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An Unpublished Granite Statue of *Diskophoros Ephébos* in Cairo

Sobhi Ashour

This article is dealing with an unpublished granite statue kept in the Cairo, Egyptian Museum J.E. 45055B, with unknown provenance. A label with a Basement Register Number reads N.723, is attached to the statue. The statue is missing the head and the largest portion of the neck which is broken diagonally. The legs beneath knees are broken away; maximum height reaches 30.5 cm.

The statue represents a boy dressed in *chlamys* carrying a round object on his back hanging in a sling. The body shows wide shoulders and tender lines indicate boyish appearance. The left arm is bent from elbow, enveloped inside the mantle and held tightly to the chest (fig. 1). The left hand is holding the two hanging robes of the round object on the back side (fig. 2). The right arm is extending beside the body, curves slightly to fix two folding edges of the mantle together on the thigh. The details of fingers beneath the heavy mantle are charmingly executed: four fingers appear on the left strap and the index rests on the right one (fig. 1). The details of the right hand are well treated, where the fingers are countable as well.

I would like to thank the anonymous referee of the IFAO who added very valuable remarks to this article.

1 Keith 1975, p. 138-139, no. 24, pl. 19, published a Hermeracles from Tell Timai in Cairo Museum with the same Journal d’Entrée number 45055. The two entries are described “*statuette de Hermès drapé, tenant une massue, Tête et base manquente*”. The height of Keith’s herm is 22.2 cm and the material is white fine soft limestone, while the statue published here is carved in red granite and reaches 30.5 cm in height. The Timai herm is different from the statue; the mantle is grasped by right hand on the center of the chest not the left as in our statue. The left hand of the herm rests on the hip and carries a club, yet a broken Heraklian club is not traceable in the Cairo statue at all. Prof. Keith kindly sent me an image of her cat. 24 which confirms that there are two objects with the same register number. The authorities of Egyptian Museum in Cairo decided to keep the two pieces with the same number with adding a different labeling letters to distinguish them. The Basement Register N. 723, which was JE. 45055 is now JE. 45055 B. Previously the provenance of the two objects was confused and considered Thmuis, now it is clear that the statue in Cairo JE. 45055 B has no authenticated provenance.
The inner distance between legs indicates a marching posture, most likely the left leg was striding with a slight torsion outwards, while the right was fixed. The heavy chlamys is knee-length, or slightly longer, fastened on the right shoulder, with an elongated clasp appears beside the hanging robe. This clasp consists of two parts: a larger upper one, oval in shape, with round term, while the lower part is circular (fig. 3). The characteristic loose neck of the chlamys is elegantly carved on the left side, and the flaring textile has additional small fold. There is no indication of the chiton, since no hem of the neck or sleeves appear, and most likely this chlamys was worn on nude body.

The surface is well designed; the folds mostly follow diagonal lines, and reflect the marching and grasping action. Three folds appear on the right side of the chest, reflect the pose of the left hand. A triangular shaped group of folds appears beneath the left elbow on the belly. The right hand is grasping the mantle where its two edges are deeply folded between the legs (fig. 4). Circular folds appear on the right side, reflect the posture of fixed right leg and the grasped textile. The left side of the chlamys is worked into a group of vertical folds, almost flat in execution (fig. 5).

There is a circular object on the upper third of the back side, hanged by two thick robes, held in the left hand (fig. 6). The right side robe passes above the shoulder, while the left side one passes on the forearm, which indicates the heaviness of the slung object. On the front side, these two robes appear as a double robe with knots on equal distances, which don’t appear on the back side. These two straps get thinner gradually downwards and the difference in thickness is very apparent between its width on the backside and the belly. There are traceable spots of black paint all over the statue’s surface, which are most likely, remains of a painted surface rather than a fire in antiquity.

Subject

The ephebic chlamys, should gather the statue with two interesting sculptures: the much debated Tralleis Boy, and another statue in the Roman National Museum. The first is believed to represent a boxer or pankratiast after his swollen ears (fig. 7), while the later is connected to the Palaistra and labelled ephébos (fig. 8). The drapery of the chlamys on the three statues is similar to a specific draped type of torso herms, mostly represents Hermes, Herakles or

---

2 Pollux X, 164; Bieber 1928, p. 22-23, p. 69 pl. XXXV.i; see Roussel 1941, p. 163ff; Tod 1951, p. 90; Gauthier 1985, p. 154, n. 25, p. 156, n. 31, 157; Gauthier 1986, p. 15f; Palagia 1989, p. 338 n. 17; Della 1991, p. 83, n. 55; Montserrat 1993, p. 222; Miller 2004, p. 131; During the Hellenistic period classical nude of athletes was substituted by chlamys or nude chest. Zanker 1993, p. 221.
3 Mendel 1914, no. 542; Lawrence 1927, p. 44-45, pl. 74-75; Bieber 1955, p. 164, fig. 698-699; von Steuben 1972; Pollitt 1986, p. 256, fig. 286; Smith 1991, p. 54, fig. 11; Andréae 2001, p. 60, taf. 3-4; Ridgway 2002, p. 171.
5 Lawrence 1927, p. 44-45, first suggested a boxer on basis of the bruised ears. Andréae 2001, p. 61ff, sided to Pankratiast. The swollen ear is best shown in von Steuben 1972, taf. 35.
athletes. Many examples are known from Attica, Delos, Asia Minor, Egypt, Cyrenaica, and Italy. The herm, whether pillar or torso type, had a specific athletic significance and it was the standard symbol of Palaistra and Gymnasia, and hence comes Cicero’s label ornamenta γυμνασιῶν. The torso type of herms appears frequently in athletic context in the Hellenistic and imperial times, whether as Hermes, or Heracles. The pillar herm appears as well, on many Hellenistic and imperial funerary monuments, from ca. 300 BC, from Attica, Cyclades, Asia Minor, Delos, and Egypt. Therefore the subject

Hermes and Herakles are attested as sponsor gods of gymnasia and palaistra in Graeco-Roman Egypt, and I have hinted the herms within athletic context from Egypt. Therefore the subject
of the Cairo statue could be connected to *palaistra* and *gymnasion*, and it is identifiable as *ephébos* or athlete boy *paides* after his tender body and boyish appearance. Another point could support such identification is the traces of black paint on the statue. I do not believe that they are resulting after firing, but rather remaining from a painted surface, which was a common Greek and Egyptian practice. This black paint is very suggestive to recall the Athenian tradition of the ephebic black *chlamys*. That may confirm the proposed subject of the Cairo statue as *ephébos* and the round object on the backside may decide his athletic profession.

The round object with *chlamys* should recall a Macedonian head gears. Two types of head gears are candidate: the *Kausia* which never appeared with such hanging robes, while the *Petasos* has similar robes, but their shape is not gradually thinned. The *Petasos* sometimes is slung on the back but its shape is still indicating a head gear, and it is usually seen on the nape level, not down any more. The *Petasos* has a broad brim, shown circular or cut at angles, but its hallmark is the central knob. Both features are lacking on the Cairo statue’s round object. The statue is wearing the ephebic *chlamys* and the affinities with *gymnasia* world is already attested, therefore the round object perhaps, is best sought within Greek athletics equipments.

Among Greek athletic round equipments, shield should be excluded, after the size and shape of the object on the Cairo statue. This round object could be *diskos*, (fig. 6) which is the most famous round equipment in Greek athletics. The two ropes on the Cairo statue stand against this interpretation since the Greek *diskos* when appears in action does not have such robes. The Greek *diskos* when not in use was kept in a sort of sling, with its two ends tied in a knot, and this sling with the *diskos* inside is frequently represented hanging on the wall or carried in hands.

The athletic scenes on Greek vases show this sling or round bags, hanging on the wall, to keep *halteres* and *diskoi* (fig .9). An important feature of this bag is the gradual thinness of its hanging straps. The thickness of the Cairo statue bag and the object inside favors a *diskos*
more than *halteres*. Real *diskoi*, range mostly around 1 cm in thickness, and therefore, conforms to the volume of the object on the Cairo statue. Literary evidence attests the existence of such bags; *sakkos* and *thulakos* were used by the Greeks to keep their equipments while going to *Gymnasia* or baths. Pollux speaks about *trophoi*, *halteres* and *diskoi*, kept in these bags. Therefore it is very reasonable to identify the round object as *sakkos* with *diskos* inside. The statue therefore, represents *ephèbos* or boy athlete in training on *diskobolia*. The *diskos* on the Cairo statue is decisive evidence that the two statues in Istanbul and Rome, belong to the world of *Gymnasia* and *Palaistrai*, and support their identification as athletes.

