

AVULSA A LATERE MEO: AUGUSTINE'S SPARE RIB —
CONFESSIONS 6.15.25*

By DANUTA SHANZER

But the worse you express yourself these days the more profound people think you are — though that's nothing new. Like Browning and those quaint metaphysical people, when you never know whether they really mean their mistress or the Established Church, so bridegroomly and biblical — to say nothing of dear S. Augustine — the Hippo man, I mean.

Dorothy L. Sayers, *Clouds of Witness* (1995), 149

Concubina igitur ab uxore solo dilectu separatur.

Paulus, *Sententiae* 2.20.1

Concubina ex sola animi destinatione aestimari oportet. Paulus, *Responsa* 19 in *Digest* 25.7.4

Ratio: Quid uxor? Nonne te delectat interdum pulchra, pudica, morigera, litterata, vel quae abs te facile possit erudiri, afferens dotis tantum, quoniam contemnitis divitias, quantum eam prorsus nihilo faciat onerosam otio tuo, praesertim si speres certusque sis nihil ex ea te molestiae esse passurum?

Augustine, *Soliloquia* 1.17.4

ANATOMY OF A DISCIDIUM

In A.D. 385, after more than a decade together, Augustine parted from his in many ways mysterious first partner,¹ 'la mère d'Adeodat'.² The woman (hereafter 'Anonyma 1') was taken away from him.³ She returned to Africa vowing never to have sexual relations with another man, and left the child with Augustine. But he was unable to tolerate celibacy and took another woman (henceforth 'Anonyma 2') to while away the two years until his marriage. In the meantime he still missed his first one, and the wound left by the separation failed to heal. Many scholars have cited and discussed Augustine's description of the episode, but few have commented on the language, which is highly significant, or its implications for Augustine's biography. This article will begin with a selective commentary on *Conf.* 6.15.25 and continue with a reinterpretation of a key text in Augustine's marital theology. It will then trace some of the broader legal and historical issues raised by Augustine's account in the *Confessions* to make some new suggestions about the chronology, constraints, and nature of his relationship with Anonyma 1. This study, it is hoped, will be of general interest to Romanists for the insight into the ambiguities of Roman marriage and quasi-marital relationships provided by Augustine's *Confessions*.

Interea mea peccata multiplicabantur, et *avulsa a latere meo* tamquam impedimento coniugii cum qua cubare solitus eram, cor, ubi *adhaerebat, concisum et vulneratum* mihi erat et trahebat sanguinem. Et illa in Africam redierat vovens tibi *alium se virum nescituram*, relicto apud me naturali ex illa filio meo. at ego infelix *nec feminae imitator*, dilationis impatiens, tamquam post biennium accepturus eam quam petebam, quia non amator coniugii sed libidinis servus eram, procuravi aliam, non utique coniugem, quo tamquam sustentaretur et perduceretur

* Earlier drafts of this paper were presented at the 13th International Conference on Patristic Studies (Oxford, 1999) and at Rosamond McKitterick's Medieval History Seminar in Cambridge (November 2000). Augustine is best savoured with friends. I am very grateful to Charles Brittain, Peter Brown, Gillian Clark, Ralph Mathisen, and Philip Burton for their comments and criticism. Special thanks go to Roger Tomlin who asked the awkward questions and helped me worry the matter through at every stage.

¹ Eschewing the prejudicial 'mistress', 'entirely wrong' according to J. J. O'Donnell, *Augustine: Confessions, vol. 2: Commentary on Books 1-7* (1992),

384 n. 10 and incorrect 'au sens strict' per A. Solignac in E. Tréhorel, G. Bouissou and A. Solignac, *Les Confessions BA* 13 (1962), 679, and the technically correct, but unacceptable-in-English 'concubine'. She appears as 'La mère d'Adeodat' in the *Augustinus-Lexikon*, ed. C. Mayer, vol. 1 (1986-94), 87-9.

² Their total time together could have been thirteen to fifteen years: A.D. 370/72-385.

³ B. D. Shaw, 'The family in Late Antiquity', *Past and Present* 115 (1987), 3-51, at 45, distorts what Augustine says, 'he therefore rid himself of the concubine by rudely dismissing her back to Africa'.

vel integer vel auctior morbus animae meae *satellitio* perdurantis *consuetudinis* in *regnum uxorium*. nec sanabatur vulnus illud meum, quod prioris praecisione factum erat, sed post fervorem doloremque acerrimum putrescebat et quasi frigidius, sed desperatius dolebat. (Conf. 6.15.25, p. 122.7–22 Skutella)

In the meantime my sins were multiplying, and after there had been torn away from my side as an impediment to my marriage she with whom I had been accustomed to sleep, my heart, where she used to cleave, had been cut to pieces and wounded and it left a trail of blood. And she had returned to Africa, vowing to you that she would never know another man, and left with me my natural child by her. I, wretch that I was, and no imitator of the woman, was intolerant of any delay, on the grounds that I would only receive her whose hand I was seeking in marriage two years later.⁴ Because I was no lover of marriage, but a slave of lust, I got myself another one (not at any rate a wife) in order that the disease of my soul might be sustained as it were either intact or increased and led safely under the attendance of long-standing sexual intercourse to the uxorious kingdom. But that wound of mine that had occurred when the previous [woman] was cut out, did not heal. Instead after burning and very bitter pain it grew septic and hurt, more coldly, as it were, but more desperately.

One could begin to investigate the passage with a series of questions. Who forced Augustine's woman to return to Africa? Monica?⁵ Or was pressure brought to bear by his future in-laws? 'The professor's concubine had to leave Milan a good two years before the marriage was to take place'.⁶ The possibly legal flavour⁷ of *impedimentum* and the use of *tamquam*, which suggests virtual indirect discourse, put distance between Augustine and this highly moral sentiment.⁸ Instead the passive voice is employed, and the curious expression 'avulsa a latere meo'.⁹ The woman is never named, and her removal is expressed in one of Augustine's ablative absolutes — a sinister and evasive construction.¹⁰ But her status and function are revealed in sly sound-plays ('coniugii, cum qua cubare') that avoid the actual C-word — *concubina*.¹¹ The term was neutral: it regularly appears in funereal inscriptions,¹² but Augustine never used it in the *Confessions*. 'A well-bred gentleman would not mention his concubine'.¹³ It was however quite acceptable in the *City of God* or *Questions on the Heptateuch* — so long as Abraham was the man under discussion.¹⁴ Augustine, every inch the grammarian, suggests the word through an etymological figure.¹⁵

Peter Brown considered Augustine's early friendship with an anonymous man 'the sweetest joy of his life'.¹⁶ This is a reasonable conclusion to draw about one who would say notoriously, 'How more fittingly for companionship and conversation would two male friends live together than would a man and a woman!'¹⁷ It is thus not surprising that Augustine had used similar language of the state of his soul after the death of his anonymous friend in Book 4.7.12: 'portabam enim *concisam* et cruentam animam meam.' But contrasts count too: *that* wound was treated neutrally and eventually healed,¹⁸ unlike the one considered here. Why does Augustine say his mistress was *torn*

⁴ See also Conf. 6.13.23.

⁵ Conf. 6.13.23 'maxime matre dante operam'.

⁶ P. Brown, *Augustine of Hippo* (1969), 89.

⁷ See TLL s.v. 'impedimentum' 528.74–84.

⁸ i.e. not 'because she was a hindrance', (H. Chadwick, *Saint Augustine: Confessions* (1991), 108) but 'on the grounds that she was a hindrance'. See below for a self-distanced virtual *oratio obliqua* used of Augustine's own self-deceptive pretext, namely that he would have to wait two years.

⁹ The same passives adorn Augustine's account of the search for a new wife. See Conf. 6.13.23 'et instabatur impigre . . . instabatur . . . petebatur . . . expectabatur'. Note also the impersonal 'quia ea placebat', and Conf. 2.2.2 'non tenebatur modus' for Augustine's adolescent sexuality.

¹⁰ Compare the death of Patricius at Conf. 4.4.7 'defuncto patre ante biennium'. Note especially the ellipsis of the subject of the ablative absolute, the implied antecedent of *qua*.

¹¹ See Old Latin Judges 19.24, as preserved at, for example, Ambrose, *De Off.* 3.19.114, 'Tunc senior filiam suam virginem et coaequalem ejus cum qua cubitare solitus esset, offerebat viris iniquitatis, tantum ne vis irrogaretur hospiti' compared to the Vulgate 'et hic homo habet concubinam'.

¹² TLL s.v. 'concubina'. Also S. Treggiari, *Roman Marriage: Iusti Coniuges from the Time of Cicero to the Time of Ulpian* (1991), 52.

¹³ Brown, op. cit. (n. 6), 89.

¹⁴ *Civ. Dei* 16.25 and 16.34; *Quaest in Hept.* 1.70, 90, and 124; *De bono coniugali* 14.16.

¹⁵ cf. the *Ars Bernensis* in *Gramm. Lat.* Suppl. p. 74.1 Keil 'ut cubo concubina'.

¹⁶ P. Brown, *The Body and Society* (1988), 389.

¹⁷ See DGAL 9.5.9 'Quanto enim congruentius ad convivendum et conloquendum duo amici pariter quam vir et mulier habitarent!'

¹⁸ See Conf. 4.5.10 'lenitum est vulnus meum'.

(*avulsa*) from his side? And why does he describe the *wound* she left with such curious emphasis?

Modern scholars have tried to demythologize,¹⁹ deromanticize,²⁰ and desentimentalize²¹ Augustine's (dare one call it?) 'relationship'. But the language of the passage is a heady and significant mixture of the biblical and the medical. Augustine invites one to read a world of emotional, and indeed theological, significance into the trauma. Maybe one should be slower to mock this 'terrible *séparation*' or French scholars who take the dismissal of mistresses seriously.²²

In another familiar passage, namely the second version of the Creation of Eve in Genesis 2.21–24, something is torn from someone's side:

Vulgate text: Immisit ergo Dominus deus soporem in Adam: cumque obdormisset, tulit unam de costis eius, et replevit carnem pro ea. Et aedificavit Dominus deus costam, quam tulerat de Adam, in mulierem: et adduxit eam ad Adam. Dixitque Adam: Hoc nunc, os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea: haec vocabitur Virago, quoniam de viro sumpta est. Quamobrem relinquet homo patrem suum et matrem, et *adhaerebit* uxori suae: et erunt duo in carne una.

Augustine's lemma from the *De Genesi ad litteram* (hereafter *DGAL*) 9.1.1: et immisit deus exstasin in Adam et obdormivit. et accepit unam costarum eius, et adimplevit carnem in locum eius. Et aedificavit Dominus deus costam, quam accepit de Adam, in mulierem: et adduxit eam ad Adam. et dixitque Adam: Hoc nunc os ex ossibus meis, et caro de carne mea: haec vocabitur mulier, quoniam ex viro suo sumpta est. et propter hoc relinquet homo patrem et matrem, et conglutinabitur ad uxorem suam: et erunt duo in carne una.

