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**Summary.** In the article the problem of intercommunication and differences between a psycho-analysis and psycho-history from the point of view of texts of Z.Freud is examined. The problem of interdisciplinary and disciplinary transit of professional roles of Z.Freud rises. A question about the place of psycho-analysis "archaeology" of Z.Freud in intellectual history of Europe between "genealogy" of F.Nietzsche and "archaeology of knowledge" of M.Foucault is defined. A hypothesis of legitimation of psycho-analysis as scientific discipline by archaeology is analysed. The mechanisms of such legitimation and at the same time of rationalization, an important role among which was executed by opening logic, are determined.
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The theoretical problematic, which is lately at the centre of our attention, is the research of interdisciplinary field of interaction between psychology and historiography, from the perspective of the history of historical science. This perspective is quite different from the traditional psycho historical viewpoint of the interdisciplinary communication on axis “psychology – historiography”.

If psycho historians’ interest as usual revolves about which psychological theories, in what way and with what degree of validity can be applied in space of historiography, when historians fit in psychological discourse exercising their rights as “debtors” and “borrowers” of knowledge, so we are interested in questions of opposite area, such as which elements of the historical knowledge and in what way were involved by psychologists to form standards of their own scientific character in the XX century. This repayment of symbolic debts to psychologists can become the first step for a dialogue of full value and interdisciplinary interaction, symbolic exchange, in the course of which the general intellectual space of historiography and psychology is to be gradually formed.

This study will show that at the bottom of modernistic project, the dominating project of psychology of the XX century, which was completed as discipline in the form of psychoanalysis and, with all variations, chronologically lasted until the early 80’s, are some images of historical knowledge and models of historiography. There is more ambitious aim behind such a demonstration, an attempt to examine rising of psychological disciplines ant theories of the XX century, as milestones in the development of historiography and historical science, interpreting them as distinctive “anomalies of historiography”. In such a way, in our opinion, not only possibilities of overcoming a distance between psychological and historical knowledge can be showed, but also an image of historical knowledge of the XX century is to be reviewed, and naturally it’s more important that the perspectives of its further development are already given.

Conforming to this final aim, it will be demonstrated, how the disciplinary distance between psychology and historical study was being overcome in the psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud from the initial stage of its occurrence. We’ll have to review the history of origin of psychoanalysis in an outline and contextually, referring to the prorated groundwork of Euro-Atlantic view, according to which a certain image of historical science and prorated image of historical knowledge were those common models, with which patterns Sigmund Freud made the psychological discipline of his own name.

However, the starting point of our thinking will be the tangent lines of one of the leading methodologists of Ukrainian history, Professor V. V. Pidgayetskiy, who in the subsection of his monograph “Basics of the theory and methodology of the source study of the history of Ukraine in the XX century” drew readers’ attention to unexpected enough Sigmund Freud’s disciplinary role. In such a way, as a sudden, V. V. Pidgayetskiy revealed unfeatured counters of Sigmund Freud, who during a lecture of the basics of a new discipline at that time - psychoanalysis, speaking to professional audience of medical students held a session of transformation into the image of a professional historian - professor historian: " And then, quite unexpectedly, as for me, from a purely medical problems Z. Freud turns to historical problems. He suggests the students to imagine that they are not at the lecture on psychoanalysis, but at the lecture of history and lecturer tells them about Alexander the Great."

What did this "historic" gesture of founder of psychoanalysis mean? Was this "game of historian" an ordinary "theater" reprise and can the sense of such an "interdisciplinary" reincarnation be exhausted by means of purely didactic and rhetorical tasks that psychiatrist S. Freud faced with at one of his public lectures? Or maybe figure of "psychoanalyst-historian", wandering from one professional text of Austrian intellectual to another, acquired traits of constant value, which refers to the deep disciplinary senses of psychoanalysis?

At least in the Euro-Atlantic intellectual tradition the problematic of presence of historiographic discourse in the texts of Sigmund Freud, since the 80's of the twentieth century, was studied quite intensively, that tilts in his non-random and not situational character’s favor. But some astonishment is still expected from Western readers, when talking about legality and validity of S. Freud’s place as a canonical figure in the traditional hierarchy of European philosophers of history. In this regard, one of the founders of psychohistory Bruce Mazlish: "It may surprise some readers while discussing S. Freud as the last of the great classical philosophers of history. Yet the description is accurate. The founder of psychoanalysis belongs to the tradition of Comte and Hegel, and especially – Vico, through which content it can be well considered. Like the last one, Freud developed a new science - in this case, psychoanalysis instead of philology - which offered important clues to solve the mysteries of the human’s past."