The Cairo *diskophoros* is of particular importance, first of all because of the paucity of athletic representations from Graeco-Roman Egypt. The statue subject is unique and does not find parallel anywhere, it presents for the first time a glimpse of the ephebic daily life, up to now never been caught in classical art. A draped boy carrying *diskos* on his way to *gymnasion*, is completely different from the before action, nude Antretender *diskobolos*, and not to mention the Myron famous statue. The *diskobolia* was one of the Greek pentathlon’s five contests, and this category of athletes was regarded as the superior in ability and power, and winning a pentathlete contest required different skills and qualifications. The Greek pentathletes represented the *Kalokagathia* which means the physical and moral beauty and harmony. The sophisticated composing and elaborated style of the Cairo *diskophoros* correspond to these highly estimated athletic Greek conceptions.

The Greek pentathlon appears in few papyri but without a single Olympian victor from Egypt, while within other Pan-Hellenic games, however one victor is recorded. Nikostratos son of Nikostratos from Alexandria won the boys Pentathlete at the *Asklepieia* of Kos in the second half of the third century BC. Few figurative references to *diskobolia* are known from Egypt among which is a small bronze statue in Basel. In addition to an inscribed *diskos*, found in Kom Ischgaou Aphroditopolis, was dedicated to Apollo by Apollodoros, dated to late fourth century BC.

The Cairo *diskophoros* perhaps is the first assured athletic sculpture in the round from Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. The archaeological material is scanty and lacking decisive attributes: a statue of a boy athlete in the Louvre may represent a god as well. Another

---

33 La Regina 2004, p. 190, no. 28, 1 cm in thickness, from Tarentum. Another *diskoi* from la tomba del guerriero di Lanuvio, in Roman National Museum, varies between 0.65-0.7 cm. La Regina 2004, p. 272, no. 47. Fifteen real discs tabled by Gardiner 1907, p. 6, vary between 5-13 mm in thickness. A marble *diskos*, dates to the second half of the sixth century BC, reached 5 cm in thickness, see Bothmer 1986, p. 6; on *diskoi*, see Miller 2004, p. 60f, fig. 105-107.

34 Pollux, Onomasticon III.155, X. 64; Lafaye Sacco.

35 I am very grateful to the anonymous referee, for stressing this note in his report.

36 La Regina 2004, p. 146, no. 11.


38 Deckler 1991, p. 96; among 163 victor athletes known from literary material from Egypt, there is no single example of *diskobolos* or pentathlete, see Perpillou-Thomas 1995, p. 241ff. The Penathlon appears Poxy.II. 222, Poxy.XXIII. 2381, both contain lists from 480-452 and 396 BC. The inscription of the 267 *basileia* doesn’t mention pentathlete or *diskobolia* among agonistic contests held there. Koenen 1977, p. 4-5, 9.

39 Klee 1918, p. 6, lines. 13-14. Peremans-Van’t Dack 1968, no. 17223a; Remijsen 2009, p. 256, n. 44.

40 Rolley 1983, no. 177. A statue depicts Hermes, formerly in von Sieglin Collection, from Alexandria, showing the god carrying a *diskos*, in his right hand, which is an interesting indication of Hermes’ patronage of athletics. A similar figure on plaster cast, formerly in von Bissing Collection shows Hermes carrying *diskos* in his right hand as well. See Pagenstecher 1923, p. 51f, taf. 32, abb. 35-37.

41 Michaïlidès 1949, p. 100, pl. III, a; Peremans-Van’t Dack 1968, no. 17193; Remijsen 2009, p. 256 n. 44.

42 Charbonneaux 1963, p. 76.
wreathed head of Isthmian victor, perhaps represents a boxer from imperial times. Funerary stelai show few athletic figures, as do mosaics. The mummy portraits present the main bulk of athletic figures, where the nudity and muscled chests are the main attributes, but no athletic professions are detectable.

Few terracotta and bronzes are known as well: among which is the bronze *diskobolos* in Basel, and another bronze boxer in Cleveland. An upper bust of boxer in terracotta, from Canopus in Alexandria, is very remarkable with its high boxing gloves. Many groups of wrestlers or pankratiasts in bronze and terracotta could be listed: in London, Baltimore, St Petersburg, Munich, Tanta, Marymount, Athens, Istanbul, and Cairo. Some examples perhaps have an allegoric meaning, and Ptolemaic royal identity has been already proposed.

This paucity of archaeological material is contrasted to the plenty of literary material, which reflects noticeable athletic activities. The Alexander’s theatrical and athletic games *Basileia* at Memphis in 332-331 BC, perhaps did not lack the political purposes, but it was connected with the king birthday since Philadelpus’ reign. Philadelpus founded many *agones;* the iso-Olympic *Ptolemaieia,* the *Pentaeteris* and *Theadelphia* were remarkable theatrical and athletic events, while the *Arsinoeia* was annual festival for the deified queen Arsinoe II. Ptolemaic kings were active sponsors of athletes and athletics since the Soter’s reign, especially the equestrian contests. The Zenon archive shows a professional training of boy athletes,

---

An Unpublished Granite Statue of Diskophoros Ephébos in Cairo.

During Roman times, imperial sponsorship of athletics most likely extended to Egypt, and at least athletic festivals and games began by the Aktia in Nicopolis by 30 BC, and other festivals are recorded within second century as well. Athletes in Roman Egypt enjoyed many privileges and benefits in their cities up to public offices, pension and exemption of public liturgies. These athletic activities perhaps are owing to the flourishing of metropoleis life, where the Hellenic elite recalled traditional Greek conceptions of polis culture, especially after the Severus and Caracalla reforms. Alexandrian athletes of Roman era were professionals in heavy contests like boxing, pankration and wrestling in addition to stadion. Many remarkable heavy athletes with outstanding careers are known and well documented. The Olympian victors between 480-452, lack Alexandrian or Egyptian athletes, in addition to other victors in Pan-Hellenic games. The lists of Olympiad victors did not about possible victories, Gardiner 1930, p. 116; Gardiner 1930a, p. 211-213, n. 56; Paplas 1991, p. 179, n. 56; Legras 1999, p. 25f. From the same archive appears another boy athlete named Dionysos, winner in Prolomaia of Hiera Neson in 259 BC, under protection and training, Legras 1999, p. 27; Cribiore 2001, p. 52f; Remijesen 2009, p. 258. Ptolemys IV or perhaps Epiphanes, trained the pupil Aristonikos who nearly defeated the great Kleitomachos in the 141st Olympiad 216 BC, see Fontenrose 1968, p. 97; Paplas 1991, p. 192, n. 56; Bremen 2007, p. 374; Fraser 1981; Hölbl 2001, p. 142.

In addition to the above, for the late Roman period in Egypt, see Miller 1991, p. 171; Goette 1992, p. 178. For other remarkable athletes, see Drew-Bear 1991, p. 211, n. 20; Goette 1992, p. 178. For other remarkable athletes, see Drew-Bear 1988, Decker 1991, p. 95, 100f.
lists of Egyptian victors in Roman times show dramatic increase from Julio-Claudian to late imperial times.74

The Athletic building like Gymnasia75 are known in Ptolemaic Egypt since third century BC.76 The Metropoleis and villages had their gymnasia in the Ptolemaic period,77 but those of village were closed in Roman time when gymnasion was considered a symbol of the proper polis.78 The Palaistrai are known in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt as well.79 Alexandria had more than one of such buildings,80 and even a town like Philadelphia had small palaistra which denotes the existence of another.81 Other athletic buildings like stadia are documented, the Lageion was the chief stadion in Alexandria and remains of another at least, were documented in Antinopolis.82

The ephebic institutions are well attested from inscriptions since second century BC,83 which show different stages of ephébeia.84 The ephebic training most likely was timed for one year, and began by age of fourteen.85 The ephebic institutions continued in Roman times and each metropolis had an elite male group defined by membership of the gymnasion which was obtained via admission to the ephebe. The Alexandrian citizenship was constructed on this gymnasia pattern and ephebic training and privileged to the sons of citizens only.86 The

74 One victor only is recorded in the Julio-Claudian period, see Scanlon 2002, p. 51f, n. 31 table 2.2 while 15 Alexandrian athletes are recorded with 17 victories within Flavian to Antonine periods, Scanlon 2002, p. 56 tab. 2.3. The third and fourth century shows 17 Egyptian victors: eleven come from Alexandria, and one from Antinopus, Hermopolis, Naukratis, Oxyrhynchos, and victor with unknown city, Scanlon 2002, p. 60, tab. 2.4.

75 See n. 25.

76 Marrou 1982, p. 104; Scanlon 2002, p. 52; Remijsen 2009, p. 257; Alexandria’s gymnasion is well documented within central events in the history of the city, in addition to other gymnasia as well, Delorme 1960, p. 137-140; Fraser 1961, p. 145; Burkhalter 1992, p. 145 ff.

77 Cribiore 2001, p. 35; Two inscriptions on two statue bases from Thmuis in the Nile delta attest two gymnasiarchoi, see Breccia 1932, p. 68; Fraser 1972, II, p. 115, n. 23; Delorme 1960, p. 201; Meulenaere-Mackay 1976, no. 237; Breccia 1923, p. 123-124; Fraser 1972, II, p. 116, n. 23; Meulenaere-Mackay 1976, no. 235, dated to 150 BC, see Fraser 1972, II, p. 185, n. 66.

