

[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_f0201

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

things, these also the diviners interpret, sometimes with, sometimes without success. But in neither case do they know the cause, either of their success or of their failure. They recommend precautions to be taken to prevent harm, yet they give no instruction how to take precautions, but only recommend prayers to the gods."¹²⁹ Thus part of the realm of the diviners is in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. usurped by the physicians and declared to be their own. But the priests are still the only interpreters of divine dreams.

Yet later on also physicians do interpret the divine dreams as well as the physical ones. The Empiricists and Galen do not ask the diviners about the contents of dreams, they understand them by themselves. This type of divination becomes a science of its own, and now "the divine prescriptions are simple and have nothing mysterious . . .," they fall within medical reasoning.¹³⁰ At the same time a change in the theoretical understanding of dreams takes place. In the Hippocratic book, although it is the soul which tells beforehand what will happen, it is the body which causes the dreams.¹³¹ But Herophilus declares dreams to be merely psychological phenomena; it is not the bodily changes but only the psychic changes that are manifested in dreams; these are the natural dreams which have to be separated from the divine.¹³² His theory comes to be generally recognized even by the diviners. The book of Artemidoros, which is the most famous treatise on the interpretation of dreams, takes over its theory almost verbally from Herophilus.¹³³

What are the reasons for the belief in the validity of dreams? They are partly philosophical but differ according to the various systems.¹³⁴ Yet the fact that the Empiricists also acknowledge the reality of divine

¹²⁹ Jones, l. c., IV, p. 423: *ὅκοσα δὲ ἡ ψυχὴ τοῦ σώματος παθήματα προσημαίνει, πλησμονῆς ἢ κενώσεως ὑπερβολὴν τῶν συμφυτῶν ἢ μεταβολὴν τῶν ἀηθέων, κρίνουσι μὲν καὶ ταῦτα, καὶ τὰ μὲν τυγχάνουσι, τὰ δὲ ἀμαρτάνουσι, καὶ οὐδέτερα τούτων γινώσκουσι δι' ὃ τι γίνεται, οὐθ' ὃ τι ἂν ἐπιτύχωσιν οὐθ' ὃ τι ἂν ἀμάρτωσι, φυλάσσεσθαι δὲ παραίνεοντες μὴ τι κακὸν λάβῃ. οἱ δ' οὖν οὐ διδάσκουσιν ὡς χρὴ φυλάσσεσθαι, ἀλλὰ θεοῖσιν εὐχεσθαι κελεύουσι.*

¹³⁰ Artemidoros, *Oneirocritos*, ed. R. Hercher, 1864, p. 215, 1 sq.: *τὰς δὲ συνταγὰς τῶν θεῶν ἦτοι ἀπλᾶς καὶ οὐδὲν ἔχούσας αἰνίγμα εὐρήσεις.* Cf. in general A. Bouché-Leclercq, *Histoire de la divination dans l'antiquité*, I, 1879, pp. 295 sq.

¹³¹ Jones, l. c., IV, p. 420.

¹³² Herophilus, l. c., 416, 14: *Ἡρόφιλος τῶν ὀνείρων τοὺς μὲν θεοπέμπτους κατ' ἀνάγκην γίνεσθαι, τοὺς δὲ φυσικοὺς ἀνειδωλοποιουμένης ψυχῆς τὸ συμφέρον αὐτῇ καὶ τὸ πάντως ἐσόμενον*

¹³³ Cf. Bouché-Leclercq, l. c., I, p. 297, who gives a thorough analysis of the book of Artemidoros and also names all the physicians and philosophers interested in the theory of dreams.

¹³⁴ Cf. e.g., Aristotle, *On Dreams* and n. 127, above.

dreams already indicates empirical proof too, for this school has no other valid principle. Accordingly it is sometimes expressly stated that "some dreams are prophetic for this is shown by experiment."¹³⁵ Nay, even the dream-interpreters rely on experience rather than on argument. They say that the validity of dreams can hardly be proved by reason but that it can be shown by experience.¹³⁶ Dreams, to the ancients, are a natural phenomenon even when they are considered to be divine, and as such they belong to natural science. There is then no reason for the scientific physician to object to healing by priests according to advice given in temple dreams.

But the physicians could not object to the miracles performed by the god either. For ancient dogmatic philosophy acknowledges the possibility of miracles. This depends on the fact that the natural laws are not held valid by the Dogmatists in every case but only in most cases. Exceptions are then always possible; things may happen for reasons still unknown, but they are not at all contrary to nature. Aristotle says: "It is the miracle, a thing contrary to nature but not contrary to nature as a whole, rather contrary to it as it appears in most cases. For in regard to the eternal nature which acts with necessity nothing comes into being contrary to it."¹³⁷ This sentence is valid for later generations too. Also the Stoic philosophers and the Neo-Platonists are able to understand miracles as nothing more than events whose causes are unknown. Dogmatic medicine, then, based on rational philosophy, cannot oppose religious cures; miracles are not excluded by its conception of science. The Empiricists, on the other hand, cannot disapprove of miracles since they acknowledge no general rules beyond experience. There is no sufficient reason to allow them to contradict those facts. Only the Epicureans, who try to explain everything and do not acknowledge the assumption that something can happen without an intelligible

¹³⁵ Galen, *Opera*, ed. Kühn, VI, p. 833: *καὶ δὴ τίνα μαντικῶς ὑπ' αὐτῆς (sc. τῇ ψυχῇ) προδηλοῦνται, καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο τῇ πείρᾳ μαρτυρεῖται.*

¹³⁶ Artemidoros, l. c., p. 1, 11; 15-16 . . . *περὶ ὧν ἂν ἔχω κατάληψιν, ἣν διὰ πείρας ἐπορίσασθην, συγγράψαι . . . φέρων εἰς τὸ μέσον τὴν πείραν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀποτελεσμάτων μαρτυρίαν, ἣ πᾶσιν ἰκανὴ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀντισχεῖν ἀνθρώποις, καὶ μέντοι καὶ πρὸς τοὺς χρωμένους μὲν μαντικῇ διὰ δὲ τὸ μὴ ἐντετυχηκέναι λόγοις περὶ τούτων ἀκριβέσι πεπλανημένους.* Cf. p. 197, 12; 198, 14; 199, 1. Just because of their experimental basis dream-interpretations must not be identified with magic. Artemidoros therefore rejects every kind of magical belief and opposes magicians no less than do the doctors. Cf. p. 205, 25-206, 11.

¹³⁷ Aristotle, *On the Generation of Animals*, IV, 4, 770b9. *ἔστι γὰρ τὸ τέρας τῶν παρὰ φύσιν τι, παρὰ φύσιν δ' οὐ πᾶσαν ἀλλὰ τὴν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ. περὶ γὰρ τὴν αἰὶ καὶ τὴν ἐξ ἀνάγκης οὐθὲν γίνεται παρὰ φύσιν.* Cf. Zeller, l. c., II, 2³, p. 429, 3.

