Figure 21.1. View of the statue monument of C. Billienus inside the Stoa of Antigonus Gonatas in the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos. Photograph by author.
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The statue monument of C. Billienus (GD 28;\(^1\) Fig. 21.1) was dedicated at the end of the second or beginning of the first century BC, at a time when the Athenian klerouchoi, Italian settlers, as well as other members of the international merchant community on Delos were making dedications in and around the Sanctuary of Apollo, in an effort to affirm their authority and promote their interests on the island. The monument was later damaged and repaired, probably after the Mithridatic sack of Delos in 88/87 BC. By analysing the style of the over-life-size cuirassed statue, the different languages used in its dedication and repair, as well as the location of the monument inside the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas (GD 24) at the north-east end of the sanctuary, this paper studies the stylistic, textual, and visual strategies used by merchant communities of Delos, in the construction of their identity in the turbulent political climate of the Late Republic. Already in 167/66 BC, the island had become a free-trade commercial base under nominal Athenian supervision, and the cultural framework of the sanctuary was rapidly changing. The choices in style, language, and architectural context of this monument shed light on the distinct modes of self-fashioning in the public realm of cosmopolitan Delos.

Inscriptions and Statue Base

The orthostate base of the monument is monumental (Figs 21.1–21.2), measuring 2.846 m by 1.63 m, with a height of 1.017 m. There are two inscriptions on the base of the statue of C. Billienus (ID 1854 [inv. nos E 122 and 123]),\(^2\) one on the body (inv. no. E 123) and one on the cornice of the base (inv. no. E 122). The Greek inscription is placed on the body of the blue-grey marble statue base (ID 1854 [inv. no. E 123]) and tells us that Midas, son of Zinon, from the city of Herakleia, dedicated the statue of Gaius Billienus, son of Gaius, praetor pro consule, his friend, to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto:

Γάιον Βιλιενον Αυτος Νεκτορν Ερακλειαν

The beginning of the second line, where the name of the dedicatee would have been, is lost. There is only the end of the name of the dedicatee’s father (...ον) and the ethnic identification (Ερακλειας). Because the lines are symmetrical, and the distance on the left leaves space only for a short name, Roussel proposed the name of Midas of Zenon from Herakleia.\(^3\) Midas is well known in other Delian inscriptions: he dedicated a marble bank in the exedra of the Cluvi in the Agora of the Italians (ID 1689 [inv. no. E 100]), and he built an exedra in the Sanctuary of the Syrian goddess (ID 2253 [inv. no. E

---

\(^1\) GD plus number indicates the numbering of the monuments in the Guide de Delos (Bruneau and Ducat 2005).

\(^2\) ID 1854 (inv. nos E 122 and 123) = CIL III.07233 = CIL 1.2

\(^3\) Roussel 1909. Greek inscription: letters of 3.5–4 cm, with strong verticals and slender lines; alpha with broken bar; lunar omega and sigma; pi having a second leg half as long as the first; the leg of the phi exceeds the upper line; and theta with central point. The second, Latin inscription, is on the cornice of the base (height 0.195 m, width 2.846 m), which is broken on the left side. The inscription is located on the ledge of the cornice, almost in the middle, and has a length of 1.561 m. Letters of 5 cm with short verticals. The tight shape and elongated straight ridge of the R indicate a date of the Late Republican period.
616]; ID 2254 [inv. no. E 385]; ID 2288 [on the mosaic in the exedra]).

Gaius Billienus, son of Gaius, is identified as legatus in ID 1710 (πρεσβευτήν Ρωμαίων) and in ID 1632 as quaesitor and legatus (line 3: Βιλλίνον ...). He may be identified with the C. Billienuus mentioned by Cicero who was active between 104–100 BC. According to Cicero, he was ‘a self-made man of great distinction [...] attained to almost the highest recognition’ (Brutus XLVII.175), but his career is only attested in the Delian inscriptions. Inscription ID 1710 attests the dedication of another statue of Billienus, the work of Agasias of Ephesus who worked on Delos before 88 BC.

On the cornice of the statue base, a Latin inscription (ID 1854 [inv. no. E 122]) indicates that Aulus Attiolenus Velina son of Aulus repaired the monument:

A(ulus) Attiolenus A(uli) f(ilius) Vel(lina)
reficiundam coiravit.

