

# Statius' Capaneus and Virgil's Laocoon

*Revised from a paper given to the Virgil Society on 24 January 2015\**

## 1. Expectation and subversion

To readers of the *Aeneid*, Statius' Amphiarus, the ill-fated prescient priest who resists the initial Argive push toward self-destruction, will swiftly bring Virgil's Laocoon to mind.<sup>1</sup> This observation is verified by the wider influence of Virgilian epic on the 1st century AD *Thebaid* of Statius.<sup>2</sup> The figures of Amphiarus and Laocoon have several parallel features, including awareness of the self-destructive madness their people are about to embrace, which they cannot stop,<sup>3</sup> and verbal links: Amphiarus asks *quo, miseri, fatis superis obstantibus, arma / quo rapitis?* ("Where, you poor citizens, where are you taking your weapons, with the fates and the gods opposed to it?" *Theb.* 3.629–30), drawing on Laocoon's *O miseri, quae tanta insania, cives?* ("O you poor citizens, what great madness is this?" *Aen.* 2.42). This makes for

---

\* With many thanks to those who commented on drafts of this article: Daniel Hadas, Ruth Morello and Will Leveritt.

<sup>1</sup> See Fantham (2006) 159–60. Seo (2013) 146–184 sees similarly that Amphiarus is a composite of earlier vatic models, but rather emphasises Amphiarus' surpassing his previous models through apotheosis. See also Tuttle (2013) 78–87 and Manolaraki (2013) 89–107 on Amphiarus' augury in *Theb.* 3: both show how his vatic performance draws on earlier models.

<sup>2</sup> In turn a greater understanding of Statius' epic has been shown to contribute meaningfully to readings of the *Aeneid*. Hardie (1993) 22 observes that post-Virgilian epic in general is extremely useful for understanding the potential in the *Aeneid*'s text for generating meaning: "modern readers will find in the epics of Lucan, Statius, Valerius Flaccus and Silius Italicus some of the most penetrating readings available of the *Aeneid*". The most prominent of the studies on the interaction between the *Thebaid* and the *Aeneid* is perhaps Ganiban (2007). Important studies also include Criado (2000); Hardie (1993); Pollmann (2001). The editions used throughout are Hill's of the *Thebaid* (1983) and Conte's of the *Aeneid* (2011); all translations are my own.

<sup>3</sup> On Amphiarus as a composite and deliberately representative example of the "prescient but ill-fated priest" figure see Seo (2013) 147. Ganiban (2007) 57 also sees the Odysseus-Calchas dynamic as a model for Capaneus vs Amphiarus: in both cases, war is perpetuated in spite of warnings to the contrary. But he argues that the model also undermines the pairing of Capaneus and Amphiarus, because of the treachery in Odysseus' and Calchas' cooperation in the deception of the Trojans involving Sinon (*Aen.* 2.126–29). Stover (2009) 440–51 sees multiple models in this particular confrontation. There is also a close resonance between Amphiarus and Laocoon, in that Laocoon is traditionally, if not ostensibly in Virgil, associated with Apollo, as noted by Servius *ad Aen.* 2.201, on which see Tracy (1987) 451–53. On Virgil's Laocoon against the backdrop of the wider and older tradition see further Heinze (1993) 9–14, 39–42; Harrison (1970) 327–28; Lynch (1980); Most (2010) 326–29.

a straightforward allusion which frames the Argive expedition as self-destructive, validates Amphiaraus' foresight and foreshadows his own destruction.

The allusion is contextualised, however, by the relationship which is set up between Capaneus and Amphiaraus.<sup>4</sup> Amphiaraus, just prior to his Laocoon-esque question, turns to Capaneus himself: *nam te, vesane, moneri / ante nefas*; ("for it is an impious act for you to be warned, crazy man, in advance", 3.627–28). He *does* then go on to warn Capaneus, creating in his own actions violation of the divine order.<sup>5</sup> This itself is no wild departure from the precedent set by Laocoon, who is (though perhaps less knowingly) set against the divine machinations surrounding the Trojan Horse. Capaneus' own role as *contemptor divum*, inherited from the epic and tragic tradition and Theban mythology more widely,<sup>6</sup> then accentuates the sense of resistance to the divine, for we might very well observe that this precisely is what we expect from *him*. Not only that, but Capaneus is also on a self-destructive path, imposed ultimately by the divine.

The straightforward allusion of Amphiaraus to Laocoon is further compromised in this direction, as Capaneus' first speech in *Thebaid* 3, which comes before Amphiaraus' allusive question, has links to Laocoon's repudiation of the Horse in *Aeneid* 2.<sup>7</sup> Identity slippage occurs between *contemptor divum* and priest: the prophetic voice which urges delay of self-destruction is supplanted by one which incites it. A further nexus of voices from the *Aeneid*, both prophetic and bellicose, generates overlaps in conflict proposed, hastened or foreshadowed.

Both Amphiaraus and Capaneus have been identified with the voice of the poet, and their drawing on vatic models enhances this: here we find them moving in the direction of a *shared* vatic link. But, since Laocoon is an "emergency" priest, it is one which is not quite stable in its prophetic, and thus poetic identity.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>4</sup> There has been considerable discussion of this. On their dispute see Lovatt (2001) 118; Masterson (2005) 291–92; Stover (2009); Dominik (1994b) 44 (for the structure surrounding the exchange), 147–148; Fantham (2006).

<sup>5</sup> Fantham (2006) 159 points to the illogicality of Amphiaraus' point here.

<sup>6</sup> Much of current scholarship on Capaneus himself focusses on his supernatural, monstrous or gigantomachic overtones, often as part of his (unsuccessful) attempt to transcend mortal existence, along with his poetic pretensions. See Lovatt (2005) 128–139; Leigh (2006); Parkes (2009) 486–87; Fucecchi (2013) 112–17; Chaudhuri (2014) 256–97. See also Harrison (1992) 251; Criado (2000) 107–10; McNelis (2007) 140–05; Ganiban (2007) 145–48; Parkes (2012) 126 *ad* 4.65–86; Marinis (2015) 349–51.

<sup>7</sup> Mezentius is another Vergilian model for Capaneus, and has been much treated in this light. I will not delve into that link in this paper. See Caiani (1990) 265–76; Ganiban (2007) 60, 146.

<sup>8</sup> On Capaneus, and particularly the sublimity of his endeavours relating to the poet, see Leigh (2006) 225–35, and see Masterson (2005) *passim* on Amphiaraus as generating a new poetics of Roman manhood. See also Ash (2015) 207–08 on the problems of military success in the Domitianic context, where the emperor himself lacks the genuine capacity for exemplarity in this arena. See Austin (1964) 100 *ad* 201 (following Heinze, 1993, 15), who points to Laocoon as potentially an "emergency priest" and observes that his priestly status is only emphasised at the point where it contrasts with his status as sacrifice.

I give both Laocoon's and Capaneus' speeches in full below. Subsequent to that, I treat their links in detail, in line with other allusions to key figures such as the *Aeneid's* Tarchon, as well as the *Thebaid's* own Tydeus. Tarchon's and Tydeus' more obviously martial context acts to overlay the home-front with the immediacy of the battlefield, allusively capturing the duality of that contested space occupied at Troy. Capaneus' taking on of a prophetic voice also encompasses Helenus, and his future-facing turn to the chthonic is therefore set in dialogue with Aeneas' own immediate descent into the Underworld. Finally, I delve beyond the boundary of Amphiarauus' home, as pointed out by Capaneus, to explore the ways in which his disparaging attitude to what lies within presents an attempt to undermine celestial power, which is in dialogue with Laocoon's take on the Horse.