And the Lord God caused a deep sleep to fall upon Adam, and he slept: and he took away one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh instead thereof; and the rib which the Lord God had taken from man, made he a woman, and brought her unto the man. And Adam said, 'This is now bone of my bones and flesh of my flesh: she shall be called Woman, because she was taken out of Man. Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife: and they shall be one flesh'. (Authorized King James Version)

God created Eve by taking a rib from Adam. He healed the wound by filling it in with flesh. Adam gained a helpmate, whom he acknowledges as his own flesh, names ('she shall be called woman'), and vows to cleave to. The Biblical narrative and that in the *Confessions* are parallel, but precisely opposite. Augustine, instead of gaining a wife, loses a bedmate. Instead of declaring independence from his parents, he obeys his formidable mother. Instead of 'cleaving' to his concubine, he acquiesces in her dismissal. Instead of acknowledging and naming this nameless woman, he (no doubt tactfully) erases her name and identity completely.²³ And instead of emerging miraculously intact from the process, he is left with a bleeding wound that will not heal.

It is now time to look at Augustine's precise words:

'Avulsa a *latere* meo':

A latere in combination with *avulsa* demands a separative translation:²⁴ either as 'away from my side'²⁵ or as 'out of my side'. But what of *latus*? Does it suggest Adam's anatomy? While Genesis does not use the word *latus*, but *costa*, Augustine, commenting

¹⁹ See J. O'Meara, *The Young Augustine* (1954), 129, for derision of sentimental scholars, 'the best years of her life', and practicality, 'Augustine had no duty to marry his mistress', followed by a relentment, 'she was well loved by him for many years'. For a modern novel about Anonyma 1, see J. Gaarder, *That Same Flower: Floria Aemilia's Letter to Saint Augustine*, trans. A. Born (1998).

²⁰ O'Donnell, op. cit. (n. 1), 385.

²¹ e.g. Shaw, op. cit. (n. 3), 45, 'Augustine kept a concubine for the purposes of sexual enjoyment for a period of at least fourteen years'.

²² See O'Donnell, op. cit. (n. 1), 384 n. 10.

²³ I disagree with A. Zumkeller, 'Die geplante Eheschließung Augustins und die Entlassung seiner Konkubine', in *Signum Pietatis: Festgabe für Cor-*

nelius Petrus Mayer, OSA (1989), 21–35, at 24, who sees here a sign of respect for the 'Unbekannte'.

²⁴ *A latere* can naturally also mean 'on the side' in some contexts, e.g. *a latere occidentis*, or 'at the side', as in Ps. 90.7 'cadent a latere tuo'. *Ex latere* can indicate 'made out of', as in 'mulier ex latere iam facta erat' or 'eique formata uxor ex latere'. *De* covers some of the same range, i.e. 'material' as in *DGAL* 6.46 'mulier illi de latere'; *Enarr. in Ps.*, *PL* 47.1324 'de latere coniunx fiet ecclesia'; but *ex* also can indicate separation and source, e.g. *Contra Faustum*, *PL* 42.274 'sacramenta ecclesiae manentia ex latere hominis illius'; as can *de*, cf. *Civ. Dei*. 22.17 'de latere viri dormientis costa detracta femina fiet'.

²⁵ See *Conf.* 8.11.27 'Alypius affixus lateri meo'.

on the passage in the *De Genesi ad litteram*²⁶ and elsewhere,²⁷ repeatedly and invariably uses *latus*.

'*Cor, ubi adhaerebat, concisum et vulneratum mihi erat*':

Augustine's *heart* is the affected organ: he uses a vivid expression to describe its condition: *concisum*, 'cut to pieces'. He uses it elsewhere of a worm that is cut up and even of Jesus cut up and cooked as paschal lamb.²⁸ For the resonances of the *wounded heart*, one need go no further than the Song of Songs 4.9: 'Vulnerasti cor meum, soror mea, sponsa; vulnerasti cor meum.'

The relative clause, 'ubi adhaerebat', merits attention. Who or what is the subject? To answer this, one must first consider the resonances of the passage. Since 'avulsa a latere meo' points to Genesis, one cannot help noticing that the Vulgate text of Genesis 2.24 reads 'Quamobrem relinquet homo patrem suum et matrem, et adhaerebit uxori suae'. However, the continuous *lemmata* to Book 9 of the *De Genesi ad litteram* have not *adhaerebit* but the more literal calque, *conglutinabitur*, rendering the Septuagint's προσκολληθήσεται.²⁹ Does this invalidate Genesis as the source? Hardly. Almost everywhere that Augustine discusses the passage, he cites the text as in the Vulgate of Genesis, or alternatively as it is quoted by Jesus in Mt. 19.4 where *adhaerebit* is again the verb.³⁰ *Adhaerebit* thus evokes the cleaving of man to wife in Genesis as quoted in Matthew 19.4.³¹ This in turn may suggest that the *subtext* in Augustine's mind is the *context* in Matthew — namely Jesus' argument with the Pharisees and his teaching on divorce and repudiation of wives: 'What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.'³² The mediation of the allusion through Matthew suggests that Augustine regarded his concubine as an *uxor*.³³

But this still leaves the problem of the subject of *adhaerebat*. Chadwick takes it as the heart, 'which was deeply attached'.³⁴ But if the correspondence to Genesis and Matthew ('man cleaves') is exact, then Augustine is distancing himself: it is something that his *heart*, not he, used to do. He can be seen as avoiding *adhaerebam*, the duty of every good post-Adamic husband. But an alternative interpretation favours a human subject, the concubine herself, i.e. 'my heart, where *she* used to cleave'. *She* in contrast to him faithfully sought to stay with him.

'Vovens tibi alium se virum *nescituram*':

Troncarelli has already mentioned the flavour and significance of *vovens*, a word that suggests the marital commitment of the *univira*, not the freedom of a *concupina* to remarry after *repudium*.³⁵ The remaining point to note here concerns *nescio*. Although verbs of knowing are used in this sense in Classical Latin, here there is a deliberately biblical euphemism.³⁶ Cf. Gen. 4.1, 'Adam cognovit uxorem suam', and especially the words of the Virgin Mary at Luke 1.34, 'quomodo fiet istud, quoniam virum non cognosco?'³⁷ Augustine paints his woman's post-Augustinian chastity in serious biblical colours. He would eventually repeat the phrase, and possibly even recall this event in the *De Fide et operibus* 35 in c. A.D. 413: 'de concubina quoque, si professa fuerit nullum se alium *cognituram*'.³⁸

'Nec feminae imitator':

²⁶ It appears in *DGAL* combined with a number of different prepositions, e.g. 9.17.31 'ex viri latere feminam fieri'; 9.18.34 'quod ita mulier facta est de latere viri'; 10.1.1 'at illa de illius latere'. *DGAL* 9.16.30 'virile autem latus unde femina fieret non habebat'.

²⁷ e.g. *Civ. Dei* 22.17 'de latere viri dormientis costa detracta femina fieret'.

²⁸ *De Quant. An.* 31.62–3, *PL* 32.1070 'cur nonnullum animal concisum in omnibus partibus vivat'; *In Joh. Evang. Tract.* 11.5, *PL* 35.1477 'Jesum, quod eum possent concisum sicut agnum coquere'.

²⁹ See *DGAL* 9.1.1.

³⁰ Both in the Vulgate and in most Itala versions. See A. Jülicher, *Itala 1. Matthäus-Evangelium* (1972), 133. *Coniungetur* and *adiungetur* are two occasional variants, the latter being found in *DGCM* 2.1 *PL* 34.196. The passage is also quoted at Eph. 5.31–2.

³¹ Mt. in the Greek New Testament reads κολληθήσεται.

³² Mt. 19.6 'Quod ergo Deus coniunxit, homo non separet'.

³³ i.e. he may have had 'marital intent'. See G. Clark, *Women in Late Antiquity* (1993), 31–3.

³⁴ Chadwick, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 109.

³⁵ F. Troncarelli, *Il Ricordo della sofferenza. Le Confessioni di Sant'Agostino e la psicoanalisi* (1993), 167–8.

³⁶ J. N. Adams, *The Latin Sexual Vocabulary* (1982), 190.

³⁷ Also, naturally, *Conf.* 4.2.2 'non quod legitimum vocatur coniugio mihi cognitam'.

³⁸ See Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 33.

In what sense is Augustine *not* the imitator of the woman? Again Gen. 3.12 provides an example of a man who imitated a woman in doing what she had done. Adam explained that the woman gave the fruit to him and he ate: his plea being essentially that he only followed the woman's lead.³⁹ The idea of imitation (though not the precise wording) may thus evoke Adam's exculpation.⁴⁰ Here again Augustine inverts his source. Adam followed his love into sin. Augustine failed to follow his into continence. In his own interpretation in the *DGAL* 9.18.34 the rib removed signifies the woman's *strength*: 'She was made strong through him, as if strengthened by his bone. But he was made weak on her account because in the place of the rib was supplied not a rib, but flesh.'⁴¹ And 'the flesh', we know, 'is weak'.⁴²

'*Satellitio* perdurantis consuetudinis in *regnum* uxorium':

Gibb and Montgomery rightly drew attention to this sentence: 'The words "in regnum" and "perduceretur" seem to suggest that the military metaphor in "satellitium" is consciously in view here.'⁴³ *Satellitio*, however, is not just an 'armed escort',⁴⁴ but in Augustine's usage a more deeply pejorative expression, a true hiss-word. *Satellites* are 'minions' or 'henchmen'.⁴⁵ *Consuetudo* may likewise be not mere neutral 'custom', or 'habit',⁴⁶ but the familiar euphemism for 'sexual intercourse':⁴⁷ 'under the escort of my long-standing need for sex all the way to the uxorious kingdom.'⁴⁸ Both words, significantly, occur in close proximity in *De Doctrina Christiana* 3.18.26–7, where the concubinage and polygyny of the Old Testament patriarchs are the topic, and Augustine intimates that the devil can cite scripture to justify lust.⁴⁹ *Regnum uxorium* evokes Comic misogynistic quips about the dominion of the *uxor dotata*.⁵⁰ Augustine's ambition, after all, was to marry a woman with some money: 'Ducenda uxor cum aliqua pecunia, ne

³⁹ Given the loaded nature of God's question, and the chain of exculpation that follows, Adam's reply was almost certainly intended as a plea of innocence and an attempt to 'pass the buck', not as a bald statement of fact. See *DGCM* 2.17.25 'Deinde iam more superbiae in se non accusat quod consensit mulieri, sed in mulierem refundit culpam suam . . . voluit ad ipsum Deum pertinere quod peccavit'. Also *DGAL* 11.35.47.

⁴⁰ Augustine however in *DGAL* 11.42.59 also read Adam's imitation of the woman as due not to concupiscence of the flesh, but to *amicalis benevolentia*, the desire not to make her unhappy.

⁴¹ *DGAL* 9.18.34 'Quae per ipsum firma facta est, tamquam eius osse firmata, ille autem propter ipsam infirmus, quia in locum costae non costa sed caro suppleta est'. Already present in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* 2.13.18 'Hoc nunc os . . . os de ossibus: fortasse propter fortitudinem'.

⁴² Mt. 26.41; Mc. 14.38.

⁴³ p. 163.

⁴⁴ Brown, *op. cit.* (n. 16), 393.

⁴⁵ For fuller documentation of Augustine's use of the word, see the Chadwyck-Healey *Patrologia Latina* Database. All literal uses in Augustine apply to the devil's allies, *Circumcelliones*, those associated with Gildo, and Manichees. For an interesting figurative use in a similar context to that of the *Confessions*, see *In Joh. Evang. Tract.* 41.12 'quia non poterat facere ut non concupisceret: faciebat tantum ut concupiscentiam refrenaret, ut concupiscentiae non consentiret, et concupiscentiae membra ad satellitium non praerberet'.

