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Crossing Borders
Edipus in Asia and the Resistance to Psychoanalysis

包里华

1923年，布瑞纽斯尔·马里诺斯基给《自然》杂志写了一篇题为“精神分析学与人类学”的信，报告了他曾经在特罗布里恩群岛上“现代野蛮人”观察到的家庭结构的“原始类型”，希望通过他的人种学证据来修正一些精神分析学的概念，而非驳斥它们。他指出，在特罗布里恩群岛的母系氏族体系中，《图腾与禁忌》中没有凶猛残暴的父亲形象。“压抑性压抑”和“压抑禁忌”的一些基本概念以“一种不同于父系家庭的方式”在别处的地方起作用；因而，如果弗洛伊德的总理论是正确的，压抑愿望的形成就应该接受一种不同于俄狄浦斯情结的外现。

In several subsequent papers published a year later, Malinowski developed these ideas by drawing upon his observations of the development of male Trobriander children. Without a prohibiting father, according to him, a child’s sexuality proceeded along with its social development, with the “cravings of its mother” expiring in “a natural spontaneous manner” but its genital sexuality generally was never “dislodged.” The later intervention of the mother’s brother to enforce the taboo of physical contact with the boy’s sister holds in check his homicidal and incestuous wishes for her, this being, for Malinowski, evidence of a different nuclear complex. By drawing into sharper relief the relationship between biological and social development in different kinds of family structure, this led him to assert that adherents of orthodox psychoanalysis, rather than assuming the universality of the Edipus complex, should study “every type of civilisation, to establish the special complex that pertains to it.”


弗洛伊德学派的权威代表欧内斯特·琼斯很快就对这种修正主义的理论观点作出了回应。1924年，英国皇家人类学会对马里诺斯基的说法展开了激烈的讨论，于是该学会在那一年邀请琼斯做了一次讲座。琼斯提出，马里诺斯基所观察到的野蛮人对其父亲的忽视显示出了他们的自由态度，其结果就是将“某种可能带来不快后果的关系中的情感”转移及“放逐到某个更安全的距离”。十四年之后，弗洛伊德再次想起了这件事——当然，艾滋病和疟疾的流行让他在到了马里诺斯基写信给安娜的一封信，马里诺斯基信中将自己称为“弗洛伊德及其工作的忠实仰慕者”，对此弗洛伊德表现出一种惊讶，因为他一直更留意马里诺斯基对“他的观点的反对与否定”。
Ernest Jones, representing the Freudian establishment, was quick to respond to this attempted revision of orthodoxy. Malinowski's work was hotly debated in the Royal Anthropological Society in 1924, and Jones had been invited to deliver a lecture before it that year. Jones assumed that Malinowski's observations of savages' ignorance of their paternity indicated denial on their part, the effect of which was to shift the "affect in a relationship where it might have unpleasant consequences and depositing it at a safer distance." Freud was reminded of this fourteen years later when, frail and ill and in exile in London, he received a letter from Malinowski addressed to Anna describing himself as a "devoted admirer of [Freud] and his work" to which Freud expressed pleasant surprise as he had been more aware of his "opposition and contradiction to [his] views."

Jones's reinstatement of the foundational role of the Oedipus complex, however, was already at odds with others in the movement, notably Otto Rank, whom Malinowski had cited. As editor of Image, he had republished both Malinowski's and Jones's articles. Rank, in The Trauma of Birth, raised the radical idea that all paternal conflicts with the father, including Oedipal ones, were but a chimera to more "essential ones concerning birth." His placing the mother at the centre of the child's first dealings with the world brought to the fore the important role she plays in nurturing, and prioritised it over the potentially castrating role of the father. Freud initially accepted Rank's work as a contribution, but did not feel it had much of a future, little realising how his ambivalence toward the work would be used by members of his secret committee to drive a wedge between the two.

