

ARTICLE

(IM)POSSIBLE LIMITS AND REACHES BETWEEN PSYCHOANALYSIS AND EDUCATION: FROM FREUD'S TIME TO THE PRESENT¹

SILVANO MESSIAS DOS SANTOS¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5003-7184>

<silvano.messias.santos@gmail.com>

INÊS MARIA MARQUES ZANFORLIN PIRES DE ALMEIDA¹

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1292-7327>

<almeida@unb.br>

¹ Universidade de Brasília (UnB). Brasília, DF, Brazil.

ABSTRACT: The purpose of this article is to discuss the interface between Psychoanalysis and Education. To this end, a historical journey is made through attempts to bring the fields closer together: part of the first decade of the twentieth century, when the dialogues around the relationship between Psychoanalysis and Education began with Sándor Ferenczi and Oskar Pfister, among other contemporary authors of Freud, and then transit through psychoanalytic studies in the field of Education developed in Brazil over the last 100 years. The experiences and theoretical-practical productions socialized by the wide list of intellectuals interested in the possible incidences of psychoanalysis in the educational field, in Brazil and other countries, lead us to admit that, although they encounter resistance both in the psychoanalytic environment and within educational studies, the possible encounters between both areas should not be ignored, not from the perspective of one field that overlaps the other, but of two fields that can hurt and nourish each other. Thus, it is concluded that, after more than a century of Sigmund Freud's invention, the limits and scope of the interlocutions of Psychoanalysis and Education do not cease to be (not) inscribed, inciting fruitful debates on consecrated pedagogical themes or aspects involved in education.

Keywords: psychoanalysis and education, research in Psychoanalysis, historical path.

LIMITES E ALCANCES (IM)POSSÍVEIS ENTRE PSICANÁLISE E EDUCAÇÃO: DO TEMPO DE FREUD À ATUALIDADE

RESUMO: O objetivo que sustenta o presente artigo é discutir a interface Psicanálise e Educação. Para tanto, faz-se um percurso histórico pelas tentativas de aproximação entre os campos: parte da primeira década do século XX, quando os diálogos em torno da relação Psicanálise e Educação têm início com Sándor Ferenczi e Oskar Pfister, dentre outros autores contemporâneos de Freud, para em seguida transitar pelos estudos psicanalíticos no campo da Educação desenvolvidos no Brasil ao longo dos últimos 100 anos. As experiências e produções teórico-práticas socializadas pela ampla lista de intelectuais interessados nas possíveis incidências da psicanálise no campo educativo, no Brasil e noutros países, nos levam a admitir que, embora encontrem resistências tanto no meio psicanalítico quanto no interior dos

¹ Article published with funding from the *Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico* - CNPq/Brazil for editing, layout and XML conversion services. The translation of this article into English was funded by Coordenação de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior - CAPES/Brazil.

estudos educacionais, os possíveis encontros entre ambas as áreas não devem ser ignorados, não na perspectiva de um campo que sobrepõe o outro, mas de dois campos que podem se ferir e se nutrir mutuamente. Assim, conclui-se que, transcorridos mais de um século da invenção de Sigmund Freud, os limites e alcances das interlocuções Psicanálise e Educação não cessam de (não) se inscrever, incitando frutíferos debates sobre temas pedagógicos consagrados ou aspectos implicados na educação.

Palavras-chave: psicanálise e educação, pesquisa em psicanálise, percurso histórico.

LÍMITES Y ALCANCE (IM)POSIBLES ENTRE PSICOANÁLISIS Y EDUCACIÓN: DESDE LA ÉPOCA DE FREUD HASTA EL PRESENTE

RESUMEN: El propósito de este artículo es discutir la interfaz entre Psicoanálisis y Educación. Para ello, se hace un recorrido histórico por los intentos de acercar los campos: parte de la primera década del siglo XX, cuando se iniciaron los diálogos en torno a la relación entre Psicoanálisis y Educación con Sándor Ferenczi y Oskar Pfister, entre otros autores contemporáneos de Freud, para luego transitar por los estudios psicoanalíticos en el campo de la Educación desarrollados en Brasil en los últimos 100 años. Las experiencias y producciones teórico-prácticas socializadas por la amplia lista de intelectuales interesados en las posibles incidencias del psicoanálisis en el campo educativo, en Brasil y en otros países, nos llevan a admitir que, aunque encuentran resistencias tanto en el ambiente psicoanalítico como dentro estudios educativos, no se deben ignorar los posibles encuentros entre ambas áreas, no desde la perspectiva de un campo que se superpone al otro, sino de dos campos que pueden lastimarse y nutrirse mutuamente. Así, se concluye que, después de más de un siglo de la invención de Sigmund Freud, los límites y alcances de las interlocuciones Psicoanálisis y Educación no dejan de inscribirse, incitando frutíferos debates sobre temas pedagógicos consagrados o aspectos involucrados en la educación.

Palabras clave: psicoanálisis y educación, investigación en psicoanálisis, trayectoria histórica.

INTRODUCTION

This text came from readings and reflections constructed within the scope of the Postgraduate Program in Education of the University of Brasília (PPGE/UnB) and is a repercussion of the doctoral research registered in the theoretical field of Psychoanalysis and Education.

The discussions are organized in two sections: i) initially we are situated in the “time of Freud” to discuss the dialogue between Psychoanalysis and Education based on the initial efforts undertaken by authors such as August Aichhorn, Hans Zulliger, Oskar Pfister, Sándor Ferenczi and Siegfried Bernfeld, among others; and ii) next, we present psychoanalytic studies in the field of Education developed in our country between 1920-2020.

PSYCHOANALYSIS AND EDUCATION: FROM FREUD'S TIME TO OUR TIMES

Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) is internationally (re)known as “the father of Psychoanalysis”, a *science of the psyche* that has the unconscious as its object of study. It is important to say that researchers before Psychoanalysis had already referred to the existence of this “unknown and little-visited aspect of the human psyche”. However, it was up to Freud “to explain its dynamism and establish the bases of a clinic that had the unconscious as its core” (ENDO; SOUSA, 2018, p. 11). This allows us to say that by reinventing what was known about the psyche and, thus, establishing a rupture with the entire tradition

of Cartesian and rational Western thought, this author occupies the place of “founder of a very particular and unprecedented way of producing science and knowledge” (Ibid., p. 7).

Intentionally introduced in 1900, at the turn of the 19th century, Psychoanalysis emerged with the “promise” of building new knowledge about the psychic world and being willing to question our certainties about ourselves based on the assumption that the unconscious thinks. Thus, it dislodges consciousness from its central place, contradicting Psychology in its attempts to explain psychic processes and human behavior. Endo and Sousa (2018, p. 7) point out that Freud’s studies “on unconscious life, carried out throughout his vast work, are today an obligatory reference for the science and contemporary philosophy”, given that his influence “on Western thought is not only indisputable but also continues to expand its reach, dialoguing with and influencing the most varied areas of knowledge”, including the arts, literature, politics, philosophy, neuroscience and the field of education.

Regarding the relationship between Psychoanalysis and Education, Lajonquière (2010, p. 32) observes that with the introduction by Psychoanalysis of “a radically different way of thinking about ‘man’ and his relationship with himself, there were many contemporaries and followers who questioned themselves – and still question themselves today – about the implications of its unique creation for education”. According to Pereira (2017, p. 9), attempts at dialogue between Psychoanalysis and Education date back to the beginning of the 20th century: “since the beginnings of psychoanalysis, education has been the subject of research and intervention by scholars of theories of the unconscious”.

