of devices for paraphrasing (pp. 35-43); but Bednara’s pages make one realise how supremely important is a thorough acquaintance with the morphology of Ovidian verse. Briefly to state Bednara’s plan. Founding his work on the observations of Koene (1840), but avoiding some of his fallacies, he subjects the Amores and Ars Amatoria of Ovid (perhaps he should have added the Heroides) to a thorough scrutiny. His aim is to demonstrate the devices by which Catullus and Ovid surmounted the difficulties which the Latin language put in the way of dactylic composition. The first of his three main sections deals with words metrically unfit for dactylic verse. The second treats of the solutions which the poets found for their difficulties, solutions connected with such points as order of words, elision, etc.; with shortening and lengthening of vowel sounds; with the use of alternative forms; the adjustment of syntax (as of number, gender, mood, and tense) to verse needs; and with ‘remedia lexicalia,’ that is, the adoption of synonyms or coining of new words so as to dispense with inconvenient words. ‘Ea (vocabula) quae non quadrabant, seponebantur, et saepe exilibus quasi artificiis et argutiis pro iusto verbo minus iustum, tamen dactylicum eligebatur’ (Ploen). This second section is worked out clearly and thoroughly, and many interesting topics are treated by the way, but especially to be commended is the thorough examination of the subject of poetic plurals (pp. 50-79). In his third section the author sums up. His finding is that Catullus is not influenced by metrical necessity nearly so much as Ovid: ‘sermo Catullianus magis est naturalis atque genuinus quam Ovidi.’ ‘Ovidius multo audacior est in vocabulis transponendis et in prosodia vocum mutanda, . . . Graecis flexionibus multo magis indulget, multo frequentius et licentius plurali (item singulari) poetico utitur, . . . multo plures adhibet periphrasises, multo plura dactylica vocabula vel inventa receptit vel ipse invenit.’

S. E. WILBOLT.

OBITUARY

DR. JAMES ADAM.

JAMES ADAM was born in Aberdeenshire in 1860. He was educated at the Grammar School and University of Aberdeen, and in 1880 came to Cambridge as a scholar of Gonville and Caius. After his degree in 1884 he was elected fellow and became lecturer of Emmanuel, and he had no small share in the rapid growth of that college in reputation. He at once began to give his attention to Plato, compiling excellent school editions of the Apology, Crito, and Euthyphro. For the next twelve years he was engaged in preparing for his edition of the Republic; in 1891 he published a paper on the Nuptial Number, and in 1897 an edition of the text. For the elaborate commentary of 1902 he had searched practically the whole of Platonic literature, neglecting no bundle of chaff which might contain a grain of corn. A volume of essays on the text and matter of the Republic was left for posthumous publication, together with his Gifford lectures on the Religious Teachers of Greece. As a lecturer he was stimulating in a high degree, and his lectures were favourites with all sorts and conditions of men. His death followed suddenly after an operation on August 30, and is an irreparable loss to scholarship. His personal qualities, which made him a staunch friend, and a trusted guide, will be no less missed in the University.

PROFESSOR STRACHAN.

The death of Prof. John Strachan at the early age of forty-five after only a short illness, is a grievous loss, not merely to Keltic learning, in which his acute and monumental research had made him one of the first authorities of our time, but also to the study of Greek. He was one of a group of eager Scotch students who owed their enthusiasm for study and a distinguished career in the world of learning to the inspiration of the