Bengal beckons

But disagreements with Freud over the centrality of the Oedipus complex were not confined to Europeans. In 1920, Freud received the first of several letters from Girindra Sekhar Bose, an Indian medical doctor who had turned to experimental psychology and completed a doctoral thesis on the subject of repression, a copy of which he sent to Freud. Suitably impressed that psychoanalysis had been recognised in a "forlorn country," Freud wrote a short introduction for Bose when his thesis was published as a book. Following the formation of the Indian Psychoanalytic Society and its affiliation to the International Psychoanalytic Association in 1922, he also asked Bose if he would like his name appended to the masthead of both the Zeitschrift für Psychoanalyse and the English language International...
Journal of Psychoanalysis. It was only later when Bose sent him copies of a number of his own papers that Freud had an opportunity to scrutinise (and criticise) his Indian colleague's work for its deviating from orthodoxy.

Bose's theory rested on two radical departures from Freud's work. First was his theory of the "opposite wish" whereby whatever is consciously wished is hospitalized to a wish for its opposite. This bipolarity comprises an active and a passive element, one of which is conscious, the other unconscious. As Bose put it, "the wish to strike somebody is accompanied by the unconscious wish to be struck." During the course of free association to presenting symptoms, Bose claimed to observe a 'see-saw' mechanism at work in his patients whereby, instead of disappearing completely even after wishes had been made conscious, symptoms persisted and further associations revealed an unconscious element of the opposite type. As analysis proceeded, conscious tendencies abated or slipped back into the unconscious and the opposite repressed tendency was made conscious. These alterations continued in a see-saw fashion but, over time, the force of the opposite wishes weakened as the frequency of oscillation increased. Bose theorised that the see-sawing was proceeding at its own pace but was time consuming, so he also induced it by asking his analysands to put themselves in the place of the object and thus force a new set of associations.

It was partly on the basis of this theory that Bose also re-conceptualised the Oedipus complex. Arising out of his theory of the opposite tendency, the desire to be male is accompanied by a desire to be female, seen according to Bose, "to be more easily unenrolled in Indian male patients than in Europeans... The Oedipus complex is very often a combined parental image and this is a fact of great importance. I have reasons to believe that much of the motivation of the 'maternal deity' is traceable to this source." The bringing to the fore of this figure has the effect of muting the threat of castration as exhibited in the Oedipus father since the fear is diminished by an opposing desire to be female, which implicitly accepts castration. According to Sudhir Kakar, the mention in Bose's letter of a maternal deity would have to be understood within Hindu culture as a possible reference to Deth, the great goddess. In one explanation of this myth, Kakar elaborates an Indian variant of Oedipus, termed by him the Ganesh complex.

Ganesha was one of the two sons of the goddess Deth (the other being Skanda) who, amongst her many incarnations, is known as the conqueror of the demon Mohisura whom she destroyed along with most of his army. She effected this feat through the
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medium of riding naked to battle and dancing, cutting off the heads of thousands and thousands as she wielded her sword. When Mahisasura tried to escape by transforming himself into an elephant, she cut off his trunk; when he transmuted to a buffalo whose thick hide made her swordplay impotent, she rode the buffalo to the point of exhaustion and then killed it by driving a spear through its neck. Karak suggests she is the phallic mother, the half-male, half female who incorporates through her son’s attachment to her his wish to be a man without having to separate from her. However, her husband Shiva becomes a rival for his wife’s affection and in the mythical narrative kills his son who stands guard at her bedroom while she bathes. Ganesh represents that half of the boy who refuses individuation and liberation through maternal separation.

Freud’s written reply to Bose on receiving his theoretical and popular papers was neutral in tone. Christiane Hartnack, in her book Psychoanalysis in Colonial India, details several anecdotes that suggest, however, that Freud was fresh from happy about this revision, even though in his penultimate letter to Bose he acknowledges that the bipolar nature of wishes shows up in three relatively neglected areas of bisexuality: masculinity/femininity, love/hate and activity/passivity. Freud’s major criticism of Bose’s ideas was that they were too “moralistic,” an epithet Freud seems to have employed to cover his disdain for what he took to be Bose’s lack of empirical support for his own theories. Nonetheless, in the same letter, Bose invited Freud to write a paper detailing these central tenets for publication in the two international psychoanalytic journals, but this seems not to have occurred.

