УДК 159.964.2:[316.75:929](477)

Vadim Menzhulin

FREUD AND OTHERS IN UKRAINIAN: TRANSLITERATION, IDEOLOGY AND BIOGRAPHY

"It was observed that… in genius of no other people music and metaphysics have been so inherent and have taken root so much than that in the German people; and it is true that since the second half of the 17th century the biggest musicians and the biggest metaphysicians have come from Germany: on the one hand, Bach and Handel, Gluck and Haydn, Mozart and Beethoven, and on the other - Leibniz and Kant"[1]. The question of why the author of this quote (famous XIX century historian of philosophy Kuno Fischer) praised those great men more than Vivaldi or, say, Malebranche, would be rhetorical. Understandably, Fischer, a German, emphasised achievements and greatness of the representatives of German nation. The author of multivolume "History of New Philosophy" as a German had all grounds to be proud of German genii. And so do other people of the world, proud of their nations' own prominent names. However, is this sort of national 'appropriation' always well-grounded?

To begin with, let's consider Leibnitz as an example. Fischer was well aware of the Slavic origin of the family name of the creator of monadology. Its original spelling was *Lubeniecz*. Fischer also knew that the major works of that great German of Slavic origin were written in Latin and French rather than German. Therefore Fischer's remark on Leibnitz' ideas being "happy stars which brought the German spirit into the history of the newest philosophy"[2] required quite a few explanations. Thus it appeared that the philosopher, who lived in Roman world for many years, had always remained a convinced Germanophile. Furthermore, according to Fischer Leibnitz considered German to be the most appropriate language of philosophy, and was writing in other languages only "because of his public to whom his writings were proposed"[3]. Fischer simply derides as illogical the idea of Leibnitz's French editor Foucher de Careil that Leibnitz's personality evolved as a combination of and interaction between its Slavic, German and Christian elements. It is possible indeed that Foucher de Careil's musings on national and cultural identity of Leibnitz were not exactly well-grounded. It could also happen that strictly following logics and facts was less of a priority on Foucher de Careil's agenda – he, as a Frenchman, could have simply succumbed to temptation of denting German pride by diluting Leibnitz's 'Germanness'. However it is also possible that Fischer's reduction of 'non-German' elements of Leibnitz's life and work was prompted by a certain ideological bias – German patriotic this time. May be, the truth, however trivial it sounds, is somewhere in between?

The research on prominent historic personalities very often brings about this sort of complications, which sometimes turn into quite sharp ideological arguments. From *Philosophia Perennis* perspective the question of Leibnitz belonging to this or that nation or culture may be irrelevant. However, permanent competition of national ideologies, which has been going with varying intensity and is likely to go on for a long time, sets a different context. The supporters of competing ideological projects demand a straightforward answer on whether Gogol is a Ukrainian or Russian writer or who was the first Ukrainian spaceman – Pavlo Popovich, or Leonid Kadenyuk[4]. One can find numerous examples of similar ideological battles. However it is more important to understand that any victory in those battles is illusionary and does not sustain. Any ideology is 'existentially connected' and reflects a relative and particular view rather than the only true one – the point very

---

[1] "Man hat die Bemerkung gemacht, das Musik und Metaphysik... in dem Genius keines anderen Volkes so einheimisch und angebaut seien wie in dem des deutschen, und es ist wahr, das seit der zweiten Hдlfte des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts die grцЯten Musiker und die grцЯten Metaphysiker aus Deutschland hervorgegangen sind, wie aus der einen Seite Bach und Hдndel, Gluck und Haydn, Mozart und Beethoven, aus der anderen Leibniz und Kant" (Fischer Kuno, *Schopenhauers Leben, Werke und Lehre* (Geschichte der neuern Philosophie von Kuno Fischer, Neunter Band), Heidelberg: Carl Winter's Universitдtsbuchhandlung, 1898, S. 383).

[2] "… die glьcklichen Sterne unter denen der deutsche Geist eingefьhrt wird in die Geschichte der neuern Philosophie (Fischer Kuno, *Leibniz und seine Schule* (Geschichte der neuern Philosophie von Kuno Fischer, Zweiter Band), Heidelberg: Verlagsbuchhandlung von Friedrich Oallcrmann, 1867, S. 349).

