

Marxism, Psychoanalysis and Sociological Methods: Voloshinov's, Soviet and European Marxists' Dialogue with Freud / *Marxismo, psicanálise e método sociológico: o diálogo de Volóchinov, marxistas soviéticos e europeus com Freud*

*Sheila Viera de Camargo Grillo**

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this article is to understand, on the one hand, the dialogical relationships between the texts of Voloshinov and Freud's theory and, on the other hand, the reception of Freud among Soviet Marxists from the first half of the 1920s and by European Marxists. Our main findings included evidence that: a great number of Soviet Marxists from the period mentioned argued that Marxism and Freudianism interfaced regarding the same presuppositions of dialectical materialism; Voloshinov rejected Freudianism, above all, due to Freud's criticism of the Soviet State; and, finally, Soviet and European Marxists tried to link Freudianism to Marxism, or trace the differences between the two theories.

KEYWORDS: Freudianism; Marxism; Voloshinov

RESUMO

O objetivo central deste artigo é compreender, por um lado, as relações dialógicas entre os textos de Volóchinov e a teoria de Freud e, por outro, a recepção do freudismo entre marxistas soviéticos da primeira metade dos anos 1920 e marxistas europeus. Nossas principais descobertas foram: boa parte dos marxistas soviéticos do período mencionado argumentavam que o marxismo e o freudismo encontravam-se sob os mesmos pressupostos do materialismo dialético, Volóchinov rejeita o freudismo sobretudo em razão das críticas de Freud ao Estado soviético, marxistas soviéticos e europeus ora tentaram unir freudismo ao marxismo, ora buscaram traçar as diferenças entre as duas teorias.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: *Freudismo; Marxismo; Volóchinov*

* Universidade de São Paulo [University of São Paulo] – USP, São Paulo, São Paulo – Brazil; CNPq Proc. 309502/2014-4; sheilagrillo@uol.com.br

Introduction

One aspect of the work done by the Bakhtin Circle that has yet to be explored is Valentin Nikolaevitch Voloshinov's (1895-1936) interest in psychoanalysis,¹ which resulted in the writing of two interrelated texts: the article *Pelo lado do social. Sobre o freudismo* [Beyond the Social: On Freudianism] (1925)² and the book *Freudianism: A Critical Sketch* (1987) / *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique* (1976).³ The article of 1925 is an expanded abstract (*avtoreferát*) of the book published two years later, both containing scientific production by Voloshinov, described in the first (1925-1926) and third (1927-1928) reports presented to the Institute for the Comparative History of the Languages and Literatures of the West and East (ILJaZV - *Institút Srovnánelnoi Istórii literatúr i iazykóv Západa i Vostóka*) (p.302, op. 2, no. 51).

¹ A pioneering work is the preface to the Portuguese translation by Paulo Bezerra of *Freudismo: um esboço crítico* [*Freudianism: A Critical Sketch* / *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique* (For reference, see footnote 2)], *Freud à Luz de uma Filosofia da Linguagem* [Freud in Light of a Philosophy of Language] (2001). In this work, Bezerra defends that the analysis of Freud's work is from a Marxist perspective, given the concept of ideology as false awareness. Moura-Viera's text (2009) collects, in addition to the 1927 edition of *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique* (1976), the article *Beyond the Social* (1925) and established the following fundamental distinction between them: "In general, we can say that 'Beyond the Social' reviews Freudian theory from a sociological-marxist perspective and that *Freudianism* institutes the socio-dialogical method of analysis of a particular discourse, in this case, the psychoanalytic-Freudian discourse" (In the original: "Grosso modo, poderíamos dizer que 'À margem do social' resenha a teoria freudiana por um prisma sociológico-marxista e *O freudismo* institui o método sociológico dialógico de análise de um determinado discurso, no caso, o discurso freudista-psicanalítico) (MOURA-VIERA, 2009, p.69). In the article by Lima and Perini (2009, p.81), the objective "is to present the concepts described by Bakhtin in which Freudian thought was reduced and even tried to demonstrate the points of contact between Freud and the Bakhtinian theory of language and where there are differences" (In the original: "é apresentar os conceitos descritos por Bakhtin em que o pensamento de Freud foi reduzido e ainda tentar demonstrar os pontos de contato entre Freud e a teoria da linguagem bakhtiniana e em que residem as diferenças").

² TN. There is no English translation of this early article; however, the title is referred to in the literature in English, for the most part, as *Beyond the Social*. There is an expanded version of this article which appeared in Russian in 1927, and was translated in 1976 and 1987 respectively as – *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique* and *Freudiansim: A Critical Sketch*. We will refer to the 1927 version, and the 1976 translation, for quotes in Portuguese taken from the 1925 version, where they are identical; otherwise we will use the Portuguese as the source. The following are the two references of the work translated into English by Titunik: VOLOSHINOV, V. *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique*. Trans. I.R. Titunik. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1976, and VOLOSHINOV, V. *Freudianism: A Critical Sketch*. Trans. I.R. Titunik. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1987.

³ For reference, see footnote 2.

With respect to his interest in Freudianism, Voloshinov (1976 [1925])⁴ affirms that attempts – erred attempts in his opinion – were made to unite Freudianism with dialectical materialism in the Russian and Western European bibliographies. More closely related to the Circle, Vassiliev (1995, p.10), Voloshinov’s biographer, wrote that “The Russian intelligentsia at that time was overcome with a general Freudian fervor, which was reflected directly in the scientific interests of the Bakhtinian Circle.”⁵ Among the members of the Circle who were interested in Freud, Vassiliev reports that Sollertinski taught a class about psychology in which special attention was dedicated to the works of Freud and to Pumpianski, who had prepared an article – Por uma crítica de Rank e da psicanálise [Criticism of Rank and Psychoanalysis].

Based on these data, obtained from the research carried out at the Archive of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Saint-Petersburg Branch (*Sankt-Peterbúrgski Filial Arkhiva RAN*), where some of Voloshinov’s personal archive is found, and on bibliographic research, our objective is to recover the active type of dialogical relationships (discourse reflected/refracted by the other), in which “[a]nother’s discourse in this case is not reproduced with a new intention, but it acts upon, influences, and in one way or another determines the author’s discourse, while itself remaining outside it” (BAKHITIN, 1984, p.195),⁶ among the two texts of Voloshinov previously cited, and the work of Freud, on the one hand, as well as the among the European and Soviet Marxists and Freudian theory, on the other. These controversial dialogical relationships can be explained by the Soviet academic context of the 1920s, of which the investigation of the scientific basis of Freudianism was a part, aiming to prove its compatibility or incompatibility with historical materialism. To show that diligence in researching Freudianism characterized the Soviet context of the time, we completed a search on writings and analysis of articles written by Soviet authors from the 1920s about this subject, and those that Voloshinov cited in the two previously mentioned texts. In addition, we conducted readings of Freud’s works referred

⁴ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁵ In the original: “Российская интеллигенция переживала в это время повальное увлечение фрейдизмом, что прямо отразилось на научных интересах бахтинского круга.” TN: This biographical material does not appear in the later version to which we have access.

⁶ BAKHTIN, M. *Problems of Dostoyevsky’s Poetics*. Translated by Caryl Emerson. University of Minnesota Press: Minneapolis, 1984, p.195.

to in these articles and texts, aiming to foreground the open controversy between the use of the sociological method and Freudianism. Finally, we analyzed the dialogue between Freudianism and two European Marxists: Marcuse and Althusser, for the representativeness and originality of their work.

