



Statistics and the Conversion of the Roman Aristocracy

T. D. Barnes

The Journal of Roman Studies, Vol. 85. (1995), pp. 135-147.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0075-4358%281995%2985%3C135%3ASATCOT%3E2.0.CO%3B2-6>

The Journal of Roman Studies is currently published by Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/sprs.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

STATISTICS AND THE CONVERSION OF THE ROMAN ARISTOCRACY*

By T. D. BARNES

Even when accurate, statistics can mislead: R. Syme, *Roman Papers* VII (1991), 620.

In a justly famous paper published in 1961, Peter Brown set out a model for understanding the historical process whereby the formerly pagan aristocracy of imperial Rome became overwhelmingly Christian during the course of the fourth and fifth centuries.¹ Brown's paper has deeply influenced all who have subsequently studied this historical phenomenon, at least in the English-speaking world. Since this article argues that the Roman aristocracy became Christian significantly earlier than Brown and most recent writers have assumed, it must begin by drawing an important distinction. Brown's paper marked a major advance in modern understanding because it redirected the focus of scholarly research away from conflict and confrontation, away from the political manifestations of paganism culminating in the 'last great pagan revival in the West' between 392 and 394, away from episodes which pitted pagan aristocrats of Rome against Christian emperors, away from 'the public crises in relations between Roman paganism and a Christian court', towards the less sensational but more fundamental processes of cultural and religious change which gradually transformed the landowning aristocracy of Italy after the conversion of Constantine. This change of emphasis was extremely salutary in 1961, it has permanently changed our perception of the period, and it entails a method of approaching the subject which remains completely valid.² Unfortunately, however, Brown also adopted prevailing assumptions about the chronology of these changes which are mistaken, on the basis of which he asserted that the 'drift into a respectable Christianity' began no earlier than the reign of Constantius. The evidence and arguments set out here indicate that the process began much earlier and proceeded more rapidly than Brown assumed, but they in no way challenge the validity of his approach to understanding the nature of the process.

I

Ten years after Brown's paper was published, a prosopographical study by Werner Eck seemed to establish that the Roman aristocracy was solidly pagan at the start of the fourth century and thus indirectly to confirm that the decisive stages in its conversion to Christianity belong to the second half of the fourth century, most particularly to the Theodosian period.³ In a thorough and careful search for Christians of senatorial rank before 312, Eck found only seven 'Christian members of the senatorial class who belong with certainty to the period before Constantine's victory over Maxentius' at the Battle of the Milvian Bridge — and one of these select seven must be rejected as being non-senatorial in status.⁴ The remaining six comprise (i, ii) the wives of a governor of Cappadocia and a governor of Syria c. 200 known from two contemporary allusions (Tertullian, *Scap.* III.5; Hippolytus, *In Daniele* IV.18.3, p. 232.2–4 Bonwetsch), a provincial senator and three Roman aristocrats:—
iii. Astyrius, who buried the martyr Marinus in Palestine early in the reign of Gallienus and is described by Eusebius as ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐπὶ Ῥώμῃς συγκλητικῶν γενόμενος βασιλεῦσί τε προσφιλὴς καὶ πᾶσι γνῶριμος εὐγενείας ἕνεκα καὶ περιουσίας ('a member of the

* Earlier versions of the present paper were given at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, at the Freie Universität, Berlin, and at the Universität zu Köln: I learned much from the lively discussions which it provoked, and I am also grateful to Andreas Gutsfeld, Christer Bruun, and the Editorial Committee of *JRS* for helping me to refine my argument. Any errors or miscalculations that remain are my own.

¹ P. R. L. Brown, 'Aspects of the Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy', *JRS* 51 (1961), 1–11, reprinted in *Religion and Society in the Age of Saint Augustine* (1972), 161–82.

² See, for example, the sensitive recent discussion of 'conversion and uncertainty' by R. Markus, *The End of Ancient Christianity* (1990), 27–43.

³ W. Eck, 'Das Eindringen des Christentums in den Senatorenstand bis zu Konstantin d. Gr.', *Chiron* 1 (1971), 381–406, cf. A. Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*⁴ (1924), 946–58, esp. 950 (Rome).

⁴ viz., the African martyr Crispina: the *Acta Crispinae* (BHL 1989a/b) imply that she lacked the senatorial status which Augustine attributes to her (*Enarr. in Ps.* 120.13 (CCL 40.1799)).

senatorial order at Rome, in favour with the emperors and well known to all for noble birth and wealth')(HE VII.16);

iv. Liberalis, saluted as consul and martyr on a pair of fifth-century inscriptions from the Via Salaria (ILCV 56, 57);

v. Sotheris, a martyr, presumably in 303/4, who was of noble birth and a relative of Ambrose (*De virginibus* III.7.38 (PL 16.244); *Exhortatio Virginitatis* 12.82 (PL 16.376));

vi. The wife of a *praefectus urbis Romae* under Maxentius (Eusebius, HE VIII.14.16–17).⁵

To these six Marie-Thérèse Rapsaet-Charlier has recently added the names of four Christian women of senatorial status who almost certainly belong to the third century, viz., the daughter of the governor Aemilianus who condemned the Bishop of Tarraco to death in 259 (*Acta Fructuosi* 5), Catia Clementina, Hydria Tretulla, and Iallia Clementina.⁶ As Eck noted, the result is extremely meagre, even if one also takes into account certain Christians who may belong before 312 but cannot be dated so early with confidence, and men and women of senatorial rank who showed (or were claimed to show) sympathy for Christianity before 312. Since at least twenty men entered the Roman Senate each year as quaestors, more than 2,600 men became senators between the death of Marcus Aurelius and the Battle of the Milvian Bridge.⁷ Hence, if we include wives and daughters, we must reckon on an absolute minimum of 5,000 members of the senatorial order between 180 and 312. But among these 5,000, we can identify only ten Christians (Eck's seven less Crispina plus Rapsaet-Charlier's four), i.e., 0.2 per cent.

