

Over-Refining.—It is idle to ignore in Mr. Gladstone's style an over-refining in words, an excess of qualifying propositions, a disproportionate impressiveness in verbal shadings without real difference. Nothing irritated opponents more. They insisted on taking literary sin for moral obliquity, and because men could not understand, they assumed that they wished to mislead. Yet if we remember how carelessness in words, how the slovenly combination under the same name of things entirely different, how the taking for granted as a matter of positive proof what is at the most only possible, or barely probable—when we think of all the mischief and folly that has been wrought in the world by loose habits of mind that are almost as much the master vice of the head, as selfishness is the master vice of the heart, men may forgive Mr. Gladstone for what passed as sophistry and subtlety, but was in truth scruple of conscience in that region where lack of scruple half spoils the world.

Italian Preaching.—The fundamental distinction be-

tween English and Italian preaching is, I think, this: The mind of the English preacher or reader of sermons, however impressive, is fixed mainly upon his composition, that of the Italian on his hearers. The Italian is a man applying himself by his rational and persuasive organs to men in order to move them; the former is a man applying himself, with his best ability in many cases, to a fixed form of matter in order to make it move those whom he addresses. The action in the one case is warm, living, direct, immediate, from heart to heart; in the other it is transfused through a medium comparatively torpid. The first is surely far superior to the second in truth and reality. The preacher bears an awful message. Such messengers, if sent with authority, are too much identified with and possessed by that which they carry to view it objectively during its delivery; it absorbs their very being and all its energies; they are their message, and they see nothing extrinsic to themselves except those to whose hearts they desire to bring it.

The Date of Polycarp's Martyrdom.

BY PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, LL.D. D.C.L., ABERDEEN.

THE date of the martyrdom of Polycarp was generally considered to have been settled by Mr. Waddington. Polycarp was burned in the stadium at Smyrna on Saturday, 23rd February, in the year when Quadratus was proconsul governing the province of Asia. The 23rd February fell on a Saturday in the years 155 and 166 A.D. Now in which of those years was Quadratus proconsul of Asia? If we had a complete list of the proconsuls of Asia (who with the rarest exceptions governed for one year), the date would be certain; but there are many gaps in the list, and not many of the proconsuls are fixed with certainty to a definite year. About the period 150–170 there are unfortunately no dates fixed with certainty for the ten or more proconsuls who are known to have governed Asia. The question, though it looks very simple, is really a most complicated one, as the whole life of Aristides must be moved up or down to suit the date assigned to Quadratus. Eusebius favours the later date.

Mr. Waddington, in a paper of extraordinary acuteness, ingenuity, and learning on the life of the rhetorician Aristides, a friend of the Proconsul Quadratus, established with great probability (but not with conclusive certainty) that Quadratus governed and Polycarp died in 155 A.D. The evidence was rather thin, and depended on a series

of long drawn out inferences; but Mr. Waddington did all that skill could do, and it was generally agreed that, until new evidence was discovered, the matter must rest as he had left it. At any moment an inscription may be found which shall fix with absolute certainty the date of the Proconsul Quadratus. As yet the decisive inscription has not been discovered; but something has been done; and it is worth while, in face of some contrary arguments, to point out that new positive evidence tends to support Mr. Waddington against the elaborate arguments which some German scholars have brought forward in criticism of his chronology.

In the *Rheinisches Museum*, 1893, p. 53 ff., Mr. W. Schmid published a paper on the life of Aristides, in which, from some unobserved notes in two of the MSS, he argued that the later dates for the whole series of his works must be preferred; and therefore that a Proconsul Quadratus must have governed and Polycarp died in 166 A.D.

Waddington's reasoning was founded on the fact that Aristides mentions a Proconsul Julianus (whom Waddington places nine years before Quadratus). Now epigraphic and numismatic evidence proves that a Proconsul Claudius Julianus¹ governed Asia.