[3] "Wir werden nachher einer seiner staatswissenschaftlichen Schriften der bedeutendsten aus der mainzischen Zeit in deutscher Sprache begegnen Wenn Leibniz dennoch meistentheils lateinisch und franzцsisch schrieb so war er dazu durch das Publicum genцthigt fьr welches seine Schriften bestimmt waren" (Ibid., S. 103).

[4] Popovich was a Soviet citizen of the strong Ukrainian roots who took part in the Soviet space mission as early as 1962. Kadenyuk is the citizen of sovereign Ukraine who made a space flight on the board of an American shuttle in 1994.

well founded by Karl Mannheim quite a long time ago. Mannheim's own life, by the way, may be a brilliant case in point, illustrating all complications around the attempts to properly 'localise', culturally and nationally, any personality of a *world* importance. Mannheim was born and brought up in Austro-Hungarian Empire, then moved to Germany, and was forced in 1933 to immigrate to Great Britain where his views changed dramatically. A well known historian of sociology Lewis Coser quite persuasively demonstrates that changes in Mannheim's views were so deep and decisive that we can speak about a sharp distinction between 'German' and 'English' Mannheim[5]. Coser suggests quite convincingly that it is exactly Mannheim's own 'existential connectedness' that prompted him to construct the ideal model of 'free-floating intellectuals', personalities fully independent of ideological bias of any sort. If this ideal model is ignored, intellectual work inevitably becomes ideologically loaded. However it should be equally emphasised that Mannheim is referring to an *ideal*, something one can approximate but never completely attain. Disregarding this nuance may lead to even more severe consequences – development of the total ideologies, 'existentially connected' convictions and beliefs that are imposed on the whole of the society without any recognition of their particularity.

In my opinion the latter warning is highly relevant to the recent years' practice of searching for and substantiation of a Ukrainian transliteration of proper names of foreign historical personalities. Seemingly innocent and technical, it may lead to sharp and most likely irresolvable ideological conflicts, unless complemented with thorough self-analysis and, respectively, recognition of limits of a researcher's objectivity. The recent discussions on authentic Ukrainian spelling of the last name of the founder of psychoanalysis seem to me one of the most staggering, and I would like to elaborate on those.

The latest edition of "Encyclopaedic dictionary of philosophy", prepared by the Institute of Philosophy of the Ukrainian National Academy of Sciences, suggests two possible alternatives of Ukrainian transliteration - *Фройд* ([**f r ɔɪ d**]) and *Фрейд* ([**f r eɪ d**])[6]. Another newly published Ukrainian encyclopaedic book spells the great man's name as *Фройд* ([**f r ɔɪ d**]), however provides '*фрейдизм*'[7] ([**f r eɪ d i z m**]) for the teaching founded by him. A separate section of a fundamental work by a prominent Ukrainian historian of psychology V. Rometetz is dedicated to the heritage of *Фрейд* ([**f r eɪ d**])[8], however the translator of the Ukrainian version of "Introduction to Psychoanalysis" [9] published in the same year names *Фройд* ([**f r ɔɪ d**]) as its author.

Who is right? There is no definitive answer however a trend is clearly visible. More and more of Ukrainian humanitarians adopt a point of view that the transliteration [**f r eɪ d**] is a copycat of the 'foreign' (Russian) and 'old' (Soviet) standard. Furthermore, a solid linguistic argument in support of the alternative spelling is brought up postulating that the Ukrainian transliteration should best reflect the pronunciation of a proper name in the language of its origin. The latter is supposed to be *German* which, as its speakers rightly point out, implies [**f r ɔɪ d**]. Linguistic argument, however, is very closely linked to the ideological one. [**f r eɪ d**] associates with dark Soviet past, while [**f r ɔɪ d**] – with bright European future of Ukraine. Under those circumstances spelling and transliterating Freud as [**f r eɪ d**] get more and more out of fashion and good style. It is outshined by more 'modern' [**f r ɔɪ d**]. However, one could claim that this 'good style', paraphrasing the title of a popular modern Ukrainian novel, would make the pioneer of psychoanalysis burst into tears[10]. Let me try to explain why.