78 The last attestation of a village gymnasion comes from Herakleopolite nome AD 2, Bowman-Rathbone 1992, p. 121, n. 74. From third century gymnasia are recorded in Luxor, Philadelphia, and Samareia in Fayum, see Delorme 1960, p. 139-40. Known as well in Ombos, Pharbaithos, Psenamos, Ptolemais, Theadelphia and Thmuis, in the second century, Delorme 1960, p. 199-200. A gymnasion and ephebeum is recorded from Aphroditopolis in first century BC. Delorme 1960, p. 220. A dedicational inscription from the Pelseum gymnasion was recently uncovered, see Carrez-Maratray 2006, p. 384ff, fig. 1.

79 The Naukratis palaistra is the oldest, dated by its dedicational inscription to early iv or late iv early iii century BC. For archaeological notes on this type of buildings, see Bailey 1990, p. 121; Delorme 1960, p. 90.n. 1; Fraser 1961, p. 144. For survey of papyrological data, see Bailey 1999, p. 235 ff. There were perhaps private palaistrai as conducted from a letter dates to 257-256 BC, shows a physician charged for opening an illegal palaistra, Delorme 1960, p. 138, n. 6; Forbes 1929, p. 251 however, comments the paucity of traces of Palaistra education in Graeco-Roman Egypt.

80 Delorme 1960, p. 137 f.

81 Delorme 1960, p. 139, n. 7; Legras 1999, p. 28.

82 McKenzie 2007, p. 203, fig. 355. For the Antinopolis stadium, see McKenzie 2007, p. 154ff.

83 Whitehorne 1982, p. 173-174, it disappeared from Egyptian documents after 323 AD, see Bagnall 1993, p. 60, n. 96.

84 The first age class is the prephile mellakes, but their age is not definite yet. The next age class is the ephébein. The ancient ephébein oi ephebeuones appear on five inscriptions date between 116-94 BC, perhaps they are who finished their ephebic training. The companion ephebes oi sunepheboi who passed all their ephebic time. Legras 1999, p. 135-137.

85 That could be inducted from Roman period papyri, and most likely it was the same age in Ptolemaic period, Boak 1927, p. 152; Milne 1957, p. 217; Abbadi 1962, p. 113; Marrou 1982, p. 109; Whitehorne 1982, p. 171; Bowman-Rathbone 1992, p. 124; Legras 1999, p. 142; Cribiore 2001, p. 35.

86 Forbes 1929, p. 231ff; Abbadi 1962, p. 113, n. 2. The connection of the ephebic training and citizenship is rooted in Ptolemaic period, after an inscription dates to 104 BC, perhaps from Ptolemais. The gnomon of Idioslogos prescribes a financial penalty for any Egyptian who
ephebes were required to show gymnasial ancestry on both sides, and later under Domitian a permanent rolling system of *epikrisis* examination was introduced.87 Therefore it was socio-political elite and an aristocratic institution88 that may explain the storming political events within Ptolemy Physcon's reign.89 Ephebic games as well, are known since Ptolemaic period,90 but were very common in Roman times.91

The statue represents *ephébos*, therefore a member of a class which belongs to the Hellenic elite in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt. Unfortunately the head is missing, that it could reveal many artistic and cultural aspects relating to this remarkable sculpture and its identity. The boy athletes *paides* and *ptolemaikoi* are very well known from Egypt, their appearance in the chief royal athletic celebrations is celebrated.92 The above mentioned Pyrrhus, is described as *paidiarion*, little boy.93 Three groups of young athletes appear in an agnostic inscription relating to the Basileia celebrated in Herakleopolite nome in 267 BC.94 *Paides* are less than 14 years, *Ptolemaikoi* between 14-17, and *ageneioi*, “beardless” range between 17-20 years.95 Therefore the Cairo statue most likely represents *paides* or *Ptolemaikos* after the tender body and boyish appearance.

Typology

The statue already has been gathered with the Tralleis Boy96 and the *ephébos* in Rome,97 all have specific hallmarks: the left hand is held tightly to the chest and a short mantle is fastened on the right shoulder. These two sculptures are connected to Dauchos I statue in...
Delphi,\textsuperscript{98} (fig. 10) and considered reproductions of the type. The Cairo statue depends on this type for the body and dress, with some additions. The three statues supposed to copy the Daochos statue show some typological differences. The Tralleis boy is, uniquely, standing against a pillar (fig. 7), while the Rome (fig. 8), and Cairo statues (fig. 1), are standing freely, since no attaching points are traceable (fig. 2, 4, 5).

The Daochos I statue, like the rest of the Thessalian dedication depended on struts,\textsuperscript{99} clearly differs from the Tralleis Boy pillar. The absence of the pillar in addition to the full frontal posture in the Cairo statue should indicate that the Tralleis Boy and Cairo statue are two different variations depended on the same prototype. The Tralleis Boy with its leaning body and crossed legs seems very developed after the Daochos statue, and the type perhaps was created in the late fourth or early third century BC\textsuperscript{100} (fig. 7). The posture of leaning figure against a pillar, with crossed legs is hinted on fourth century vases.\textsuperscript{101} A Hellenistic terracotta statuette from Egypt, depicts a leaning kausiaphoros against a pillar with crossed legs, would challenge the Roman date of the Tralleis Boy type.\textsuperscript{102} The Cairo diskophoros most likely depended on the body type of Daochos I with modified drapery lines.

The head perhaps was turning right in the entire group, as seen on Tralleis statue (fig. 7), the breakage on the Rome (fig. 8), and the Cairo statues (fig. 1), indicates the same posture and the same slightly looking down head. The Daochos statue is missing the head, neck and largest portion of right shoulder; therefore it is difficult to judge its original head’s pose (fig. 10). The accordance of the three statues, in Istanbul (fig. 7), Rome (fig. 8) and Cairo (fig. 1) perhaps suggest the original pose of the same prototype; Daochos I statue (fig. 10).

Another interesting typological difference is the crossed legs, since it appears in the Tralleis Boy, (fig. 7) but it is neither attested in the statues at Rome and Cairo nor the Daochos I. The marching pose in Cairo statue is closer to the Daochos statue, where the left foot is firming while the right leg is drawn backwards to make the next step, the missing right foot perhaps, was touching the ground by toes only (fig. 10). This posture is executed in mirror figure with

\textsuperscript{98} For Daochos group, Bieber 1955, p. 33, fig. 76; Dohrn 1968; Ridgway 1990, p. 48ff, pl. 25; Smith 1991, p. 52; fig. 44, Moreno 1995, p. 82ff, cat. 4.11.1, 4.11.2, 4.11.3; Edwards 1996, p. 136. About the typological relation with the Tralleis Boy, see, Lawrence 1972, p. 236; von Steuben 1972, p. 131ff, Moreno 1995, p. 84, cat. 4.11.2; Andreae 2001, p. 63, abb. 18; De Lachenal 1979, p. 148, connects the Rome statue to the Daochos group as well, and thinks about a replica of The Tralleis Boy.

\textsuperscript{99} Ridgway 1990, p. 49: “They are inconspicuous from the front, but support the bare legs up to the calf muscles, or rise to disappear under the edge of the garments in the draped figures.”

\textsuperscript{100} The dating of the Tralleis Boy is very problematic; late fourth-early third century date is argued by Andreae 2001, p. 60ff; Moreno 1995, p. 82ff, supports a typological relation with the Daochos I statue. Bieber 1955, p. 164; thinks about second to first centuries BC. von Steuben 1972, p. 131ff, sides to the first century BC, and attributes the statue to a contemporary of Paseileos. Ridgway 2002, p. 171, sides to severizing type from first century BC. The statue should be a Roman copy after the missing interpretation of the footwear, Podeia, Morrow 1985, p. 113. The pankration competition for boys was not introduced into Olympia before second century BC. Paplas 1991, p. 174, n. 42; Miller 1991, p. 60; Smith 1991, p. 54. I find the arguments of Andreae for a fourth-third century type, and a late copy in the Istanbul statue, very coherent and the stylistic comparison with the Praying Boy in Berlin is interesting. The appearance of the posture on fourth century vases cannot be ignored, and supports Andreae conclusion.


\textsuperscript{102} Perdrizet 1921, p. 18, no. 78, pl. LXXX. “Type fréquent à l’époque hellénistique”, the face and drapery side to third or second century BC.
An Unpublished Granite Statue of Diskophoros Ephébos in Cairo.

The sculptor of this Alexandrian eclectic type added interesting innovations which are the pose of right arm and the slung disks. The last feature, it is apparent, depends on the tightly held left arm to the chest beneath the chlamys which is already found in the entire group. The hanging ropes of the disks on the back side, is clearly an Alexandrian innovation. The pose is natural and perhaps the sculptor was inspired by the gymnasia world at the poleis, where an athlete is expected to be seen in such posture with such bag. The composing should have depended on Greek models, but typical parallel is not detected yet.

