Is it possible yet to quote Mr. Gladstone in the pulpit without being called a political parson? If it is, there are telling things in Morley’s Life (Macmillan; 3 vols., 42s. net). Here, as ‘P. and I.’ for the present month, will be found some of them. But their force will be properly felt only by those who get the book and read them in their place.

A Religious Exercise.—I cannot help here recording that this matter of speaking is really my strongest religious exercise. On all occasions, and to-day especially, was forced upon me the humiliating sense of my inability to exercise my reason in the face of the House of Commons, and of the necessity of my utterly failing, unless God gave me the strength and language. It was after all a poor performance, but would have been poorer had He never been in my thoughts as a present and powerful aid.

Not a Blasphemous Prayer.—Through the debate I felt the most painful depression. Except Mr. Plumptre and Lord John Russell, all who spoke damaged the question to the utmost possible degree. Prayer earnest for the moment was wrong from me in my necessity! I hope it was not a blasphemous prayer, for support in pleading the cause of justice.

Incessant Wrestling.—Strength of will found scope for exercise where some would not discover the need of it. In native capacity for righteous anger he abounded. The flame soon kindled, and it was no fire of straw; but it did not master him. Mrs. Gladstone once said to me (1891), that whoever writes his life must remember that he had two sides—one impetuous, the other all self-control, able to dismiss all but the great central aim, able to put aside what is weakening or disturbing; that he achieved this self-mastery, and had succeeded in the struggle ever since he was three or four and twenty, first by the natural power of his character, and second by incessant wrestling in prayer—prayer that had been abundantly answered.

Point and Illustration.

One with His Will.—The final state which we are to contemplate with hope, and to seek by discipline, is that in which our will shall be one with the will of God; not merely shall submit to it, not merely shall follow after it, but shall live and move with it, even as the pulse of the blood in the extremities acts with the central movement of the heart.

Ambition.—Once in a conversation with Mr. Gladstone, some fifty years from the epoch of this present chapter, we fell upon the topic of ambition. ‘Well,’ he said, ‘I do not think that I can tax myself in my own life with ever having been much moved by ambition.’ The remark so astonished me that, as he afterwards playfully reported to a friend, I almost jumped up from my chair. We soon shall reach a stage in his career when both remark and surprise may explain themselves. We shall see that if ambition means love of power or fame for the sake of glitter, decoration, external renown, or even dominion and authority on their own account, then his view of himself was just. I think he had none of it. Ambition in a better sense, the motion of a resolute and potent genius to use strength for the purposes of strength, to clear the path, dash obstacles aside, force good causes forward—such a quality as that is the very law of the being of a personality so vigorous, intrepid, confident, and capable as his.

Right and Wrong.—At nearly every stage of Mr. Gladstone’s active career the vital problem stares us in the face, of the correspondence between the rule of private morals and of public. Is the rule one and the same for individual and for state? From these early years onwards, Mr. Gladstone’s whole language and the moods that it reproduces,—his vivid denunciations, his sanguine expectations, his rolling epithets, his aspects and appeals and points of view,—all take for granted that right and wrong depend on the same set of maxims in public life and private. The puzzle will often greet us, and here it is enough to glance at it. In every statesman’s case it arises; in Mr. Gladstone’s it is cardinal and fundamental.
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 nobody half spoils the world.

Italian Preaching.—The fundamental distinction between 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. 52 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 Claudia Julianus 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.