Laocoon's speech:

*'O miseri, quae tanta insania, cives?  
Creditis auctos hostis? Aut ulla putatis  
dona carere dolis Danaum? Sic notus Ulixes?  
Aut hoc inclusi ligno occultantur Achivi,  
aut haec in nostros fabricata est machina muros,  
inspectura domos venturaque desuper urbi,  
aut aliquis latet error: equo ne credite, Teucri.  
Quidquid id est, timeo Danaos et dona ferentis.'*

("O you poor citizens, what great madness is this?  
Do you believe the enemy to have sailed away?  
Or do you think any Greek gifts to lack trickery?  
Is Ulysses thus known? Either Greeks, closed up in the wood,  
are secreted here, or this machine has been made to go against our walls;  
it's ready to spy on our homes and come into the city from above,  
or some other deception lies hidden: don't trust the Horse, Trojans.  
Whatever it is, I fear the Greeks, even when they bring gifts").

(*Aen.* 2.42–49)

Capaneus' speech comes as the narrator shifts the focus from the Argives gearing up for war to the specific scene at Amphiarauus' door (3.604–05):<sup>9</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Dominik (1994b) 147 calls this speech "one of the most rhetorically violent speeches in the *Thebaid*".

*'Quae tanta ignavia', clamat,  
 'Inachidae vosque o socio de sanguine Achivi?  
 Unius (heu pudeat!) plebeia ad limina civis  
 tot ferro accinctae gentes animisque paratae  
 pendemus? Non si ipse cavo sub vertice Cirrhae  
 (quisquis is est, timidis famaеque ita visus) Apollo  
 mugiat insano penitus seclusus in antro,  
 exspectare queam dum pallida virgo tremendas  
 nuntiet ambages. Virtus mihi numen et ensis  
 quem teneo! Iamque hic timida cum fraude sacerdos  
 exeat, aut hodie, volucrum quae tanta potestas,  
 experiar.'*

("What great cowardliness is this?' he shouted,  
 'O sons of Inachus, and you, O allies of Argive blood?  
 At the commoner's door (for shame!) of one citizen  
 are we waiting, so many races with ready minds and armed?  
 Not if Apollo himself, closed off deep within his  
 frenzy-inspiring cave beneath hollow Parnassus' heights  
 (whoever he is, so he seems to the fearful and to rumour),  
 were to bellow, would I be able to wait while the pale girl  
 spouted her terrible prophecies. My manliness and  
 the sword I hold are my god! And right now let this  
 priest with his over-cautious trickery come out, or this very day  
 I will test out what power there is in birds!'"

*(Theb. 3.607–18)*

Both speakers open with questions which sets them apart from their listeners. They attempt to undercut the supernatural through foregrounding of the human, and focus on the contents of internal spaces which are hidden or mysterious, with a threatening overtone. They couple this with strong statements and a militarily aggressive stance – reinforced for Laocoon when he couples words with action and throws a spear at the Horse (*Aen.* 2.50–02).

The occasion of Capaneus' speech is his introduction in the *Thebaid*, a moment shared with Amphiaraus' Laocoon-like resistance to the war. Amphiaraus has already been framed by Capaneus as a pacifist, in contrast to the latter's warlike attitude.<sup>10</sup> While Laocoon embodies

<sup>10</sup> See Masterson (2005) 291–92.

delay at the narrative level in his command to be wary of the Horse, his actual behaviour is both hasty and seeks to perpetuate violence suspended. In his marked reluctance to take action, Amphiaraus thus departs from the military assertiveness expressed in Laocoon's injury to the Horse.<sup>11</sup> Amphiaraus is reluctant to speak, while Laocoon cannot wait to start: he speaks before arriving on the scene (*procul*, "from afar", *Aen.* 2.42),<sup>12</sup> and throws the spear straight after his speech, without any pause.<sup>13</sup>

Laocoon's enthusiasm for action, with his hasty entry into the space and overtly aggressive stance, are in fact evoked more clearly in Capaneus' enthusiasm than Amphiaraus' delay. Laocoon has had to come to the location – like Capaneus and *his* crowd, and unlike Amphiaraus, around whose home the crowd are gathered. His belligerent, exemplary act is echoed in Capaneus' self-promoting statement of strength (*Theb.* 3.615–16), which is accentuated by the contrast the hero makes in his own speech. The punchy *virtus mihi numen et ensis* (615) is augmented only by the enjambed relative *quem teneo* (616), to contrast with the elaborate syntax preceding it, which contains an unreal condition built around a parenthesis, and lengthened by a temporal clause (611–15).

## 2. Opening questions

When we turn further to the content of the speeches of Capaneus and Laocoon, we find verbal echoes and structural similarities. The first of these is Laocoon's initial question, Capaneus' echo of which opens up the issue of the speaker's isolation and configuration of the collective. Capaneus and Laocoon respectively ask *quae tanta ignavia* and *quae tanta insania*, almost verbatim repetition in the same metrical pattern. The questions, pointing to a collective attitude which the speaker is able to comment on, and thus be apart from, suggest that the speaker is isolated from the wider community. However, in the *Thebaid* it is Amphiaraus who is really isolated, for Capaneus reveals that both he and the people are ready to fight. He states that the Argive populace have their swords drawn (610), and sets in opposition the "lone citizen" (*unius civis*, 609), Amphiaraus. This draws on Laocoon himself being presented as part of a collective – he descended *magna comitante caterva* ("accompanied by a large crowd", *Aen.* 2.40) – but sensitises us to Laocoon's self-isolation here, as he makes no mention of their psychological accompaniment. Indeed, it is precisely at the mental level that he places the collective apart from himself, in their "madness", in spite of our awareness that those who have spoken before, like Capys, have largely shared Laocoon's mistrust of the Horse. Capaneus, through his somewhat undermined

<sup>11</sup> On the marked vigour of Virgil's Laocoon, see Austin (1964) 44 *ad* 40–56.

<sup>12</sup> See Lynch (1980) 171.

<sup>13</sup> On the logic and structure of Laocoon's speech, see Austin (1964) 45 *ad* 40–56.

outspokenness (for how can one be truly outspoken when everyone is ready to act in the same way?) reveals the way in which Laocoon imposes a psychological barrier between himself and the collective.