Greek vases present very close conceptions and forerunners of the gesture. An Apulian amphora in the Hermitage depicts a priestess of Hera, carrying a clef on her left shoulder, where the bent left arm is very comparable (fig. 11). The komos scenes on Greek vases sometimes show comasts with hanging baskets or boxes on the backside. The motive should have depended on wide range of genre figures; farmers, shepherds and hunters, sometimes are depicted carrying their loads in comparable gestures. An Alexandrian statue of farmer is a good confront; the man is marching, carrying a basket on his back and the straps are passing on forearms across the chest. Many other examples of this category of art works show occasionally straps, but ever in different way.

Another Alexandrian statue presents close typological confront to this.

103 Löwy 1893, p. 270f, fig. 1; Toutain 1969, p. 939-40, fig. 5990.
104 Beazley 1927, p. 44, no. 4, pl. 43.4; Thompson 1947, pl. 67; Moore 1997, no. 633, pl. 68. Moore speaks about straps, and the whole appearance is similar to an Egyptian bronze statuette in Copenhagen. Bayer 1983, abb. 21-22, p. 123ff, p. 268. Himmlmann 1983, taf. 43 b. Many examples of the theme show baskets hanging on walls, see Moore 1997, nos. 19, 173, 629, 890, 1416, 1421, 1607, 1625. The subject of running boy with wineskin slung on the back presents very close conception and could be forerunner of the complicated pose on the Cairo statue. See, Hayes 1981, p. 32, pl. 37.8; a cup in Royal Ontario Museum. See as well, Simon 1997, p. 113, fig. 210, old Selinos with wineskin on shoulder, 350-325 BC. This posture appears in two figures of Papposelinus from Delos, marching with tambourine in right hand and wineskin on the left shoulder, second century BC. The left arm is bent and holding the rim of the wineskin, and the whole appearance is conceptually very close to the Cairo Statue. Marcadé 1969, p. 102, n. 2, 113, 137, 200ff, 288, 450, pl. XXIII; Smith 1991, p. 242, fig. 313. Similar wineskin carried in similar way by a satyr accompanying Dionysos on the Poet visit relief, Pollitt 1986, p. 197, fig. 211; Moreno 1994, p. 726f, fig. 899. An interesting comast figure in Mississippi shows a lyre hanging on the left shoulder, and bent left arm to the chest with clinchéd fist. The relation between the hand and lyre is not clear, but shows very close conception to the Cairo statue. Robinson 1956, p. 19ff, pl. 15-16, fig. 68. A Chous in Berlin shows a laden young man, but the way in which the object is carried is different. Smith 2007, p. 159, fig. 8.5.
105 Bonacasa 1960, p. 170ff, tav. L-LIV; Laurscher 1982, cat. 23a, tav. 17.1. A funeral stelie of hunter carrying a load on his back, in Paul Getty Museum, dated around 325 BC, presents different details but similar conception, Grossman 2001, p. 104-106, no. 38. A terracotta type from Myrina, known in many copies: a boy with left hand is held to the chest, carrying a quiver on his back, Winter 1952, II, taf. 239 no. 10, with list of replicas; Higgins 1967, pl. 116-117, pl. 56 E; Kassab Tezgör 1988, nos. 80-86, 183. The motive is close but the way in which the quiver is hanging still unclear. Artemis carries sometimes a quiver on backside, mostly without indication of suspension way, but sometimes hanging strap is used, Walters 1893, B.245, B.260, B.316, LIMC II, sv. Artemis, nos. 113, 155, 162-168, 171, 174, 242, 268, 317a, 560, 1140, 1171a, 1283. From Alexandria, some genre figures present a closer conception to this part. A bronze statuette in Copenhagen represents fisherman carrying a basket or box on his back. The load is slung; straps are seen on the shoulder passing beneath the armpit, Bayer 1983, abb. 22-22, p. 123ff, 268; Himmlmann 1983, taf. 43b. Very close as well, is a terracotta figurine from Hadra Necropolis, that represents a harp player. The harp is
motive: the terracotta satiric donkey-headed statuette of a teacher, dated to second century BC.107 The left arm is bent inside the mantle and holding presumed diptychon.

Among athletic figures, an Alexandrian terracotta statuette is very worthy mentioning: the boy is enveloped in elegant himation, carrying a crown inside Lemniscus on the right shoulder in mirror figure of our statue108 (fig. 12). Another statue of boy athlete in the Cleveland Museum, known in many replicas, presents good conceptual confront to the Cairo diskophoros. The boy is nude, marching; his face is turning right and looking down. The right arm pose is a mirror figure as well, held tightly to the chest. The right hand is holding a robe, on each end hangs a jumping weight. The conception of carrying a load on the back side with robe passes on the shoulder is comparable to the same motive on the Cairo statue109 (fig. 13). These two statues belong to the world of gymnasia, both present a feature should be labeled rare.

The other interesting addition to the Daochos type is the pose of the right hand, which fixes the two edges of the chlamys. The Daochos statue shows the right arm hanging freely beside the body110 (fig. 10). The right arms in Tralleis boy and the Rome statue are enveloped inside the mantles, and the folds are flaring on that side (fig. 7, 8).111 The gesture of the right hand in the Cairo statue shows the mantle’s rear edge held by hand, overlapping the front edge, but in diagonal pattern and severe linear execution, with no typical parallel up to my knowledge (fig. 1, 2). The motive of holding a dress’ edge with the hand enveloped inside the same mantle began with the muses figures on the Mantinea base,112 and the statue of Aeschines from ca. 320 BC.113 The motive appears as well on the famous Herculaneum women,114 male and female sculptures,115 funerary stelai 116 (fig. 16), Tanagra figurines,117 and a common Hellenistic type of kausiaphoros boys.
The common terracotta type is showing a standing boy with ankle length *Chalmys*, *Kryptides* and *Kausi* on his head,\textsuperscript{118} and therefore its Macedonian affinities are unsuspected.\textsuperscript{119} The type is attested in Attica from third century BC,\textsuperscript{120} from Demetrias, Thessalia, Troy, Sicily, Asia Minor, Syria and Cyrenaica.\textsuperscript{121} Alexandria earliest examples come from Chatby,\textsuperscript{122} Ibrahim\textsuperscript{123} and Hadra cemeteries and date to the third century BC.\textsuperscript{124} The posture is similar to Cairo statue and the conception of folding edges of the mantle held by the hand is very common. The beautiful boy from Attica in the British Museum presents close conception, but the whole appearance is still different.\textsuperscript{125} More closely is a terracotta statuette of *kausiaphoros* boy, from Hadra Necropolis, dates to third century BC\textsuperscript{126} (fig. 14).

The Cairo statue shows many typological differences from this terracotta type, but its dependence on the same conceptions is apparent. The body of the Cairo statue is still loyal to the Daochos I statue, in the marching pose which is different from the twisted body and contrapposto posture of the Alexandrian *kausiaphoroi*. Despite the missing head, one can guess a different hair style; since no traces of hair locks are seen on the shoulders. The terracotta type, it is noticed, usually has a shoulder length hair style\textsuperscript{127} (fig. 14). More interestingly is that

---

\textsuperscript{118} Winter 1903, II, taf. 237ff; Thompson 1963, p. 54ff; Higgins 1967, p. 100; Schneider-Hermann 1984, p. 303f.

\textsuperscript{119} Saatsoglou-Paliadel 1993, pasim; Fischer 2003, p. 375ff. The *chlamys* was the dress of Macedonian courtiers, Thompson 1963, p. 54, no. 144 suggested that Theocritus XV, 6, is talking about soldiers in uniform in the Alexandrian Adonisia. The garment in Ptolemaic Egypt should have indicated high rank, since it was Macedonian dress and Theocritus talks about men *Andres*, Gow 1938, p. 190. Ptolemy the younger son of Cleopatra and Antony was dressed in *Kaustia*, *Chlamys* and *Kryptides*, during the Alexandria donation of 34 BC. Thompson 1963, p. 53, n. 116; Gow 1938, p. 190. Therefore the *chlamys* should be regarded as Macedonian symbol in Egypt as well. The prototype of this Alexandrian terracotta type, should not be royal, since these *kausiaphoroi* boys have their head gear painted in blue or blue green not purple which was the insignia of royal Macedonian kings and notaries. Saatsoglou-Paliadel 1993, p. 126, 144; Fischer 2003, p. 376-377, n. 25, 35. From Egypt, few known examples of royal Ptolemaic statuary bodies in Greek style are dressed in the *chlamys*. The Memphite plinter cast in Heldsheim with bust of Ptolemy I, Grimm 1998, abb. 63; the statuette of Ptolemy III in Bonn, with *chlamys* fastened on the right shoulder. Moreno 1994, p. 325ff, fig. 417; a small bust in Paris represents Ptolemy XII dressed in *chlamys* as well, see Smith 1988, p. 97, n. 67; Grimm 1998, abb.121 a,b; Stanwick 2002, p. 60. Standing figure of Ptolemy Soter hunting in Melager attire after Alexandrian lost painting, see Prommer 1999, abb. 86 a-b. There were other *Chlamidophoros* types, for example the rider on a galloping horseman over an enemy, celebrating a Macedonian triumphal event by Ptolemy Soter. Fischer 2003, p. 375ff, fig. 1. Another cavalry type without defeated enemy, Kassab Tezgör 2007, nos. 18-20, 258, pl. 17, 78, p. 351-354 with supposed Alexandrian origin as well. The Ptolemaic funerary stelai representing soldiers should not be missed here, see Brown 1957; Rouveret 2001. An interesting papyrus 199-200 AD, shows that a *charnidiophoros* enjoyed some civil privileges, granted by the senate of Karanis. Another papyrus from Oxyrhinchus third-fourth century AD, appoints out that the *chlamys* was the proper garment for a meeting of notaries, Pehl 1940, p. 384f, 388f. One may guess that the *chlamys* here is an insignia of ephepic education? A late third century funerary stele, Coptic Museum 8029, attests the last phase of *chlamys* draping in Graeco-Roman Egypt, see Török 2005, p. 66, fig. 10.