1 The Open Controversy between the Sociological Method and Freudianism

The article *Beyond the Social: On Freudianism*⁷ (*Po tu stóronu sotsiálnogo. O freidizme*) (1925), presents, in the second part of its title, an explicit mention of Freud's work and, in the first, an allusion to the text *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (*Po tu stóronu printsípa udovólstviia*)⁸ published by Freud in 1920 and translated [into Portuguese] in volume 14 of the *Complete Works* (*Obras Completas* - FREUD, 2010 [1920]) [in English] (FREUD, 1961a [1920]).⁹ In other words, while Freud investigates “beyond the pleasure principle,” Voloshinov is investigating “beyond the social.” Consequently, in the title we identify two types of dialogical relations between the works of the two thinkers: veiled by an allusion and revealed in the naming of the theory, which is the object of analysis. The word that returns as another word is not only the object of the sociological method of Bakhtin, Medvedev and Voloshinov and the metalinguistics of Bakhtin, but also the way these theories are constituted, which is our focus. The analysis undertaken by Voloshinov about Freudianism is built on highlighting its merits and defects – a procedure that he

⁷ The French translation by Guy Verret is *Au delà du social. Essai sur le freudisme* [Beyond the Social. Essay on Freudianism), which speaks to the title of Freud's text - *Au delà do principe du Plaisir* [Beyond the Pleasure Principle] (FREUD, S. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*. Trans. James Strachey. New York: W.W.Norton & Company, Inc., 1961a). TN. The later, an expanded version of *Beyond the Social: Essay on Freudianism* became *Freudianism: A Marxist Critique* (1976) and *A Critical Sketch/Freudianism* (1987), as previously mentioned.

⁸ In this text, Freud develops the thesis that “there is in the mind a strong *tendency* towards the pleasure principal, but that that tendency is opposed by certain other forces or circumstances, so that the final outcome cannot always be in harmony with the tendency towards pleasure” (p.3) [For reference see footnote 9]. Two forces oppose the tendency to satisfying pleasure: the principle of the reality that leads to the delaying of pleasure without abandoning the intention to satisfy it; and the conflicts and ruptures in the mind that conduct the repression and transform them into “the possibility of pleasure into a source of unpleasure” (p.5) [For reference see footnote 9].

⁹ For reference, see foot note 7.

repeats in his criticism of Saussure, the formalists, Vossler, etc. Thus, we begin with the defects.

Voloshinov (1976, [1925], pp.67-68) recriminates Freudianism for the lack of “dialogue” with the psychology of its time, or rather, for not trying to make

the slightest effort to elucidate precisely and concretely the Freudian position on contemporary psychology and its methods. [...] It became the habit of Freud and his students to quote only themselves and refer only to one another. In more recent times, they have begun quoting Schopenhauer and Nietzsche, as well.¹⁰

In our view, this criticism is unwarranted, since we can identify many references to psychologists, philosophers, anthropologists, biologists, and sociologists in Freud’s texts, which we will briefly elucidate here. At the beginning of the text *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1961a),¹¹ Freud sets up two pillars of reflection – the concepts of pleasure and unpleasure – the “quantity of excitation that is present in the mind [...] and to relate them in such a manner that unpleasure corresponds to an *increase* in the quantity of excitation and pleasure to a *diminution*” (1961a[1920], p.2; author’s emphasis),¹² and the principle of the “tendency towards stability” (1961a [1920], p.3),¹³ in which the psychic apparatus operates to maintain a low and constant level of excitement, articulated by the German philosopher and psychophysician, Gustav Theodor Fechner (1801-1887), considered the founder of the Psychophysics and Psychology as science. Fechner’s psychophysical theory is based on a dual-monistic philosophy in which the mind and the body are two aspects of one reality: physical and psychological.

¹⁰ In the original: “выяснить сколько-нибудь точно и подробно свое отношение к современной им психологии и практикующимся в ней методам. [...] Фрейд и его ученики цитируют только себя и ссылаются только друг на друга; в более позднее время начали цитировать ещё Шопенгауэра и Ницше.”

¹¹ For reference, see footnote 7.

¹² For reference, see footnote 7.

¹³ For reference, see footnote 7.

We find similar approaches in the following texts:

1) In *Totem and Taboo* (2001[1912-1913]),¹⁴ Freud developed his thesis about the intimate connection and the simultaneous origin between totemism and exogamy in dialogue – at times in accordance with, and, at others, opposed to – Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), founder of experimental psychology and scholar of the conscious. Along with Wundt, Freud developed his hypothesis by regularly citing anthropologists, biologists, ethnographers, philosophers, religious scholars, sociologists who were focused on this subject;

2) In *The Uncanny* (1956-1974[1919]),¹⁵ Freud cites the German psychiatrist Ernst Anton Jentsch (1867-1919) as one of the few who worked on the variation from person to person of the susceptibility of the uncanny. Throughout the text, Freud cedes the dictionary definition of “uncanny,” as well as its presence in works of art, to affirm that Jentsch’s concept of the uncanny is an “intellectual uncertainty” (1956-1974, [1919] p.233)¹⁶ that does little to aid in comprehending it;

3) In *The Ego and the Id* (1976a [1923]),¹⁷ Freud, based on the pioneering work of the German physiologist of psychosomatic medicine, Georg Groddeck (1866-1934), develops the concept of the *Id* – a part of the human psyche that passively leads us through unknown and uncontrollable forces;

4) In *The Interpretation of Dreams* (1955 [1900])¹⁸ – considered by Freud to be one of his most important works for presenting his work on hypnosis, as well as proof of the existence of the unconscious, on which point he had been attacked by his detractors – Freud dedicates the first 100 pages to a thorough review of the scientific literature on dreams, which preceded his, and which helped him formulate his thesis that “*a dream is a (disguised) fulfillment of a (suppressed or repressed) wish*” (1955 [1900], p.183; author’s emphasis);¹⁹

¹⁴ FREUD, S. *Totem and Taboo*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: Routledge Classics, 2001.

¹⁵ FREUD, S. *The Uncanny*. Translated by James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud. In: FREUD, S. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XVII. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1956-1974.

¹⁶ For reference, see footnote 15.

¹⁷ FREUD, S. *The Ego and the Id*. Translated by James Strachey In: FREUD, S. *The Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. 1-24 Volume Set*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1976a.

¹⁸ FREUD, S. *The Interpretation of Dreams*. Translated by James Strachey. Basic Books: New York, 1955.

¹⁹ For reference, see footnote 18.

5) In the first three chapters of *Group psychology and analysis of the Ego* (2010 [1921]),²⁰ Freud summarizes and transcribes long fragments of the book *Psychology of Crowds* (LE BON, 2009),²¹ by the French sociologist and social psychologist Gustav Le Bon (1841-1931). This is followed by a detailed analysis of the work of the English, social psychologist, William McDougall (1871-1938) *The Group Mind* (1920).²² In addition to these, Freud's bibliography comprises a long list of works by authors who deal with the psychology of groups.

Although he does not synthesize the psychology of his time, it is clear, from the list above, that Freud, in fact, does dialogue with the psychology of his contemporaries, although in a manner that differs from Voloshinov, Medvedev and Bakhtin: Freud tends to choose the interlocuters and concepts that establish dialogical relationships of affiliation and partial agreement, transforming them through his unique view of the human psyche, while the Circle opts for authors and theoretical lines with which to establish dialogical relationships of open controversy.

