

Showing and Telling Spolia: the Triumphal Procession of Aemilius Paullus in Plutarch and Diodorus Siculus

Michel Buijs

1 Introduction

In 167 BCE, Aemilius Paullus received a triumphal procession (θρίαμβος/πομπή) to commemorate his victory in Macedonia. Reports of this procession have come down to us through Plutarch (*Aemilius Paullus* 32–34), Diodorus Siculus (31.8.9–12), Livy (45.40, covering the last part of the procession only), and Florus (*Epitoma de Tito Livio* 1.28.12–14). In this chapter, I will discuss the two more extensive reports, those of Plutarch and Diodorus, for both of whom a report in Polybius, now lost to us, probably was their source.¹

Both Plutarch and Diodorus report that Macedonian spoils were on display during this procession, which took three days. In both authors, the defeated Macedonian king Perseus and the victor, Aemilius, pass by on the third day, but the two reports disagree as to what exactly was to be seen on the first two days: Plutarch reports that captured works of art were carried along on the first day, and weapons on the second, while Diodorus reports that weapons and wagons carrying arms were on display on the first day, while statues of gods and men were on view on the second.²

More importantly, Plutarch and Diodorus Siculus differ conspicuously in narrative technique. Whereas the narrator in Diodorus presents his narratee with a – rather dull – *summary* of events, the Plutarchian narrator in comparison dedicates much more text to this procession, and rather offers his narratee a detailed *scene*, full of language of perception and emotion, which creates the feeling that we are dealing with an eyewitness report.³ This way of trying to

1 Liedmeier 1935: 43 and 253.

2 The fact that the trumpeters (σαλπικταί) are placed at the beginning of the procession, i.e. in front of the arms on day one, in Diodorus, whereas Plutarch places them in front of the sacrificial animals on day three, would make Diodorus' account historically more plausible; see Liedmeier 1935: 43, 253–254 for discussion.

3 Compare Liedmeier 1935, 261, *ad* Plutarch, *Aemilius Paullus* 34: “Treffend is weer de aanschouwelijkheid van voorstelling in dit en het volgend gedeelte: het is alsof Plutarchus een tafereel

make the narratee see and feel what is recounted can be seen as tied up with Plutarch's praise for authors like Thucydides and Xenophon who extensively show this ability in their works.⁴

I will first discuss the artistry and the linguistic means with which the account of Aemilius' triumphal procession is presented in the *Life of Aemilius Paullus*, and then contrast Plutarch's account to that found in Diodorus Siculus. The following analysis should be read as a narratological-linguistic introduction to the chapter by Strootman in this volume, who presents a historical discussion of the impact of the spoils on Roman society, in terms of appropriation, objectification, incorporation and transformation.

2 Plutarch, *Aemilius Paullus* 32–34

Aemilius Paullus 32.1–2

οὕτω φασὶν ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων τούτων ἀνακοπήναι καὶ μεταβαλεῖν τὸ στρατιωτικόν, ὥστε πάσαις ταῖς φυλαῖς ἐπικυρωθῆναι τῷ Αἰμιλίῳ τὸν θρίαμβον. πεμφθῆναι δ' αὐτὸν οὕτω λέγουσιν.

This speech, they tell us, so rebuffed the soldiery and changed their minds that the triumph was voted to Aemilius by all the tribes. And it was conducted, they say, after the following fashion.⁵

beschrijft, dat hij zelf voor ogen had' (The visibility of the depiction in this and the following part is, again, striking: it looks as if Plutarch is describing a scene which he had himself before his mind's eye).

- 4 See Webb 2016: 211: 'For Plutarch (...) Thucydides' battle narratives were understood to show him as a master of this type of effect, inducing in his readers an impression that they were there alongside the people of the past and, most importantly, inducing them to feel similar emotions (*Moralia* 347a). For Plutarch's praise of Xenophon, see Huitink and Rood 2019: 38: 'Plutarch praised the account of the battle of Cunaxa (1.8) for the way "Xenophon brings it all but before our eyes and through his vividness (*enargeia*) all the time places the reader, much affected and sharing in the dangers, near to the action, as if it had not been concluded, but is going on" (*Artax.* 8.1: Ξενοφώντος ... μονονουχί δεικνύοντος ὄψει καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν ὡς οὐ γεγενημένοις, ἀλλὰ γινομένοις ἐφιστάντος αἰεὶ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐμπαθῆ καὶ συγκινδυνεύοντα διὰ τὴν ἐνάργειαν)'; cf. however Huitink 2019: 213: 'For all that he [Plutarch, MB] praises Xenophon, his comment is double-edged (...) And so, Plutarch implies, Xenophon's striving for ἐνάργεια comes at the expense of a complete and accurate report of events – that is of the historiographical virtue of ἀκρίβεια'.
- 5 I have used translations (with slight adaptations) found in the public domain: Plutarch, translated by Bernadotte Perrin, published at www.perseus.tufts.edu and Diodorus Siculus,

By his speech, Marcus Servilius, a man of consular rank, effects that a triumph (θρίαμβος) is granted to Aemilius. The actual start of the narration of this procession is marked by a summarizing sentence (πεμφθῆναι δ' αὐτὸν οὕτω λέγουσιν) providing – in terms of Labov's theory of narrative structure⁶ – an Abstract.⁷ Although the narrator explicitly points to an (oral) source for his account (λέγουσιν),⁸ this does not necessarily mean that he will not shape his narrative the way he wishes – on the contrary, it rhetorically gives him ample opportunity to do so.

Aemilius Paullus 32.2

ὁ μὲν δῆμος ἔν τε τοῖς ἵππικοῖς θεάτροις, ἃ κίρκους καλοῦσι, περὶ τε τὴν ἀγορὰν ἱκρία πηξάμενοι, καὶ τὰλλα τῆς πόλεως μέρη καταλαβόντες, ὡς ἕκαστα παρείχε τῆς πομπῆς ἔποψιν, ἐθεῶντο, καθαραῖς ἐσθῆσι κεκοσμημένοι.

The people erected scaffoldings in the theatres for equestrian contests, which they call circuses, and round the forum, occupied the other parts of the city which afforded a view of the procession, and were watching, arrayed in white garments.

