

Citation: SUN Feiyu. From Seele to mind: a sociological study of knowledge on the rationalization of psychoanalysis, *Sociological Studies*, 2017 (04): 94–118, 244.

From Seele to mind: a sociological study of knowledge on the rationalization of psychoanalysis

SUN Feiyu

Department of Sociology, Peking University

Abstract From the perspective of the sociology of knowledge, this paper analyzes the rationalization of classical psychoanalytic text knowledge during its diffusion. Working on a sphere of knowledge constituted by the author, translator, readers and the social-historical context, this paper tries to map out the process of a systematic rationalization represented by the translation of Sigmund Freud's works from German into English. This paper finds out that the problem of this translation cannot be explained merely by the translator's views, but should consider the socio-historical background. Within this process of rationalization, the problem of the soul, which occupies the center of Freud's writings, becomes a scientific psychological issue. As a modern phenomenon of knowledge, this transformation can help us understand modern social science and its internal dilemma.

Keywords Seele/soul, psychoanalysis, rationalization

The ancient conflict between love and cognition has run through the entire modern history.

—Max Scheler (2014b: 137)

At the end of *The Social Construction of Reality*, Peter L. Berger and Thomas Luckmann used an example of psychoanalysis to illustrate the research purport of the sociology of knowledge: “the present interest on

Translated by TAN Wenwen and edited by LIU Xin.

the part of social scientists in theories derived from psychoanalysis would take on a very different coloration as soon as these theories were not regarded, positively or negatively, as propositions of 'science,' but analyzed as legitimations of a very peculiar and probably highly significant construction of reality in modern society" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967: 188). This statement appears to point to a tendency in the American academic community at that time, which is to view the theory of psychoanalysis as a "scientific" proposition rather than anything else. And in this well-acknowledged classical work about the sociology of knowledge, the reason why the authors used this statement as an example to demonstrate the purport of the sociology of knowledge is that the knowledge related to psychoanalysis represents a "very peculiar and probably highly significant construction of reality in modern society." Understanding this reality can help us understand not only the modern society but also the modern social science. From the two authors' point of view, this is precisely the key of the sociology of knowledge.

The direct question here is, in the original sense, what is the theory of psychoanalysis? In the psychoanalysis field, the definition of "classical theories" is not complex, which refers to Sigmund Freud's work, yet when we specifically examine the image of Freud and the carrier of this image (i.e. his classical works) in American social science, this question becomes more complicated. In the English-speaking world, the image of Freud is mainly constructed by the English translation but not his original work, but the translation is not the "original work," and is much different from the original German version. The main reason is that in the development history of psychoanalysis, Freud's writing style, core concepts, theoretical demands, personal image, the relationship between Freud himself and his works, and the theory-related psychoanalysis practice have all been systemically changed with the publication of the English translation.

In the view of this paper, Freud's works and his ambiguous attitude towards the translation, the academic standing of his English translators, the English translation and the development of the psychoanalysis practice in the United States have all constituted a field of sociology of knowledge which is worth studying. In this field, the fact Berger and Luckmann stated

that American social scientists regard psychoanalysis as a “scientific proposition” is just a final result, while the “rationalization” of the “original knowledge” of psychoanalysis during its dissemination and changing process is the main feature of this field. This paper does not intend to trace back to any authentic “original knowledge,” but to interpret the rationalization of the image of Freud and his thoughts as a phenomenon of knowledge in the twentieth century with sociological significance by researching the changes and tensions in this field.

1 From German to English: the rationalization in the translation of Freud’s work

1.1 The standard edition of the English translation

Freud wrote his works in German, and his German collection (Freud, 1999/1940) is certainly the core texts for Freudian studies. However, the most authoritative and the most influential Freudian work in the English-speaking world is *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud* (hereinafter *The Standard Edition*), which was edited by James Strachey and Freud’s daughter Anna Freud and translated by James Strachey and Alix Strachey. From 1955 to 1967, 23 volumes of this translation were published. The style of the translation is coherent and mature. An introduction was added by the translators before all of Freud’s works, which briefly introduced the version of the work, the translation and related information about Freud’s writing and the development of his thoughts. A large number of translator’s notes was also added in the translation. In addition to some necessary explanatory annotations, these notes have also provided a detailed index for the date and location of Freud’s various key conceptual terms to facilitate scholars’ research. Because of the reasons mentioned above, although there are other translations of Freud’s work, this version is almost regarded as the most authoritative translation of Freud’s work in the English-speaking world, which has also shaped the image of Freud in the English-speaking world. We can hardly find other English translations to be defined as the “Standard Edition,” and even the original German version of Freud’s works was not called so. Therefore, this version itself has become a rather special academic phenomenon.

However, the title of “Standard Edition” does not necessarily mean that the translation is accurate. Despite the fact that it is hard to define a translation as “absolutely accurate,” compared with Freud’s original work in German, the translation mainly done by James Strachey has indeed undergone many changes which are worth studying. Correspondingly, important changes of Freud’s image have also been done during the shift from the German-speaking world to the English-speaking world. Although professional scholars would not be content with James Strachey’s translation and would still refer to Freud’s original works, the authority of *The Standard Edition* has still made the translation not only a must-read for researchers in a wider range of fields (e.g. social science), but also one of the fundamental reading materials for practice of psychoanalysis in the United Kingdom and the United States. It is essential to consider this background if we want to examine Berger and Luckmann’s aforementioned criticisms towards American social science.

1.2 The phenomenon of rationalization in the English translation

In the modern English academic fields, the research of the “revision” occurred during the translation process from German to English has already become a small individual field (Mahony, 1982, 1984, 1986, 1989; Bettelheim, 1983). In addition, since the issues of meaning, understanding and translation are particularly emphasized in psychoanalysis, in many significant studies of Freud and his works, the scholars would also discuss the issues of semantic problems related to this translation. However, an analysis from the perspective of the sociology of knowledge is still lacking.

To sum up, in this field, a series of studies have all come to the same conclusion that this translation has scientized and rationalized Freud’s original work from its core concepts to the style of translation.

1.2.1 The rationalization of the core concepts

In this field, the most famous and the most severe criticism of the English translation is from American scholar Bettelheim’s work *Freud and Man’s Soul*. According to Bettelheim, the core errors in the English version is the translation of the word “soul” (die Seele) to “mind.” Bettelheim believed that this translation mechanized Freud’s work, which has drawn away

from the depth of the notion of “Seele.” In other words, the translation of “Seele” to “mind” embodies an effort to scientize Freud’s work, which shifts Freud’s notion of the unconscious, its influence on human behaviors and Freud’s thoughts on human beings into an abstract, de-personalized, highly theoretical, mechanistic and complex scientific work about the human mind. Bettelheim advocated re-translating the word “Seele” to “soul,” in order to restore the humanistic aspect of Freud’s original work (Bettelheim, 1983).

There is much concrete evidence in Freud’s work which can support Bettelheim’s claim. For example, in *The Question of Lay Analysis* published in 1926, Freud has made it clear that his research object was the human soul (Seele). If comparing carefully with Freud’s original work, it can be found that the mistranslation in the English version might be more serious than what was stated by Bettelheim. In the English translation, “Seele” is no longer a fixed term. Besides “mind,” it is also translated as “mental,” “psycho,” or others. In many cases, this term just disappears. In other words, Seele, the core concept in Freud’s original work in German, is scattered and dissolved into the text background of the English translation, which is no longer concerned by readers.