A second criticism is that Freudianism did not develop “effectively scientific methods in his theoretical approach” (VOLÓCHINOV, 1925, p.205)²³ and, thus, continues to “operate with the old, subjective method of psychology that consists of self-observation [...] and its interpretation” (VOLÓCHINOV, 1925, p.205).²⁴ In fact, Freud himself recognizes, without finding any problem in this, that the therapeutic task is comprised of three goals: the first is the art of interpretation, by the psychoanalyst, of the unconscious, which is hidden by the patient; the second aims “to oblige the patient to confirm the analyst's construction from his own memory” (FREUD, 1961a [1920], p.12);²⁵ and in the third, as the patient cannot remember what is repressed in its entirety, the therapist leads the patient “to repeat the repressed material as a contemporary experience” in which these

²⁰ FREUD, S. *Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1922; Bartleby.com, 2010. Available at: [<http://www.bartleby.com/290/>]. Accessed on: July 01, 2017.

²¹ LE BON, G. *Psychology of Crowds*. Translated by anonymous. Southampton, UK: Sparkling Books, Ltd., 2009.

²² MCDUGALL, W. *The Group Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1920.

²³ In the original: “действительных научных методов их теоретического познания”

²⁴ In the original: “старый метод субъективной психологии: самонаблюдение и его интерпретация.”

²⁵ For reference, see footnote 7.

reproductions “are invariably acted out in the sphere of the transference, of the patient's relation to the physician” (FREUD, 1961a [1920], p.12).²⁶

A third criticism was the accusation that Freudianism was “pansexualist,” condemning the Freudian theory for reducing the explanation of all social, ideological and cultural phenomenon to the dynamics of sexual impulses. According to Voloshinov, this “pansexualism” is a manifestation of a bourgeois philosophy in reaction to its own decadence. Freud responded to this type of accusation made by other critics by, firstly, explaining that his view of sexuality diverged from the ordinary sense, such that it is: “divorced from its too close connection with the genitals and is regarded as a more comprehensive bodily function, having pleasure as its goal and only secondarily coming to serve the ends of reproduction” (FREUD, 1959 [1925], p.38).²⁷ Secondly, in his text, *A Difficulty in the Path of Psychoanalysis* (FREUD, 1961b [1917], p.3609),²⁸ Freud himself voiced this objection, since it had been previously and repeatedly voiced by Voloshinov:

Unintelligent opposition accuses us of one-sidedness in our estimate of the sexual instincts. ‘Human beings have other interests besides sexual ones,’ they say. We have not forgotten or denied this for a moment. Our one-sidedness is like that of the chemist, who traces all compounds back to the force of chemical attraction. He is not on that account denying the force of gravity; he leaves that to the physicist to deal with.²⁹

A fourth critique is that, in Freud’s theory, “there is not a single word in his theory about any of the material bases of character formation that are inherent in the constitution of the body or about the physical or objective social effects of the environment” (VOLOSHINOV, 1976 [1925], p.71).³⁰ However, the consideration of the role of civilization and/or culture in the constitution of the human psyche would be developed in a

²⁶ For reference, see footnote 7.

²⁷ FREUD, S. *An Autobiographical Study: Inhibitions, Symptoms and Anxiety – The Question of Lay Analysis and Other Works*. In: FREUD, S. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, Vol. XX Translated by James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1959.

²⁸ FREUD, S. *A Difficulty in the Path of Psychoanalysis*. In: FREUD, S. *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*: vol. XVII. Translated by James Strachey in collaboration with Anna Freud. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, 1961b.

²⁹ For reference, see footnote 28.

³⁰ For reference, see footnote 2.

more explicit way in one of Freud's most well-known texts *Civilization and its Discontents* (1962b [1930]).³¹ Since they were published three years after *Freudianism* (1927), Freud's considerations could not have been commented on in the two texts by Voloshinov, and it no longer constituted an object of Voloshinov's critical analysis, who may have not had access to Freud's work for personal reasons regarding institutional restrictions or even loss of interest, and therefore, the controversy was considered resolved.

Freud conceives civilization as “the whole sum of the achievements and the regulations which distinguish our lives from those of our animal ancestors and which serve two purposes –namely to protect men against nature and to adjust their mutual relations” (FREUD, 1962 [1930], p.36).³² Reintroducing his previous discovery that the pleasure principle, or the search for happiness, governs the finality of life and that this finality is irreversible, permanently, and for various reasons, Freud concentrates on one of the obstacles of satisfying the pleasure principle: social relationships. The basic cement in the construction of social life, according to Freud, is the compulsion to work and the power of love. Work and love repress and modify the satisfaction of instinctual and aggressive impulses in benefit of the collective life of mankind. However, the civilizing forces (love and work) and the individual instincts are in constant conflict in the history of humanity. Economic needs tend to absorb and regulate sexuality and familial life, generating conflict and displeasure. Struggle and disputes are inherent to human activity, and here Freud makes explicit mention to the Communists, for whom the elimination of private property would be on the basis of the elimination of the conflicts, injustices and antagonisms within humankind. Freud recognizes that “a real change in the relations of human beings to possessions” (1962 [1930], p.90)³³ is capable of rewarding the virtue and improve life, but without yielding to an idealistic vision of human nature, as the economic structure is just one of the spheres of the existence of privileges and inequalities, and it would not eliminate the other conflicts of mankind, for example, the privilege in the realm of sexual relations or the unjust distribution of intellectual talents and physical aptitudes endowed by nature.

³¹ FREUD, S. *Civilization and Its Discontents*. Translated by James Strachey. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1962.

³² For reference, see footnote 31.

³³ For reference, see footnote 31.

Freud continues his essay arguing that the struggle between Eros and death, life instincts and destructive ones, constitute the vital struggle of the human species in the construction of culture and civilization. In this process, the force of the social sphere exerts its influence both on the external coercions and the internalizations of the social ideas in the Super-ego that lives in constant conflict with the Ego.

In *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis* (1933),³⁴ Freud explicitly analyzes the theory of Karl Marx on the following points: firstly, Freud does not appreciate the historical conception of Marx about the origin of the social classes, but rather conceives the phylogenesis of human society as the conjunction of psychological factors of social groups and the dominion of nature (weapons, metals, the conquest of space, etc.); in suit, Freud recognizes that the force of Marxism is:

in its clear insight into the determining influence which is exerted by the economic conditions of man upon his intellectual, ethical and artistic reactions [...] But it cannot be assumed that the economic motives are the only ones which determine human behavior of men in society. The unquestionable fact different that individuals, races and nations behave differently under the same economic conditions, in itself proves that the economic factor cannot be the sole determinant (FREUD, 1933, p.244).³⁵

Freud continues arguing that the psychological factors originate from the economic relationships, as follows: the self-preservation instinct, aggression, the need for love, the impulse to obtain pleasure and avoid pain, the conservative demands of the Super-Ego, the evolution of culture and scientific empowerment. These last two factors clearly approach the transformative influence of the spheres of superstructure on economic relationships in the infrastructure. Finally, Freud denounced that practical Marxism lost its scientific and critical character and was redesigned with procedures characteristic of religion, such as the rejection and persecution of critics, and the dislocation of the destructive tendencies of man

³⁴ FREUD, S. *New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis*. Translated by W.J.H. Sprott. Carleton House: New York, 1933. Available at: [<https://archive.org/stream/in.ernet.dli.2015.49982/2015.49982.New-Introductory-Lectures-On-Psycho-analysis#page/n1/mode/2up/search/economic+>]. Accessed on: July 01, 2017.

