Introduction: Augustine’s conversion to Christianity

Augustine of Hippo (354–430 CE) was not only concerned with his own self-promotion but also eminently endowed with the rhetorical skills to convey the desired image of himself. For evidence of this we need look no further than his *Confessions*,1 in which the newly appointed bishop provides us with his version of events leading up to his conversion to Christianity in 386. While debates have arisen over the truth of the story – it has even been argued that Augustine was converted in 386 not to Christianity but to Neoplatonism2 – the narrator’s account has set the terms of the debate so completely that his readers have accepted his judgement that the defining moment of his life was his conversion in 386 (whether it was to Christianity or Neoplatonism or some mixture of the two). O’Donnell sounds a cautionary note here:

It remains the assumption, in short, of all modern biographers – hostile, friendly, and merely attentive – that a “conversion” in Milan, on or about the time of 386, is the central and most powerful explanatory fact about Augustine’s life. Augustine would be pleased that we agree with him so readily.

But perhaps we should not. Perhaps Augustine, in telling this story about himself, had interests and purposes he could not avow. Perhaps this retrospective story, which first appears almost a decade later in something like its *Confessions* form, is creating a structure for the past that is not irrefutable.3

We would do well to heed O’Donnell’s caution. It is true, of course, that the *Confessions* is a great boon to our understanding of Augustine. Moreover, I believe that the narrator is a great deal more accurate, and more literal, in his retelling of the events than is generally appreciated. But however accurate the detail, every story is told (and heard) from one perspective or another.

---

1 But further evidence may be drawn from *Retractationes*, written near the end of his life, in which Augustine does us the service of arranging his voluminous corpus, correcting and (re)interpreting his writings where he sees fit.
2 See below, p. 20.
And such is the force of the personality narrating the *Confessions* that, unless we are very much on our guard, his perspective will become ours as well. And this may keep us from an adequate understanding of Augustine. Again – the point bears repeating – this is certainly not to cast aspersions upon Augustine’s honesty. It is only to say that there is more to Augustine than what he tells us about himself directly. And no one is more sensitive to this fact than the narrator of the *Confessions* himself, who recognizes that man is not entirely transparent even to himself, but only to God, his Creator.  

Now that we have signalled the danger of leaning too heavily upon the official story of Augustine’s conversion, let us review the main elements of this story.

### EARLY LIFE

Aurelius Augustinus was a North African, probably of Berber stock, and spent the bulk of his life in what is today Algeria. He was born on 13 November in 354 CE, in the town of Tagaste (modern Souk Ahras, Algeria), which was situated in the north-eastern part of the Roman province of Numidia, near the modern Algerian-Tunisian border. His mother Monica was Christian while his father Patricius may have been pagan, although he would be baptized late in life. Augustine was raised with the religion of his mother, and seems to have believed, to the best of his ability, in what was being instilled in him at this tender age. As he recalls in the *Confessions*, ‘While still a boy I was hearing about an eternal life...’
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4 *Conf.* 10.5.7.  
5 *Confessions* is our primary source for details of Augustine’s life prior to his conversion. All of his extant writings postdate his conversion. He did compose a two- or three-volume work c. 380, entitled ‘On the beautiful and the fitting’ (*De pulchro et apto*), but it is lost and had already been lost in Augustine’s own lifetime (*Conf.* 4.13.20); cf. Solignac, *BA* 13, 1962, pp. 670–3.  
6 *De beat. vit.* 1.6.  
7 *Vit.* 1.1.1.  
8 This is a common view, but has been challenged by Fredriksen 2008, p. 3 and p. 379, n. 1.  
9 Augustine was himself a Donatist, but later converted to Catholicism.  
10 *Conf.* 9.9.22.  
11 Cf. C. Acad. 2.2.5; *De duab. anim.* 1.1. Monica’s religious background is bound up with that of the turbulent North African church of the fourth century, which was divided into Donatists and Caecilianists (or Catholics), who received the support of Rome. The theological faultline was the issue of the *tradiiores* (traitors), those clerics who had ‘handed over’ the Scriptures to be burned by the imperial authorities in times of persecution. The Donatists insisted that the sin of the *tradiiores* was so grave that the sacraments they administered were ineffectual; the Caecilianists, on the other hand, insisted upon the absolute efficacy of the sacraments. Augustine’s hometown of Tagaste had once been Donatist but was officially converted to Caecilianism, along with the rest of Donatist Africa, by imperial decree in the late 340s. The conflict would continue, however, and eventually Augustine himself would play an important role in promoting the Caecilianists, or what he would call the ‘Catholic Church’. See O’Donnell 2005a, pp. 209–43.
promised to us through the humility of the Lord our God, who had come down to our pride … I then believed, along with my mother and the entire household, except my father.\footnote{Conf. 1.11.17.} Following the example of those he observed praying to God, he diligently beseeched this great invisible being, as he imagined him, to spare him from beatings in school.\footnote{Conf. 1.9.14.}