In addition, many scholars have also discussed the rationalization of some other core concepts in Freud’s work. For example, in *Vocabulaire de la Psychanalyse (Vocabulary of Psychoanalysis)* written by Jean Laplanche and Jean-Bertrand Pontalish, the authors advocated translating the word “das Ich” into “the I” instead of “the ego.” They believed that the word “ego” actually failed to embody the multiple meanings of “ich.” Bettelheim also noticed the translating issue of “ego and id” (Bettelheim, 1983: 53). From his point of view, in Freud’s work *Das Ich und das Es (The Ego and the Id)*, to demonstrate the concept of mind that people generally are not aware of, Freud used the pronoun “it” (es) as a noun (das Es); correspondingly, the English translation of “Ich” should be “the I.”^① “Ich” and “es” are very common concepts in German, while their

^① In addition, Bettelheim considered the meaning of “Das Ich” to be closer with “the me” in English, since this concept emphasizes the personality more deeply and strongly than “the I” (Bettelheim, 1983).

English translations “Id” and “ego” originate from Latin, which would make the readers feel alienated and lose their sense of daily-used language in the original work. In addition, “es” (the translation of “it” in German) can also be used to refer to *das Kind* (the child), which is a neutral noun in German. This concept refers to childhood, which, as is well-known, occupies an extremely important position in Freud’s theory. However, the theoretical features contained in this term disappeared in the English translation.^①

The third typical example of the mistranslation of Freud’s core concepts is related to a basic method of psychoanalysis. In the English translation, this method was translated into “the free association,” yet this translation makes it easy for us to forget the essential premise of this method: the association is actually not free (Bettelheim, 1983: 94–95). Although Freud used terms like “*freie Assoziation*,” it usually corresponds to the concept of “*Einfall*.” In German, “*Einfall*” means “a sudden enlightenment or idea.” As it suggests, an essential logical premise of the free association in psychoanalysis is that no mental activity is completely free, and there is no arbitrariness in mental activities (Freud, 1941: 337–338). However, the translation “the free association” is particularly apt to give readers a misunderstanding that association can be free, which runs counter to the methodological principles that Freud followed in his clinical treatment.

The translation issues mentioned above are only a part of the problems,^② but we can find through these translations that the basic idea and feature of the English translation of Freud’s work is to rationalize psychoanalysis so as to professionalize his concepts. During the translation process, the early translators, such as A. A. Brill, Ernst Jones and James Strachey, usually used Latin and Greeks to translate psychiatric

^① Corresponding to the above discussion, “*über-Ich*” can be translated as “above-I,” while in English it is translated as “super ego.”

^② We can continue the list: “*das Ubewute*” is translated into “the unconscious,” “*Verschiebung*” is translated into “displacement,” “*Verdichtung*” is translated into “condensation,” “*Abwehr*” is translated into “resistance,” “*Verdrängung*” is translated into “repression,” “*Traumarbeit*” is translated into “dream work,” “*primäre und sekundäre Prozes*” is translated into “primary and secondary process,” “*Libido*” is translated into “libido,” and *Vorstellung* is translated into “presentation/idea/representation.”

terms.^① Even the non-professional and daily vocabularies in Freud's original work were translated into an academic language to show its professionalism.^②

1.2.2 The rationalization of the translation

Another typical feature of the English translation is related to the mistranslation of the core concepts mentioned above, that is the elimination of Freud's art of writing. As a recipient of the Goethe Prize, Freud has excellent writing skills. He is good at using everyday German to express his ideas. The work itself is an excellent German writing model and a piece of literary work. However, in the English translation, Freud became an obscure thinker and a medical expert. In this respect, by systematically summarizing Mahony's systemic research of the English translation (Mahony, 1986, 1984, 1989), "revisions" can be found in the following two aspects.

First, in the content, the translation omitted all the rich local experiences, German and Jewish cultural traditions, its relevance to the reality and the sexual connotations which are very common in Freud's original work. Such phenomena can be found everywhere in the English translation, and the most direct and typical example is the translation of "psychoanalytic treatment." The German romantic tradition contained in Freud's original phrase, "Psychoanalytische Kur," completely disappeared in the English translation (Uwe, 2001: 67). In addition, Freud also used Latin in his original work, yet to eliminate the aforementioned meanings of what Freud indicated in these Latin words, the translators chose to translate these terms into English.^③

^① There are also many translations of terminologies in this aspect. Apart from the aforementioned concepts, there are many other concepts such as anaclitic, fixation, epistemophilia, parapraxis. The daily German word "Lust" is translated into libido, "Trieb" is translated into "instinct," and "Angst" is translated into anxiety. The original meaning of Besetzt is taken or occupied, yet is translated into cathected.

^② For example, "Good" is translated into "appropriate," "need" is translated into "exigency," and "at rest" is translated into "in a state of quiescence."

^③ A typical example is the translation of the word "Via Regia." At the end of *The Interpretation of Dreams*, Freud's famous statement "Die Traumdeutung aber ist die Via regia zur Kenntnis des Unbewußten im Seelenleben" is translated into "The interpretation of dreams is the royal road to a knowledge of the unconscious activities of the mind." The Latin word "Via Regia" is not preserved, but translated into "royal road." However, this idea, in Freud's theory, has a clear sense of self-identity, which is based on European history and Freud's life history (Sherwin-White, 2003). With the change of the English translation, the use of this idea has little to do with Freud's own history and subjectivity.

The second feature of the translation is the systematic revision of the writing style, which is mainly reflected through the grammatical changes of the original German work. This change is particularly evident in the translation of Freud's various cases. By comparing the German and the English version of the two dreams in Dora's case study, C. Edward Robins found the following changes have taken place from Freud's German work to Strachey's English translation. Firstly, the present tense in the original work is changed to the past tense; the active voice of verbs (e.g. Verbrennen) is changed into passive voice; "before" (vor) is translated into "besides"; "Ich will nicht" (I want/desire not) is translated into "I refuse"; the colloquial names that Dora used to address her parents are also changed into formal names (Robins, 1991). Besides, in the textual level, we can also see that the dynamic grammar and writing style in Freud's original work is replaced by a static and structural writing style (Ornston, 1982: 409).^①

Among all the changes mentioned above, the change of the tenses is most systematic and comprehensive. In Freud's works, the present tense is the one which can most fully express and convey the connotation of dreams, and it is also the tense which can mostly express the connotations contained in Freud's theories. Yet the past tense, which can be found everywhere in the English translation, together with other revisions in the translation, has changed the style of Freud's work and made it into a medical clinic report (Mahony, 1984: 14).

In conclusion, it can be found that compared with the original German work, *The Standard Edition* has almost created a brand new and rationalized image of Freud due to its lack of core concepts and the systematic classicizing of them, as well as its change of the original writing style to a medical scientific style. It has transformed the original image of Freud, who was reflected by an author with near-literature work containing rich connotations of humanities and history, into an image of a calm, objective, scientific and professional doctor who wears a white lab coat.

^① The author further considers that the structural theory in Freud's work is the invention of Strachey, but not Freud's original intention.

2 From author to translator: the new proposition

How should we interpret this series of changes? Are the problems in the English translation merely caused by the translators' understanding and propositions (Robins, 1991), or is it more complicated than that? From a perspective of the sociology of knowledge, we are certainly not satisfied with the former answer. Besides, historically speaking, the translation and publishing process of *The Standard Edition* is not only attributed to the Stracheys.