³⁵ For reference, see footnote 34.

for the “hostility of the poor against the rich” (FREUD, 1933, p.246).³⁶ Freud’s final evaluation is that Marxist theory would have to be conjugated and complemented with the explanation of the instinctual human compliance, its racial variations and its cultural transformations about the conditions of social ordering, from professional activities and the means of subsistence.

In this brief exposition, I hope to have made it clear that Freud was not indifferent to the individual. Nor does it seem to me incompatible with the concept of a socio-ideologically constituted subject and a society motivated by the contradiction and the struggle of economic interests. The dispute between the different groups and social classes for hegemony in the production and control of ideological signs that, in its turn, provide the material and the content of the human consciousness would be a dimension and would coexist with the interior struggle of individuals between the satisfying of their desires and the demands of the social realm, between the aggressive forces of death and the collective power of Eros.

One concept that is not the target of Voloshinov’s criticism, but that, in our view, is important to understanding the controversy between Freudianism and the sociological method is the human conscience. In *Beyond the Pleasure Principle*,³⁷ consciousness is conceived as a function of the psychic processes that, in anatomical terms, is located “in the cerebral cortex –the outermost, enveloping layer of the central organ” (FREUD, 1961a [1920], p.18),³⁸ and “extend into the system directly and in undiminished amount, in so far as certain of their characteristics give rise to feelings in the pleasure-unpleasure series” (FREUD, 1961a [1920], p.23),³⁹ these coming from the inside of the apparatus of the psyche. The conscious does not leave traces of memory – it empties in the very process of excitation and possesses a mode of work governed by the categories of time and space, which Freud refers to directly in the work of Kant.

³⁶ For reference, see footnote 34. In an earlier work, *Group psychology and the Analysis of the Ego* (2010 [1921] - for reference see footnote 20), Freud suggests that the weakening of religious sentiment in his time could be substituted for socialism, which will direct those outside of it the same intolerance that was experienced in the era of the religious wars.

³⁷ For reference, see footnote 7.

³⁸ For reference, see footnote 7.

³⁹ For reference, see footnote 7.

Following his theory begun in *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* (1961a [1920]),⁴⁰ Freud developed a relation between language and the human psyche in *The Ego and the Id* (1976a [1923]),⁴¹ where part of the basic premise of psychoanalysis was the differentiation between the conscious and the unconscious in the psyche. After this affirmation, Freud anticipates the reaction of a part of his readers, those with philosophical culture⁴² for whom the idea that something psychic that is not also conscious would be absurd, to argue that the phenomena of hypnosis and dreams are the actual proof of the existence of the unconscious. According to Freud, the unconscious cannot manifest because of the acting forces of repression and resistance. The unconscious “is carried out on some material which remains unknown” (FREUD, 1976a [1923], p.12)⁴³ and passes through the pre-conscious⁴⁴ by means of the link with verbal representations.

The conscious is a quality of the psyche and can be characterized as: formed by “all perceptions which are received from without (sense-perceptions) and from within - what we call sensations and feelings...” (FREUD, 1976b [1923], p.3954);⁴⁵ these sensorial perceptions and inner feelings link to the verbal acoustic and visual perceptions, which are older, ontogenetically and phylogenetically. The theory of dreams is based on the verification that: “Dreams, then, think predominantly in visual images—but not exclusively. They make use of auditory images as well, and, to a lesser extent, of impressions belonging to the other senses” (1955 [1900], p.79).⁴⁶ Later in the work, Freud’s point of departure is the affirmations by Schleiermacher and Strümpel: “The waking mind

⁴⁰ For reference, see footnote 7.

⁴¹ For reference, see footnote 17.

⁴² In the text *Resistances to Psychoanalysis* (1976b [1925]) (FREUD, S. *Resistances to Psychoanalysis*. Translated by James Stachey in collaboration with Anna Freud. The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud Vol. 1-24 Volume Set. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1976b), Freud returns to approach the resistance of philosophers to psychoanalysis: “the psychic of the philosophers was not the psychoanalyst. By and large, they considered the psychic, only that which is the phenomenon of the conscious. For them, the conscious world coincides with the sphere of the psychic” (pp.257-258).

⁴³ For reference, see footnote 17.

⁴⁴ In this article, we do not discuss the differentiating aspects of the preconscious, as they are too complex to be developed here, and therefore beyond the scope of this article.

⁴⁵ For reference, see footnote 42.

⁴⁶ For reference, see footnote 18.

produces ideas and thoughts in verbal images and in speech; but in dreams it does so in true sensory images” (1955 [1900], p.80).⁴⁷

Under the influence of Humboldt, Ptiebnia, Cassirer and Chapet, on the one hand, and of the Russian Marxists, on the other, Voloshinov in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*,⁴⁸ conceives that the conscious is born and exists embodied in the word, which is formed by the self-conscious and attributed to it, as conceptual stability. This does not mean that thought only exists after the advent of verbal language, but that thought was transformed qualitatively through the encounter with verbal language, and also visual, musical, architectonic languages, etc. In the individual as a historical and social subject, it is possible to distinguish the “life of the self,” close to the physiological reaction of an animal – and the “collective life” – which has an ideological differentiation that guarantees firmness/certitude to the conscious. However, here we see that, on the one hand, language is the forming element of the human conscious both for Voloshinov and Freud, and, on the other hand, that Voloshinov focuses on the human conscious, while Freud theorizes the existence of an extra-verbal dimension – the unconscious in constant tension with the conscious. The division of the human psyche for Voloshinov corresponds to the perception of the complexity of the psychic apparatus that exists in a state of tension between subjective and objective forces. This perception occurs, in our view, as a result of the dialogue with Freudianism, which signals the departure point of our investigation into the merits, according to Voloshinov’s analysis.

The first of these is that “Freudianism, in many cases, operates with the real greatness of human behavior and, in practice, knows how to advise within it” (FREUD, 2010 [1920], p.205),⁴⁹ however Freudianism deals with real phenomena and knows how to operate with it. The second is that it brings a new understanding of the psychic phenomenon: “What is new is the grandiose metaphoric conception of the dynamic of the psyche, through which we find, in the majority of cases, the dynamic material of the

⁴⁷ For reference, see footnote 18.

⁴⁸ VOLOŠINOV, V. *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language*. Translated by Ladeslav Matejka and I.R. Tutinik. New York: Seminar Press, 1973.

⁴⁹ Text in Portuguese: “o freudismo, em muitos casos, opera com grandezas reais do comportamento humano e na prática sabe se orientar no meio delas.” TN: Not found in previously translated material.

somatic processes yet to be studied by science” (FREUD, 2010 [1920], p.205).⁵⁰ Voloshinov recognizes the Freudian contribution to the understanding of the complexity of the human psyche, but condemns, then, its lack of the development of the scientific method.

The last aspect to be analyzed is that in the criticism of Freudianism, the first steps at developing the sociological methods are taken, and these are further developed later in *Marxism and the Philosophy of Language* (1973).⁵¹ The psychoanalysis session is submitted to the sociological method in the following excerpt from the 1925 article:

We bear in mind the complex relationships between the medical psychiatrist and the neurotic patient, that is, this small social world, with its specific conflicts, with a tendency of the patients to hide some aspects of their lives from the doctor, to fool him, to persist in their symptoms and so forth. This small social phenomenon is very complex. The economic base, the physiological aspect and the bourgeois ideological aspect (moral and aesthetic), all of this determines the concrete interrelation in its totality (VOLÓCHINOV, 1925, p.208).⁵²

We surmise from this that the psychoanalytic session is a small social act that produces utterances and ideological signs that can only be understood in relation to the closest social participants, the closest social situation and the broad social horizon. Freud describes the session of psychoanalysis in different terms: “Analysis is not, however, suitable for polemic use; it always presupposes the consent of the one analyzed and the situation of a superior and subordinate” (1995 [1914], p.797).⁵³ In other words, Freud is aware of the social and interpersonal dynamic of a psychoanalytic therapy session.