### i. *insania* vs *ignavia*

A departure in the allusion to Laocoon within Capaneus' first question is the verbal trade of *insania* in the *Aeneid* for *ignavia* in the *Thebaid*. A vice which stands in opposition to *virtus*, at the level of ethics and military assertiveness, *ignavia* is deployed frequently in a rhetorical context.<sup>14</sup> Capaneus thus takes a more obviously military stance, rather than drawing attention to the madness of the collective, as Laocoon does.<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> On *virtus* McDonnell (2003) 236 notes: "In Rome ... physical prowess, or courage, especially as displayed in war, remained the central element of manliness throughout the Republican period and into the Empire"; see further 238–10 on "martial *virtus*". On mid-Republican uses of the contrast of *virtus* and *ignavia* see McDonnell (2006) 61, who points out that Plautus and Naevius use *virtus* in an ethical sense. He also notes (293) that, by the time we get to the late Republic, *virtus* has acquired the full range of meanings in Latin. He points to a shift in the conceptualisation of Roman manliness in the late Republic (293–384), which sees martiality and ethics in a complex relationship to the term, and he subsequently maps a harmonisation in the imperial period, noting of the Flavians in particular that a heroic, military sense of *virtus* is brought to the fore around the person of the emperor (387–88), though the actuality of Domitian's capacity for exemplarity is questionable (see n.16 below). We see *ignavia* used prominently at Cic. *Cat.* 2.25.12, where Cicero lists it among other vices, so too *Tusc.* 3.17.2. Then see *Inv.* 1.22.15 and 2.165.1, where it is opposed to *fortitudo* ("bravery"), as it is at *Fin.* 1.49.20; *Rep.* 2.68(fr.4).9, where it is also juxtaposed with fear, as at *Fin.* 1.50.10 and *Tusc.* 3.14.14. At *Pro Rab.* 21.21, the defendant's action is contrasted with the *ignavia* he might have shown, were he not to have acted decisively and militarily. Besides Cicero, Sallust employs the word at *Cat.* 52.29, where Caesar attempts to rouse the senate to action and accuses it of *ignavia* in taking none; 58.4, where Catiline sets Lentulus' *ignavia* in opposition to the action he and the other conspirators must now take; *Iug.* 31.2, where Memmius decries the sloth which degeneracy has led the Roman citizenry into, as opposed to the action they *should* be taking; and *Iug.* 85, where Marius' speech uses the word four times in drawing contrasts between his suitability as a general, though he is a *novus homo* ("new man"), given the merits of his action to date, and the weakness or inaction of the senatorial classes. Livy uses the word 23 times, notably in Tullia's impassioned speech to Tarquinius (2.3.3), inciting him to kill Tullius; when (24.16.12–14) Gracchus makes a distinction between military *virtus* ("manly qualities") and *ignavia* ("cowardice"); just such a contrast is also used at 22.60.8. Nor are these themes confined to the early imperial and republican usage of the word: Valerius Flaccus has his Jason express concern about the *ignavia* of his men (*Arg.* 3.376), setting it in opposition to *fama* ("renown") and their homes, both recognisably heroic objectives, especially for an epic involving travel. Silius Italicus (*Pun.* 11.33) lists *ignavia* alongside other vices, as well as having Pedianus address the beautiful youth Cinyps with the superlative *ignavissime* (12.236). Cinyps is crucially not warrior enough to wear the spoil which is Paulus' helmet, and thus fits the negative configuration of the word in a martial context. More widely, Suetonius has his Caesar bemoan his *ignavia* in contrast to Alexander's conquest of the world (*Iul.* 7.1.5), the word appears in a list of typical vices at *Tib.* 66.1.8 and *Calig.* 45.1.8, in contrast to military assertiveness on the part of Caligula.

<sup>15</sup> Austin (1964) *ad loc.*, detects archaism in *insania* ("madness"), especially when combined with other elements, such as *ne* plus imperative. Lynch (1980) 171 takes this further, pointing to both stylistic and syntactical features of Laocoon's speech which bring him into close alignment with archaic diction and particularly that of Cato.

Capaneus puts himself forward as an inspirational figure at *Theb.* 3.615–18, and in allusion to Laocoon, as an exemplary one.<sup>16</sup> His emphasis on his *virtus* (“manly qualities, virtue, military prowess”) and sword reinforces physical action as part of exemplary behaviour. This is of course what we see happening with Laocoon, who backs up his advice to the Trojans on not trusting the Horse with an act which realises that mistrust. In contrast, Capaneus’ stance does not actually engender any action on his part.<sup>17</sup>

## ii. Intermediaries: Tarchon and Tydeus

There is however more than Capaneus and Laocoon in this intertextual dynamic. Statius alludes to Tarchon, Virgil's Etruscan leader, who adds another layer of bellicosity. He and Laocoon are remarkably similar in the way they couple encouragement with exemplary action. Laocoon hurls his spear at the Horse (2.50), and Tarchon too backs up *his* words through activity: *Haec effatus equum in medios moriturus et ipse / concitat* (“Having said these words he spurred his horse into the midst of the fray, even ready to die himself”, 11.741–42).

Tarchon reproaches his men thus: *Quae tanta animis ignavia venit?* (“What great cowardice has come upon your minds?”, 11.733). This is the only such line in the *Aeneid*, and Lactantius, the ancient commentator on the *Thebaid*, believed that Statius was alluding to it in Capaneus’ speech.<sup>18</sup> I have no reason to differ from Lactantius, with the clear verbal echo plain to see, but take the allusion as being in dialogue with the situation that draws Laocoon into the picture at the same time.

There is more of Tarchon alluded to in Capaneus. The readiness of weapons, brought out by Capaneus at *Theb.* 3.610–11 (*tot ferro accinctae gentes animisque paratae / pendemus?*)<sup>19</sup> evokes Tarchon's *Quo ferrum, quidve haec gerimus tela irrita dextris?* (“Where are your swords? Or what are these weapons we are wielding vainly in our right hands?” *Aen.* 11.735). This draws attention to the fact that Capaneus and his audience need not be so ready for battle, as

<sup>16</sup> This fits into a wider pattern of Capaneus’ attempts to reinforce links between his own heroic persona and that of positive exemplary figures. He accompanies another notable deed, the killing of the sacred snake (5.565–70) with a narrative placing expectation on his own role and its relationship to the mythological past, in what Parkes (2009) 487 reads as a bid to retain a Hercules-like heroic persona. This is in sharp contrast to his close ally Hippomedon, who simply acts without speaking at 5.558–61. See Masterson (2005) on exemplarity in Flavian epic which is far from straightforwardly positive or negative: “The *Thebaid* functioned both as a treasure house of exemplars and a provocation” (290).

<sup>17</sup> On the role of the visual in exemplarity, see Leigh (1997) 160–72, and for the *Thebaid* in particular Bernstein (2004) 78–83, who sees multiple relationships between exemplars and receiving audience, based on differing points of view or focalisations of the final duel.

<sup>18</sup> *ad Theb.* 3.613; on this see Chaudhuri (2014) 261 n.12.

<sup>19</sup> Capaneus’ elevation of his own *virtus* and sword to the level of the gods also resonates with prior models who are on the cusp of battle. See Fantham (2006) 159 n.34, who notes his make-up comprising Aeschylus’ Parthenopaeus and Tydeus, alongside Virgil's Mezentius.



they have not even left Argos yet. Capaneus' exhortation at one level seems misplaced, with battlefield readiness brought to a domestic situation. In this he evokes figures who promote civil discord, such as Sallust's Catiline, who likewise gives a speech resonant with battle exhortation in a setting which does not call for it (*Cat.* 20).<sup>20</sup>

The alteration from *insania* to *ignavia* brings Tarchon meaningfully into play – and with it the military immediacy which forms the backdrop of *his* position in that moment – but we can go further. The *animis* between *tanta* and *ignavia* in Tarchon's speech is displaced by Capaneus, shifted to express that *his* mob is ready for battle, and mentally in tune with him: *animisque paratae* (3.610). Tarchon used *animis* to reveal the mob's opposition to his stance at 11.733, and his speech goes further in this direction – drawing on the Roman, and negative, conceptualisation of Etruscans to render their position oppositional and manifestly "other": referring to their cowardice, love of luxury and association with the east in Bacchic revelry.<sup>21</sup> The shift of *animis* then brings together Tarchon and Laocoon, with the latter the closer syntactical model. This effectively doubles Vergilian models who are isolated psychologically from the collective, in an escalation that throws into greater relief Capaneus' position.