It seems that the monument was damaged — probably during the Mithridatic sack of Delos in 88/87 BC — and subsequently repaired by A. Attiolenus Velina, who is not known from other Delian inscriptions. Whether the repair of the monument included a renewal of the dedicatory inscription as well is contested. On the basis of the form of the letters, which in both inscriptions are equally hurried and clumsy in their execution, and the similarity of the workmanship, it has been suggested that the inscriptions are contemporary. A scraping of the marble’s surface on the body of the statue base, which would support the argument that the Greek inscription was re-carved, is not visible, however, and the statue shows no signs of a repair having taken place. It is therefore unlikely that the dedicatory inscription was renewed when Aulus Attiolenus Velina repaired the monument.

Finally, whereas Midas’s dedication, which consists of three lines of the 3.5- to 4-cm-high letters, is carved on the 79-cm-high body of the roughly 1-m-high base, Attiolenus’s inscription is carved on a 6-cm-high crown of the cornice of the base. Midas’s dedication is roughly centred on the horizontal axis on the body of the base, and it is placed vertically towards the top of the body of the base. This allows a height of 35.5 cm before the moulding of the base, which Attiolenus could have used in order to carve the inscription commemorating his repair of the monument. However, the position of his inscription there would have forced a viewer to get on his/her knees in order to read it. He chose instead to squeeze the 5-cm-high letters into the 6-cm-high crown of the cornice of the base. The crown of the cornice protruded the body of the base by 13 cm, thus casting

---

4 This exedra was dedicated when Ζωις Ζωιου Φυισις was priest in 106/05 BC (ID 2253 [inv. no. E 616] and ID 2254 [inv. no. E 385]) and therefore dates to 105/04 BC. On Midas, see Hatzfeld 1912, 52, and Mancinetti Santamaria 1983, par. 22.

5 For review of the scholarship on the career of Billienus, see Trümper 2008, 172 n. 841.


7 Courby 1912, 41–45, esp. 44.

8 Payne 1984, 221–22, argues that the Greek inscription is original, and that the Latin inscription is dated after 88 BC.
of command, with Billienus’s right leg placed against the ram of a ship, alluding to command at sea or a naval victory. He is wearing a short tunic covered by a standard Hellenistic cuirass, with rectangular straps, cingulum, and two rows of pteryges, while a long fringed cloak drapes over the shoulders and down the back. His legs are bare, but the extant right foot is wearing a calceus. Billienus is presented in a dynamic pose, which Tuchelt has described as standing figure in movement (‘bewegtes Standmotiv’) and is holding a spear with his right hand. Billienus’s dynamic pose, his Romanized attire (Hellenistic cuirass with Roman calcei), and his position next to a ship’s ram, as well as his designation as a strategos (στρατηγός) in the dedicatory inscription, underline his role as a troop leader with naval command.

The calcei were usually worn with the toga and indicated public rank and office and were not officially part of the military footwear. The footwear marked the difference between Greek and Roman identity in these late first-century-BC-armoured statues, as the armour of Roman imperatores was indistinguishable from that worn by Hellenistic kings and their generals. During the early empire, Roman governors and other officials with military authority (imperium) were probably honoured with this kind of statue in provincial cities, but over time, the cuirassed statue became the special preserve of the emperor and his sons and heirs. Billienus is wearing calcei patricii (not senatorii). The calceus patricius has four corrigae (fastening straps) whereas the calceus senatorius has two corrigae.

Although Billienus is represented in a Hellenistic-type cuirass, his cuirass has some Roman particularities: the artist curved the lower edge of the cuirass slightly.

---

Figure 21.3. Reconstruction of the statue monument of C. Billienus. Drawing by author, after Tuchelt 1979, 79, fig. 7.

---

Statue

The marble larger-than-life statue of Billienus (2.07 m) is the earliest existing example of a Roman represented in a cuirass (Fig. 21.3). The figure stands in an attitude of a shadow over it, and brought closer to the eye the one-line inscription. Attiolenus’s dedication featured 5-cm-high letters, which were larger by 1 to 1.5 cm than the letters of Midas’s dedication whose height ranged between 3.5 and 4 cm. Seen in perspective, Attiolenus’s dedication on the protruding cornice overshadowed, both literally and figuratively, Midas’s dedication on the body of the base. Attiolenus did not need to re-carve the dedicatory inscription to highlight his restoration of the monument. He found a cost-effective way to mark his action, ingeniously employing the architecture of the base.