⁵⁰ Text in Portuguese: “O que há de novo é a grandiosa concepção metafórica da dinâmica psíquica, atrás da qual encontra-se, na maioria dos casos, a dinâmica material dos processos somáticos ainda não estudados pela ciência” (FREUD, 2010 [1920], p.205). TN: Not found in previously translated material.

⁵¹ For reference, see footnote 48.

⁵² In the original: “Мы имеем в виду сложные отношения врача-психиатра и больного-невротика, - этот маленький социальный мирок, с его специфической борьбой, с тенденцией больного скрывать от врача некоторые моменты своей жизни, обманывать его, упорствовать в своих симптомах и пр. и пр. Это маленькое базис, физиологический момент и момент буржуазно-идеологический (моральный и эстетический) – всё это определяет конкретное взаимоотношение в его целом.”

⁵³ FREUD, S. The History of the Psychoanalytic Movement. Translated by Dr. A.A. Brill. In: FREUD, S. *The Basic Writings of Sigmund Freud*. New York: The Modern Library, 1995.

In the expanded version of the article published in 1927 – the book titled *Freudianism: a Marxist Critique* (1976),⁵⁴ the sociological method was elaborated even further, such that it proposed even more substantial alternatives to Freudian concepts, through the valorization of the word or language, and the development of the concept of behavioral ideology:

At all stages of this route the human consciousness operates through words – that medium which is the most sensitive and at the same time the most complicated refraction of the socioeconomic governance (VOLOSHINOV, 1976 [1927], p.87).⁵⁵

Let us call that inner and outward speech that permeates our behavior in all its aspects “behavioral ideology.” This behavioral ideology is in certain respects more sensitive, more responsive, more excitable and livelier than an ideology that has undergone formulation and become “official” (VOLOSHINOV, 1976 [1927], p.88).⁵⁶

Dream, myth, joke, witticism, and all the verbal components of the pathological formations reflect the struggle of various ideological tendencies and trends that take shape within *behavioral ideology* (VOLOSHINOV, 1976, [1927], p.88).⁵⁷

Other levels, corresponding to Freud’s unconscious, lie at a great distance from the stable system of the ruling ideology (VOLOSHINOV, 1976 [1927], p.89).⁵⁸

I identify here that the concept of behavioral ideology was developed as an alternative proposal to the Freudian unconscious from the concept of Marxist social psychology. Voloshinov identifies it as one of the Freudian novelties – “the *strife*, the *chaos*, and the *adversity* of our psychical life” (VOLOSHINOV, 1976 [1927], p.75)⁵⁹ – is reread from a dialectical materialist stance in which the ideological conflicts of social reality provide the content of the human psyche, generating conflicts and all their complexities. In this sense, our analysis corroborates Moura-Viera’s (2009) conclusion that the tests about Freudianism do not constitute “a deviation from the decidedly linguistic

⁵⁴ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁵⁵ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁵⁶ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁵⁷ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁵⁸ For reference, see footnote 2.

⁵⁹ For reference, see footnote 2.

studies of the Circle” (p.69),⁶⁰ but are “one of the pillars of the constitution of dialogic thought” (p.69).⁶¹

2 European and Soviet Marxist Dialogue with Freud

Valentín Voloshinov’s interest in Freudian theory is not an isolated case in the Soviet context of the 1920s and reflects, in part, the rapid reception of Freud’s work in pre-revolutionary Russia. Already in the 1910s, Freud declared that his work had achieved great recognition in Russia: “In Russia, psychoanalysis is very generally known and widespread; almost all my writings, as well as those of other advocates of analysis, are translated into Russian” (FREUD, 1995 [1914], p.786).⁶² Thus, by the second half of the 1920s, the work Freud produced until then had been translated and widely distributed for at least 11 years in Russia and later in the Soviet Union, which indicates the Soviet Marxist’s interest in Freudianism.

In a footnote at the beginning of *Beyond the Social: On Freudianism* (1976 [1925])⁶³ Voloshinov related 6 articles that treat relationships between historical materialism and Freudianism, not to mention others. The 5 first aimed to discuss Freudianism in relation to Dialectical Materialism— 1) A. B. Zalkind *Freidizm i marksizm* [Freudianism and Marxism], *Ótcherki kultury revoliúts. vriémeni* [Sketches of culture in revolutionary times]; 2) B. Bykhóvski [*O metodologuítcheskikh osnovániakh psikhoanalit. utchéniia Freida*] [On the methodological fundamentals of the psychoanalytic doctrine of Freud] (*Pod známenem marksisma* – N. 12, 1923); 3) K. D. Fridman *Osnóvnye psikholog. vozzriéniia Freida i teóriia istor. mat-zma* [Fundamentals of Freud’s psychological perspective and the theory of Historical Materialism] (“Psychology and Marxism” – *Psikhológuia i marksísm* – organized by Kornílova); 4) A. R. Lúria *Psikhoanáliz kak sistiéma monistíkh. psikhológuii* [Psychoanalysis as a system of monist psychology] (Ibid.);

⁶⁰ In the original: “um desvio dos estudos propriamente linguístico do Círculo.”

⁶¹ In the original: “um dos pilares da constituição do pensamento dialógico.”

⁶² For reference see footnote 53.

⁶³ For reference see footnote 2. TN: These footnotes do not appear in the English 1976 version, nor in Chapter 10.

5) A. M. Reisner *Freud i ego chkóla o relíguii* [Freud and his school on religion] (“Petchát i Rev.”, N. 2, 1924) - and the sixth takes up an open, controversial position on Freudianism that Voloshinov considers more correct: 6) - V. Iuriniéts. *Freudizm i marksízm* [Freudianism and Marxism] (journal, *Pod známenem marksisma*, N. 8-9, 1924).⁶⁴

We begin with Iuriniéts’ text, which was the only one Voloshinov described as correct. Iuriniéts’ proposal was to investigate “from a purely critical position, the basis of Freud’s theory” (1924, p.53)⁶⁵ and, for this, the author repeatedly cites the texts *Beyond the Pleasure Principle* – the very text Voloshinov alludes to in his title – and *The Ego and the Id*. Freud’s theory is characterized as a “philosophy of degradation” (p.65),⁶⁶ “mystical spirit” (p.67)⁶⁷ and an “unattainable fantasy world” (p.67).⁶⁸ Iuriniéts attacks, above all, the changes in the concept of the “unconscious” in the chronology of Freud’s work and the supposed lack of definition of the “Id,” which originates from, “a continuation and modernization of the German romantic philosophy of Schelling” (p.71).⁶⁹ In the second part of the article, Iuriniéts focuses on Freud’s social psychology, in which, in our view, the Marxist aggression against Freud can be found: “Freudian sociology is the weakest part of the psychoanalytic system; it is simply a complete and colossal contradiction; besides this, it is the expression of a blind hate and rage in relation to Marxism” (1924, p.75).⁷⁰ In addition to this critical synthesis, Iuriniéts copies several statements against soviet Marxism that were written by Freud’s disciples: “Communism is the expression of the tendency to join with the mother – the eternal nostalgia to return to the mother’s womb” (1924, p.90);⁷¹ “The communist workers movement is an attempt to return to an infantile state” (1924, p.90);⁷² “Communism is neo-feudalism” (1924, p.91);⁷³ “Marx’s dialectic is an expression

⁶⁴ TN: There is no previously translated version for this and the following citations from footnote 65 to 75.