At school Augustine studied classical literature, which had the effect of undermining his Christian morality. The lustful characters depicted so eloquently in the pagan myths were glorified by Augustine’s teachers, who were more concerned to educate their pupils in grammar than in morality.\footnote{Conf. 1.19.30.} Augustine began to develop some vices of his own: he disobeyed his parents and teachers,\footnote{Conf. 2.4.9.} told ‘countless lies’, stole food from home, cheated at games and was furious when others did the same.\footnote{Conf. 2.3.7.} One night he and a band of hooligans stole a large quantity of pears from a tree, not because they wanted to eat the fruit, but simply because the action was prohibited.\footnote{Conf. 1.16.26–1.19.30.} Delighting in his sinful ways not only for their own sake but also for the praise and prestige that he received from such acts, Augustine felt such shame at participating less in wickedness than his peers that he even fabricated stories of his vile doings, fearing to be regarded as more innocent and chaste than the others.\footnote{Conf. 1.10.16.} (There may be a subtext here, as O’Meara has pointed out, which is that the boy Augustine was not really as bad as the narrator of the \textit{Confessions} makes him sound, for he actually ‘had to make an effort to keep up with his companions’.\footnote{Conf. 1.3.1.}) Augustine’s parents did little to restrain their son.\footnote{Conf. 1.3.8.} Monica did counsel him to chastity – and Patricius derided her counsel as ‘womanish’ – but Patricius was only too pleased to see the signs of his son’s physical maturity and to think of the grandchildren who could not be far off.\footnote{Conf. 1.3.6.}

Although he was a landowner of modest means, Patricius scraped together enough money to send Augustine to study in the nearby town of Madauros (modern Mdaourouch, Algeria) and then, in 371, to Carthage (near Tunis), the main centre of Roman Africa. The big city left its mark upon the seventeen-year-old, as the narrator of the \textit{Confessions} vividly recalls: ‘I came to Carthage [\textit{Karthago}], where a cauldron [\textit{sartago}] of shamefull loves boiled all around me.’\footnote{Conf. 1.3.1.} Augustine was strongly attracted by sex, and took up residence with a certain woman (whom he never identifies) who would give birth to his only son, Adeodatus. Their common-law arrangement, which would last some fifteen years, was a perfectly normal
one in Roman society, but Augustine would later denigrate it as ‘the bargain of a lustful love’.

The year 373 was a pivotal one for Augustine. In that year the nineteen-year-old read Cicero’s *Hortensius* – essentially an introduction to philosophy – in the ordinary course of his studies. This book, of which only fragments survive today, inflamed him with the desire to attain wisdom. Unfortunately, his knowledge of the Greek language was minimal, which effectively precluded him from any serious study of the classical philosophical tradition until he encountered some ‘books of the Platonists’ in Latin translation thirteen years later (we will examine this development shortly). Moreover, he could not be satisfied with a wisdom that was purely pagan, as he was convinced that wisdom must have something to do with ‘the name of Christ’ (the religion of his mother had instilled this much in him). And so he turned to the Christian Scriptures, apparently the first time he had paid them any serious attention. Unfortunately, he was quickly repulsed by the simplicity of their style, which paled in comparison with Cicero’s eloquence.

He turned next to the Manichaeans, who receive this unflattering introduction in the *Confessions*:

I fell in with men blabbering arrogantly, excessively carnal and talkative men. The snares of the devil were in their mouths, and a bird-lime made from a mixture of the syllables of Your Name and of the Lord Jesus Christ and of the Paraclete our Comforter, the Holy Spirit. These names did not leave their lips, but only as a sound and a noise of the tongue, while their heart was empty of the truth.

This does not, of course, reflect Augustine’s attitude to the Manichaeans in 373. Nevertheless, the passage does allow us to see why the nineteen-year-old would have been attracted to the sect: like Cicero, they spoke eloquently; and like Augustine’s childhood religion, they had ‘the name of Christ’ (and of the Father and Holy Spirit).