As for the period after 312, which Eck expressly excluded from his purview, strong and direct confirmation that the decisive stage in the conversion of the Roman aristocracy belongs to the reign of Theodosius appeared to be provided by the Bonn dissertation of Raban von Haehling which was presented in 1975 and published in 1978.⁸ Von Haehling used prosopographical methods to investigate what role religious affiliation may have played in official appointments after Constantine's final defeat of Licinius in 324. He listed the attested praetorian prefects, *praefecti urbis* of both Rome and Constantinople, proconsuls of Africa, Asia, and Achaëa, prefects of Egypt, *comites Orientis*, and *magistri militum*, discussed what (if anything) was known about their religious beliefs or attitudes, and classified them accordingly as Christian, Arian (as a separate category!), Manichee, pagan, or unknown. Table 1 reproduces von Haehling's tabulated results reign by reign as he presents them. They present a clear historical picture: only in the reigns of Valens and Gratian does the number of Christians holding the posts considered by von Haehling begin consistently to exceed the number of pagans. To put it in terms of percentages, as von Haehling did in both a consolidated table and a graph, Christians constituted 20 per cent of the known holders of high office under Constantine, 22 per cent under Constantius, and 50 per cent under Gratian.⁹ Von Haehling's evaluation of his results started from the proposition that what requires explanation is 'the relatively high proportion of pagan office-holders under Christian emperors' and argued that it must reflect the religious composition of the pool of candidates for high office: therefore, the upper classes of the Roman Empire still contained a majority of pagans until the last quarter of the fourth century.¹⁰

⁵ Eusebius leaves her anonymous, while Rufinus names her Sophronia, apparently misunderstanding Eusebius' description of her as σωφρονεστάτη γυνή (HE VIII.14.16). She was plausibly identified as the wife of Junius Flavianus, *praefectus urbi* from 28 October 311 to 9 February 312, by A. Chastagnol, *Les fastes de la préfecture de Rome au Bas-Empire* (1962), 58–9.

⁶ M.-Th. Rapsaet-Charlier, 'Les femmes sénatoriales du III^e siècle. Étude préliminaire', *Prosopographie und Sozialgeschichte. Studien zur Methodik und Erkenntnismöglichkeit der kaiserzeitlichen Prosopographie. Kolloquium Köln 24.–26. November 1991* (1993), 147–63, at 162, cf. *PIR*² A 319; C 573; H 236; J 6.

⁷ I have deliberately chosen the lowest possible estimate and ignored *adlecti*: on the probable size of the Senate

during the third century, see briefly R. J. A. Talbert, *The Senate of Imperial Rome* (1984), 29–38, 131–4; F. Jacques, 'Le nombre des sénateurs aux II^e et III^e siècles', *Epigraphia e ordine senatorio* 1 (Tituli IV, 1982, pub. 1984), 137–42.

⁸ R. von Haehling, *Die Religionszugehörigkeit der hohen Amtsträger des römischen Reiches seit Constantins I. Alleinherrschaft bis zum Ende der Theodosianischen Dynastie* (1978) (hereafter von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*).

⁹ Von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 507 ('Tabelle VI: Der Anteil von Heiden und Christen bei den ermittelten Amtsinhabern unter den einzelnen Kaisern'), 510 ('Graphische Darstellung zu Tabelle VII').

¹⁰ Von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 614–18.

The size of von Haehling's book and its evident thoroughness seemed to guarantee the validity of his results, and the majority of reviewers expressed enthusiasm for both his methods and his results.¹¹ The book was saluted as 'ein Standardwerk zur Geschichte des spät-römischen Reiches',¹² and experts in prosopography lavished praise on it. André Chastagnol commended the work as 'une étude sérieuse et documentée qu'on peut considérer comme un modèle' and 'un beau travail, qui se recommande par sa rigueur, sa prudence (qu'on est tenté de juger parfois excessive) et ses résultats, qui donnent sans cesse à réfléchir'.¹³ Even Werner Eck, while noting that some details were controversial and that additions could be made, stated that the reliability of the work was not thereby affected.¹⁴ Perhaps the most influential review was that by John Martindale, to whom the three parts of the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* owe most of their virtues: he commended von Haehling's individual discussions as 'soundly judged'; he proclaimed that 'minor adjustments could be made to [his] figures, but not to any significant extent'; and he affirmed that von Haehling had clearly refuted 'the statements of Eusebius and Theodoret suggesting a predominance of Christians in high office under Constantine' and that 'before the reign of Gratian, paganism was the normal thing, after it it was Christianity'.¹⁵ Martindale's verdict continues to be repeated, sometimes using his very words, by those who have recently written about 'Roman Society and Religion and the Codex-Calendar of 354' and the role of women in the conversion of the Roman aristocracy.¹⁶ Moreover, a recent statistical study, supported by nine tables, fully endorses von Haehling's conclusions that 'pagan control of the traditional senatorial and civic *cursus* begins to slip' only under Constantius and that 'pagans continue to make up a greater percentage than Christians in the traditional civic *cursus*' until the 380s.¹⁷

On a more general level, recent discussions of the art and culture of the fourth century have employed von Haehling's conclusions as a criterion for evaluating specific items of historical, archaeological, and epigraphic evidence. It is simply assumed (or else asserted with appeal to von Haehling) that there were few Christians in the Roman Senate before the late fourth century and still fewer in the inner circles of the aristocracy. The controversy between Alan Cameron and Kathleen Shelton over the date of the Esquiline Treasure perhaps provides the best illustration of how prevalent this assumption has been. Cameron's discussion of the identity of the Secundus and Proiecta whose names appear on the larger of the two caskets in the treasure contains the following set of propositions:-

When the brothers Asterii married in the 340s or 350s, the situation was simple. There cannot have been more than a handful of suitable Christians available for marriage. But by the 380s and (even more so) the 390s, the majority of eligible females may have been Christian. This change posed a problem for responsible parents.¹⁸

¹¹ In addition to the reviews cited in nn. 12-15 and 27-8, I am aware only of those by J. Gaudemet, *RHDFE* 58 (1980), 648-50, and J. von Ungern-Sternberg, *MH* 37 (1980), 265.

¹² D. Nellen, *Gymnasium* 89 (1982), 378-9.

¹³ A. Chastagnol, *Latomus* 39 (1980), 487-8.

¹⁴ W. Eck, *HZ* 231 (1980), 139-41.

¹⁵ J. R. Martindale, *JRS* 69 (1979), 194-6.

¹⁶ M. R. Salzman, 'Aristocratic women: conductors of Christianity in the fourth century', *Helios* 16 (1989), 207-20, at 208; *On Roman Time. The Codex Calendar of 354 and the Rhythms of Urban Life in Late Antiquity* (1990), esp. 195 n. 8, 223; K. Cooper, 'Insinuations of womanly influence: an aspect of the Christianization of the Roman aristocracy', *JRS* 82 (1992), 150-64, at 150 n. 4.

¹⁷ M. R. Salzman, 'How the West Was Won: The Christianization of the Roman Aristocracy in the Years after Constantine', in C. Deroux (ed.), *Studies in Latin Literature and Roman History*, Collection Latomus ccxvii (1992), 451-79. Her Table 3: 'Religious Identification by Emperor at Highest Appointed Office' gives figures of

eleven pagans and six Christians for the period 312-337, eight pagans and three Christians for the period 337-350, and eleven pagans and ten Christians for the period 351-360. Unfortunately, she does not make clear exactly what these figures represent or how they have been obtained, except to state that they are 'senatorial aristocrats' culled from *PLRE* 1 and that she has 'included only those people for whom there was explicit evidence for religious preference' (456-8).

¹⁸ Alan Cameron, 'The date and owners of the Esquiline Treasure', *AJA* 89 (1985), 135-45, at 144. The inscription, which reads $\frac{P}{AW}$ Secunde et Proiecta vivatis in Chri[sto], is reproduced in K. J. Shelton, *The Esquiline Treasure* (1981), 31-3, cf. 72-5 no. 1.