First of all, this translation is certainly related to the academic attitude of the translator and their academic community. Although Strachey is the editor and main translator of *The Standard Edition*, Freud's student Ernst Jones also had a direct impact on the translation (Steiner, 2001). However, it would not be true to solely attribute the standardized conceptual terms to Jones. Brill, the very first English translator of Freud's work, has already used the terminologies which were later regarded as "standardized" terms when he was translating parts of *Studies in Hysteria* in 1909, and *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* and *The Interpretation of Dreams* later on.^① After that, other notable concepts were soon translated by early translators such as Brill, Jones and Putnam.^② Strachey adopted these terms in his translation as well (Steiner, 2001).

The Stracheys have not only basically adopted the standard terminologies provided by Jones, but also adopted the same academic attitude towards the translation of terminologies in their translation. The first reason is that Strachey and Jones agreed on the nature of Freud's work. Both of them believed that Freud's work should belong to the scientific field rather than the humanity field. Thus, adopting a scientific and professional writing style and terminologies in the English translation corresponds with the nature of Freud's work (Brill, 1913).

^① Such as the ego (das Ich), the unconscious (das Unbewute), displacement (Verschiebung), condensation (Verdichtung), resistance (Abwehr), repression (Verdrangung), libido (Libido), Instinct/impulse (Trieb), Seele (mind/soul).

^② Such as homosexual, heterosexual, oral, anal, fixation, perversion, sado-masochism, narcissism.

The second reason is related to the massive amount of work done by Jones during this period. From 1913 to 1923, Jones continued to translate and introduce new English terminologies,^① and he has also set up a complete list of psychoanalysis terminologies. These terminologies, accompanied by Jones' increasing status in the academic field, have become more and more influential (Steiner, 2001: 239). When Strachey began the translation work in the 1920s, a clear and immutable paradigm style has already been established before him.

Secondly, Freud's own attitude has played a key role. In general, Freud has always had an ambiguous attitude towards the English translations and the translators.^② This kind of attitude derives from his definition of his work: it is both a science and an art (Freud, 1986a; 1984: 288).

Freud has always claimed that his work belongs to the scientific field. In the case study of Dora, no matter whether it is an expression of expediency, Freud particularly stated his intention to deal with the relationship with his patients in a scientific and professional way. From this perspective, the appearance of scientific expressions in the English translation seems to have its own reasons. However, this is only one aspect of Freud's academic claims. On the other hand, Freud himself has repeatedly stated that his work is also an art. Specifically, Freud intended to study and care human beings through a scientific approach. This requires an extraordinary "intimate relationship" with the patients.

In other words, Freud's ambiguous attitude towards English

^① Such as omnipotence of thoughts, pain (Unlust), ego ideal

^② As mentioned above, since the English translation of many Freud's works were published while he was alive, and the translations and publications were authorized by him and he was also good at English, it was hard to say whether the changes made in the translation from German to English was Freud's own will. Even if it was not his will, then at least his daughter Anna Freud, who had read the full English translation, intended to do so. In 1908, Brill asked Freud's permission to translate all of his works, and Freud agreed. Jones showed strong disapproval to this issue (Jones, 1961: 259). He believed that Brill lacked the knowledge of psychoanalysis, and English was not even Brill's mother tongue. A few years later, when Jones told Freud that Brill was not up to this job, Freud answered that "I would rather have a good friend than a good translator" and accused Jones of being jealous of Brill (Jones, 1961: 259). In 1924, Jones published an academic compilation of psychoanalysis with the help from Freud and Joan Riviere, who is another early English translator of Freud. Jones clearly proposed using classical Greek and Latin to improve the translation, and Freud did not against it.

translation firstly comes from his own understanding of the nature of psychoanalysis. Thus, although the translations done by Jones and Strachey are not absolutely accurate, they still have the source to justify their legitimacy. Viewing from the perspective of phenomenological sociology, this is a result of how English translators tend to understand Freud's work from their own horizons. Thus, as a sociological study of knowledge, the question that this paper intends to focus on is under what kind of knowledge context the translators gained such horizon(s) to interpret Freud's work. What kind of interpretation of psychoanalytic practice does this translation reflect?

This is certainly what Berger and Luckmann claimed to be the core issue of the sociology of knowledge. They believed that "a sociology of knowledge will have to deal not only with the empirical variety of 'knowledge' in human societies, but also with the process by which *any* body of 'knowledge' comes to be socially established as 'reality'" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967: 3). The reason behind it is that "all the human 'knowledge' is developed, transmitted and maintained in social situations," thus, it is necessary for a sociological study of knowledge to understand the process that "how a taken-for-granted 'knowledge' is realized in the reality" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967: 3).

From this perspective, if we solely observe the aforementioned systematic mistranslation from the perspective of the author or translators, we can only scratch the surface of the whole history of the development of psychoanalysis and its sociological connotations. We must also understand the text by placing it in a larger context of the ideological history and social history. Bettelheim has placed the systemic mistranslation in the English version in a background of the debate on the nature of science occurred in the early 20th century in Germany. He believed that the English translators merely understood Freud's work as natural science (Naturwissenschaften). Although this interpretation is inherently justified, since Bettelheim has a clear position in opposition to *The Standard Edition*, he did not consider it as a phenomenon of knowledge. Thus, he did not raise any questions from the perspective of the history of social ideology: why the authority of this English translation

was quickly and widely acknowledged?

Focusing on this issue, much of the research on the development history of psychoanalysis has noticed the following phenomenon: the influence of psychoanalysis in the twentieth century was directly related to its rapid development in the United States and its departure from Freud's control. Therefore, what is relevant to the aforementioned translation problems is the understanding that the American academic community and related practice field had for psychoanalysis itself, but not merely their understanding for Freud.

3 The issues about the rationalization of practice and the “Lay Analysis”

Max Scheler has described a principle in his work about the sociology of knowledge, that the “purer” the spirit is, the less the dynamic impact it has on the society and history. . . only when people combine a certain “idea” with interests, internal or collective internal drive, or with “various trends,” these ideas can indirectly obtain the power or possibilities to be connective with the reality (Scheler, 2014a: 9). From the perspective of the dissemination history of psychoanalysis, Scheler's principle is quite summative. By investigating the dissemination history of such a knowledge, it can be found that the historical drive behind it is what Webber called “rationalization, the destiny of this era.”

The specific background of this change is that the era when the English version started to be used on a large scale echoes with the historical process of psychoanalysis, as a practice, entering into the United States and being accepted as a scientific and rationalized practice. Both of these processes belong to Freud's journey to the English-speaking world.

In Europe, although Freud himself has always emphasized the highly scientific nature of psychoanalysis, both he and his followers have sought to transcend the field of medicine in terms of its discipline and influence. However, when psychoanalysis spread from Europe to the United States, the situation became completely different. In the United States, psychoanalysis has almost completely become a branch of psychiatry and neurology. Medical training has become a compulsory subject for psychoanalytic treatment (Schwartz, 2015).

The development of psychoanalysis in the United States is not completely coherent, and there are still some strong internal disagreements regarding this issue.^① Yet the Americanized psychoanalysis practice, which appears to belong to the medical field, becomes a major problem that Freud must respond to (Zaretsky, 2013; Schwartz, 2015; Mitchell and Blake, 2007). This is a scientific process of how psychoanalysis is adapting to the trend of modernization and is turning into a professionalized, rationalized practice, which is consistent with the changes in the English translation (Zaretsky, 2013).