An overture from Japan

During the period of his exchanges with Bose in the 1920s and early 1930s Freud also entered into correspondence with a psychologist, two psychiatrists and a litteratus from Japan. Each of them had read and been impressed by Freud’s work and three had travelled to see him on separate visits with a view to being analysed by him. That story has been told elsewhere but its significance for the current paper is that one of these early admirers of Freud, Kosawa Hisakomi, travelled to Vienna in 1931, and although he could not afford an analysis with Freud who passed him on to Richard Sterba, he did present him with a paper he had written about his ideas on the Edipus complex as it might pertain to Japanese culture. Hoping for a considered response, Freud gave him only

反趋势也变得有所意识。这些交替变化仍以一种拉拔的方式继续，但后来随着时间的推移，那些对立愿望的力量会按照越来越频的增加而减弱。佛也得出一种理论，这种拉拔虽然有其自身的节奏，但需要消磨时间，于是他引导他的精神分析接受者，让其将自己置于对象的位置，于是强制形成一套新的联想。

正是以此理论为部分基础，伯西也重新定义俄狄浦斯情结。出于他的相对趋势理论，那种希望成为男性的愿望伴随成为女性的愿望，用伯西自己的话就是“这种希望成为女性的愿望在印度比在欧洲的男性病人中更容易发展。俄狄浦斯情结通常是一个天真的父形象，而且这种事实具有非常重要的意义。我有理由相信，‘母性神明’的很大一部分动机来源于此。”这个人物的重要意义在于它能消解阉割的威胁，这正如伯西斯父子间所体现出来的，因为那种希望成为女性的相对愿望（暗中接受阉割）缓和了这种恐惧。按照苏荷尔，卡尔卡尔的说法，伯西信中提到这样一位母性神明的创作需要从印欧文化中的伟大女神方能那里面找理由。[11]在卡尔卡尔对神话的一个解释中，他提出了俄狄浦斯的印度版本，即法西雅情结。[12]

迦乃沙是女神曼维的两个儿子之一，另一个儿子叫斯堪达。曼维具有许多化身，其中之一是那魔马西撒拉的征服者，她消灭了马西撒拉及她的大部分军队。她成就此举的主要方法是亲身骑马走向战场，并一路奔跑去去，挥舞着它的宝剑砍下成千上万的头颅。当马西撒拉变成一块人像想要逃跑时，她砍下了自己的象牙；当它变成一块牛骨时，他勒断并且使它的宝剑失去了作用，于是她踏在牛骨上拼命追赶，使其劳累不堪，然后用一只长矛刺入它的脖子而杀死了它。卡尔卡尔认为她是一位系男女的性器崇拜的母亲。通过她儿女对她的依恋，使那种希望成为男人而同时又不与其分离的愿望融入己身。然而，她的丈夫成为妻子情感的对手，传说中她杀死了在妻子浴室房间门口的儿子。迦乃沙的形象代表了半个男孩，拒绝那种与母亲分离的个性化和自由化过程。

弗洛伊德在接到伯西寄来的理论及通俗论文之后，给伯西回了一封信中描述他收到的信。克里斯汀内·哈特克拉在其《精神分析在殖民地印度》一书中详细讲述了这几段轶闻，这些轶闻表明，弗洛伊德对伯西这种修正十分不满，尽管他在给伯西的倒数第二封信中
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15. Freud to Bose, January 1st 1933.
20. Miller.
the briefest of replies: “Dear Doctor, I have received and read your essay. I’ll keep it with me since it seems as if you have no intention to use it otherwise.”

In Kosawa’s version, Oedipus becomes the Ajase complex in his paper entitled “Two Kinds of Guilt”. His modification takes account, in Japanese society, of the mutual dependency that develops between mothers and their children. The myth of Ajase can be traced to two Buddhist texts. These are the Nirvana Sutra [The Sutra of Contemplation on the Buddha of Immeasurable Life], introduced to Japan between 700 and 1000 AD, and the Kyōgishinshō [The Collection of Passages expounding the True Teaching, Living, Faith, and Realizing of the Pure Land], written by Shinran Shōnin (1173-1262), a celebrated Japanese priest of the Kamakura period (1185-1333).