---


10 On the significance of the ram of the ship in the armoured representations, see Marcadé 1969, 220; Cadario 2004, 59–60.

11 The so-called ‘bewegtes Standmotiv’: Tuchelt 1979, 96–98. Courby had originally suggested that he was holding a shield with his left arm: Courby 1912, 42, fig. 61, and 43 n. 2.

12 Republican magistrates often had themselves represented wearing calcei, the best-known cases being from the Agora of the Italians on Delos. Marcadé 1969, 332; Bergemann 1990, 69, under no. P 19.

13 A new kind of parade armour was created for Augustus and his officers after Actium, when cuirassed statues of members became distinguishable from earlier Hellenistic and Republican leaders: Hallert 2006, 117.

and he bordered his *paludamentum*, or military cloak, with fringes.\textsuperscript{15} Garments with a decorative fringe began to be worn by Eastern Greeks in the Hellenistic period and were perceived by contemporary writers as a luxurious mannerism (Athenaeus iv.159d, ix.374a),\textsuperscript{16} but no extant Greek statues wear fringed cloaks.\textsuperscript{17} The use of the fringed cloak in images of local ruling classes during the age of the civil wars is attested in Greece and Italy and seems to have had a connection with the military world.\textsuperscript{18}

Both the fringed cloak and the *calcei* distinguish the statue of Billienus from the cuirassed statues from the Mithridateion, whose cloaks are not fringed, and who are wearing *krepides* instead of *calcei*.\textsuperscript{19} In addition, these two features — fringed cloak and *calcei* — are also attested in statues of Romans from the 'Agora of the Italians'.\textsuperscript{20} It seems that the fringed cloak together with the *calcei* operated as ethnic markers, enabling the ancient viewer to identify the honorand as Roman.\textsuperscript{21}

\textsuperscript{15} Marcadé 1969, 331–33.
\textsuperscript{16} Hallett 2005, 133 n. 30.
\textsuperscript{17} On this point, see Cadario 2016, 310.
\textsuperscript{18} Marcadé 1969, 329–32; Cadario 2016, 310–15.
\textsuperscript{21} Cadario 2016, 312.
A consideration of the languages used in the inscriptions vis-à-vis the appropriation of the Hellenistic cuirass motif is interesting here. Midas of Zinion from Herakleia was a Greek of South Italy who chose to dedicate a statue to Billienus in Greek. Midas was content using Greek for a statue monument dedicated to a prominent Roman outsider. The language choice in this case reflects the preference of the dedicatee to conform to the local expression and thus be integrated in the merchant community of Delos. Furthermore, by using the Greek language in his dedication to Billienus, Midas not only conformed to the local language but also made reference to the language in which the statue itself was dedicated (IG xi.4.1095).

While following this epigraphic practice, Midas — a Greek Romanophile — chose a ‘Romanized’ Hellenistic cuirass statue type for Billienus. He chose a monument that appropriated the local visual and epigraphic habits to make a visually and verbally effective dedication to Billienus. Both the statue and the dedication employ Greek models — the former a Hellenistic military image, the latter the Greek language. While the visual language adopts ethnic markers (caleii and fringed cloak) to point to the Roman identity of the honorand, the Greek language assures that the Roman identity and position (prætor pro consule) of Billienus will be unambiguously communicated to the Greek community on Delos.

The use of Latin by A. Attiolenus Velina, in his repair of the monument, is equally interesting in light of the historical circumstances of the damage of the monument — the Mithridatic sack of Delos in 88/87 BC. The analysis of the use of Latin by Romans or Italians has shown that it was used as a means of underlining the specificity of their ethnic group. Attiolenus’s use of the Latin language indicates a wish to emphasize his ethnic identity and, further, publicize his loyalty to the Roman general following the devastation of his monument by the troops of Mithridates.

**Position of the Monument**

The position of the monument of Billienus is exceptional. It is located inside the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas (GD 29), which forms much of the north perimeter of the Sanctuary of Apollo, at the short east end of the stoa (Figs 21.4–21.5). The Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas is a two-aisled stoa with projecting wings facing south, which was built in the third quarter of the third century BC as a benefaction of Antigonos Gonatas. It is a peculiar building. The intercolumniations of the wings, of the returns, and of the central part are all different, and there is no contracted intercolumniation at the corners of the wings. The same sort of license — typical of

---

22 It seems that the Greeks, or groups embracing both Greeks and Romans, made no linguistic accommodation to their addressees: Adams 2003, 664–65.