The Plutarchian narrator opens his account of the three-day procession with, in cinematographic terms, a panoramic view presenting an Orientation. In one sequence, the camera hovers over the city of Rome;⁹ this may be labeled a full shot. The narratee is invited to 'see' these events in his/her mind's eye by the use of the language of perception (sight: ἔποψις, θεάομαι). By using the imperfect for the focalization marker ἐθεῶντο, the narrator presents his narratee with an *unbounded activity*, thereby keeping the perspective open and raising questions as regards what will happen next, and especially since no

translated by Francis R. Walton, published at https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Diodorus_Siculus/home.html (q.v. for details on copyright).

- 6 The global structure of narratives typically consists of a. Abstract; b. Orientation; c. Complication; d. Peak; e. Evaluation; f. Resolution; g. Coda; especially Complications, Peaks and Resolutions may be recursive. See Labov 1972: 362–370; Fleischman 1990: 135–154; for an application to Greek texts, see Allan 2007; Allan 2009.
- 7 The triumphal procession (πομπή) as the subject matter of the upcoming passage is referred to in the Abstract by πεμφθῆναι; cf. 32.4 τῆς δὲ πομπῆς εἰς ἡμέρας τρεῖς νενεμημένης and 32.5 ἐπέμπετο.
- 8 According to Liedmeier, 1935: 42–43, λέγουσιν ('they say', 'it is said that') is the regular formula with which Plutarch refers to his main source.
- 9 The narrator seems to be aware that (part of) his audience is not familiar with the situation in Rome or the Latin language, as he calls the Roman *circi* the theatres for equestrian contests, before giving the Latin term (ἃ κίρκους καλοῦσι).

object of ἐθεῶντο is expressed, these questions boil down to: What were they watching? What were they going to see? And, as a consequence, what is the narratee going to 'see'?¹⁰ From the beginning of the account of the procession onwards, the narratee shares the perspective of the people watching.

Aemilius Paullus 32.3

πᾶς δὲ ναὸς ἀνέωκτο καὶ στεφάνων καὶ θυμιαμάτων ἦν πλήρης, ὑπηρέται τε πολλοὶ καὶ ῥαβδονόμοι τοὺς ἀτάκτως συρρέοντας εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ διαθέοντας ἐξείργοντες, ἀναπεπταμένας τὰς ὁδοὺς καὶ καθαράς παρείχον.

Every temple was open and filled with garlands and incense, while numerous servitors and lictors restrained the thronging and scurrying crowds and kept the streets open and clear.

Here, the camera is at a closer angle on things specific in the city. In cinematographic terms, this may be labeled a long shot, as the camera focuses, so to speak, on *every* temple, and on *many* servants. As far as the language of perception is concerned, this time olfaction is activated, as the temples are full of garlands (στεφάνος) and incense (θυμίαμα) – incense being something one can smell, and the same probably goes for the garlands. Again, the finite verb of this sentence is an imperfect (παρείχον), the tense-aspect to be expected in an Orientation.

Aemilius Paullus 32.4

τῆς δὲ πομπῆς εἰς ἡμέρας τρεῖς νενεμημένης, ἡ μὲν πρώτη μόλις ἐξαρκέσασα τοῖς αἰχμαλώτοις ἀνδριάσι καὶ γραφαῖς καὶ κολοσσοῖς, ἐπὶ ζευγῶν πεντήκοντα καὶ διακοσίω κομιζομένοις, τούτων ἔσχε θέαν.

Three days were assigned for the triumphal procession. The first was nearly too short for, yet saw the exhibition of, the captured statues, paintings, and colossal figures, which were carried on two hundred and fifty chariots.

The Complication starts with a genitive absolute τῆς δὲ πομπῆς εἰς ἡμέρας τρεῖς νενεμημένης creating a boundary between the Orientation and the Complication; by providing the information that the triumphal procession

¹⁰ It may be worth noting that within the semantic field of sight, we do not find, e.g., ὄραω, 'see' (an object), but θεάομαι, 'view as spectators, esp. in the theatre' (LSJ θεάομαι A3).

lasted for three days, it paves the way for a presentation of the objects on display on the first day (ἡ μὲν πρώτη). The camera is at an even closer angle firmly focused on captured statues, paintings and colossal figures – a medium shot. The final words of the account of the first day of the procession again contain a word belonging to the semantic field of sight (θέα), and an aorist finite verb (ἔσχε) rounds off this passage.

Aemilius Paullus 32.5–7

τῇ δ' ὑστεραία τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ πολυτελέστατα τῶν Μακεδονικῶν ὄπλων ἐπέμπετο πολλαῖς ἀμάξαις, αὐτά τε μαρμαίροντα χαλκῶ νεοσμηκτῶ καὶ σιδήρῳ, τὴν τε θέσιν ἐκ τέχνης καὶ συναρμογῆς, ὡς ἂν μάλιστα συμπεφορημένοις χύδην καὶ αὐτομάτως εἴκοι, πεποιημένα, κράνη πρὸς ἀσπίσι, καὶ θώρακες ἐπὶ κνημίσι, καὶ Κρητικαὶ πέλται καὶ Θράκια γέρρα καὶ φαρέτραι μεθ' ἵπικῶν ἀναμειγμέναι χαλινῶν, καὶ ξίφη γυμνά διὰ τούτων παρανίσχοντα καὶ σάρισαι παραπεπηγυῖαι, σύμμετρον ἐχόντων χάλασμα τῶν ὄπλων, ὥστε τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα κροῦσιν ἐν τῷ διαφέρεσθαι τραχὺ καὶ φοβερόν ὑπηχεῖν, καὶ μηδὲ νενικημένων ἀφοβόν εἶναι τὴν ὄψιν.

On the second, the finest and richest of the Macedonian arms were borne along in many wagons. The arms themselves glittered with freshly polished bronze and steel, and were carefully and artfully arranged to look exactly as though they had been piled together in heaps and at random, helmets lying upon shields and breast-plates upon greaves, while Cretan targets and Thracian wicker shields and quivers were mixed up with horses' bridles, and through them projected naked swords and long Macedonian spears planted among them, all the arms being so loosely packed that they smote against each other as they were borne along and gave out a harsh and dreadful sound, and the sight of them, even though they were spoils of a conquered enemy, was not without its terrors.