**Manichaeism**

Manichaeism was a remarkably successful gnostic religion that began in Persia with the prophet Mani (216–c. 277) and had by Augustine’s time reached the height of its influence in the Roman Empire (it would later extend east as far as China). It was a dualistic religion, telling the story of a cosmic struggle between two opposed principles or ‘kingdoms’: Light and Darkness. The kingdom of Light was governed by God and the kingdom of
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22 Conf. 4.2.2.  
23 Conf. 3.4.7–8.  
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28 On Manichaeism at the time of Augustine, see Van Oort et al. 2001; Decret 1995a; Lieu 1985.
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Darkness by Hyle (Matter), or Satan, the ‘Prince of Darkness’. The two kingdoms were originally separate, but the kingdom of Light was later attacked by the kingdom of Darkness, and in the ensuing conflict particles of Light became imprisoned within the realm of Darkness. Manichaens believed that this was the present condition of the universe. All that was in the universe, including humankind, was a mixture of Light and Darkness. The soul, an emanation from God, was presently trapped within the body, a product of the evil Darkness. Thus each person was a battleground in the struggle between Light and Darkness, or Good and Evil. The apostle Paul often refers to this struggle, as at Rom. 7:23: ‘But I see another law in my members, fighting against the law of my mind and captivating me in the law of sin that is in my members.’ The struggle against Evil is a struggle against an alien entity (the body), for humans are essentially identified with their souls. Humans will only achieve salvation by separating themselves, through an ascetic lifestyle, from the particles of Darkness that have infiltrated their nature. (In practice, however, Manichaens were divided into two classes: the ‘elect’, who were required to adopt lives of poverty, vegetarianism and chastity, and the ‘hearers’, who were able to admire the ascetic life from a safe distance.)

The Father of Light had sent many messengers, including Zoroaster, Buddha, Jesus and, finally, Mani (the ‘seal of the prophets’), to teach this way of salvation. The Manichaens regarded Jesus as the divine Son of God, but not as the Word made flesh in whom the Catholics believed. He was not ‘born, according to the flesh, of the seed of David’. Because ‘flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God’ (1 Cor. 15:50), Jesus instead had to be a ‘spiritual Saviour’. He took on the appearance (but not the reality) of a physical body, and his suffering and death were therefore only an appearance. As for Mani, he was identified with the Paraclete promised by Jesus (John 14:16, 14:26, 15:26, 16:7), whom the Catholics erroneously believed to have been sent at Pentecost (Acts 2). Modern scholars have debated the religious origin of Manichaemism: was it rooted in Christianity or did it spring from Persian (Zoroastrian) stock and subsequently take on a Christian veneer in order to facilitate its spread westward?

101 See, for example, C. Faust. 5.1. The extent to which these requirements were actually followed is, of course, another matter altogether (cf. De mor. ecc. Cath. 2.19.68–72).
102 C. Fort. 19. 103 Cf. C. Fort. 19.
104 Sec. 4, p. 897, l.18: ‘spiritalem secuti sumus salvatorem’.
105 C. Faust. 29.1. 106 C. p. fund. 6.7–9.10; C. Faust. 13.17; C. Felic. 1.9; De haer. 46.16.
most surprised by the suggestion that Manichaeism was not Christian. He was drawn to it because it had ‘the name of Christ’, and even after he left the sect, he continued to believe that its appeal was restricted to those who have ‘in some way already submitted to the name of Christ’. The Manichaens of Augustine’s acquaintance regarded themselves as authentic Christians, followers of the New Testament alone, and vilified the Catholics as ‘semi-Christians’, almost Jews. Because they continued to accept the authority of the Old Testament, the Catholics are likened to those who would foolishly pour two different substances into the same vessel, thinking that the one will complete the other, when the result is in fact the corruption of both. For the Manichaens, the teaching of Jesus is utterly opposed to that of Moses, as is clearly evidenced by the blasphemous words of the latter: ‘Cursed is everyone who hangs on a tree’ (Deut. 21:23). This shows that the New Testament must not be mixed with the Old, just as ‘no one sews a new cloth onto an old garment, otherwise the split becomes worse’ (Matt. 9:16). In worshipping the God of the Hebrews, the Catholic Church is like a bride who is faithless to her bridegroom, Christ, and desires the favours of an inferior lover.

