

he dies. This tallies exactly with our other sources (Lic. 18 F, Oros. 5.19.10. Liv. *Ep.* 79), all of whom mention his inaction and intrigues. App. *B.C.* 1.67, by his silence as to what Pompeius Strabo did, after arriving allegedly to help the state, implies the same.

It is left to Velleius to state explicitly why he was militarily inactive and why he engaged in intrigues. Someone had refused to give him a second consulship and it is a reasonable assumption that the somebody was the rigid and unbending Octavius. Guess becomes near certainty when we consider what happened next.

Strabo eventually came down on the side of Octavius and fought a battle against Sertorius (Lic. 18, 20 F; Oros. 5.10–12) and then a battle on the Janiculum (Vell. Pat. 2.21.3–4; App. *B.C.* 1.68; Lic. 18, 19 F; Liv. *Ep.* 80). The reason for this activity is clear. He had been promised a second consulship but he still feared a double-cross (Lic. 19 F). The military situation had so far worsened that Octavius was forced to grant (Lic. 19 F) to Pompeius Strabo what he had originally refused (Vell. Pat. 2.21.2) in order to gain his help. It was obviously because of his fear of being cheated that after the battle, Pompeius once more intrigued with Cinna (Lic. 21 F). However, these negotiations were cut short by his sudden death (Lic. 21–2 F; Oros. 5.19.18; Vell. Pat. 2.21.3; App. *B.C.* 1.68).

C. Van Ooteghem suggested,⁵ without bringing forward any evidence, that Pompeius Strabo in 88 may have desired the Mithridatic command. There is, as it happens, some slight evidence to support this view. Plutarch (*Marius* 34.1) mentions that many men sought this command *διὰ τῶν δημαγωγῶν*. Pompeius Strabo is likely to have been one of these both in view of his military ability, his ambition and the fact that later in the year we find him able to command the services of a tribune.⁶

Hull University

A. KEAVENEY

⁵ *Pompée le Grand* (Brussels, 1954), p.45. first triumph', *Hermes* 83 (1955), 107.

⁶ Cf. E. Badian 'The date of Pompey's

SENECA, *MEDEA* 723

Altum gurgitem Tigris premens: what is Tigris doing? Gronovius has no remark to the point. The context however points the way to interpretation. For in the list of four rivers, two others are given some word or phrase to characterize them: Hydaspes is *gemmifer* and Baetis is said to give his name to nearby lands. Thus *altum gurgitem premens* should refer to some characteristic act or condition of Tigris, not to a unique or casual occurrence. H. M. Kingery (1908, reprinted 1966) cannot be right in saying that 'the Tigris, noted for its swift current, is pictured here as *checking its deep torrent*, so as to water the plants that grow in or near its bed'; this suggestion, adopted also by C. D. N. Costa in his recent Commentary (1973), implies, to me at any rate, an unusual slowing of his swift waters. The interpretation is linguistically sound, but it does not accord with the other descriptive phrases in the context. What then is characteristic of Tigris, and can be understood from *altum gurgitem premens*? Seneca's pupil and his nephew can tell us. They believed, erroneously (see *RE*

6A1.1009.55–64), that Tigris was one of those rivers who hides his diving flood. Twice Lucan alludes to this notion in the *Pharsalia*; at 3.261–3, where the *adnotationes* offer us the rather clever lines of Nero on the same theme (*frag. poet. Lat.*, ed. Morel, p.131), and again at 8.438 f. Of the latter passage Housman says ‘nugatur Lucanus’, but the tall story appealed to Milton, whose Satan enters Eden by Tigris’s underground course at *Paradise Lost* 9.69–75. Seneca’s phrase therefore means ‘who submerges his waters deep underground’.

This is brief and allusive writing, and verges on obscurity. But it is also typical of contemporary poetry; a most interesting account of a like practice of allusion and imitation in the case of the Sun’s reaction to the Thyestean dinner is given by U. Hübner in *Philol.* 120 (1976), 110–12.

Bedford College, University of London

ROLAND MAYER

PROPERTIUS 4.7.26

laesit et obiectum tegula curta caput.

Of all the explanations of this line the most sensible seems to be that first proposed by Beroaldus:¹ ‘Conqueritur Cynthia sibi defunctae tegulam fractam mutilatamque sub capite fuisse suppositam, quum debuerit amator puluinos molles delicatosque subiicere.’ That Cynthia is talking about the performance of funeral rites is confirmed by Shackleton Bailey’s discussion of 1.25 (*CQ* 63 (1949), 28 f.). In default of ancient parallels, I offer a modern one. In the last wishes of the Princess Teresa Uzeda in the novel *I vicere* by Federico De Roberto, first published in 1894, is included the provision: ‘In segno di particolare penitenza ed umiltà, espressamente impongo che il mio capo sia appoggiato sopra una semplice e nuda tegola: così voglio e non altrimenti’ (Garzanti, 1967, p.24). Further, on p.27, we read: ‘Le comari esclamavano: “E una tegola sotto il capo! . . . Che gli mancavano forse cuscini di velluto?”’

University of Sydney

FRANCES MUECKE

¹ It does not solve the problem of *obiectum*, however.