Thus, just eight years after the publication of *The Interpretation of Dreams* (FREUD, 1900) – the inaugural work of Psychoanalysis –, the Hungarian psychoanalyst Sándor Ferenczi (1873-1933) – one of Freud's disciples and pioneering collaborators – made the first public statement known about the relationship between Psychoanalysis and Education, during a meeting with Freudian psychoanalysts in 1908 in the city of Salzburg (Austria). In this conference, when discussing the theme of Psychoanalysis and Pedagogy, Ferenczi “questions, in the name of psychoanalysis, the repressive nature of education at the time and sees pedagogy as a ‘breeding ground for the most diverse neuroses’, which neglects the real psychology of man, cultivates the repression of emotions and leads to an ‘introspective blindness’” (FILLOUX, 1997, p. 8 Apud CIFALLI and MOLL, 1985, author’s emphasis).

In 1913, five years after Ferenczi’s first allusion, the Swiss pedagogue, philosopher, theologian, and Protestant pastor Oscar Pfister (1873-1956), a great admirer of Freud, published the work *The Psychoanalytic Method*, in which he sought to connect psychoanalysis to pedagogy, as an attempt to introduce Freudian discoveries into training courses for educators and pastors. Invited to write the preface to this book, Freud admitted the possibility of “his psychoanalysis” reaching other disciplines, to dialogue with them: “May the use of psychoanalysis in the service of education bring about the fulfillment of the hopes that educators and doctors place in it! A book like this by Pfister, which aims to make psychoanalysis known to educators, can then count on the gratitude of future generations” (FREUD, 1913, n.p).

It is important to note that before the publication of the aforementioned book, Pfister – who did not hide his passion for psychoanalysis, although he disagreed with Freud on some points, such as the religious issue – presented his initial reflections on the possibilities of psychoanalysis “coming to fertilize” education in *Delusional and suicidal ideas of students* and *Psychoanalytic care of souls and moral pedagogy*, two texts written in light of his experiences as an educator and pastor linked to the Swiss Reformed Church, in which he refers to “pedanalysis”, an expression created to name a possible pedagogy that considered the discoveries of psychoanalysis. Thus, these two writings by Pfister sent to Freud in 1909

mark the beginning of a close friendship that would last a lifetime, as for almost 30 years the two would exchange correspondence regularly, in which they would address different subjects, including the theme of Psychoanalysis and Education: it is known that at least 134 of Freud's manuscripts, such as letters, notes, telegrams and postcards, were delivered to Anna Freud (1895-1982) by her father's admirer himself, authorizing her to “use the appropriate material” as long as nothing “that could harm living people” was made public (FILLOUX, 1997; FREUD and MENG, 2009; LAJONQUIÈRE, 2010).

Mobilized by religious purposes, Pfister would publish *The Field of Pedoanalysis* (1917), in which he proposed a psychoanalytic pedagogy whose purpose would be to “lead unconscious forces to the path of good”, developing morality, suggesting that the educator should “work as an analyst” and simultaneously “remember that he is pursuing a moral goal”; thus, even aware that psychoanalysis and, therefore, the analyst, cannot be established as an ideal model, he defended the idea of an educator who would serve as a model of identification of life and thought for children and young people (KUPFER, 1989). Although his claim for a psychoanalytic pedagogy along the idealized lines had little impact at the time, he later contributed to the creation of child psychoanalysis.

In a letter dated September 10, 1926, five years after the publication of several lectures under the title *Psychoanalysis in the Service of Educators* (1921), Pfister wrote to Freud: “Educators have accepted many things, and from all sides I hear that analysis is increasingly occupying the center of interest,” but he emphasizes that his fellow theologians “have become too involved in a foolish dispute over principles, instead of worrying about the psychic well-being of lay people – and their own” (FREUD and MENG, 2009, p. 136), which characterizes this author’s continued investment in the complex relationship between psychoanalysis and education (expressed in the idealization of a pedagogy that would take into account the discoveries of psychoanalysis) and psychoanalysis and religion (betting on a psychoanalysis that would be at the service of the analytical healing of souls).

In the text *Psychoanalysis and Education, Points of Reference*, Filloux (1997, p. 9) suggests that Freud recognized Pfister as the one who “inaugurated” the application of psychoanalysis to pedagogy. If we look at the letters shared between Freud and Pfister, we will see that the former praised the latter for his attempts to bring psychoanalysis and education closer together, as revealed in a letter dated 11/21/1926, in which Freud once again confesses his interest in Pfister’s work: “I am quite willing to find a special place on the bookshelf for the translations of your works, if you would like to donate them to me.” And he congratulates him, immediately afterward, for the intellectual efforts employed in the “application” of psychoanalysis to the field of pedagogy: “In fact, among all the applications of psychoanalysis, only the one inaugurated by you, that of pedagogy, flourishes. I am very happy that my daughter is beginning to produce something in this area” (FREUD, 1926, Letter 77, Apud FREUD and MENG, 2009, p. 139).

In this sense, historical records show that, in addition to Pfister, other intellectuals participated in this “inauguration” of the “application” of psychoanalysis to pedagogy. As Lajonquière (2010, p. 32-33) confirms, “the list of those interested in the incidence of psychoanalysis in the educational field includes determined pedagogues and educators who, already at the beginning of the 20th century, enthusiastic about psychoanalysis, “applied” it to education”, such as August Aichhorn, Charles Baudouin, Hans Zulliger and Siegfried Bernfeld.

Considered one of the founders of “psychoanalytic education,” August Aichhorn (1878-1949) worked as an educator and psychoanalyst in clinics and educational institutions for “delinquent, problematic, and antisocial” adolescents. He is currently recognized for his pioneering work in bringing

psychoanalysis closer to the topic of juvenile delinquency – a field that we now call socio-education. It is known that Aichhorn turned to psychoanalysis in 1922 when he joined the Vienna Psychoanalytic Society, influenced by Freud’s youngest daughter, the educator and psychoanalyst Anna Freud, who was interested in clinical work with children (GURSKI; MORAES; GOMES, 2016).

Although Aichhorn is the author of several texts that articulate psychoanalysis and education (some of which are reproduced in posthumous collections), his best-known work is *Verwahrloste Jugend* [*Abandoned Youth*], prefaced by Freud, who reaffirms his support for possible dialogues between psychoanalysis and education as long as the identity and place that each occupies is preserved, as he understands that education in the school environment could never be confused with or replaced by psychoanalysis, but rather should foster dialogues with it: “[...] the work of education is something sui generis, which cannot be confused with the influence through psychoanalysis nor be replaced by it. Child psychoanalysis can be used by education as an auxiliary resource, but it is not in a position to take its place” (FREUD, 1925, p. 349). In the same preface, Freud (1925, p. 349) reiterates his position regarding the viability of discoveries from psychoanalysis being rescued and “re-signified” by the field of education: “None of the applications of Psychoanalysis has excited so much interest and awakened so many hopes, and none, consequently, has attracted so many capable collaborators, as its use in the theory and practice of Education”.

Siegfried Bernfeld (1892-1953), one of the first-generation psychoanalysts who gained the most prominence in the two decades before the Second World War, was also recognized at various times by Freud as an important intellectual in and for psychoanalysis. Having graduated from the University of Vienna in Psychology, Philosophy, Psychoanalysis, Sociology, and Education (he expressed curiosity about the pedagogical ideas of the revolutionary educator and physician Maria Montessori), in 1925 he published *The Psychology of the Infant* and the first edition of the work *Sisyphos oder die Grenzen der Erziehung*. Believing that educational practice is forged under the influence of the social context and that teachers and their training are marked by the dominant ideology imposed by their time, the author in this last text seriously criticizes the pedagogy of the time, positioning in defense of a school education that values and listens to the needs of students and counteracts the authoritarianism present in pedagogical relationships.

Thus, this conception of education – arising from the relationship with socialism and psychoanalysis (Bernfeld was one of the precursors of Freudian-Marxism) – appears inscribed in the idealization of Long Garden, a “children’s colony” that he created and managed intending to welcome Jewish and refugee children, for whom he sought to provide an education based on anti-authoritarian principles (HORTELANO, 1997). It is important to note that, throughout his 61 years of life, Bernfeld published numerous texts with timely reflections for us to think about the “issues of his time” and the “issues of our days”, especially regarding the complex relationship between psychoanalysis, education and Marxism, a tripod that guided a significant part of his intellectual and political investments.