The Catholics believed that the Old Testament must be retained because it prophesied the coming of Christ. But the leading Manichaean teacher of Augustine’s time – Faustus of Milevis (modern Mila, Algeria) – said that he could find no such prophecies, and that, even if they were there, they must be of interest only for the Jews and not for those (like himself) who had converted to Christianity from paganism. Faustus also rejected the Old Testament on moral grounds, seeing much that was objectionable in the lives of the patriarchs and prophets. He catalogued the following offences: Abraham slept with a mistress, and twice gave his wife to foreign kings for their gratification, saying that she was his sister; Lot committed incest with his two daughters; Isaac did the same as his father Abraham, calling his wife Rebecca his sister; Jacob’s four wives fought with each other for the right to sleep with him at night; Judah slept with his daughter-in-law, who was disguised as a prostitute; David seduced the wife of his soldier Uriah, whom he then had killed in battle; Solomon had countless wives, concubines and princesses; Hosea married a prostitute, supposedly at the command of God; Moses committed murder, plundered Egypt, waged wars and committed

As we move into the early years of the twenty-first century, the current general consensus is that Manichaeism has its origin in one stream of early Jewish Christianity, no matter to what extent its further development was influenced by Iranian elements, and that the figure of Jesus is of central or at least great significance to the Manichaean system.
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atrocities. Either these stories were forgeries, Faustus claimed, or the patriarchs really were sinners. In either case the Old Testament should be rejected, certainly an attractive conclusion for the young Augustine, who was also troubled by what he found in the Hebrew Scriptures.

The Manichaeans also rejected as spurious parts of the New Testament. They did not accept the Acts of the Apostles; indeed, this is a book, says Augustine, that the Manichaeans ‘dare not even name’, apparently because the coming of the Paraclete (whom the Manichaeans identify with Mani) is described in it. They did accept the other New Testament books, but saw many interpolations, errors and contradictions in them, attributing all of this to unknown people who aimed to Judaize the Christian faith. Augustine grew sceptical of this claim while he was still a Manichaean, and after he left the sect he insinuated, not without some justification, that the Manichaeans accepted passages as genuine simply because they supported their doctrine, and rejected passages as spurious simply because they did not. He criticized his former co-religionists for divesting Scripture of all authority, and making each person’s mind the sole judge of which passages were genuine, and which were not.

This rational, critical approach to the study of the Scriptures had, however, been very attractive to Augustine as a nineteen-year-old. Indeed, it seems to have been precisely what led him to join the sect:

You know, Honoratus, that we fell in with such men for no other reason than that they were claiming that, apart from frightful authority, by pure and simple reason, they would lead to God, and liberate from all error those who were willing to hear them. For what else compelled me, for nearly nine years, having spurned the religion that had been implanted in me from boyhood by my parents, to follow and hear those men diligently, except that they said that we are frightened by superstition, and that faith is imposed upon us before reason, while they urge no one to faith, unless the truth is first discussed and elucidated?

The Manichaeans had offered Augustine a ‘religion of reason’, thereby setting themselves apart from the Catholics, who insisted upon the importance of faith. It proved to be an irresistible lure for the young Augustine. This proud and intelligent young man, who had no time for ‘old wives’ tales’, promptly rejected the religion of his mother and joined the Manichaeans, during his first stay in Carthage, at the age of nineteen.
Augustine was actively involved with the Manichaeans for nine years, until the age of twenty-eight. He accepted their explanation of evil, convinced that ‘it was not we that sinned, but some other nature sinning in us’.

He debated and proselytized on behalf of the sect, and dutifully brought food to the elect for their ritual use. He remained all the while at the level of a hearer; as such, his access to the writings of Mani and his participation in worship would have been limited, as only the elect were fully initiated into the mysteries of the religion.

He was, however, troubled by some aspects of Manichaean doctrine, and hoped to receive further clarification. Most significantly, he was perplexed by Mani’s astronomical writings, which seemed to be confounded by the accurate predictions of ‘the philosophers’.

Those Manichaeans with whom he discussed these difficulties were unable to provide him with solutions, but assured him that his questions would be answered by Faustus upon the arrival of this esteemed bishop in Carthage. For almost nine years Augustine eagerly waited for this encounter, but when Faustus finally did arrive (in 382 or 383), he proved unable to assuage Augustine’s concerns about Manichaean cosmology. Indeed, he readily confessed his ignorance on such matters, impressing Augustine with his honesty but not his intellect.

Augustine grew increasingly disenchanted with the Manichaeans after this disappointing meeting, which marked the end of his active involvement with the sect. Their promise of a rational approach to the truth now seemed to be a siren song, and Augustine began to fear that his search for wisdom itself might end in failure.

