neapolis, AE
Date: c.325-250
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.; quiver at shoulder
Rev.: Bow and quiver; ΝΕΑΠΙ
Ref.: HN3 802; SNG ANS I 712

Lucania

C I11
Mint: Metapontion, AR stater
Date: c.330-290
Obv.: Head of Demeter I.
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Rev.: Ear of barley; at l., symbol, Artemis running with torch; **META**
Ref: *HN*³ 1590; *SNG Ashmolean*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C 112</th>
<th>Mint: Metapontion, AE</th>
<th>Date: c.225-200</th>
<th>Obv.: Head of Artemis r., bow and quiver at shoulder</th>
<th>Rev.: Amphora; at r., ear of barley</th>
<th>Ref.: <em>HN</em>³ 1706; <em>SNG ANS II</em> 575-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C 113</th>
<th>Mint: Paestum, AE sextans</th>
<th>Date: second century</th>
<th>Obv.: Head of Artemis r., quiver over shoulder</th>
<th>Rev.: Ear of corn, symbol; ΠΑΙΣ</th>
<th>Ref.: <em>HN</em>³ 1204; <em>SNG ANS II</em> 763-7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C 114</th>
<th>Mint: Paestum, AE</th>
<th>Date: after 215</th>
<th>Obv.: Head of Artemis</th>
<th>Rev.: Boar; ΠΛΕΣΤ</th>
<th>Ref: <em>SNG ANS II</em> 768</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| C 115 | Mint: Thurium, AE | Date: third century | Obv.: Head of Artemis r., quiver over shoulder | |
|-------|------------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------------------| |
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Rev.: Apollo standing with lyre and patera; ΘΟΥΠΙΩΝ
Ref.: HN³ 1930; SNG ANS II 1196

C 116
Mint: Thurium, AE
Date: c.280
Obv.: Head of Apollo r., laureate
Rev.: Artemis advancing right, holding torch, two spears, dog at feet; ΘΟΥΠΙΩΝ
Ref.: HN³ 1924; SNG Munich 1234

Bruttium

C 117
Mint: The Bretti, AR hemidrachms
Date: 216-203
Obv.: Head of Apollo r., laureate
Rev.: Artemis advancing l., holding torch and arrow; behind, hound; above star; ΒΡΕΤΤΙΩΜ
Ref: HN³ 1965-8; SNG ANS III 23-4

C 118
Mint: Consentia, AE
Date: c.325-300
Obv.: Head of Artemis (?), hair bound with cord wound four times round it
Rev.: Bow and three crescents; ΚΩΣ

239
Ref.: *HN*³ 2071

C 119
Mint: Petelia, AE
Date: 215-203
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Dog running r.; ΠΕΘΑΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: *HN*³ 2458; *SNG Copenhagen* 1913

C 120
Mint: Petelia, AE sextans
Date: after 203
Obv.: Head of Apollo r., laureate
Rev.: Artemis walking and holding torch; ΠΕΘΑΙΝΩΝ
Ref: *HN*³ 2463; *SNG ANS* III 614-8

C 121
Mint: Rhegion, AE
Date: c.425
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Hare running r.
Ref.: *HN*³ 2519

C 122
Mint: Rhegion, AE
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Date: c.260-215
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.; symbol, bow
Rev.: Lyre; ΠΗΓΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN² 2546; SNG Copenhagen 1963-4

C 123
Mint: Rhegion, AE
Date: c.260-215
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Asklepios standing l., holding bird; to l., cornucopia; ΠΗΓΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN² 2547; SNG ANS III 736-40

C 124
Mint: Rhegion, AE
Date: c.260-215
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Lion walking r.; ΠΗΓΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN² 2544; SNG ANS III 725-6
C 125
Mint: Rregion, AE
Date: 215-150
Obv.: Jugate heads of Apollo and Artemis
Rev.: Tripod; ΠΗΓΙΝΩΝ
Ref.: HN³ 2548, 2550; SNG ANS III 741

C 126
Mint: Rregion, AE
Date: c.215-150
Obv.: Head of Artemis r.
Rev.: Apollo seated on omphalos, holding bow and arrow; ΠΗΓΙΝΩΝ
Ref: HN³ 2552; SNG ANS III 750-3

C 127
Mint: Rregion, AE
Date: c.215-150
Obv.: Jugate heads of Asklepios and Hygieia r.
Rev.: Artemis standing facing holding bow and torch; behind, dog
Ref.: HN³ 2555; SNG ANS III 716
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Other

C 01
Mint: Rhodes, AR
Date: 300-200
Obv.: Helios facing; head radiate
Rev.: Rose with bud; to l., Artemis running holding torch
Ref.: SNG Lockett 2956

C 02
Mint: Corinth, AR
Date: 350-300
Obv.: Pegasos flying l.
Rev.: Head of Athena l.; to r., Artemis holding torch
Ref.: SNG Lewis 738
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C03
Mint: Taras
Date: c.332-302
Obv.: Horseman r., as ephebus with shield and three spears
Rev.: Dolphin rider r., holding bow and arrows
Ref.: HN19 938; SNG Lockett 190