Recently, with appeal to a forthcoming study entitled *The Last Pagans of Rome*, Alan Cameron and Jacqueline Long have reiterated that 'the aristocracies of Athens and Rome continued to be substantially pagan into the late fourth century' (*Barbarians and Politics at the Court of Arcadius* (1993), 14).

It is not relevant in the present context whether or not Proiecta's husband was an otherwise unattested homonymous son of the Turcius Secundus who was *corrector* of Picenum in the 340s.¹⁹ What is relevant is Cameron's assumption that the Roman aristocracy was predominantly pagan before 350 and, still more, the fact that despite her thoroughgoing rejection of his arguments Shelton let this assumption pass without challenge.²⁰

The model of the Christianization of the Roman aristocracy espoused by Brown and von Haehling fits well into the model of the Christianization of the Roman Empire as a whole which has been propounded in recent years by historians as diverse in their interests and techniques as Ramsay MacMullen, Robin Lane Fox, and Averil Cameron. According to these three historians, Christianity only 'came out into the open in the fourth century and later' when 'the constraints on the Church had been removed after the Diocletianic persecution'.²¹ Constantine was unable to abolish pagan sacrifice in the East in 324/5, as Eusebius claims that he did, because 'most of the governors who would have had to enforce [the ban] were themselves still pagan'.²² It was only 'after the official condemnation of paganism under Theodosius' that 'cities began to look and to sound Christian',²³ for 'the empire overall appears to have been predominantly non-Christian in A.D. 400':²⁴ hence 'the Christianization of the Roman aristocracy as a whole belongs to the early fifth century, and only by then can one . . . begin to speak of a Christian society'.²⁵

II

How can such apparently impregnable views be impugned? Because they rest upon statistics which have been accepted on trust instead of being subjected to the detailed and searching scrutiny that they require.²⁶ Von Haehling's statistics are, in fact, fundamentally flawed. Despite his title, he does not count office-holders, but offices held, which is potentially a very different matter — even if no Roman ever held as many offices simultaneously as W. S. Gilbert's Pooh-Bah. This basic error was detected by Heinrich Chantraine, who insisted on the importance of distinguishing between 'Stellenbesetzungen' and 'Amtsinhaber', and by Émilienne Demougeot and Karl Leo Noethlichs who noted that the overall total of 787 offices used by von Haehling in his tables represents only 584 different individuals.²⁷ In my review I went further: observing in general that 'the statistical interpretations make no allowance for the fact that some men held more than one known office', I pointed out that von Haehling's presumed sixteen pagans holding high office under Constantine included one man counted four times and another who was a Christian.²⁸ Such double, triple, and quadruple counting fatally undermines von Haehling's conclusions. If one compares the ratio of Christians and non-Christians among different categories of office-holders during a given period, then it does not matter if a man appears as either a Christian or a pagan in more than one such list. But such lists for individual posts cannot simply be added together to produce an overall ratio of pagan and Christian office-holders: if several men appear in more than one list, then adding together the numbers from different lists will produce a total of appointments to the offices in question ('Stellenbesetzungen') larger, perhaps considerably larger, than the number of different men

¹⁹ As argued in *PLRE* 1.817, adding that the postulated son 'was possibly the first of the Turcii to become a Christian'.

²⁰ K. J. Shelton, 'The Esquiline Treasure: the nature of the evidence', *AJA* 89 (1985), 147–55. As in her book of 1981, Shelton steadfastly refused to date the casket any more precisely than between the broad termini of 330 and 370.

²¹ Averil Cameron, *Christianity and the Rhetoric of Empire. The Development of Christian Discourse* (1991), 41, 121.

²² R. Lane Fox, *Pagans and Christians* (1986), 667.

²³ Averil Cameron, *Christianity* (1991), 191.

²⁴ R. MacMullen, *Christianizing the Roman Empire* (1984), 83.

²⁵ Averil Cameron, *The Later Roman Empire AD 284–430* (1993), 78. Cameron also turns Petronius Probus, cos. 371, into a 'pagan aristocrat' (73).

²⁶ e.g., recently, P. Thrams, *Christianisierung des Römerreiches und heidnischer Widerstand* (1992), 170: 'Sehr aufschlussreich ist die Tabelle zu den heidnischen und christlichen Inhabern hoher Ämter bei R. von Haehling'.

²⁷ H. Chantraine, *BZ* 73 (1980), 362–4; É. Demougeot, *RHE* 74 (1979), 389–95; K. L. Noethlichs, *JAC* 21 (1978), 193–8. The fallacy emerges clearly from a comparison of von Haehling's Tabelle II and Tabelle III, which arrive at the overall total of 757 when considering both the 'Zahl der ermittelten Religionsangehörigen in den einzelnen Ämtern' and 'Feststellbarer Anteil von Heiden und Christen bezogen auf die Amtsinhaber' (*Religionszugehörigkeit*, 492, 495). The review by R. Klein dutifully follows von Haehling and erroneously speaks of '757 Amtsinhaber' (*ZKG* 91 (1980), 401–6).

²⁸ *Phoenix* 33 (1979), 364–5.

who held those offices during the relevant period ('Amtsinhaber'). Since von Haehling obtains his overall totals for each reign by adding together his lists for different offices under the relevant emperor, his double counting has produced statistics which are misleading and invalid.

Let us examine von Haehling's lists for the appointments made by Constantine after 324 and by his sons between 337 and 361. Customary abbreviations are used: for Constantine and Constantius, von Haehling's list forms the basis of discussion, and the dates and offices of each man are stated as he registers them, with minor corrections noted in parenthesis.²⁹ For Constantine, von Haehling lists ten Christians and sixteen pagans. Both numbers need to be reduced to eliminate double counting, but one list shrinks much more than the other. Von Haehling's ten Christians comprise the following eight men:

- i. Fl. Ablabius, *ppo* 329–337
- ii. Gregorius, *ppo Africae* 336–337
- iii. Acilius Severus, *PUR* 325–326
- iv. Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius, *proc. Achaeae* 325/329; *PUR* 329, 333
- v. Sex. Anicius Paulinus, *PUR* 331–333
- vi. Felicianus, *comes Orientis* 335
- vii. Archelaus, *comes Orientis* ?after 335
- viii. Philagrius, prefect of Egypt 335–337.

Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius has been counted three times, including once for a proconsulate which he held before 324, probably in fact before 306,³⁰ while if Archelaus was ever *comes Orientis* (which is in itself dubious), he cannot have held the post before the death of Constantine.³¹ Von Haehling's ten Christians thus reduce to seven different men. His sixteen pagans comprise the following men:

- i. Junius Bassus, *ppo Galliarum* ?326–?329; *ppo Italiae* 329–331 (in fact, *ppo* 318–331)
- ii. M. Ceionius Julianus Kamenius, *proc. Africae* 326/333 (probably 327–328); *PUR* 333–334
- iii. Amnius Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus, *proc. Asiae* 324/334 (c. 330); *PUR* 334–335
- iv. Ceionius Rufius Albinus, *PUR* 335–337
- v. *PLRE* 1: Anonymus 12, *proc. Achaeae*; *proc. Asiae*; *PUR* before 337
- vi. L. Aradius Valerius Proculus, *proc. Africae* 331/333 (332–333); *PUR* 337–338
- vii. Domitius Zenophilus, *proc. Africae* 326/333 (probably 328–332)
- viii. Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus, *proc. Africae* 334/337; *comes Orientis* before 337
- ix. Fabius Titianus, *proc. Asiae* c. 337 (c. 330/336).

It is immediately obvious that von Haehling has counted five men twice. Moreover, since the anonymous proconsul of Achaea and Asia who became *praefectus urbi* (Firmicus Maternus, *Math.* 11.29.10–20) must be Ceionius Rufius Albinus,³² the latter has been counted no less than four times. In addition, Junius Bassus, who was consul in 331 as well as praetorian prefect for fourteen years (*AE* 1964.203 = 1975.370), was long ago identified as the Christian consul of the Constantinian period who is depicted with his wife on the fragment of a sarcophagus built into the walls of the Villa Doria Pamfili in Rome,³³ and the fact that the career inscriptions of Anicius Paulinus (cos. 334) omit any mention of a pagan priesthood creates a strong

²⁹ From *The New Empire of Diocletian and Constantine* (1982), 131–9, 158, 160, 171; 'Praetorian Prefects 337–361', *ZPE* 94 (1992), 249–60, unless otherwise stated.

³⁰ As argued in 'Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius', *AJP* 96 (1975), 173–86.

³¹ So, rightly, *PLRE* 1 (1971), 100. The only evidence is the horribly confused account of the Council of Tyre in Rufinus, *HE* x.16–18, which explicitly dates the council, which is irrefragably dated to 335, after the death of Constantine in 340 and alleges that Constantius ordered Athanasius to be condemned by bishops assembled at

Tyre under the supervision of (1) a *comes* sent from court, (2) Archelaus, who was *comes Orientis* at the time, and (3) the governor of Phoenice.

³² 'Two senators under Constantine', *JRS* 65 (1975), 40–9.

³³ W. N. Schumacher, 'Zum Sarkophag eines christlichen Konsuls', *Röm. Mitt.* 65 (1958), 100–20, cf. H. Fuhrmann, 'Studien zu den Consulardiptychen verwandten Denkmälern I. Eine Glasschale von der Vicennalienfeier Constantins des Grossen zu Rom im Jahre 326 nach Chr.', *Röm. Mitt.* 54 (1939), 161–75.

presumption that he too was a Christian (*ILS* 1220, 1221 (Rome)).³⁴ Hence these two men should be transferred from von Haehling's pagan column to his Christian one.

When multiple counting and mistaken classifications are eliminated, therefore, von Haehling's totals for the period 324–337 must be adjusted to nine Christians and six pagans in the categories of office-holders whom he includes. His figures for appointees of Constantius are equally vulnerable. Waiving his tendentious and misleading classification of 'Arians' as a category separate from orthodox Christians produces a total of twenty two Christians and twenty pagans. Again, both figures need to be trimmed to transform the number of offices attested into the number of office-holders — and again it is the pagan list that shrinks far more upon close examination. Von Haehling lists the following pagans as office-holders under Constantius:

- i. Hermogenes, *ppo Orientis* 358–359 (358–360)
- ii. Vulcacius Rufinus, *comes Orientis* 342; *ppo Italiae* 352 (*ppo Illyrici* 347–?353); *ppo Galliarum* 354 (?353–354)
- iii. C. Ceionius Rufius Volusianus, *ppo Italiae* 355 (*ppo Galliarum* 354–355)
- iv. Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus, *ppo Galliarum* ?354–356; *ppo Italiae* 356 (*ppo Illyrici* 355–356)
- v. Anatolius, *ppo Illyrici* 354–360 (357–360)
- vi. Memmius Vitrasius Orfitus, *proc. Africae* 353; *PUR* 353–356, 357–359
- vii. Tertullus, *PUR* 359–361
- viii. Salutius Secundus, *proc. Africae* before 356
- ix. Aelius Claudius Dulcitius, appointed *proc. Asiae* before 3 Nov. 361
- x. Scylacius, *proc. Achaeae* after 350
- xi. Flavius Hermogenes, *proc. Achaeae* 353/358
- xii. Ampelius, *proc. Achaeae* 358–359
- xiii. M. Maecius Memmius Furius Baburius Caecilianus Placidus, *comes Orientis* c. 340³⁵
- xiv. Flavius Philagrius, prefect of Egypt 338–340
- xv. Hermogenes Parnasius, prefect of Egypt 357–359
- xvi. Italicianus, prefect of Egypt 359.

It is immediately obvious that both Vulcacius Rufinus and Vitrasius Orfitus have been counted three times and Lollianus twice. Moreover, six of these presumed pagan office-holders under Constantius must be rejected as either inadequately attested as pagans or wrongly dated. (1) Salutius Secundus was probably proconsul of Africa before 350, that is, he was an appointee of Constans.³⁶ (2) Even if Aelius Claudius Dulcitius was a pagan after Julian reinstated traditional cults, he had previously been a loyal servant of Constantius (Libanius, *Orat.* 42.23–4; 62.10–11) and hence had probably presented himself as a Christian.³⁷ (3) The Hermogenes whom Himerius so lavishly praised (*Orat.* 48) was probably proconsul of Achaea c. 370.³⁸ (4) The ostentatiously pagan Anatolius who was praetorian prefect in Illyricum from 343 or 344 to 346 (Eunapius, *Vit. phil.* x.6.4–7.4, pp. 490–2; *CTh* XII.1.36) must be distinguished from his homonym who was prefect of Illyricum from 357 to 360, whose religious sympathies seem to be undocumented: the former was prefect under Constans, not under Constantius.³⁹ (5) Italicianus was flattered by Libanius as a fellow devotee of the Muses when he became governor of Syria (*Ep.* 238), but that hardly seems sufficient warrant for enrolling him as an attested pagan.⁴⁰ (6) It is naive and absurd to take Athanasius' taunt that Philagrius was an apostate (*Epistula Encyclica* 3.2) as proof that he became a pagan between

³⁴ Against the earlier assumption that he was a pagan, see A. Chastagnol, *Fastes* (1962), 91. In the present context, I refrain from challenging von Haehling's classification of Domitius Zenophilus as a pagan (*Religionszugehörigkeit*, 420, adducing *AE* 1915.30 (Lambaesis)), lest I appear to be constructing a circular argument.