Hans Zulliger (1893-1965), a Swiss professor and psychoanalyst, author of several works produced to discuss the “application” of psychoanalysis in the education of adolescents and school-age children, among which *Psychoanalytische Erfahrungen aus der Volksschulpraxis*, published in 1921, and *Aus dem unbewussten Seelenleben unserer Schuljugend*, from 1923. An enthusiastic reader of Freud’s works, Zulliger was analyzed by Oskar Pfister, with whom he conceived the creation of the discipline Psychoanalytic Pedagogy, whose stimuli rest on the defense of the transposition of the clinical situation to the school institution with a view to the “psychoanalyzing” of students as a possible guiding strategy for pedagogical interventions, according to the work *Difficult Children*, published in 1946. Zulliger believed that with

psychoanalysis in schools, as he states in a text from 1928, the methods of teaching and other issues that interfere with the teaching-learning process could be reanalyzed and fertilized by psychoanalytic references. In *Difficult Children*, Zulliger, who became a child analyst and psychoanalyzed his students, moving the clinical situation into the school environment, points out that from the application of psychoanalysis in school, it was possible to “free” some students “from their inhibitions in the field of learning, from hostility and aggression, from lack of friendships, from nocturnal incontinence, from feelings of guilt caused by masturbation, as well as from impulsive thefts and other similar symptoms” (ZULLIGER, 1946, p. 25 Apud KUPFER, 1989, p. 68-69).

As for Charles Baudouin (1893-1963), a French-Swiss psychoanalyst who wrote many books, including *L’Ame enfantine et la psychanalyse*, published in 1931 and considered one of the classics of psychoanalytic education, in which he continued his interest in portraying the child’s mind and enabling the application of psychoanalysis to children. Among other aspects, the author also questioned in his works the place of science – and whether there would be a “science of souls” in the future – in the face of the desire for the progress of the “modern man”, politically and historically situated, that is, “educatable” based on the said and unsaid things that circulate in the field of culture and that permeate the domestic, school and clinical spaces, with repercussions on the psychic and subjective constitution of the subject. In 1924, Baudouin founded the famous Charles Baudouin International Institute of Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy in Geneva, which is still active today.

Furthermore, in addition to Aichhorn, Anna Freud, Baudouin, Bernfeld, Ferenczi, Pfister and Zulliger, other psychoanalysts “from Freud’s time” interested in the articulation between psychoanalysis and education can be added, such as Vera Schmidt, Wilhelm Reich and Melanie Klein.

Vera Schmidt (1889-1937) was a Russian pedagogue and psychoanalyst, a founding member of the Russian Psychoanalytic Society and creator of the Experimental Kindergarten, known as the Laboratory Home for Children, a “pedagogical home” established in Moscow four years after the Russian Revolution of 1917 to promote pedagogical experiences different from those associated with the traditional pedagogy of the time, through the proposal of a non-coercive and libertarian education that combined principles of Marxism and psychoanalysis, as Bernfeld had also done with his proposal for anti-authoritarian education. Together with psychoanalysts such as Hermine Hug-Hellmuth (1871-1924), Sabina Spielrein (1885-1942), and Tatiana Rosenthal (1884-1921), among others, she is among the founders of child psychoanalysis (SCHMIDT, 2014).

Wilhelm Reich (1897-1957), an important Austrian psychiatrist and psychoanalyst, also the author of several works in which he addresses the theme of education, begins by addressing the possibilities of an “educational psycho-prophylaxis of neuroses” –influenced by early Freudian ideas on the role of education in the prophylaxis of neuroses – and goes on to attempt to formulate a “theory of psychic economy” and an “economic-sexual pedagogy” that could be practically assimilated in the field of education. Although he was not a pedagogue, Reich brings interesting articulations in his works about “sexuality, children and education” based on Freudian psychoanalysis, presenting us with “timely provocations” on this and other themes to reflect on “our education” in contemporary times. These are provocations that cross the interface between education and politics, a theme that permeates Reich's work: he conceived critical capacity as a prerequisite of/for a democratic society and questioned how to form autonomous women/men and promote “a healthier” and more emancipated society – from a sexual, social, and political point of view – if the individuals that constitute it, repressed in their education – moral, religious, family, and school –, are afraid of freedom (MATTHIESEN, 2003; 2005).

Considered a post-Freudian psychotherapist, the Austrian Melanie Klein (1882-1960), dedicated to analytical work with children, is recognized as the creator of Child Psychoanalysis and one of the most famous female names in the history of psychoanalysis. She produced much-debated works in the field of Psychoanalysis and Psychology, introducing valuable concepts and new ways of thinking and theories – discussed in the field of education, however, still in an incipient way (ALMEIDA, 2018) – focused on the early stages of psychic life and the issue of introjection/projection mechanisms and unconscious fantasies in both children and adults, among other issues, with approaches and distances about Freudian ideas that culminated in what we know as “Kleinian thought”. Thus, beyond the clinical setting, as possible contributions to the context of school education, texts such as *The Psychoanalysis of Children*, *The Role of School in the libidinal development of the Child*, and *Transference*, among others, are emblematic (KLEIN, 1923; 1932; 1943).

At various points in his life and work, Freud expressed that the interests of psychoanalysis are multiple and go beyond the strictly psychological and therapeutic scope, as he stated in 1913 in the Italian magazine *Scientia*, with the publication of the article *The Scientific Interest of Psychoanalysis*, in which he mentions that the then newly born science of the unconscious does not hesitate to touch upon various spheres of knowledge, expressing his intention to expand the frontiers of psychoanalysis by suggesting the establishment of dialogues with philological, philosophical, biological, historical, aesthetic, sociological and educational knowledge. In this text, Freud states that the interest of psychoanalysis does not end in psychotherapeutic aspects, because – starting from the law of the unconscious that operates on the subject (of desire) and that surprises man in his relations with the world of culture and language mediated by the subjectivity of each era – it finds itself crossed by different questions arising from other fields of knowledge: then he affirms, on the one hand, the psychological interest of psychoanalysis and, on the other, does not disallow the multiple interest of the metapsychological reflection of psychoanalysis for the so-called “non-psychological sciences” (FREUD, 1913) and the relevance of its “non-medical applications” (FREUD, 1932), citing as an example the field of education (and pedagogy), to which he refers on these and other occasions, such as in *An Autobiographical Study* (1924), in the preface to *Abandoned Youth* (AICHHORN, 1925), in *The Question of Lay Analysis* (1926), *The Future of an Illusion* (1927) and in *Explanations, Applications and Guidelines* (1933), among others.

Although Freud's hope for “another education,” an “education for reality,” permeated his texts, Freud's propositions about the “application of psychoanalysis to education” initially appear associated with prophylactic illusion, as can be seen in *The Sexual Enlightenment of Children* (FREUD, 1907) and “*Cultural*” *Sexual Morality and Modern Nervousness* (FREUD, 1908). A careful reading of Freud's work leaves us with the feeling that, in a certain way and to a certain extent, even though we come across a “first Freud” and a “second Freud” in terms of teaching, as Lajonquière (2010) points out, Freud's ideas do not completely detach themselves from the “prophylactic question,” which he had already questioned in *Analysis of a Phobia in a Five-Year-Old Boy* (FREUD, 1909) and problematized in 1932, in Lecture XXXIV.

According to Filloux (1997, p. 9), the idea of an “application” of psychoanalysis to education (or pedagogy) appears in Freud's discourses since the beginning of the 20th century: education, on the one hand, “is seen as a factor of virtual or truly pathogenic vocation, insofar as the social repression of drives is a factor of neuroses”, and on the other hand, “it can become an incitement, an aid to the mastery of the pleasure principle through adaptation to reality and sublimation”, so that the therapeutic process

reveals to be imbued with an educational aspect, “with the cure being a kind of late education, of post-education”.

