

of S. Ronchey (1990) arguing for a controversial late date for the “original” text of MPol in the third century². We couldn’t deal extensively with Ronchey’s book in our ‘Forschungsbericht’, but responded to it afterwards³. Although Ronchey has defended her case afterwards more than once⁴, her thesis was not generally accepted. J. den Boeft and J. Bremmer, to give just

L’élément historique d’un texte n’est pas toujours facile à discerner. Il sera suffisant d’accorder quelque attention au livre encore récent de S. Ronchey à propos du *Martyre de Polycarpe*¹⁷. Si l’on se tient à la critique historique – selon Madame Ronchey – il est évident que le *Martyre de Polycarpe* en tant que texte ne peut dater du deuxième siècle, mais se

H.E. IV, 15, represent the *menologium* text as well, and that there is no reason to believe that Eusebius’ text was based on an earlier form of the martyrdom: *Martyrium Polycarpi* (n. 1), pp. 34-38, 62-71. In the mean time, authors as different as S. RONCHEY, *Indagine sul martirio di san Policarpo*, Roma, 1990, and BUSCHMANN, *Martyrium* (n. 1), have followed the same argument.