³⁵ On the motives which may have led Constantius to make the unusual appointment of Placidus and Vulcacius Rufinus to this eastern post in the early 340s, see von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 179.

³⁶ As argued in *PLRE* 1 (1971), 814.

³⁷ B. Malcus, *Opuscula Atheniensia* 7 (1969), 106–8.

³⁸ See 'Himerius and the fourth century', *CP* 82 (1987), 206–25, at 218–20.

³⁹ *ZPE* 94 (1992), 258, 259, cf. A. F. Norman, 'The Illyrian prefecture of Anatolius', *Rh. Mus.*, N.F. 100 (1957), 253–9; R. Penella, *Greek Philosophers and Sophists in the Fourth Century A.D. Studies in Eunapius of Sardis* (1990), 90–1, 96–8, 130–2.

⁴⁰ As von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 200. O. Seeck, *Briefe des Libanius* (1906), 188, deduced that Italicianus was a pagan from Libanius, *Ep.* 8, which von Haehling disallows.

335 and 339.⁴¹ Not only was Philagrius appointed prefect of Egypt in 338 to remove Athanasius as Bishop of Alexandria and to install Gregory in his place, but in 343 he escorted and counselled the eastern bishops on their journey to the Council of Serdica.⁴² Philagrius was clearly a Christian whom Constantius trusted to represent his interests in ecclesiastical affairs.⁴³

The Christian list also contains double counting: Strategius Musonianus appears as both proconsul of Achaëa and as praetorian prefect, Honoratus as both praetorian prefect of Gaul and the first *praefectus urbis Constantinopolitanae*.⁴⁴ With these two exceptions, however, von Haehling's list appears to be completely solid, since both the dates and the religious sympathies of the men in it are well documented. Moreover, Constantius' praetorian prefects Septimius Acindynus and Flavius Florentius are attested as Christians by Augustine and Athanasius respectively.⁴⁵ Accordingly, when the necessary adjustments are made, the total of Christian office-holders remains twenty two, while that of pagan office-holders shrinks to ten, so that the ratio changes from approximate equality between Christian and pagan office-holders to 2.2:1 in favour of the former.

Only one appointee of Constantinus to the offices included by von Haehling is known from the period between the death of Constantine and his own in 340, viz., his praetorian prefect Ambrosius, who is certified as a Christian by his son's biographer (Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii* 3).⁴⁶ But the appointees of Constans between 337 and 350 show a marked preponderance of pagans. The following is a corrected version of von Haehling's list, which both makes the necessary subtractions and (in this case) additions and corrects his description and chronology of praetorian prefects:

- i. Aconius Catullinus, *ppo Galliarum* 341; *PUR* 342–344
- ii. Fabius Titianus, *PUR* 339–341, *ppo Galliarum* 342–350
- iii. M. Maecius Memmius Furius Baburius Caecilianus Placidus, *ppo* 342–344 (at first prefect of Constans, then of Italy); *PUR* 346–347
- iv. Anatolius, *ppo Illyrici* 343/4–346
- v. Vulcacius Rufinus, *ppo Italiae* c. 345–347; *ppo Illyrici* 347–?353
- vi. Ulpius Limenius, *praefectus praetorio et urbis* 347–349
- vii. L. Turcius Apronianus, *PUR* 339
- viii. Aurelius Celsinus, *proc. Africae* 338–339, *PUR* 341–342
- ix. Q. Flavius Maesius Egnatius Lollianus, *PUR* 342
- x. M. Aurelius Consius Quartus, *proc. Africae* 340/350
- xi. Salutius Secundus, *proc. Africae* before 350
- xii. Cervonius, *proc. Achaëae* 353–354.⁴⁷

This comprises a total of twelve men, as opposed to only two certain Christians in the same categories (viz., Petronius Probinus, *praefectus urbi* in 345–346, and Flavius Salia, who was *magister equitum* from at least 343 to 348).⁴⁸ In this case, therefore, correction of von Haehling's figures for Constans increases the ratio of pagans to Christians from an unadjusted figure of 12:3 to a corrected figure of 12:2.

⁴¹ As does von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 195–6, asserting that in its context 'ist παραβάτης kein Schimpfname für die Anhänger der Athanasianischen Gegenpartei'. Similarly, he classifies the general Sebastianus as a Manichee on the strength of Athanasius, *Fug.* 6.5; *Hist. Ar.* 59.1, 61.3 (*Religionszugehörigkeit*, 260): for the fallacy in this case, see M. Tardieu, 'Sebastianus étiqueté comme manichéen', *Klio* 70 (1988), 494–500.

⁴² See Athanasius and Constantius. *Theology and Politics in the Constantinian Empire* (1993), 72, 83, 85, 167.

⁴³ Von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 61, uses precisely the same argument to classify Strategius Musonianus as an Arian.

⁴⁴ For the attestations, see *PLRE* 1.611/2; 438/9.

⁴⁵ Augustine, *De sermone domini in monte* 1.50 (*PL* 34.1254); Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 22.1, cf. O. Seeck, *Die Briefe des Libanius* (1906), 156.

⁴⁶ Von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 522, mis-

takenly includes as appointees of Constantinus three men who held office under Constans between 337 and 340, viz., L. Turcius Apronianus, *PUR* 339, Fabius Titianus *PUR* 339–341, and Aurelius Celsinus, *proc. Africae* 338–339.

⁴⁷ *CP* 82 (1987), 216.

⁴⁸ Von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 417, includes Clodius Celsinus Adelphius in his list of proconsuls of Africa under Constans. However, the only evidence for a proconsulate (province unspecified) is Isidore of Seville, who identifies the centonist Proba as 'uxor Adelphii proconsulis' (*De viris illustribus* 18 (22) (*PL* 83.1093)): that is diagnosed as a mistake for *praefecti* by J. F. Matthews, 'The poetess Proba and fourth-century Rome: questions of interpretation', *Institutions, société et vie politique au IV^{ème} siècle ap. J. C.* (284–423). *Autour de l'oeuvre d'André Chastagnol* (1992), 277–304, at 284 n. 1.

III

The claim that a majority of the holders of high administrative office under the Christian emperors continued to be pagan until the reign of Gratian is quite simply false. Accurate prosopography tends to confirm, not disprove, Eusebius' statement that Constantine gave preference to Christians in appointments (VC II.44). But what of the Roman aristocracy? It might be argued, with a show of plausibility, that since this traditional landowning aristocracy was more resistant to Christianity than other elements in imperial society, Roman aristocrats at least continued to be predominantly pagan long after Constantine. Indeed, it has recently been reasserted that Augustine's account of the conversion of Marius Victorinus (*Conf.* VIII.2.3) proves that the senatorial aristocracy in Rome was almost completely pagan around 350.⁴⁹

In his paper of 1961, Peter Brown stated that Petronius Probus was 'acclaimed by Christian writers as the "first" conversion among the Roman aristocracy'.⁵⁰ But that identification is mistaken, together with all that it implies. When carefully analysed, the passage of Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum* to which Brown alludes, says rather that the first Christian convert among the Roman nobility was an Anicius of an earlier generation. The logic of the passage and external considerations place this conversion no later than c. 300.⁵¹ For at least two other noble families of Rome asserted a claim to early conversion more potent than that of the Anicii: a virgin of the family of Ambrose had preferred holy faith to the consulates and prefectures of her ancestors and suffered martyrdom (Ambrose, *De virginibus* III.7.38 (PL 16.244); *Exhortatio Virginitatis* 12.82 (PL 16.376)),⁵² and one Liberalis was honoured on the Via Salaria as *consul et martyr* (ILCV 56, 57).