⁶⁵ In the original: “чисто критическая – предполагает знакомство с основами учения Фрейда.”

⁶⁶ In the original: “философия разложения.”

⁶⁷ In the original: “мистический дух”

⁶⁸ In the original: “фантастический, непостижимый мир”

⁶⁹ In the original: “Это отрывок немецкого философского романтизма, модернизированный Шеллинга.”

⁷⁰ In the original: “Социология фрейдизма является самой слабой частью системы психоанализа, она полна прямо чудовищных противоречий; кроме того, она является выражением слепой, бешеной ненависти по отношению к марксизму”

⁷¹ In the original: “Коммунизм – выражение стремления к слиянию с матерью, вечная тоска о возврате в *uterus* матери”

⁷² In the original: “рабочее коммунистическое движение является попыткой возврата к детскому состоянию.”

of paranoia that, together with the mystic belief in the role of the proletariat, acquires a form of religious paranoia” (1924, p91);⁷⁴ and even, “The slogan ‘workers of the world unite’ is an expression of class homosexuality” (1924, p.92).⁷⁵ Iuriniets criticisms seem to us less motivated by the possible insufficiencies of Freud’s works than a reaction to the attacks by Freudians against Marxist theory and Soviet Marxism in general. Along these lines, Freud himself made some very well thought out criticism of Marxist theory and the Russian revolution, as he recognized, on the one hand, the possibility of greater social justice with the elimination of private property and, on the other, the astuteness of dialectical materialism as shining a light on the influence of economics on the way people think.

The other articles, on undertaking attempts to reconcile Freudianism with Marxism, are considered false or failed by Voloshinov: “we find profoundly false, Zalkind’s central theoretical conviction, according to which the human psyche is a biological reflex of its social being” (BAKHTIN, 2001[1927], p.108);⁷⁶ “The central failure of the article by Bykovskij can be summarized thus: absence of focus of the very psychoanalytic method as an objective fact” (BAKHTIN, 2001[1927], p.99).⁷⁷ Among the five texts cited by Voloshinov as favorable to a reconciliation between Freudianism and Marxism, Fridman’s (1925)⁷⁸ article is the most consistent and extensive, which impels us to address it specifically as follows.

Fridman begins from the observation that the Freudian theory approaches man from two interrelated points of view – organic and social – and seeks to analyze the social basis for the psychic phenomenon, making it possible to analyze Freudian theory in light of the theory of historical materialism. After analyzing Freud’s proposal about the organization

⁷³ In the original: “Коммунизм является собственно неофеодализмом.”

⁷⁴ In the original: “диалектика Маркса выражение параной, которая вместе с мистической верой в роль пролетариата приобретает формы религиозной параной.”

⁷⁵ In the original: “Лозунг: ‘пролетарии всех стран, соединяйтесь!’ – не что иное, как классовое выражение гомосексуализма”

⁷⁶ In the original: “achamos profundamente falsa a convicção teórica central de Zalkind, segundo a qual o psiquismo do homem é um reflexo biológico do seu ser social.” TN: Not found in the English version.

⁷⁷ In the original: “A falha central do artigo de Bykhóvski pode ser assim resumida: ausência de enfoque do próprio método psicanalítico como fato objetivo.” TN: Not found in the English version.

⁷⁸ TN: There is no previously translated version.

and formation of the human psyche, Fridman concludes that the external conditions are the origin of the same inner impulses and, therefore, incompatible with dialectical materialism:

The rift between the unconscious and the conscious represents the hostility between the inner tendencies and outward conditions. The psychical apparatus, overall, is an area in which there is a shock between the internal and the external. However, the same inner impulses emerge dependent on reality and become concrete through it; the dynamic of the psyche reflects the struggle for the same external conditions within itself, of which some correspond to the remotest periods of human life, and, consequently, of its development, as well as others, in later periods (1925, p.141).⁷⁹

At the end of the article, Fridman concentrates on a point-by-point comparison of the differences in aims, objects and methodology between Freudian theory and Historical Materialism, without considering the irreconcilable incompatibility or even the antagonism between the two theories; on the contrary: “The psychological presuppositions of both theories is the thesis that the source of our activities are the demands of life, the ultimate guiding force of development of the society of man” (1925, p.158).⁸⁰ The following is a synthesis of Fridman’s comparison.

Historical Materialism	Psychoanalysis
Studies collective phenomena from the tendency of humans to satisfy the central demands of life, taking them as already given.	Studies the way these tendencies are formed.
Aims to explain the development of the collective conditions that determine man’s	Stems from given social conditions to explain the way its influences appear in

⁷⁹ In the original: “Антагонизм между БСЗ и СЗ репрезентирует вражду внутренних тенденций с внешними условиями. Психический аппарат в целом есть арена, на которой происходят столкновения внутреннего с внешним.

Но самим внутренне побуждения – влечения – возникли в зависимости от реальности и конкретизируются ею; в таком случае психическая динамика представляет, в конечном итоге, отражение борьбы самих внешних условий между собой, из которых одни соответствуют более древним периодам жизни человека, следовательно, и развития психики, а другие соответствуют более поздним.”

⁸⁰ In the original: “Психологической предпосылкой обоих учений является положение, что источником нашей деятельности являются жизненные *потребности* – конечные двигатели развития общества и человека.”

activity.	particular activities.
Is limited to the explanation of the influence of the social conditions in the emergence of the content of the psychological phenomenon.	Studies how (the mechanism) the psychological phenomenon is formed.
Studies the person as constituted by the social.	Studies the development of the individual person under the influence of given collective conditions.
Studies activities shaped as a result of other social conditions.	Studies people's sexual relations as a formative source of their activities.
Takes the result of this activity as already formed.	Studies the activity of the psychoanalytic apparatus as a means of forming human representations.
Stems from human desire, as a source of action, for the study of the development of complex phenomena in collective life.	Studies the process of the emergence of an individual's own desire.
Studies the influence of the social conditions in the origin of the content of the psychic phenomenon.	Studies how (the mechanisms) forms of content are developed
Reaches the point where the influence of the socioeconomic aspect is revealed.	Continues, from the methodological point of view, in the psychological orientation of materialism. Freud begins where historical materialism ends in the study of human activity.
Targets the determining factor.	Can explain how the reflex of the socioeconomic aspect emerges in the psyche and conditions the development of given psychic phenomena.
Links human psychology with society, or rather, how the social forms the psyche.	Links human psychology with the biological, or rather, how the biological, under the influence of the social, is transformed into the psychological.