First of all, in my opinion, the perception of Russian language tradition of psychoanalysis (and respective spelling of the name of its founder) as radically foreign to Ukraine is a little short-sighted. By alienating Russian-language psychoanalysis we substantially impoverish our own cultural baggage. Precisely, the tradition of *psychoanalysis in Ukraine* is absolutely impossible if the heritage of the prominent *Russian-speaking* psychoanalysts is disregarded. Some of them the founder of psychoanalysis stayed in close professional contact and even viewed as the future successors of his teachings[11]. Besides,

[5] See: Coser, Lewis A. *Masters of Sociological Thought: Ideas in Historical and Social Context*, New York: Harcourt Brace Jivanovich, 1977.

[6] Філософський енциклопедичний словник / НАН України; Інститут філософії ім. Г.С.Сковороди / В.І. Шинкарук (голова редкол.). – Київ: «Абрис», 2002. – С. 691.

[7] УСЕ: Універсальний словник-енциклопедія / М. Попович (голова редкол.), Б. Антоняк (авт. текстів і пер.). – 2 вид., доп. – Київ: ПВП «Всеувито», 2001. – С. 1440, 1441.

[8] *Роменець В.А., Маноха І.П.* Історія психології XX століття: Навч. посіб. для студ. вузів, що навч. за спец. «Психологія». – Київ: Либідь, 1998.

[9] *Фройд З.* Вступ до психоаналізу: Лекції зі вступу до психоаналізу з новими висновками / Петро Таращук (пер.). – Київ: Основи, 1998.

[10] "Freud would weep" is the title of a novel written by the popular contemporary Ukrainian writer Irena Karpa (*Карпа І.І.* Фройд ([**f r ɔɪ d**]) би плакав. — Х.: Фоліо, 2004).

[11] A lot of information on the early psychoanalysts worked on the territory of contemporary Ukraine before the Bolshevist Revolution and in the first post-Revolutionary decades is collected in: История психоанализа в Украине / Бондаренко Л.И., Кутько И.И., Петрюк П.Т. (сост.). – Харьков: Основа, 1996. – 360 с.

in any case the strictly Russian transliteration is out of question. The direct copycat would give 'Фрєйд' ([**f r j̲ e̲i̲ d**]) rather than 'Фрейд' ([**f r e̲ɪ̲ d**]), since Ukrainian *Фрейд* is the direct equivalent of Russian *Фрейд* only graphically, but not phonetically.

The choice between a) continuing the tradition of Russian-speaking Ukrainian psychoanalysis and b) following the norms of Ukrainian spelling, in the light of continuing quest for Ukrainian unique national self-identity, is obviously in favour of (b). Let's make it, and spell Freud's name as the Ukrainian spelling norms prescribe. What are those norms? There is a common view that the Ukrainian language tends to adopt a phonetic approach toward transliteration of foreign proper names – the spelling is meant to result in the pronunciation as close as possible to the one in the language of origin. Therefore, in dealing with a *German* family name *Freud*, the Ukrainian spelling and pronunciation should give [**f r ɔ̲ɪ̲ d**], since this is exactly the way it is pronounced by German speakers. However, *is* German actually *the language of origin?* Is it really German we should translate the name from? Would it happen that, having solved a fairly simple ideological dilemma (between Soviet-Russian and Ukrainian spelling) we find ourselves in the epicentre of a much more complicated ideological conflict? Would the substitution of [**f r e̲ɪ̲ d**] to [**f r ɔ̲ɪ̲ d**] be a senseless jump out of the frying pan into the fire?