A relatively larger amount of text is devoted to a description of what was to be seen on the second day of the procession, introduced by the dative of time τῇ ὑστεραία, with the imperfect ἐπέμπετο again presenting the state of affairs as unbounded, to the effect that the narratee shares the perspective of those present at the procession¹¹ (and probably indicating that more information is to follow). The Plutarchian narrator indeed presents his narratee with an

11 For the relation between imperfect tense and character perspective, see Fleischman 1991, Rijksbaron 2012 and Bentein 2016.

extensive and even closer shot on the arrangement of the Macedonian arms carried along. Without going into the actual nature of these arms,¹² one might say that the richly detailed way in which the Plutarchian narrator presents them in this passage invites the narratee to *see* and *hear* them – to engage the imagination as if physically part of the scene. The language of perception combines sight (μαρμαίρω, ὄψις; cf. εἰκοί ἄν) and, this time, hearing (κροῦσις, ὑπηχέω); moreover, their sound is presented as harsh and dreadful (τὴν πρὸς ἄλληλα κροῦσιν ... τραχὺ καὶ φοβερόν ὑπηχεῖν), and the sight of them likewise was not without terror (μηδέ ... ἄφοβον εἶναι τὴν ὄψιν).¹³

Aemilius Paullus 32.8–9

μετὰ δὲ τὰς ὀπλοφόρους ἀμάξας ἄνδρες [ἐπ]έπορεύοντο τρισχίλιοι, νόμισμα φέροντες ἀργυροῦν ἐν ἀγγείοις ἑπτακοσίοις πεντήκοντα τριταλάντοις, ὧν ἕκαστον ἀνὰ τέσσαρες ἐκόμιζον· ἄλλοι δὲ κρατήρας ἀργυροῦς καὶ κέρατα καὶ φιάλας καὶ κύλικας, εὖ διακεκοσμημένα πρὸς θέαν ἕκαστα καὶ περιττὰ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῇ παχύτητι τῆς τορείας.

After the wagons laden with armour there followed three thousand men carrying coined silver in seven hundred and fifty vessels, each of which contained three talents and was borne by four men, while still other men carried mixing-bowls of silver, drinking horns, bowls, and cups, all well arranged for show and excelling in size and in the depth of their carved ornaments.

In his presentation of the last spoils that were seen on the second day of the procession, the finite verbs in this passage are, again, imperfects ([ἐπ]έπορεύοντο, ἐκόμιζον), presenting the state of affairs as unbounded, thereby evoking the perspective of the onlookers at the procession. The Plutarchian narrator once more refers to sight, as mixing-bowls of silver, drinking horns, bowls, and cups were all well arranged for show (θέα).

12 At any rate, the arms are not on display as they were brought in from the battlefield; in sanitized form, they shine and glitter (μαρμαίροντα χαλκῶ νεοσμήκτω καὶ σιδήρῳ). From the *Iliad* onwards, the verb μαρμαίρω is associated with (bronze) arms (e.g. ἔντε(α) ... χάλκεα μαρμαίροντα *Il.* 16.663–664, τεύχεα μαρμαίροντα *Il.* 18.617). For a discussion of the arms, see the chapter by Strootman.

13 This is the first time words belonging to the semantic field of emotion appear; the language of emotion will return abundantly later on (chapters 33–34).

Aemilius Paullus 33.1–4

τῆς δὲ τρίτης ἡμέρας ἔωθεν μὲν εὐθύς ἐπορεύοντο σαλπικταί, μέλος οὐ προσ-
 ὀδιον καὶ πομπικόν, ἀλλ' οἷω μαχομένους ἐποτρύνουσι αὐτοὺς Ῥωμαῖοι, προσ-
 εγκελευόμενοι. μετὰ δὲ τούτους ἦγοντο χρυσόκερω τροφίαι βοῦς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι,
 μίτραις ἡσκημένοι καὶ στέμμασιν· οἱ δ' ἄγοντες αὐτοὺς νεανίσκοι περιζώμασιν
 εὐπαρύφοις ἐσταλμένοι πρὸς ἱερουργίαν ἐχώρουν, καὶ παῖδες ἀργυρᾶ λοιβεία
 καὶ χρυσᾶ κομίζοντες. εἶτα μετὰ τούτους οἱ τὸ χρυσοῦν νόμισμα φέροντες, εἰς
 ἀγγεῖα τριταλαντιαῖα μεμερισμένον ὁμοίως τῷ ἀργυρῷ· τὸ δὲ πλῆθος ἦν τῶν
 ἀγγείων ὀγδοήκοντα τριῶν δέοντα. τούτοις ἐπέβαλλον οἱ τε τὴν ἱεράν φιάλην
 ἀνέχοντες, ἦν ὁ Αἰμίλιος ἐκ χρυσοῦ δέκα ταλάντων διάλιθον κατεσκευάσεν, οἱ
 τε τὰς Ἀντιγονίδας καὶ Σελευκίδας καὶ Θηρικλείους καὶ ὅσα περὶ δειπνον χρυ-
 σώματα τοῦ Περσέως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι.

On the third day, as soon as it was morning, trumpeters led the way, sounding out no marching or processional strain, but such a one as the Romans use to rouse themselves to battle. After these there were led along a hundred and twenty stall-fed oxen with gilded horns, bedecked with fillets and garlands. Those who led these victims to the sacrifice were young men wearing aprons with handsome borders, and boys attended them carrying gold and silver vessels of libation. Next, after these, came the carriers of the coined gold, which, like the silver, was portioned out into vessels containing three talents; and the number of these vessels was eighty lacking three. After these followed the bearers of the consecrated bowl, which Aemilius had caused to be made of ten talents of gold and adorned with precious stones, and then those who displayed the bowls known as Antigonids and Seleucids and Theracleian, together with all the gold plate of Perseus' table.

Throughout *Aemilius Paullus* 33–34, the remainder of the account of Aemilius Paullus' procession, the language of perception is ubiquitous. At the start of the account of day three, marked by, this time, a genitive of time (τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας),¹⁴ hearing is evoked by trumpeters (σαλπικταί) playing a rousing tune

14 The difference between a dative of time (τῇ ὑστεραίᾳ in 32.5) and a genitive of time (τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας) is subtle; see Van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019: 378: 'the dative of time expresses the time when the action takes place (it refers to a specific moment or period)' and 373: 'the genitive of time expresses the time within which something takes place'; here, the use of ἔωθεν triggers the genitive.

