

[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_f0037

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

not like a barren tree because of their being childless according to the flesh, but as flourishing plants they are adorned with the many fruits of justice (792D-793A).

This passage shows that the ἀθανασία obtained by the engendering of posterity is only a relative one, as it is exceeded by far by the immortality that will be the virgin's part. Here again we notice the coherence of Basil's terminology: this time he does not speak of ἀφθαρσία, but of ἀθανασία. Marriage and virginity are not opposed as φθορά and ἀφθαρσία, but as two forms of ἀθανασία, more precisely, as two ways of overcoming physical death, of which the one is superior to the other. The relative immortality which one acquires by the fact that one's name is carried on by one's children, is still exposed to death; the mortality of human nature is only partly compensated by the succession of posterity; the virgins' immortality, on the other hand, is such that they do not even need the succession of children, because they find satisfaction in themselves. In a certain sense this antithesis has something in common with the one Plato makes between immortality-by-engendering which is appropriate to mortal nature, and immortality-by-identity which is the privilege of the Godhead. We can further remark that the virgins in spite of their childlessness have their appropriate fruitfulness (another point on which virginity contrasts with marriage), and secondly that the immortal name (and the place in heaven) seems to be conceived as a future reward rather than as a present gift; throughout the passage Basil uses the future tense. But we do not find here the radical eschatological motivation of the Egyptian Encratites, for whom abstinence from procreation meant the hastening of the final victory over Death.

To sum up, the texts we have been dealing with in this paragraph, show the most complete picture of the opposition between marriage and virginity as regards the relation of both with death and immortality or incorruptibility we have found so far. Marriage (as the institution of procreation) was necessitated by the appearance of physical death and gives a kind of immortality (ἀθανασία) by the bringing forth of posterity which safeguards, at least for some time, the survival of the name of the departed. Basil here both develops an old christian tradition based on the argumentum e silentio from *Gen.* 4, 1, and adopts the platonic view of immortality-by-engendering. On the other hand, he makes it understood that virginity is a superior way to immortality (as it is also a higher sort of fruitfulness); it is the immortality of the angels that will be the virgins' future reward. So the immortality-by-posterity is, in fact, regarded as immortality of a lesser sort, though not, for that reason, completely repudiated.

Basil also opposes marriage and virginity as corruption and incorruptibility. As the terminology, to which the author keeps very strictly, indicates, this line has to be sharply distinguished from the former that concerned physical death and its overcoming. As marriage is characterized by corruption, so virginity by the actual possession of incorruptibility; marriage, here, is not so much seen as the institution of procreation (and as a way to an only temporal immortality), but as something that inflames passion and lust. That explains why the virgins by freeing themselves from these, already enjoy the incorruptibility which makes them equal to the angels.

4. John Chrysostom.

John Chrysostom makes some interesting statements on the subject that concerns us here. The first we will discuss is to be found in his treatise on Virginity (PG 48, 543-544). In ch. 14 he deals with an objection against virginity voiced by people from the church, saying that the strict observance of Paul's precept in *1 Cor.* 7, 1 ("It is good for a man not to touch a woman") would lead to the dying out of the human race and of civilisation. For every day death would get more hold of it and, in the end, annihilate it, and

and like a certain type of death, of their being established according to the flesh, but as laws of nature, they are identical with the laws of nature (1942-1943).

The passage shows that the knowledge obtained by the signification of power is as well a technical one, as it is accepted by the by the immortality that will be the virgin's part. Thus again we notice the coexistence of death's immortality: this time in 1942, the speech is identical, but of different. Death and virginity are not opposed as death and virginity, but as two forms of different, more precisely, as two ways of overcoming physical death, of which the one is superior to the other. The relative immortality which one acquires by the fact that one's name is carried on by one's children, is still exposed to death; the immortality of human nature is only partly compensated by the succession of the generations; the virgin's immortality, on the other hand, is such that they do not even need the succession of children, because they had established in themselves, in a certain sense, this immortality, as something in common with the one which exists between immortality-by-signification which is superior to death, nature, and immortality-by-identity which is the privilege of the Gospel. We can further remark that the virgin in spite of this childhood into their appropriate childhood (another point on which virginity contrasts with marriage), and immortality that the immortal name (and the place in heaven) seems to be reserved as a future reward rather than as a present gift; throughout the passage, death and the future town. But we do not find here the radical technological construction of the virgin's immortality, for which immortality from preservation means the preservation of the first virginity itself.

To sum up, the text we have been dealing with in this paragraph, shows the main complete picture of the opposition between marriage and virginity as regards the relation of both with death and immortality or immortality-by-signification and immortality-by-identity. The distinction of preservation (which is the relation of physical death and gives a kind of immortality) by the technical form of power, which establishes it, is not for some time, the survival of the name of the deceased. But here both develop as an opposing tradition based on the argument of a technical form (see 4.1 and 4.2) and attempt to show how a technical form of power, which establishes it, is also a higher sort of immortality. On the other hand, he makes it clear, that the virginity is a superior way to immortality (as it is also a higher sort of immortality). It is the immortality of the virgin that will be the virgin's reward. So the immortality-by-identity is, in fact, regarded as immortality of a lower sort, though not, for that reason, immortality-by-identity.

But this opposition between marriage and virginity as techniques and immortality-by-identity, in which the latter is superior, indicates, that has to be sharply distinguished from the former that concerned physical death and for overcoming. As death is established by signification, as virginity by the actual preservation of immortality-by-identity, there is not an equal way to the immortality of preservation (and as a very different technical form, but as a technical form, it is not an equal way to the immortality of preservation). In the virgin's reward, the immortality-by-identity is not an equal way to the immortality of preservation (and as a very different technical form, but as a technical form, it is not an equal way to the immortality of preservation). In the virgin's reward, the immortality-by-identity is not an equal way to the immortality of preservation (and as a very different technical form, but as a technical form, it is not an equal way to the immortality of preservation).

4. John Chrysostom.

John Chrysostom makes some interesting comments on the subject that concerns us here. The first we will discuss is to be found in his *Homilies on Virginité* (1942, 241-242). In the 24th he deals with an objection against virginity raised by people from the church, saying that the strict observance of Paul's command in 1 Cor. 7: 1 ("It is good for a man not to touch a woman") would lead to his dying out of the human race and of civilization. For every day death would put more hold of it and in the end, annihilate it, and