⁴⁶ P. Brown, *Augustine and Sexuality*, The Center for Hermeneutical Studies (1983), 3 translates *consuetudo* throughout this passage as 'habit'.

⁴⁷ *TLL* s.v. 'consuetudo' 561.46–75. i.q. *amor, concubitus, matrimonium*.

⁴⁸ For further passages in the *Confessions* where it may have the same meaning, see *Conf.* 6.12.21 'delectationes consuetudinis meae'; *Conf.* 8.5.12 'lex enim peccati est violentia consuetudinis, qua trahitur et

tenetur etiam invitus animus eo merito, quo in eam volens inlabitur'; *Conf.* 8.5.13 'et de vinculo quidem desiderii concubitus quo artissimo tenebar'; *Conf.* 8.7.18 'remanserat muta trepidatio et quasi mortem reformidabat restringi a fluxu consuetudinis, quo tabescebat in mortem'; *Conf.* 8.11.26 'cum diceret mihi consuetudo violenta "putasne sine istis poteris?"'

⁴⁹ *De Doctr. Christ.* 3.18.26–7 'Item cavendum est ne forte, quod in Scripturis veteribus pro illorum temporum condicione, etiamsi non figurate, sed proprie intellegatur, non est flagitium neque facinus, ad ista etiam tempora quis putet in usum vitae posse transferri. Quod nisi dominante cupiditate, et ipsorum quoque Scripturarum, quibus evertenda est, *satellitium* quaerente, non faciet; nec intelligit miser ad hanc utilitatem illa sic esse posita, ut spei bonae homines salubriter videant et *consuetudinem* quam aspersionem posse habere usum bonum, et eam quam amplexantur esse posse damnabilem, si et ibi caritas utentium, et hic cupiditas attendatur. Nam si multis uxoribus caste uti quisquam pro tempore potuit, potest alius una libidinose: Magis enim probro multarum fecunditate utentem propter aliud, quam unius carne fruentem propter ipsam. Ibi enim quaeritur utilitas temporum opportunitatibus congrua, hic satiatur cupiditas temporalibus voluptatibus implicata inferiorisque gradus ad Deum sunt, quibus secundum veniam concedit Apostolus carnalem cum singulis conjugibus consuetudinem propter intemperantiam eorum (I Cor. VII, 2), quam illi qui plures singuli cum haberent, sicut sapiens in cibo et potu nonnisi salutem corporis, sic inconcubitu nonnisi procreationem filiorum intuebantur'.

⁵⁰ I owe to the late Harry Jocelyn references to such passages as Caecilius' *Plocium* in Gellius, *NA* 2.23; *Mostellaria* 692, 699, and 703; and *Aulularia* 158 and 167–9. Modern ideas on the topic continue in the quip that the husband of a rich wife has 'two sets of cheeks to kiss'. Jerome as always faced the issue squarely. See *Contra Jov.* 1.47 'pauperem (sc. uxorem) alere difficile est, divitem ferre tormentum'.

sumptum nostrum gravet.⁵¹ But it could also suggest a bitter parody of safe-conduct into the *regnum caelorum*.⁵² 'Adveniat regnum uxorium!'

'Nec sanabatur vulnus illud meum, quod prioris *praecisione* factum erat':

Praecisio here confirms the surgical imagery, and here again a contrast with the Bible is implied.⁵³ Not only did Augustine's wound cause him great pain. It also failed to heal. Augustine wonderingly notes the lack of pain felt by Adam when his rib was removed. The question is 'how was Adam put to sleep and his rib painlessly removed from his body *sine ullo doloris sensu*?'⁵⁴

MARITAL THEOLOGY AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY

In his *De bono coniugali* of A.D. 401 Augustine revisited concubinage and in chapter 5 even wrote a case-history that everyone has seen as Augustine's own.⁵⁵

Solet enim quaeri, cum masculus et femina, nec ille maritus nec illa uxor alterius, sibimet non filiorum procreandorum, sed propter incontinentiam solius concubitus causa copulantur ea fide media, ut nec ille cum altera, nec illa cum altero id faciat, utrum nuptiae sint vocandae. Et potest quidem fortasse non absurde hoc appellari connubium, si usque ad mortem alterius eorum id inter eos placuerit et prolis generationem, quamvis non ea causa coniuncti sint, non tamen vitaverint, ut vel nolint sibi nasci filios, vel etiam opere aliquo malo agant, ne nascantur. Etenim si aliquam sibi vir ad tempus adhibuerit, donec aliam dignam vel honoribus vel facultatibus suis inueniat, quam comparem ducat, ipso animo adulter est, nec cum illa quam cupit invenire, sed cum ista, cum qua sic cubat, ut cum ea non habeat maritale consortium. Unde et ipsa hoc sciens et volens, impudice utique miscetur ei, cum quo non habet foedus uxorium. Verumtamen si ei tori fidem servet et, cum ille uxorem duxerit, nubere ipsa non cogitet atque a tali prorsus opere continere se praeparet adulteram quidem fortassis facile appellare non audeam; non peccare tamen quis dixerit, cum eam viro, cuius uxor non est, misceri sciat?

It is customary to ask whether it can be called a marriage when a man and a woman, neither he anyone else's husband, nor she anyone else's wife, are joined to one another not for the sake of having children, but — because of their incontinence — for the sake of sexual intercourse alone, with the agreement that he will not do it with another woman, nor she with another man. And perhaps indeed this can without absurdity be called a marriage, if they stayed by their decision up to the death of one of them, and they did not avoid having children, even though they were not joined for that purpose, with the result that they were unwilling to have children or did some evil deed to prevent them from being born. For if a man take a woman to himself on a temporary basis, until such a time as he find another one to marry who is an equal, worthy either of his rank or means, in his very spirit he is an adulterer, not in relationship with her whom he wishes to find, but with her with whom he sleeps in such a way that his relations with her are non-marital. Whence she too, knowing this, and being willing, is correspondingly unchaste in mixing with one with whom she doesn't have a marital compact. But if she should keep the faith of their bed, and, once he has married, not think of getting married herself, and make herself ready to refrain from that sort of act altogether, I would perhaps not dare lightly to call her an adulteress. But who would say that she did not sin, since he knows that she had intercourse with a man to whom she was not married?

⁵¹ *Conf.* 6.19. The fullest statement is in *Solil.* 1.17.4 cited above p.157. The male professor's dream graduate student, the 'litterata, vel quae abs te facile possit erudiri', as admiring, unpaid research assistant!

⁵² Mt 17.10 'adveniat regnum tuum'.

⁵³ See *Conf.* 6.11.19 'Si feminae privarer amplexibus et medicinam misericordiae tuae ad eandem infirmitatem sanandam non cogitabam'.

⁵⁴ *DGAL* 9.15.26 'aliter ergo quaeritur quemadmodum sit soporatus Adam costaque eius *sine ullo doloris sensu* a corporis compage detracta sit'.

⁵⁵ See O'Donnell, op. cit. (n. 1), 384–5; Brown, op. cit. (n. 16), 393.

The passage is traditionally interpreted *in its entirety* as a description of Augustine's relationship with Anonyma 1.⁵⁶ But to do so fails to take account of the fact that two different types of concubinage are clearly contrasted: what Zumkeller called long-term concubinage ('*concubinatus von Dauer*') and short-term concubinage ('*concubinatus auf Zeit*').⁵⁷ First comes the pair who enter concubinage on account of incontinence, solely for the sake of sexual relations, with every intention of staying together, but with none, initially, of having children. Can this be considered a marriage? Augustine concludes that it would not be ridiculous to call it one, provided that both stick by it till the death of the other partner and they do not prevent the birth of children. This clearly matches what is known of Augustine's relationship with his first *concubina* as described in *Conf.* 4.2.2:

in illis annis unam habebam non eo quod legitimum vocatur coniugio cognitam, sed quam indagaverat vagus ardor inops prudentiae, sed unam tamen ei quoque servans tori fidem; in quo sane experirer exemplo meo, quid distaret inter coniugalis placiti modum, quo foederatum esset generandi gratia, et pactum libidinosi amoris, ubi proles etiam contra votum nascitur, quamvis iam nata, cogat se diligi.

Augustine seems to draw attention to his own situation by specifying that even if the arrangement was not originally intended to produce children, it could still be called a marriage, provided that children were welcomed, if they came.

The second instance is the man (*si . . . vir*) who takes a concubine temporarily (*ad tempus*) until he can find a wife worthy of his rank and means. This, one might suggest, describes his second concubinage.⁵⁸ While it is possible that Augustine all along intended to supplant his first concubine with a wife, such an intention cannot be proved from his writings.⁵⁹ The *Confessions*, instead, suggests that the search started only later on at Monica's instigation, after the improvement of his prospects in Milan.⁶⁰ The second case-study with its subjunctive clause of anticipation, '*donec aliam . . . inveniat*', applies to the second concubinage, which Augustine clearly described as a temporary arrangement until he should get married.

The two cases are presented in distinctly different ways. To make things clearer the text could be arranged into sections with different typefaces:

(CONCUBINE 1) SOLET ENIM QUAERI, CUM *MASCULUS ET FEMINA*, NEC ILLE MARITUS NEC ILLA UXOR ALTERIUS, SIBIMET NON FILIORUM PROCREANDORUM, SED PROPTER INCONTINENTIAM SOLIUS *CONCUBITUS* CAUSA COPULANTUR EA FIDE MEDIA,⁶¹ UT NEC ILLE CUM ALTERA, NEC ILLA CUM ALTERO ID FACIAT, UTRUM NUPTIAE SINT VOCANDAE. ET POTEST QUIDEM FORTASSE *NON ABSURDE HOC APPELLARI CONNUBIUM*, SI USQUE AD MORTEM ALTERIUS EORUM ID INTER EOS PLACUERIT ET PROLIS GENERATIONEM, QUAMVIS NON EA CAUSA CONIUNCTI SINT,⁶² NON TAMEN VITAVERINT, UT VEL NOLINT SIBI NASCI FILIOS, VEL ETIAM OPERE ALIQUO MALO AGANT, NE NASCANTUR. (Man hunts for Concubine 2) Etenim si aliquam sibi vir ad tempus adhibuerit,

⁵⁶ Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 34, despite his distinction between two types of *concubinatus*, clearly identifies Augustine's relationship with Anonyma 1 as 'Konkubinat auf Zeit'. See also O'Donnell, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 384: 'In a nearly contemporaneous passage that must refer to *this* relationship' (Italics mine).

⁵⁷ Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 32, who nonetheless identifies the second type of concubinage with Augustine's first relationship (*ibid.*, 34). Augustine recognizes the concept of temporary concubinage at *De bono coniugali* 14.16.

⁵⁸ Pace O'Donnell, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 386: 'No mention is ever made again of the second concubine'.

⁵⁹ Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 34, assumed that he knew from the start that he was going to leave her: 'Die Entlassung war . . . war also von Anfang an eingepplant'.

⁶⁰ *Conf.* 6.13.23 'Et instabatur inpigre ut ducerem uxorem . . .' For Augustine's following the path of

least resistance, one might compare his decision to stay with the Manichees after being disillusioned by meeting Faustus. See *Conf.* 5.7.13 'ceterum conatus omnis meus, quo proficere in illa secta statueram, illo homino cognito, prorsus intercidit, non ut ab eis ominino separarer, sed quasi melius quicquam non inveniens eo, quo iam quoquo modo inrueram contentus interim esse decreveram, nisi aliquid forte, quod magis eligendum esset, eluceret'.