Capaneus' actual readiness for action during his conflict with Amphiaraus is expressed through words alone (*Theb.* 3.615–16), while both of his models couple deeds with their rhetorical stances. Capaneus' character is not restricted by a lack of desire for excessive violence and action (and we have already been made aware by the narrator that he wants war for war's sake at 3.597–601). Rather, he is manifestly unable to separate proper conflict from non-conflict situations, as evidenced by his behaviour in the games (6.807–25).<sup>22</sup> Capaneus has also been observed as using a predominantly challenging mode of speech against both friends and enemies.<sup>23</sup>

The phrase *quae tanta ignavia* draws on the package of vices used in political invective. It expresses the power of words, but also undermines that power in favour of deeds, being regularly used to indicate a need for practical, military intervention.<sup>24</sup> The relationship between rhetoric and action in epic itself is problematic, with epic heroism shaped from its earliest incarnations by a need to balance skill at verbal expression with physical prowess.<sup>25</sup>

<sup>20</sup> As noted by Batstone (2010) 237. I would particularly point to 20.2, where Catiline praises his followers for their lack of *ignavia*.

<sup>21</sup> On typical Etruscan qualities see Bittarello (2009) 212–19. Most of these negative aspects are captured in Tarchon's address to his soldiers, as well as in the characterisation of Mezentius, Tarchon's principal antagonist (*Aen.* 7.648: disrespect of the gods; 8.481–82: tyranny; 8.483–88: ill-treatment of the dead). Bittarello also notes that Virgil's Etruscans draw on the monarchic and Early Republican period. On Tarchon see further Horsfall (2003) 146–47 *ad* 184.

<sup>22</sup> On which see Lovatt (2005) 154–62.

<sup>23</sup> Dominik (1994b) 147.

<sup>24</sup> See Craig (2004) 190–01 on the pool of conventional qualities drawn on in speeches which employ invective.

<sup>25</sup> See Hardie (2012) 129–30 on rhetoric and the epic narrative, particularly with reference to invective in *Aen.* 11.



Capaneus' use of *quae tanta ignavia*, coupled with the intertextual link to two models who then take decisive action, both presents the hero as shackled by circumstance to a purely rhetorical usage, frustrated in any genuine pretension to physical activity, and offers a potential warning about the disastrous consequence for civil cohesion were he to act. For if he were to lead the charge at this point, it would be against Amphiaraus.

Tarchon's action is decisive, and itself filled with connotations of internal strife. His first kill is Venulus, whose diminutive name associates the figure with Aeneas' mother.<sup>26</sup> Tarchon creates of himself a double for Turnus, who also pursues an Aeneas *manqué* (10.636–65). Internal strife is represented, but in the safe space of a transfer of identity.<sup>27</sup> Tarchon takes Venulus *arma virumque* ("arms and the man", 11.747), a phrase encompassing the core identity of Aeneas, but also of the *Aeneid* itself.<sup>28</sup> Capaneus, in alluding to Tarchon, taps into the intimations of internal strife present in the *Aeneid*, particularly Tarchon's tendency to turn supposed allies into enemies, alongside his threat at the level of poetics – precisely what is happening with Amphiaraus.

Even from within the *Thebaid* itself, and relatively recently at that, *quae tanta ignavia* has been coupled with exemplary action. No one in the *Thebaid* emblematises the epic tradition more ably than Iliadic exemplar *par excellence* Tydeus.<sup>29</sup> Deployed on a mission of peace to Thebes, Tydeus is, however, bellicose to the point of disobeying orders from Athena herself, according to the *Iliad* (5.802–08). The picture of him as exemplary in his martial prowess emerges from his function in the *Iliad* as part of repeated *epipoleseis*<sup>30</sup> for Diomedes, at 4.370–98, 5.802–08, and 10.285–90. The Iliadic Tydeus is drawn on for Statius' version of his *aristeia* in book 2, as it presents what we hear of him from the *Iliad*: his battle against the fifty Thebans. His bellicosity is brought out further in the *Thebaid*, as he, like Capaneus, is a

<sup>26</sup> We are already invited to compare the two figures. Muse (2007) 587 notes the contrast to be made between Aeneas and Tarchon at the level of leadership (in their control over landing, for example). The way the two men are brought together reveals a need to alleviate anxiety about Tarchon's status.

<sup>27</sup> See Pogorzelski (2009) 261–62 for a useful survey of the divergent possibilities of reading the war in the second half of the *Aeneid* as a civil war.

<sup>28</sup> Fratantuono (2007) 344 refers obliquely to Virgil "smiling" at this line, and Horsfall (2003) *ad* 747 similarly finds humour here.

<sup>29</sup> Gervais (2015) 56, placing emphasis on the role of his *virtus*, points to Tydeus as a figure in whom the concept of the "epic hero" is exemplified (if only to crash). Graziosi & Haubold (2010) 38 note the exemplary function of Tydeus for his son Diomedes in the *Iliad*, but point to Diomedes' selectivity in when to deploy him as a model: he is only appropriate in moments where battle savagery is needed. They also note that Tydeus is "remembered as a savage warrior" by the audience. The antagonism between Capaneus as *contemptor deorum* and the priest Amphiaraus is a marked departure from the Aeschylean version of the Seven against Thebes myth, where it was Tydeus who played antagonist to Amphiaraus on a religious level. Hardie (1993) 69 couples Tydeus with Capaneus, among others, as a hero with "immortal yearnings". He also, along with Gervais (2015) 59, 65–67 and Roche (2015) 396, points to Lucan's Scaeva as a key model for Tydeus, another figure around whom issues of exemplarity cluster. See also Leigh (2006) 178–84 and McNelis (2007) 131–33.

<sup>30</sup> That is, exhortations directed at specific individuals or groups within a fighting force, prior to battle, and which draw on personal experience. Cf. Keitel (1987) 161–62.

keen proponent of war.<sup>31</sup> In book 2 he forms a window of allusion through which Capaneus accesses Virgil.<sup>32</sup> The two instances connect the heroes as catalysts of the war, and as challengers to figures who champion delay or diffusion of tensions.

The question Capaneus issues at the opening of his speech alludes internally to Tydeus at *Theb.* 2.548 as much as it does to Tarchon. Tydeus' use of *quae tanta ignavia* occupies the same metrical position as Capaneus':

*'Quis timor audendi, quae tanta ignavia? Solus,  
solus in arma voco.'*

("What fear of bold action, what great cowardice is this? Alone,  
alone I call you to arms!")

(*Theb.* 2.545–46)

This is said during Tydeus' *aristeia*, to encourage his would-be ambushers to take him on. Such usage corresponds to Capaneus' employment of the phrase contextually, specifically to the heightening of military tension, for this is the beginning of open hostilities in the text. Tydeus is here inciting his enemy, rather than his compatriots and allies.<sup>33</sup> When Capaneus repeats the phrase only one book later, the words cannot help but recall Tydeus' *aristeia*.