In fact, the issue of S. Freud’s disciplinary and interdisciplinary professional roles transit is that he was neither professional source-study expert, nor a philosopher of history and already probably not (continuing series of surprises in the list of his "historiography" roles) professional "archaeologists". But we will concentrated on the last of these roles , having in mind "amateur" interests of the "founder of psychoanalysis" and the methods and "disciplinary character" that he formed for a new discipline created by him – psychoanalysis, and also on the corresponding intellectual heritage in the Euro-Atlantic tradition.

Between the "genealogy" of Friedrich Nietzsche and the "archeology of knowledge" of Foucault the "archeology" of psychoanalysis of Sigmund Freud has to find its rightful place in the intellectual history of Europe. Especially, a considerable number of indicative European intellectuals of the twentieth century hold such a disciplinary view of psychoanalysis. For example, Paul Ricoeur (Ricoeur P.), emphasizing the importance of the archaeological metaphor in Freud’s thought, said: "Freudism is an explicit and thematic archeology... psychoanalysis is archeology, he is the archeology of subject." But what does it really mean to think of psychoanalysis in terms of archeology of the soul? The problem, that we are interested in, - is purely historiographic problem: which images of historical science of the nineteenth century and, in particular, archeology, were involved by the founder of psychoanalysis for designing successful disciplinary image of psychoanalysis.

1. **The emotional background of the archaeological project of Sigmund Freud’s psychoanalysis: desire, envy and interests.**

Let's start thinking of the place of S Freud’s disciplinary archaeological project and his role in the modernization of the psychology of breaking XIX - XX centuries with something personal - from the emotional background that accompanied the archaeological metaphor in the texts of the founder of psychoanalysis. These too human emotions - rather strong , in fact the strongest - and it was, as we shall see, about the whole line of desires, which are envy and hate ( or at least about their obvious markers) - outlined the initial stage of writing within which unfolded "Archaeological Project" of his psychoanalysis.

**1.1 Desire: correction of self-image or S. Freud known as "expert" of archeology.**

In a letter dated February 17, 1931 to Stefan Zweig - an ardent supporter and promoter of psychoanalysis - the founder of psychoanalysis subjects out to small, but very significant correction the image that was created by Austrian writer, giving an intellectual biography of S. Freud: "... your picture is not the same ... that I still offered many sacrifices in order to assemble a collection of Greek, Roman and Egyptian rarities and generally read more archeology than psychology ... " So, Stefan Zweig wrote a novelized biography of S. Freud, given him a tribute respect as to the founder of a new psychological discipline - psychoanalysis. Instead, the founder of this rebellious discipline, carefully shifting the accents from psychology to archeology, would prefer in line with it retrace contours of his own biography, instead of enjoying legal recognition and honored pioneer status. At least taking account of books read by him and gotten intellectual experience, he at least could claim to be rather the expert of archeology than psychology and regrets that it is his incarnation was not reported to the public and readers of his biography in the performance of S. Zweig. Freud as an archaeologist, more archaeologist than a psychologist – this is a difference between S. Freud as literary projection constructed by the writer S. Zweig, in short, " a portrait outside" and his, psychologist S. Freud’s, "true face" or rather " desirable face " that he would prefer to see and which, unfortunately, won’t see the others - readers of his intellectual biography. It was not the only and the last case, when the "real" S. Freud-"psychologist" realized interdisciplinary jump in a plane of "desired" S. Freud-"archaeologist."

**1.2 Envy: the struggle for supremacy in archeology, or passing ahead of H. Schliemann and Evans A.**

In the "Moses and Monotheism" - the latter, and therefore meaningful text (three parts of which were published in 1937-1938), seriously ill, exhausted by the struggle with cancer and numerous operations, S. Freud wrote:

       "Being at the level of psychology today, we could long ago, long before Schliemann and Evans, ask: where did all these materials of legends and myths from, that Homer and the Greek dramatists ... turned into immortal works of art." (Our given translation by R. Dodeltsev, which is hardly a brilliant one, grades the sense of written texts by S. Freud, keeping of from the language specific of saying: "From the standpoints of our present psychological concepts we could long before Schliemann and Evans ask the question: where Greeks took all the material of legends, made over by Homer and the great ancient dramatists in their masterpieces").