⁶¹ cf. *DGAL* 9.7.12 'Hoc autem triperitum est; fides, proles, sacramentum. In fide attenditur ne praeter vinculum coniugale cum altera vel altero concumbatur: in prole, ut amanter suscipiatur, benigne nutriatur, religiose educetur: in sacramento autem, ut coniugium non separetur, et dimissus aut dimissa nec causa prolis alteri coniungatur'.

⁶² This clause permits his first concubinage to qualify.

donec aliam dignam vel honoribus vel facultatibus suis inueniat,⁶³ quam comparem ducat, ipso animo adulter⁶⁴ est, nec cum illa quam cupit invenire, sed cum ista, cum qua sic cubat, ut cum ea non habeat maritale consortium.⁶⁵ (Concubine 2) Unde et ipsa hoc sciens et volens, impudice utique miscetur ei, cum quo non habet foedus uxorium. (Concubine 1) VERUMTAMEN SI EI TORI FIDEM SERVET ET, CUM ILLE UXOREM DUXERIT, NUBERE IPSA NON COGITET ATQUE A TALI PRORSUS OPERE CONTINERE SE PRAEPARET ADULTERAM QUIDEM FORTASSIS FACILE APPELLARE NON AUDEAM; NON PECCARE TAMEN QUIS DIXERIT, CUM EAM VIRO, CUIUS UXOR NON EST, MISCE RI SCIAT? *De bono coniugali* 5

The first is a free and mutual arrangement between two partners. The second is one clearly sought by *the man*. The first could under certain circumstances, according to Augustine, be called a *connubium*. In the second, however, the man is clearly an *adulter ipso animo*,⁶⁶ since his eye is on his coming marriage, and the woman involved acts *impudice* in having knowing and voluntary sexual relations with a man with whom she did not have (and could not have) a *foedus uxorium*. Her actions are then contrasted, starting at *verumtamen*, with those of the first woman, who not only has no intention of marrying, but indeed none of having any further sexual relations at all. Augustine cannot lightly call the first woman an adulteress. The implied contrast is to the man in the second case-history who is indeed to be considered an *adulter*. The *De bono coniugali* has been misinterpreted over the years, and, though it indeed applies to Augustine himself, it describes not just the first of his sexual relationships, but *both*. We should not, perhaps, be surprised that readers have found it difficult: it reverberates with the sound of the splitting of hairs.

There are, in addition, a number of telling literary and verbal parallels between the *De bono coniugali* and the *Confessions*. The first concubinage is carefully described as entered upon by both the *masculus* and the *femina*.⁶⁷ Just as *Confessions* 6.15.25 described the separation of Augustine and his concubine as a biblical event, here too we find a precise echo of the language of Genesis 1.27: 'masculum et feminam creavit eos.' This pair are 'male and female' like Adam and Eve. 'Tori fidem servet' is extremely close to *Conf.* 4.22 'servans tori fidem'. And both *De bono coniugali* 5 and the *Confessions* significantly avoid the word *concubina*. But the C-word, as in the *Confessions*, is again subliminally present in the same set of sound-plays: 'nec cum illa quam cupit invenire, sed cum ista, cum qua sic cubat, ut cum ea non habeat maritale consortium'. Also, one might suggest, its sister, 'concupiscentia.'

AUTOBIOGRAPHY AND SOCIAL HISTORY

The autobiography of the *Confessions* is spiritual, intellectual, and emotional. But externals peek out from behind strictly personal developments: the names, dates, places, and events that form the grid of the author's life. Outside lie the social forces said by historians to shape Augustine's choices. Here be sociological entities such as career, class, provincialism, and marital options.

It is difficult to balance authorial narrative, external events, and the operation of social forces in reading an autobiography and writing a biography from it. And there are special problems involved in mechanically applying alleged general social principles to individual cases: namely that the individual case-studies may have been used to construct the general principle, and there is thus the potential for circularity of

⁶³ *Inueniat* throws dust in prying eyes and serves to disguise his own case somewhat. He had technically 'found', i.e. 'located', or become engaged to his future wife, but he had not yet gained possession of her.

⁶⁴ *Adulter* 'avant la lettre' so to speak: he has committed adultery in his heart with his promised wife.

⁶⁵ The obfuscation in *inueniat* necessitates this embarrassing explanation of why he is committing

adultery in his heart when involved with the temporary concubine: in truth he had already 'found', i.e. become engaged to, his future wife.

⁶⁶ This should probably be taken as equivalent to Mt. 5.28 'iam moechatus est eam in corde suo'.

⁶⁷ The obvious alternative paired opposition was the less biblical *vir* and *femina*. Gal. 3.28 has 'non est masculus et', echoed by Justinian, *Novel* 5.2.

argumentation. Problems such as these, I suggest, affect the answer to crucial questions about Augustine's relationship with Anonyma 1.⁶⁸ In addition, religious or sentimental presuppositions about Augustine ('Saving the dignity of the saint' or 'Surely he wouldn't have been so cold-blooded . . .') have clouded scholarly judgement.⁶⁹ A more sophisticated and 'modern' appreciation of Roman social realia seeks to exculpate Augustine: 'Such things were quite routine then.'⁷⁰

Augustine's relationship with Anonyma 1 was a concubinage. The language he uses to describe it⁷¹ and its nature as described make that clear. But, as we have seen, passages from the *Confessions* show a clear desire to line the relationship up with and compare it to marriage — if one imagines a continuum between marriage, concubinage, and *stuprum*. The same desire is evident in the *De bono coniugali*. Concubinage was respectable, so why did Augustine worry the question and why was he so eager to equate his concubinage with a marriage? This is, at root, a psychological question, but it is one that can, I believe, shed light on facts. And it is at this point that literature and the representation of reality impinge upon history.

Explanations as to why Augustine entered into a concubinage rather than a marriage usually start with assumptions about Anonyma 1's status: it was low,⁷² perhaps even servile.⁷³ She was a *femina probrosa*, or an actress.⁷⁴ But, as Troncarelli rightly notes, there is absolutely no evidence to that effect.⁷⁵ There is silence. And that can speak either way. It is my aim to turn the discussion of her status around and consider a different reading of the evidence. Anonyma 1's orthodoxy,⁷⁶ her fidelity to Augustine, and her eventual choice of chastity and perhaps even the monastic life do not suggest a woman of ill repute⁷⁷ — unless Augustine's was an even more colourful romance than we imagined or he intimated. Furthermore the *Confessions'* audience would have included some people who knew Augustine well, e.g. Alypius. If his had been a liaison with a legally unmarriageable woman, and this would have included one of servile status, one wonders how intimates would have heard all his attempts to equate the relationship with a marriage, or to say that it was a 'quasi-marriage'. There was no reason for him to labour the point, unless she was indeed marriageable, but they did not marry. In other words, what we are hearing is Augustine protesting too much. The following is a somewhat risky argument, but one might deduce Anonyma 1's literacy and education, though not necessarily her status, from the tempting shopping-list for an *uxor* presented by Ratio to Augustine in the *Soliloquies*.⁷⁸

The following syllogism underlies modern Anonyma 1 studies: 'Concubines are regularly of lower or servile social status.' 'Concubines are women one cannot or should not marry.' 'Augustine had a concubine.' 'Therefore she must have been of lower social

⁶⁸ For example it has been assumed that Augustine dismissed his concubine in A.D. 385 because higher officials (such as professors of rhetoric) could not have concubines. See Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 27, who states that a marriage to her in A.D. 385 would have been not just 'undenkbar', but also 'gesetzlich unmöglich'. But this false conclusion is derived from interpretation of Augustine's actions to the exclusion of the case of Libanius. Zumkeller, 35, contrasted the higher social class and greater security of Libanius who stayed with a concubine throughout his life, and claimed that Augustine's status was too low to get away with living in professorial concubinage. Thereby the saint could be exonerated: at that stage in his life he could not have married her — even had he wanted to.

⁶⁹ For more fine material along these lines see Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 21–2. Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 153, rightly speaks of our embarrassment about Augustine's conduct.

⁷⁰ Zumkeller, *op. cit.* (n. 23), 22, calls it research into the social and legal background of the relationship, but notes that it is not his intention to excuse

Augustine and Monica 'at any cost'. Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 157, characterizes such views as 'il santo pur sofferendo, non si cura molto della sua donna'.

⁷¹ See the word plays, above p. 158.

⁷² Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 152–3, attributes the authority of this view to Solignac's notes in the *Bibliothèque Augustinienne* edition of the *Confessions* (*op. cit.* (n. 1), 677 ff.).

⁷³ Brown, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 62; H. Chadwick, *Augustine* (1986), 10, 'a girl-friend of servile or low social class'; J. Evans-Grubbs, *Law and Family in Late Antiquity: the Emperor Constantine's Marriage Legislation* (1995), 295 and 300.

⁷⁴ Gillian Clark's secret explanation: that she was 'an actress, from one of those sexy shows in Carthage', because it would help to explain Augustine's obsession with theatre!

⁷⁵ Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 154.

⁷⁶ See below pp. 173–4.

⁷⁷ Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 154; at 157 he uses Libanius as a viable model for what Augustine could have done.

⁷⁸ See the epigraph above p. 157.

status.⁷⁹ But this syllogism may not be valid. It marginalizes another possibility, baldly stated by Aline Rousselle: 'Concubines were essentially women who could not marry *or whom men did not wish to marry*.'⁸⁰ The latter alternative must be kept in mind, and is, I shall argue, the correct one. We should abandon 'could not' and instead concentrate on 'would not'. When we look squarely at a superficial level at Augustine's failure to marry Anonyma 1, two facts emerge: 'They' did not want him to⁸¹ and he *chose* not to. But there is far more to the matter than that.

Outcomes (concubinage instead of marriage), it is important to remember, do not necessarily reflect intentions, nor how a situation may look to its principals at the time. And we might profitably leave aside the external facts to inquire into Augustine's *fides* and *bona fides*, and try to reconstruct what sort of relationship he thought he was in between A.D. 371/2 and 385. To understand his decision, outcomes and events have to be mapped onto the messy Augustinian meditations on sexuality and significant silences contained in Book 2, while authorial statements have to be disentangled from the virtual *oratio obliqua* that he uses to represent the intrusive opinions of others. Augustine could have told things differently, clearly, flatfootedly. But even though we would have had our answers, it would not have been the same story. He is obscure and allusive, not necessarily with conscious intent, but so as to betray something of his unconscious confusion and motivation.

SEX, LIES, AND AUTOBIOGRAPHY

Non autem hoc est occultare veritatem, quod est proferre mendacium. Quamvis enim omnis qui mentitur velit celare quod verum est, non tamen omnis qui vult quod verum est celare mentitur. Plerumque enim vera non mentiendo occulimus, sed tacendo . . . Non est ergo mendacium cum silendo absconditur verum, sed cum loquendo promitur falsum.

Augustine, *Contra Mendacium* 10.23

I would like to re-examine and to some extent paraphrase the sections of the *Confessions* relevant to the problem, starting with the vaguely articulated sexual narrative of *Confessions* 2 which covers events of Augustine's sixteenth year.⁸² In doing so I lay the foundation for a revised reading of his concubinage and its background, in which I shall suggest that the argument for Anonyma 1's lower social status is circular (as above) and based on a possibly false deduction. Augustine begins with *foeditates* and *amores* (2.1.1). But *Conf.* 2.2.3 already introduces the topics of marriage and procreation:

Quis mihi modularetur aerumnam meam et novissimarum rerum fugaces pulchritudines in usum verteret earumque suavitatibus metas praefigeret, *ut usque ad coniugale litus exaestuarent fluctus aetatis meae*, si tranquillitas in eis non poterat esse fine procreandorum liberorum contenta, sicut praescribit lex tua, domine, qui formas etiam propaginem mortis nostrae potens imponere lenem manum ad temperamentum spinarum a paradiso tuo secluserum?

