

follow; thus, for example, *bonus vir* expresses a subjective judgement about the man while *navis triremis* conveys an objective classification of the ship. It is easy to find examples where this neat distinction appears to break down; nevertheless, S.'s rather more complicated table of factors involved in the position of modifiers (335), while based on a detailed study of a large number of examples, still looks something like an expansion of Marouzeau's principle, with the addition also of logical factors (generic versus specific, contextually given versus contextually new) and pragmatic ones (emphasis and contrast; though bewilderingly, 'contrast' appears as a factor making for both anteposition and postposition).

The main material of the book is a series of case studies of the way modifiers of different types are ordered with certain specified nouns. S. starts with a typology of nouns and their modifiers based ultimately on that of John Lyons, *Semantics* (1977). Among the modifiers, some are given less attention as they are 'not very problematic' (for example, demonstrative and indefinite pronouns and possessives) but other categories are treated fully. Quantifiers (*omnis/nullus, multus, magnus* etc.) are rightly distinguished from ordinary adjectives, although not all their peculiarities are highlighted (for example, their tendency to appear widely separated from their nouns). Ch. 2 covers the most common types of single-word modifiers (for example, quantifying, classifying, descriptive, evaluative, possessive, and 'valency complements' such as objective genitives). Ch. 3 covers prepositional phrases, both in their own right and in terms of their integration into a larger noun phrase, while ch. 4 covers apposition of various kinds. The examples are largely taken from a defined corpus of pre-Augustan prose texts (selected texts of Cicero, Caesar and Sallust) which, though limited, is not inadequate for the purpose; as in the earlier book, comparatively little attention is given to differences of style and register.

S.'s consideration of the examples chosen is alert and sensitive to nuances which are not always immediately obvious, for example, the distinction between attributive and predicative adjectives (does *militēs omnes occisi sunt* correspond to 'all the soldiers were killed' or 'the soldiers were all killed?'), and, as one would expect in a functionalist account, to the various pragmatic functions such as topic, focus, contrast etc. Even so, the linguist's almost inevitable convention of taking examples out of context makes it not always easy to check up (without turning away to look up individual passages) on what wider contextual or rhetorical factors may lie behind the word order in any particular case (take as a typical example the variation between *dies comitorum* and *comitorum dies* (204–5)). Occasionally S. resorts to explanations that do not convince fully; for example, it seems hard to see a valid semantic distinction between *dies* + numeral expressing 'how many days?' and numeral + *dies* answering the question 'how much time?'. However, even where the hypotheses advanced seem uncertain or speculative, the questions are always interesting and will provide material for further research.

The overall conclusions are perhaps more tentative than some might expect, but the absence of clear-cut rules is itself to some extent a salutary conclusion, and the greatest value of the exercise undoubtedly lies in the detail. Commentators on Latin texts will find the book particularly helpful, as it is a mine of information (not always obvious or well-known) on Latin usage, including facts about other things than word order. For example, S. was the first to bring it clearly before this reader's mind that 'a lot of money' is virtually never **multa pecunia* but rather *magna pecunia*. The grammarian's myth that Latin prepositional phrases do not typically function as modifiers of nouns is decisively seen off in ch. 3; as in other areas, it depends on the semantics of the noun. And some editors of Latin texts will echo, while others may learn from, S.'s plea: 'there are close and free appositions in Latin, so please punctuate them properly!' (330). The only major regret is that there is no index verborum, which makes the book unnecessarily difficult to use for reference; could Brill be persuaded to include one if they reprint?

Royal Holloway, University of London
J.Powell@rhul.ac.uk

J. G. F. POWELL

doi:10.1017/S0075435815001276

J. M. SEO, *EXEMPLARY TRAITS: READING CHARACTERIZATION IN ROMAN POETRY*.
Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. xi + 220. ISBN 9780199734283. £74.00.

Modern critics express dissatisfaction with major characters in Roman literature with surprising frequency: the Virgilian Aeneas, for example, has been denigrated as a colourless and uninspiring

hero. Such instances of discomfort, however, often indicate that we are missing something: the ‘disconnect’ between modern expectations and ancient culture exposes a problem worth examining. In this spirit, J. Mira Seo has undertaken an ambitious reassessment of characterization in Latin poetry within its Roman context.

