

[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_f0029

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

and late hellenistic spirit ("spätantiker Geist"), but also to notice the affinity of these texts with the ideas of the christian Encratites. Both seem characterized by a sharp dualism in which marriage as the institution that keeps this world going is rejected; Eros and, indeed, the whole realm of γένεσις have become something very inferior. We find an echo of this repudiation of human zest of life and ambition in 1 *John* 2, 15-16. This statement, however, should not blind us to an important difference between the gnostic (izing) and the encratic texts we have discussed. The latter are unmistakably eschatologically coloured; the motivation of encratic life has remained eschatological, however different it may be from the pauline perspective in 1 *Cor.* 7. This eschatological motivation can even be different from one text to another. So in APTh continence is motivated by the hope of the future resurrection as the reward of an encratic life, whereas in the texts produced (and attacked) by Clement in Strom. 3 the idea that the Encratites by their way of life anticipate the eschatological situation (resurrection, victory over death) is predominant. Here we saw the influence of *Lk.* 20, 34-36 at work. In the gnostic texts the eschatological motivation of the rejection of Eros and procreation is completely lacking. The eschatological dualism (this and the coming world) has been replaced by an anthropological dualism: part of man (his body) belongs to this inferior world of senses, Eros and death, another, more essential, part (his mind) belongs to the realm of immortality. The discussion of these few texts shows, that scholars who argue that Encratism and Gnosticism should be nicely distinguished, are right²⁹. On the other hand, I disagree with G. Quispel on the nature of the Encratism of EvEg: it is not hellenistic, but eschatological (Salome's questions!) and, therefore, Jewish-Christian; and the link between marriage and death does not necessarily derive from the Poimandres, but can also be explained from *Lk.* 20, 36, a text of which Quispel is ready to admit the influence on Egyptian Encratism.

We should not think, however, that the Poimandres and the Nag-Hammadi treatise "On the Origin of the World" represent the current gnostic view of procreation. As a matter of fact, we know from Clement's Excerpts that the second century Valentinian gnostic Theodotus criticizes the Encratites' view as laid down in EvEg:

And when the Lord says to Salome that Death will reign as long as women give birth, he does not want to disapprove procreation, as this is necessary for the salvation of the faithful. For this birth has to be there, until the seed (τὸ σπέρμα) that is determined beforehand, has been brought forth (67, 2-3).

As Clement himself³⁰, Theodotus tries to give a non-encratite interpretation of this logion of EvEg. According to him procreation is not in itself meaningful, but only insofar it serves "the salvation of the faithful", i.e. the gathering together of the Elect, the pneumatic seed. Here we have the traditional idea, that the number of the Elect is determined from the beginning, and that the world (and the γένεσις) will not cease to exist before this number is completed. But birth in this world is not in itself good, for it leads to death. In Exc. Theod. 80, 1 we read: "He whom the Mother³¹ begets (γεννᾷ) is brought into death and into the world, but he whom Christ begets again (ἀναγεννᾷ) is transferred to life and to the Ogdoad". We notice that we have here the same equation of world, γένεσις and death as in the encratite texts; but there is now another γένεσις, the ἀναγέννησις, which in Valentinian texts is also called the μόρφωσις. So there are two kinds of γένεσις, the one leading to death, the other to life; the former is only meaningful insofar as it is the necessary condition of the latter.

29. Fundamental for this distinction: F. BOLGIANI, *La tradizione eresiologica sull'Encratismo* I, Atti dell' Acad. delle Scienze di Torino 91 (1956-57) p. 1-71; II, ib. 96 (1961-62), p. 1-128. See also G. QUIPSEL, *o.c.* and in many other publications.

30. See below p. 220-221.

31. The Mother, i.e. the female representing this present world in its need of salvation by the male saviour. See above p. 216-217.

BnF
MSS

and the biblical story ("Spiritus Sanctus," but also to notice the affinity of these texts with the idea of the ancient Gnostics. Both seem characterized by a sharp duality in which marriage as the institution that keeps this world going is rejected; but not, indeed, the whole notion of heaven but heaven as something very inferior. We find an echo of this rejection of human sex of the soul ascription in 1 John 4: 17-18. This statement, however, should not blind us to an important difference between the Gnostic (being) and the biblical text as we have discussed. The latter are unambiguously eschatological; they affirm the mortality of man while the former eschatological, however different it may be from the biblical perspective in 1 Cor. 7. This eschatological mortality can even be different from one text to another. So in 2NTM continuity is maintained by the fact (and stated) by Clement in Strom. 1 the fact that the Christians by their way of life are participating in the resurrection as the reward of an eschatic life, whereas in the text before us we see the influence of 1st Cor. 15: 52 at work. In the Gnostic text the eschatological mortality of those not progressing is completely lacking. The eschatological domain (and with the eschatic world) has been replaced by an anthropological domain (and with this body) belongs to this relative world of heaven, earth and death. Another, more essential, part (the mind) belongs to the world of immortality. The distinction of these two states shows, that scholars who argue that Gnosticism and Gnostic should be clearly distinguished, are right. On the other hand, I disagree with G. Quispel on the nature of the function of 2NTM: it is not eschatological, but eschatological elements and their eschatic derivation from the Gnostics, but can also be explained from 1st Cor. 15: 52. A text of which I agree is ready to admit the influence of 1st Cor. 15: 52.

We should not think, however, that the Gnostics and the 2NTM-Hermetic texts "The Origin of the World" represent the entire Gnostic view of resurrection. As a matter of fact, we know from Clement's letters that the second century Valentinian Gnostic Theodotus criticizes the Gnostics' view as laid down in 1 Peter. And when the text says to believe that death will reign as long as women give birth he does not want to interpret resurrection as the necessity for the resurrection of the dead. For this fact has to be there with the text (1-2) that a resurrected individual has been brought back (1: 2-3).

As Charles Lewis, *Theodotus* tries to give a somewhat interpretation of this text of 1 Peter. According to his interpretation it is not in itself meaningful, but only under a certain "revelation of the insight," i.e. the Gnostic rejection of the flesh, the humanistic view. Thus we have the tradition that the number of the flesh is determined from the beginning, and that the world (and the women) will not cease to exist before the number is completed. But what is this world is not in itself good, for it leads to death in the Flood, so we read: "It is when the flesh begins (again) is translated to death and into the world, not be when flesh begins again (again) is translated to life and to the Ogdoad." We notice that we have here the same rejection of world, flesh and death as in the eschatic text, but here it now means beyond the development, which in Valentinian texts is also called the *epiphany*. He thus has two kinds of death: the one leading to death, the other to life, the former is only meaningful insofar as it is the necessary condition of the latter.

20. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 21. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 22. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 23. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 24. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 25. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 26. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 27. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 28. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 29. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement. 30. Theodotus on the Resurrection: 1 Clement.