

[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_f0025

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

The Codex Bezae (D) has in v. 35, before "marry and given in marriage": are begotten and beget (γεννῶνται καὶ γεννῶσιν), of which, according to the syriac versions, the aramaic original may have been: yale dhin umole dhin (in Greek: τίκτους καὶ γεννῶσιν)¹⁶.

We make two remarks on this text. First, as P. Nagel has pointed out¹⁷, the lukan text, especially in the old syriac versions, can easily be read in this way, that, as in the APTh, abstinence from marriage is a condition for having part in the resurrection and the world to come: those who have been accounted worthy of it, *already* do not marry nor are they given in marriage. Nagel seems to leave undecided whether in this interpretation v. 36 refers to the present or the future situation of those who do not marry. But it is also possible to interpret the text in such a way, that all what is said in vv. 35-36 applies to the *present* situation of the Encratites; they anticipated the situation after the resurrection, i.e. they had already part in the resurrection and the angelic life while abstaining from marriage. They could consider themselves as already transferred to the other, new eon, though still being in the midst of the children of this world. This interpretation which, as we shall see, was that of the Egyptian Encratites, is not ruled out by the text itself.

Secondly, the lukan text suggests a certain relation between marriage and death. It follows from v. 36 that marriage ceases to exist when people have obtained the resurrection and have become immortal. The text says that marriage is only characteristic of the present eon, or, as Origen puts it in his commentary on the passage: "Hic vero, ubi mors, et nuptiae et liberi necessarii sunt; ubi autem immortalitas, nec coniugio opus est nec filiis" (Hom. in *Luc*, 39, 2; GCS 35, p. 227, 6-9). — Although in this eschatological text, there is no attempt of a 'protological' explanation of marriage (viz. as necessitated by death and the expulsion from Paradise), it nevertheless suggests that death is the cause of marriage. As we shall see, this aspect will be further developed in 4th-century writings on virginity. But even if the text refers to the eschatological situation after the resurrection ("at the resurrection, when death is abolished marriage is no longer meaningful and, therefore, ceases to exist"), the conclusion could easily be drawn, that by abstaining from marriage man could anticipate the future eschatological situation, and overcome death. Again the future eschatology is then turned into realized eschatology without violence being done to the text.

If we compare this text from the Gospel with the platonic-aristotelian view, it appears that the former reveals the reverse aspect of the latter; whereas for Plato marriage (= procreation) means the overcoming of death, a way to immortality, in the lukan text it is death that necessitates marriage and resurrection or (personal) immortality that makes it superfluous.

We turn now back to the Encratites of Strom. 3, 48. It will be clear that they interpreted *Lk.* 20, 35-36 in the sense of realized, or anticipated eschatology. — Perhaps without denying that there will be a future resurrection, they claim that they already partake in it and, therefore, reject marriage. It appears from Clement's account that they referred to this text to justify their way of life; Clement tries very hard to refute this interpretation (87, 1-88, 1).

It is possible that the Encratites referred to in Strom. 3, 48 also used the Gospel of the Egyptians; as a matter of fact, a quotation from this Gospel is to be found shortly before in par. 43, without, however, an explicit reference to the source of the quotation; but from par. 63-64 we may derive that this source is the EvEg. The following passages of this apocryphal gospel are relevant for our purpose. There is, first, Salome's question to the Lord, of which there are two versions: "How much longer will Death have power?" (45) and: "Until when will men die?" (64). The answer is in both cases the same: "As long as (you) women give birth". The other passage runs like this: "They (scil. the Encratites)

16. QUISPÉL, o.c. p. 82.



17. o.c. p. 34-39.

The Greek text (B) has in v. 42, before "marry and given in marriage," *καὶ ποιεῖται* (and he/she will do/make), of which, according to the Greek version, the woman ought not have been told (in Greek *ποιεῖται καὶ γυναικὶ* M).

The text has two variants on this word. First, as F. Nagele has pointed out, the Latin text, especially in the Vulgate version, can easily be read in this way, that, as in the V.T., the woman from marriage is a condition for having part in the resurrection and the world in marriage. Nagele seems to have understood whether in the interpretation v. 42 refers to the present or the future situation of those who do not marry. But it is also possible to interpret the text in such a way, that all what is said in vv. 32-42 applies to the future situation of the Resurrection; they anticipated the question after the resurrection, but they had already part in the resurrection and the angelic life while waiting from marriage. They could consider themselves as already transferred to the other, new world, though still being in the midst of the children of this world. This interpretation which, as we shall see, was that of the Egyptian Ecclesiastical, is not told out by the text itself.

Secondly, the Latin text suggests a certain relation between marriage and death. It follows from v. 42 that marriage cannot exist when people have obtained the resurrection and have become immortal. The text says that marriage is only characteristic of the present age, or, as Origen puts it in his commentary on the passage: "Hic vero, ubi nunc, et nuptiae et haec res necessaria sunt; ubi enim immortales, nec coniugio opus est nec filii" (there is here, now, v. 42-43, p. 275-6-7). — Although in this ecclesiastical text there is no mention of a "resurrection," expression of marriage (v. 42) is connected by death and the resurrection from death; it is nevertheless suggested that death is the cause of marriage. As we shall see, this aspect will be further developed in the context with regard to virginity. However, if the text refers to the ecclesiastical situation after the resurrection ("at the resurrection," when death is abolished), there is no longer meaningful and, therefore, cannot exist, the condition could easily be dropped, then by eliminating from marriage man could anticipate the future ecclesiastical situation, and overcome death. Again the future ecclesiology is then turned into ecclesiology without virginity being taken to the text.

If we compare this text from the Gospel with the Platonic ecclesiastical view, it appears that the former reveals the reverse aspect of the latter: whereas for Plato marriage (= procreation) means the overcoming of death, a way to immortality, in the Latin text it is death that reconciles marriage and resurrection or (personally) immortality that makes it superfluous.

We turn now back to the Ecclesiastical of Strom 2, 42. It will be clear that this interpretation of v. 42, 43-44 is in the sense of spiritual, or ecclesiastical, virginity. — Perhaps without denying that there will be a future resurrection, they claim that they already possess it and, therefore, reject marriage. It appears from Clement's account that they referred to this text to justify their way of life; Clement tries very hard to return this interpretation (87, 1-33, 1).

It is possible that the Ecclesiastical referred to in Strom 2, 42 also used the Gospel of the Egyptians; as a matter of fact, a quotation from this Gospel is to be found shortly before in par. 42, without, however, an explicit reference to the source of the quotation. The following passage has been put 63-64 we may derive that this source is the I.V.E.G. There is, first, Salome's question in this apocryphal Gospel no relevance for our purpose. There is, first, Salome's question in the Lord, of which there are two versions: "How much longer will I have power?" (42) and "Until when will I die?" (64). The answer is in both cases the same: "As long as (you) women give birth". The other passage runs like this: "They (both the Ecclesiastical