S. observes that modern misunderstandings of characterization in Roman poetry derive from misleading expectations of ‘psychological roundedness’ (ix). She argues for an ‘intertextual and semiotic’ as opposed to ‘mimetic’ approach (5): Roman poetic characterization, S. suggests, can be read ‘as a form of literary allusion’ (15). S. is perhaps necessarily concise in this introductory discussion of ancient and modern conceptions of character and self, but the brief references to figures and phenomena as diverse as Descartes (5), Flaubert (6) and Romanticism (9) bring up many unanswered questions: the large-scale opposition of modern and ancient, while heuristically sound, belies a complex history only glanced at here. (Freudian psychology, for example, is not explicitly discussed.) Still, the overall point is well taken: an appreciation of the intertextual dynamics of Roman literary works should motivate a different mode of attention to their techniques of characterization, one that is not solely based on the expectations of psychological or novelistic realism.

This insight is supported by discussion of the ‘distinctly Roman approach to the self’, which is seen as ‘aemulatory, referential, and circumscribed by traditional expectations of society’ (15). S. points in particular to Roman concepts of *decorum* and *persona*, aspects of rhetorical training, and M. Roller’s analysis of exemplarity in Roman culture (*CPhil.* 99 (2004), 1–56). The striking density of intertextual reference in Latin poetry has all too often been viewed as an inevitable outcome of the increasing Hellenistic refinement of the Roman *doctus poeta*. S.’s discussion, by contrast, points the way toward a true sociology of Roman intertextuality that would allow literary allusion and the “‘habit” of Roman exemplary thinking’ (15) to be viewed in terms of a shared cultural matrix.

In exploring this perspective, S. assigns a privileged rôle to Ovid. Ovid’s overt emphasis on rhetoricity, repetition, convention and ‘the fundamentally constructed nature of the world’ (17) makes him a paradigmatic case for S.’s line of interpretation (‘the Ovid code’, 16–18). I find this approach intriguing, but problematic: Ovid is not the main subject of any of the book’s subsequent chapters, yet a (simplified, 18) version of his poetics is granted hermeneutic scope over other authors. The final section of the introduction looks at Apollonius as a forerunner of Roman poets’ treatment of literary characterization, and in particular, examines his ‘palimpsestically layered characterization’ of Thetis (31). This section helpfully complements the previous discussion of the Roman background, yet with that end in mind, it would also be interesting to know what is *not* Roman about Apollonius’ approach.

The core of the book is devoted to case studies examining characters in works of Roman epic and tragedy: Virgil’s *Aeneid*, Lucan’s *Bellum Civile*, Seneca’s *Oedipus*, Statius’ *Thebaid*, and in an appendix, Seneca’s *Phaedra*. In each instance, S.’s claims are amply supported by interpretations that are insightful and well informed about the current state of research. Especially impressive are S.’s masterful unpacking of the sometimes lethal aesthetics of hair in epic poetry and Flavian culture (ch. 4), the richly erudite and highly original analysis of Amphiarus’ literary genealogy as intra-textual *vates* in Statius’ *Thebaid* (ch. 5), the acute examination of the problematic workings of exemplarity in Lucan’s Cato figure (ch. 2), and the persuasive reading of Seneca’s *Oedipus* as a ‘work ... crowded with textual ghosts’ (ch. 3, 109). At times, the choice of subject matter seems eccentric. Many readers, for example, will want a fuller account of Aeneas’ characterization than is allowed by S.’s narrow focus on the Paris subtext in ch. 1. On the other hand, subtler, less prominent aspects of characterization, not to mention minor characters themselves, sometimes offer deep insight into an author’s approach (123).

A more fundamental potential objection concerns the book’s massive emphasis on the semiotic and metadiscursive aspects of characterization. Ch. 4 concludes: ‘... in the figure of Parthenopaeus, Statius’ epic thematizes the affective emotionality of grief’ (145). This is no doubt true, but it is worth pointing out that Statius’ narrative of Parthenopaeus’ death not only ‘thematizes ... emotionality’, but also arouses emotions in the reader. There is an undeniable mimetic dimension in Roman characterization, which is one reason why these literary works engage us in the first place. S. knows this, but focuses on a less well understood aspect of Roman characterization in order to make a powerful and valid point. Still, it is tempting to imagine a sequel to this study articulating a more synthetic model of the relation between the ‘mimetic’ and ‘semiotic’ components of Roman poetic characterization.