23 Courby 1912, 37–40 on the inscription E 192 a–b (figs 55–57 on p. 39); Durrbach 1921, no. 35.

24 Correspondeingly, the analysis of the language used in dedicatory inscriptions to Italians or Romans has shown that the use of Greek answered the wishes of the Italian community to conform to the local expression: Hasenohr 2007.

25 The donor of the monument is identified by a fragmentary inscription that is restored to read: ‘King Antigonos, son of King Demetrios of Macedon, to Apollo’: Courby 1912, 37–40.
the Hellenistic period — is apparent in the extended metopes, some with a width of more than 1\(\frac{1}{4}\) times their height. Although the column spacing is adapted to three-metope spans, only two metopes were placed above each span, with the aim of placing the unique bull’s-head triglyphs over the centre of the span (Fig. 21.6).\(^{26}\) This unusual placement of the motif seems to be an innovation of the Hellenistic period that continued into Roman architecture.\(^{27}\) The bull’s head is a familiar Hellenistic device.\(^{28}\) The use of these extraordinary triglyphs also affected the cornice: since the bull’s heads project about as far as the cornice does, they appear to support its soffit and would have interrupted the series of mutules, which was therefore omitted entirely.\(^{29}\) All these features make up a building that is ‘striking but unusual in appearance.’\(^{30}\)

Visitors to the sanctuary would have spotted the arresting stoa quickly, since it forms much of the north side of the sanctuary’s peribolos, and no other building obstructs more than half of its east end (Fig. 21.4). The stoa faces the so-called Monument of the Bulls (GD 24; c. 300 BC), a Neorion, which aligned on a roughly north–south axis perpendicular to the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas. A visitor entering the sanctuary from either the south-east or south-west would have immediately encountered the unobstructed view of the east end of the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas. Recent excavations have shown that the east wall of the peribolos was built during the period of the Second Athenian dominion.\(^{31}\) While the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas and the Neorion (or Monument of the Bulls) had monumentalized the north-east part of the sanctuary during the third century BC, the construction of the east peribolos wall at this time defined the north-east end and created a clear-cut approach to the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas from this end. Walking between the defined areas of the east wall of the Neorion and the east peribolos wall, a visitor would appreciate the view of the stoa while gradually coming closer to it. While a series of portrait statue monuments were set up in front of the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas,\(^{32}\) but the wide intercolumniations of the wings and the non-contrasted intercolumniation at the corners of the wings enabled the view of the space inside the stoa and the monument of Billienus inside it. If we examine the sanctuary’s overall plan, we notice that the area to the east of the Neorion is the only one where ample space allowed for such an impressive approach to a building. Antigonos Gonatas was surely aware of this advantage in dedicating his stoa, which faced the Neorion, which might have been a dedication of his father, Demetrius Poliorcetes.\(^{33}\) By placing his dedication at the east end of the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas, Midas employed the visual strategies of Hellenistic architecture in order to enhance his dedication to Billienus.

The statue monument of Billienus along with the statue monument next to it were the only statues to be set up inside a building of the sanctuary.\(^{34}\) The statue next to Billienus has not survived, and the badly pre-

---

26 Vallois 1944, 37–38, 39 n. 11.
27 For example, on the Lesser Propylaeum at Eleusis (c. 50 BC): Hörmann 1932, 45–48, pl. 6. See discussion in: von Hesberg 1980, 64 n. 272; Webb 1996, 22.
28 Miller 1972, 205 n. 462. On the connection of the bull’s heads with the Macedonian dynasty: Thiébaut 1931, 48–50. See also discussion in: Moretti, 2015, 108–10. The bull’s heads make reference to a sacrificial animal, and in half of the instances in which this motif occurs on architectural sculptures, it may also express a connection with Apollo: Webb 1996, 29–30.
29 Courby 1912, 23. On the cornice: von Hesberg 1980, 60, 64. See also discussion in: Miller 1972, 204–05.
31 The east peribolos wall dates to the period of the Athenian dominion: Peignard-Giros 2000. This is not surprising, as the construction technique of this wall bears great resemblance to the north wall of the Iktos des bijoux. The study of the walls of the peribolos of the sanctuary will be presented in the forthcoming publication of the study of the Sanctuary of Apollo, directed by Roland Étienne.
32 Portrait monuments started to appear in this area from the 130s BC onwards, when space for dedications on the dromos leading to the principal entrance (propylon) to the sanctuary became limited: Dillon and Palmer Baltes 2013, 230–32; Herbin 2014a, 177–78; Herbin 2014b, 26 and 28–29.
33 Tréheux 1987.
34 For the study of the statue bases from the sanctuary, see Herbin 2010 (on these two statue bases: pp. 154–55, M 158 and M 159).
served base does not preserve the name of the dedicatee or the person who dedicated it (ID 2020 [inv. no. E 121]). However, the statue monument of Billienus with its monumental orthostate base dominated the view of a visitor walking down the south aisle of the stoa, as the column supporting the diagonal cross-beam obstructed the view of the statue monument to the right of Billienus (Fig. 21.7). The choice of location, setting it aside from the crowded statuary landscape in front of the stoa, distinguishes the statue monument of Billienus.