And all these S. Freud’s confessions of not obsessive passion to the activity of archeologist take place against the background of frank, certified in his "Autobiography", "dislike" to the medical profession: "Any special passion to the profession and the activities of a doctor I did not feel in those early years, as, in fact, later too... I was more interested in human affairs, than in the nature objects...”

Everything is prescribed by S. Freud, as if psychoanalysis as a discipline and he, recognized founder, compete not with the relevant theories in the fields of psychology and psychiatry, not with specialist-psychiatrists, but comes into direct interdisciplinary competition with archeology and prominent archaeologists. Moreover, the priority issue haunts compulsively the Austrian intellectual, caused by H. Schliemann and A. Evans - actual founders of archeology as a discipline. For this a weird narrative temporal structure was used that breaks any natural passage of time in fiction of imagination and mythic cyclic construction: "we long ago, long before Schliemann and Evans ...", however, if "modern psychology" and him like its founder, move in time before them. What does such a "transfer" and the destruction of time in the fight for the championship mean? Just jealousy, which directs the writing of S. Freud? Language gives pleasure to get a championship, if you really want it. And it looks like if the enterprise of all his life - psychoanalysis, was designed so that S. Freud at the end of life could write this sentence, taking complete satisfaction. Even if in the written form. Just formed by S. Freud psychoanalysis, from the perspective of its own designs, could claim a place of archeology and archaeological discoveries made by Schliemann and Evans concerning Troy. Just he, S. Freud, could be in place of Schliemann and Evans, just he could have their discoveries.

So, firstly, S. Freud *in the desired* disciplinary self-image regards himself as an expert in archeology, more archeology than psychology.

Secondly, such his desire to self-image archaeologist is reinforced by arguments and brought about against the background of his own confession in *the lack of passion* (dislike) to the medical profession and, by contrast, *interest* in human affairs, which he interprets as a lack of interest in science.

Thirdly, S. Freud with his psychological disciplinary project claiming to be the first in the field of archeology, showing obvious *envy* regarding leading contemporary archaeologists - a German H. Schliemann and an Englishman A. Evans.

Thus, we must keep in mind that archaeological writing created by S. Freud, his rationality and interrelated theoretical discourses in psychology and archeology are developed within these personal desires, interests, envy and objections of founder of psychoanalysis.

Just his contemporary psychology would be archeology. And who said that "psychoanalysis" belonged to the field of "medicine" rather than "archaeology" and that S. Freud did not develop an original variety of historical subjects that just ironically turned out in the part " psychiatry" or "psychology"? Because archeology as "powerful metaphor" within the "psychoanalytic texts" of S. Freud (so called it one of the leading researchers of this theme - Donald Kuspit ( Kuspit D.)) inspired him from his earliest researches in the field of the etiology of hysteria to recent theoretical works in the field of psychology of religion in "Moses and monotheism".

**2. Creating of image of psychoanalysis as an archaeological discipline**

**1.1 Following the logic of discovery of H. Schliemann: walking by the ancient myth**

So, if the hypothesis of a set of emotions and desires of S. Freud, the core of which was formed by envy to discoveries of H. Schliemann, makes a sense, then we can suppose that the entire disciplinary character of psychoanalysis was formed as a way of psychological rationalization these mental emotions by his founder and "transfer" of theoretical and disciplinary provisions of contemporary archeology and also the transfer of logic of H. Schliemann’s discovery to the field of psychoanalysis.

Strengthening of this assumption serves as a simple fact that life of S. Freud in modern measurement covered the period of formation of archeology as a scientific discipline. The founder of psychoanalysis was born in 1856, when Troy was a myth and robbing ancient burial places was a standard of conduct of the large number of wealthy and not so adventurers - a treasure hunters, and died - in 1939, when in many centers of ancient civilization (e. g., Athens and Cairo) was established the archaeological museums.