In 1913, in the preface to Pfister's book, Freud reiterates this bet by supporting a possible articulation between education and the prophylaxis of neuroses, conceiving therapy and education as if they somehow “completed” each other: in this period, his ideas emerged from the belief that neuroses could be prevented through “appropriate education” (LAJONQUIÈRE, 1999; 2010), given that, following the type of education employed, neuroses could be prevented or aggravated. In this regard, Freud stated that education, by assuming a prophylactic character, should act in the prevention and impediment of the formation of neuroses, while (psycho)therapy, by being guided using re-education, should correct the pathology and be at the service of impeding a morbid evolution of psychic discomfort: “It is in the hands of a psychoanalytically enlightened education that rests what we can expect from an individual prophylaxis of neuroses” (FREUD, 1913 Apud FILLoux, 1997, p. 10).

However, twelve years later, when he prefaced Aichhorn's book, this “optimistic vision” of a “psychoprophylactic education” based on psychoanalysis (LAJONQUIÈRE, 1999; 2000; 2010) brought a conception of education intertwined with new meanings, since, this point in his theoretical elaboration, Freud had already restructured his scheme of neurosis formation and re-edited his view on the links between psychoanalysis, education, and pedagogy; these are now seen beyond the bet on the possibility of neurosis prophylaxis, encompassing the idea that educational work and psychoanalytic intervention, given the nature of each of these two areas, should not be confused and/or replaced by one another. He reiterates that educational work is *sui generis*, its nature especially singular and, therefore, different in psychoanalytic intervention. Psychoanalysis, for Freud (1925, p. 162-163), “can be called upon by education as an auxiliary means of dealing with a child, but it does not constitute an appropriate substitute for education. Such a substitution is not only impossible on practical grounds, but should also be discouraged for theoretical reasons”.

In Lecture XXXIV, Freud (1933, p. 147) resumes his 1913 position on “a psychoanalytically enlightened education”, when he explains that he considers the experience of analysis to be important for the teacher, because “if we now consider the difficult problems that the educator faces [...] we will have to say to ourselves that the only adequate preparation for the profession of the educator is a solid psychoanalytic training”. He argues that these “difficult problems” that the educator encounters are related to the need “to recognize the constitutional individuality of the child, to infer, from small clues, what is going on in his immature mind, to give him the exact amount of love and, at the same time, to maintain an effective degree of authority” (FREUD, 1933, p. 147).

Based on the understanding that it is impossible to assimilate analysis without personally experiencing it and reviewing his former position on the ideal of psychoprophylactic education with students, Freud in the aforementioned Conference points out that “[the] analysis of teachers and educators seems to be a more efficient prophylactic measure than the analysis of the children themselves, and the difficulties in putting it into practice are fewer” (FREUD, 1933, p. 147). In other words, when proposing analytical training for educators, Freud would be convinced of its possible effects on the learning subjects, to the extent that the now “psychoanalytic educator”, with the uses or “application” that he could make of the “knowledge acquired by (or through) psychoanalysis [...] would be equipped with means that allow him to become more sensitive to the educational reality, to invent techniques of ‘educational assistance’” (FILLoux, 1997, p. 11, author’s emphasis).

Lajonquière (2010, p. 48) points out that Freud when recognizing “the difficulty of putting prophylaxis into practice with children, [...] outlines the analysis of educators as a sui generis possibility for education to find its proper path”, betting on “another education”, education beyond the psychoprophylactic sense, which was different from that proposed by the pedagogy of his time, an education *that was focused on reality*, that considered the dynamics of desire.

Education for reality does not aim to produce the psychic harmony that is lacking and that, for this very reason, every deluded pedagogy neurotically pursues. Freud then bet on a humble education without any transcendental foundation and, therefore, on the possibility that the old man would come to know that the “world is not a nursery” (1932a: 3.197) or, if we prefer, recalling his text *Considerations of Current Affairs on War and Death* (1915), that man would endure life by preparing himself for death (LAJONQUIÈRE, 2010, p. 61, author’s emphasis).

Therefore, it is in *The Future of an Illusion*, from 1927, that Freud expresses his hope for an “education for reality”, which would be freed from the burden of religious doctrines, their “illusions” and repressions; that is, even though he admitted that it seemed like an unrealizable idea at that time, he preferred to believe in and defend an education that was “thought of as an education beyond the pedagogical *justifications* of a moral-religious nature, hegemonic in the Germanic world of the time” (LAJONQUIÈRE, 2010, p. 61, author’s emphasis).

However, despite his statements on education, Freud was not a pedagogue; he had, let's say, no “direct relationship” with the field of education. In *From Piaget to Freud: for a Clinic of Learning*, Lajonquière (2013) addresses this issue when he states that Freud, nowadays, is an unknown name in the national pedagogical field, even though in recent years, especially after the 1990s, in the case of Brazil, scholars interested in the interface between Psychoanalysis and Education have dedicated to the (im)possible articulations between these areas. However, as the author reminds us, Freud was not a pedagogue, and “his works do not justify any pedagogy [although] they did make personal comments on education and pedagogy on some occasions”, but without “answering systematically the questions that articulate all orthodox pedagogical discourse” (LAJONQUIÈRE, 2013, p. 23).

In *Figures of the Child: Psychoanalysis in Everyday Life with Children*, Lajonquière (2010, p. 32) reiterates this thought, because although he did not develop systematic reflections on the ends and means of education, “there were many opportunities in which Freud made comments on education, on the pedagogy of his time, as well as even on his own experience as a young schoolboy at the *Erzherzog-Rainer-Realgymnasium* in Vienna”. In *An Autobiographical Study*, Freud (1924[1925], p. 40-41) wrote: “I have contributed nothing to the application of analysis to education. It was natural, however, that analytical discoveries should attract the attention of educators and make them see their problems in a new light”, and mentions, at the time, that “it is no longer possible to restrict the practice of psychoanalysis to doctors and exclude lay people from it”, citing the efforts of psychoanalysts such as Pfister, Hug-Hellmuth and Bernfeld in the “application” of psychoanalysis to education.

In *Explanations, Applications and Guidelines* (1932), Freud once again admits that, unfortunately, he devoted little time to matters related to pedagogy and once again expresses his satisfaction with his daughter Anna Freud's interest in the issue of the “applications of psychoanalysis to education”, implying that her investment in the field of education could, in a certain way, make up for his oversight and correct this “fault” of not having contributed more strongly to this subject. As he states:

There is one subject, however, that I cannot pass over so easily—and yet not because I understand much about it, nor have I contributed much to it. Quite the contrary: in fact, I have dealt with this subject very little. I must mention it because it is of the greatest importance, it is so full of hope for the future, and it is perhaps the most important of all the activities of analysis. I am thinking of the applications of psychoanalysis to education and to the upbringing of the new generation. I am glad that I can at least say that my daughter, Anna Freud, made this study her life's work and in this way made up for my failure (FREUD, 1932, p. 98).

As we can see, Freud saw education as a theme of “the greatest importance”, and possibly “the most important of all analytical activities”. In this sense, although he did not write any work dedicated specifically to the study of educational phenomena, he did not treat it with disdain. On the contrary, as Kupfer (1989) points out, far from neglecting it, education was a theme that accompanied Freud throughout his work, with reflections, analyses, and criticisms on different issues connected to it. Consequently, these Freudian reflections, analyses, and criticisms on issues related to education, added to the efforts undertaken by pedagogues and educators interested in the “application” of psychoanalysis to education since the beginning of the 20th century, incited post-Freudian critics to position themselves in the incidence of psychoanalysis in the educational field, in Brazil and other countries, armed with arguments for or against the rapprochement of two areas notably marked by their singularities.