Moreover, it is precisely in response to the ambush plotted against Tydeus, and the injuries he suffers during the ambush, that the Argives are galvanised to go to war. It is, in fact, on Tydeus' treatment at the hands of the Thebans that Capaneus plays in the very section where he takes on the guise of Laocoon, persuading the people to fight:

*'Sileamus inulti  
Tydeos egregii perfossum pectus et arma  
foederis abrupti?'*

("Ought we to allow that the pierced body of outstanding  
Tydeus and arms of a broken treaty go unavenged?")

(*Theb.* 3.653–56)

<sup>31</sup> As, for example, at *Theb.* 7.611–24. Capaneus is also the one who brings Melanippus' head which Tydeus then cannibalises at 7.745–50, colouring Tydeus' final act with resistance to the celestial gods, as Ganiban (2007) 124 observes.

<sup>32</sup> Capaneus in book 3 of course replaces Tydeus, modifying the antagonistic pairing of Amphiaraus with the latter familiar from the Greek literary tradition, noted by Fantham (2006) 158 n.32. With Capaneus in the pairing, the dynamic shifts to one more straightforwardly concerned with the divine.

<sup>33</sup> As Gervais (2015) 56 points out, Tydeus' *aristeia* is the first martial action of the text. The way in which Capaneus' words echo those of Tydeus may suggest that Capaneus' bid to "start" a war is, in fact, belated – it has already begun.

In alluding to Tarchon, he brings war to Amphiarus' doorstep. The additional window through Tydeus then reveals Capaneus making enemies of his compatriots, blurring the identity of Tydeus' Theban ambushers with the "home crowd". Capaneus names Amphiarus' *plebeia limina* (3.609), which sensitises the reader to his physical position, and to the fact that he is not on a battlefield at all. The focus on Amphiarus' doorway, while emphasising the domestic locale, also makes prominent its role as a boundary. Any crossing of such a boundary constitutes a self-destructive act, an inward turn and thus an act of civil war.

Boundary violation is not the only intimation of civil war at work here.<sup>34</sup> Tarchon's behaviour comes as a response to Camilla's *aristeia* (11.664–724), a moment where Etruscans are on both sides of the battlefield, and an uncomfortable proximity to civil war occurs. Laocoon's situation, in contrast, and the thin boundary between unknown enemy and Trojan host, seems markedly different. The space he occupies seems as caught between battlefield and home-front as Capaneus on Amphiarus' doorstep: it barely exists in the gap between the Horse standing outside of Troy and breaking through the walls. The concept of the boundary then (to which our attention is so drawn by Capaneus) and the unknown force which lies behind it, merit further examination.<sup>35</sup>

### 3. Beyond the boundary

In the *Thebaid*, the boundary is the threshold of Amphiarus' home (3.609). The threat within constitutes Amphiarus' knowledge, which he will not share (3.566–75) and the Apolline source of that knowledge. Amphiarus' home, blurred with the Pythia's cave, becomes like the Horse in the *Aeneid*, hiding a threat which the speaker's words attempt to penetrate. The external audience of the *Thebaid* is already well-aware of the dire omens which have been recognised by Amphiarus prior to this event (3.516–65), just as the *Aeneid's* audience is aware of the threatening contents of the Horse, thanks to Aeneas' power of hindsight. A space is thus established between the knowledge the external and internal audiences have of the latent threat contained beyond the boundary.

The internal spaces which Capaneus and Laocoon imagine during their speeches are presented in recognisably similar ways. Capaneus' speech takes us to a place where prophetic utterance occurs in an enclosed space qualified by *cavum*, *penitus*, *seclusus* (3.611–13). These are all words which resonate with the inside of the Horse, to which the adjective *cavae* (*Aen.* 2.53),

<sup>34</sup> Bartsch (1997) 10–47 comprehensively explores boundary violation as part of civil war narrative, specifically in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, as an expression of self-destruction, and in opposition to narratives of order which convey political and social stability.

<sup>35</sup> As McNelis (2007) 129–30 notes, boundary transgression is a key theme of the *Thebaid*, and Amphiarus and Capaneus encapsulate it, with their chthonic and (attempted) celestial transgressions (see further 124–25, 144–45).

the adverb *penitus* (2.19), and the related *inclusi* (2.45) are applied, as both external and internal narrators struggle to resist its ability to hide its contents.

Capaneus describes Apollo as *penitus seclusus in antro* (3.613), just as Laocoon says that the Achaeans are *inclusi ligno* (*Aen.* 2.45). Statius' *seclusus* (3.612) in part echoes Virgil's *inclusus* (*Aen.* 2.45, 258), aligning the unknown threat of the soldiers locked in the Horse to the god. The *penitus* also picks up Aeneas' words as he reveals to his audience the contents of the Horse prior to Laocoon's appearance:

*Huc delecta virum sortiti corpora furtim  
includunt caeco lateri penitusque cavernas  
ingentis uterumque armato milite complent.*

("There, in its dark sides, they shut in strong, chosen men in secret,  
and filled the depths of its huge hollow spaces and womb with an armed cohort").

(*Aen.* 2.18–20)

The allusion places Apollo on the level of the marauding Achaeans, rendering the god inimical. The depth with which the space behind the surface is furnished is integral to communicating the threat, but also points to the speaker penetrating to the very heart of the unknown.

The importance of such words in denoting not simply revelation but penetration becomes clear from intratextual connections within the *Aeneid* itself. The adverb *penitus* in conjunction with *cavae* is also used later at 2.487 of domestic interiors. This recalls the Horse, and helps define the relationship of city and machine as reciprocal in acts of attempted or successful penetration. The ransacked homes, where Aeneas sees tearful women, are in dialogue with the internal space of the Horse.<sup>36</sup> Its threat is now brought to fruition with a bittersweet dualism that claims the status of inner space as safety now lost. For what emerges from the safety of the Horse's womb enters and conquers Troy's domestic, feminine, and hitherto safe centre.<sup>37</sup> The homes then become, rather than places which offer comfort to the hero, a reminder of failed penetration: the Trojans did not break open the Horse, and so the contents of the Horse have broken Troy open.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>36</sup> Rossi (2004) 23–24 offers a useful overview of the opinions on the nature of the correspondence Servius observed in this passage to the sack of Alba in Ennius' *Annales*; see further 41–43, on the fall of Troy extending to embody Rome, as well as Alba, and working against the teleology of foundation.

<sup>37</sup> Graziosi & Haubold (2010) 33 point particularly to the city being configured as a feminine space in *Iliad* 6, itself powerfully drawn on throughout *Aen.* 2, as noted by Hughes (1997), through Aeneas' actions replicating those of the Iliadic Hector.

<sup>38</sup> Rimell (2015) 35–36 argues for reciprocal acts of penetrating enclosed, small spaces in the *Aeneid*, which redress the Trojan failure to heed Capys' advice at *Aen.* 2.38 on probing the *latebras* ("hiding spaces"). She suggests spaces used for hiding carry a connotation of "homeliness or nostalgic smallness", though if these spaces are uncontrollable, or unknown, they "arouse suspicion".

