

[Accueil](#)[Revenir à l'accueil](#)[CollectionBoite_028 | Ultimes papiers.CollectionBoite_028-2-chem | Pile – Ensemble. 1° médecins ; 2° Antiques \(notes diverses sur la sexualité dans l'Antiquité\). Dite `pile I` \[annotation de D. Defert\]](#) Item[\[Greek medecine in its relation to religion and magic - suite\]](#)

[Greek medecine in its relation to religion and magic - suite]

Auteur : Foucault, Michel

Présentation de la fiche

Coteb028_f0194

SourceBoite_028-2-chem | Pile – Ensemble. 1° médecins ; 2° Antiques (notes diverses sur la sexualité dans l'Antiquité). Dite `pile I` [annotation de D. Defert]

LangueFrançais

TypeFicheLecture

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 22/03/2021 Dernière modification le 23/04/2021

would say do not belong to the art. Seeing then that there is nothing that cannot be put to use by good physicians and by the art of medicine itself, but in most things that grow or are made are present the essential substances of cures and of drugs, no patient who recovers without a physician can logically attribute the recovery to spontaneity. Indeed, under a close examination spontaneity disappears; for everything that occurs will be found to do so through something, and this 'through something' shows that spontaneity is a mere name, and has no reality. Medicine, however, because it acts 'through something,' and because its results may be forecasted, has reality, as is manifest now and will be manifest for ever."⁷⁴ In this way the self-sufficiency of medical art is demonstrated on a rational basis contrary to the naturalists and disbelievers.

It is the usual attitude for the physician which is formulated in the first book of the *Epidemiae*: "The art has three factors, the disease, the patient, the physician. The physician is the servant of the art. The patient must cooperate with the physician in combating the disease."⁷⁵ Art and nature are thus properly evaluated. In the fight against illness, the knowledge of the physician is one factor, nature the other. Yet such a conception obviously presupposes a belief which gives God his share in the processes of the world. It is again the religious rationalist who, contrary to the atheistic thinker, has real confidence in his art. He notes equally and fairly the success and failure of nature. For nature, to him, has two different aspects: it not only heals, it also destroys. The physician, in some cases, can rely on it, in others he must fight against it.⁷⁶

⁷⁴ Jones, l. c., II, pp. 199-201: "Ἐτι τοίνυν εἰ μὲν ὑπὸ φαρμάκων τῶν τε καθαιρόντων καὶ τῶν ἱσάντων ἡ ἰησις τῇ τε ἱητρικῇ καὶ τοῖσιν ἱητροῖσι μόνον ἐγίνετο, ἀσθενὴς ἦν ἂν ὁ ἐμὸς λόγος. νῦν δὲ φαίνονται τῶν ἱητρῶν οἱ μάλιστα ἐπαινεόμενοι καὶ διατετήμασιν ἰώμενοι καὶ ἄλλοις γὰρ εἶδεναι, ἃ οὐκ ἂν τις φαίη, μὴ ὅτι ἱητρός. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἰδιώτης ἀνεπιστήμων ἀκούσας, μὴ οὐ τῆς τέχνης εἶναι. ὅπου οὖν οὐδὲν οὐτ' ἐν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖσι τῶν ἱητρῶν οὐτ' ἐν τῇ ἱητρικῇ αὕτῃ ἀχρεῖον ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖσι πλείστοις τῶν τε φρομένων καὶ τῶν ποιεμένων ἔνεστι τὰ εἶδεα τῶν θεραπειῶν καὶ τῶν φαρμάκων, οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι οὐδενὶ τῶν ἀνευ ἱητροῦ ὑγιαζομένων τὸ αὐτόματον οὐδὲν φαίνεται ἔξω ἐλεγχόμενον. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ γινόμενον διὰ τι εὐρίσκειτ' ἂν γινόμενον, καὶ ἐν τῷ διὰ τι τὸ αὐτόματον οὐ φαίνεται οὐσίην ἔχον οὐδεμίαν ἀλλ' ἡ ὄνομα. ἡ δὲ ἱητρικὴ καὶ ἐν τοῖσι διὰ τι καὶ ἐν τοῖσι προνοουμένοις φαίνεται τε καὶ φανέϊται αἰεὶ οὐσίην ἔχουσα.