Let's look closer at some of our hero's biographic details. The parents of the future psychoanalyst born on May 6 1856 in Freiburg (now – Pribor, Czech Republic) came from Halychyna (Galicia, a historical region in East Central Europe, currently divided between Poland and Ukraine, named after Ukrainian city of Halych). The father – Jacob – was born in1815 in the town of Tysmenytsya (now – Ivano-Frankivsk region of Ukraine) and lived there until 25. In Tysmenytsya his first marriage produced two older brothers of future psychoanalyst – Emmanuel and Philip. However the 'Ukrainian roots' of Freuds' family are much deeper. Apparently, many generations of Freuds lived in the town of Buchach (Ukrainian Ternopil' region). Amalia (Malka) Nathanson (1835-1930), mother of the prominent psychiatrist, also comes from Ukraine. Some of her son's biographers refer to her as 'pretty Galician', as she was born in Brody (now Lviv region of Ukraine). Amalia before her move to Vienna lived in Odessa, where two of her brothers stayed after the family's immigration to the Austria-Hungarian capital. Her son having become a well known doctor maintained relationships with numerous relatives from various parts of modern Ukraine (not just Odessa and Halychina but Zhytomyr region as well[12]).

Why then should we adopt the *German* manner of pronunciation the name of a *Jew* born in contemporary Czech Republic, with brothers and parents coming from contemporary Ukraine? The family's language was not German but Yiddish – Freud's mother spoke it the whole of her life, including seventy four years of her genial son's growth, maturity and ageing. It has to be noted that Yiddish is not one of the 'dialects' of German as some people in Ukraine think, but one of the German languages in its own right, old and well developed. What would we see upon closer took at it? Let's refer to the Oxford University dictionary explaining the etymology of a number of common family names in USA. The dictionary tells that the last name Freud may belong to either Germans or Jews. In German it originates from the word *Freud(e)* (joy, delight) and is pronounced as [**f r ɔ̲ɪ̲ d**]. However, Ashkenazi Jews would trace it to the Yiddish name *Freyde*[13]. Yiddish also has its own equivalent for the word *joy*, which is not *freud*, but *freyd* and sounds not as [**f r ɔ̲ɪ̲ d**] but as [**f r e̲ɪ̲ d**]. Therefore in language of many generations of our hero's ancestors (including his parents) their family name had been highly probably pronounced as [**f r e̲ɪ̲ d**].

The major argument against the above drawn by the Ukrainian defenders of [**f r ɔ̲ɪ̲ d**] transliteration may be articulated as follows. Yes, in a personal domestic context we are talking about a man from the Yiddish language environment. However, Freud has contributed to the world's scientific heritage not as a Jewish boy but as the author of many works, lectures and letters written and delivered in German; his private life may be of some interest to relatives while the scholars should concentrate on his research; therefore his last name should be read under the standards of the language he used as the world famous scholar.

Partly the above propositions make sense. Freud indeed studied his future profession, built his official career, wrote his works and spoke to his colleagues-compatriots in German. However, can a personal identity be reduced to a person's professional activities? If so, the spelling choice for the name of the founder of psychology should be undoubtedly made in favour of the German [**f r ɔ̲ɪ̲ d**]. The conclusion is slightly undermined by the fact that Freud's name pronounced in the common local dialect of the country Freud was pursuing his professional career (Austro-Hungary, later – Austria) would sound still closer

[12] See: *Эткинд А.* Эрос невозможного: История психоанализа в России. – СПб., 1993. – С. 270.

[13] See: http://www.answers.com/topic/freud-2

to [**f r e͟ɪ d**], rather than [**f r ɔ͟ɪ d**]. However 'Austrian dialect' is not the last argument against [**f r ɔ͟ɪ d**]. Once again – why looking at the *family name* as an important part of one's identity shall we limit our research to the person's professional career only and ignore the family tradition, the history of the *family* as such? It was not the diploma of the Vienna University, nor his German-speaking readers and colleagues that gave Freud his family name. He got it from at least a few generations of Yiddish-speaking ancestors and, first and foremost, from his father. Yes, through most of his life, and in his professional activity, their great descendant was speaking the title language of the empire he was a national of. However, if a title language of an empire is assumed the right basis for transliteration of the names of the empire's nationals, the name of the great Ukrainian poet Taras Shevchenko (Шевченко) should be spelled in Ukrainian as 'Шевчєнко' to reflect its pronunciation in Russian as the title language of then Russian empire. Most of Shevchenko's texts were written in Russian, however in no way this would justify spelling his name in Russian manner – it is very clear how embarrassing the Russian pronunciation of the prophet of Ukrainian independence would sound. Back to the founder of psychoanalysis, the ideology twists differently – not 'from' the empire but 'back' to it. In Ukraine Freud is traditionally identified first as an Austrian[14], and then is automatically labelled as a representative of German speaking culture. In this way, whether deliberately or not, the imperial logics is revived: to ignore, repress or exterminate the cultural diversity of the ethnic minorities.