When psychoanalysis is to be placed into a professionalized psychopathologic institution in the United States, it involves not only the issue of spreading its ideas, but also many sociological issues which relate to the historical changes of the American society. The heart of these issues should be the changing phenomenon that Andrew Abbott's work clearly pointed out, which is related to the rise of the system of professions in the American society and the core issue of modernity associated to this phenomenon: "how does the modern society institutionalize professional skills?" (Abbott, 2016: 2). The form that this process usually adopts is professionalism. Abbott found that as a part of historical evolution, in the process of professionalization, "exclusion" is a particularly important feature, which is also an inevitable path for a profession to become an occupation (Abbott, 2016: 24–26). This does not only involves the competition of "intellectuals" from a certain professional field for the jurisdiction of knowledge and related everyday life, but also the various competitions concerning the resource and social status within and among professions (Abbott, 2016: 37). When psychoanalysis entered the United States, the area of "care and treatment" for the human mind and soul in American society was not a complete blank, but a thriving therapeutic movement with various development paths. At that time, the competition and conflict between these ideas were still in the ascendant. In this context, it was extremely difficult for psychoanalysis to gain legitimacy and

^① A typical example is the conflict between the New York school represented by Brill and the Washington school represented by White (see Schwartz, 2015).

to gain the jurisdiction of everyday life in the dramatic social change and the fierce competition in the knowledge market (Abbott, 2016: 425–438). Thus, psychoanalysis had to adopt a more radical professional attitude in the practice level.

In accordance with Abbott's study, when psychoanalysis firstly entered the United States, the most debated issue in this field is the "question of lay analysis." At the annual meeting of the International Psychoanalytical Association in 1927, this issue became the bone of the contention. From Freud's own theoretical view, the real threat to this transcultural scientific challenge is probably not merely the method of treatment and the definition of qualification, but how the basic idea of psychoanalysis counters his own theory. When the psychoanalytic treatment methods are regarded as dogmas and taught in schools, and when psychoanalysis needs to depend on the professional attitude to be developed and to gain a foothold in the society, this movement of the realization of souls and ego has basically lost its vitality.

However, Freud's attitude towards the Americanization of psychoanalysis has always been ambiguous. On the one hand, this is due to the fact that, in contrast with the deep-rooted prejudices and neglect of Freud in the German-speaking academic field, the English-speaking academic field, especially the United States, are more friendly to Freud's work. On the other hand, Freud understood that this friendly attitude was based on the misunderstanding (Freud, 1986d: 236). Many American scholars have already regarded it as a part of scientific psychology when they accepted the idea of psychoanalysis. J. B. Watson once stated that he would omit the "vitalistic terminology and psychological terms" when he was teaching Freud's psychology (quoted from Zaretsky, 2013: 102).^① Thus, Freud's ambiguous attitude towards the English translation of his work also contained his ambivalence brought by the demand of developing psychoanalysis.

^① In addition, Zaretsky also cited a prominent example to prove American's scientized understanding of psychoanalysis. The first popular American work that introduced psychoanalysis was *The Concept of Consciousness*, written by Edwin Holt and published in 1914. In this book, the author defined "wish" as the "motor set of the organisms" (see Zaretsky, 2013: 119).

In general, in the process of large-scale translation and dissemination, Americanized psychoanalysis has become a psychopathological knowledge structure and practice which can be applied to patient analysis, rather than a practice which introspects one's soul and enhances his/her self-awareness. However, in Freud's original works, his focus on the soul emphasized on the issue of self-salvation. This is also why Freud has repeatedly emphasized that psychoanalysis was, above all, a kind of self-analysis. From the self-analysis in *The Interpretation of Dreams* to the collective self-analysis in the *Jewish Nation in Moses and Monotheism*, the methodology principle that Freud has always obeyed is that psychoanalysis is, above all, a kind of self-analysis and a self-realization of the soul. Psychoanalysis is not only a requirement for the patients, but also a primary requirement for physicians. However, this connotation has disappeared in the English translation during the Americanization process of psychoanalysis. It has become merely a professional knowledge and a skill. It is in this sense that Bettelheim claimed that the Americanized psychoanalysis has completely ignored the issue of the soul.

However, this issue requires more detailed and complex sociological analysis. First of all, despite the fact of Americanization, psychoanalysis still faces the process of separating from Freud and entering the field of specialization or professionalization. It is also necessary to normalize Freud's charisma, which is the process of moving from "Freud's private authority to an open, rational and decentralized form of self-governance" (Gay, 2015: 249). Secondly, as Abbott pointed out, the professionalization of psychoanalysis in the American society, just like any other professionalization process, has to be embedded into a macro context, which is the process of the transformation of American modern society (Abbott, 2016: 56). Obviously, this point is not only beyond the translator's consideration, but also beyond Freud's own control.

The trend of modernization in the American society is the trend of rationalization in this era. In this context, the psychoanalysis in Europe and the United States has been increasingly medicalized, which corresponds to its trend of being professionalized and specialized. This

trend is particularly prominent in the United States, where psychoanalysis is developing rapidly. In 1925, the American Psychoanalytic Association made a new regulation which required all the psychoanalysts in the United States to obtain a medical degree (Gay, 2015: 260). Freud immediately objected to that, but his objection did not work. In 1927, the *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* published a monograph on the topic of amateur psychoanalysis, with the vast majority of the authors opposing Freud's views on this issue.

Freud's attitude is very clear on this issue. In 1926, he published the most famous work *The Question of Lay Analysis*. In this book, he even discussed the relationship between psychoanalysis and American culture.^①

The basic goal of this book, on the one hand, was to defend his student Theodor Reik; on the other hand, it was to respond to the wider debate aforementioned. Freud's response is not only reflected in this work. Before his death in 1938, Freud also made his point that "I have never repudiated these views, and I insist on them more intensely than before" (Freud, 1986c: 281).

In this work, Freud distinguished between psychology and psychoanalysis as university disciplines. He believed that the major difference between these two lies in the fact that psychoanalysis deals with the question of "mental life" (Seelenleben).^② The question of mental life is the question of meaning, which could not be answered by any scientific psychological research.

^① When *The Question of Lay Analysis* was firstly published, Jones and Sachs worried that Freud's arguments would provoke the Americans and make them quit the American Psychoanalytic Association. This part was then deleted. The part about the relationship between psychoanalysis and American culture that Jones and Sachs suggested to delete seems to be quite prophetic now. Freud expressed his doubts about the United States and stated that the highest ideal of American is life with efficiency and fitness. He said that time is indeed money, but we do not fully understand why we are in such a rush to turn time into money. . . in our region of Alps, when two acquaintances meet or say goodbye, the common greeting is slow down, do not rush. We used to laugh at these polite words, yet when seeing the American's edgy efficiency, we now gradually realized how wise it is. But the Americans do not have time. The Americans are passionate about large-scale data. They are passionate about magnifying all sizes, and passionate about cutting time into small units (Grubrich-Simitis, 1996: 176–181). As mentioned above, Freud did regard psychoanalysis as science, but his understanding of science is related to the human soul, so the scientized psychoanalysis should not be simplified as the treatment of mental illness.

^② The English translation here is "mental life."

Freud regarded psychoanalysis as depth-psychology about the soul, which is different from general psychology. Freud admitted that since psychoanalysis always involves issues related to sexuality, the patients and the general public tend to think that only genuine licensed doctors are eligible to talk about these issues with patients. However, Freud argued that in psychoanalysis, the issue about sexuality actually dated back the patients' childhood, yet the knowledge about this period cannot be learned in medical schools. In addition, the knowledge of the history of civilization and mythology is also essential for psychoanalysis, which, as well, cannot be provided by professional training in medical schools. Doctors who have received professional medical training are more likely to be hostile towards psychoanalysis, since they are already used to focusing on "objective knowledge" related to anatomy, human body and chemistry. They are also used to describing, investigating and treating diseases in a way that is unrelated to one's soul, while ignoring or disdaining the materials which are truly important in psychoanalytic practice (such as slip of tongue, jokes, dreams and crazy words).