⁷⁵ Jones, l. c., I, p. 165: ἡ τέχνη διὰ τριῶν, τὸ νόσημα καὶ δὲ νοσέων καὶ δὲ ἱητρός. δὲ ἱητρός ὑπερτίτης τῆς τέχνης' ὑπεραντιοῦσθαι τῷ νοσήματι τὸν νοσέοντα μετὰ τοῦ ἱητροῦ.

⁷⁶ M. Neuburger, *Die Heilkraft d. Natur*, 1926, pp. 9-10, stresses the fact that in the Hippocratic books the healing power of nature is not exaggerated in a phantastic measure. He is also of the opinion that thereby the negativism and quietism is avoided which very easily results from too strong a belief in nature.

All these ideas, I think, are summed up in the statement "that there could surely be nothing more useful or more necessary to know than these things (sc. which the physician knows) and how the first discoverers, pursuing their inquiries excellently and with suitable application of reason to the nature of man, made their discoveries, and thought their art worthy to be ascribed to a god, as in fact is the usual belief."⁷⁷ For medicine is so great a power and is so mighty in itself that a god must have given it to mankind. The rational element contained in medical art is divine. Yet very seldom does this conviction lead to an exaggeration of the power of the art. In contrast to the conception that nature alone, not the physician, heals the disease, it is stated in one book: "By stitching and cutting, that which is rotten in men is healed by physicians. This too is part of the physician's art: to do away with that which causes pain, and by taking away the cause of his suffering to make him sound. Nature of herself knows how to do these things. When a man is sitting it is a labour to rise; when he is moving it is a labour to come to rest. In other respects too nature has the same qualities as has medical art."⁷⁸ The religious physician is usually aware of the limits of his art as his definition of medicine reveals: "In general terms, it is to do away with the sufferings of the sick, to lessen the violence of their diseases, and to refuse to treat those who are overmastered by their diseases, realizing that in such cases medicine is powerless."⁷⁹

In later centuries the recognition of nature as a teleological power must have confirmed the advisability of the withdrawal of the physicians. Themison, who does not believe in teleology, is the first to pro-

⁷⁷ Jones, l. c., I, 37: οὐκ ἂν οὖν ἕτερα τούτων χρησιμώτερα οὐδὲ ἀναγκαιότερα εἴη εἶδεναι δῆπου, ὥς δὲ καλῶς καὶ λογισμῷ προσήκοντι ζητήσαντες πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου φύσιν εὗρον αὐτὰ οἱ πρῶτοι εὐρόντες καὶ ψήθησαν ἀξίην τὴν τέχνην θεῷ προσθεῖναι, ὥσπερ καὶ νομίζεται.

⁷⁸ Jones, l. c., IV, pp. 253-55 (slightly altered): κεντέμενοι τε καὶ τεμνόμενοι τὰ σαθρὰ ὑπὸ τῶν ἱητρῶν ὑγιαίνονται. καὶ τότε ἱητρικῆς. τὸ λυπεῖν ἀπαλλάσσειν, καὶ ὕψ' οὐ ποιεῖ ἀφαιρόντα ὑγίεια ποιεῖν. ἡ φύσις αὐτομάτῃ ταῦτα ἐπίσταται. καθήμενος ποιεῖ ἀναστήναι, κινούμενος ποιεῖ ἀναπαύσασθαι, καὶ ἄλλα τὰ αὐτὰ ἔχει ἡ φύσις ἱητρικῇ. It is in accordance with the interpretation given in regard to the attitude of the physician that the book on Ancient Medicine states that the nature of man consisting of the mixture of the humors can and should be voluntarily altered by the physician. The same is valid for the book on the Nature of Man (Jones, l. c., IV, p. 10) and, I think, for more of the Hippocratic writings. But it is impossible again to deal with all of them in this connection.

⁷⁹ Jones, l. c., II, p. 193: τὸ δὲ πᾶμπαν ἀπαλλάσσειν τῶν νοσέοντων τοὺς καμάτους καὶ τῶν νοσημάτων τὰς σφοδρότητας ἀμβλύνειν, καὶ τὸ μὴ ἐγχειρεῖν τοῖσι κεκρατημένοις ὑπὸ τῶν νοσημάτων, εἰδότες ὅτι ταῦτα οὐ δύναται ἱητρικῇ. As regards the restraint of Hippocratic physicians and the modern discussion of this problem cf. Jones, l. c., I, p. XVI sq.