Who was going to control my misery for me and turn the fleeting beauties of the lowest things to use and set limits⁸³ to their delights in order that⁸⁴ the waves of my time of life break and seethe up to the [safe] shore of marriage, even if calmness amongst them could not be content with the goal of procreating children, as your law prescribes, Lord, who shape even the offspring of our death and are capable of imposing a gentle hand to soften the thorns that were excluded from your paradise?

⁷⁹ J. B. Plassard, *Le concubinat romain sous le haut empire* (1921), 59, notes the fallacy: 'Cette allégation suppose en effet que toutes les fois qu'un texte mentionne une concubine affranchie, l'homme avec qui elle vit appartient à la classe sénatoriale; elle suppose aussi que toutes les concubines ingénues sont, au moins au premier siècle, des *mulieres famosae*. Or la plupart de ces textes ne contiennent aucune preuve qui l'établisse, aucun indice qui permette de le supposer.'

⁸⁰ A. Rousselle, *Porneia* (1993), 100.

⁸¹ One could call this the 'Lay the blame on Monica school'.

⁸² *Conf.* 2.2.4 covering November 369 to November 370.

⁸³ Lit. 'turning points'.

⁸⁴ Or 'with the result that'.

'You, Lord' (or 'No man') is the answer to this rhetorical question, which clearly views marriage as a desirable option. The voice of St Paul (1 Cor. 7.28) then speaks about the conflicts between love of God and love of wife, while Augustine expresses regret that he failed to pay heed (2.2.3). In 2.2.6 Patricius sees signs of his son's sexual maturity in the baths and already rejoices at the prospect of grandchildren.⁸⁵ Monica, *qua* voice of God, tells Augustine not to fornicate and especially not to commit adultery. In this she is surely being human and society-conscious, in regarding the second as worse than the first. But he clung to the figurative town centre (*umbilicus*)⁸⁶ of 'Babylon'.⁸⁷ And even Monica was slower than she should have been to flee the sinful city.⁸⁸ The paragraph is difficult and needs to be examined in its entirety. So Skutella's Latin text:

Ecce cum quibus comitibus iter agebam platearum Babyloniae et volutabar in caeno eius tamquam in cinnamis et unguentis pretiosis. et in umbilico eius quo tenacius haererem, calcabat me inimicus invisibilis et seducebat me quia seductilis eram. non enim et illa, qui iam de medio Babylonis fugerat, sed ibat in ceteris eius tardior, mater carnis meae, sicut monuit me pudicitiam, ita curavit quod de me a viro suo audierat, *iamque pestilentiosum et in posterum periculosum sentiebat cohercere termino coniugalis affectus, si resecari ad vivum non poterat*; non curavit hoc, quia metus erat, ne impediretur spes mea conpede uxoria, non spes illa quam in te futuri saeculi habebat mater, sed spes litterarum, quas ut nossem nimis volebat parens uterque.

Look with what sort of companions I walked the broad streets of Babylon and rolled myself in her mud as if in spices and precious unguents. And the invisible enemy trod on me and seduced me, because I was seducible, to make me cling more tightly to her navel. For not even she — the mother of my flesh, who had by now fled the middle of Babylon, but was moving too slowly on her outskirts — although⁸⁹ she counselled chastity, was equally⁹⁰ concerned about what she had heard from her husband . . .

Before translating further the section in italics must be re-examined. In this context *sentiebat* has to mean 'to give one's opinion, to vote, or to decide',⁹¹ rather than 'sensed' or 'felt', since 'cohercere termino coniugalis affectus' represents an unrealized decision, not a fact.⁹² But who is the subject? The point is crucial and has not been addressed adequately by translators and commentators. The sentence makes no sense if it is

⁸⁵ *Conf.* 2.2.6 'quasi iam ex hoc in nepotes gestiret'.

⁸⁶ For the (telling and deliberate) biblical euphemism missed by commentators on the *Confessions*, see Adams, op. cit. (n. 36), 92–3. Jerome (*Ep.* 22.11) in the course of convincing Eustochium that the Devil invades both men and women through their private parts, makes an unpromising start with Job 40.16 — a description of Behemoth: 'Virtus eius in lumbis eius et potestas eius in umbilico', 'See the strength in his loins, the power in his massive belly'. He cites various biblical passages where *lumbus* may refer to the male genitalia. The principle of euphemism is invoked: 'it is only fit that men's and women's genitalia should be referred to by other names', 'Honeste viri mulierisque genitalia immutatis sunt appellata nominibus'. He then adduces an allusion to women's genitalia in *in umbilico*. This is not pure fantasy. The *Septuagint* has ἐπ' ὀμφαλοῦ γαστροῦ, (both sexes have navels), and the Hebrew word is apparently the same as that used in Ct. 7.3 to mean 'vulva'. See Marvin H. Pope, *Song of Songs* (1977), 617: The word used means umbilical cord at Ezech. 14.4.

⁸⁷ *Conf.* 2.3.8.

⁸⁸ *Conf.* 2.3.8 'sed ibat in ceteris eius tardior'.

⁸⁹ The *sicut* sets up the following 'ita curavit', and has the force of a concessive *qui*-clause.

⁹⁰ Representing the 'sicut . . . non ita'.

⁹¹ Meanings such as 'to feel', 'to perceive', etc. are impossible if *cohercere* (as is most natural) is construed with *sentiebat* rather than with *curavit*, as below n. 92.

⁹² Tréhorel and Bouissou, op. cit. (n. 1), 342, miss the 'sicut', take 'cohercere termino' etc. as the complement of 'ita curavit' (which at least is in line with Monica's actions), but run into trouble with the 'quod' and the 'iamque . . . sentiebat'. They end up taking the same relative pronoun first as *what* Monica heard and then as (effectively) Augustine (depersonalised as a pestilential thing). O'Donnell, likewise, op. cit. (n. 1), 125, believes that 'ita curavit' governs 'cohercere' and that the latter takes as its object the 'compound relative clause "quod . . . sentiebat"'. Presumably this would yield something along the lines of 'Thus she did not take care to confine within the limit of conjugal affection what she had heard from her husband and already sensed was diseased and henceforth a danger, etc'. But the parallel construction with the subsequent 'non curavit hoc' renders such a translation improbable and awkward. In addition, *pestilentiosum* and *periculosum* work better as attributes of a person, rather than of some abstract news heard. O'Donnell, 125, takes 'non curavit hoc' as 'Finally the explicit answer to the question posed at the beginning of 2.2.3', despite a separation of approximately four pages. 'Non curavit hoc' must rhetorically pick up 'ita curavit quod'.

Monica, for she clearly was against marriage.⁹³ But it is worth noting that the section ends with a balanced comparison of both parents' opinions (2.3.8). The third interested party present as part of the *dramatis personae* of the sentence is Patricius, and coherence would be restored, if *he* were the subject. He after all had been eager for grandchildren. The change of subject required by the sense would be clearer, if one conjectured a *quiam* for *iamque*. If one did, this is how the sentence could be translated:

who was voting⁹⁴ to restrain me, already infectious and from henceforth a danger,⁹⁵ within the confines of conjugal affection, if [my] passions could not be cut to the quick.⁹⁶ She did not care about this, because she was afraid lest my prospects be impeded by the shackles of a wife, not the prospects my mother held of the life to come, but my career in letters, which both parents were excessively concerned that I master.

Books 3 and 4 continue Augustine's sexual history. When he went to Carthage in A.D. 371 at the age of seventeen he rushed into a love-affair and consummated it, suffering all the time-honoured distressing symptoms (3.1.1).⁹⁷ At 4.2.2 we hear of the liaison with Anonyma 1, said (annoyingly vaguely) to have started in *illis annis*, when he was teaching rhetoric. And then in 4.4.7 his close relationship with the childhood male friend who died is described as having started when he first began to teach in Thagaste.

The start of the relationship with Anonyma 1 is often dated to A.D. 372, when Augustine was eighteen, and he is assumed to have met her at Carthage, presumably because she is first explicitly mentioned just before Augustine's account of a poetic competition that must have occurred there.⁹⁸ But in fact the locale and the absolute chronology of *Confessions* 4 are difficult to sort out: for example, even though Augustine returns from Thagaste to Carthage (4.7.12), he is only indirectly seen to have gone there from Carthage in the first place (4.4.7). O'Donnell assigns the Carthaginian events of Book 4 to a window of A.D. 376/83, framing an episode in Thagaste in A.D. 375/6 in the middle.⁹⁹ Adeodatus was almost fifteen in the spring of A.D. 387,¹⁰⁰ so he must have been born in A.D. 372, and Augustine must thus have become involved with Anonyma 1 by A.D. 371/2 at the latest. But these dates still do not suffice to prove where and when the relationship started. They do not preclude the possibility that the two met in Thagaste in Augustine's sixteenth year (November 369–November 370).¹⁰¹ She may be the figure prompting the *basso ostinato* of Augustine's thoughts about marriage and indeed about children at Thagaste when he was sixteen.

These thoughts were favourable. Indeed he blames the ambitions and snobbishness of his parents for — indirectly at any rate — enabling his fornication. We may even have been able to recover the rather Pauline views of the catechumen Patricius, who wanted grandchildren: marriage was a good idea, if Augustine's sexual feelings could not be scotched, as his mother might have preferred. But Monica, still on the outskirts of Babylon, inconsistently preferred him to fornicate rather than be tied to a woman who would become an impediment to his studies or a social liability. The phrase 'quia metus

⁹³ Translators regularly resort to fancy footwork to take it that way, e.g. O'Donnell, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 125; Chadwick, *op. cit.* (n. 8), 28, 'and which she felt to hold a danger for the future', and R. S. Pine-Coffin, *Saint Augustine: Confessions* (1961), 46, 'She saw that I was already infected with a disease that would become dangerous later on . . . she did not think it right to restrain them to the bounds of married love'.

⁹⁴ Or, leaving the text as it is, 'and [he] was voting . . .'

⁹⁵ The assessment (*pestilentiosum* and *periculosum*) may be Augustine's own retroactive one, not his father's opinion at the time.

⁹⁶ Augustine's *affectus*. This protasis may represent a concession of Patricius to Monica's opinion.

⁹⁷ 'Ut caederer virgis ferreis ardentibus zeli et suspitionum et timorum et irarum atque rixarum.' The symptoms are close to those that poison marriage. See *De Sancta virginitate* 16 'ipsam carnis tribulationem,

quam praenuntiavit eis qui eligunt nuptias, in suspcionibus zeli conjugalibus, in procreandis filiis atque nutriendis, in timoribus et moeroribus orbitatis. Quotus enim quisque, cum se connubii vinculis alligaverit, non istis trahatur atque agitetur affectibus?'

⁹⁸ See Brown, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 39; H. Chadwick, *Augustine* (1986), 10; G. Clark, *Augustine: The Confessions* (1993), 24.

⁹⁹ O'Donnell, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 203.

¹⁰⁰ *Conf.* 9.6.14.