Yet there are some grounds to assume that the necessity to refuse the language of the ancestry (Yiddish) in favour of the language of the empire (German) was one of the hardest cultural-psychological experiences of Freud's childhood. The dominant imperial view of Yiddish as inferior to German could make Freud conceal his awareness of Yiddish since youth. In his mature years he claimed many times in public that has no knowledge of Yiddish whatsoever, however in his private letters to relatives and compatriots he used the words of the language of his childhood[15]. There is a special research on the impact of that fundamental repression on Freud's life[16]. His deep understanding of the Jewish spiritual tradition could be repressed in a similar way. The studies of the hand-written materials kept in the archives of the U.S. Congress Library reveal the intensity of trauma and the extent of its concealment in Freud's mature years. One of the researchers on the subject B. Goodnick tried to prove with documentary evidence the truth of what Freud strongly denied in his public speeches – that in his early years he systematically studied Judaic both at school and at home[17]. In Goodnick's opinion, the anti-Semitic environment in Austria in Freud's early academic years made him disguise his specific Judaic education to present himself as a 'pure scholar'. If Freud had managed to displace *fully* into unconsciousness those unwanted yet essential elements of his biography and personality, he would have refuted one of the fundamental provisions of his own theory. He had not. In the last years of his life Freud focused on studying the origins of *Jewish identity* rather then on 'pure' science or on praising the German culture. This fundamental shift in Freud's research interests is manifested by his last big work "Moses and monotheism" (1939).

The above facts are much more than insignificant biographic details. First of all, in humanities unlike science the individual (idiographic) plays no lesser role than the universal (nomothetic). Secondly, Freud's particular case is not just about a natural curiosity many individuals experience in their late years towards origins of their people. The man in question is one of the greatest sons of his nation, and furthermore – the story in question touches upon the huge catastrophe in the history of that nation, with the author of "Moses and monotheism" being one its direct victim.

The dominance of the German spelling of Freud's family name becomes particularly dubious once, further to the above, we mention that sadly the German-speaking scholar of Jewish origin happened to witness the beginning of Holocaust. Many sources report how hard the first months in nazified Vienna were for Freud (after the Anschluss in 1938). A lot has been written on the Nazi attitude to psychoanalysis as such – how Hitler clique 'cleaned up' 'Arian psychotherapy' from 'harmful Jewish factor'[18]. The fate of the founder of psychoanalysis, should he had stayed in *German-speaking 'father-*

[14] For example, the above mentioned article in "Encyclopedic Dictionary of Philosophy" refers to the founder of psychoanalysis as an *Austrian* psychiatrist, psychologist and philosopher, while his Jewish origins are not mentioned at all. Overall, looking at Freud as an Austrian is not new – a similar approach was adopted in the West in 1920-1950s. The recognition of Jewish background as a significant part of Freud's personality came only in the middle of XX century).

[15] Yerushalmi, Y.H. *Freud's Moses: Judaism terminable and interminable*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991, P. 69.

[16] Kohn, M. *Freud Et Le Yiddish: Le Psyanalytique*, Paris: Christian Bourgois Йditeur, 1982.

[17] Goodnick, B. "Jacob Freud's birthday greeting to his son Alexander" // American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 1994, #54 (4), P. 372-375.

[18] See, for example: Goggin, J.E., Goggin, E.B. *Death of "Jewish Science": Psychoanalysis in the Third Reich*, Western Lafayette, Indiana: Purdue University Press, 2001.

land', would have been most likely disastrous, however his world fame as well as his influential admirers saved him from physical extinction. He managed to emigrate and died free – in Britain. As one of his biographers put it, "Freud was fortunate that he died never knowing how his sisters would end: Adolfine perished of starvation at the Theresienstadt camp, while the other three were murdered, probably at Auschwitz, in 1942"[19].