\textsuperscript{120} Higgins 1967, p. 100, pl. 41. d.

\textsuperscript{121} Thompson 1963, p. 53, 84; Fischer 1994. Comment on no. 196; Kassab Tezgör 2007, p. 208.

\textsuperscript{122} Breccia 1912, p. 145, pl. LXXII, fig. 217; Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 98 pl. 37c.

\textsuperscript{123} Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 124, 126-129.

\textsuperscript{124} Adriani 1940, p. 78-79, pl. XXXII.2; Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 170. Adriani 1952, p. 14, pl. VI.2; Glore d’Alexandrie, no. 70. Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 177, pl. 4b, 12f, 58a. Some examples date from third to second centuries BC from Alexandria, see Fischer 1994, no. 196, 198, 225, seated.

\textsuperscript{125} Higgins 1967, p. 100, pl. 41d. Terracotta examples are numerous, Besques 1972, p. 31, D.165, p. 38, the type is known as well from Roman times, for example, Grandjouan 1961, p. 54, no. 391-395, pl. 8. AD 200-250, attested as well from fourth century Egyptian terracottas, Kassab Tezgör 2007, p. 209.

\textsuperscript{126} Adriani 1952, p. 14, pl. VI.2; Glore d’Alexandrie, no. 70; Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 177, pl. 4b, 12f, 58a.

\textsuperscript{127} Adriani 1940, p. 78-79, pl. XXXII.2; Higgins 1967, p. 41 d; Glore d’Alexandrie, no. 70; Kassab Tezgör 2007, nos. 98, 126-129, 170, 177.
the Alexandrian figurines are unparalleled anywhere and considered Alexandrian creations of local ateliers in the third century BC. I find it is probable that these Alexandrian terracottas and the Cairo diskophoros were inspired by the same model, which could be a missing Alexandrian statue.

The Cairo diskophoros shows clear difference between the elegant typological confront and the less stylized execution of the body and surface treatment. The statue stands without typical parallel and recalls sophisticated sculptures of early Hellenistic period, and best confronted to conceptions and models from third century BC. The absence of the typical parallel from Egypt or a broad may confirm the originality of the proposed Alexandrian third century sculpture. It is difficult to believe that the hand which composed such sophisticated sculpture is responsible for this rough execution. This feature may suggest that the statue is a copy or second edition of unknown Alexandrian type. The hypothesized type, except the pose and hair style, is close to the common kausiaiaphoros boy type. The statue with its typological peculiarities is another document revealing the creativity of Alexandrian art and its ability to give a particular taste to common Hellenistic types and norms. This statue perhaps belongs to same span of time which produced other Alexandrian originals like the old fisherman or the British Museum spinario, or the sculptures of the Memphite exedra.

### Style and Date

The dress lines show a mixture of styles; the style in which the chlamys is worn, including the left arm inside began in Alexander’s time, and perhaps the Daochos I statue is its earliest sculptural attestation. Similar tightly held right hand beneath the himation began to appear with the Mantineia base and continued with Muses and relating figures through Hellenistic and Roman era. The hand beneath a mantle appears in two variations: fingers and fist are stretched on the chest, or the hand is seen by side and the fist is clinched in hook-like shape. The left hand in the Cairo statue follows the second variation with side seen clinched fist, which perhaps began in the third century since it appears with terracotta kausiaiaphoroi from Alexandria, and the Ambrakia Muses. Moreover the chlamys’ neck fold in the Cairo statue does not follow the Daochos I pattern; it rather falls on the chest. This pattern is common among military figures, appears with the Aknonios statue from the same Thessalian dedication.

129 One can count a specific Alexandrian alternation to the Palliatius type, where the caps is substituted by the Thoth Baboon, see Schreiber 1908, p. 273, Abb. 204, no. 7, n. 11; Ashour 2007, p. 697, cat. 267, p. 613, cat. 271.
130 Himmelmann 1983; Moreno 1994; Ashour 2007.
131 Bieber 1928, p. 69, from early Hellenistic period, the two standing chlamidaphoroi on the entrance to the Hagios Athanasios tomb in Thessalonica.
132 Clearly different from the Palliatius type, where this right hand is resting on the diagonal roll of the mantle, see Bieber 1959, passim.
134 Ridgway 1990, p. 246-249, p 269, n. 9, pl. 122 b, it is very interesting that the Ambrakia Muses from third century BC, are connected to Pyrrhos of Epeiros, Ridgway 1990, p. 246-249, p 269, n. 9, pl. 122 b, who came to Egypt and married a daughter of Ptolemy Soter and with his help, regained his empire in 279, Delia 1996, p. 41. This group of muses were brought to Rome by Fluvius Nobilior to Rome by 187 BC, Ridgway 1990, p. 247, therefore their dating to third century is very reasonable.
known in royal Ptolemaic portraits on coins136 (fig. 18). The Hellenistic funerary monuments of Macedonian officers and soldiers usually show this fashion.137 It is possible that this feature is borrowed from military sphere to stress the military future of this ephèbos, since the athletic exercises were part of the regular military training.138

The style, in which the mantle is grasped on the right side, where its rare side overlaps its front side, is expressive and well designed. A similar drapery of chlamys is not detected up to now, but the third century torso herm in Megara Museum,139 shows a bent right arm and most likely the missing forearm was fixing a diagonal edge of the mantle on the hip and belly. The Megara herm confirms the existence of the bent arm motive in the third century, such pose is presumed in the Alexandrian type, which was copied in the Cairo statue. Another late fourth century terracotta type from Kyramikos represents boys dressed in mantle showing very close conception. The composing is a mirror figure from the Cairo diskophoros, and the mantle is heavily folded on the right side with the edge diagonally executed.140 This bent arm is comparable to many Muses figures, begins, again with the Mantinea base,141 the statue of Aeschines,142 the Herculaneum women,143 private sculpture,144 funerary stelai (fig. 16),145 Tanagra figurines and kausiaphoros boys146 (fig. 14). The Hierapetra boy in Crete with its replicas147 is another interesting confront despite it is a mirror figure of the right arm of the Cairo diskophoros. It is reasonable that this motive depended on sculptural models from late fourth or early third century BC, most likely the Muses groups, since neither the Daochos statue nor the Tralleis boy show such motive.