¹⁰¹ O'Donnell, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 207, acknowledges the possibility: "'in illis annis" . . . suggest a liaison that must have begun in 371 or perhaps even 370, thus apparently probably in the first year of studies at Carthage, but conceivably during the year of indolence recorded at 2.3.5–6 (the philoprogenitive optimism of Patricius did not have long to wait).'

erat ne impediretur spes mea compede uxoria¹⁰² reflects not Augustine's view,¹⁰³ but his mother's. Patricius, as we saw, had not made his son's marriage a priority in the abstract: after all, Patricius thought primarily of his career, and it was neither parent's concern to catch Augustine safely in the net of marriage as he rushed headlong.¹⁰⁴ But for Patricius marriage may have been preferable to fornication and the difficulties attendant upon it in a small community.¹⁰⁵

Once Patricius (who may have been prepared to allow his son to marry) died,¹⁰⁶ it would have been harder for Augustine to withstand Monica's will. Since she objected not, it would appear, to Anonyma 1 in particular, but to *any compes uxoria* (viz. marriage 'to the wrong woman'), one cannot safely conclude from Augustine's choice of concubinage rather than marriage that Anonyma 1 was a social inferior or unmarriageable. Inferior social status and parental permission to marry were separate issues. No provincial equal could have satisfied his mother's ambitions. Brown provides an eloquent statement of her view: 'His huge talents could not be shackled by an early arranged marriage that would have tied him forever to a wife chosen from among the same class as himself, the petty squirearchy of upland Thagaste.'¹⁰⁷ Anonyma 1 could have been Augustine's social equal, and there is no indication that a marriage to her was impossible for him. It might have been possible for him to have married young in Africa, had he not succumbed to the perhaps financial foresight and snobbery of his elders and betters.¹⁰⁸ Whether he subscribed to them is another matter. He kept his options open with a concubinage.

Anonyma 1's status comes under consideration at different stages in her relationship with Augustine: initially in connection with Augustine's failure to marry her, and subsequently in the context of A.D. 385, events narrated in Book 6 of the *Confessions*. Here, as in Book 4, chronology is tricky. Office, wealth, and marriage attracted Augustine¹⁰⁹ and his soliloquy at *Conf.* 6.11 ended with (6.11.19) the ambivalent passive periphrastic 'ducenda uxor cum aliqua pecunia, ne sumptum nostrum gravet', coupled with the reassuring thought that many great men had managed to combine the pursuit of wisdom with marriage.¹¹⁰ Thought soon turned to words used to convince the sceptical Alypius of the compatibility of *coniugium* and *sapientia* (*Conf.* 6.12.21). At *Conf.* 6.12.22 Augustine directly refers to his concubinage with Anonyma 1:

Cum enim me ille miraretur, quem non parvi penderet ita haerere visco illius voluptatis, ut me adfirmarem, quotienscumque inde inter nos quaereremus, caelibem vitam nullo modo posse degere atque ita me defendere, cum illum mirantem viderem, ut dicerem multum interesse inter illud, quod ipse raptim et furtim expertus esset, quod paene iam ne meminisset quidem atque ideo nulla molestia facile contemneret et *delectationes consuetudinis meae ad quas si accessisset honestum nomen matrimonii*, non eum mirari oportere cur ego illam vitam nequirem spernere . . .

¹⁰² *Conf.* 2.3.8.

¹⁰³ As Brown, op. cit. (n. 6), 62 n. 4 takes it.

¹⁰⁴ *Conf.* 2.3.4 'non fuit cura meorum ruentem excipere matrimonio'.

¹⁰⁵ Particularly fornication with a woman who, if she was Anonyma 1, might have been marriageable. See *Dig.* 48.5.35 'Modestinus libro primo regularum Stuprum committit, qui liberam mulierem consuetudinis causa, non matrimonii continet, excepta videlicet concubina. Adulterium in nupta admittitur: stuprum in vidua vel virgine vel puero committitur'. There might always be the fear of the sort of charge alluded to by Ulpian and Aticilinus in *Dig.* 25.7.1.2 'Cum Aticilino sentio et puto solas eas in concubinato haberi posse sine metu criminis, in quas stuprum non committitur'. Paulinus of Pella, *Eucharisticon* 159–86 has interesting comparative material on opportunities available to respectable young men (with resources). He prudently avoided liaisons not only with unwilling women, married women, and others' slaves, but also with women who merited special watchfulness, *ingenuis oblati sponte*, free women offering either

sexual relations or concubinages. He confined his attentions to slaves in his own household. Paulinus' parents nonetheless compelled him to marry at approximately eighteen.

¹⁰⁶ Patricius died in Augustine's seventeenth year (*Conf.* 3.4.7).

¹⁰⁷ Brown, op. cit. (n. 16), 390.

¹⁰⁸ For a concise statement of the issue, see H. Chadwick, 'The attractions of Mani', in E. Romero-Pose (ed.), *Pléroma: Salus carnis. Homenaje a Antonio Orbe*, S. J. (1990), 219. 'A partner in bed and board from the lower classes of Carthage would hardly be acceptable at the governor's residence as hostess.'

¹⁰⁹ *Conf.* 6.6.9.

¹¹⁰ Necessity? Or obligation? Theophrastus, Cicero, and Jerome disagreed. See Jerome, *Contra Iov.* 1. 47 'Theophrastus de nuptiis . . . Non est ergo uxor ducenda sapienti. Primum enim impediri studia philosophiae, nec posse quemquam libris et uxori pariter inservire' and 1. 48 'Cicero dicens post non posse se uxori et philosophiae pariter operam dare'.

When he (sc. Alypius) used to marvel that I, whom he esteemed greatly, was so stuck in the birdlime of that pleasure that I affirmed whenever we were discussing the matter that I could in no way live a celibate life and that I defended myself in this way, when I saw him sceptical, — namely to say that there was a great difference between *his* hasty and surreptitious experience (which he barely even remembered and for that reason could easily condemn) and the pleasures of *my* cohabitation,¹¹¹ and that if the respectable name of matrimony had been added to them,¹¹² he should not be surprised why I was unable to reject that life . . .

Clearly by now, with marriage in the offing, he had been made aware that he was not in what was called an *honestum matrimonium*, but could still imagine the greater perfection of his relationship, if the *name* of matrimony had been added to it.¹¹³ Again as before at 4.2.2. he refuses to speak of marriage, *matrimonium*, *tout court*, but draws attention to *de facto* marriage as opposed to *de iure* marriage, *res* against *nomen*. The topic was clearly like a sore spot on his gum that he could not resist exploring with his tongue.

Then in 6.13.23 came the pressures from Monica to marry and the choice of a particular girl, two years under age. Obviously Anonyma 1 had to go, if Augustine was to marry into a rich and respectable family.¹¹⁴ The issues that remained were money (the *uxor dotata*), career, external pressures,¹¹⁵ and, inevitably, the implacable Monica. In 6.14.24 the philosophical commune is discussed, but dreams of it are shattered, as the men wonder whether the *mulierculae* would permit it. Some of his friends had them already, and Augustine wishes to have one.¹¹⁶ The context suggests that *mulierculae* are wives, and that Augustine does not include Anonyma 1 in this derogated category of 'little women'.¹¹⁷

But where was Anonyma 1 during these discussions? By 6.13.23 Monica was already soliciting a prophetic dream at Augustine's behest about his marriage.¹¹⁸ By 6.15.25 Anonyma 1 had already left, but it is unclear when. The ablative absolute *avulsa a latere* and the pluperfect *redierat* show simply that the departure had occurred, even though it is not depicted in any clear absolute or relative time. We may reasonably conjecture that it postdated the discussions of 6.12.22,¹¹⁹ but that it had already occurred when the communal life of 6.14.24 was at issue and Augustine desired his *muliercula*. All this silence, vagueness, and chronological obfuscation (Which woman precisely is he with when? at what stage did he start discussing the Milanese marriage?), like similar symptoms in Books 2 and 4, cannot but be, as Troncarelli says, a strategy to mask a sense of guilt towards other human beings without lying: he had difficulty in acknowledging the depth of a personal tie that he subsequently would deny.¹²⁰

¹¹¹ Or 'relationship', see Modestinus, *Dig.* 23.24 'In liberae mulieris consuetudine non concubinatus, sed nuptiae intellegendae sunt, si non corpore quaestum fecerit'.

¹¹² The protasis of the condition represents an original contrafactual condition in past time in *oratio obliqua*. The *oratio recta* would have been: 'Multum interest inter illud quod tu expertus es, quod paene iam ne meministi quidem atque ideo nulla molestia facile contemnes et delectationes consuetudinis meae ad quas si *accidisset* honestum nomen matrimonii, non te mirari oportet cur ego illam nequeam spernere.'

¹¹³ It is important to note that the protasis of the condition is *accidisset*, implying simply that it had not happened, not that it could not have happened.

¹¹⁴ While a monogamous concubinage was acceptable, both a wife and a concubine were not. See *Cŷ* 5.26.1 and A. Arjava, *Women and Law in Late Antiquity* (1996), 208.

¹¹⁵ Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 162.

¹¹⁶ *Conf.* 6.14.24 'sed posteaquam coepit cogitari, utrum hoc mulierculae sinerent, quas et alii nostrum

iam habebant et nos habere volebamus, totum illud placitum, quod bene formabamus, dissiluit in manibus atque confracum et abiectum est'.

¹¹⁷ Augustine's usage conforms to the definition at *TLL* s.v. 'muliercula' 1575.32–1756.33 *mulier parva, miseranda, contempta, nec non familiaris*. See, for example, *Civ. Dei* 10.16 'una muliercula', 'one weak woman', *Ep.* 137.3.12 'quae abiecta muliercula', or *Contra Gaudentium* 1.31.39 'blandienti mulierculae' (of Delilah).

¹¹⁸ The *tamen* in 6.13.23 'instabatur *tamen*' suggests that the dream, whatever its nature was, did not give a positive augury on Augustine's matrimony.

¹¹⁹ Unless the *delectationes* were those enjoyed with Anonyma 2. This seems unlikely given the respectful tone Augustine uses and the fact that he contemplates the addition of the name of matrimony to the relationship. See *Conf.* 6.15.25 'non utique coniugem'.

¹²⁰ See the persuasive discussion of Troncarelli, *op. cit.* (n. 35), 116–19, especially 119. To this one might add his own statements about 'suppressio veri' in the *Contra mendacium*, cited above p. 166.

