written, where the inscription runs from left to right, ζ where it runs from right to left. He cites many instances of wrong direction (quoting mostly from F. Lenormant *Rhein. Mus.* 1867, vol. xxii. pp. 279 ff.); among them *C.I.G.* 28.

Next, *ā* for *η*. I do not know of any instance of the word *ἀνέθηκε* itself spelt with *a* instead of *η* (i.e. **ἀνέθακε*) on Laconian inscriptions, either in Greece or in Italy. (We find however *ἔσακε* = *ἔθηκε* as a *v.l.* in Alcman (*v. supra*), which is worth mentioning, although perhaps we may not attach much importance to it.) One way of explaining this difficulty is to suppose that the long *ā* in the word under discussion (*ανασάκετ*) is a hyper-Dorism; Doric is noted for its retention of original *a* where Attic preferred *η* or *ε* (as *μάτηρ*, *ἄλλοκα*). Hence long *ā* might have come in by false analogy here. Or again, as it is in a votive inscription, the *a* may possibly have come in from wrongly assumed connexion with *sakrim* 'sacrum,' *saka-hīter* 'sanciat,' &c. (Compare the example cited by Prof. Kirkland in *Class. Rev.* vi. p. 435, of *sarcophagus* becoming in vulgar idiom *sacrophagus*, through the influence of *sacer*.)

For instances of hyper-Dorism we have only to look at the Elean inscriptions, where they abound. Thus the Elean inscriptions

show *ā* often, where even Doric has *η*—for example *παράρ*: Doric *παρήρ* &c. (cf. Carolus Daniel *De Dialecto Eliaco*, § 3, p. 17). Those who went to the Olympian festival might well carry away with them a taint of this characteristic of the Elean dialect. The *τ* is no real difficulty, because Oscan in the Greek alphabet regularly writes *τ* in secondary tenses, while in the native alphabet it has *-d* (Conway *A.J.P.* xi. 309 f.). The alteration of the *ε* (augment) to *a* may perhaps have arisen in a short syllable from ignorance on the part of those who borrowed the word.

I would add as a possible parallel to *ανασάκετ* (in case my explanation be right) the Phrygian *αδδακετ* *αδακετ* (*v. Brugmann Gr.* ii. § 864, p. 1232) which is referred generally to *θηκ*, Lat. *fec-i* from *√dhē*, just as I would refer *ανασάκετ* also back to *ἀνέθηκε*, there being however this difference, that the Phrygian forms are not necessarily supposed to be borrowed, while I believe *ανασάκετ* is so.

I confess that this explanation of *ανασάκετ* may seem at first sight improbable, and has certainly many difficulties in the way of its reception, but as the word does not seem to have been, as yet, satisfactorily explained, it may be worth while to put forward the conjecture.

L. HORTON-SMITH.

CICERO, *EPIST. AD FAM.* XI. 13.

It may be worth noting in connexion with Lord Harborton's interesting article in the February number of this *Review* that Gurlitt in *Fleck. Ann.* 1880, p. 611, called attention to the fact that Cic. *ad fam.* xi. 13 was made up of fragments of two different letters, and Mendelssohn in his lately-published edition of the *Epist. ad fam.* has accepted Gurlitt's conclusions. Koerner

and Schmidt in fact in their appendix to the same work express the belief that the two fragments formed parts of letters addressed respectively by D. Brutus to Cicero and by Plancus and D. Brutus to the Senate and People of Rome.

F. F. ABBOTT.

The University of Chicago.

TACITUS, *GERM.* c. 29.

MANET honos et antiquae societatis insigne; nam nec tributis contemnuntur nec publicanus atterit.

In this passage *contemnuntur* is commonly translated 'humiliated'; but no other example of this usage of *contemnere* is given in the standard editions. Should we not

read *contaminantur*, 'are polluted,' 'degraded'? The change is an easy one, and *contaminantur* would correspond well to *atterit* in the next clause, both words having an underlying *physical* sense.

H. W. HAYLEY.

Harvard University.