The motive denotes dignity and respect, as well as intellectuality and aidos, especially with the edge of the mantle on the shoulder, which is rooting in representations of aged men on Attic funerary stelai.148 The subject of the statue is ephèbos, therefore belongs to high social class after his dress, well educated after his gymnasium membership. This education is not

136 Poole 1883, pl. XVII.1; Poole 1883, pl. XVII.5; Kyrieleis 1975, taf. 40; Grimm 1998, abb 1044.
139 Inv. 389, the herm is not published, I would like to thank Petros Themelis and Olga Palagia for this information via personal communication. A date in third century is reasonable when compared to a similar torso herm, with left hand on the hip from Rhamnous in Athen National Museum, dates to 330 BC or late fourth century. Pouilloux 1954, p. 11; Palagia 1989, p. 339; Harrison 1965, p. 160-161.
141 Raftopoulou 1975, p. 4, pl. VII.1; Ridgway 1990, pl. 132; Moreno 2009, p. 66, fig. 57.
143 Smith 1991, p. 75, fig. 89; many other copies, see Bieber 1962, pasim.
144 Female statue from Kos, Smith 1991, p. 84, fig. 112. The Eretria youth, Lewerentz 1993, p. 242, kat. 1.4, abb. 3.
145 From Smyrna, Zanker 1995, fig. 14; from Attica, Conze 1922, pl. 405-410, nos. 1894-1920; from Canopus, Breccia 1932, p. 15, tav. IV.13; Schmidt 2003, kat. 48.
146 GRM, 25711. Adriani 1932, p. 14, pl. VI.2; Glore d’Alexandrie, no. 70; Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 177. Many other examples see, Kassab Tezgör 2007, nos. 124, 125, 127, 128, 170.
147 Edwards 1996, p. 144-145, n. 88, quoting Hesiod who describes Nemesis and Aidos “shrouding their bright forms in pale mantles”. The statue of Archilochos in the Louvre, shows a marching man grasping his mantle’s edge by right hand Schefold 1997, p. 94, abb.29. confirms as well the intellectual significance of this style. The Muses types frequently show this style, within different gestures, Ridgway 1990, p. 246ff, pl. 13ff.
exclusively physical one, but should have followed the Isokrates pattern of intellectual and athletic education.\textsuperscript{149} Therefore the intellectual taste in modeling the figure is very expected.\textsuperscript{150} The boy did not leave his mantle open to expose any more of his body, but rather secured it with his hand. The conception is very different from the athletic nudity in classical times and conforms to Hellenistic conception which was expressed by the nude chest beneath \textit{chlamys}.\textsuperscript{151} The head looking down could be another indication of \textit{aidos}, especially among \textit{ephéboi} and athletes. This virtue was much stressed in classical times to make the future good citizen of the \textit{polis}. The head of the Cairo statue most likely was looking down, as was conducted from the Tralleis Boy, labeled by Zanker “particularly powerful expression of Aidos.”\textsuperscript{152} Ptolemaic Alexandria with its learned and sophisticated society was able to host and develop such artistic and intellectual conceptions.

The whole appearance of drapery treatment on the left side of the proposed Alexandrian original statue, finds a good parallel in the terracotta figurine from Manara Necropolis, representing \textit{kausiaphoros} boy\textsuperscript{63} (fig. 14). The superficial treatment of the folds beneath the left elbow is similar; on both figures the triangular pattern is used, and the surface is worked into short light folds express surface tension. The vertical folds on the left side are comparable as well, but its execution on the Cairo \textit{diskophoros} is cold and schematic, even when compared to these terracottas.\textsuperscript{154} From third century as well, another Alexandrian statuette of seated \textit{chlamidophoros} presents a close style of the \textit{chlamys} treatment on the right shoulder and arm.\textsuperscript{155} The edge is following the arm and held by the hand, recalls pure intellectual conceptions.\textsuperscript{156}

The lively appearance of the tender body is remarkable, sometimes the details are traceable beneath the heavy mantle; a feature should reflect the high artistic level of the third century statue. The surface is still showing remains of the original pattern of the elegant expressive textile folds, despite its linear execution on the Cairo \textit{diskophoros}. This treatment reflects the muscular reaction of the hand against the weight of the \textit{diskos}. The grasping hands are surrounded by a group of short light folds giving natural expression of tensioned surface. The right hand is completely covered, but the textile is impressed by the grasping fingers, not only on the right leg where this hand rests but on the left leg as well.

The ropes of the slung \textit{sakkos} are expressively treated as well; the strap on the left side is moved to the forearm, and does not repeat the style of right shoulder, giving variety in treatment of such motive. The gesture is expressionist and reflects the load and the adolescent reaction of the boy athlete, most likely to avoid any expected hurt. This style is very close to the marching farmer in Alexandria,\textsuperscript{157} but best compared to a half nude boy from Myrina,\textsuperscript{158} with the mantle shifted to the forearm dates to 300-250 BC. The diagonally fallen strap on the belly is enriching the folds lines, in successful contrast to the other diagonal edge of the mantle.

\textsuperscript{150} Seated young men with mediating expression and very closely fashioned mantle are known from third century BC, see Zanker 1995, p. 90ff, fig. 51-52.
\textsuperscript{151} Zanker 1993, p. 221; Hallett 2005, p. 29-30.
The original statue copied in the Cairo diskophoros, stylistically is best located in the high Hellenistic period, and finds close parallel among terracotta boys from third century BC\(^{159}\) (fig. 14). Many third to second centuries’ genre figures present the closest conception of the slung diskos on the back side. The style of left arm held to the chest, seems of remarkable fortune within third century BC. In addition to the Alexandrian terracottas, a third century bronze plaque from Galjub shows this motive with different pose of the right arm.\(^{160}\) The gesture is repeated in the Ambrakia Muses group known from Roman moulds and coins, but the original is dated to third century BC.\(^ {161}\) Within this century, I prefer to date the Alexandrian type, copied in the Cairo diskophoros. It is less likely that the Cairo diskophoros is the original type with its incorrect proportions and deformed execution, even without a support. The proposed original Alexandrian type was carved earlier, perhaps in the last quarter of the third century.

The sculptor of the Cairo diskophoros seems of medium level, despite his ability to copy highly stylized models and transfer pure Greek conceptions and motives into an Egyptian hard stone like granite. The body lines are rigid and less harmonious and the right side is unnaturally treated, where a linear rough furrow separates the covered arm from the body. The side views show less stylized treatment; the chlamys rigid lines dominate the body modeling in many parts, especially the chest, which does not show any flesh details. The shoulder hardly, is recognized from the body and the whole composing is lacking depth. The right arm is treated asymmetrically; the volume of the forearm is very narrow and contradicting the wide elbow beneath the mantle. The arm line follows the mantle edge on the bare part of the body and its whole appearance should be labeled disproportioned.

The left arm and hand which are supposed to copy highly stylized model are executed in the same asymmetrical and disproportioned values. The details of the arm are merging into the body and the forearm seems as additional mass of stone to the body, while the elbow is smaller in volume and disproportioned in appearance. The lower part of the body seems disproportioned and squeezed, owing to the tightly held mantle on the right side. The feature should have been copied after the third century model, as confirmed by many Post-Tanagra Alexandrian terracottas, which however are still showing the lively proportions of the lower part of the body.\(^ {162}\) This deformed appearance is owing to the medium ability of the Cairo diskophoros sculptor, or perhaps generations of copies that are still unknown.

The style of wearing the chlamys and surface execution recalls middle to late Hellenistic conceptions, and best compared to terracotta and funerary stelai.

The flat dry surface of the statue is comparable to a chlamidophoros figure on a funerary stele perhaps from Smyrna, dated to middle second century BC.\(^ {163}\) The figure shows similar sketchy treatment of the folds and left arm within its relation to the surface. The folds on the right leg of the Cairo statue, in their circular pattern and linear execution find close parallel in Alexandria funerary stele of Ptolemaeos in Amsterdam, dates to first century BC.\(^ {164}\)

\(^{159}\) Breccia 1930, p. 37, no. 110, tav. XI.1; Adriani 1932, p. 14, pl. VI.2; Gloire d’Alexandrie, no. 70; Fischer 1994, no. 225, respectively.  
\(^{160}\) Ippel 1922, nos. 82-83, taf. IX.  
\(^{161}\) Ridgway 1990, p. 246-249, p. 269, n. 9, pl. 122 b.  
\(^{162}\) Kassab Tezgör 1998a, p. 206, fig. 1 a-b; Kassab Tezgör 2007, nos. 98, 126-129.  
\(^{163}\) Pfuhl-Möbius 1979, no. 539, taf. 83.  
\(^{164}\) Pfuhl 1901, no. 31; Moormann 2000, no. 129 pl. 58 b.
The diagonal folds between legs are comparable to Post-Tangara statuette from Hadra, the fresher lines should predate the Cairo diskophoros with its static lines and suggest a date in the first century BC for the later (fig. 15). This style of wide grooved folds, is very comparable to another stele from Smyrna, dates between 150-100 BC.\textsuperscript{166} The figure is wearing himation, but the left arm is bent and the end of textile is held in similar style to the Cairo statue. Grooved folds appear between legs corresponds to the fingers on the left side. Closer in execution and technique is another Egyptian late Hellenistic chlamidophoros figure in farewell scene with similar diagonal flat folds concentrated around the grasping hand.\textsuperscript{167} The surface is turned into schematic rough flat grooved folds, mostly similar in its reflection of the grasping action.

The style of executing the right hand where it is clinched, resting on the thigh with its outer surface facing the seer, is very comparable to an inscribed funerary stele from near Smyrna dates between 150-100 BC.\textsuperscript{168} (fig.17). The right arm is partially enveloped in the mantle leaving a small portion of the forearm exposed. The serious difference between the two figures is the mantle treatment below the clinched hand: where the textile is flaring on the funerary stele while its two edges are closed together on the Cairo statue. The chlamidophoros athlete on a funerary stele from Canopus (fig. 16),\textsuperscript{169} presents close style of the right arm, in its pose relation to the mantle edge. The triangular form of the two edges of the mantle on the right shoulder is very similar. The stele with its more worked and less dry surface, should predate the statue, but still valid to suggest a date in the first century BC. A later date could be proposed after a terracotta female statue in Alexandria, most likely depended on sculptural model.\textsuperscript{170}

The statue shows fresher lines and richer dynamic execution reflect the action of a covered right hand grasping the mantle. This highly stylized motive is contrasting its counterpart on the Cairo diskophoros with its rigid lines and more static surface, and suggests later date for the statue. The terracotta figurine is dated to late third or early second century BC, close to the proposed Alexandrian type, which is presumably copied in the Cairo diskophoros.

