Sontheimer’s most original idea, an idea which, if one could accept it, would be revolutionary, for it would remove from Vitruvius’ work the only occurrence of the name Augustus. The idea is to render “pronai aedis augstii” (v. 1. 7) not by “pronaos of the temple of Augustus,” but by “an august temple-pronaos,” taking aed[us]t[us]i as the adjective frequently applied to sacred buildings, and holding that the building added to the basilica was no temple at all but only what looked like the pronaos of a temple. Fatal, however, to this idea is the immediately following feminine relative quae, which must refer to aedis, not to pronai. This conclusive objection has already been pointed out by Nohl in a review in the Wochenschrift für kl. Phil. 1909, p. 604. Further, the word aede, not pronao, is used with reference to this building in the next clause but one. This forces Sontheimer to the unwarrantable assertion that the phrase pronaos aedis and the word aedes must in this passage denote the same thing. And his whole interpretation leads him to the conclusion that Vitruvius knew nothing of the title Augustus and that he published his work before the title was bestowed on January 16, 27 B.C. For Sontheimer is still laboring under the exploded theory that after the bestowal of this title, everybody must always have addressed the emperor by it; on this see my Preface of Vitruvius, pp. 153 ff. But although the novel interpretation of aegusti cannot be accepted, yet this chapter contains a useful account of Fano as it is today, with a plan of the place and indications of the few ancient remains still to be found there.

M. H. Morgan


The author has won a well-deserved reputation among scholars for his unique efforts in behalf of a quickening of interest in Greek and Graeco-Roman culture during the middle and later ages. His achievements in this direction have been so marked that it is difficult to realize that his doctorate dates from so late a time as 1883. His quarter of a century of academic activity is now marked by the collection and reprinting of various essays, chiefly in his favorite field, that originally appeared for the most part in popular journals, many of the contributions being under the guise of book-reviews. They are grouped under the four heads of “Sprachliches,” “Litterarisches,” “Geschichtliches,” and “Allerlei,” of which the last two include the larger number of especially interesting tractates, though all well repay reading. The biographical notice of Ferdinand Gregorovius is an especially sympathetic picture of an interesting personality, and the review of the late
Professor Traube's *Nomina Sacra* furnishes an excellent summary of that lamented scholar's views on the points treated in his last work. In reading the brief essay, "Zur Aussprache des Griechischen und Lateinischen" one is led to wonder whether any—of course not all—of our English cousins actually do, as Professor Krumbacher (though with a prudent "oder in ähnlicher Weise") asserts, pronounce the first verse of the *Odes* of Horace, "Mesines eteweis ideiti redschibós."

E. T. M.


The subject of this interesting and well-considered discussion is the question of the grouping of the Indo-European languages as reflecting dialectic differences already existing in the parent speech. After an introductory statement on the principles involved in any question of "dialect," the author reviews the points of agreement which characterize, e. g., the Indo-Iranian, Italo-Celtic, and Balto-Slavic languages, and proceeds to discuss those linguistic phenomena which are significant of various other, wider, groupings, e. g., the treatment of the gutturals, of the combination *tt*, the distribution of the case-endings with *bh* or *m*, etc. One conclusion, to which the facts have led others also and with which the reviewer is in full accord, is that the spread of the Indo-European languages from the relatively restricted territory occupied in what we term the Indo-European period to that of the historical period took place by gradual radiation without serious disturbance of their position relative to one another.

C. D. B.


Nine papers which appeared at various dates from 1903 to 1907 are here reprinted by the zealous Vorkämpfer of the new metric. To these are appended twenty-two "Thesen zur griechischen Versgeschichte," a convenient brief statement of the author's positions. In this volume, together with his two editions of Pindar, larger and smaller, and his *Aeschyli cantica* and *Sophoclis cantica* (which latter are to be followed by similar editions of the lyrics of Euripides and Aristophanes) we have full materials for the study of Schroeder's doctrine. Whoever would essay such a study must bring to the task leisure and patience; Schroeder is not easy reading. He admits that even his friends complain of the "Schwerverdauliche der Zubereitung," and grants that they are