As for the ones in the psychoanalysis camp who support to professionalize, specialize and scientize psychoanalysis, Freud believed that their point of view stems from the tremendous pressure that they are undergoing, which is in the hope that psychoanalysis could be recognized as a "profession." However, in a real therapeutic practice, an analyst with medical background often behaves and responds the same as an average person, which is far from the requirements for psychoanalytic practice (Freud, 1986b: 349).

Because of his understanding of psychoanalysis, Freud did not want psychoanalysis to be forced into the curriculum system of medical schools and become a branch alongside other therapeutic methods. He argued that psychoanalysis is more scientific than therapeutic methods such as hypnosis and autosuggestion. However, Freud's understanding of science is clearly beyond the realm of natural science. In this respect, Freud is extremely ambitious. He expected psychoanalysis to be a part of great science and art related to human civilization, saying that "as a depth-psychology, a theory of the mental unconscious, it can become

indispensable to all the sciences which are concerned with the evolution of human civilization and its major institutions such as art, religion and the social order” (Freud, 1986b: 351).

In this sense, the use of psychoanalysis for treatment is only one of its various applications. Freud has ambitiously stated, “the use of analysis for the treatment of the neuroses is only one of its applications; the future will perhaps show that it is not the most important one” (Freud, 1986b: 351). Therefore, it is actually wrong to “trap” psychoanalysis under the medical school system at the expense of all other applications simply because its application for treatment involves medical knowledge.

In the postscript of this book, Freud said that although he had entered the medical profession because of the need to earn a living, he had never considered himself as a real doctor. For him, the research subject of psychoanalysis requires a starting point that resembles Durkheimian sociology: the only subject of psychoanalysis is the mental process of human (*seelischen Vorgänge des Menschen*), which can only be studied among human. For some obvious reasons, people with functional disorders can provide more instructive materials than normal ones, and these materials are also easier for us to accept (Freud, 1986b: 359; Freud, 1948: 291).

However, Freud’s assertion did not arouse too much resonance at that time. He himself, his work and his thoughts soon encountered another great historical change: the persecution towards Jews and psychoanalysis from Fascism. Hitler was elected as the chancellor of Germany on January 31, 1933. On May 10th of that year, Freud’s works were publicly burned in Berlin. In October, psychoanalysis was attacked as a Jewish science and was banned by the Congress of Psychology in Leipzig, and Freud’s works were also banned. In his later years, Freud witnessed the devastating crisis of psychoanalysis. As most of the psychoanalysts were Jews, this crisis was co-occurring at both the physical and intellectual level. Although Freud finally chose London as his shelter, most psychoanalysts escaped to the United States. Thus, no matter how Freud, as the founder of psychoanalysis, was sarcastic towards the American culture and the Americanization of psychoanalysis, or remained an ambiguous attitude

towards the English translation, the United States seemed to have become the best place to preserve the knowledge of psychoanalysis, even though it needed to pay the price of being “alienated.”

4 Love and cognition: from text to society

At the beginning of the first volume of *The Standard Edition* published in 1966, Strachey defended his own translation.^① However, none of these defenses has responded to the doubts to his translation. This is not only because Strachey’s response did not answer to the core issue, that is, the transformation of the style in the English translation, but also because Strachey did not realize that the meaning of this translation has already gone beyond his control. To understand this phenomenon from the perspective of sociology of knowledge, besides the theories raised by Berger and Luckmann, it is essential to shift to Max Scheler and Michel Foucault’s theories, in order to understand the phenomena of love and cognition, texts and authors, and how the changes of texts are regarded as the representations of the production mechanism in the modern society.

4.1 Love and cognition

As mentioned earlier, Freud’s stylistic features and writing style are closely related to his theory. It can even be said that his writing style is already part of his theory. This feature is not uncommon in the European

^① For example, in his explanatory notes, Strachey stated that he tried to maintain the coherence of the terminologies as much as possible in the whole translation, yet it often leads to misunderstandings. In addition, he also responded to the controversial translation of some concepts. For example, some translations simply followed the existing translations, such as translating Abwehr into defence (it is criticized for the lack of the sense of activeness and the addition of passiveness). As for the difference between Psyche-psychisch and Seele (or Seelenleben) - seelisch, Strachey believed that since Freud used them alternately in many places, these two phrases should be synonymous in Freud’s works. A typical example is in Chapter 7 (B) in *The Interpretation of Dreams*. However, his defense did not deny the fact that the English translation could cause misunderstanding. As for the translation from “Trieb” into “instinct,” Strachey believed that the translation “drive” was not appropriate, as this word was not originally English, which did not exist in the Oxford Dictionary published in 1933 or the English psychological textbooks. Strachey believed that many critics thought that “drive” should be used as the translation, simply because it matched the meaning of “Trieb.” However, Freud used “Trieb” to express many different meanings. As a translator, Strachey finally chose a vague word to embody this concept, which seemed to be the only choice.

ideological history (Nussbaum, 1990: 262). In the case of Freud's work, the study of the symbiotic relationship between his writing style, writing techniques and his theory of transference has already become the core of Freudian studies. This research has become an essential representation of how Freud's thoughts have contributed to the modern sociology of knowledge (O'Neill, 2016; Mahony, 1982). Therefore, if we believe that the changes in the English translation are due to the great transformation in the understanding of psychoanalysis, this translation, obviously, has already revised Freud himself.

The fundamental problem of the English translation is not only about any specific translation. The key point is that the irreversible scientization and rationalization of psychoanalysis during its dissemination and practice is counter to Freud's most central idea of treatment. In Freudian theory, the transference (transfert/übertragung) is the core issue,^① which is also the key to the success of the treatment (Freud, 1973: 497–498). In other words, only through transference can the patient and therapist gain a new understanding of themselves. Transference requires that the relationship between the patient and the therapist be beyond the modern professional relationship in the general sense, and enter into the relationship where the emotion and (self)-understanding are mutually promoted. In other words, knowledge about love can only be acquired during a certain emotional experience. This point is evident in several of Freud's long cases (O'Neill, 2016). However, this writing style is not only opposed to the professionalized, rationalized and scientized psychoanalysis, but is also missing in the English translation. That is to say, the changes in the English translation not only involve the changes that Cose described as the transformation from Western traditional intellectuals to the modern academic professional scholars (Cose, 2004:

^① Freud firstly used the French word "transfert" instead of the German word "übertragung." In the Taiwan translation of *The Dictionary of Psychoanalysis*, the translators discussed the difficulties of translating this word into Chinese, since in Freud's theory, this word represents not only the transmission of the emotions but also the patterns of behavior and types of the object relationship (Laplanche and Pontalis, 2000: 534–535). They also suggested using the word "传会" (chuanhui, transference) to translate this term. This paper still adopts the long-established translation in China's mainland, "移情" (yiqing, transference).

302), but also the changing process of the principles of practice. From a perspective of the sociology of knowledge, the basic feature of the horizon of understanding is that the current conception will affect what we see. In this sense, transference becomes particularly important, because there must be a close relationship between transference and conception, and transference leads to major changes of the conceptions in order to notice things that are not meant to be seen. When the horizon of understanding changes, the things that are seen are certainly quite different.