In revealing the spaces of the Horse to the audience's view retrospectively, Aeneas fulfils a wish to expose the Greeks, which challenges Laocoon's failure at the time. Amphiarus in the *Thebaid* has retreated into his own domestic space for safety – from the imminent future – and the antagonism in Capaneus' assault on his home, through its connection to the Horse, is more fully realised. The failed attempts of Laocoon and Aeneas to reveal the internal workings of the Horse, and in so doing redress or anticipate the Greek attack in some way, are taken further by Capaneus' verbal exposure of Apollo and the Pythia. He is ultimately successful, for he obtains an opening up of the internal, domestic unknown, as Apollo's representative Amphiarus emerges to reveal what he knows of the future, and articulate the self-destructive path they will all take.

#### 4. Between mortal and divine

There is more than simply human antagonism to be considered for both Laocoon and Capaneus: both also attempt to detract from the divine. In his treatment of the Horse, Laocoon effectively denies its divine aspect, and this denial is alluded to in Capaneus' antagonistic stance towards Apollo. In using Laocoon's suspicion around the Horse to frame his own stance, the hero re-draws Laocoon's response to the Horse as one which debunks *any* claim it has to divine association or status, a response which heightens a sense of antagonism in Laocoon's relationship to the divine.<sup>39</sup> At the same time, in aligning the inner spaces of Amphiarus' home to the Horse's inner spaces, Capaneus punctures Apollo's gravitas and supernatural capacity to threaten, by placing him in the more mundane house of a single citizen (*unius ... civis*, 3.609).

##### i. Whatever it is ...

Laocoon sees the potential for something hidden, something which is not open in the danger it poses, as fundamental to the Horse. Apollo, from Capaneus' perspective, represents something similar. In an aside, Capaneus says of Apollo, *'quisquis is est, timidis famaеque ita visus'* (3.612).<sup>40</sup> The metrical positioning of *quisquis is est* is identical to that of *quidquid id est* at the start of the climax of Laocoon's speech (*Aen.* 2.49), where the priest expresses the unknown, yet patently frightening aspect of the Horse. The only variant between the two phrases is in the

<sup>39</sup> Marinis (2015) 349 points to Capaneus' martial valour being the motivation for his disdain for the divine, as with Mezentius in the *Aeneid*. In this too we may detect a link to Laocoon, who is similarly loaded with martial connotations.

<sup>40</sup> Chaudhuri (2014) 263 discusses the line, noting that the question mark Capaneus raises over Apollo's status is an embellishment on his typical boast about his weapons, and that his scepticism is a key part of his presentation here, beyond his criminality or hubristic nature.

gender assigned to Apollo by Capaneus, which undermines any sense of genuine uncertainty, and which affects the tone of the utterance.

Not only is *quidquid id est* almost repeated here, but the Lucretian resonances which the original phrase tapped into are also evoked.<sup>41</sup> The scepticism which characterises Capaneus' approach, along with the stance he takes relative to augural practice, link to philosophical approaches which insist on divine lack of involvement; though his flagrant disrespect is not part of that connection.<sup>42</sup> What prefigures Capaneus' use of the evocative phrase does not correspond to the typically Lucretian options which Laocoon presents: "it might be x, it might be y, whatever it is". Rather we have a marked contrast between the specific knowledge that it is Apollo *himself* who is in the cave, and the sarcastic uncertainty created by *quisquis is est*.

Capaneus' *quisquis is est* also echoes a trope that was well-established in ancient prayer formulae, as part of a pious effort to enable a prayer to take effect.<sup>43</sup> In Capaneus' mouth it becomes a rejection of Apollo's identity. With *timidis famaеque ita visus* (3.611),<sup>44</sup> he marks a clear difference between his own knowledge and the suspicions of the fearful. In using *fama*, he also reflects on the capacity of narrative itself to shape the divine, and particularly the epic tradition – answering with what is stridently his own narrative.<sup>45</sup>

Laocoon fears the Horse, and positions himself as someone afraid of the unknown. Capaneus, however, refers to the *timidis* in the abstract, and allows fear to be communicated as something experienced by those external to himself. This, coupled with the alterations to the presentation of the unknown in *quisquis is est*, emphasises a shift in his stance from that of Laocoon. Capaneus is *not* afraid, precisely because he does not buy into the dread of the unknown: he does not find it powerful. Laocoon, in spite of his determined distancing of the Horse from the divine (subsequently opposed by Sinon), cannot help but allow it to become

<sup>41</sup> Lynch (1980) 170 cites this phrase as a particularly Lucretian example: it is used at *DRN* 3.135 of *harmonia*, which the poet is refuting, and at 5.577 of the moon. In both instances, the poet has given a few different options, before deploying the phrase and moving on to a specific assertion which nevertheless does not fully clarify the unknown quantity. See also Chaudhuri (2014) 257–59 for an overview of Capaneus' status as engaged with philosophy, and particularly on the complexities of reading the contradictions inherent in the figure's suspicion of divine existence and simultaneous challenge to it. Lovatt (2013) 62 points to Capaneus' later alignment of Amphiarus with a "Lucretian Epicurus figure (3.657–9)", while "Lucretian language" in turn generates Capaneus' own conceptualisation of the gods as being generated by fear (3.661).

<sup>42</sup> Chaudhuri (2014) 262 points to the differences in Capaneus' presentation and that of Mezentius, a figure who forms part of Capaneus' intertextual makeup, but falls short of the thorough religious disregard and disrespect Capaneus shows, and to whom the label Epicurean has been applied, on which see Kronenberg (2005) 403–31. On Epicureanism in Virgil see Adler (2003).

<sup>43</sup> We find it at Aeschylus, *Agamemnon*, 99–10, where Fraenkel (1950) *ad* 160–02 notes its traditional nature, but also the pointed use in Aeschylus, where it encompasses not the deity's name but his character and inscrutable nature.

<sup>44</sup> *timidis* is a word sharing its root with the verb used by Virgil in the same position, *timeo* (*Aen.* 2.49).

<sup>45</sup> On *fama* as narrative see Hardie (2009) 555–72, and on *fama* as "tradition" see Hardie (2012) 81.



something which defies logical explanation.<sup>46</sup> His rationalising, but nevertheless fearful, explanation reveals the Horse as something which has the capacity to bemuse and terrify as much as any natural phenomenon attributable to the gods, and which, crucially, has had precisely this effect on him. In casting Apollo as an understood object of a fear that is separate from the speaker's own experience, Capaneus potentially realises a paradoxical sense in which Laocoon's resistance to the divine function of the Horse allows for its supernatural capacity.

Capaneus highlights the dualism present in the seer's act of divine mediation, to which we are already sensitised through Amphiaraus' description of it in rather less benign terms than the typically sanctioned act should merit (3.633–35). Through Laocoon, Capaneus reveals the extent to which he and Amphiaraus are aligned, enabling a full collapse of the binary between seer and theomach.