PSYCHOANALYTICAL STUDIES IN THE FIELD OF EDUCATION IN OUR COUNTRY: HISTORICAL NOTES AND CURRENT AFFAIRS

On Brazilian soil, the first work of a psychoanalytic nature aimed at education appears to be the book *Psicanalyse na Educação*, published in 1927, written by the pedagogue Deodato de Moraes, who, in the following year, participated in the process of planning and implementing the Course of Psychoanalysis Applied to Education offered in Rio de Janeiro by the Brazilian Education Association, whose curriculum is included in the first edition of the book *Ensaio de Psicanalyse*, by the physician and university professor Júlio Pires Porto-Carrero, published in 1929 (ABRÃO, 2006; MERCADANTE, 2015). Porto-Carrero, still in the 1920s, published several articles on the incidence of psychoanalysis in the educational field, driven by the desire to disseminate psychoanalytic theory to teachers and introduce them to Freudian thought, among which: *A psicanalyse na Liga Brasileira de Higiene Mental* (1926), *O caracter do escolar segundo a Psicanalyse* (1927), *Leitura para crianças: ensaio sob o ponto de vista psicanalytico* (1928), *Instrução e educação sexuais* (1928), *Psicanalyse: a sua história e o seu conceito* (1928), *Educação sexual* (1929), *A arte de perverter: applicação psicanalytica à formação moral da criança* (1929), *O que esperamos dos nossos filhos* (1930), *Psicanálise de uma civilização* (1930), *A psicologia profunda ou psicanálise* (1932) e *Sexo e cultura* (1933).

It is important to note that in this historical context, the ideology of the *Escola Nova* movement, already in circulation in Brazil since the end of the 19th century on the initiative of Rui Barbosa (1849-1923), gained increasing strength, driven by well-known intellectuals from “our pedagogical history”, such as Anísio Teixeira (1900-1971), Fernando de Azevedo (1894-1974) and Lourenço Filho (1897-1970), among others, who wanted to renew teaching in opposition to the current traditional model, coincidentally in the same period in which psychoanalysis arrived in the country and began to influence educators and critics from other areas in the sense of rethinking important themes to education from it.

In this sense, Abrão (2006, p. 233) points out that “psychoanalysis, as a theoretical and practical foundation, provided elements that contributed to supporting the philosophical assumptions of the ‘New School’, which emerged in the 1920s as an alternative to traditional education”. This historical moment, marked by the New School ideology that criticized traditional pedagogy and sought to renew education, opened up the new, to the expansion of knowledge in children and their school place, favoring the insertion of psychoanalysis in the educational environment.

[...] Brazilian education in the 1920s, a period in which psychoanalytic influences began to reach the country, was undergoing a process of transformation, incorporating an educational philosophy that considered the child in all his or her singularity. This condition was quite favorable for the penetration of psychoanalytic ideas since this theory had a well-established theoretical framework related to the development of the child's psyche, interpersonal relationships, and the child's emotional problems, which supported the philosophy of the “*Nova Escola*” (ABRÃO, 2006, p. 238).

As Abrão (2006) states, when concepts associated with child psychoanalysis began to spread in Brazil in the 1920s and 1930s, professionals linked to medicine and education, enthusiastic about Freud's proposals, sought to employ psychoanalytic concepts in discussions on topics related to education, to introduce psychoanalysis to educators and its possible influences on education. According to Abrão (2006), in addition to the interest in disseminating psychoanalytic theory to teachers and parents, with the belief that, through learning psychoanalytic concepts, they could understand students' behavior and the effects of pedagogical practices on them, the first Brazilian authors engaged in attempts to insert psychoanalysis into the educational universe believed in the potential for a prophylactic intervention, influenced by the hygienist ideology present in Brazilian psychiatry of that period, which directed its attention to the area of mental health.

By employing psychoanalytic theory in the education of children, these authors aimed to provide prophylactic intervention, providing children with favorable conditions for development, to prevent emotional disorders from taking hold and compromising their personality adjustment. In this sense, teachers should be informed about psychoanalytic hypotheses regarding child development to better manage their students' education, understand their school difficulties and, ultimately, form emotionally healthy individuals (ABRÃO, 2006, p. 236).

Thus, according to the historical surveys carried out by the author, in addition to Deodato de Moraes and Porto-Carrero, other educators or critics belonging to “non-pedagogical areas”, seduced by the psychoanalysis that had recently arrived in the country, also tried to explore “education themes”, such as: i) Arthur Ramos (1903-1949), with the books *Educação e Psychanalyse* and *A criança problema*, published, respectively, in 1934 and 1939, in addition to the articles *A tecnica da psychanalyse infantil* (1933), *Os furtos escolares* (1934), *A mentira infantil* (1937), *A dinâmica afetiva do filho mimado* (1938) and *O problema psycho-sociológico do filho único* (1938), among others; ii) Hosannah de Oliveira (1902-1996), with the articles *O complexo de Édipo em pediatria* and *A higiene mental do lactente*, published in 1932 and 1933, respectively; iii) Gastão Pereira da Silva (1897-1987), with the publication of *Educação sexual da criança*, in 1934, and *Como se deve evitar o drama sexual de nossos filhos*, in 1939; and iv) Pedro de Alcântara (1901-1979), with the publication, in 1936, of the article *Objecções da Psychanalyse ao uso da chupeta: análise e crítica*; among others.

In the following decade, other authors also sought to explore themes involved in education from a psychoanalytic perspective, as had been done, for example, by the psychiatrist/psychoanalyst Durval Bellegarde Marcondes and the sociologist/psychoanalyst Virgínia Leone Bicudo. Durval Marcondes (1899-1981) was one of the pioneers of the psychoanalytic movement in Brazil, an enthusiast who disseminated Freud's concepts in the country through works such as *A higiene mental escolar por meio da clínica de orientação infantil* (1941), *Contribuição para o problema do estudo dos repetentes da escola primária: condições físicas, psíquicas e sociais* (1941), *Clínica de orientação infantil: suas finalidades e linhas gerais de sua organização* (1946) and *Noções gerais de higiene mental da criança* (1946). Virgínia Bicudo (1910-2003), the first non-physician woman recognized as a psychoanalyst in Brazil, a pioneer in the debate on racial studies in the field of psychoanalysis and interested in the clinic of the child's psyche, published the articles *A visitadora social psiquiátrica e seu papel na higiene mental da criança* (1941), *Funções da visitadora psiquiátrica na clínica de orientação infantil e noções de higiene mental da criança* (1946) and *Papel do lar na higiene mental da criança* (1946), among others.

Thus, according to Abrão (2006, p. 233), efforts to introduce psychoanalysis into the Brazilian educational environment in the first half of the 20th century occurred in distinct and complementary ways: initially, during the 1920s until the mid-1930s, through the “dissemination of theoretical information related to psychoanalytic concepts and the characteristics of children’s emotional development, through books and courses aimed at educators”, and, later, until approximately 1950, “through the creation of a practice of assistance to students with learning or behavioral problems, developed in child guidance clinics [of a prophylactic nature], which consisted of evaluating the child and providing guidance to parents and teachers”, that is, through the application of psychoanalysis to school mental hygiene by paying attention to students’ symptomatic manifestations.

Thus, it is possible to recognize that psychoanalysis, present in Brazil since the beginning of the 1920s, disseminated mainly by psychiatrists, entered the field of education linked to a kind of conviction that it has something to teach, apply, and prevent, occupying, during the 20th century, a “master’s place” by assuming the position of specialist knowledge, as Kupfer (1989, p. 70-71) emphasizes: “In truth, Psychoanalysis has attended scheduled meetings [with Education] as a master, as a transmitter of ‘truths’ about the child that it believes to be unknown” in this field.