*So, it is clear, that the establishment of psychoanalysis as a scientific discipline was at the same time when archeology constituted its own standards of scholarship.*

However, as compared with the infantile discipline, which only got on their foot – as compared with psychoanalysis, archeology in times of S. Freud had more popular appeal and real respect. And combining psychoanalysis with archeology, S. Freud did "theatrical gesture" to the public in general - not to the intellectual crowd. This appeal of S. Freud to one of the legitimate historical subjects linked unpopular and shady business - psychoanalysis, with respected one - archeology, which, in fact, became particularly popular after the discovery of Troy by H. Schliemann.

So, from the social disciplinary perspective the Freud’s appeal to archeology can be considered as an effort to find a devotion to social environment and even have some of the heroic qualities associated with the transfer of the heroic aura of archeology of the nineteenth century in psychoanalysis.

However, at this populist connotation of the interdisciplinary strategy of Austrian psychiatrist was easy distinguished and much more serious goal that chased S. Freud, involving the archaeological metaphor. At *the disciplinary level* may look completely valid hypothesis concerning the legitimation of psychoanalysis as a scientific discipline by archeology and of these perspectives *should follow the mechanisms of such legitimation*.

To the mechanisms of such legitimation and at the same time rationalization belonged the logic of discovery involved by H. Schliemann during the excavations of Troy and, obviously, was moved by S. Freud to psychoanalysis as one of its basic theoretical constructs. This is a concept of the famous "Oedipus complex" which, by common consent, forms the theoretical core of psychoanalysis.

H. Schliemann’s “The logic of discovery”, recall, was laid in his demonstration of the reality of the heroes and the facts of Troy. In fact, *the ancient Greek legend gave to archaeology a special respectable social position*. This archaeological strategy of German archaeologist - following ancient Greek legendary material that allowed to create specific scientific results, opened for S. Freud the way of legitimization his new discipline: going by the myth of Oedipus the Austrian psychiatrist opened the main sexual complexes that control human behavior - so-called "Oedipus complex": "As Schliemann substantiated his excavations in Homer so, Freud's images relatively the work of psychoanalysis substantiated on confidence regarding evidentiary value of classical literature, as is evident in its use of drama of King Oedipus".

On this occasion we give a spreading quote from monograph by Lis Moler, in which revealed the mechanisms of transfer of "logic of discovery" by H. Schliemann to the field of psychoanalysis: "As far as most archaeologists directly considered it, this excavations of Troy and Knossos entered the myth to the kingdom of reality. The work of Schliemann and Evans showed archaeologists that "there is no doubt that there is the core of historical truth in many of the ancient Greek legends" and Freud saw his own psychoanalytic project reflected in this opening. If the core of historical truth can be found in ancient legends and myths of this culture, why it can’t be applicable to the myths and legends of an individual, i.e., the fantasies and dreams that form the psychoanalytic object of research? And since the archaeologists, according to Schliemann’s words, had success "in penetrating to the deepest darkness of prehistoric time ", why it may not be possible for psychoanalysis in the opening of the prehistory of the subject? Reporting Fleece on occasion of the progress of his the most recent analysis, Freud wrote: "For buried deep beneath all his [the patient's] fantasies we found a scene from its primitive period (to twenty - two months) which meets all requirements and from which flow all the puzzles." The letter which is dated December 12, 1899 , continues ...: " It's all at the same time - sexy, innocent, natural and so on. I still can’t believe it. It's like Schliemann excavated another Troy, which, as he believed was mythical." In the light of the comparison of Freud the scenes from childhood with Schliemann’s Troy, psychoanalysis is not new and suspicious business , but rather an attempt to expand the archaeological project in the field of the individual soul. And in fact, I think, it was the way as Freud at the turn of the centuries perceived his own work ".

**2.2 Stratigraphic method in archeology and psychoanalysis: the models of adoption**

Psychoanalysis has moved to its own disciplinary space not only a "logic of discovery" that has been successfully involved in contemporary archeology, but also the appropriate methodology - so-called "stratigraphic" method. What is the sense of this method?

As the researcher of the archaeological strategies in the literature of the nineteenth century Alexandra Warwick notes: "... Schliemann’s excavations of Troy in the 1870s depended on a very specific idea, which he followed: dig deep to find the truth of being of the city of Homer. In his own words: “Since it was my goal to excavate Troy, I was hoping to find in one of the lower cities, I had to destroy many interesting ruins in the upper ones “.