Scheler has ascribed this original core concept of psychoanalysis to the European cultural traditions (Scheler, 2014b). Scheler believed that the rise of modern society has led to a strong rejection of religious traditions, as a diametrically opposed view appeared in the modern thought, namely, love makes one blind rather than seeing, that therefore all genuine knowledge of the world can be based only on the most extreme restraint of emotional acts and on the simultaneous ignoring of the value differences of the objects, whose values are profoundly connected in the unity of experience with these experiences of acts (Scheler, 2014b: 137). Furthermore, Scheler has combined this modern cognition mechanism with the rise of modern society and regarded it as a “very modern view of the citizens” (Scheler, 2014b: 137). This is also a view in line with the values shared by the modern citizen class, their personality temperament and their view of the family structure. In this sense, Scheler believed that the ancient conflict between love and cognition has run through the entire modern history (Scheler, 2014b: 137).

We know that scholars such as Weber, Husserl and Mannheim discussed the tension between science and life brought by the establishment of the modern academic mechanism represented by scientization (Weber, 1998; Husserl, 2001; Mannheim: 2007). Therefore, if we consider the changes produced by the English translation as a phenomenon of knowledge which can reflect the modernized connotation, it is possible to thoroughly explore the social and political background of the English translation. In other words, as a “process of civilization,” the significance of the rationalization of this “theory” requires further detailed analysis.

4.2 Texts as representations

The relationship between the above authors and their works is more clearly reflected in Foucault's studies. Foucault never separated himself from his work (Foucault, 1988: 156). On the contrary, in the light of the production mechanism of the modern scientific knowledge, he constantly emphasized the explicit relationship between the author and his/her work. The work one has done must have a substantial relationship with its author, rather than being an anonymized industrial product. Furthermore, we must realize that this production mechanism is not only related to the modern knowledge, but also a power mechanism related to social construction (Foucault, 1984: 88).

When it comes to the understanding of sexuality, Foucault summed up five scientific modern paradigms to discuss sexuality in his work *The History of Sexuality*. By separating one's cognition from their cognitive objects, these paradigms conceal the sexuality on one hand, while following a modern power mechanism produced by knowledge and truth on the other. According to Foucault, the process of constructing and developing modern science is a grand process, aiming to produce a variety of discourses about truth. In this sense, the modern sexuality and modern sexology have developed together. If we re-interpret the issues in the English translation and the change of the psychoanalysis practice from this perspective, it can be found that the English translation has changed Freud's work from a scientific and artistic work, which are closely related to the author and filled with rich power of libido from the author, to a modern scientific work which can be separated from the author. This attempt to conceal the author's relationship with his/her work has become a modern phenomenon of knowledge which is worth in-depth study.

First, the universal use of Latin in the English translation is not meaningless. As mentioned above, on the one hand, besides being an attempt to scientize the original work, the use of classic terms in the translation wiped out the various connotations about sexuality, culture, history, religion, society and personal life history in Freud's original work. On the other hand, this approach can make the psychoanalytic texts easier to be accepted by the public while generating a sense of alienation at the

same time. Freud himself also used Latin in his writing. It certainly has a rich historical and cultural connotation, but often in exceptional circumstances. Freud often used Latin when writing about certain concepts which are extremely challenging to the morality of the world or himself, aiming at alienating the author and easing the tension in the treatment and study. The most famous example, of course, is his statement in Dora's case, and the most classical example is the use of Latin in Freud's description of his own dreams. For example, in a letter to Fliess on October 3, 1897, Freud used Latin *matrem* (mother) and *nudam* (nudity) to create a sense of alienation and ease the tension when writing about his dream about his mother's nudity, which has a similar function with changing the style in English translation.

As mentioned above, the direct reason why the English translators have scientized and professionalized Freud's work is to wipe out its particularity and to shape his idea into a universal scientific theory. This tendency deserves our attention. Steven Marcus has clearly summarized this idea in his research. He believes that the sociological connotation of this tendency is to correlate Freud's insight with a broader personality structure, which is the depth-personality structure of the Bourgeois culture of the late Victorian era (Marcus, 1984: 33–34). This idea is supported by Peter Gay (Gay, 1978). In fact, a series of research on sociology of knowledge has also covered the relationship between Freud's theoretical contents, thought structures, and the Freud's Jewish historical and cultural traditions, social structure and even the political changes (Schorske, 1981; McGrath, 1986; Bakan, 1958; Cuddihy, 1974; Klein, 1981).

Second, the paradox of these efforts mentioned above is that the search for pervasiveness comes at the expense of its own richness and depths. Peter Gay has come to the following exquisite conclusion: keen historians have pointed out more than once that Queen Victoria does not belong to the Victorians; similarly, Freud does not belong to the Freudian school. They are not responsible for the myths weaved around their names (Gay, 2015: 4). From the perspective of civilization, just as Freud's discovery of libido revealed the mechanism of human civilization, the situation that Freud's work encountered and the changes of his ideas have also

demonstrated the repression and disguise of desire. Just as how the use of Latin words in Freud's work has created a safe space between himself and the forbidden impulse (Gay, 2015: 11), the English translation has created a safe space between the world and Freud. Based on this idea, we can now relate the phenomenon of English translation with what Abbott described as the process of professionalization in the modern American society to explain why the English translation has become so popular. Abbott described two develop processes of the change of knowledge with a background of professionalization: growing and updating. On the one hand, the process of professionalization requires to produce a large amount of new and detailed knowledge; on the other hand, the more detailed the division of a profession, the higher is the demand for abstract knowledge. The reason behind it is that "abstract knowledge lasts longer than knowledge about specific facts or methods" (Abbott, 2016: 261). In other words, the more professionalized that psychoanalysis becomes, the more it needs Freud, especially the abstract image of Freud in the English translation.

In the twentieth century, Freud's original work was above all a modern experience. This experience has changed us, brought us great joy and self-understanding, while increased our anxiety about ourselves at the same time. It changed the way we see the world while was rejected or repressed by us. This means that even we acknowledge Freud, it is hard for us to accept Freud's experience. Just as Foucault puts, "since the classical age, depression has always been the fundamental connection between power, knowledge and sexuality" (Foucault, 1978: 5). The English translation is naturally one of the manifestations of depression. In this sense, even Freud himself has embodied the trend of this depression. This is also why Foucault has firmly stated that we have to abandon the normative functions of Freud's conservative psychoanalysis (Foucault, 1978: 5).

Under this great pressure under the name of Freud, the father of psychoanalysis, these original text has become some sort of distant, silent, erratic, non-cooperative and wild early experiences. They are like the seeds of experience which cannot be directly accepted by the civilized world,

while changed and reshaped the world through the English translation. The English translation is by no means this experience itself, but its transformation and sublimation. It has to be disguised before it can enter the stage of history, even though the original version is its genuine driving force to change history. However, both versions are indispensable for us to understand civilization and history. In the comparison of these two versions, it can be found that there is obviously a social mechanism similar with Elias' "civilizing process." Gay noticed that with the development of history, there was a civilizing process about the understanding of sexuality, which is an increasing sense of anxiety with a mask of science. The English translation is also in line with this major process. In this sense, the English translation can be seen as a product produced by the modern bourgeois' "cultural superego" (Gay, 2015: 438). The problem never lies in sexuality itself, but in the social connotations it represents and the social anxiety and guilt it causes. The modernization of sexual languages can only be possible in conjunction with the development of capitalism, for only in this way can it become an integral component of the Bourgeois order (Foucault, 1978: 5). As a result, the reflections and expressions of sexuality become the reflections and expressions of a macro historic order, which also causes greater difficulties. However, this is precisely the essence of this matter. The desires in daily life are increasingly "transformed" into discourses linked to greater orders. Yet the more we talk and research sexuality in this way, the further we are from the real sexuality. Only in this trend can Freud's work and its translation be truly understood. As Foucault stated, cases such as *Three Essays on the Theory of Sexuality* and "Little Hans" have successfully re-raised the issue of sexuality in this trend (Foucault, 1978: 27).