Perhaps as an expression of his disillusionment, Augustine became attracted at this time to the sceptical stance of the New Academy. This school, under the leadership of Carneades in the second century BCE, attacked the views of the Stoics. The Stoics were confident that it was possible for a human to attain knowledge of the world, and to live in accordance with that knowledge. The Academy rejected such ‘dogmatism’, however, arguing that it was impossible to attain knowledge, and that the sapiens, or wise man, should...
therefore withhold all assent in order to avoid error.66 This claim resonated with Augustine, who now felt that he had been rash in his enthusiasm for Manichaeism and was determined not to repeat the mistake.

But Augustine could not be satisfied for long with a thoroughgoing scepticism. For him, wisdom had to involve ‘the name of Christ’, and this was not something he could find with the Academics, or with ‘the philosophers’ whose accurate astronomical predictions had eroded his confidence in Manichaean cosmology.67 And so the disgruntled Manichaean hearer was now willing to reexamine the faith he had so quickly dismissed as a nineteen-year-old. There seemed little reason for optimism, however, as Augustine still felt that the Manichaean criticisms of Catholicism were decisive. He supposed, under the influence of the Manichaeans, that Catholics believed God to be a corporeal substance contained within a human form. This conception of God led him to regard the doctrine of the Word made flesh as utterly repugnant, for it seemed to entail evil, which at that time he identified with matter, somehow being a part of God’s nature.68 Moreover, he still did not think that the Manichaean criticisms of the Scriptures could be answered. Nevertheless, he did at least desire to discuss the difficulties afresh with some learned man free from the prejudices of the Manichaeans.69

Despite his increasing scepticism towards Manichaean doctrine, Augustine continued to network within the Manichaean community. In fact, he spent a considerable amount of time with Faustus when he was in Carthage. The two men found a common interest in literature, and read a number of books together (apparently the bishop’s ignorance of cosmology was not too offputting for Augustine).70 In 383, in search of better students than could be found at Carthage,71 Augustine set sail for Rome, where he became violently ill and recovered in the house of a Manichaean hearer. He also established contacts with the Manichaean elect residing in that city.72 Augustine’s connections paid dividends the following year, as he managed to secure, with the assistance of some Manichaeans, a prestigious appointment as professor of rhetoric at Milan.73

Augustine arrived at Milan in the autumn of 384, outwardly successful but a deeply disillusioned man. He began attending the Catholic church, not because he expected to discover the truth there, but only to catch a
glimpse of the famous Ambrose and to judge the quality of his oratory. (He was impressed, but judged it inferior to that of Faustus.) He may also have been under some pressure to attend because his mother was making arrangements for his marriage (arrangements which necessitated a painful break-up with his long-time concubine). But whatever his motivations, the content of Ambrose’s sermons nevertheless affected Augustine, as he began to see that it was possible to mount a rational defence of the Catholic faith. Augustine discovered that Catholics regarded God as spirit, and not as a corporeal substance confined to human form, as the Manichaeans had led him to suppose. At this point Augustine did not much understand what a spiritual substance was (he conceived of spirit as a more rarefied body, and God as an infinite being containing and penetrating his creation like an infinite sea containing and penetrating an immense but finite sponge); nevertheless, he was impressed (and ashamed) to learn that Catholic beliefs were not what he had thought. He was also impressed by Ambrose’s use of the spirit/flesh distinction in scriptural exegesis. Basing himself upon 2 Cor. 3:6 (“The letter kills, but the spirit gives life”), Ambrose was able to respond to Manichaean objections to the Old Testament by explaining the spiritual meaning of passages that, if taken literally, would seem false.

Augustine listened to all of this with great interest, but it was not enough for him. Because he had resolved to doubt all things, ‘in the manner of the Academics’, he could not accept the Catholic faith simply because it was possible for Ambrose to make a plausible case for its truth. In fact, what Ambrose had done for Augustine was only to show him that Manichaeism and Catholicism were equally defensible. But Augustine was determined not to fall in with the Catholics as he had with the Manichaeans; he would not assent to the Catholic faith until it could be demonstrated with certainty. In the meantime he resolved to make a clear break with the Manichaeans, since their views seemed less probable than those of ‘the philosophers’. He did desire further instruction in the Catholic Church, however, and so he decided to become a catechumen. (Of course, his impending marriage may also have had something to do with this decision.)

Augustine had little direct contact with Ambrose at this time. Ambrose did greet him warmly upon his arrival in Milan, but Augustine found him too busy to hear his concerns at length. Augustine encountered the bishop, for the most part, only as a congregant listening to his preaching.
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