Two late Hellenistic terracottas from Chatby,\textsuperscript{171} present the same dry static surface, and rigid lines of drapery. The frontal pose is used and the left arm adds more volume to the body where details are mostly absent beneath the chlamys. The treatment of neck fold is similar and the twist of the mantle edge on the right arm is more open on the terracotta type but still shows closer conception. The type belongs to the Post-Tangra group with its conic headgear, bulky execution and less modeled body. The dry treatment of the surface on the Cairo diskophoros finds close parallel in a specific Cypriote type of cult servant dates to the first century BC. The type shows a standing boy dressed in chlamys and left hand tightly held to the chest. The affinities to Egypt after the shaven head are apparent and it is already connected to Isis cult.\textsuperscript{172}

\textsuperscript{165} Breccia 1930, p. 37, no. 110, tav. XI.1. The statuette shows a different drapery of the chlamys in addition to a different hair style, that should locate it after the late third century BC, for Post-Tangaras, see Kassab Tezgör 2007, p. 248ff.

\textsuperscript{166} Pfuhl-Möbius 1979, no. 158, tav. 35.

\textsuperscript{167} Pfuhl 1901, p. 282, no. 20; Edgar 1903, p. 33, no. 275, pl. XVIII.

\textsuperscript{168} Pfuhl-Möbius 1979, no. 640, tav. 98.

\textsuperscript{169} Schmidt 2003, Kat. 48. It is noticeable that the style of holding the dress with a bent arm and hand enveloped inside the same dress appears frequently on funerary stelae from late second and first centuries BC. See Schmidt 2003, no. 46; second to first century BC from Egypt, from Delos, Couilloud 1974, no. 304, pl. 59; from the Greek east, Pfuhl-Möbius 1979, nos.164-166.

\textsuperscript{170} Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 252.

\textsuperscript{171} Breccia 1930, p. 37, no. 114, pl. LV.14, similar type is pl. LV.16.

\textsuperscript{172} Queyrel 1988, p. 119ff, no. 377-387, pl. 38.
The surface lines are poorly executed and the whole appearance is close to the Cairo diskophoros. Another Cypriote sculptural type dates to the end of Hellenistic period may support a date in the first century for the Cairo diskophoros. The type shows a mirror himation figure with similar summarized static surface and rough flat grooved folds with plain backside.\(^{173}\)

The style of the left hand with its fist clinched in hook-like shape, seen by side already has been traced till third century BC. The motive is frequently attested in the second century BC as well. First of all, is the Muse with kithara in the upper row of the Homer apotheosis relief, dated around 125 BC,\(^{174}\) and 150 BC.\(^{175}\) Funerary stelai show the same motive as well: the Chamilophoros athlete from Egypt\(^{176}\) (fig. 16), and other examples from the Greek east, perhaps Smyrna, date to middle second century BC.\(^{177}\) The same style is found on many Post-Tanagra statuettes from Alexandria, date after the last quarter of third century;\(^{178}\) and many torsi herms from Delos date to second century BC.\(^{179}\) The treatment of this hand is slightly different owing to the rope passing inside, and it is still closer to third century style best compared to Alexandrian Kausiaphoros\(^{180}\) (fig. 14). This motive, perhaps, depended on the third century statue.

An interesting feature in the Cairo diskophoros that should not be ignored in the chronological question is the clasp on the right shoulder. The elongated form is rare and very distinguishable from the round Roman ones.\(^{181}\) The shape is different from buttons and round fibulae used by Greeks to fasten both male and female dresses.\(^{182}\) The Byzantine period fibulae are characterized in the famous cross-bow type.\(^{183}\) The Ptolemaic evidence for fibulae and clasps is fragmentary, and I have hinted the paucity of draped royal figures, except small bronzes, showing however, the round fibula.\(^{184}\) Ptolemaic coins are helpful when the design is well preserved, where two ends of a cloak like aegis are simply fastened,\(^{185}\) or buttons are clearly used with chlamys.\(^{186}\) A third method appears on these coins, showing the clasp technique.

A golden coin of Ptolemy V shows a metal clasp with two round ends penetrate his chlamys on the shoulder.\(^{187}\) The shape is different from that one on the Cairo statue, but presents closer model to the elongated clasp. A similar object appears on a coin of Ptolemy IV in Glasgow.\(^{188}\)

---

173 Hermary 1989, nos. 553-555.
174 Pinkwart 1965, p. 55-65, the Halikarnassus base ca. 120 BC show similar pose but the hand is damaged, Ridgway 1990, p. 258, ill. 32.
175 Andrae 2001, p. 176, no. 168.
176 Schmidt 2003, kat. 48.
177 Pfuhl-Möbius 1979, no. 130, taf. 30, no. 539, taf. 83.
179 Marcadé 1969, p. 43ff, pl. XVIII; A list of 41 stone herm were dedicated to the Delain Gymnasion in 156-155 BC, see Harrison 1965, p. 127, n. 146.
180 Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 177.
181 Croom 2000, p. 72.
182 Elderkin 1928, passim; Ridgway 1990, p. 48, commented a round fibula on the dress of a member of Daochos group and questioned its date. Round fibulae began to appear among Greeks at least by Alexander’s time; the famous lion hunt mosaic shows Alexander the Great with round fibula. Moreno 1995, p. 63, cat. 4.7.1; Moreno 2004, fig. 73-74. The Faun House mosaic shows this round fibula on Alexander’s chlamys as well. Daszewska 1985, pl. 45; round fibulae appear with terracotta figurines from early Hellenistic date, see Higgins 1967, pl. 41d.
183 Croom 2000, p. 72.
184 The famous Berenike II mosaic panel shows anchor-shaped fibula, see Daszewska 1985, p. 145, pl. 23; Grimm 1998, abb. 81c; a statuette of Ptolemy III in Bonn, see Moreno 1994, p. 332ff, fig. 417.
185 Kyrieleis 1975, taf. 17; Ptolemy III; Stanwick 2002, fig.216.
186 Kyrieleis 1975, taf.30.3; Moreno 1998, abb. 105c; Stanwick 2002, fig. 221; a ring intaglio in Paris, with a later Ptolemaic portrait clearly shows a button. Walker-Higgs 2001, no. 45; Stanwick 2002, fig. 224. The coins and Gems of Berenike II and Arsinoe III, uniquely shows a clasp in buckle-like shape, Grimm 1998, p. 106, abb.103 c; Plantzos 1999, p. 114, pl. 6, no. 30; Stanwick 2002, fig. 219.
187 Poole 1883, pl. XVII.; Kyrieleis 1975, taf. 40-4; Grimm 1998, abb. 104a.
188 Grimm 1998, abb. 103 e.
Most interesting is a coin of Ptolemy V in London, showing a metal clasp with round top and flat stud. The clasp is typically fastened like the one on the Cairo statue but placed its up-down\textsuperscript{189} (fig. 18). The type of these clasps is close to the Cairo statue, but is not decisive evidence to suggest a secure date. It is difficult to decide, if the clasp belongs to the third century original statue, or to the later copy in the Cairo diskophoros.\textsuperscript{190} A similar conception of bar-shaped clasp with spirals appears on the funerary bed plaque in the Telephos frieze from Pergamon dating to second century and perhaps around 160 BC, therefore supports a Hellenistic context for the clasp type\textsuperscript{191} (fig. 19). The Pergamene evidence accords to the clasp type on the Epiphanes coins, but both are still helpless to decide a date.

The execution of the statue is very different from Roman natural proportions; the indefinite body is sunken beneath the chlamys. This inferior treatment is apparent when compared to similar figures from Roman date from Egypt,\textsuperscript{192} Italy\textsuperscript{193} and Cyrenaica.\textsuperscript{194} Therefore a Roman date seems improbable, and the elongated clasp does not appear in Roman times. The stylistic analysis appoints out that the second half of the second century and the first century show many comparable sculptures, terracotta and funerary stelai in style and execution. The less stylized surface and disproportioned execution of the Cairo statue may favor later date and suggest the first century BC.