Therefore, from the plain and smooth German version, to the English version that can be taught and learnt as a scientific knowledge in the class and can be used as a professional knowledge, the process is both an example of the transformation into a modern knowledge, and a representative of the knowledge production system of the modern society (as well as a social mechanism).

In this regard, there is no need to distinguish too much between the

translation and the original work. As Gay stated, although historians and psychoanalysts often point out that the human perceptions, languages and actions are richer and deeper than what the average people can see, it does not mean that the truth is exactly opposite of what it appears to be: Paradoxically, things are not what they seem to be, but at the same time are what they seem to be (Gay, 2015: 13). This statement can also apply to the relationship between the English translation and Freud's original work. In this sense, the changes made in the English translation are more like Freud's metaphor of circumcision: it does not have any substantial influence, yet contains strong ceremonial and symbolic meanings.

Thirdly, this change, at the same time, certainly corresponds to the modernized evolution of the American society. On the one hand, as mentioned earlier, the professionalization of psychoanalysis is bound to shift from the early distinctive European personal attribution to a scientized and rationalized attribution which is dependent on technology (Abbott, 2016: 283) in the American society. This has made the Freudianism a great success in the United States (Abbott, 2016: 441–443), and the specific features that Abbott concluded for its success (Abbott, 2016: 442, 445) coincide with the attributes that the English translation contained. On the other hand, to correspond with this historical process, when Zaretsky was researching the history of Freudianism as a modern American mental structure through the Weberian perspective, he found that in order to gain legitimacy in the modern history, psychoanalysis could only rely on two channels: the emerging psychiatric treatment and research universities (especially the medical schools in the university). Both of these two channels are subordinated to the historical process of modern rationalization in the Weberian perspective, which has shown a narrower and harsher form at the realistic level (Gay, 2015: 198).

Gay's work was certainly not influenced by the English translation, but directly pointed out the essence of psychoanalysis. He believes that in this respect, Freud's psychoanalysis shared the same characteristics with Weber's Calvinism. They are both concerned with the state of the soul (Gay, 2015: 212). It is in this sense that psychoanalysis has its sociological significance in its changes in the United States.

This sociological significance is that, just like Weber's analysis about the process of protestants making their choices, the historical change mentioned above also belongs to "this-worldly program of ethical rationalization" (Zaretsky, 2013). The institutionalization of psychoanalysis needs to cut its connection with the charisma of its founder. On the one hand, the connotations of psychoanalysis are closely integrated with the great social and cultural transformation during the post-war reconstruction, providing both theoretical support and was changed too during the transformation; on the other hand, the main theme during this great historical change, which is the interweaving of charisma and rationalization, has also become the main theme of the changing process of psychoanalysis. The rationalization, represented by the institutionalization of science and medicine, started to dominate the changing process of psychoanalysis. Psychoanalysis became more and more closely linked to the scientific conceptions of positivism, while the latter, after a while, was used against psychoanalysis (Zaretsky, 2013: 424). Psychoanalysis, in the end, does not only become a pure version in the sense of the text, but also a pure version in the sense of practice. At the same time, however, some psychoanalysts are still loyal to Freud and regard psychoanalysis as a vocation, yet the emergence of *The Standard Edition* formed a corresponding trend with the pure version of psychoanalysis practice.

5 The rationalization of knowledge

In this paper, we started from discussing the rationalization in Freud's English translation, and researched it as a phenomenon of modern knowledge. It is not our intention to deny the English translation, but to regard it as a textual phenomenon. The significance can only be revealed by the differences, and the original meaning of the German texts can only be revealed by the English translation. Therefore, these two versions have constituted the indispensable texts we need in order to understand Freud. What is more, the differences between the two versions are also the starting point for us to understand the change of "reality" (Berger and Luckmann, 1967) in the modern society from a perspective of the sociology

of knowledge. The change of Freud's work, from its original style of a prose to a scientific style, is not only a trend in the ideological history, but also the reflection of the psychoanalysis practice and its social background in the United States. It is also an expression of the social mechanism of the modern society.

In Freudian psychoanalysis, analysts must go through a deep self-analysis or be analyzed before conducting his/her work to ensure that he/she can accept and analyze the materials impartially (Freud, 1986b: 320). However, this "scientized" way to acquire neutral knowledge was gradually replaced by a formalized and institutionalized modern science mechanism. The kind of emotional language in Freud's text has shifted into indifferent and rationalized terms. The same kind of change can be found in the practice of psychoanalysis. The process of rationalization began to shift from the practice to the theory. Psychoanalysis eventually turns from the method to examine one's own soul to a professional and rationalized knowledge that can be experimented and measured, which is used to examine the morbid psychology of others in a subject-oriented and professional way. This is a basic story of the change from soul (Seele) to mind. In this story, the relationship between knowledge and passion, authors and works, researchers and objects, research as a work and the self-growth of researchers all started to break down. We can see how a kind of knowledge and other knowledge about such a knowledge were produced in a field constituted by various academic ideas, trends of conceptions, power struggles and historical changes, and are considered as tools for production, which are waving in the destiny of the rational and the irrational age. From Nietzsche to Freud, then to Weber, Scheler and Foucault, the thinking about this issue has always been the central field to understand the modern society and its self-understanding. Clarifying this change cannot only help us understand Freud's own work, but also allow us to re-understand his discussion about "soul/body" in the tradition of Western ideological history. In this sense, is Freud not another "son of European civilization"?

As for the story itself, the English translation certainly has made Freud's ideas widely spread, yet it also brought extensive criticisms to

Freud in the scientific field. On the one hand, many scholars have strived to validate Freud's work in a scientific way (Rieff, 1959: 19); on the other hand, in the tradition of ideological history, although Freud used a scientific approach to understand and save human souls, which is exactly the same as the sociological approaches represented by Comte, Spence, Durkheim and others, which are regarded as scientific approaches to solving moral problems, yet this trend has brought many criticisms to Freud (Rieff, 1959: 3). In this spreading and changing process, as is well-known, the reason why psychoanalysis was eliminated in the psychology field is precisely that it is not scientific enough. The original intention to change it eventually became the reason to bury it in the scientific field. Although the psychoanalysis practice still exists nowadays, in Weber's words, the floating cloak that was originally worn for understanding the souls eventually turned to be a heavy cage. Although this cage can protect the professionals in this field, the cage, however, is still a cage after all.

Acknowledgements

This paper was finished in the course of translating Freud's anthology, and was presented in the Jusheng Academic Forum/Workshop on Chinese Translations of Classical Works in August 2016, which was co-hosted by the Commercial Press and the Institute of Humanities and Social Sciences of Peking University, and was read out at the Fifth Workshop on Social Theory in Shanghai University in October 2016. I thank the colleagues for their criticisms and suggestions. Thanks for the advice and help of the anonymous reviews.

References

- [1] Abbott, A. *The System of Professions: An Essay on the Division of Expert Labor*. Li, R. (trans.) Liu S. (ed.) Beijing: The Commercial Press, (2016).
- [2] O'Neill, J. *The Domestic Economy of the Soul*. Sun, F. (trans.) Hangzhou: Zhejiang People's Publishing House, (2016).
- [3] Freud, S. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Sun, M. (trans.) Beijing: The Commercial Press, (2006).
- [4] Gay, P. *Education of the Senses*. Zhao, Y. (trans.) Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House, (2015).