In the 1970s David Novak identified several aristocratic Christians among the ordinary consuls and *praefecti urbis* of Constantine and drew the conclusion that the process which Brown and others assigned to the later fourth century was well under way in the 320s.⁵³ In 1982 Edward Champlin convincingly identified the Gallicanus whom the *Liber Pontificalis* registers as donating silver plate and four estates with an annual revenue of 869 solidi to the church of Saints Peter, Paul, and John at Ostia (34.29, p. 184 Duchesne) as Ovinus Gallicanus, the consul of 317, whose family owned land in the area of one of these estates and who had himself been *curator* of Teanum Sidicinum in the 290s (CIL x.4785).⁵⁴ This identification has profound consequences. The earliest known Christian consul is not, as would be expected *a priori*, a provincial careerist of obscure origin, but a member of one of the great senatorial families of the third century. Champlin spoke of 'a small group among the highest aristocracy who converted early to the religion of their emperor' before the final defeat of Licinius: that group certainly grew after 324 and before 324 it may have been larger than Champlin suspected.

The three parts of Table III present the results of my analysis of the religious affiliation of ordinary consuls and *praefecti urbis* from 317 to 361 and of praetorian prefects from 324 to 361.⁵⁵ Several features of my statistics should be noted. I include only consuls and prefects, for two reasons. First, since *consulatus et praefecturae* constitute the defining criterion of *nobilitas* in the Later Roman Empire, consuls and prefects (urban and praetorian) form a clearly defined social group.⁵⁶ Second, the names of all the ordinary consuls and *praefecti urbis* from 317 to 361 are known, as are all (or all but one) of the praetorian prefects from 324 to 361.

⁴⁹ K. Rosen, 'Ein Wanderer zwischen zwei Welten: *Carmen ad quendam senatorem ex Christiana religione ad idolorum servitutem conversum*', in K. Dietz, D. Hennig and H. Kaletsch (eds), *Klassisches Altertum, Spätantike und frühes Christentum. Adolf Lippold zum 65. Geburtstag gewidmet* (1993), 393–408, at 393: 'Um 350 n. Chr. war fast noch die gesamte Senatsaristokratie in Rom heidnisch'.

⁵⁰ *JRS* 51 (1961), 9 = *Religion and Society* (1972), 177.

⁵¹ T. D. Barnes and R. W. Westall, 'The conversion of the Roman aristocracy in Prudentius' *Contra Symmachum*', *Phoenix* 45 (1991), 50–61.

⁵² Ambrose's claims are treated with extreme scepticism, and in effect denied by N. McLynn, *Ambrose. Church and*

Court in a Christian Capital (1994), 33–5. Their validity or otherwise does not affect the point at issue here.

⁵³ D. M. Novak, 'Constantine and the Senate: an early phase in the Christianization of the Roman aristocracy', *Ancient Society* 10 (1979), 271–310.

⁵⁴ E. J. Champlin, 'Saint Gallicanus', *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 70–6.

⁵⁵ Table III A–C supersedes the less systematic analysis which I prepared in 1987 and which was published in 'Pagans and Christians in the reign of Constantius', *Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique* 34 (1989), 301–37, at 315–20.

⁵⁶ 'Who were the nobility of the Roman Empire?' *Phoenix* 28 (1974), 444–9.

These statistics, therefore, avoid a hidden variable which casts a shadow over von Haehling's results, even after his figures for Christians and pagans have been corrected for double counting and misattributions. For von Haehling seriously underestimated how many office-holders in his chosen categories are totally unknown. He calculated that the fifty office-holders between 324 and 337 whom he listed (including twenty four whose religious affiliation is unknown) comprise 89 per cent of what he estimated as a total of fifty six men who held the relevant posts in these years.⁵⁷ But he registered only four proconsuls of Africa, three of Asia, and one of Achaea, even though each of these posts was normally annual: admittedly, all the proconsuls of Africa are probably known,⁵⁸ but no proconsul is attested for twelve of the thirteen proconsular years from 325/6 to 337/8 for Achaea, and none for eight of the same thirteen years for Asia.⁵⁹ Moreover, von Haehling's total of fifty represents a total of offices, not office-holders. It follows, since the known office-holders number only forty, that the proportion of the overall total of names known in von Haehling's categories is less than 60 per cent.

The main methodological innovation in my tables is to assign the men in question to five categories. It is necessary to distinguish both between the attested and the probable and between the probable and the uncertain. To be sure, it will sometimes, perhaps often, be difficult to decide which side of these two boundaries a particular individual falls. But, although decisions in many cases may be doubtful or even erroneous, the attested is not likely to be confused with the genuinely uncertain. In contrast, if only the three categories of Christian, uncertain, and pagan are employed (as by von Haehling), there is a much greater danger of subjectivity and circularity in deciding cases where the precise purport of the evidence is not entirely unambiguous. Subjective decisions cannot in practice be avoided, but their effect is much greater when three columns are used than when five are. For a mistaken judgement will only move an individual one column to the right or left — whether there are three columns or five.

Brief comment may be made on the six *praefecti urbis* appointed by Constantine between 317 and 337 who are classified as Christians in Table IIIc in addition to Ovinus Gallicanus (cos. 317). Acilius Severus (*PUR* 325–326) is widely identified as the Severus to whom Lactantius wrote two books of letters (Jerome, *De viris illustribus* 111).⁶⁰ Anicius Julianus (cos. 322), Sex. Anicius Paulinus (cos. 325), and Anicius Paulinus (cos. 334) belong to a family which Prudentius presents as Christian from the start of the fourth century (*Contra Symmachum* 1.552/3). Moreover, the fact that a Roman inscription styles the consul of 325 *benignus, sanctus* (*CIL* vi.1651) and the career inscriptions of the consul of 334 show that he held none of the standard pagan priesthoods at Rome (*ILS* 1220, 1221) confirms that these men were Christian.⁶¹ Publilius Optatianus Porfyrius worked patterns of *versus intexti* depicting Christian motifs into the cycle of twenty poems which he probably dedicated to Constantine in 325.⁶² The two probable Christians are Lucr. Verinus (*PUR* 325–326), whom John Morris argued to be a Christian on the basis of Christian inscriptions from Clusium,⁶³ and Petronius Probianus (cos. 322), whom I have proposed to identify as the Probianus to whom Lactantius dedicated a lost work (*CSEL* 27.155/6).⁶⁴