It is undeniable that this place of specialist knowledge occupied by psychoanalysis in education gained new configurations from the second half of the last century, when Millot (1979), Kupfer (1989), and Lajonquière (1999), among others, problematized this relationship between the two, reaffirming that psychoanalysis does not have the role of “applying” or “positivating” anything in the pedagogical/educational field. In the preface to the book *Children's Figures*, by Lajonquière, Kupfer (2010, p. 13) about the connection between psychoanalysis and education asserts: “Talking about psychoanalysis in the field of education does not imply defending the application of one field over the other. On the contrary, I believe [...] there is no interest in proceeding with colonization of psychoanalysis over education”. Psychoanalysis, according to the author, “does not illuminate, speak or think about education, nor does it place itself in a position of exteriority”; Likewise, it suggests “assuming the subject of the unconscious of psychoanalysis and the ‘cognizing subject’ of Psychology as one, and expanding the educational act to include the libidinal dimension inherent in the desire” of the subject who teaches and the subject who learns (KUPFER, 2010, p. 13). Therefore, in contrast to the idea of application, the author believes that, if the psychoanalytic is placed at the heart of the educational, in its knot, in its core, as Lajonquière (2010) points out, the educational act becomes one, given that the subject (of desire) of

psychoanalysis is not averse to the subject of education (this, in fact, is not an object outside of the cure and is also inserted in the field of culture).

According to Lajonquière (1999, p. 16-17), although the relationship between psychoanalysis and education has been taking shape since the beginning of the 20th century, from 1970 onwards, what he calls the “psychoanalytic *approach* to the educational field”, was consolidated, through works by authors such as Mannoni (1973), Filloux (1974), Hameline (1976), Kaes and Anzieu (1976), Nimier (1976), Bigeault and Terrier (1978), Millot (1979) and Cifali (1982), among others, including Brazilians such as Kupfer (1982) and Morgado (1989), who fostered valuable discussions on “established pedagogical themes” or on “aspects involved in education”, based on “psychoanalytically oriented perspectives”.

In the case of Brazil, although productions around the relationship between psychoanalysis and education were promising until the beginning of the 1950s, there was a shortage of publications on the subject in the following thirty years or so, with a still timid recovery during the 1980s and its progressive expansion from the 1990s onwards.

As Barros (2016) reveals, regarding what was produced in the field of articulations between Psychoanalysis and Education in the second half of the 20th century in Brazil, two historical periods can be identified: i) the first period, from 1950 to 1980, called the “latency period”, marked by the retraction or near-paralysis of productions related to Psychoanalysis and Education, under the influence, including, of the Military Dictatorship (1964-1985), which, given its antidemocratic nature, controlled Brazilian education and inhibited spaces of action and ways of thinking contrary to the government's interests, resulting in the distancing of Psychoanalysis – seen as subversive – from the educational field; and ii) the second period, from 1990 to 2000, marks the effervescent resumption of publications about the possible agreements and disagreements between these two areas of knowledge, with a return to Freud and a boom in productions on different “educational themes”, aspiring, on the one hand, to recover what had been thought up until then in previous decades around the Psychoanalysis-Education articulation and, on the other, to outline the new directions of this relationship and its possible contributions.

However, we observed that the dialogues around the limits and scope of a rapprochement between Psychoanalysis and Education have never been – and still are not – immune to controversy. On the contrary, attempts at linking them have always been surrounded by suspicion, resistance, and objections. In this regard, Kupfer (2013) reminds us that Psychoanalysis and Pedagogy, from a theoretical-epistemological point of view, are disciplines that are structurally opposed, which seems to make it impossible to create a “psychoanalytic pedagogy” (in the sense that it would have the same goals as the analytical cure) or an “analytic pedagogy” (in the sense that it would be inspired by the analytical method to transpose it to the pedagogical relationship).

The same problematizations are incisively made by the French Lacanian psychoanalyst Catherine Millot in *Freud Antipedagogue*, a classic work published in 1979 in France and in 1987 in Brazil, in which the author questions the applicability or not of psychoanalysis to pedagogy and shows to be quite hostile to attempts to connect psychoanalysis and education, since, for her, the psychoanalyst should leave pedagogy to the pedagogue and the pedagogue should leave psychoanalysis to the psychoanalyst, making any endeavor to seek some integration unfeasible. Lajonquière (1999) and Kupfer (2013), when critically discussing Millot's formulations, agree that the intention of creating an “analytical pedagogy” would indeed be impossible, but they emphasize that pedagogy and education, although they share congruences, are not the same thing and, therefore, we should not confuse one with the other. In this sense, if we understand that pedagogy seeks “positive knowledge about how to adjust means of action to

existential ends established a priori”, we should ignore pedagogy, that is, leave it out of the work around the connection between education and psychoanalysis (LAJONQUIÈRE, 1999, p. 29 Apud KUPFER, 2013, p. 23, author’s emphasis).

In the text *Psicologia, psicanálise e educação: três discursos diferentes?*, Almeida (1993) emphasizes that the common interest shared by these areas of knowledge is the search for understanding the human being – this complex and still largely unknown subject –, around which the mentioned disciplines produce different discourses, based on the object that constitutes the field of investigation of each one, the methods that are specific to it and their consequent theoretical elaborations. Therefore, for the author, the link that generates interrelations and divergences between Psychology, Psychoanalysis, and Education resides in ourselves, that is, it is the human being himself, “to the extent that he appears fragmented, split, objectified, subjectivized, educable, conditioned, repressed, neuroticized, according to the cut that science makes when discussing the ‘object’ man” (ALMEIDA, 1993, p. 19). Thus, although they are disciplines that oppose each other in structure due to the theoretical-epistemological bias that guides each one, the object of investigation of Psychology, Psychoanalysis and Education is situated in the “human being”; this being who, once conceived and born within a social organization constituted by words and language, is, from the beginning, subject to the Law of desire, order, culture, language and the symbolic, exposed to the effects of historical, social and cultural structures.

Almeida (1993, p. 25) understands that “education is praxis par excellence and constitutes a privileged field of application of the human and social sciences, quite conducive to interdisciplinary, perhaps transdisciplinary, work”. He reflects on the relationships that psychoanalytic discourse can establish with education conceived as praxis, based on what would be a “psychoanalytically enlightened education” proposed by Freud (1913) in *The Scientific Interest of Psychoanalysis*. He points out that:

[...] a psychoanalytically enlightened education would involve the understanding, by educators, of the different problems related to the psychosexual development of the child; the recognition of the importance of the affective bases of learning; the fundamental role, in the pedagogical context of the school, of the phenomena of transference between students and educators; the relevance, in the process of development of sexuality and identity, of identification models; the recognition that it is through the desire of the other that the child will recognize himself. There are many teachings arising from psychoanalytic theory that could be extended to educational practice (ALMEIDA, 1993, p. 29).

Returning to Lajonquière (2010, p. 32), although there is a consensus “both in the psychoanalytic field and within educational studies [...] that Freud cannot be considered a pedagogue, in the full sense of the term”, the theoretical-practical productions shared since 1900 by the vast list of intellectuals interested in the possible incidences of psychoanalysis in the educational field lead us to admit that “Freud's invention” should not be ignored when dealing with education.

Regarding the future of possible connections between Psychoanalysis and Education, we return to Freud (1925) when he points out that this relationship between the two would probably be the subject of future detailed investigations. After almost a century, interest in discussions around – and beyond – the interface between Psychoanalysis and Education has not ceased to be (not) written, especially in recent decades, through the holding of scientific events and the increasingly growing publication of books, articles, monographs, master's dissertations and doctoral theses produced within the scope of a plurality of lines of research, in Brazilian and international universities.

(IN)CONCLUSION

The aim here is to historicize and contextualize the relationship between Psychoanalysis and Education, from “Freud’s time” to “our time”. As we have seen, Psychoanalysis has reinvented itself and incited debate on various subjects, both yesterday and today, in permanent dialogues with different areas of knowledge, one of which is the field of Education. However, we believe that this approach needs to be careful, paying attention to the logic of the former colonizing the latter, since this is not an “application” of Psychoanalysis to Education.

As Kupfer (2013, p. 123) argues, psychoanalysis is not responsible for illuminating education, nor vice versa: “Psychoanalysis, on the contrary, does not come to positivize anything and can only point to the real, to the lack-to-be”. In the words of Pereira (2017, p. 10-11): “Psychoanalysis and Education is not psychoanalysis, nor is it education. But it is an interface field that welcomes, from both, elements to better analyze and intervene in the educational real – without commiseration, without relaxing rigor”.