(μέλος ... προσεγκελεύόμενοι). Again, the finite verbs of main clauses are imperfects (έπορεύοντο, ήγοντο, έχώρουν, ήν, επέβαλλον) throughout.¹⁵

Aemilius Paullus 33.5–9

τούτοις θ επέβαλλε τὸ ἄρμα τοῦ Περσέως καὶ τὰ ὄπλα καὶ τὸ διάδημα τοῖς ὄπλοις ἐπικείμενον. εἶτα μικροῦ διαλείμματος ὄντος ἤδη τὰ τέκνα τοῦ βασιλέως ἤγετο δοῦλα, καὶ σὺν αὐτοῖς τροφῶν καὶ διδασκάλων καὶ παιδαγωγῶν δεδακρυμένων ὄχλος, αὐτῶν τε τὰς χεῖρας ὀρεγόντων εἰς τοὺς θεατάς, καὶ τὰ παιδιά δεῖσθαι καὶ λιτανεύειν διδασκόντων. ἦν δ' ἄρρενα μὲν δύο, θήλυ δ' ἓν, οὐ πάνυ συμφρονούντα τῶν κακῶν τὸ μέγεθος διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν· ἦ καὶ μάλλον ἐλεινὰ πρὸς τὴν μεταβολὴν τῆς ἀναισθησίας ἦν, ὥστε μικροῦ τὸν Περσέα βαδίζειν παρορώμενον· οὕτως ὑπ' οἴκτου τοῖς νηπίοις προσεῖχον τὰς ὄψεις οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ δάκρυα πολλοῖς ἐκβάλλειν συνέβη, πᾶσι δὲ μεμειγμένην ἀλγυθόνη καὶ χάριτι τὴν θέαν εἶναι, μέχρι οὐ τὰ παιδιά παρήλθεν.

These were followed by the chariot of Perseus, which bore his arms, and his diadem lying upon his arms. Then, at a little interval, came the children of the king, led along as slaves, and with them a throng of foster-parents, teachers, and tutors, all in tears, stretching out their own hands to the spectators and teaching the children to beg and supplicate. There were two boys, and one girl, and they were not very conscious of the magnitude of their evils because of their tender age; wherefore they evoked even more pity in view of the time when their unconsciousness would cease, so that Perseus walked along almost unheeded; so much were the Romans moved by compassion that they kept their eyes upon the children, and it came to pass that many of them shed tears, and that for all of them the pleasure of the spectacle was mingled with pain, until the children had passed by.

Once the gold plate of Perseus' table has been mentioned, the path is paved for the introduction of the defeated Macedonian king. This happens immediately (note the *asyndeton*), albeit in successive steps creating suspense for the narratee: first, we encounter Perseus' chariot, second, his children and their

15 In the relative clause ἦν ὁ Αἰμίλιος ἐκ χρυσοῦ δέκα ταλάντων διάλιθον κατεσκευάσεν, the aorist indicative κατεσκευάσεν expresses a comment from the perspective of the narrator – something that, of course, could not be seen during the procession.

through. This is a scene full of emotion¹⁶ that might be regarded as the Peak of the narrative. Much attention goes to Perseus' children, who despite their tender age (ήλικία, νήπιος) are led along as slaves (ήγετο δούλα). The attendants, foster-parents, teachers, and tutors, all in tears (δεδακρυμένοι), stretch out their hands to the spectators and instruct the children to beg and supplicate (αυτων τε τας χειρας ορεγοντων εις τους θεατας, και τα παιδια δεισθαι και λιτανευειν διδασκοντων). The children inspire pity (ελεινος) as they are unaware of the magnitude of their evils (των κακων το μεγεθος) because of their youth. The Roman spectators of the procession are presented as moved by compassion (οικτος) when keeping their eyes (οψις) upon the youths, and after a series of imperfect main verbs (επεβαλλε, ηγετο, ην (twice), προσειχον), and a present infinitive in a ωστε-clause (βαδιζειν), the narrator switches to his own perspective with the aorist indicative συνεβη ('it came to pass') in order to round off this passage, adding that many of them shed tears (δακρυον), and that for all of them the pleasure (χαρις) of the spectacle (θεα) was mingled with pain (αλληλων). With one final aorist indicative in a μεχρι ου-clause (παρηλθεν), the children are finally brought out of sight for the narrator and narratee in their communicative situation, as they are for the spectators *in situ*.

Aemilius Paullus 34.1–2

αυτος δε των τεκνων ο Περσευς και της περι αυτα θεραπειας κατοπιn επορευετο, φαιον μεν ιματιον αμπεχομενος και κρηπιδας εχων επιχωριους, υπο δε μεγεθους των κακων παντα θαμβουντι και παραπεπληγμενω μάλιστα τον λογισμον ομοιωως. και τουτω δ' ειπετο χορος φιλων και συνηθων, βεβαρημενων τα προσωπα πενθει, και τω προς Περσεα βλεπειν αιει και δακρυειν εννοιαn παρισταντων τοις θεωμενοις, οτι την εκεινου τυχηn ολοφύρονται, των καθ' εαυτους ελαχιστα φροντιζοντες.

Behind the children and their train of attendants walked Perseus himself, clad in a dark robe and wearing the high boots of his country, but the magnitude of his evils made him resemble one who is utterly dumbfounded and bewildered. He, too, was followed by a company of friends and intimates, whose faces were heavy with grief, and whose tearful gaze continually fixed upon Perseus gave the spectators to understand that it

16 Compare and contrast the flat account of the same episode in Diodorus Siculus: ... εφ' οίς Περσεύς ό δυστυχής βασιλεύς Μακεδόνων άμα δυσιν υίοις και θυγατρι μιá και τοίς ήγεμόσι διακοσίοις πενήκοντα ... ('... followed by Perseus, the hapless king of the Macedonians, with his two sons, a daughter, and two hundred and fifty of his officers ...').

was his misfortune which they bewailed, and that their own fate least of all concerned them.

Finally, the defeated Macedonian king Perseus enters the stage. The perspective of the spectators of the procession (οἱ θεώμενοι) is maintained by imperfections (ἐπορεύετο, εἶπετο), and so is the presentation of events in the language of perception and emotion: sight is conjured up in the case of Perseus himself, who resembled (ἔοικώς) someone utterly dumbfounded and bewildered, while the language of perception is employed side by side with the language of emotion in the case of the friends and intimates of Perseus, who continually held their eyes on him (βλέπω) and did so in tears (δακρῦω), their faces heavy with grief (πένθος), to the extent that the spectators thought that it was Perseus' misfortune which they bewailed (ὀλοφύρομαι), not their own.