The myth centres on Ajase’s lifelong dependency upon his mother toward whom he initially targets his hostility, and then becomes resolved to her undying affection. It tells of an Indian prince Ajatasatru (Ajase) and his mother, Idaika, a woman who fears that her fading beauty makes her no longer attractive to her husband, King Bimbashara, the protector of Buddha. This leads her to desire a child, and, on the advice of a soothsayer, to become pregnant with the reincarnated soul of a hermit after his death. Impatient for this natural event to occur, she hastens by murdering the hermit, who curses her on his deathbed with the prophecy that he will return in the form of her son, the Prince, to murder her husband. Fearful of her unborn son’s revenge (the hermit’s curse) she attempts to kill him at birth by dropping him from her womb at a great height. He survives the fall but breaks his finger, and is later reminded of the origin of this event by Daibuddha, an enemy of Buddha. Engulfed in feelings of rage he attempts to kill his mother, Idaika, but is overpowered by such feelings of guilt that he falls seriously ill, and is only nursed back to health by her intervention. Idaika’s charitable act resolves her own conflicts over her son who recovers to become a wise king.

Kosawa’s use of the story exemplifies, for him, the fundamental issue of birth. According to his own student, Okonogi, who would go on to develop the psychical consequences of this structure itself, the originality of Kosawa’s Ajase complex lies in its themes of matricide and “prematernal rancour” (from the Buddhist concept of misshō, or resentment towards one’s origins), in contrast to the Oedipus Complex, which emphasises incestuous desire and patricide. The mother wishes both to have her child and to kill it, her ambivalent feelings arising out of her desire to exercise power over its life and death, and the paranoid fear of retaliation that a projection of this desire onto the child brings in its wake. On the other hand, the ambivalent feelings of the child arise out of an idealisation of the mother as a love

18. Freud to Kosawa, July 30th 1932. In German in the original.
20. One of the Chinese characters for Ajase’s name means “broken finger”.
object and the knowledge that she is capable of killing it. As to the question of the two kinds of guilt in the original paper's title, in the Greek story, Oedipus, upon realizing the horror of his act(s) inflicts self-punishment by tearing out his eyes, an act motivated by the burden of his crime. According to Kosawa, Aja's feelings of guilt change over the course of the story's development. After attempting to kill his mother he is frighten by punishment and falls ill. This resembles the “persecutory guilt” of which members of the Kleinkind school speak. After Aja's mother pardons him, he, seeks remorse towards her, what Kleins call “repetitive guilt.” As Kosawa's paper dates from 1932, the question of whether his thinking was influenced by Melanie Klein's ideas, or anticipated them, remains an open one.

Like Bose's version, Kosawa's can be seen as a considered modification of the orthodox view of psychodynamic development at that time, and another attempt at an Asian cultural variant on what, for Freud, was a universal mechanism. Freud's evasive comment on it suggests his possible displeasure at its contents.  

The Chinese case

Although Freud faced no similar problem of being presented with a reworked version of Oedipus from China, in 1929, nonetheless, he received a letter from the dissenting Chinese intellectual Zhang Zhishao. Although the letter has disappeared, Freud's extant brief reply suggested its contents.

Most esteemed Professor,

In whatever way you wish to carry out your intention, whether it is by paving the way for the development of psychoanalysis in your homeland - China - or by contributions to our journal Image in which you would judge against your own language our conceptions about the nature of the message of expression, I will be extremely pleased. What I quoted in my lectures from the Chinese, was taken from an article in the Encyclopaedia Britannica (11th edition).

Very respectfully,

Yours Freud”  

22. This plays on a strong cultural element for it was sometimes a custom in Japan up to the Edo period (1603-1868) for mothers to kill their children in times of famine.