⁵⁷ Von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit*, 505. His discussion of the 'Zahl der erfassten Amtsinhaber in Relation zur wahrscheinlichen Gesamtzahl' calculates that 70 per cent of the proconsuls of Asia and 56 per cent of the proconsuls of Achaea are known between 324 and 450 (487–489, with Tabelle 1). However, the figures which he gives for 'ermittelte Anzahl' and 'geschätzte Gesamtzahl' (including anonymi, respectively, forty two out of sixty for Asia and thirty five out of sixty three for Achaea) indicate that his 'geschätzte Gesamtzahl' in these cases represents not the total of all proconsuls who held office between 325 and 450, but an estimate of the number of proconsuls who are unattested. By my count, for the period 325–450, the names are known of about twenty five proconsuls of Asia and of about thirty five proconsuls of Achaea: admittedly, some proconsuls served several years, especially in Asia, but the number of proconsular years in which the name of the proconsul of Asia and Achaea are unknown exceeds seventy five and ninety

respectively (in each case out of 125), so that we probably know the names of less than 30 per cent of the proconsuls of Achaea and less than 40 per cent of the proconsuls of Asia between 325 and 450. (Table II Column (5) gives my estimate of the percentage of office-holders in von Haehling's categories who are attested for the period 324–361.)

⁵⁸ *New Empire* (1982), 171; 'Proconsuls of Africa, 337–392', *Phoenix* 39 (1985), 144–53, at 145.

⁵⁹ *New Empire* (1982), 158, 160.

⁶⁰ *PLRE* 1.834; J. F. Matthews, *Western Aristocracies and the Imperial Court AD 364–425* (1975), 147.

⁶¹ D. M. Novak, *Ancient Society* 10 (1979), 293; E. J. Champlin, *Phoenix* 36 (1982), 76.

⁶² See the edition of G. Polara (1973), I. 12, 32, 41, 57, 69, 72.

⁶³ J. Morris, 'Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire', *Klio* 46 (1965), 361–5, at 363–4, cf. *PLRE* 1.951.

⁶⁴ 'More missing names (A.D. 260–395)', *Phoenix* 27 (1973), 135–55, at 149.

Constantine and Constantius (it is clear) preferred Christians when they appointed men to high office. After 312, it was only under Constans, who ruled Italy, Africa, and the Balkans from 337 to 350, adding Gaul, Spain, and Britain in 340, that non-Christians predominated among consuls, praetorian prefects, *praefecti urbis*, and proconsuls of Africa and Achaëa. But, while that may reflect the strength of paganism among the senatorial aristocracy of Rome and Italy, it also reflects the weakness of Constans as a ruler and, in all probability, an implicit decision to allow the Senate more influence than it had enjoyed under Constantine. For it seems that the Christians of Rome would have welcomed victory by Constantine when he invaded Italy in 340: Athanasius, then resident in Rome and on good terms with the bishop of the city, had resided in Trier in the 330s and was suspected of having invited Constantine to make war on his brother (Theodoret, *HE* II.16.21).⁶⁵ It is illegitimate to construe the prominence of pagans in the decade 340–350 as reflecting a situation which also prevailed under Constantine or under Constantius after he obtained control of Italy and Africa in 352 and of the rest of the West in 353: there may still have been a majority of pagans among the *nobiles* of Rome, but both Constantine and Constantius ensured that the majority of those whom they appointed to the urban prefecture were Christian. It is significant that of the six certain and two probable Christian *praefecti urbis* under Constantine discussed above, five come from already noble families. Moreover, the appointment of Vitrasius Orfitus as prefect in December 353 and again in early 357 (he served a total of nearly five years) should not be interpreted as a gesture of reconciliation towards a hypothetically powerful and intransigent pagan aristocracy.⁶⁶ Orfitus was indeed a pagan, but what weighed far more with Constantius was his loyalty to the Constantinian dynasty — into which he had apparently married.⁶⁷ Dynastic loyalty similarly accounts for Constantius' employment of the pagans Vulcacius Rufinus, Volusianus, and Lollianus as praetorian prefects: an emperor would need to be very foolish to make religious affiliation a more important criterion for appointment to high office than loyalty and political skill.

With reference to Champlin's article of 1982, and his identification of Ovinus Gallicanus as the first Christian consul, Arnaldo Marcone has recently written of 'the few hypothetical Christians who reached elevated positions' under Constantine and has emphasized 'the difficulties of the penetration of Christianity within the senatorial aristocracy'.⁶⁸ According to both my own tables (III A–C) and to my corrected version of von Haehling's tables (Table II), Christian consuls outnumbered pagans among the consuls appointed by Constantine after he went to war with Licinius in 316, and among Constantine's *praefecti urbis* aristocrats who were Christian formed a majority.⁶⁹

⁶⁵ On the plausibility of the charge, see *Athanasius* (1993), 52.

⁶⁶ As by A. Alföldi, *Die Kontorniaten. Ein verkanntes Propagandamittel der stadtromischen heidnischen Aristokratie in ihrem Kampfe gegen das christliche Kaisertum* (1943), 8–85, largely reprinted in A. and E. Alföldi, *Die Kontorniat-Medaillons* II (1990), 12–63.

⁶⁷ Alan Cameron, 'Orfitus and Constantius: a note on Roman gold-glasses', (forthcoming), cf. 'Religious Affiliation' (Table III), 10 n. 1.

⁶⁸ A. Marcone, 'Costantino e l'aristocrazia pagana di

Roma', in G. Bonamente and F. Fusco (eds), *Costantino il Grande* II (1993), 645–58, at 653.

⁶⁹ For a converging argument based on the results of excavations at La Magliana, see H. Broise and J. Scheid, *Recherches archéologiques à la Magliana. Le balneum des frères arvales*, Roma antica I (1987), 275–7. If the Arval Brethren ceased to use the sacred grove of Dea Dia and the attached private *balneum* shortly after 334/5, that implies that Christianity had already made serious inroads into the social strata from which the confraternity was recruited.

TABLE I SUMMARY OF VON HAEHLING'S RESULTS REIGN BY REIGN

	<i>Pagan</i>	<i>Orthodox Christian</i>	<i>Arian (+Manichee)</i>	<i>Religious sympathies unknown</i>
Constantine (324-337)	16	10		24
Constantinus (337-340)	3	1		4
Constans (337-350)	12	3		11
Constantius (337-361)	21	18	4	39
Julian (361-363)	14	3		0
Jovian (363-364)	1	6		1
Valentinian (364-375)	12	10		10
Valens (364-378)	9	10	3+1	13
Gratian (375-383)	5	22		17
Valentinian II (383-392)	6	6		7
Theodosius (379-395)	16	22		45
Arcadius (395-408)	5	13	4	33
Honorius (395-423)	14	36	1	55
Theodosius II (408-450)	3	43	4	50
Valentinian III (425-455)	3	28	1	25

From von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit* (1978), 507 (Tabelle VI: 'Der Anteil von Heiden und Christen bei den ermittelten Amtsinhabern unter den einzelnen Kaisern'): only attested office-holders are here included.