Aemilius Paullus 34.3–4

καίτοι προσέπεμψε τῷ Αἰμιλίῳ, δεόμενος μὴ πομπευθῆναι καὶ παραιτούμενος τὸν θρίαμβον. ὁ δὲ τῆς ἀνανδρίας αὐτοῦ καὶ φιλοψυχίας ὡς ἔοικε καταγελῶν, ἄλλὰ τοῦτό γ' εἶπε 'καὶ πρότερον ἦν ἐπ' αὐτῷ, καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ἂν βούληται,' δηλῶν τὸν πρὸ αἰσχύνης θάνατον, ὃν οὐχ ὑπομείνας ὁ δεῖλαιος, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἐλπίδων τινῶν ἀπομαλακισθεὶς, ἐγεγόνει μέρος τῶν αὐτοῦ λαφύρων.

And yet Perseus had sent to Aemilius begging not to be led in the procession and asking to be left out of the triumph. But Aemilius, in mockery, as it would seem, of the king's cowardice and love of life, had said: 'But this at least was in his power before, and is so now, if he should wish it,' signifying death in preference to disgrace; for this, however, the coward had not the heart, but was made weak by no one knows what hopes, and became a part of his own spoils.

Here, the narratee no longer follows the procession as it went by, but is informed about something that took place before: Perseus had begged not to be part of the procession, to which Aemilius had mockingly responded. The Plutarchian external primary narrator recapitulates what was told in *Aemilius Paullus* 26.7–12. The anecdote seems to be a Plutarchian invention, and the repeated reference to Aemilius' indignation over Perseus' cowardice (ἀνανδρία) and love of life (φιλοψυχία) seems in line with ideas on choosing death over disgrace found in Plutarch's extant works¹⁷ (cf. ὡς ἔοικε καταγελῶν, indicating

17 See Liedmeier 1935: 217–219.

that the narrator interprets Aemilius' words and shares the latter's indignation). At any rate, this passage is unequivocally presented from the perspective of the narrator, the events by aorists (προσέπεμψε, εἶπε), the resulting state that Perseus had become a part of his own spoils by a pluperfect (ἔγεγόνει) – a sure sign that we are off the narrative main line. Moreover, Aemilius' words are explained for the narratee (δηλών τὸν πρὸ αἰσχύνης θάνατον), and it is clearly the Plutarchian narrator who, by using the evaluative term ὁ δειλίαιος, frames Perseus as a coward. The reason that the narrator intrudes so conspicuously in the otherwise continuous account of the procession is probably to be found in the fact that it is the *Life of Aemilius Paullus* that this passage is taken from: throughout the *Life*, the Plutarchian narrator takes a positive stance towards his subject, stressing above all his qualities as a true statesman.¹⁸

Aemilius Paullus 34.5–8

ἐφεξῆς δὲ τούτοις ἔκομίζοντο χρυσοὶ στέφανοι τετρακόσιοι τὸ πλῆθος, οὓς αἱ πόλεις ἀριστεία τῆς νίκης τῷ Αἰμιλίῳ μετὰ πρεσβειῶν ἔπεμψαν· εἶτ' αὐτοὺς ἐπέβαλλεν, ἄρματι κεκοσμημένῳ διαπρεπῶς ἐπιβεβηκῶς, ἀνήρ καὶ δίχα τοσαύτης ἐξουσίας ἀξιοθέατος, ἀλουργίδα χρυσόπαστον ἀμπεχόμενος καὶ δάφνης κλώνῃ τῇ δεξιᾷ προτεινών. ἐδαφνηφόρει δὲ καὶ σύμπας ὁ στρατός, τῷ μὲν ἄρματι τοῦ στρατηγοῦ κατὰ λόχους καὶ τάξεις ἐπόμενος, ἄδων δὲ τὰ μὲν ὠδᾶς τινὰς πατρίους ἀναμειγμένας γέλωτι, τὰ δὲ παιᾶνας ἐπινικίους καὶ τῶν διαπεπραγμένων ἐπαίνους εἰς τὸν Αἰμίλιον, περιβλεπτόν ὄντα καὶ ζηλωτὸν ὑπὸ πάντων, οὐδενὶ δὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἐπίφθονον, πλὴν εἴ τι δαιμόνιον ἄρα τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ὑπερόρκων εἴληχεν εὐτυχίων ἀπαρύτειν καὶ μειγνύναι τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον, ὅπως μηδενὶ κακῶν ἄκρατος εἴη καὶ καθαρός, ἀλλὰ καθ' Ὀμηρον ἄριστα δοκῶσι πράττειν, οἷς αἱ τύχαι ῥοπήν ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρας τῶν πραγμάτων ἔχουσιν.

Next in order to these were carried wreaths of gold, four hundred in number, which the cities had sent with their embassies to Aemilius as prizes for his victory. He himself came next, mounted on a chariot of magnificent adornment, a man worthy to be looked upon even without such marks of power, wearing a purple robe interwoven with gold, and holding forth in his right hand a spray of laurel. The whole army also carried sprays of laurel, following the chariot of their general by companies and

18 See Liedmeier 1935: Preface; cf. *Plu. Comp. Tim. Aem.* 2.1: καθαρῶν οὖν καὶ δικαίων ἐν τοῖς πράγμασιν ἀμφοτέρων γεγόντων ('in their administration of affairs both were just and incorruptible') – even in this *Comparison*, Aemilius Paullus is set above Timoleon in 2.5: φαίνεται τελειότερος ὁ Αἰμίλιος ('Aemilius turns out to be more perfect').

divisions, and singing, some of them songs of yore intermingled with jesting, and others paeans of victory and hymns in praise of the achievements of Aemilius, who was gazed upon and admired by all, and envied by no one that was good. But after all there is, as it seems, a divinity whose province it is to diminish whatever prosperity is inordinately great, and to mingle the affairs of human life, that no one may be without a taste of evil and wholly free from it, but that, as Homer says, those may be thought to fare best whose fortunes incline now one way and now another.