**Function and Archaeological Context**

The Cairo diskophoros therefore is a copy, or a later edition of a remarkable sculptural original type, its function as ornamentum in a gymnasion is very probable, and such buildings are well documented in Ptolemaic Egypt. The small scale reduces the portrait probability, but does not exclude it.\textsuperscript{195} The statue is 30.5 cm and its original height will not exceed 50-55 cm. The Cairo statue most likely was carved to celebrate a remarkable victor in diskobolia, or celebrating a member of Greek elite beginning his ephébbeia, which increases the probability of a portrait statue. The statue with the diskos on his back should have been exhibited to be seen from

---

\textsuperscript{189} Poole 1883, p. 74, no. 62, pl. XVII-5; from the same series, p. 74, no. 68; the Romanized type of Cleopatra coins shows her chlamys fastened with dolphin-shaped fibula. Kyrieleis 1975, taf. 107.2. The clay seal impressions from Edfu and Nea-Paphos are not helpful, after the small size and the less detailed design, but they show chlamys fastened with a fibula or buttons. Milne 1916, pl. IV, V; Kyrieleis 1975, taf. 54-55; Smer 1989, fig. 37, 38; Kyrieleis 1990, p. 456-457, taf. 67; Kyrieleis 1996, p. 315-320, pl. 54-62; Stanwick 2002, fig. 234-239. The engraved gems with Ptolemaic royal portraits, when design is well preserved show the button type of such clasps, see Platzos 1999, p. 113ff, nos. 1-50, pls.1-9.

\textsuperscript{190} I owe to the anonymous referee for this remark.

\textsuperscript{191} Pollit 1986, p. 199, fig. 213; Dreyfus 1997, p. 74, cat. no. 12; Ridgway 2000, p. 67ff; Round fibulae appear as well on this frieze, see Andreae 2001, no. 119.

\textsuperscript{192} Adriani 1961, no. 124, pl. 66, fig. 210; Keith 1975, no. 46.

\textsuperscript{193} von Steuben 1972, p. 134, taf. 36, 1-2; De Lachenal 1979, p. 148, no. 103; Andreae 2001, p. 61, abb. 15.

\textsuperscript{194} Huskinson 1975, no. 119, pl. 46.

\textsuperscript{195} The head is expected to reach 7-8 cm in height, which is close to some known portraits from Egypt in minor scale, like the Ptolemy Epiphanes portrait in Cairo, 14 cm, see Quevrel 2003, p. 481, no. 8, p. 489, fig. 15, 16; The small bronze bust of Ptolemy XII in Paris, see Grimm 1998, abb. 121 a, b; Stanwick 2002, p. 60. Close in the early Roman period, there is the Augustus head from Alexandria 3 cm, see Kiss 1984, p. 36, fig.42-43.The Severus two heads in Alexandria 12 cm and Frankfurt 10.5 cm Kiss 1984, p. 73, fig. 183-184, p. 78, fig. 199. Some portraits on Egyptian herms reach 4 cm in height, see Keith 1975, p. 64.
all sides to message the identity of the subject. The original statue, as well, perhaps was celebrating a remarkable victor athlete, such hypothesis does not conform to any candidates, except Nikostratos the victor pentathlete, or a young king perhaps child, like Ptolemy V.

Material

The use of Egyptian local hard stones in Greek style sculptures is interesting, and the Cairo diskophoros sculptor followed an original Ptolemaic tradition; known as early as third century BC. The Alexandrian Nile statue was carved in basalt and attributed to Philaeus’ reign, after a second century copy in Stuttgart. A red granite head represents Alexander, perhaps in the Kristēs type. The basalt veiled head in Boston from third century funerary relief, show the use of such material in private sculpture as well. A basalt head of Marcus Antonius from near Canopus, in the Bankes Collection, is interesting for its date 40-30 BC and subject. Many torsi and pillar herms from Hermopolis and Alexandria are known in dark grey and black basalt.

Such feature is known as well from Roman times, the black basalt Augustus bust in Boston, supposedly to be carved in Egypt, is remarkable. The green basalt cuirassed bust of Germanicus in London, and another small cuirassed figure with unknown provenance in Cairo, are interesting attestations of such type. Basalt and grey granite Palliati statues are

196 I am grateful to the anonymous referee to change my suggestion from a niche to this conclusion.

197 It is a pure matter of speculation if one may arouse a question that the third century original statue might represent Nikostratos the only known Egyptian winner of the boys pentathlon in the Asklepeia at Kos, Klee 1918, p. 6, lines 13-14; Remijsen 2009, p. 256, n. 44. The event is dated in the second half of the third century, or around 200 BC, close to the proposed date of the original Alexandrian statue. The Koan inscription is just a list of victors by name, city and profession, and nothing else. The carving of a statue in athlete’s home city is a well-known Greek tradition, but in the Nikostratos case and the Cairo diskophoros nothing further could be confirmed.

198 Ptolemaic court showed an active patronage of athletics and the possibility that the statue could memorialize a little prince or child king in typical Macedonian ephetic attire is possible. It is another speculation but finds a literary support in a victory recorded by Ptolemy Epiphanes around 91 BC in the Panathenaia. Epiphanes won the armed double course in foot race which connects him to pentathlon. Ferguson 1908, p. 355; Peremans-Van’t Dack 1968, p. 294, no. 17232. Epiphanes’ skills in hunting, riding and using weapons were once commented by Polybius, and the training of the boxer Aristonikos is debated among scholars to be shifted to his reign, Pleket-Stroud 1984, p. 73; Hölbl 2001, p. 142, n. 76, not his father Philopator, see note 65.


200 Kákosy 1982, p. 292, n. 21; Moreno 1994, p. 226, the statue was seen by Pliny in Templum Pacis in Rome, dedicated by Vespasian.

201 Bianchi 2007, p. 29ff, especially p. 38, fig. 3-4, said to have come from Hermopolis.

202 Vermeule-Newman 1990, p. 41, fig. 3-4, a similar head from ca. 100 BC, attributed to unknown Ptolemaic queen. Grimm-Wildung 1978, no. 132.


204 Kyrieleis 1975, taf. 82,5-6.


206 Walker-Higgs 2001, no. 16.

207 Kiss 1984, p. 29, fig. 22-23; Vermeule-Newman 1990, p. 41ff, fig. 5-6; Walker-Higgs 2001, no. 261.

208 Keith 1975, no. 2, pl. 2; no. 6, pl. 5; no. 7, pl. 6.


211 Edgar 1903, no. 27496, p. 27 pl. XIII.
known from Arment and Edfu in Upper Egypt. A statue of a wine seller in Ismailia Museum, carved in grey granite, is another manifestation of such phenomenon. The black granite statue of an aged man holding a crocodile and dressed in himation and Greek sandals, from Fayuum, perhaps a God or a priest, but once was thought to represent Septimius Severus. Two small figures in schist and another Egyptian hard stone from Koptos in Cairo represent Hermes or gladiator and athlete, show pure Greek conceptions and styles.

These sculptures do not leave any doubt that Hellenistic sculptors in Egypt had the ability at least from third century BC, to model Egyptian hard stones into Greek subjects and styles. This plenty of such sculptures from Ptolemaic Egypt, however, is not decisive evidence to suggest if the sculptor was native Egyptian or Greek. It is helpless as well, to speculate the material of the original statue since one example at least; the Nile statue shows an original Greek style sculpture carved in basalt.

Alexandria itself has shown recently that its harbor was heavily decorated with sculptures in granite and marble. Such hard stones were used by Ptolemies even in their dedications in the Greek world, like the columns carrying statues of Philadelphus and his wife in Olympia. The carving in one piece of granite, in addition to the absence of any Alexandrian piecing and stucco techniques, may favor a local workshop in the chora for the Cairo copy.
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FIG. 1. Cairo J.E. 45055B.

FIG. 2. Cairo J.E. 45055B.

FIG. 3. Cairo J.E. 45055B.
An unpublished granite statue of *Diskophoros Ephébos* in Cairo.

**FIG. 4.** Cairo J.E. 45055 B.

**FIG. 5.** Cairo J.E. 45055 B.

**FIG. 6.** Cairo J.E. 45055 B.


FIG. 9. Attic Kotyle, Boston Museum of Fine Arts, after Caskey 1915, fig. 2.
An Unpublished Granite Statue of Diskophoros Ephébos in Cairo.

FIG. 10.
Daochos I statue, Delphi Museum 1828, after Dohrn 1968, taf. 29.

FIG. 11.
Apulian Vase, Hermitage St Petersburg, after Toutain Sacerdos, Fig 5990.
**FIG. 12.** Terracotta statuette, Alexandria GRM 30854, after Kassab Tezgör 2007, no. 271.

**FIG. 13.** Athlete boy, Cleveland Museum 85.79, after http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Youth_with_Jumping_Weights,_about_50_AD,_Roman,_Italy,_marble_-_Cleveland_Museum_of_Art_-_DSC08272.JPG

**FIG. 14.** Chamydophoros Boy, Alexandria GRM 25711.

**FIG. 15.** Terracotta statuette, Alexandria GRM 9263.
FIG. 16. Funerary stele, Alexandria GRM 27903.


FIG. 19. The Telephus Frieze, Funerary bed scene, after http://www.flickr.com/photos/24729615@Noo/7197866530/sizes/k/in/photostream/.