23. Klein wrote of the need for the baby, in the course of its development, to separate good and bad elements of the object about which it has fantasies, and about which it can harbour ambivalent feelings of love and hate. Beginning with anxieties over being attacked by a bad object (thief/mother), the baby shifts to fear for the safety and return of the good. Its feelings of depression as a result may persist, which becomes the motive for separation. See, for example, Melanie Klein, Love, Guilt and Reparation, and other works. London, Hogarth Press, 1975.

24. Although Freud initially offered to analyze knowns at a reduced rate, his analysis was eventually taken over by Richard Strauss.


26. Freud's letter first appeared as a photographic reprint of the original appearing in a pedicle to Zhang Zhishao's translation of Schröder's book (1930). The letter was not translated into Chinese until many years later and appears in Yu Feng Goo's, Psychoanalysis and Modern Chinese Novel (1967). The translation here is from the German photocopy.

27. "Oedipus (Ajae) in the Chinese language has a different meaning.  "Oedipus" means the "outrageous" or "shameful".


29. This is similar to the idea of split in Oedipus' complex.

30. The idea of a "love" as such is not possible for a child. It can only be the love of self.

31. This is similar to the idea of split in Oedipus' complex. The child is still not able to understand the real meaning of love or hate.

32. This is similar to the idea of split in Oedipus' complex. The child is still not able to understand the real meaning of love or hate.

33. This is similar to the idea of split in Oedipus' complex. The child is still not able to understand the real meaning of love or hate.

34. This is similar to the idea of split in Oedipus' complex. The child is still not able to understand the real meaning of love or hate.

35. This is similar to the idea of split in Oedipus' complex. The child is still not able to understand the real meaning of love or hate.
章教授的信函：

弗洛伊德撰《精神分析引论》
1929年5月27日

亲爱的教授：

您在信中提到的关于精神分析的问题，我深表赞同。弗洛伊德的理论是开创性的，它深刻地影响了心理学的发展。弗洛伊德的理论不仅限于心理学领域，它在许多领域都有广泛的应用。尤其是弗洛伊德的后继者们，他们将弗洛伊德的理论应用于临床治疗，使得精神分析成为一个重要的治疗工具。

弗洛伊德的理论也对文学和艺术产生了深远的影响。他的理论被许多作家和艺术家所引用，成为了他们创作的灵感来源。弗洛伊德的理论还被翻译成多种语言，被世界各地的人们所接受。弗洛伊德的理论是现代心理学的基础，它在20世纪的科学革命中扮演了重要的角色。

在弗洛伊德的影响下，心理学的发展不断向前。今天，心理学已经成为了一门重要的学科，它在医学、教育、社会学等领域都有着广泛的应用。弗洛伊德的理论作为心理学的基础，将继续对现代心理学的发展产生深远的影响。

顺祝教安！

弗洛伊德撰《精神分析引论》
1929年5月27日

2006年10月至12月
神州风采
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whose is out hunting. The dénouement comes with their horrifying discovery that Xue has killed their son.

The tale's structure is almost the reverse of the Oedipal myth. It is Xue, the father rather than the son who leaves home to make his fortune (Oedipus was abandoned), and it is the father who kills the son. But like the Oedipal myth, the killing is of one to whom the perpetrator is unaware of his familial relationship, making them equally tragic. The doubts the father has about his wife's fidelity reveal a tension in the father-son relationship that can be traced to the particularly intense mother-son tie exemplified in the 24 examples of a son's devotion to his parents, as described in the classic Confucian text of filial piety. This myth better serves as an exemplar of the Chinese family structure, which stresses a lifelong devotion to parents and discourages a breaking away to a newfound individuality that typifies Western European families.