TABLE II REVISION OF VON HAEHLING'S FIGURES FOR THE PERIOD 324-361

The following table registers the holders of the same offices as Table I, but divided into different categories as follows:

- (1) the total of known holders of the offices included by von Haehling who are attested as pagans;
 - (2) the total of known holders of the offices included by von Haehling who are either attested as Christians or probably to be regarded as Christians;
 - (3) the approximate number of holders of the offices included by von Haehling whose names are known but whose religious affiliation is undocumented;
 - (4) the estimated number of men who held the offices included by von Haehling but whose names are unknown;
 - (5) the proportion of the total number of office-holders in the categories included by von Haehling whose names are known, i.e., columns (1) + (2) + (3) as a percentage of the total of columns (1) - (4).
- (Approximate and estimated numbers are enclosed in square brackets.)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Constantine	6	9	[19]	[20]	63%
Constantinus	0	1	0	[1]	50%
Constantius	10	22	[36]	[28]	70%
Constans	12	2	[8]	[15]	59%

The missing office-holder under Constantinus is the praetorian prefect who may have preceded Ambrosius: if Ambrosius was, as seems quite probable, Constantinus' only prefect after the summer of 337, then 100 per cent of his appointments in the offices included by von Haehling are known. It should be noted that the sixty three estimated *ignoti* under Constantine, Constantius, and Constans are virtually all proconsuls of Asia, Africa, and Achaëa: I have assumed annual tenures, but, if unknown proconsuls served for more than one proconsular year, these estimated totals will be too high.

TABLE III THE RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF CONSULS AND PREFECTS, 317-361

The following tables are taken from 'The Religious Affiliation of Consuls and Prefects, 317-361', *From Eusebius to Augustine. Selected Papers 1982-1993* (1994), No. VII, with the accidental transposition of two numerals corrected. The five numbered columns give the totals for each of the following categories:

- (1) men attested as Christians
- (2) men who were probably Christians
- (3) men whose religious sympathies are unknown
- (4) men who were probably pagan
- (5) men attested as pagans.

A. CONSULES ORDINARII

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Total
317-37	8	9	7	2	3	29
338-40	2	0	1	0	1	4
341-50 (E)	1	1	3	0	0	5
341-50 (W)	1	1	4	0	4	10
351-61	4	2	1	0	1	8
Total 317-61	16	13	16	2	9	56

(The two consuls of 344 and 350 whose appointment cannot be assigned with certainty to either Constantius or Constans are excluded.)

B. PRAEFECTI PRAETORIO

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Total
324-37	2	4	6	0	1	13
337-50 (E)	2	1	0	0	0	3
337-50 (W)	1	0	2	1	6	10
351-61	7	1	3	1	2	14
Total 324-61	12	6	11	2	9	40

C. PRAEFECTI URBIS ROMAE

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	Total
317-37	6	2	1	1	3	13
338-50	0	1	2	1	7	11
352-61	3	0	0	0	2	5
Total 317-361	9	3	3	2	12	29

(The prefects appointed by Magnentius in 350-352 are omitted.)

APPENDIX

The evidence on which the classification in Table III A-C is based is set out fully in the original publication. For the convenience of readers of *JRS*, however, I list here what I regard as the decisive

evidence for the Christianity of those men who appear in Column (1), but whose religious sympathies are not explicitly discussed in the text of the present article. (For prefects who were also ordinary consuls, the relevant evidence is noted only in the list of consuls.)

Consules ordinarii

Ovinus Gallicanus (317); Amnius Anicius Julianus (322); Severus (323); Sex. Anicius Paulinus (325); Junius Bassus (331); Flavius Ablabius (331): *Const. Sirmond.* 1; Athanasius, *Festal Letter* 4.5; Amnius Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus (334); Flavius Felicianus (337): Johannes Malalas pp. 318/19, Dindorf; Flavius Polemius (338): Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 22.1; Septimius Acindynus (340); Flavius Philippus (348E): Athanasius, *Fug.* 3.6; Theodoretus, *HE* II.5.4; Flavius Salia (348W): Theodoretus, *HE* II.8.54; Censorius Datianus (358): Libanius, *Ep.* 81.5; Epiphanius, *Pan.* LXXI.1.5; Naeratius Cerealis (358): Epiphanius, *Pan.* LXXI.1.5; Flavius Taurus (361): Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 22.1; Epiphanius, *Pan.* LXXI.1.5; Sulpicius Severus, *Chronica* II.41.1, 43.3-44.1; Flavius Florentius (361): Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 22.1.

Praefecti praetorio

Junius Bassus (cos. 331), prefect 318-331; Flavius Ablabius (cos. 331), prefect 329-337; Ambrosius, prefect of Constantinus ?337-340: Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii* 2.2-4, cf. Ambrose, *De Exhortatione Virginitatis* 12.82 (*PL* 16.376); Septimius Acyndinus (cos. 340E), prefect of Constantius 338-340; Flavius Philippus (cos. 348E), prefect of Constantius 344-351; Thalassius, prefect of Gallus 351-353: Athanasius, *Hist. Ar.* 22.1; Maiorinus, prefect of Constantius 351-354: L. Robert, *Hellenica* 11/12 (1960), 302-5; Strategius Musonianus, prefect of Oriens 354-358: Eusebius, *VC* III.62.1; Athanasius, *Apol. c. Ar.* 15.3; Ammianus xv.13.1/2; Honoratus, prefect of Gaul 355-357: Sozomenus, *HE* IV.23.3, cf. von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit* (1978), 115; Flavius Taurus (cos. 361), prefect of Italy 355-361; Flavius Florentius (cos. 361), prefect of Gaul 357-360, then of Illyricum 360-361; Helpidius, prefect of Oriens 360-361: Jerome, *Vita Hilarionis* 14, cf. von Haehling, *Religionszugehörigkeit* (1978), 63/4.

Praefecti urbis Romae

Ovinus Gallicanus (316-317), cos. 317; Acilius Severus (325-326), cos. 323; Amnius Anicius Julianus (326-329), cos. 322; Publilius Optatianus (329, 333); Sex. Anicius Paulinus (331-333), cos. 325; Amnius Manius Caesonius Nicomachus Anicius Paulinus (334-335), cos. 334; Naeratius Cerealis (352-353), cos. 358; Flavius Leontius (355-356): Epiphanius, *Pan.* LXXI.1.5; Junius Bassus (359): *ILS* 1286 (Rome), cf. A. Chastagnol, *Fastes* (1962), 150; E. S. Malbon, *The Iconography of the Sarcophagus of Junius Bassus* (1990).

University of Toronto