From this perspective, it seems to us that the significant and continually expanding volume of academic-scientific events and productions dedicated to the limits and scope between Psychoanalysis and Education today, in Brazil and other countries, is perhaps motivated precisely by the “not-all-word” and possible convergences, sometimes intertwined, of ambiguities and controversies present in the relationship between both areas, inciting fruitful debates.

REFERENCES

ABRÃO, Jorge Luís Ferreira. As influências da psicanálise na educação brasileira no início do século XX. *Psic.: Teor. e Pesq.*, Brasília, v. 22, n. 2, p. 233-240, 2006. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.unesp.br/handle/11449/6598>. Acesso: 20 ago. 2022.

AICHHORN, August. *Vernahrloste Jugend: die Psychoanalyse in der Fürsorgeerziehung: zehn Vorträge zur ersten Einführung*. Herausgeber: Hogrefe AG, 2005 [1925].

ALCÂNTARA, Pedro de. Objecções da psychanalyse ao uso da chupeta: análise e crítica. *Revista da Associação Paulista de Medicina*, São Paulo, v. 9, n. 5, p. 385-387, 1936.

ALMEIDA, Alexandre Patricio de. **Psicanálise e educação escolar**: contribuições de Melanie Klein. São Paulo: Zagodoni, 2018.

ALMEIDA, Sandra Francesca Conte de. Psicologia, psicanálise e educação: três discursos diferentes? In: BUCHER, Richard; ALMEIDA, Sandra Francesca Conte de (Org.). *Psicologia e psicanálise*: desafios. Brasília: Editora UnB, 1993, p. 19-31.

BARROS, Juliana Fernanda de. *Um estudo histórico no campo das articulações entre psicanálise e educação no Brasil: segunda metade do século XX*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia). São Paulo: Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho”, 2016.

BAUDOIN, Charles. *L'Âme enfantine et la psychanalyse*. Éditeur: Delachaux & Niestlé, 2012 [1931].

BERNFELD, Siegfried. *The psychology of the infant*. Editora: Andesite Press, 2017 [1925].

- _____. *Sisyphos oder die Grenzen der Erziehung*. Leipzig: Internationaler Psychoanalytischer Verlag, 1925.
- BICUDO, Virgínia Leone. A visitadora social psiquiátrica e seu papel na higiene mental da criança. *Revista de Neurologia e Psiquiatria de São Paulo*, São Paulo, v. 7, n. 6, p. 293-298, 1941.
- _____. Funções da visitadora psiquiátrica na clínica de orientação infantil e noções de higiene mental da criança. In: MARCONDES, Durval Bellegard. (Org.). *Noções gerais de higiene mental da criança*. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1946, p. 79-89.
- _____. Papel do lar na higiene mental da criança. In: MARCONDES, Durval Bellegard. (Org.). *Noções gerais de higiene mental da criança*. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1946, p. 101-110.
- BIGEVAULT, Jean-Pierre; TERRIER, Gilbert. *L'illusion psychanalytique en éducation*. Paris: PUF, 1978.
- CIFALI, Mireille. *Freud pédagogue?* Paris: Interéditions, 1982.
- CIFALI, Mireille; MOLL, Jeanne. *Pédagogie et psychanalyse*. Paris: Dunod, 1985.
- ENDO, Paulo; SOUSA, Edson. Itinerário para uma leitura de Freud. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Compêndio da psicanálise*. Porto Alegre: L&PM, 2018, p. 07-19.
- FERENCZI, Sándor. Psychanalyse et pédagogie. In: CIFALI, Mireille; MOLL, Jeanne. *Pédagogie et psychanalyse*. Paris: Dunod, 1985.
- FILLOUX, Janine. *Du contrat pédagogique*. Paris: Dunod, 1974.
- FILLOUX, Jean-Claude. Psicanálise e educação, pontos de referência. *Estilos da Clínica*, São Paulo, v. 2, n. 2, p. 8-17, 1997. Disponível em: <https://www.revistas.usp.br/estic/article/view/60714>. Acesso: 25 ago. 2022.
- FREUD, Ernst; MENG, Heinrich. *Cartas entre Freud e Pfister (1909-1939): um diálogo entre psicanálise e fé religiosa*. Viçosa, MG: Editora Ultimato, 2009.
- FREUD, Sigmund. O esclarecimento sexual das crianças. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 9. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1976. Originalmente publicado em 1907.
- _____. A moral sexual “cultural” e o nervosismo moderno. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Obras completas (1906-1909)*. v. 8. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2015. Originalmente publicado em 1908.
- _____. Análise de uma fobia em um menino de cinco anos. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 10. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1996. Originalmente publicado em 1909.
- _____. O interesse científico da psicanálise. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 13. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1974. Originalmente publicado em 1913.
- _____. A interpretação dos sonhos. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Obras completas*. v. 4. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2019. Originalmente publicado em 1900.
- _____. Um estudo autobiográfico. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 20. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1996. Originalmente publicado em 1925 [1924].

- _____. A questão da análise leiga. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Psicológicas Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 20. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1969. Originalmente publicado em 1926.
- _____. O futuro de uma ilusão. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 21. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1996. Originalmente publicado em 1927.
- _____. Conferência XXXIV: Explicações, aplicações e orientações. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 22. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1996. Originalmente publicado em 1933 [1932].
- _____. Prefácio a O Método Psicanalítico, de Oskar Pfister. In: FREUD, Sigmund. *Obras Completas (1911-1913)*. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2012. Originalmente publicado em 1913.
- _____. Prefácio a Juventude Abandonada, de Aichhorn. *Edição Standard Brasileira das Obras Completas de Sigmund Freud*. v. 19. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1996. Originalmente publicado em 1925.
- GURSKI, Rose; MORAES, Larissa; GOMES, Paula Gus. August Aichhorn: uma obra abandonada? *SIG: Revista de Psicanálise*, Porto Alegre, v. 5, n. 9, p. 63-72, 2016. Disponível em: http://sig.org.br/bkp/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/Revista_sig_9_-completa.pdf. Acesso: 01 set. 2022.
- HAMELINE, Daniel. *Le domestique et l'affranchi*. Paris: Editions Ouvrières, 1976.
- HORTELANO, Xavier Serrano. *Contato, vínculo, separação: sexualidade e autonomia egóica*. São Paulo: Editora Summus, 1997.
- KAES, René; ANZIEU, Didier. *Désir de former et formation de savoir*. Paris: Dunod, 1976.
- KLEIN, Melanie. *A psicanálise de crianças*. Rio de Janeiro: Imago, 1997. Originalmente publicado em 1932.
- _____. O papel da escola no desenvolvimento libidinal da criança. In: KLEIN, Melanie. *Amor, culpa e reparação e outros trabalhos (1921-1945)*. Imago: Rio de Janeiro, 1996. Originalmente publicado em 1923.
- _____. Transferência. In: BARROS, Elias Mallet da Rocha (org.). *Melanie Klein: evoluções*. São Paulo: Escuta, 1989. Originalmente publicado em 1943.
- KUPFER, Maria Cristina Machado. *Educação para o futuro: psicanálise e educação*. São Paulo: Escuta, 2013.
- _____. Em defesa das crianças “tontas”. In: LAJONQUIÈRE, Leandro de. *Figuras do infantil: a psicanálise na vida cotidiana das crianças*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2010, p. 09-15.
- _____. *Freud e a educação: o mestre do impossível*. São Paulo: Scipione, 1989.
- _____. *Relação professor-aluno: uma leitura psicanalítica*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia Escolar) – Universidade de São Paulo. São Paulo: USP, 1982.
- LAJONQUIÈRE, Leandro de. *De Piaget a Freud: para uma clínica do aprender*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013.
- _____. *Figuras do infantil: a psicanálise na vida cotidiana das crianças*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2010.
- _____. Freud, a educação e as ilusões (psico)pedagógicas. *Associação Psicanalítica de Porto Alegre*, Porto Alegre, v. 9, n. 16, p. 27-38, 1999.