Even without the myth's being "discovered" by commentators of the early Chinese psychoanalytic scene, it is clear that, when the first psychoanalyst Bingham Dai (Dai Binyue) began practising in China, his neo-Freudian training, coupled with his sensitivity to and pedagogical experience of the culture, predisposed him to a cultural framework that had departed from Freudian orthodoxy. Dai, a graduate of St. Johns University in Shanghai, had undergone training by Leon Saul and supervision by Karen Horney while studying for a doctorate in sociology in Chicago. He had been recommended for this by Harry Stack Sullivan who, during Dai's tenure, had approached him at a Rockefeller seminar in 1932. He returned to China in 1935 to take up a position at Peking Union Medical College, teaching medical psychology to Chinese doctors, setting up a small analytic training group, and seeing patients.

He worked at sensitising the doctors to forms of therapy based on a system of thought that departed from the Freudian frame of reference. Like his mentors, instead of seeing personality problems solely in terms of intra-psychic tensions, he sought to understand them in their social cultural contexts. While this orientation owed much to Sullivan's influence, it had its origins for Dai in an earlier series of intellectual encounters that led him to reject the Christian teaching of the missionary college in which he had been educated and to embrace Confucianism. He was inspired in this move by his reading of a hugely influential text by Liang Shuming, Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophies, published in 1922. Liang, a former Buddhist scholar who had turned to Confucianism, was a staunch conservative cultural critic in a period of significant cultural reform. His book spoke of the need to identify, cultivate and protect the essence of Chinese culture from the onslaught of newly imported Western scientific ideas. This was not in itself a new concern. While in the final decade of the Qing dynasty, prior to the formation of the Republic, there had been many calls for modernisation, a compromise had been displayed in that a relation of one's father to his son, with the son's birthright, is the central theme of Confucius and the revered Chinese political culture.

In this sense, the story of Xue's story is the reverse of the Oedipal myth. It is Xue, the father rather than the son who leaves home to make his fortune (Oedipus was abandoned), and it is the father who kills the son. But like the Oedipal myth, the killing is of one to whom the perpetrator is unaware of his familial relationship, making them equally tragic. The doubts the father has about his wife's fidelity reveal a tension in the father-son relationship that can be traced to the particularly intense mother-son tie exemplified in the 24 examples of a son's devotion to his parents, as described in the classic Confucian text of filial piety. This myth better serves as an exemplar of the Chinese family structure, which stresses a lifelong devotion to parents and discourages a breaking away to a newfound individuality that typifies Western European families.

Even without the myth's being "discovered" by commentators of the early Chinese psychoanalytic scene, it is clear that, when the first psychoanalyst Bingham Dai (Dai Binyue) began practising in China, his neo-Freudian training, coupled with his sensitivity to and pedagogical experience of the culture, predisposed him to a cultural framework that had departed from Freudian orthodoxy. Dai, a graduate of St. Johns University in Shanghai, had undergone training by Leon Saul and supervision by Karen Horney while studying for a doctorate in sociology in Chicago. He had been recommended for this by Harry Stack Sullivan who, during Dai's tenure, had approached him at a Rockefeller seminar in 1932. He returned to China in 1935 to take up a position at Peking Union Medical College, teaching medical psychology to Chinese doctors, setting up a small analytic training group, and seeing patients.

He worked at sensitising the doctors to forms of therapy based on a system of thought that departed from the Freudian frame of reference. Like his mentors, instead of seeing personality problems solely in terms of intra-psychic tensions, he sought to understand them in their social cultural contexts. While this orientation owed much to Sullivan's influence, it had its origins for Dai in an earlier series of intellectual encounters that led him to reject the Christian teaching of the missionary college in which he had been educated and to embrace Confucianism. He was inspired in this move by his reading of a hugely influential text by Liang Shuming, Eastern and Western Cultures and their Philosophies, published in 1922. Liang, a former Buddhist scholar who had turned to Confucianism, was a staunch conservative cultural critic in a period of significant cultural reform. His book spoke of the need to identify, cultivate and protect the essence of Chinese culture from the onslaught of newly imported Western scientific ideas. This was not in itself a new concern. While in the final decade of the Qing dynasty, prior to the formation of the Republic, there had been many calls for modernisation, a compromise had been displayed in that a relation of one's father to his son, with the son's birthright, is the central theme of Confucius and the revered Chinese political culture.
sought in which Western learning could be imported only to the extent it did not devalue the essence of Chinese culture. Although many references to national essence were vague, and there were differences about how best to preserve it, there was general agreement amongst scholars, poets and educators that it signified a return to Confucian ethical values, most notably the principle that, in the flux of life, all elements are bound together harmoniously and are best expressed in the concept of jen (benevolence). Reacting against the “modern condition,” it was Liang’s view that learning based solely on Western science would foster the critically rational mind, but this in turn would threaten, by critical devaluation, all values. The solution to this was that learning should proceed in contexts in which, not only intellectual, but moral improvement might be achieved. (33)