By locating the cuirassed statue of Billienus inside the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas, Midas further underlined the military achievements of the praetor pro consule. The dedication of a stoa was a means of gaining the citizens' good will by providing a structure that could be enjoyed by all, a policy already tried by the Macedonians and widely adopted by the Hellenistic kings. On Delos, a series of stoai effectively monumentalized the sanctuary area during the course of the third century BC: the South Stoa (GD 4; 270–30 BC), the Stoa of Philip (GD 3; 216–200 BC), and the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas (GD 29; 246–39 BC). The construction of stoai was also

associated with the commemoration of military achievements. For instance, the Stoa that Eumenes II built around the Temple of Athena Nikephoros at Pergamon concretized allusions to the victories of Eumenes and his predecessors, as the parapets of the second storey of the stoa bore sculptural reliefs that featured Galatian booty and Macedonian weapons. The Greek tradition of displaying spoils of war in these stoai goes back to the fifth century BC; for example, booty was displayed inside the Stoa of the Athenians in the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi (Paus. x.11.5) and the winged Stoa of Zeus in the Athenian Agora contained the shields of famous military men as well as paintings of a religious commemorative nature (Paus. 1.3.3–4). This practice appealed to victorious generals of the Late Republic, who — seeking to celebrate their deeds and promote their political ambitions — emulated the Hellenistic sovereigns and started constructing ex manubii monumental porticus in

35 Courby 1912, 41–42.
36 On the use of monumental orthostate bases for the staging of statues in the Hellenistic period: Griebich 2014, 115 n. 104.
37 On the location of the statue monument in the Stoa of Antigonos Gonatas, see also Griebich 2013, 116; Ma 2013, 288; Dillon and Palmer Baltes 2013, 238.
38 Coulton 1976, 231–34.
39 On this point, see Senseney 2011, 430–32.
40 Pausanias (x.11.5) described the display of booty within this stoa, and he assumes that the inscription of the stoa refers to the naval victories of Phormion in 429 BC. On the basis of the epigraphic style of the inscription and the architecture of the stoa, Armandry proposed an earlier date, and more specifically the Athenian victory over the Persians at the Battle of Mycale in 479 BC at the end of the Persian war: Amandry 1953, 108–15. For a discussion of the Greek precedent for the display of spoils of war, see Senseney 2011, 430–32.
41 Winter 2006, 52.
the city of Rome. The monument of Billienus points to the different ways in which this Hellenistic practice was appropriated in the Late Republican period. By placing the statue monument of Billienus inside the Stoa of Antigonos, Midas drew fittingly on the stoa’s allusion to victory in battle. In this way, the military attire (cuirass), backdrop (ram’s prow), as well as dynamic posture of the statue underlined Billienus’s status as a military leader, with command at sea or naval victory, and the placement of the statue inside the Stoa of Antigonos further underscored his military achievements.

The only other statue monument located inside a building in the area of the Sanctuary of Apollo on Delos was set up inside the Portico of Philip at its southern end (ID 1851; inv. nos E 280 and A 1088). This statue monument was equally monumental — the orthostate statue base was 3.30 m wide and 1.565 m high — and supported a statue of L. Cornelius Sulla. Sulla visited Delos after the Mithridatic sack of the island, and the statues set up for Sulla are dated from early 87 BC, hence post-dating the statue monument of Billienus. By choosing to place Sulla’s statue monument inside the Stoa of Philip, the Italian community of Delos not only emulated the visually captivating setting of Billienus’s statue monument inside the Stoa of Antigonos but also equally employed the stoa as a primary setting for the display of military achievements.