From ἐφεξῆς δὲ τούτοις onwards, the perspective changes back to that of the spectators *in situ*, as the imperfects ἐκομίζοντο, ἐπέβαλλον, and ἔδαφνηφόρει show.¹⁹ After the wreaths of gold, Aemilius himself follows, and some attention is paid to what actually was to be *seen*: he stood on a chariot of magnificent adornment (κεκοσμημένῳ διαπρεπῶς), he himself worthy to be looked upon (ἀξιοθέατος),²⁰ wearing a purple²¹ robe interwoven with gold, and holding forth in his right hand a spray of laurel. This spray of laurel gives rise to the observation that the entire army was carrying sprays of laurel, as the soldiers followed their general – something the Roman public will have expected from their knowledge of triumphal processions in general. What is notable here is that the soldiers were singing (ᾄδω) songs (ᾠδή) and paeans (παιάν) of victory and hymns in praise (ᾗταινος) of the achievements of Aemilius.²²

-
- 19 Again, in a relative clause (οὓς αἱ πόλεις ἀριστεία τῆς νίκης τῷ Αἰμιλίῳ μετὰ πρεσβειῶν ἔπεμψαν), an aorist indicative expresses a comment from the perspective of the narrator – cf. note 15.
- 20 Whether this qualification reflects the perspective of the narrator, the spectators *in situ*, or both, cannot be decided, but it is at least made clear later on that Aemilius was actually looked at from all sides and admired by all observers (περίβλεπτος).
- 21 The color purple is, of course, also something that can be seen. I have not marked nor discussed the use of color-terms individually, though they do belong to the language of perception; cf. Levinson *et al.* 2007: 11: ‘Perceptual terms are likely to be coded in verbs, nouns and, if the language has them, adjectives. Of course it is of some interest where a semantic domain, such as colour, is covered by a mix of e.g. nouns and verbs, or nouns and adjectives. This is not an uncommon pattern’.
- 22 This audible detail is conspicuously absent from Livy’s account. Livy’s report implies that the soldiers were in completely different spirits, because they were allegedly not very pleased with the amount of money they received; see Liv. 45.40.5: *pediti in singulos dati centeni denarii, duplex centurioni, triplex equiti. alterum tantum pediti daturum fuisse credunt et pro rata alii, si aut in suffragio honori eius favissent, aut benigne hac ipsa summa pronuntiata acclamassent* (‘Each infantryman received one hundred denarii, each centurion, twice the amount, and each cavalryman, three times as much. It is thought that double the amount would have been given to the infantry, and proportionately to the rest, if they had supported Paullus’ triumph in the voting, or had cheerfully applauded the

There is a smooth transition from the narrative passage to a narratorial comment (πλὴν εἴ τι δαιμόνιον ἄρα τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ὑπερόγκων εἴληχεν ...; note the attitudinal-interactive particle ἄρα),²³ where the narrator refers to Homer (καθ' Ὅμηρον)²⁴ for the well-known²⁵ theme of the instability of the human condition, in order to bridge the account of Aemilius' prosperity as was shown in his victory over the Macedonians and triumphal procession, and the passage to follow²⁶ on his sons, especially on the loss of two of them, one of whom died five days before the triumphal procession, the other three days after it. This discursive passage may be regarded as the Coda to the narrative account of the triumphal procession.

3 Diodorus Siculus 31.8.9–12

Let us now turn to the account of the same triumphal procession as offered by Diodorus Siculus.

31.8.9–10

ἐπὶ τούτοις ὁ Αἰμίλιος ἀγῶνας καὶ πότους μεγαλοπρεπεῖς τῷ πλήθει συντάξας τὰ εὐρεθέντα χρήματα εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἀπέστειλεν καταλαβὼν δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς θρίαμβον καταγαγεῖν ἅμα τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ στρατηγοῖς κελεύεται παρὰ τῆς συγκλήτου. καὶ πρῶτος μὲν Ἀνίκιος καὶ Ὀκτάουιος ὁ τῆς ναυτικῆς δυνάμεως ἡγησάμενος ἀνὰ μίαν ἡμέραν ἐκάτερος ἐθρίαμβευσεν, ὁ δὲ σοφώτατος Αἰμίλιος ἐπὶ τρεῖς.

Subsequently Aemilius, after arranging splendid games and revelries for the assembled multitude, sent off to Rome whatever treasure had been discovered, and when he himself arrived, along with his fellow generals,

announcement of the gift as actually given; translation Alfred C. Schlesinger; emphasis mine).

- 23 Compare Thijs 2021: 72: 'In Ancient Greek (...) there are specific particles that appear to primarily convey attitudinal-interactive meaning aspects. Clear examples are ἄρα ('apparently, as it turns out') ...'
- 24 The passage *Il.* 24.525–533 comes closest to this reference.
- 25 Compare for instance Hdt. 1.5.4: τὴν ἀνθρωπιήν ὣν ἐπιστάμενος εὐδαιμονίην οὐδαμὰ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μένουσαν, ἐπιμνήσομαι ἀμφοτέρων ὁμοίως ('Knowing therefore that human prosperity never continues in the same place, I shall mention both alike'; translation A.D. Godley); cf. Hdt. 1.8.2, 1.32.9, 1.86.6 and 7.203.2.
- 26 35.1: ἦσαν γὰρ αὐτῷ τέσσαρες υἱοὶ ... ('for Aemilius had four sons ...'), the connective particle γὰρ marking the upcoming passage as an exemplification of the narratorial comment.

he was ordered by the senate to enter the city in triumph. Anicius first, and Octavius, the commander of the fleet, celebrated each his triumph for a single day, but the very wise Aemilius celebrated his for three days.

The passage starts with the simple statement, expressed by the aorist ἀπέστειλεν, that Aemilius sent to Rome ‘the discovered things’. Next, the present for preterite κελεύεται marks the onset of the episode on Aemilius’ triumphal procession:²⁷ he was ordered by the senate to enter the city in triumph (θριαμβος), together with his fellow generals. In the μέν-member of a μέν ... δέ-construction, it is stated by the complexive aorist²⁸ ἐθριάμβευσεν that these fellow generals each celebrated the triumph for a single day, and in the δέ-member Aemilius, referred to as ‘most wise’ (σοφώτατος), enters the focus of attention: he celebrated the triumph for three days. The remainder of the passage, introduced by καί, is structured by sentence-initially placed datives of time: τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ ... τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ ... τῇ τρίτῃ. Although Diodorus uses both aorist indicatives and imperfects, the alternation of tenses is rather straightforward, and especially the discourse potential of the imperfect is put to limited use.