## ii. The cave

At *Theb.* 3.611–15, Capaneus highlights the cave from which Apollo's prophecies are commonly experienced, and more specifically the Pythia who dwells within, as a key element in his argument and derision.<sup>47</sup> Capaneus creates slippage between the mere *plebeia limina* (609) of the human Amphiaraus and the prophetic enclosure associated with Apollo. This complements the not unnatural blur between the Pythia and Apollo, when he tells us Delphi is where Apollo *ipse* speaks (611). Negotiating the human-divine dynamic forms a fundamental part of Capaneus' attack on Amphiaraus' prophecies and prophetic power. Such an attitude complements Laocoon's attempts to lock the Horse, in spite of the supernatural agency he cannot help ascribe to it, into the mortal and thus manageable realm.<sup>48</sup>

The shift in focus, from Amphiaraus to the Pythia, might seem rather odd in the context. Amphiaraus is in no way like the Pythia: he is not the same type of prophet as the Pythia, and has not "accessed" Apollo in her customary manner at all.<sup>49</sup> An inversion in his speech

<sup>46</sup> On the pendant nature of Laocoon and Sinon see Lynch (1980) and Austin (1964) 94 *ad* 199–227, who also notes (101 *ad* 201) that Laocoon does not address the man who undermines his persuasive power. Note that Amphiaraus puts Capaneus high on the agenda of people who have *not* motivated his decision to come out (*Theb.* 3.620–24) and about whom he will *not* speak (3.627–28) – something of a *recusatio* in contrast to Laocoon's simple lack of engagement.

<sup>47</sup> The discourse surrounding the Pythia here taps into wider philosophical concerns about the nature of oracles themselves, expressed by Plutarch, for example. Writing in the same period, Plutarch focusses on the mechanics of the oracular process, and has his characters dwell on the nature of the Pythia's utterances, in particular on the human element in the relaying of the god's message. Plutarch too treats the Pythia with the Sybil (*De pyth.* 9), showing it was easy enough to make a connection between these prophetic figures and contexts.

<sup>48</sup> The Horse's ambiguity in status as dedicatory is also inherent, as noted by Horsfall (2008) 78 *ad* 40–56, though later (177 *ad* 189) he points out that destruction of the Trojans is entirely what one would expect following destruction of a tutelary image.

<sup>49</sup> Tuttle (2013) 72–73 places emphasis on Amphiaraus as augur, that is one who consults the flight of birds, and observes that Statius' version "echoes the Roman rite of taking the auspices" (73).

draws our attention to this, as Capaneus takes for himself the ability to read the birds' flight (3.617–18), having submerged the augur's typical association with the skies in the Pythia's cave.

The clarity of Capaneus' sword, emphasised through his verbal brandishing of it at 3.616, contrasts with the obscurity which surrounds the riddles of the prophetess, now connected to Amphiaraus himself. When combined with Capaneus' attempt to claim augury for himself (617–18), the opposition sees the hero appropriating something of Amphiaraus' role, both within the text and as a prophetic voice with wider significance at the poetic level. This is achieved not only through the intertextual link to Laocoon, but through a wider submersion in the *Aeneid's* framework of prophecy, which takes control in a way that corresponds to Capaneus' own pretensions to divine power.

Capaneus' turn to the chthonic, internal space of the Pythia's cave in response to the augur brings his words into dialogue with the associations of the divinely possessed female located in such a space in Latin epic. Vergil's Sibyl, as imagined by Helenus, is a prominent model, embedded as she is in the speech of another prophet, paralleling Capaneus' imagining of the Pythia in *Thebaid* 3. *Seclusus*, the word denoting Apollo's containment at *Theb.* 3.613, is used by Helenus in the *Aeneid* of the Sybil's prophecies, sealed by her in the cave, at 3.446: *antro seclusa relinquit* ("she leaves them closed up in her cave"). Helenus' speech finds further echoes in that of Capaneus, as he refers to the Pythian priestess as a *virgo* ("girl", *Theb.* 3.614), as Helenus does the Sybil (*Aen.* 3.445),<sup>50</sup> and the cave in both instances is also designated by *antrum* (*Theb.* 3.613 / *Aen.* 3.446). Of course Capaneus emphasises the prophetic voice itself (*ipse ... Apollo ... mugiat*, *Theb.* 3.610–12), which alludes to Aeneas' desire that the Sybil speak the prophecy herself in *Aeneid* 6 (*ipsa canas oro*; "I beg you, sing [them] yourself", 76), and his drive towards the war evokes her predictions for Aeneas of the horrors of war to be faced in Italy.<sup>51</sup> But I would suggest that structural links to Helenus and Laocoon, who both look toward internal spaces which will promise destruction, are as crucial as the Sybil herself.

Capaneus, firmly positioned in the *Aeneid's* nexus of prophetic voices, foreshadows, as Helenus does, a heroic descent which precipitates a prediction of war to follow. The link to militarily assertive figures like Tarchon and Tydeus foregrounds the bellicosity Capaneus combines with his prophetic role, as well as augmenting the resistance Laocoon already displayed to the divine aspects of the Horse. The combination offers a reading of Laocoon in turn, which renders his foresight accurate, but as antagonistic as it is insightful.

<sup>50</sup> Roche (2015) 395 points to an alignment of Tydeus with Virgil's Sibyl (*Theb.* 2.460–01 and *Aen.* 6.87–88), among other models. Another character takes intertextual ownership of the power to predict and shape the future, and it is significant that this occurs in the *Thebaid* with excessively violent figures.

<sup>51</sup> The allusion to *Aen.* 6.98–101 itself in Capaneus' conceptualisation of the Pythia, noted by Lactantius (*ad Theb.* 3.613) is read by Chaudhuri (2014) 261–62 as deliberately dismissive of both the Greek (epic) and Roman (cultural) heritage of engagement with the divine through augury and oracles: Capaneus is seeking to supplant divine authority on this front with himself. He also (n.13) points to Capaneus' capacity to offer a reading of the *Aeneid* which undermines prophetic authority on foundation.

Helenus' promise of clarity for Aeneas in the Underworld, brought to fruition in the Sybil's own voice, opposes the underworld space which Capaneus projects for the silent Amphiaraus – amplified by his use of it to break the force of divine communication through a refusal to listen. Capaneus challenges Amphiaraus' primacy in dialogue with the literary model, usurping Amphiaraus' role, while the latter hangs back and does not step into the Laocoon model of his own accord. Laocoon, of course, is an emergency priest, not an established augur or prophet like Helenus or Amphiaraus. That momentary role he steps into, in the absence of an actual priest of Neptune, signals Capaneus' assuming of a role suitable to a specific moment. This opposes the multiple, universalising allusions which connect him to other prophetic figures in the *Aeneid*, and so generates an instability in his role corresponding to the identity shifts taking place in the *Thebaid*.

In Helenus, Laocoon and the Sybil, Capaneus evokes repetition and re-narration of the Trojan war. Through Laocoon in particular, he does so as a liminal figure, contextualised by an insistence on a liminal Troy – at the tipping point into the final struggle leading to the city's destruction. Like the *Aeneid*'s Helenus, Capaneus' intertextual layers of prophetic voices foreshadow a destructive downward spiral, undercutting the *Aeneid*'s transcendent underworld experience with a somewhat more terminal one, and undermining the balance of city falling to city rising (Troy to Rome). Capaneus does not simply foreshadow the violence of the rest of the *Thebaid*, but in the shared model of Laocoon, and the martiality of bellicose intermediaries, actively brings war to the domestic setting, and renders a potentially safe space into a threat. In the self-destructiveness which allusion to Laocoon generates, there is no escape for the descending hero or the emergency priest.