_____. Freud, sua “educação para a realidade” e a ilusão (psico)pedagógica de nossos dias. *Educação e Realidade*, Rio Grande do Sul, v. 25, n. 1, p. 15-23, 2000. Disponível em: <https://seer.ufrgs.br/index.php/educacaoerealidade/article/view/47306>. Acesso: 22 nov. 2022.

_____. *Infância e ilusão (psico)pedagógica*: escritos de psicanálise e educação. Petrópolis: Vozes, 1999.

MANNONI, Maud. *Éducation impossible*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1973.

MARCONDES, Durval Bellegard. A higiene mental escolar por meio da clínica de orientação infantil. *Revista de Neurologia e Psiquiatria de São Paulo*, São Paulo, v. 7, n. 6, p. 252-258, 1941.

_____. Clínica de orientação infantil: suas finalidades e linhas gerais de sua organização. In: MARCONDES, Durval Bellegard. (Org.). *Noções gerais de higiene mental da criança*. São Paulo: Livraria Martins Editora, 1946, p. 43-48.

_____. Contribuição para o problema do estudo dos repetentes da escola primária: condições físicas, psíquicas e sociais. *Revista de Neurologia e Psiquiatria*, Salvador, v. 7, n. 6, p. 263-271, 1941.

_____. *Noções gerais de higiene mental da criança*. São Paulo: Martins Editora, 1946.

MATTHIESEN, Sara Quenzer. *A educação em Wilhelm Reich: da psicanálise à pedagogia econômico-sexual*. São Paulo: Editora: UNESP, 2005.

_____. Educação de educadores: pressuposto psicanalítico ou utopia reichiana? *Psicol. USP*, São Paulo, v. 14, n. 2, p. 17-34, 2003. Disponível em: <https://www.scielo.br/j/psusp/a/cDtkCZt73dLq8sF5LpQs5ZJ/?lang=pt>. Acesso: 11 ago. 2022.

MERCADANTE, Jefferson. *A psicanálise entre a higiene mental e a Escola Nova na obra de Arthur Ramos: contribuições à história da educação no Brasil*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Educação Escolar). São Paulo: Universidade Estadual Paulista “Júlio de Mesquita Filho”, 2015.

MILLOT, Catherine. *Freud antipedagogo*. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2001. Originalmente publicado em 1979.

MORAES, Deodato. *A psicanalyse na educação*. Rio de Janeiro: Mendonça, Machado & Cia Editores, 1927.

MORGADO, Maria Aparecida. *Ensaio sobre a sedução na relação pedagógica*. Dissertação (Mestrado em Psicologia). São Paulo: Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo, 1989.

NIMIER, Jacques. *Mathématiques et affectivité*. Paris: Stock, 1976.

OLIVEIRA, Hosannah de. A higiene mental do lactente. *Archivos Brasileiros de Higiene Mental*, Maringá, v. 6, n. 2, p. 221-233, 1933.

_____. O complexo de Édipo em pediatria. *Bahia Medica*, Salvador, v. 3, n. 1, p. 306-309, 1932.

PEREIRA, Marcelo Ricardo. Psicanálise, educação e sintoma: uma introdução. In: PEREIRA, Marcelo Ricardo (Org.). *Os sintomas na educação hoje: o que fazemos com “isso”?* Belo Horizonte: Scriptum, 2017, p. 7-11.

PFISTER, Oskar. A ilusão de um futuro. In: WONDRACEK, Karin Hellen Kepler. (Org.). *O futuro e a ilusão: um embate com Freud sobre psicanálise e religião*. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2003. p. 17-56. Originalmente publicado em 1928.

_____. *Psycho-analysis in the Service of Education, Being an Introduction to Psychoanalysis*. Editora: Andesite Press, 2017 [1921-1922].

_____. *The Psychoanalytic Method*. London: K. Paul, Trench, Trubner and company, ltd., 1917[1913].

PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. A arte de perverter: aplicação psychanalytica à formação moral da criança. In: PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. (Org.). *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929, p. 133-142.

_____. *A psicologia profunda ou psicanálise*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara, 1932.

_____. A psychanalyse na Liga Brasileira de Hygiene Mental. In: PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. (Org.). *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929, p. 27-40. Original publicado em 1926.

_____. Educação sexual. *Archivos Brasileiros de Hygiene Mental*, Maringá, v. 2, n. 1, 1929. p. 120-133.

_____. *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929.

_____. Instrução e educação sexuais. In: PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. (Org.). *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929, p. 71-79. Original publicado em 1928.

_____. Leitura para crianças: ensaio sob o ponto de vista psychanalytico. In: PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. (Org.). *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929, p. 165-176. Original publicado em 1928.

_____. O caracter do escolar segundo a psychanalyse. In: PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. (Org.). *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929, p. 41-59. Original publicado em 1927.

_____. O que esperamos dos nossos filhos. *Revista da Associação Brasileira de Educação*, Rio de Janeiro, v. 1, n. 3, p. 71-77, 1930.

_____. *Psicanálise de uma civilização*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara, 1930.

_____. Psychanalyse: a sua história e o seu conceito. In: PORTO-CARRERO, Júlio Pires. (Org.). *Ensaio de psychanalyse*. Rio de Janeiro: Flores & Mano, 1929, p. 11-25. Original publicado em 1928.

_____. *Sexo e cultura*. Rio de Janeiro: Guanabara, 1933.

RAMOS, Arthur. *A criança problema*. 4ª. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Livraria Editora da Casa do Estudante do Brasil, 1947. Originalmente publicado em 1939.

_____. A dinâmica afetiva do filho mimado. *Neurobiologia*, Recife, v. 1, n. 1, p. 265-287, 1938.

_____. A mentira infantil. *Revista Médica da Bahia*, Salvador, v. 5, n. 10, p. 195-210, 1937.

_____. A technica da psychanalyse infantil. *Archivos Brasileiros de Hygiene Mental*, Maringá, v. 6, n. 2, p. 195-205, 1933.

_____. *Educação e psychanalyse*. São Paulo: Companhia Editora Nacional, 1934.

_____. Os furtos escolares. *Archivos Brasileiros de Hygiene Mental*, Maringá, v. 7, n. 2, p. 229-235, 1934.

_____. O problema psycho-sociologico do filho único. *Revista Médica da Bahia*, Salvador, v. 6, n. 9, p. 185-200, 1938.

SCHMIDT, Vera. *Scritti su psicoanalisi infantile ed educazione*. Editora: Frenis Zero, 2014.

SILVA, Gastão Pereira da. *Como se deve evitar o drama sexual dos nossos filhos*. Rio de Janeiro: Oscar Mano & Cia. Editores, 1939.

_____. *Educação sexual da criança*. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Mariza, 1934.

ZULLIGER, Hans. *Aus dem unbewussten Seelenleben unserer Schuljugend*. Alemanha: Inktank publishing, 2019 [1923].

_____. La psychanalyse et les écoles nouvelles. *Revue française de psychanalyse*, Paris, v. 5, p. 721-750, 1928.

_____. *Los niños difíciles*. Madrid: Ed. Ediciones Morata, N/C [1946].

_____. *Psychoanalytische Erfahrungen aus der Volksschulpraxis*. Berlim: Ernst Bircher, 1921.

Submitted: 01/12/2023

Preprint: 01/12/2023

Approved: 05/24/2023

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Author 1 – Research, conceptualization, data collection and analysis, writing of the text and final review/editing.

Author 2 – Supervision of data construction, conceptualization and writing/final review of the article.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest with this article.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank the *Universidade Federal do Oeste da Bahia* (UFOB) and the Postgraduate Program in Education of *Universidade de Brasília* (PPGE/UnB).