Fridman's comparison shows that, in the Soviet Union from the first half of 1925, part of the reception of Freud's work pointed to a possible articulation between the two theories, without reducing them in their specificities. This way of reading Freud links the possible articulation between the two theories, in my opinion, with the interpretation of

neo-marxists, such as Marcuse in *Eros and civilization* (1966 [1955]),⁸¹ who considers that “Individual psychology is thus in itself group psychology in so far as the individual itself still is in archaic identity with the species” (1966 [1955]), p.57),⁸² or rather, psychology describes the formation of the personality as the manifestation of the general repression of humanity, undermining the modern concept of the notion of the autonomous individual. Also, very similar to Fridman, Marcuse concludes that, in Freudian theory, the instinctive impulses are subject to historical modifications and, in this way, Freud’s theory of civilization is an analysis of the mental mechanisms of the individuals that are the substance of history. The dynamics of the psyche described by Freud (the struggle between Eros and the death wish, of the edification and destruction of the culture, of the repression and return of the repressed) is freed and organized “by the historical conditions under which mankind develops” (1966 [1955]), p.108)⁸³ and “the true spirit of psychoanalytic theory lives in the uncompromising efforts to reveal the antihumanistic forces behind the philosophy of productiveness” (1966 [1955], p.222).⁸⁴ An important aspect of Marcuse’s analysis is his lecture on Aristotelian *Logos* that unites ordered, classifying and domineering reason, to that which opposes it, and the concept of the essence of being in Freud, such as *Eros*, the logic of satisfaction and not domination, of culture as self-development and not repressive sublimation, of being rather than task doing, which works under a different principle of reality. Therefore, in Marcuse’s work, Freudian theory shows the social-historical conditions of forming the human psyche in which the social and the individual are interrelated and constituted in a branch of criticizing and overcoming domination, repression – the renunciation that constitutes the modern individual and, consequently, sustains civilization.

Althusser was another intellectual that theorized about the relation between Marx and Freud, but from a very different point of view than Marcuse. Freud’s texts, such as *Totem and taboo*⁸⁵ and *Civilization and its discontents*⁸⁶ are important fundamental texts in

⁸¹ MARCUSE, H. *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1966.

⁸² For reference, see footnote 81.

⁸³ For reference, see footnote 81.

⁸⁴ For reference, see footnote 81.

⁸⁵ For reference, see footnote 14.

Marcuse's interpretation, while Althusser characterizes them as "adventurous and open to criticism" (1991[1976], p.86).⁸⁷ For Althusser, Freud and Marx begin with previously known phenomena – the effects of the class struggle and the effects of the unconscious – and therefore, did not invent new objects; what they created was "the definition of their object, its limits and extension in the characterization of its conditions, in its forms of existence and its effects [...], in short, its theory" (1991[1976], p.76).⁸⁸ Freud and Marx do not identify with the identity of the object "Freud, who only knew of Marx, thought, as he did, his object (even though it had nothing in common with him)" (ALTHUSSER, 1991[1976], p 90),⁸⁹ but "Marx and Freud approximate one another through materialism and the dialectic" (ALTHUSSER, 1991[1976], p.78).⁹⁰

Soviet Marxists such as Bykhovski also affirm that dialectical materialism is the foundation of Freudianism and situates it closer to Marxism: "Psychoanalysis is a theory with traces of monism, materialism, and the dialectic, that is, with the methodological principles of dialectical materialism." (1923, p.169).⁹¹ This approximation is categorically rebutted by Voloshinov: "Some consider Freud a materialist. Similar affirmations are based on a total misconception" (1925, p.205).⁹²

Finally, Althusser describes the condition of the production of the Marxist and Freudian theories as the necessary conflicting reality in which both were generated – a class stratified society and a divided structure, and in conflict with the psychoanalytic subject --, both question the core of the philosophical form of the bourgeois ideology (the ideology of the single and conscious subject, necessary for accepting its own subjugation to bourgeois ideology).

⁸⁶ For reference, see footnote 31.

⁸⁷ Text in Portuguese: "aventurosos e criticáveis."

⁸⁸ Text in Portuguese: "a definição do seu objeto, de seus limites e de suas extensão a caracterização de suas condições, de suas formas de existência e de seus efeitos (...) ou seja, sua teoria."

⁸⁹ Text in Portuguese: "Freud, que apenas conhecia Marx, pensava, como este, seu objeto (embora nada tivesse em comum com o dele)."

⁹⁰ Text in Portuguese: "Marx e Freud se aproximariam um do outro através do materialismo e da dialética."

⁹¹ In the original: "Психонализ в основе своей усть учение, проникнутое монизмом, материализмом и диалективой, т-е. методологическими принципами диалетического материализма." (1923, p.169). TN: There is no previously translated version.

⁹² In the original: "Фрейда некоторые считают материалистом. Подобное утверждение основано на совершенном недооазумении." TN: This does not appear in the 1976 version.

Both Marcuse and Althusser point out that Freud's theory was modified by revisionists who annulled his discoveries and its transformative character, but differ considerably in their approaches: Marcuse seeks to show the influence of social and historical reality in the constitution of the human psyche, while Althusser emphasizes the difference of the objects in Marxist and Psychoanalytic theories, even though they meet on a common epistemological base in dialectical materialism. According to what has been presented, both approaches have been proposed by Soviet Marxists, such as Fridman and Byhovski in the first half of the 1920s and were refuted by Voloshinov.

Final Considerations

The study of Freud's works, based on Voloshinov's texts on Freudianism, as well as texts by Soviet Marxists at the beginning of the 1920s and European Marxists from 1950-1970, provides us with a relatively broad understanding of the debate between Marxism and Freudianism. With regard to Voloshinov, his controversial dialogue with Freudianism sparked the initial developments of the sociological method, hence the development of the concept of quotidian ideology from the social situation and the life experience of the I/we (individual/collective) (these stemming from the German philosophy of Wilhelm Dilthey). Although Voloshinov's sociological method admits the existence of the verbal and non-verbal ideological signs constituting human consciousness, his focus in the dialogue, in the discursive interaction and in the utterance lead him to form a theory of language strongly anchored in the ideological constitution of human consciousness.

The proposals of various authors in joining Freudiansim with Marxism, formed in distinct ideological and socio-historical conditions, indicate, in our view, that there are affinities among the two theories. Voloshinov's accusations against Freudian theory seem to us conditioned on the institutional dogmatism of the second half of the 1920s in the Soviet Union in which Soviet Marxism had become hegemonic and an unquestionable truth in university and research institutions (ILIAZV), or, in Lima and Perini's terms, "the intuition in marking the ideological space dedicated to the political system in which the

Circle operates” (2009, p.81).⁹³ According to what we have pointed out, we find much well-developed criticism of the theory of Marx and Engels, but, even so, these restrictions must have provoked their total rejection in the Soviet Union, from the second half of the 1920s, when Voloshinov wrote his two texts at the ILIAZV.

I believe that the socio-ideological concept of the conscious, developed in Voloshinov’s work, would be enriched by the discoveries of the Freudian unconscious, which points to a subject that is not only divided by socioeconomic conflicts, by the dialectic of the self/other, by the presence of the other in the self, but by their biological, somatic, libidinal, familial and phylogenetic determiners. Two possibilities for this enrichment were proposed by Soviet and European Marxists: on the one hand, the psychic organization of the individual can be understood as determined by their socio-historical conditioning (MARCUSE, 1966;⁹⁴ FRIDMAN, 1925); on the other hand, the study of the subject constituted socio-ideologically is seen as ONE appropriation of the individual in language situated beside others that may be approached from a psychoanalytic view point (ALTHUSSER, 2009; BYHOVSKI, 1923).

REFERENCES

- ALPATOV, V. *Volóchinov, Bakhtin i Lingvístika*. (Volóchinov, Bakhtin e a Linguística). Moscou: Iazikí Slaviánskikh Kultur, 2005.
- ALPATOV, V. *Iazykoviédy, vostokoviédy, istóriki*. (Linguistas, orientalistas, historiadores) Moscou: Iazykí Slaviánskikh Kultúr, 2012.
- ALTHUSSER, L. *Marx e Freud*. Trad. W. J. Evangelista 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1991[1976].
- BAKHTIN, M. *O freudismo: um esboço crítico*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. São Paulo: Perspectiva, 2001[1927].
- BAKHTINE, M. *Écrits sur le freudisme*. Trad. Guy Verret. Lausanne: L’Âge d’Homme, 1980.
- BAKHTIN, M. *Problemas da poética de Dostoiévski*. Trad. Paulo Bezerra. 5. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Forense Universitária, 2010[1963].