How far Dai would have developed his psychoanalysis within this context remains unclear because he left in 1939 for America owing to the intensification of the Sino-Japanese War, bringing his program to a close. (34) Psychoanalysis in China was not to be revived for another forty years.

A summing up

What are we to conclude from this brief view about Chinese encounters with Freud and orthodox psychoanalysis? In all cases of direct contact with Freud himself, his correspondents not only had read and admired his work but, a priori, had begun working on their own transformations of his ideas. This is in sharp contrast to developments in the West where in Europe and elsewhere there had been an initial receptivity and acceptance of orthodoxy before revisions began to set in. This did not please Freud, but we know from the period of his life in which these Asian encounters began that he was already in some physical decline and that the psychoanalytic movement had, in any case, grown too big to be contained. More significantly Freud’s tendency to see his discovery of the Oedipus complex as a universal phenomenon might have blinded him to the cultural variants his correspondents were keen to impress upon him, variants, it must be said, which need not have caused him too much concern since the general principles arising from his elaboration would universally apply—his formulation that parental projections contribute to the formation of psychic structures (superego and the mechanism of defense) most notably.

If cultural myths have been found to support family structures out of which different psychodynamic constellations arise, the strong emphasis in Asian cultures generally on relationships taking priority over development of the individual self make the goal of

realization and providing that it would enable them to effect changes in the social structure. For instance, the author emphasizes the importance of education and training in the development of new technologies and skills, which would enable people to adapt to the changing social and economic conditions. The book also highlights the need for strong leadership and democratic practices in order to achieve social cohesion and stability.

In the conclusion, the author reflects on the challenges and opportunities of globalization and the need for cultural adaptation. The book provides insights into the complex dynamics of social change and the role of education and training in shaping the future of society. It is a thought-provoking work that challenges readers to think critically about the role of education and training in the context of globalization.
therapy different too. Where in the past the means of arriving at this goal have been seriously drawn into question, there has been sufficient work in the past two decades, notably in the writings of Alan Roland, Sudhir Kakar and Ashis Nandy, dealing with India and Japan, to suggest that psychoanalysis in an Asian context is possible, and is practised, albeit in culturally adapted modes, but, as elsewhere, it must content not so much with revisions to orthodoxy as with rival forms of psychotherapeutic and psychopharmacological practice, which currently dominate all cultures in which psychoanalytic ideas can be said to exist.

The article draws on a conference paper prepared for the International Symposium for the History of Psychoanalysis, "History and Function of Myth in Psychoanalysis: Relations between Mythology, Tragedy and Clinical Practice", Athens, October 4-8th 2006, under the auspices of the International Association for the History of Psychoanalysis (Paris) and the Hellenic Society of Psychoanalytical Psychotherapy.


Geoffrey Bloxam is Professor in the Department of Psychology and Associate Dean in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Hong Kong. He is co-editor with Alison Turtel of Psychology Moving East: the status of Western Psychology in Asia and Oceania (Westview, 1987), co-author with Kieron O'Connor of Personal Construct Psychotherapy in the Clinical Context (Ottawa/Montreal U.P, 1996) and has published papers on the reception of psychology and psychoanalysis in China and Japan.

本文节选自《精神分析与历史—国际研讨会论文集》一文：“精神分析与历史的关系：神话学、悲剧与心理治疗之间的关系”——摘录，2006年10月4-5日，主办方为国际精神分析学会（巴黎）和香港精神分析学会。

静也译
