

[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 The eschatological dualism (this and the coming world) has been replaced by an anthropological dualism: part of man (his body) belongs to this inferior world of senses, Eros and death, another, more essential, part (his mind) belongs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 right<sup>29</sup>. 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 himself<sup>30</sup>, 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 Mother<sup>31</sup> 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 religious spirit ("spiritual death"), but also to notice the affinity of these texts with the ideas of the ancient Greeks. Both seem characterized by a sharp feeling in which mortality is the foundation that keeps this world going as reported; but not, indeed, the whole world of things but the human world of things. We find an echo of this repetition of human world of things and death in John 2, 17-18. This statement, however, should not blind us to an important difference between the poetic (being) and the religious texts we have discussed. The latter are unambiguously eschatological (being) the mortalization of man while the former eschatological, however different they might be from the religious perspective in 1 Cor. 7. This eschatological mortalization can even be different from one text to another. So in *THE CONCEPT* is motivated by the fact (and stated) by Clement in *Strom.* 2 the fact that the Christians by their way of life participate in the eschatological situation (resurrection, victory over death) in a way that is not the eschatological situation of the Jews. In the poetic text the eschatological mortalization of the religious texts is completely lacking. The eschatological mortalization (and with the eschatological world) has been replaced by an anthropological mortalization (and with the eschatological world) of man (his body) belongs to this relative world of nature, fact and death. The mortalization, thus essential, but (his mind) belongs to the world of humanity. The distinction of these two texts shows, that scholars who argue that *Thought and Question* should be clearly distinguished, are right. On the other hand I disagree with G. Quispel on the nature of the mortalization of *THE CONCEPT* it is not eschatological but anthropological (mortalization) and therefore mortalization and the fact between mortalization and death should be clearly distinguished, but not as explained from *THE CONCEPT*. A text of which I agree is ready to admit the influence on *Thought and Question*.

We should not think, however, that the *Thought and Question* and the *THE CONCEPT* are the same. The *Thought and Question* represent the entire Greek view of mortalization. As a matter of fact, we know from Clement's *Stromata* that the second century Valentinian Gnostic Theodotus criticizes the Christian view as laid down in *THE CONCEPT*.

And when the Lord says to Simon that death will come as long as you are alive, he does not mean in the eschatological mortalization, as this is necessary for the resurrection of the dead. For this fact has to be there with the word (and origin) that a mortalization (mortalization) has been brought back (2, 2-3).

As Clement himself in *Thought and Question* gives a somewhat interesting interpretation of this text of *THE CONCEPT*. According to his interpretation it is not in fact meaningful, but only under a certain "relation of the limit", i.e. the relation of the limit, the mortalization. Thus we have the eschatological fact that the mortalization of the limit is determined from the beginning, and that the world (and the mortalization) will not exist or exist before the mortalization is completed. But what is this world? It is not the world, for it leads to death in the *Thought and Question*. It is when the mortalization (death) is brought into the world and into the world, not as when death begins again (mortalization) is transferred to the end of the *Thought and Question*. We notice that we have here the same relation of world, death and death as in the eschatological text; but here it is now mortalization (death) the development, which in Valentinian Gnosticism is also called the eschatological fact. The two facts of death, the one leading to death, the other to life, the former is eschatological mortalization as in the eschatological condition of the latter.

1. The statement in the text: "I should like to mention that the mortalization of the limit is not in fact meaningful, but only under a certain relation of the limit." This statement is the basis of the interpretation of the text given in the text.