⁹³ Text in Portuguese: “o intuito em marcar um espaço ideológico comprometido com o sistema político em que o Círculo atua” (2009, p.81). TN: There is no previously translated version.

⁹⁴ For reference, see footnote 81.

- BYKHÓVSKI, B. O metodologúitsheskikh osnovániakh psikhoanalíticheskogo utchiénia Freida (Sobre os fundamentos metodológicos da teoria psicanalítica de Freud), *Pod známenem marksizma* (Sob a bandeira do marxismo), n. 11-12, Moscou, p.158-177, 1923.
- CASSIRER, E. *A filosofia das formas simbólicas. 1. A linguagem*. Trad. M. Fleischer. São Paulo: Martins Fontes, 2001[1923].
- EVANGELISTA, W. J. Introdução: Althusser e a psicanálise. In: ALTHUSSER, L. *Freud e Lacan. Marx e Freud*. Trad. W. J. Evangelista 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Graal, 1991. p.9-43.
- FREUD, S. *A interpretação dos sonhos*. Vol. 1 e 2. Trad. Renato Zwick. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 2016[1900].
- FREUD, S. Totem e tabu. *Obras completas volume 11*. (1912-1914). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2012 [1912-1913]. p.13-244.
- FREUD, S. Contribuição à história do movimento psicanalítico. *Obras completas volume 11*. (1912-1914). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2012 [1914]. p.245-327.
- FREUD, S. Uma dificuldade da psicanálise. *Obras completas volume 14*. (1917-1920). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 2ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010 [1917]. p.240-251.
- FREUD, S. O inquietante. *Obras completas volume 14*. (1917-1920). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 2ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010 [1917]. p.328-376.
- FREUD, S. Além do princípio do prazer. *Obras completas volume 14*. (1917-1920). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 2ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010[1920]. p.161-239.
- FREUD, S. *Psicologia das massas e análise do eu*. Trad. Renato Zwick. Porto Alegre, L&PM, 2016 [1921].
- FREUD, S. O eu e o id. *Obras completas volume 16*. (1923-1925). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011[1923]. p.13-74.
- FREUD, S. Autobiografia. *Obras completas volume 16*. (1923-1925). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011[1925]. p.75-167.
- FREUD, S. As resistências à psicanálise. *Obras completas volume 16*. Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2011[1925]. p.253-266.
- FREUD, S. O mal estar-estar na civilização. *Obras completas volume 18*. (1930-1936). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010[1930]. p.13-122.
- FREUD, S. Novas conferências introdutórias à psicanálise. *Obras completas volume 18*. (1930-1936). Trad. Paulo César de Souza. 3ª. reimp. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2010[1933]. p.124-354.
- FRIDMAN, B. Osnóvnyie psikhologúitsheskie vozzriénia Freida i teória istorítcheskogo materializma (Concepções psicológicas fundamentais de Freud e a teoria do materialismo

histórico). In: KORNILOVA, K. (Org.) *Psikhológuia i marksizm* (Psicologia e marxismo). Leningrad: Gossudárstvennoe izdátelstvo Leningrad, 1925. p.113-160.

INSTITUTO Da História Comparada Das Literaturas E Línguas Do Ocidente e do Oriente (ILIAZV). Filial ARAN, São Petersburgo, F. 302, op. 2, no. 51.

IURINIÉTS, V. Freidizm i marksizm (Freudismo e marxismo), *Pod známenem marksizma* (Sob a bandeira do marxismo), n. 8-9, Moscou, p.51-92, 1924. (Citado no p. 188 do artigo de Volóchinov com a seguinte observação: “Iuriniets ocupa outra posição totalmente correta no maravilhoso artigo “Freidizm i markcizm””)

HUMBOLDT, V. *On language. The Diversity of Human Language-Structure and its Influence on the Mental Development of Mankind*. Trad. P. Heath. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988[1836].

HUMBOLDT, V. *O razlítchii organizmov tcheloviétheskogo iazyká i o vliánii étogo razlítchiia na úmstvennoe razvítie tcheloviétheskogo roda. Vvedénie vo vseóbschee iazykoznánie. (Sobre a distinção dos organismos da linguagem humana e sobre a influência dessa distinção para o desenvolvimento intelectual do gênero humano. Introdução à linguística geral)*. Trad. P.S. Biliárski. 2. ed. Moscou: Librokom, 2013[1859].

LE BON, G. *Psicologia das multidões*. Rio de Janeiro: F. Briguet & Cia, 1954[1895].

LIMA, S.; PERINI, R. Bakhtin e Freud: aproximações e distâncias, *Bakhtiniana*, São Paulo, v. 1, n. 2, p.80-99, 2009. Available at: [<https://revistas.pucsp.br/index.php/bakhtiniana/article/view/3013/1944>]. Access on: 10/02/2017

LÚRIA, A. Psikhoanáliz kak sistiéma monistítheskoi psikhológuui. (A psicanálises como sistema de uma psicologia monística). In: In: KORNILOVA, K. (Org.) *Psikhológuia i marksizm* (Psicologia e marxismo). Leningrad: Gossudárstvennoe izdátelstvo Leningrad, 1925. p.47-80.

MARCUSE, H. *Eros e civilização*. Uma interpretação filosófica do pensamento de Freud. Trad. A. Cabral. 8. ed. Rio de Janeiro: LTC, 2015[1955].

MCDUGALL, W. *The group mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1927.

MOURA-VIEIRA, M. O freudismo: uma crítica à ideologia psiquiátrico-psicanalítica. In: BRAIT, B. *Bakhtin e o Círculo*. São Paulo: Contexto, 2009. p.49-72

POTEBNIÁ, A. *Mysl i iazk: psikhológuia poetítheskogo i prozaítheskogo mychliénii* (Pensamento e linguagem: psicologia do pensamento poético e prosaico). Moscou: Labirint, 2010[1892].

REISNER, M. Freid e ego chkola o relíguui (Freud e sua escola sobre a religião). *Petchát i Revoliútsiia* (Imprensa e Revolução), n. 2, Moscou, p.40-60, 1924.

VASSÍLIEV, N. V. N. Volóchinov: biografiéhekii ótcherk (V. N. Volóchinov: ensaio biográfico). In: VOLÓCHINOV, V. *Filossófiia i sotsiológuia gumanitarnykh nauk*. São Petersburgo: Asta Press, 1995. p.5-22.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. Po ty stórony sotsiálnogo (Do outro lado do social), *Zvezdá*, n. 5 (11), Leningrado, p.186-214, 1925.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. Freidizm. *Filossófiia i sotsiológuia gumanitárnykh naúk*. São Petersburgo: Asta Press, 1995. p.87-189.

VOLÓCHINOV, V. *Marksizm i filossófia iaziká* (Marxismo e filosofia da linguagem). Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

ZALKIND, A. Freidizm i marksizm. *Ótcherki kyltúri revoliutsiólnogo vriémeni*. (Ensaio de cultura do tempo revolucionário) Moscou: Pabótnik Prosveschiénia, 1924. p.56-62.

Translated by Jennifer Sarah Cooper - jennifersarahj@gmail.com

Received March 09,2017

Accepted July 29,2017