

2. Psychology and Psychopathology.

The Psychoneuroses and Neuroses. (*Amer. Journ. Psychiat.*, vol. cxiii, p. 107, July, 1936.) Yarkin, J. C.

The writer studied 100 cases of anxiety neurosis, conversion hysteria, anxiety hysteria, compulsive-obsessive reactions and neurasthenia.

He found a neuropathic family history in 44%, and a psychopathic in 16%. The personality was neurotic in 75% and psychopathic in 2%. In general, the complexity of the causes increased in the following order: anxiety neurosis, conversion hysteria, anxiety hysteria and compulsive-obsessive reactions.

Attempts at compromise formation and partial analysis seemed to be the most effective methods of influencing underlying ætiological factors, especially in anxiety hysteria and in compulsive-obsessive reactions. In the latter group, partial analysis is the only method found to possess worth-while value.

G. W. T. H. FLEMING.

Reality and the Unconscious. (*Psychoanal. Quart.*, vol. vi, p. 23, Jan., 1937.) French, T. M.

Neuroses and psychoses are not able to ignore pain. Dreams are able to ignore unpleasant reality only in so far as the state of sleep itself in proportion to its depth is able to absorb the pain. If a dream or symptom is unable to provide reassurance by reference to the actual experiences of the patient, distortions of reality in the direction of wish-fulfilment will be followed by a compensatory tendency to correct the distortion in subsequent material.

The fundamental differences that distinguish rational waking behaviour from neuroses and dreams are based upon the quantitative relationship between the synthetic capacity of the ego and the intensity of the conflict. Due to the ego's inadequate synthetic capacity neuroses and dreams are usually able to deal with the conflict only in a fragmentary way, and tend to repeat in a stereotyped manner reactions to previous traumatic experiences. Rational behaviour requires an ego span sufficient not only to view one's situation as a whole, but also to enable one to pay attention to differential criteria so as to be able to learn from past mistakes instead of repeating them.

STANLEY M. COLEMAN.

Three Criminal Types as Seen by the Psycho-analyst. (*Psychoanal. Rev.*, vol. xxiv, p. 113, April, 1937.) Alexander, F., and Saul, L. J.

The first case presented concerns a youth of 19, who committed a double murder. In the course of a trivial quarrel he shot his younger brother and also his brother's friend. The psychological problem consists fundamentally in how this weak, introverted, not especially aggressive youth with a constant feeling of inferiority committed a deed of which no one who knew him believed him capable. Analysis revealed a fundamental split in his character—a struggle between masculine demands and the passive infantile need for dependence. His brother, through his physical superiority, had intensified this conflict, and in him he had killed the stronger person whom he envied because of his own masculine ambitions. In the friend he killed the person whose place with his brother he envied because of his own passive feminine feelings. The crime was a desperate effort to resolve the conflict between the two opposing instinct-demands of his personality by an action.

The second case describes a 21-year-old youth, who during the previous five years had a court record of four arrests. The charges were successively—indecent exposure, larceny of a car, disorderly conduct (peeping into windows), and burglary. Analysis revealed him to be what Alexander calls the "tough on the outside, soft on the inside type", and the trend towards criminality developed out of the need to show his toughness and superiority, which he felt he could not do in normal