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Alongside his ongoing series of major commentaries on individual books of the *Aeneid*, Nicholas Horsfall (H.) has now produced this elegant volume, in which he asks some hard questions about the creation of the *Aeneid*. As in all H.’s writings on Vergil, readers will find here truly remarkable learning and a mastery of the material that very few scholars can even aspire to equal. The book contains ten chapters, dealing with such topics as the immense amount of reading that went into the writing of an extraordinarily dense and allusive poem and the demands thus made on ideally learned readers; the dynamics created by the combination of massive erudition and a strong sense of tradition and a strikingly original capacity for poetic invention; problems arriving from inconsistencies in the narrative as we have it, with due respect shown for the work of J. O’Hara on this immensely difficult subject; the use of ‘signposts’ deliberately inserted by the poet to indicate a particular source that is being followed; analysis of statements such as *ut fama, dicitur*, and so on, i.e. what has been dubbed ‘the Alexandrian footnote’; the role of anachronisms; the large number of different “voices” or “languages” at work in the text, such as those that focus in detail on matters as history, geography, animals, colours, the human body, clothing, and so on. What H. has achieved is to provide as full and detailed a survey as is reasonably possible of what went into the making of the *Aeneid*. At the outset of this ambitious display of learning applied to intense analysis of the text on so many levels, H. is at pains, in a short but typically combative introduction, to point out that it is NOT (his capitals, VIII) a translation of his earlier volume on much the same topic, *L’epopea in alambicco* (Naples 1991). That volume set out many of H.’s ideas about Vergil’s working methods and in many ways prepared the terrain for the commentaries that began appearing in 2000, with the monumental edition of book 7. There is also, inevitably, some overlap with the *Companion to the study of Virgil* first published in 1995. But this *libellus* stands impressively on its own two feet, and it is useful to have access to the current state of H.’s thinking on a number of crucial matters, especially since he admits that his approach has changed over the years. It goes without saying that all those interested in the serious study of Vergil will have to read this book very carefully. Indeed, all scholars working on Augustan poetry generally will profit greatly from the researches presented here. H. does not hide the fact that he writes for scholars, so students can expect some heavy going. The writing is always lively and engaging, but it can also be terse and sometimes a little obscure. But there is much to admire along the way, and those who read carefully will learn a great deal.


Dans le champ des gender studies, Tite-Live demeurait en reste. Daniel Albrecht (A.) comble cette lacune avec cet ouvrage précis, résultant de sa thèse de doctorat. Un exposé théorique efficace révèle qu’on ne naît pas homme, mais qu’on est perçu comme tel dans une société donnée. S’engage alors une exploration dynamique de la masculinité entre les représentations véhiculées par Tite-Live et leur explication par le genre. On passe de la res publica, le cadre institutionnel de la masculinité, à ses composantes, puis à son expression chez des hommes non romains. La compétition régit l’identité masculine. Il faut sans cesse la renégocier. Elle peut donc varier et il arrive qu’elle tombe dans les extrêmes. La République finit toujours par tempérer la masculinité, en maintenant la compétition dans le cadre du cursus honorum. C’est un «jeu sérieux» aux représentations duquel les participants doivent se conformer pour être reconnus membres du cercle dominant. On identifie l’homme hégémonique à ce que ses discours portent moins sur les faits qu’ils ne l’établissent en sujet agissant selon les schémas admis. C’est un père obéi par son fils, qui garantit ainsi les limites de la compétition et contribue à les perpétuer; de même, c’est un chef respecté par ses subordonnés. Sa virtus est reconnue sur les champs de bataille, où son commandement est dicté par la modération. La discipline militaire est pour lui la règle ultime. Il correspond à l’image attendue de lui, ce qui fonde son autorité. Les hommes