CHRISTIAN MARRIAGE

Augustine did not merely insert snide asides and 'scare' quotation-marks about legitimate marriage into the *Confessions*. In other writings he explored the differences between Roman and Christian marriage¹²¹ and the nature of the institution both in the Old Testament and even in Eden, where no secular law existed.¹²² In *De bono coniugali* 24.32 he spoke of the good of marriage that for all peoples and for all men consisted of reproduction and fidelity: Christian marriage, however, required, in addition, *sacramentum*. In *DGAL* 9.7.12 he set the same threefold standard¹²³ for Christian marriage: 'Hoc autem tripertitum est; fides, proles, sacramentum. In fide attenditur ne praeter vinculum coniugale cum altera vel altero concumbatur: in prole, ut amanter suscipiatur, benigne nutriatur, religiose educetur: in sacramento autem, ut coniugium non separetur, et dimissus aut dimissa nec causa prolis alteri coniungatur.' Augustine has what might seem at first glance contradictory criteria for *sacramentum*. First that the marriage not be dissolved, but then if one or the other was repudiated,¹²⁴ that he or she not remarry, even in cases of infertility, when children were desired.¹²⁵ The sanctity of the sacrament was worth more than the fertility of the womb.¹²⁶ The two options that qualify for *sacramentum* reflect regrettable reality.¹²⁷

Thus even though Anonyma 1 and he did not stay together till death (as in *De bono coniugali* 5), and even though they did not cohabit to have children,¹²⁸ since they raised Adeodatus lovingly, and were faithful to one another, their joint relationship (if not their initial intentions) came quite close to a Christian marriage. Since she vowed never to know another man, *her* actions clearly met the criteria for the Christian sacrament. She lived up to the standards of Mark and Luke and of 1 Cor. 7.39, where St Paul stated that a woman cannot remarry as long as her husband is alive. These standards were forcefully reiterated by Jerome in *Ep.* 55.4: no matter how evil her husband was, adulterer, sodomite, or murderer, a woman could not remarry while he lived. This was the truth of Mt. 5.32 'qui dimittit uxorem . . . facit eam moechari'. Augustine's conduct, however, was clearly unsatisfactory. His initial intentions (though not his rearing of Adeodatus) failed the *proles* test of the *De bono coniugali* 5,¹²⁹ and his subsequent abandonment of his partner for the prospect of a *legitimum coniugium* failed the *sacramentum* test.

SECULAR LEGALITIES

Augustine was not unaware of legal concerns, for several of the texts related to Anonyma 1 sport legal vocabulary: *Conf.* 6.12.22 '*honestum nomen matrimonii*'; *Conf.* 6.15.25 '*tamquam impedimentum coniugii*' (clearly something others say) and '*naturali ex illa filio*'¹³⁰ and *Conf.* 4.4.2 '*unam habebam non eo quod legitimum vocatur coniugio*

¹²¹ See, for example, *De bono coniugali* 8 on divorce: 'Ceterum aliter se habere iura gentium quis ignorat?'

¹²² In *De bono coniugali* 1.1 he called the union of man and wife the 'prima naturalis copula' of human society.

¹²³ Augustine calls it 'tamquam regula' in which the fertility of nature is made honourable and the wickedness of incontinence is controlled.

¹²⁴ See *TLL* s.v. 'dimitto' 1210.69 ff. It means to repudiate a spouse, almost invariably a wife. Jerome, *Ep.* 55.4.5 'sive ipsa dimiserit virum sive a viro dimissa sit' is a broad-minded exception.

¹²⁵ Compare *De bono coniugali* 7.7 'Quae si ita sunt, tantum valet illud sociale vinculum coniugum ut, cum causa procreandi colligetur, nec ipsa causa procreandi solvatur'. Also 15.17 'Manet enim vinculum nuptiarum, etiamsi proles cuius causa initum est, manifesta

sterilitate subsequatur, ita ut iam scientibus coniugibus non se filios habituros separare se tamen vel ipsa causa filiorum atque aliis copulare non liceat'. Male infertility is addressed at 17.20: 'ita uni feminae plures viros nec prolis ipsius causa, si forte illa parere posset, ille generare non posset'.

¹²⁶ *De bono coniugali* 18.21.

¹²⁷ Even though the Church frowned upon divorce among Christians, it was permissible under Roman law and regularly occurred. See Evans Grubbs, *op. cit.* (n. 73), 242–53.

¹²⁸ Augustine acknowledged such an unlikely possibility on the part even of a temporary concubine in *De bono coniugali* 14.16.

¹²⁹ See *Conf.* 4.2.2. He would have passed the standard of the *DGAL* 9.7.12.

¹³⁰ See Plassard, *op. cit.* (n. 79), 85–6.

cognitam'. Anonyma 1 was considered an impediment to marriage, and Augustine knew that his relationship was not 'what is called a legitimate marriage'. In these places he clearly confronts the prescriptions and language of secular law. The tone is often bitter and disapproving.

But what law did he mean? What made a marriage? And what sort of disjunctions might exist between secular law, the Church, and a given individual's morality? How might the world have regarded Anonyma 1's status? Even though she was involved with a man who was not her husband, she was not committing *stuprum*.¹³¹ Her relationship was a concubinage, because it was 'quasi-marital',¹³² *concupinatus* generally being defined as a monogamous relationship between an unmarried woman and man, which the man does not consider a marriage, and in which the woman's social status was lower than her partner's.¹³³ The relationship was asymmetrical and extra-legal.

Roman *coniugium*, however, did not require the ceremonies and certificates of modern marriages.¹³⁴ Voluntary cohabitation and fidelity could in themselves constitute a *coniugium*, so distinguishing marriage from *concupinatus* could be troublesome.¹³⁵ There was room for subjective and emotional factors independent of the social status of the principals.¹³⁶ Some could work to the good to promote the relationship, for, although, as Treggiari says, 'In Roman concubinage *affectio maritalis*, the reciprocal attitude of regarding the other as wife or husband, was lacking, if both began to regard the other as *coniunx*, then the relationship became *matrimonium*, as long as there was no legal disqualification'.¹³⁷ In other cases concubinages could also be treated as marriages *in malo*.¹³⁸

One criterion used to distinguish an *uxor* from a *concubina* was legal qualification, viz. whether the woman *could* have married the man.¹³⁹ As we have seen, since concubinages were normal when the woman's social status was lower,¹⁴⁰ many have assumed the lower social status of Anonyma 1.¹⁴¹ The debate about Anonyma 1's status here impinges upon a long-standing controversy about whether *ingenuae honestae vitae* could and did enter into concubinages, when there was no legal impediment to marriage.¹⁴² Most top-down legal evidence suggests that this was not *meant* to happen and that concubinages were indeed the resort of women who could not marry or of men who did not want to marry.¹⁴³ But some legal evidence suggests that concubinages between the marriageable were possible. For example Papinian (*Dig.* 39.5.31 pr), when he states that gifts to a concubine did not lapse if one married her subsequently ('*si matrimonium inter eosdem postea fuerit contractum*'), shows that a man could change his mind about marrying a concubine, therefore there can have been no initial legal impediment.¹⁴⁴ So not all concubines were unmarriageable. There is some evidence that

¹³¹ Contrast Augustine's verdict on Anonyma 2, above p. 164. For *stuprum*, see Evans Grubbs, op. cit. (n. 73), 217–18.

¹³² See Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 12), 51. Presumably analogous (aside from the case-history of impediment) to modern common-law marriage.

¹³³ Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 12), 52; Clark, op. cit. (n. 33), 32; Evans Grubbs, op. cit. (n. 73), 294.

¹³⁴ See Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 205–6.

¹³⁵ See J. Beaucamp, *Le Statut de la femme à Byzance (4e–7e siècle)* (1990–92), vol. 1, 304; Clark, op. cit. (n. 33), 31; Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 205.

¹³⁶ See Plassard, op. cit. (n. 79), 35: 'Cette intention qui est un fait d'ordre psychologique.'

¹³⁷ Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 12), 52. Rousselle, op. cit. (n. 80), 80–1, makes the same point: all respectable concubines could attain the status of matron while they stayed with their partners.

¹³⁸ Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 12), 280 cites Ulpian *D.* 48.5.14pr for the view that a freedwoman *concubina* could be considered a *matrona* and be prosecuted for adultery by her *patronus*, if she were in a sexual liaison with him.

¹³⁹ See Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 12), 52; Evans-Grubbs, 294; Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 205.

¹⁴⁰ Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 206.

¹⁴¹ Troncarelli, op. cit. (n. 35), 153–62 is the notable exception.

¹⁴² The debate concerns the words 'excepta videlicet concubina' (interpolation or gloss? or authentic?) in *Digest* 48.5.35pr. See S. Treggiari, 'Concupinae', *PBSR* 49 (1981), 73–4. For a recent discussion, see L. A. Olsen, *La femme et l'enfant dans les unions illégitimes à Rome* (1999), 166–9. The latter is concerned exclusively with the Republic and the early Empire.

¹⁴³ See Marcianus cited in Justinian, *Digest*. 25.7.4 'alioquin si honestae vitae et ingenuam mulierem in concubinatum habere maluerit, sine testatione hoc manifestum faciente non conceditur. Sed necesse est ei vel uxorem eam habere vel hoc recusantem stuprum cum ea committere'. This suggests that *ingenuae* were taken as concubines, but that a *testatio* was required, presumably to protect against the charge of *stuprum*.

¹⁴⁴ 'Donationes in concubinam collatas non posse revocari convenit, nec, si matrimonium inter eosdem postea fuerit contractum, ad irritum recidere quod ante iure valuit', discussed by Plassard, op. cit. (n. 79), 37. See Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 212–13, for legitimation by subsequent marriage.

concubinage was practised in the early Empire amongst people of equal rank.¹⁴⁵ And in the later Empire it was not limited to cases where marriage was prohibited by law.¹⁴⁶ Marcus Aurelius, instead of marrying Fabia, after the death of Faustina, took a free concubine, the daughter of Faustina's procurator,¹⁴⁷ a clear example of choosing not to marry for testamentary reasons or so as not to provide existing children with a *noverca*.

But evidence for whether it happened is another matter. Case histories parallel to what is being posited for Augustine are hard to find: examples of free-born women with *conubium* co-habiting with young men of their own or slightly higher class, but not marrying. If we were looking for precise parallels we would need examples where the man subsequently decided to marry. There do not appear to be any.¹⁴⁸ But there are good reasons why such case-histories are unattested. Since Augustine's relationship was voluntary, consensual, and apparently amicable, even at its termination, and since there was no legacy involved, one would not expect to find parallels in legal sources.¹⁴⁹ In the latter, dispute is crucial: heredity and status the issue. Furthermore concubinages by virtue of their very nature fall below the threshold of official records. This leaves historians with inscriptions (set up by self-selecting individuals and classes of people)¹⁵⁰ and real or fictional case-histories from other sorts of sources.¹⁵¹ Concubinages could be hard to distinguish from marriages 'on the ground', and, unless the concubinage were being problematized for some reason, there would be no reason for most sources to provide legal information about the relationship of Man X with Woman Y. Historians of ancient concubinage face a serious problem with their sources.¹⁵² But at the same time they would be unwise to assume that just because something is unattested it did not occur.¹⁵³ Since there are traces of concubinage between *ingenuae* and men who were free to marry, there is every likelihood that actual examples would have been considerably more common than the state of our evidence attests.¹⁵⁴

Late Antiquity began with Peter Brown's *Augustine of Hippo*. From then onwards scholars in the field and teachers have quite understandably hitched their wagons to the glamorous and self-revealing saint whose box-office appeal is sure. Things that happened to Augustine and his experiences are somehow presented as typical of the period, or as windows onto it — no doubt to entice the uninitiate or the waverer. But to fetishize setting Augustine's case-history within any standard or normal parameters would be foolish. One has simply to consider the innumerable irregularities in, and questions surrounding, his home-life to see the vanity of such an undertaking. Augustine says that Adeodatus was raised orthodox,¹⁵⁵ which suggests that Anonyma 1 was

¹⁴⁵ Beaucamp, op. cit. (n. 135), vol. 1, 297. There is a certain amount of inscriptional evidence in Plassard, op. cit. (n. 79), 110, 112, 115 n. 2 (numerous examples), 135, 140–1, and 155–6. The difficulty with inscriptional evidence for concubinage between free individuals, as Plassard himself notes (161), is that it is impossible to determine the profession of the woman, and any, or all, could be women without *conubium*, actresses or prostitutes. Here the mute stones are silent. Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 142), 65 and 67, notes that one often cannot tell whether a free woman was free born or freed. Her study of Roman and Italian inscriptions (79 and 80–1) yields very few examples of *ingenuae* in concubinages.