S.'s book offers an important new approach to the study of characterization in Roman poetry through a series of rich, innovative readings of major Latin texts. Particularly exciting is the prospect this book offers of integrating the study of literary intertextuality with sociologically oriented research on exemplarity, rhetoric, and Roman concepts of self.

Memorial University of Newfoundland

LUKE ROMAN

romanl@mun.ca

doi:10.1017/S0075435815000337

T. D. PAPANGHELIS, S. J. HARRISON and S. FRANGOULIDIS (EDS), *GENERIC INTERFACES IN LATIN LITERATURE: ENCOUNTERS, INTERACTIONS AND TRANSFORMATIONS* (Trends in Classics: Supplementary Volume 20). Berlin/Boston: De Gruyter, 2013. Pp. ix + 478, illus. ISBN 9783110303681. €129.95/US\$182.00.

Offspring of Stephen Harrison's fertile 2007 monograph, *G(eneric) E(nrichment in Vergil and Horace)*, this heterogeneous brood of twenty-three takes on 'encounters, interactions and transformations' in Latin genre shows that this (sub-)field continues to thrive. Whereas *GE*'s aim was fixed squarely on intergeneric moments within six seminal texts of two cardinal authors, *G(eneric) I(nterfaces)* extends such an approach, together with numerous other kindred variations, to a much broader temporal and generic array.

Such internal variety could be programmatic, as if *GI*'s own multifariousness enacts a version of an argument apparently underlying most of its constituent parts. The familiar image of the *farrago* of Roman Satire might seem a pungent emblem here, but in fact, as '(post-)modern' (1) theoretical approaches to genre have rendered generic identity more fleeting(ly) than ever, and as most of the genres evoked in this collection are themselves shown to contain disparate generic elements, just about any *GI* *genus* would do if pressed into service. And this basic insight, that genres are constituted, at least in part, by *other genres*, is a powerful backdrop to these papers, even if it is treated with varying degrees of caution. But *GI* steers clear of proclaiming the impossibility of literary classification (à 'La loi du genre') via a threefold system of interpretation, graduated according to scope: Mode (1) close unpacking of specific textual moments which themselves stage a *synkrisis* of 'guest' and 'host' elements (*GE*'s terms; let's call it Meta-Intergeneric Intertextuality); Mode (2) fresh, reinvigorating re-examination of a particular (often neglected) author, work, genre or sub-genre within the context of generic expectations, usually multiple and/or contrasting (say, Interpretative Generics); and Mode (3) more abstract or theoretical genre schematization, synchronic or diachronic (speculative 'Genre Systematics').

The volume gets going with Harrison's accessible lead-in. One salutary side-effect of his neat synopsis of ancient and modern genre theory (itself a *GE*-cutting) is a bracing reminder to track the metaphors which have quietly propped up past arguments: for example, and most relevantly for Classics, Brunetière's Darwinian *évolution des genres* propagating Kroll's compelling *Kreuzung*, but even the Russian Formalists' divergent account of literariness figured as *exogamy*. Harrison's preface ends with an outline of *GI*'s components; below follows yet another digest (inevitably brief and selective) of representative essays, according to the scheme devised above.

For the first course (Mode 1), Cowan dissects Lucretius' frightful feast (3.73) to argue that the demythologizing poet has indeed cooked in a sound bite from Accius' *Atreus*, but, by blending it into a context where Roman *veneficium* would jibe, has defiantly cut off the tag's flavour of cannibalism in order to show consumers of *DRN* that Tragedy's genre does not belong to *this* recipe for philosophical didactic. Cowan's 'anti-allusion' is an absorbing paradox (the tragic meal's aftertaste lingers in spite of Lucretius) that deserves chewing over in future. Picking through the wreckage of a different genre-clash, Zissos hones our scholarly forensics of Lucan's collision with Caesar's *commentarii*. Spinning off Henderson and Masters, he retraces key steps in Lucan's metaliterarity (especially 9.983–6) to press for a *generic* rivalry — or rather, occlusion (a process emblemized in the updated editions of the Dyrachium siege and Scaeva's *virtus*): Lucan's epic comes to bury Caesar's own memoranda (palimpsest-like) and 'pauses' when it runs out of material to write over.

The pieces on shepherd songs challenge transcription. Papanghelis lines out an interpretation of *Eclogues* which would amplify its 'fiction of orality' rather than recording the latter as a mere stand-in for textuality: unless we use this take, he warns, the fixed opposition of the pastoral-elegy