**Conclusion**

The monument of Billienus was set up during a time when a number of Italians and Romans were honoured in the so-called ‘Agora of the Italians’ nearby, another unusual building (c. 120 BC) that Monika Trümper has convincingly argued was a luxurious, park-like meeting place. This building, though imitating local models (e.g. the Agora of the Delians), has no parallels in Hellenistic architecture and seems to be an early porticus garden. In the ‘Agora of the Italians’, standing cuirass statues along with equestrian statues, and standing nude statues with military attributes, formed a group that honoured Roman magistrates and civilians alike. As in the case of Billienus, the ambitious representation of Romans in some kind of military ‘costume’ was further underscored by their position in the niches within the porticoes of the so-called Agora of the Italians. Here as well, many of these statues were repaired after 88 BC. In addition, the military attributes of the honorific statues were further emphasized by groups of wounded barbarians displayed in the north or west portico, alluding to the supremacy of Romans over barbarians. During the second and first centuries BC, the Agora of the Italians was indeed the hot spot for the self-representation of the Italian community.

Given the prominence of this victory-like monumental porticus, Midas’s decision to place his dedication to Billienus in the Stoa of Antigonos might seem odd. This, however, may be explained by the status of Billienus. If Billienus governed the province of Asia, as has been proposed, Midas might have wished to draw links between Billienus and the grandfather of Antigonos Gonatas, Antigonos Monophthalmos, who had controlled much of Asia. Midas drew attention to Billienus’s military achievements not only by appropriating the Hellenistic sculptural language of the cuirass and Hellenistic architectural setting of military triumph but also by associating his dedication with a mighty Hellenistic leader, perhaps of the same geographic region as Billienus. In doing so, Midas made highly visible and physically palpable Billienus’s power but also associated himself with the stature and the importance of Billienus and demonstrated this association at the heart of the Delian sanctuary.

---

42 Gruen 1992, 84–130 (‘Art and Civic Life’).
43 ID 1851: [L.] Cor[nelius] [L. f. Sulla, pro cos.]; Hatzfeld and Roussel 1910, 399–400, no. 48; Vallois 1923, 149–52, figs 221–23; Durrbach 1921, 237, no. 147b. On Sulla’s visit to Delos: Hatzfeld 1912, 124; Roussel 1987, 329; Eckert 2016, 125–26; Dillon and Palmer Baltes 2013, 224. This is one of four statue monuments set up in honour of Sulla on Delos: ID 1849–53; Durrbach 1921, 236–39, nos 147a–b and 149. One was set up at the southern end of the dromos and bore a bronze statue and an epigram in Greek, praising Sulla for his interest in taking care of the children left orphan after the destruction of 88 BC (ID 1853); Ferguson 1911, 453 n. 5; Durrbach 1921, 239, no. 149; Roussel 1987, 328–29.
46 The combination of the architectural framework of the portico enclosure and the extensive decorative and sculptural programme points to the imperial public garden porticoes, with which we are familiar in Rome; for instance, the Porticus of Pompey and the Porticus of Livia. Contra this interpretation, see Étiéenne, Quérel, and Redon 2009, 489–94; Moretti 2011, 529–31. An important objection to Trümper’s interpretation is that the geophysical exploration of 2000 and the test trench of 2002 showed the presence of a layer of stones (perhaps from a previous building) on the west side of the enclosure, where the principal entrance was located (Étiéenne 2003). Given the building’s short life and the time it takes to cultivate a garden, I would suggest that a park was envisaged but never fully realized.
48 Broughton 1952, 475, 482, and 538.
49 On this point, see Ma 2013, 183–87 and 288.
Whether Billienus was the governor of Asia or not, we cannot ascertain. The repair of his monument shows that he was well respected on Delos, and the unusual position of his statue within a building of the sanctuary area underlines his high status. Honorific monuments continued to appear within the sanctuary, but none of them were placed inside its buildings. The unique setting as well as visual and verbal languages of this statue monument point to the different ways in which Romans and their friends appropriated the architectural, sculptural, and stylistic vocabularies of the Hellenistic period to promote themselves in the public realm of cosmopolitan Delos and champion their interests in the competitive climate of the Late Republic.
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