

[Accueil](#)[Revenir à l'accueil](#)[CollectionBoite\\_022 | Pères de l'Église](#)[CollectionBoite\\_022-1-chem | Noces spirituelles \[rayé : Chair \(Antiquité\) Virginité\]](#) Item[photocopie]

## [photocopie]

**Auteur : Foucault, Michel**

## Présentation de la fiche

Coteb022\_f0023

SourceBoite\_022-1-chem | Noces spirituelles [rayé : Chair (Antiquité) Virginité]

LangueFrançais

TypePhotocopie

RelationNumérisation d'un manuscrit original consultable à la BnF, département des Manuscrits, cote NAF 28730

## Références éditoriales

Éditeuréquipe FFL (projet ANR *Fiches de lecture de Michel Foucault*) ; projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle).

Droits

- Image : Avec l'autorisation des ayants droit de Michel Foucault. Tous droits réservés pour la réutilisation des images.
- Notice : équipe FFL ; projet EMAN (Thalim, CNRS-ENS-Sorbonne nouvelle).  
Licence Creative Commons Attribution - Partage à l'Identique 3.0 (CC BY-SA 3.0 FR).

Notice créée par [équipe FFL](#) Notice créée le 21/10/2020 Dernière modification le 23/04/2021

---

opponents appear partly pictured as gnostics, which fits in well with the general anti-*gnostic* undertone of the Acts of Paul<sup>9</sup>.

But does the first interpretation equally have such parallels? And where does it derive from? Th. Zahn<sup>10</sup> thinks that the idea of a resurrection in the begetting or raising up of children is based on such biblical expressions as ἀνιστάναι σπέρμα (*Gen.* 38, 8, where there is question of the levirate; *2 Sam.* 7, 12) or ἐγεῖραι τέκνα (*Mt.* 3, 9). On the other hand, according to A. Stüiber, the idea of a resurrection in posterity is by no means gnostic, "sondern eine konservativ-sadduzäische Polemik gegenüber der neu aufkommenden pharisäischen Auferstehungshoffnung, mit der auch rationalistische und materialistische Skeptiker einverstanden sein mochten"<sup>11</sup>. Even if it is very unlikely that Demas and Hermogenes were themselves Sadducees (the party disappeared from the scene after the destruction of Jerusalem and the synod of Jamnia), it remains possible that they took up the sadducean anti-resurrection-polemic of which we also find an example in the Synoptic Gospels (*Mt.* 22, 23-33 par). But how can we be sure? Stüiber refers, in a footnote, to Hipp. Ref. 9, 29, 2, where the author sums up all the false doctrines of the Sadducees. Not only, he says, do they deny the resurrection of the flesh, but they also think, that the soul does not survive; he then goes on: (and they hold that) "the notion of resurrection is fully realized in that one closes one's days after having left children on earth" (ἐν δὲ τούτῳ πληροῦσθαι τὸν τῆς ἀναστάσεως λόγον, ἐν τῷ καταλείψαντας ἐπὶ γῆς τὰ τέκνα τελευτᾶν). One wonders from what source Hippolytus took this information. Certainly not from Josephus. Though there is no explicit reference to the Sadducees' question in the Synoptic Gospels, it is probable that they were Hippolytus' only source. And though he seems to misinterpret their question rather maliciously, it may be deduced from this passage of the Gospel, that the Sadducees over against the modern, pharisaic, conception, held their own view of the resurrection as the raising of posterity. For it is significant that they refer to the levirate in terms of *Gen.* 38, 8, where the expression ἀνιστάναι σπέρμα is used. The ambiguity of the word ἀνιστάναι may have enabled them to propose their alternative conception of resurrection.

Another third-century text needs to be quoted here; Sextus Julius Africanus, trying to harmonize the genealogies of Christ in *Mt.* and *Lk.*, writes:

Since the names of the families in Israel were numbered either by nature or by law; ... by law, when a man begat children in the name of a brother who had died childless; for because no certain hope of resurrection had as yet been given, they portrayed the future promise by a mortal resurrection (ἀναστάσει ἐμιμοῦντο θνητῇ), in order that the name of him who had passed away might not fail to remain for ever (ὅνα ἀνέκλειπτον τὸ ὄνομα μείνῃ)<sup>12</sup>.

We read in *Deut.* 25, 6 that the purpose of the levirate is the permanence of the name of the deceased brother. But the characterization of this marriage as a θνητὴ ἀνάστασις is found nowhere in Jewish sources. It is the christian author, for whom there cannot be a certain hope of resurrection but after the resurrection of Christ, who, from this standpoint, gives his view of the Jewish institution of the levirate. The word ἀνάστασις, however, may have been suggested by *Gen.* 38, 8, where Onan is urged to fulfill his levirate-duty (ἀνάστησον σπέρμα τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου). As a matter of fact, somewhat later in this text Sextus speaks of the ἀναστάσει σπερμάτων. It should be considered, however, that

9. In the edition of LIPSIVS-BONNET (Darmstadt 1959), the words on resurrection—by—knowledge are put between brackets, as they are lacking in three manuscripts; but according to the newly discovered Pap. Heidelb. they are part of the original text.

10. *Geschichte des N.T. Kanons II*, Erlangen-Leipzig, 1890, p. 902, n. 4.

11. *Refrigerium Interim*, Bonn, 1957, p. 102-103.

12. Apud Eus. *H.E.* 1, 7, 2-16; the translation is K. Lake's, in the *Loeb Class. Libr.*, London, 1926, p. 57.

BRF  
MGS