¹⁴⁶ Beaucamp, op. cit. (n. 135), 298; Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 207.

¹⁴⁷ Historia Augusta, *Marcus Aurelius* 29.

¹⁴⁸ Treggiari, op. cit. (n. 142), 77, 'Known freeborn concubines are few and not displayed'. An exception is the case discussed in *Dig.* 34.9.16.1 'Papinianus libro octavo responsorum Quoniam stuprum in ea contrahi non placuit, quae se non patroni concubinam esse patitur, eius, qui concubinam habuit, quod testamento relictum est, actio non denegabitur. idque in testamento Coccei Cassiani clarissimi viri, qui Rufinam ingenuam honore pleno dilexerat, optimi maximeque principes nostri iudicaverunt: cuius filiam, quam alumnam testamento Cassianus nepti

coheredem datam appellaverat, vulgo quaesitam apparuit'. See Plassard, op. cit. (n. 79), 73–84 and Olsen, op. cit. (n. 142), 168–9.

¹⁴⁹ Contrast the legal nightmare attested in Cicero, *De Oratore* 1.183 and 238.

¹⁵⁰ See Plassard, op. cit. (n. 79), 100–3, for some of the problems involved in assessing the epigraphic evidence to determine whether the relationship was a concubinage.

¹⁵¹ Unfortunately the poetry of blameless concubinage fails to rival in quantity even the slim volume of the poetry of married love, and the institution failed to come under the lash of satire.

¹⁵² Concubinages suffer from numerous disabilities in the competition for air time in the sources: they involved women, usually ones of lower social status, they were extra-legal, and were sometimes concealed.

¹⁵³ Arjava, op. cit. (n. 114), 208, notes the apparent disappearance of young wastrels' concubinages during the early Principate until the time when Church Fathers began to attack such arrangements.

¹⁵⁴ If one took a modern analogy, there are probably quite a few concubinages passing as marriages in life (and in statistics) and considerable numbers of real concubinages that simply cannot be recovered from written records.

¹⁵⁵ See *Conf.* 9.6.14 'Quod enim et nutriebatur a nobis in disciplina tua, tu inspiraveras nobis'.

orthodox and took charge of his religious education, as Monica had of Augustine's.¹⁵⁶ But how did the differences in Augustine's and his partner's confessions affect their relationship? Was it possible that religious differences prevented them from marrying?¹⁵⁷ Even more questions surround the relationship when viewed from Anonyma 1's point of view. The 'parental permission' was not just that of Patricius and Monica. Did the other family also accede to Augustine living with their daughter? Were they in no position to insist upon marriage? Were they glad to get her off their hands at no expense — and no security? Was she an orphan or a woman with no family to protect her? Or an independent-minded creature who told her parents that she was packing her bags and moving to Augustine's? Did she perhaps enjoy Monica's limited approval for a while because she was not a Manichee?¹⁵⁸ We have no way of knowing.

The couple's decision to leave the *naturalis filius*, Adeodatus, with his father raises further questions. Normally a concubine's offspring inherited his mother's social status and had no testamentary expectations of his father — unless his father died intestate with no legitimate heirs.¹⁵⁹ Adeodatus' intellectual promise may have suggested a career in Italy, where he could be helped by his father,¹⁶⁰ rather than a return to obscurity in Africa with his mother. Monica may have wanted to keep the boy, however eager she was to disembarass herself of his mother. Anonyma 1, if she planned to become a nun,¹⁶¹ might have found the monastic life easier to contemplate without a male child to provide for and tend. Or perhaps she felt ready to leave him with his father after the baptism of A.D. 387?¹⁶² One wonders though how the presence of Adeodatus was regarded by Augustine's prospective in-laws. If children were expected of Augustine's future marriage, he would have been in competition for resources. Yet the boy stayed. And the mother clearly had something to return to in Africa, perhaps a family who might not have welcomed a bastard son.

I am thus suggesting that Augustine, who struggled to define marriage in varying historical and theological contexts, exploited the open border in Roman law between marriage and concubinage. From A.D. 371/2 onwards he may have considered himself from a legal standpoint to be in a *de facto* marriage with a woman who could have been his wife *de iure*.¹⁶³ They may well have regarded each other as *coniuges*. He did not, however, call the relationship a marriage, because Monica did not want him married to any woman of lower or equal status. Nor was he able to justify it as a marriage when Monica applied pressure on him to dismiss Anonyma 1 in A.D. 385. But the relationship

¹⁵⁶ See Chadwick, *op. cit.* (n. 108), 218–19.

¹⁵⁷ E. Schmitt, *Le Mariage chrétien dans l'oeuvre de Saint Augustin* (1983), 27, suggests that a Manichee Akousmatic would have preferred co-habitation to marriage (Chadwick, *op. cit.* (n. 108), 219 disagrees) and that marriage would have made a promotion to one of the Elect impossible.

¹⁵⁸ For quasi-marital relationships among the religious see Jerome, *Ep.* 22.14, who denounces *subintroductae* in terms that condemn the deliberate blurring of the borders between the wife, the concubine, and the whore: 'Unde sine nuptiis aliud nomen uxorum? Immo unde novum concubinarum genus? Plus inferam: unde meretrices univirae?'

¹⁵⁹ Clark, *op. cit.* (n. 33), 33. Arjava, *op. cit.* (n. 114), 209, suggests that they normally were given custody of the children.

¹⁶⁰ For restrictions on donations and bequests to illegitimate children in the Constantinian marriage legislation, and the subsequent relaxation of prohibitions under Valentinian I in A.D. 371, see Evans Grubbs, *op. cit.* (n. 73), 213, and Arjava, *op. cit.* (n. 114), 212–14. The law at this date was presumably that of *Cod. Theod.* 4.6.4 (A.D. 371, apparently abrogated in A.D. 397 by *Cod. Theod.* 4.6.5), whereby a

father with legitimate descendants might leave one-twelfth of his estate to his natural children and/or their mother. If he had no legitimate descendants, then one-quarter.

¹⁶¹ This may possibly be the implication of 'ovens tibi' in *Conf.* 6.15.25.

¹⁶² For the baptism, see *Conf.* 9.6.14 'sociavimus eum coevum nobis in gratia tua, educandum in disciplina tua: et baptizati sumus . . .'

¹⁶³ In *Augustine of Hippo* Peter Brown, *op. cit.* (n. 6), 39, suggested that Augustine's concubinage was effectively the marriage that he wanted, but not one he enjoyed. 'He had, in this way, got what he wanted: he had at last been "washed up on the shores of matrimony"'. Whether he particularly enjoyed the experience is another matter.' This view is favourably modified in *Body and Society*, *op. cit.* (n. 16), 390: 'Augustine chose his companion because he loved her; and he slept with her because he loved to do so, and not so as to produce grandchildren for his mother or citizens for his home town.' He thus laid the ground for the equation of concubinage with *de facto* marriage and equated the *coniugale litus* of Book 2 with the relationship with Anonyma 1, first mentioned in *Confessions* 4.

may well have had Rorschach Blot-like qualities: one saw in it what one wanted to see.¹⁶⁴ While it continued, it met the Christian standard for marriage of the *DGAL*. But it was also deniable for secular legal and social-climbing purposes. 'Ergo parietes faciunt Christianos?', joked Marius Victorinus in *Conf.* 8.2.4. There may be a similar quibble here.

We thus have to balance the supine, ambitious, and canny Augustine who may have taken the path of least resistance against the man who clearly felt the unpleasant disjunction between social convention and reality, particularly when mandated or enforced by others, and resented it. His actions show the former. The tone of many of his allusions to matrimony in the *Confessions* betrays the latter. There is also the later Augustine who was trying to work out marriage in its historical, biblical, theological, and legal perspective, both in his *DGAL* and in the *De bono coniugali*. He did not, however, only work *out* marriage, but was working *through* marriage and his own concubinage at a later stage in his life. What he did, the resentment at family and society, the intellectual attempts to set matters straight and make them right after his own personal role had ended, all of the above need to be considered as a whole in assessing his relationship with Anonyma 1. But after trying to sort through Augustine's deliberate and guilty vaguenesses and map them onto a time-scale and social and legal realia, it would be wrong to leave the topic without giving him the last emotional word on his relationship with his partner. For the deepest truth lies in the passage with which we began.

CONCLUSION

Each man in his life plays many parts. Augustine's included Aeneas, the Prodigal Son, Moses *Neoplatonicus*, and the Christian Heracles.¹⁶⁵ We should add Adam also to this list. Augustine's companion was taken away from him in a bitter echo of the original Creation-scene: torn from his side, leaving a wound that, unlike Adam's, refuses to heal. *Confessions* 6.15.25 should be vindicated for fans of the discarded Anonyma. Far from a cold-blooded account of a regrettable but familiar type of episode,¹⁶⁶ it is a complex and brilliant piece of writing that modulates between subliminal suggestion, evasion of the unacceptable, and hints of lost mysteries. One scholar has called this passage a 'tactful treatment' of the pain of separation.¹⁶⁷ This is to trivialize its biblical typology, its self-aware irony in the use of virtual indirect discourse, and its scathing sarcasm at his own and others' expense. Augustine had already problematized marriage in *Conf.* 4.2.2 in his bitter expression: 'non eo quod legitimum vocatur coniugio.' The debate about what constituted a marriage continued in Book 6. In the *Aeneid* it was Dido who 'called it a marriage'.¹⁶⁸ Here Augustine paid this nameless woman that final homage: she had become so much 'flesh of his flesh' that he suffered an unhealable wound when she

¹⁶⁴ It almost certainly could have illustrated the Rashomon syndrome too and seemed a marriage to Anonyma 1 and to Augustine and a temporary concubinage to Monica. Treggiari, *op. cit.* (n. 142), 61, allows for such situations: 'Whether a given relationship is a marriage or not may therefore be privileged information. The will of both partners is needed to make a marriage; the lack of intention of one partner suffices to reduce the union to *concubinatus*, conceivably unbeknownst to the other.'

¹⁶⁵ See D. R. Shanzer, 'Latent narrative patterns,

allegorical choices, and literary unity in Augustine's *Confessions*, *Vigiliae Christianae* 46 (1992), 40–56.

¹⁶⁶ S. Lancel, *Saint Augustin* (1999), 110: 'Ce qu'on sait de la banalité, alors, d'une telle pratique ne la rend pas moins choquante, quand son bénéficiaire s'appelle Augustin.'

¹⁶⁷ Solignac, *op. cit.* (n. 1), 679: 'toute la netteté désirable.'

¹⁶⁸ *Aeneid* 4. 172 'coniugium vocat, hoc praetexit nomine culpam'.

departed. If Adam and Eve were married in Eden, then so, in a sense, was she married to Augustine.¹⁶⁹

Cornell University

drs8@cornell.edu

¹⁶⁹ Lancel, *op. cit.* (n. 166), 112 agrees. For a fine later example of the wound caused by the separation of man and wife's 'one flesh', see F. Neyt and P. de

Angelis-Noah (eds), *Barsanuphe et Jean de Gaza, Correspondance* (1998), *Ep.* 129, p. 487. I am grateful to Peter Brown for the reference.