

[AccueilRevenir à l'accueilCollectionBoite\\_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\_f0024

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

---

he does not specifically attribute this view on the levirate as a θνητή ἀνάστασις to the Sadducees.

Coming back to the question of the background of the idea that "the resurrection has taken place in the children that we have", we suggest, in agreement with Zahn, that it is the Jewish institution of the levirate, in terms of *Gen.* 38, 8: ἀνιστάναι σπέρμα. This expression could easily pave the way for a different understanding of the ἀνάστασις<sup>13</sup>. On the other hand, it should be noticed that the levirate is rooted in the same profoundly human desire as referred to by Plato in *Nom.* 4, 721C: the desire for the permanence of the name (τὸ... μὴ ἀνόνομον κείσθαι τετελευκότεν τοῦ τοιοῦτου ἐστὶν ἐπιθυμία; cf. *Deut.* 25, 6: οὐκ ἐξαλειφθήσεται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐξ Ἰσραηλ). We may point to another similarity between Plato and the Jewish tradition. As for the former a person's ἀρετή is a superior way of immortality than his posterity (*Symp.* 209CD), so the author of the Book of Wisdom judges it better not to have children and to possess virtue (ἀτεχνία μετὰ ἀρετῆς), because immortality (ἀθανασία) is attached to its memory (4, 1). This observation makes it even more difficult to say from what source Demas and Hermogenes derived their teaching. It may be that the author of the Acts of Paul labelled a belief that was common to Greek and Jew, or even a commonplace that can be heard at any period of the history of mankind ("immortality by posterity"), with the christian name of resurrection, and put that in the mouth of Paul's opponents to make it the counterpart of his own ('pauline') teaching ("resurrection only by virginity"). This labelling may have been suggested to him by *Gen.* 38, 8 via *Mt.* 22, 24.

To conclude, for the author of the APT<sub>h</sub> there are two ways which lead to resurrection: procreation (in marriage) or virginity. The two are diametrically opposed: one chooses either the one or the other, but the only way a christian is allowed, or rather, obliged to take is that of virginity. The other way is that of lust and impurity, and leads to death and corruption. This means that marriage is to be rejected. This exclusiveness is characteristic of the Encratites' radicalism.

## 2. *The Gospel of the Egyptians* (EvEg).

In the Third Book of the Stromateis Clement of Alexandria gives the following description of the egyptian Encratites:

they have received the resurrection, as they say, and for that reason they reject marriage (48,1).

We notice immediately a striking difference with the APT<sub>h</sub>. Whereas in the latter the resurrection is the future remuneration for those who reject marriage, the Encratites criticized by Clement seem to have taken over the viewpoint of Paul's opponents in the APT<sub>h</sub>, viz. that the resurrection has already taken place. As G. Quispel has rightly seen, the Encratites' attitude rests on an exegesis of *Lk.* 20, 34-36<sup>14</sup>. As this text is very important for our subject and has played a considerable role in ascetic and monastic literature<sup>15</sup>, we must deal briefly with it. It is part of the Lord's answer to the Sadducees' question on the resurrection. It runs like this:

The children of this world marry and are given in marriage; 35 but they which are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage: 36 neither can they die anymore: for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

13. But whereas the words from *Gen.* 38,8 say that it is the seed that is raised, in APT<sub>h</sub> it is not clear, whether it is the parents that rise in their children, or the children that rise, or are raised by the parents.

14. Makarius, *das Thomasevangelium und das*

*Lied von der Perle*, Leyden, 1967, p. 83.

15. See S. FRANK, 'ATTELKOE BIOE. Begriffsanalytische und begriffsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum „engelgleichen Leben“ im frühen Mönchtum, Münster 1964.

BnF  
MSS

be done, but possibly attribute the view on the subject as a policy statement to the State.

Looking back to the question of the background of the idea that "the restriction has taken place in the children that we have," we suggest in agreement with Lewis that it is the Jewish tradition of the law, in terms of the 10 commandments. This statement could easily have the way for a different understanding of the law. On the other hand, it should be noted that the Jewish law is based in the same fundamental human ideas as referred to by Plato in *Timaeus* 47c. The basis for the formation of the laws (the 10 commandments) is based on the same fundamental ideas. We may point to another example of the same fundamental ideas in the Jewish tradition. As for the former a Jew's duty is a duty between Jews and the Jewish tradition. As for the latter a Jew's duty is a duty to God. William judges it better not to have children with a non-Jewish woman (because they are not Jewish). This statement is attached to his memory (47c). This statement is even more difficult to say than what Lewis and Harman have said that was a common thing. It may be that the author of the Acts of Paul labelled a letter that was common to Greek and Jew, or even a commonality that can be found in any part of the history of mankind ("immortality by possibility") with the Christian name of man, and put that in the mouth of Paul's opponents to make it the counterpart of his own (Pauline) teaching ("immortality only by virginity"). This labelling may have been suggested to him by the Acts of Paul, 28-30.

To conclude, for the author of the Acts of Paul there are two ways which lead to immortality: that of virginity and that of marriage. The two are diametrically opposed, and characterize the way to the other, but the only way a woman is allowed, excited, obliged to take is that of virginity. The other way is that of law and immortality, and leads to death and corruption. This means that marriage is to be rejected. This explanation is characteristic of the Christian tradition.

2. The origin of the restriction (1978)

In the Third Book of the Summary of the Christian Church of Alexandria gives the following description of the restriction:

They have received the restriction, as they say, and for that reason they reject marriage (48.1).  
We notice immediately a striking difference with the Acts of Paul. Whereas in the latter the restriction is the direct consequence for those who reject marriage, the restriction is introduced by Clement seems to have taken over the treatment of Paul's opponents in the Acts. It is clear that the restriction has already taken place. As St. Origen has rightly seen, the restriction, which seems to be a consequence of the Acts, is very important for our subject and has played a considerable role in ancient and modern literature. We must deal briefly with it. It is part of the Pauline answer to the heathen question on the restriction. It was the first.

The children of the world marry and are given to marriage; 27 but they which are accounted worthy to obtain that world, and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; 28 neither can they be married for they are equal unto the angels; and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection.

It is clear that the words here are not the Pauline words, but are the words of the Acts. It is the reason that the Acts is not the Acts of Paul, but the Acts of Paul and the Acts of Paul. The Acts of Paul and the Acts of Paul are the same. The Acts of Paul and the Acts of Paul are the same. The Acts of Paul and the Acts of Paul are the same.