Freud's intellect, intuition and life experience made him feel quite distant from the German identity long time before its apocalyptic transformation of German world. This explains clearly why in his late years, talking about his identity, the founder of psychoanalysis mentioned a number of its elements but never German language: "I have… never pretended to be anything but what I am: a Jew from Moravia whose parents come from Austrian Galicia"[20]. Many years before that, trying to smooth out the conflict between his two successors (Karl Abraham, a Jew, and Carl Gustav Jung, a German) Freud advised Abraham to "be tolerant, and do not forget that really it is easier for you to follow my thoughts than it is for Jung, since to begin with you are completely independent, and then you are closer to my intellectual constitution through racial kinship, while he as a Christian and a pastor's son finds his way to me only against great inner resistances"[21]. However Freud himself very soon disregarded his tolerance and stopped any relationship with Jung. 'The pastor's son' in his turn later found himself among those few psychoanalysts who were accused of sympathy towards Nazi ideology. One of the researchers of Freud's hand-written heritage shows that as soon as the first symptoms of Nazism spreading across Europe became obvious, Freud demonstrably turned away from German identity and started supporting the fundamental Jewish values. As early as 1923 Freud advised Jews to give the Germans up, and nine years later (a year before Hitler came to power in Germany) he put it even stronger: "Should we not leave to itself this people abandoned by God"[22]. The fact that in this period he joined the presidium of Institute for Jewish Research (YIVO), the institution which was founded in 1925 in order to study the culture of the Jews of Eastern Europe (including the language of their own, Yiddish), is therefore indeed logical and significant.

Based on the above, the attempts to rubber-stamp the Ukrainian transliteration of Freud's family name with reference to 'German as the language of origin' seem debatable and lead to irresolvable ideological dispute. There are certain arguments to support the German language-based approach, however, the reasoning in favour of Yiddish as the language of origin appears at least as strong. Both standpoints are 'existentially connected' – they reflect only some part of the truth, and adopting one of them as a 'totality' would lead to highly dubious 'appropriation' of the proper name by one of the sides. I am convinced that the other attempts of phonetic transliteration of many other foreign proper names, such as Leibnitz or Mannheim for instance, is just same ambivalent. A detailed biographic research prior to transliteration decisions can hardly be recommended – the issue is not worth the effort, and may eventually lead to tough moral choices, as demonstrated by Freud's case. The ideologically loaded questions on the 'actual language of origin' or on what is a 'language' and what is a 'dialect' would come up again and again. Therefore, in order to stay free as much as possible from ideological bias it would be advisable to abandon the phonetic system of transliteration of foreign proper names in Ukrainian. Keeping close to the usual customary transliterations used on encyclopaedias, reference books and other texts, including those of the Soviet period (mainly in Russian), seems much more pragmatic and straightforward. The least it would achieve is avoiding chaos in information processing, storage and further use and sharing. This is why in my opinion transliteration [**f r e͟ɪ d**] (which is graphically corresponds to Russian [**f r j͟ei d**]) is the most appropriate option in comparison with [**f r ɪ͟ɔ͟ɛ d**]. As to the names that are yet to be included in encyclopaedias, the graphic, letter by letter, system of transliteration seems even much more scholarly correct and ideologically safe.

[19] Gay, P. *Freud. A Life for Our Time*, New York; London: W.W. Norton and Company, 1988, P. 649.

[20] Ibid., P. 597.

[21] *The complete correspondence of Sigmund Freud and Karl Abraham, 1907-1925*, Ed. By Ernst Falzeder, London; New York: Karnac, 2002, P. 38.

[22] See: Chasseguet-Smirgel, J. "A few remarks on Freud's attitude to the Nazis, 'Jo as Jew'" // Revue internationale d'histoire de la psychanalyse, #1 (1988), P. 13-31. The quote in English is taken from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/sites/entrez.