¹ The first two letters of the name *Ἰουλιανός* in the inscription are restored; the date is given by the inscription, and the coin, though Schmid interprets the latter differently.

in 145 A.D. Waddington concluded that these two were the same person; and hence he placed Quadratus nine years later, in 154-155 A.D. But Schmid pointed out that Julianus was a common Roman name, and that there was a distinguished Roman official named Salvius Julianus, who was consul in 148 A.D., and therefore might possibly have governed Asia about 157-162 A.D. He argued that this Salvius Julianus was the proconsul mentioned by Aristides as a predecessor of Quadratus; and that the interval between the two was shorter than Waddington allowed.

Schmid's arguments partly convinced Professor Harnack, in his *Chronologie der altchristl. Litteratur*, p. 353f. He adopted the chronology which Schmid proposed for the life of Aristides; but for Polycarp's death he clung to Waddington's date, defending it by a device taken from Schmid. As Schmid had supposed that there were two proconsuls of Asia named Julianus, so Harnack supposed that there were two proconsuls of Asia named Quadratus, one in 155 (when Polycarp died) and the other eleven years later. But this is turning chronological reasoning into an absurdity; if such methods and suppositions are permitted, the whole subject becomes a joke or a riddle. Such improbable suppositions are not allowed to ordinary historical investigators; only students of Christian history *quibus est nihil negatum* employ them. A right instinct, as I believe, guided Harnack; but his means were unjustifiable.

If Schmid's chronological scheme be right, the date of Polycarp's death must go accordingly. But it is not right; though he seems, unfortunately, to have convinced Professor Dessau, in *Prosopographia Imperii Romani*, iii. p. 166. It is apparent, however, that Dessau had not examined the matter carefully, but simply followed the latest authority; in his gigantic undertaking it was hardly possible to investigate minutely every small detail. There are many other objections to make to Schmid's chronology; but they need not be stated, for one conclusive disproof has recently been discovered. Hitherto Mommsen, and following him Dessau, maintained that the famous jurist Salvius Julianus, the great African, was a different person from Salvius Julianus consul in 148; the reason being that the jurist, who was already famous under Hadrian, must have reached the consulship before 148 A.D. But Mommsen has since then recognized the error of that purely *a priori* argument; and

he not long ago, in one of his latest articles,¹ described the whole career of Salvius Julianus according to an inscription recently found in Africa. The jurist attained the consulship only in 148, as we have recently learned on indubitable evidence, and as Borghesi and others had maintained until Mommsen's time. The result of the new evidence is that Salvius Julianus never governed Asia, for he was proconsul of Africa, and it was not permitted that the same person should hold both of those high offices. That rule is well known; and the objection is final and unsurmountable.

The Julianus of Aristides must therefore be the proconsul of 145, unless another be invented, which no one is likely to venture to do. Accordingly, Schmid has carried Waddington's dating one step onwards towards certainty, instead of shattering it. Waddington's identifications of the proconsuls were the mature result of careful unprejudiced study of the evidence. Schmid's attempted identifications were the work of one who had to find proconsuls in order to bolster up a theory. Waddington's identifications were founded on the established principles of Roman official service; Schmid's were built up on vague suppositions, and required the admission of several exceptions to the rule of the service. Waddington's chronology is not certain, and moreover it is not perfect. A new discussion of the whole subject is needed, which will profit by some useful criticisms made by Schmid, and utilize some recent evidence (unknown to Waddington); but one seems to see the issue. Waddington will be modified in several details. The life of Aristides will be settled on a firmer and truer basis. But the date of the proconsulship of Quadratus will probably remain as Waddington has fixed it; and his general scheme of chronology will stand, though with several improvements in details. We are still, however, waiting for the inscription that will give definite certainty.

After the above paper was partly written I read Corssen's excellent article on the same side in *Zft. f. d. N.T. Wissenschaft*, 1902, p. 61 ff. I have avoided repeating any of his arguments; and have cut down, at the risk of obscurity, a longer article. Those who desire a fuller discussion may consult his paper. But he has not observed the important bearing of the new inscription of Salvius Julianus on the Polycarp controversy. In it we have no longer a mere general train of argument, but a hard fact with which to confront Schmid's reasoning.

¹ *Savigny Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte*, xxiii. 54.