- [5] Husserl, E. *The Crisis of European Sciences and Transcendental Phenomenology*. Wang, B. (trans.) Beijing: The Commercial Press, (2001).
- [6] Coser, L. *Men of Ideas: A Sociologist's View*. Guo, F. (trans.) Beijing: Central Compilation & Translation Press, (2004).
- [7] Laplanche, J. & Pontalish, J. *Vocabulary of Psychoanalysis*. Shen, Z & Wang, W. (trans.) Taipei: Editions du Flaneur, (2000).
- [8] Mannheim, K. *Ideology and Utopia*. Yao, R. (trans.) Beijing: Jiuzhou Press, (2007).
- [9] Mitchell, S. & Black, M. *Freud and Beyond: A History of Modern Psychoanalytic Thought*. Chen, Z., Huang, J. & Shen, D. (trans.) Beijing: The Commercial Press, (2007).
- [10] Scheler, M. *Problems of a Sociology of Knowledge*. Ai, Y. (trans.) Nanjing: Yilin Press, (2014a).
- [11] Schler, M. *Love and Cognition*. in Liu, X. (ed.) *Love and Order*. Lin, K. (trans.) Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing Group, (2014b).
- [12] Schwartz, J. *Cassandra's Daughter: A History of Psychoanalysis*. Chen, X. (trans.) Shanghai, Shanghai Translation Publishing House, (2015).
- [13] Steiner, R. in Timms, E. & Segal, N. (eds.) *Freud in Exile: Psychoanalysis and Its Vicissitudes*. Taipei: Wu-Nan Book Inc, (2001).
- [14] Uwe, H. in Timms, E. & Segal, N. (eds.) *Freud in Exile: Psychoanalysis and Its Vicissitudes*. Taipei: Wu-Nan Book Inc, (2001).
- [15] Weber, M. *Academic and Political Vocations*. Feng, K. (trans.) Beijing, SDX Joint Publishing, (1998).
- [16] Zaretsky, E. *Secrets of the Soul: A Social and Cultural History of Psychoanalysis*. Ji, G. (trans.) Beijing: Jincheng Press, (2013).
- [17] Bakan, D. 1958, *Sigmund Freud and the Jewish Mystical Tradition*. Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc.
- [18] Berger, Peter L. & Thomas Luckmann 1967, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [19] Bettelheim, Bruno 1983, *Freud and Man's Soul*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- [20] Brill, A. A. 1913, *Introduction to The Interpretation of Dreams, Freud*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- [21] Cuddihy, J. M. 1974, *The Ordeal of Civility: Freud, Marx, Levi-Strauss and Jewish Struggle with Modernity*. New York: Basic Books.
- [22] Freud, Sigmund 1941, *Gesammelte Werke Vol. VII: Werke aus den Jahren (1906–1909)*. London: Imago Publishing Co., Ltd.
- [23] Freud, Sigmund 1948, *Gesammelte Werke Vol. XIV: Werke aus den Jahren (1925–1931)*. London: Imago Publishing Co., Ltd.
- [24] Freud, Sigmund 1973, "Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis." In James Strachey & Angela Richards (eds.), *The Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 1*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- [25] Freud, Sigmund 1976, *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. New York: W. W. Norton.
- [26] Freud, Sigmund 1984, "Beyond the Pleasure Principle." In Angela Richards (ed.), *The Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 11*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- [27] Freud, Sigmund 1985, *The Complete Letters of Sigmund Freud to Wilhelm Fliess (1887–1904)*. Translated and edited by Jeffrey Moussaieff. Masson, Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- [28] Freud, Sigmund 1986a, "The Claims of Psychoanalysis to Scientific Interest." In Albert Dickson (ed.), *The Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 15*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- [29] Freud, Sigmund 1986b, "The Question of Lay Analysis." In Albert Dickson (ed.), *The Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 15*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- [30] Freud, Sigmund 1986c, "Editor's Note to The Question of Lay Analysis." In Albert Dickson (ed.), *The Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 15*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin

Books.

- [31] Freud, Sigmund 1986d, "An Autobiographical Study (1925[1924])." In Albert Dickson (ed.), *The Penguin Freud Library, Vol. 15*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- [32] Freud, Sigmund 1986e, *The Penguin (Pelican) Freud Library*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books.
- [33] Freud, Sigmund 1999/1940, *Gesammelte Werk, Chronologisch Geordnet, Edward Bibring, Ernst Kris*. Frankfurt: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- [34] Freud, Sigmund 2001/1930, "Introduction to an Article in the Medical Review of Reviews." In *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*. Translated by James Strachey & Alix Strachey. New York, London: W. W. Norton.
- [35] Freud, Sigmund 2001/1957, *Leonardo Da Vinci and A Memory of His Childhood*. Translated by James Strachey. New York, London: W. W. Norton.
- [36] Foucault, Michel 1978, *The History of Sexuality: An Introduction*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- [37] Foucault, Michel 1984, *The Foucault Reader*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- [38] Foucault, Michel 1988, *Politics, Philosophy, Culture, Interviews and Other Writings 1977–1984*. New York: Routledge, Chapman & Hall, Inc.
- [39] Fromm, E. 1982/1932, "The Method and Function of an Analytic Social Psychology." In A. A. Rato & E. Gebhardt (eds.), *The Essential Frankfurt School Reader*. New York: Continuum.
- [40] Gay, Peter 1978, *Freud, Jews and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [41] Grubrich-Simitis, Ilse 1996, *Back to Freud's Texts: Making Silent Documents Speak*. New Haven, Conn: Yale University Press.
- [42] Jones, Ernest 1961, *The Life and Work of Sigmund Freud*. New York: Basic Books Publishing Co. Inc.
- [43] Klein, Dennis B. 1981, *Jewish Origins of the Psychoanalytic Movement*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- [44] Mahony, Patrick J. 1982, *Freud as a Writer*. New York: International University press.
- [45] Mahony, Patrick J. 1984, *Cries of the Wolf Man*. New York: International University press.
- [46] Mahony, Patrick J. 1986, *Freud and the Rat Man*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- [47] Mahony, Patrick J. 1989, *On Defining Freud's Discourses*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- [48] Marcus, S. 1984, *Freud and the Culture of Psychoanalysis, Studies in the Transition from Victorian Humanism to modernity*. Boston: George, Allen & Unwin.
- [49] McGrath, W. J. 1986, *Freud's Discovery of Psychoanalysis: The Politics of Hysteria*. Ithaca, N. J.: Cornell University Press.
- [50] Nussbaum, Martha C. 1990, *Love's Knowledge: Essays on Philosophy and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- [51] Ornston, D. 1982, "'Strachey's Influence: A Preliminary Report.'" *International Journal of Psychoanalysis* 63 (4).
- [52] Paskauskas, R. Andrew (ed.) 1995, *The Complete Correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Ernest Jones, 1908–1939*. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- [53] Rieff, Philip 1959, *Freud: The Mind of the Moralizer*. New York: Anchor Books.
- [54] Robins, Edward 1991, "Dora's Dreams: In Whose Voice—Strachey's, Freud's, or Dora's?" *Contemporary Psychotherapy Review* 6 (1).
- [55] Schorske, Carl 1981, *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture*. New York: Vintage Books.
- [56] Sherwin-White, Susan 2003, "Freud, The VIA REGIA, and Alexander the Great." *Psychoanalysis and History* 5 (2).