31.8.10

καὶ τῇ μὲν πρώτῃ ἄμαξαι χίλιαι διακόσσιαι προήλθον φέρουσαι λευκάς καὶ τραχείας ἀσπίδας, καὶ ἄλλαι χίλιαι διακόσσιαι ἄμαξαι πλήρεις ἀσπίδων χαλκῶν, καὶ ἔτεραι τριακόσσιαι λόγχας καὶ σαρίσας καὶ τόξα καὶ ἀκόντια γέμουσαι· προηγούντο δὲ αὐτῶν ὡς ἐν πολέμῳ σαλπιγκταί. ἦσαν δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι πολλαὶ ποικίλα εἶδη φέρουσαι ὄπλων, κάμακες ὀκτακόσσιαι καθωπλισμέναι.

On the first day the procession opened with twelve hundred wagons filled with embossed white shields, then another twelve hundred filled with bronze shields, and three hundred more laden with lances, pikes,

27 Cf. Nijk 2019: 153: ‘the present for preterite signals to the addressees that they are to update their mental model of the discourse in the light of salient developments. Such developments concern either the segmentation of the discourse in terms of narrative structure, or the status of referents’.

28 For the complexive aorist, see Van Emde Boas *et al.* 2019: ‘The aorist of such verbs [atelic verbs, like θριαμβεύω, ΜΒ] can (...) be used as an expression of an entire period (viewed as a complete whole from beginning to end, without any interest in its component parts). This is the so-called complexive (or ‘concentrating’) use of the aorist. Typically, an expression of the duration of the action is included’. The expression of the duration of the action here is ἀνὰ μίαν ἡμέραν in the case of Anicius and of Octavius, and ἐπὶ τρεῖς in the case of Aemilius.

bows, and javelins; as in war, trumpeters led the way. There were many other wagons as well, carrying arms of various sorts, and eight hundred panoplies mounted on poles.

The aorist προήλθον just presents the information that the procession opened with wagons filled with shields, and others laden with lances, pikes, bows, and javelins. This general statement is followed by two sentences, both attached to what precedes by δέ, on trumpeters²⁹ and many other wagons, the main verb of which is a sentence-initially placed imperfect (προηγούντο and ἦσαν), marking these sentences as background material rather than evoking the perspective of the people watching, as in Plutarch.

31.8.11

τῇ δὲ δευτέρᾳ προεκομίσθη νομισμάτων τάλαντα χίλια, ἀργύρου τάλαντα δισχίλια διακόσια, ἐκπωμάτων πλήθος, ἀγαλμάτων καὶ ἀνδριάντων ποικίλων ἄμαξαι πεντακόσiai, ἀσπίδες τε χρυσαὶ καὶ πίνακες ἀναθηματικοὶ πάμπολλοι.

On the second day there were carried in procession a thousand talents of coined money, twenty-two hundred talents of silver, a great number of drinking-cups, five hundred wagons loaded with diverse statues of gods and men, and a large number of golden shields and dedicatory plaques.

In the account of the procession on the second day, we again find a single aorist stating what was borne in procession (προεκομίσθη), which is followed by an enumeration of objects:³⁰ talents of money and silver, drinking-cups, wagons loaded with statues of gods and men, and shields and dedicatory plaques.

31.8.12

τῇ τρίτῃ προηγούντο λευκαὶ βόες εὐπρεπεῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι, χρυσοῦ τάλαντα ἐν φορήμασι διακοσίοις εἴκοσι, φιάλη δέκα ταλάντων χρυσοῦ διάλιθος, χρυσωμάτων παντοῖαι κατασκευαὶ ταλάντων δέκα, ἐλεφάντων ὀδόντες δισχίλιοι τριπήχεις, ἄρμα ἐλεφάντινον ἐκ χρυσοῦ καὶ λίθων, ἵππος φαλάροις διαλίθοις καὶ τῇ λοιπῇ κατασκευῇ διαχρύσῳ πολεμικῶς κεκοσμημένος, κλίνη χρυστῆ στρωμαῖς πολυανθέσι κατεστρωμένη, φορεῖον χρυσοῦν περιπεπετασμένον πορφύραν, ἐφ'

29 For the trumpeters, see note 2.

30 For an interpretation of (some of) these as objects associated with Hellenistic court culture entering Rome, see the chapter by Strootman.

οἷς Περσεὺς ὁ δυστυχῆς βασιλεὺς Μακεδόνων ἅμα δυσὶν υἱοῖς καὶ θυγατρὶ μιᾷ καὶ τοῖς ἡγεμόσι διακοσίοις πενήκοντα, στέφανοι τετρακόσιοι δοθέντες ἐκ τῶν πόλεων καὶ τῶν βασιλέων, καὶ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν Αἰμίλιος ἐφ' ἄρματος ἐλεφαντίνου καταπληκτικοῦ.

On the third day, the procession was made up of one hundred and twenty choice white oxen, talents of gold conveyed in two hundred and twenty carriers, a ten-talent bowl of gold set with jewels, gold-work of all sorts to the value of ten talents, two thousand elephant tusks three cubits in length, an ivory chariot enriched with gold and precious stones, a horse in battle array with cheek-pieces set with jewels and the rest of its gear adorned with gold, a golden couch spread with flowered coverlets, and a golden palanquin with crimson curtains, followed by Perseus, the hapless king of the Macedonians, with his two sons, a daughter, and two hundred and fifty of his officers, four hundred garlands presented by the various cities and monarchs, and last of all, in a dazzling chariot of ivory, Aemilius himself.

The account of the procession on the third day consists of one sentence, too – this time a very long sentence,³¹ the main verb of which is an imperfect: *προηγούντο*, placed at the beginning of the sentence, immediately after *τῇ τρίτῃ*. Other than the series of imperfects in Plutarch, this single imperfect does not seem to evoke the perspective of the people watching, and it does not create tension either – at least as far as we know, for our source for this episode breaks off here.³² To all appearances, the imperfect is chosen because it continues the same line of thought as was presented by *προεκομίσθη* in the account of day two.³³

Apart from the mentioning of the trumpeters – probably just because they were present during the procession – the language of perception is conspicuously absent from this account, and so is any reference to the spectators. This account may in narratological terms be called a *summary*: the real-time duration of the events – after all, three full days – is dealt with quickly in story time: three sentences are devoted to the procession on day one, and the continuation of it on day two and on day three is presented in just one sentence each. Diodorus' account lacks rhythm altogether, apart from the structuring device

31 At the end of the enumeration of spoils, the Macedonian king Perseus and Aemilius himself are mentioned in passing.

32 The passage that follows in our text editions is from a different source.

33 Note also the asyndeton at the onset of the account of day three.

τῆ μὲν πρώτῃ ... τῆ δὲ δευτέρῃ ... τῆ τρίτῃ, which makes this passage look like a list³⁴ merely enumerating the appropriated spoils.