*King's College London*

DANIELLE FRISBY  
(danielle.frisby@kcl.ac.uk)

## Bibliography

- E. Adler (2003) *Virgil's Empire: Political Thought in the Aeneid*, Lanham MD.
- R. Ash (2015) "War Came in Disarray ..." (*Thebaid* 7.616): Statius and the Depiction of Battle', in Dominik, Newlands & Gervais (2015), 207–220.
- A. Augoustakis (ed.) (2013) *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic*, Oxford.
- R. G. Austin (1964) *Virgil: Aeneid II*, Oxford.
- W. Batstone (2010) 'The Speech of Catiline', in D. H. & A. Erskine (eds), *Form and Function in Roman Oratory*, Cambridge, 227–46.
- N. W. Bernstein (2004) 'Auferte oculos: Modes of Spectator in Statius *Thebaid* 11', *Phoenix*, 58, 62–85.
- M. B. Bittarello (2009) 'The Construction of Etruscan 'Otherness' in Later Latin Literature', *G&R* 56, 211–233.
- L. Caiani (1990) 'La pietas nella "Tebaide" di Stazio. Mezenzio modello di Ippomedonte e Capaneo', *Orpheus* 11, 260–76.
- P. Chaudhuri (2014) *The War with God*, Oxford.
- G. B. Conte (ed.) (2011) *P. Vergilius Maro: Aeneis*, Berlin.
- C. Craig (2004), 'Audience Expectations, Invective, and Proof' in J. Powell & J. Paterson (eds), *Cicero the Advocate*, Oxford, 187–213.
- C. Criado (2000) *La teología de la 'Tebaida' Estaciana: el anti-virgilianismo de un clasicista*, Zurich.
- W. J. Dominik (1994a) *The Mythic Voice of Statius: Power and Politics in the Thebaid*, Leiden.
- W. J. Dominik (1994b) *Speech and Rhetoric in Statius' Thebaid*, Hildesheim.
- W. J. Dominik, C. Newlands & K. Gervais (eds) (2015) *Brill's Companion to Statius*, Leiden.
- E. Fantham (1992) *Lucan: De bello civili, book II*, Cambridge.
- E. Fantham (2006) 'The perils of prophecy: Statius' Amphiarus and his literary antecedents', in R. R. Nauta, J. J. L. Smolenaars & H. J. Van Dam (eds), *Flavian Poetry*, Leiden, 147–62.
- E. Fraenkel (1950) *Aeschylus: Agamemnon*, Oxford.
- L. Fratantuono (2007) *Madness Unchained: A Reading of Virgil's Aeneid*, Lanham MD.
- M. Fucecchi (2013) 'Looking for the Giants: Mythological Imagery and Discourse on Power in Flavian epic', in G. Manuwald (ed), *Flavian Epic Interactions*, Berlin, 107–124.
- R. T. Ganiban (2007) *Statius and Virgil: The Thebaid and the Reinterpretation of the Aeneid*, Cambridge.
- K. Gervais (2015) 'Tydeus the Hero? Intertextual Confusion in Statius, *Thebaid* 2', *Phoenix* 69, 56–78.
- B. Graziosi & J. Haubold (2010) *Homer: Iliad VI*, Cambridge.
- P. Hardie (1993) *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*, Cambridge.
- P. Hardie (2009) 'Fame's Narrative. Epic and Historiography', in J. Grethlein & A. Rengakos (eds), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin, 555–72.
- P. Hardie (2012) *Rumour and Renown: Representations of Fama in Western Literature*, Cambridge.
- E. L. Harrison (1970) 'Divine Action in *Aeneid* Book 2', *Phoenix* 24, 320–32.

- S. Harrison (1992) 'The Arms of Capaneus', *CQ* 42, 247–52.
- R. Heinze (1993) *Virgil's Epic Technique*, trans. H. Harve, D. Harve & F. Robertson, London.
- D. E. Hill (ed.) (1983) *P. Papini Stati Thebaidos Libri XII*, Leiden.
- N. Horsfall (ed.) (2003) *Virgil, Aeneid 11: A Commentary*, Leiden.
- N. Horsfall (2008) *Virgil, Aeneid 2*, Leiden.
- E. Keitel (1987) 'Homeric Antecedents to the "Cohortatio" in the Ancient Historians', *CW* 80, 153–72.
- L. Kronenberg (2005) 'Mezentius the Epicurean', *TAPhA* 135, 403–31.
- M. Leigh (1997) *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*, Oxford.
- M. Leigh (2006) 'Statius and the Sublimity of Capaneus', in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie & R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds), *Epic Interactions*, Oxford, 217–41.
- H. Lovatt (2001) 'Mad about Winning: Epic, War and Madness in the Games of Statius' *Thebaid*, *MD* 46, 103–20.
- H. Lovatt (2005), *Statius and Epic Games: Sport, Politics and Poetics in the Thebaid*, Cambridge.
- H. Lovatt (2013), 'Competing Visions: Prophecy, Spectacle, and Theatricality in Flavian Epic,' in Augoustakis (2013), 53–70.
- J. Lynch (1980) 'Laocoön and Sinon: Virgil, *Aeneid* 2.40–198', *G&R* 27, 170–79.
- E. Manolaraki (2013) "'Consider in the Image of Thebes": Celestial and Poetic Auspicy in the *Thebaid*,' in Augoustakis (2013), 89–107.
- A. Marinis (2015) 'Statius' *Thebaid* and the legacy of Thebes,' in Dominik, Newlands & Gervais (2015), 343–61.
- M. Masterson (2005) 'Statius' *Thebaid* and the Realization of Roman Manhood', *Phoenix* 59, 288–315.
- M. McDonnell (2003) 'Roman men and Greek virtue', in R. M. Rosen & I. Sluiter (eds), *Andreia: Studies in Manliness and Courage in Classical Antiquity*, Leiden, 235–61
- M. McDonnell (2006) *Roman Manliness: Virtus and the Roman Republic*, Cambridge.
- C. McNelis (2007) *Statius' Thebaid and the Poetics of Civil War*, Cambridge.
- G. Most (2010) 'Laocoons', in J. Farrell & M. C. J. Putnam (eds), *A Companion to Virgil's Aeneid and its Tradition*, London, 325–40.
- K. Muse (2007) 'Sergestus and Tarchon in the *Aeneid*', *CQ* 57, 586–605.
- R. Parkes (2009) 'Hercules and the Centaurs: Reading Statius with Virgil and Ovid', *CPh* 104, 476–94.
- R. Parkes (2012) *Statius Thebaid 4*, Oxford.
- K. Pollmann (2001) 'Statius' *Thebaid* and the Legacy of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Mnemosyne* 54, 10–30.
- R. J. Pogorzelski (2009) "The "Reassurance of Fratricide" in the *Aeneid*", *TAPhA* 130, 261–89.
- V. Rimell (2015) *The Closure of Space in Roman Poetics: Empire's Inward Turn*, Cambridge.
- P. Roche (2015) 'Lucan's *de Bello Civili* in the *Thebaid*,' in Dominik, Newlands, & Gervais (2015), 393–407.
- M. Seo (2013) *Exemplary Traits*, Oxford.
- T. Stover (2009) 'Apollonius, Valerius Flaccus and Statius: Argonautic elements in *Thebaid* 3.499–647', *AJPh* 130, 439–55.
- S. V. Tracy (1987) 'Laocoon's Guilt', *AJPh* 108, 451–54.
- A. Tuttle (2013) 'Argive Augury and Portents in the *Thebaid*,' in Augoustakis (2015), 71–88.