This dichotomy between the depth and the surface related, eventually, to the change of the general concepts of the individual and the growing interest regarding human domestic content in postreformation era. These ideas were appeared at the same time, as the concept of stratification in geology and archeology. In both disciplines, it was recognized that the layers of rock, as well as lees of rocks were deposited over long periods of time and that decrease in depth of the earth consistent in some way lowering in the depths of linear time. However, from both of these subjects archeology was mostly combined with the study of human past, and therefore the historical time.

Thus, the sense of the archaeological "method", which was the theoretical foundation for the excavation of H. Schliemann (in fact, like other archaeologists of the nineteenth century) lay in that the lower layers of cultural excavations which concealed the truth about the past, referred to the ancient period to timeline. The truth, the depth and the history combined, according to this logic, in one indivisible sensecreated unit.

It should be noted that the whole nineteenth century was under the influence of this obsession about a certain type of relationships –alternation - between "surface" and "depth" between what appears outside and what is inside. Using archaeological narrative to describe the work of analysis, Freud placed his own business within this epistemological paradigm "outside/inside". This distinction marks the psychoanalytic method such as it does not satisfy the remains on the surface, but penetrates to what is hidden beneath, and, the past equated to the depth.

Of all the new courses of Western thought, which developed in the nineteenth century and continued their intelligent movement also in the twentieth century, psychoanalysis was probably the only one which made the highest bid for the match of relationship between the depth and the surface, and, obviously , doing so, borrowed it from the language of archeology. Freud wrote about ‘the deepest stratum of the mind', and made a distinction between demonstrative and latent, civilized and uncivilized, historic and prehistoric, adult and infantile, fact and fantasy. These different appeals in depth often mutually correlated in his work.

As we saw in the case of Freud, these various oppositions aim to become combined with each other. Past automatically combines with stratigraphic depth and need to be shifted back to the surface from the darkness and the dark and only when that happens - to be a significant source of knowledge".

\*\*\*

Summing up this brief exploration, which more opens up a space to certain problems than solve them, we can, however, talk about some of the obvious results.

Obviously, archeology of the XIX - XX centuries was one of those structure-disciplinary strategies of the description of the history which contributed to the emergence and legitimization of psychological landmark project of the twentieth century within which was made cardinal modernization of psychology and psychiatry - before the advent of psychoanalysis.

It is also clear that such implementation of archeology to psycho-discipline was impossible without "human, all too human" - without the involvement of relevant systems of the founder of psychoanalysis, the mechanisms of rationalization are also manifested themselves in the form of implementation. Such rationalization manifests itself as the form of the "logic of discovery" and in the form of "methodology".

And finally, it is clear that the symbolic interdisciplinary exchange between psychology and the description of the history that led to the formation in the twentieth century on their borders new "hybrid" discipline - psychohistory, had to interpreted not as a transit unidirectional borrowings from psychology to history, but as an equal interdisciplinary dialogue. Moreover, the psychoanalysis of these perspectives is like space of rationality, which can be interpreted as "abnormal" form of the description of the history.

**Ващенко В.В. Психоанализ как историческая дисциплина: археологический дискурс в текстах З. Фрейда – Статья.**

В статье рассматривается проблема взаимосвязи и отличий между психоанализом и психоисторией с точки зрения текстов З. Фрейда. Поднимается проблема интердисциплинарного и дисциплинарного транзита профессиональных ролей З. Фрейда. Ставится вопрос о месте "археологии" психоанализа З. Фрейда в интеллектуальной истории Европы между "генеалогией" Ф. Ницше и "археологией знаний" М. Фуко. Анализируется гипотеза относительно легитимации психоанализа как научной дисциплины археологией. Определяются механизмы такой легитимации и в то же время рационализации, важную роль среди которых выполняла логика открытия.
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**Анотація.** В статті розглядається проблема взаємозв'язку та відмінностей між психоаналізом та психоісторією з точки зору текстів З. Фройда. Піднімається проблема інтердисциплінарного та дисциплінарного транзиту професійних ролей З. Фройда. Ставиться питання про місце «археології» психоаналізу З. Фройда в інтелектуальній історії Європи між «генеалогією» Ф. Ніцше та «археологією знань» М. Фуко. Аналізується гіпотеза щодо легітимації психоаналізу як наукової дисципліни археологією. Визначаються механізми такої легітимації та водночас раціоналізації, важливу роль серед яких виконувала логіка відкриття.
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