4 Conclusion

In this chapter I have presented a narratological-linguistic analysis of the accounts of the three-day triumphal procession of Aemilius Paullus in Plutarch *Aemilius Paullus* 32–34 and Diodorus Siculus 31.8.9–12. Focusing on narrative technique, on linguistic aspects, notably the usage of the Greek tense-aspect system, and on the use of the language of perception and emotion, I have shown that in both texts the exact same Real-World situation is shaped in remarkably different narrative form.

The feeling that we are presented with an eyewitness report in Plutarch is brought about by various means. The narrative is structured and shaped so that the reader sees the procession by and large through the perspective of a spectator *in situ*. After an Abstract, Plutarch opens with an Orientation presenting a panoramic view on the city of Rome, which in cinematographic terms may be labeled a full shot. The imperfect ἐθεῶντο creates tension as to what the people in the story world were watching. From this first imperfect onwards, the imperfect remains the dominant tense, the aorist being predominantly used for narratorial comments. The cinematographic style is continued in the second sentence of the Orientation, where the camera is at closer angle, so that we may speak of a long shot. Then the camera is at an even closer angle in the Complication when the works of art on display on day one of the procession are presented, and moves to a close shot, focusing on the Macedonian arms borne along on day two. Throughout these various stages of the narrative, which read like a screenplay, words belonging to the semantic field of perception are found. By suggesting that there was actually something to *see*, *smell* and *hear* during this procession, the narrator enables what might be called an embodied mental simulation of these sights, smells and sounds. In the account of day three, when the defeated Macedonian King Perseus and Aemilius himself enter the stage, the language of perception is maintained, but here the language of emotion is also omnipresent, the most emotional scene and therewith the Peak of the narrative being the relatively long passage in which

34 Cf. Von Contzen 2021: 36: ‘First and foremost, the list is a formal feature, characterised by several (usually three or more) distinct elements employed in direct succession and in loose, if at all, syntactic and conceptual coherence to both the other elements and the surrounding narrative material.’

Perseus' children are watched by the spectators. Thus, the narratee's emotional evaluation of (the actions of) the main protagonists is steered.

None of this is found in Diodorus Siculus. The narrative is very basically structured, and the choice of tenses does not seem to aim at any internal perspective. While Diodorus is 'telling' spolia in a distanced style, Plutarch is 'showing' spolia by using what might be called immersive techniques. As a result, the immense impact these spolia once had on their Roman viewers is clearly felt by the recipient of the text as well.

Bibliography

- Allan, R.J., 'Sense and Sentence Complexity. Sentence Structure, Sentence Connection, and Tense-Aspect as Indicators of Narrative Mode in Thucydides' *Histories*', in R.J. Allan, M. Buijs (eds.), *The Language of Literature. Linguistic Approaches to Classical Texts* (Leiden 2007) 93–121.
- Allan, R.J., 'Towards a Typology of the Narrative Modes in Ancient Greek. Text Types and Narrative Structure in Euripidean Messenger Speeches', in S.J. Bakker, G.C. Wakker (eds.), *Discourse Cohesion in Ancient Greek* (Leiden 2009) 171–203.
- Bentein, K., 'Aspectual Choice and the Presentation of Narrative. An Application to Herodotus' "Histories"', *Glotta* 92 (2016) 24–55.
- Contzen, E. von, 'Theorising Lists in Literature. Towards a Listology', in R. Laemmle, C. Scheidegger Laemmle, K. Wessellmann (eds.), *Lists and Catalogues in Ancient Literature and Beyond. Towards a Poetics of Enumeration* (Berlin-Boston 2021) 35–54.
- Emde Boas, E. van, Rijksbaron, A., Huitink, L., Bakker, M. de, *The Cambridge Grammar of Classical Greek* (Cambridge 2019).
- Fleischman, S., *Tense and Narrativity. From Medieval Performance to Modern Fiction* (London 1990).
- Fleischman, S., 'Verb Tense and Point of View in Narrative', in S. Fleischman, L.R. Waugh (eds.), *Discourse Pragmatics and the Verb: the Evidence from Romance* (London 1991) 26–54.
- Huitink, L., 'There Was a River on Their Left-Hand Side. Xenophon's *Anabasis*, Arrival Scenes, Reflector Narrative and the Evolving Language of Greek Historiography', in A. Willi (ed.), *Formes et fonctions des langues littéraires en Grèce ancienne* (Geneva 2019) 185–226.
- Huitink, L., Rood, T., *Xenophon. Anabasis Book III* (Cambridge 2019).
- Labov, W., *Language in the Inner City* (Philadelphia 1972).
- Levinson, S.C., Majid, A., Enfield, N.J., 'Language of Perception. The View from Language and Culture', in A. Majid (ed.), *Field Manual. Volume 10* (Nijmegen 2007) 10–21.

- Liedmeier, C., *Plutarchus' biographie van Aemilius Paullus. Historische commentaar* (Utrecht-Nijmegen 1935).
- Nijk, A.A., *Tense Switching in Classical Greek. A Cognitive Approach* (PhD dissertation, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam 2019).
- Rijksbaron, A., 'The Imperfect as the Tense of Substitutionary Perception', in P. da Cunha Corrêa, M. Martinho, J.M. Macedo, A. Pinheiro Hasegawa (eds.), *Hyperboreans. Essays in Greek and Latin Poetry, Philosophy, Rhetoric and Linguistics* (São Paulo 2012) 331–375.
- Thijs, K., *Polysemous Particles in Ancient Greek. A Study with Special Reference to μήν and δῆ* (PhD dissertation, Radboud University Nijmegen 2021).
- Webb, R., 'Sight and Insight. Theorizing Vision, Emotion and Imagination in Ancient Rhetoric', in M. Squire (ed.), *Sight and the Ancient Senses* (London-New York 2016) 205–219.