

libidinal ties to the mother despite the mother's apparent availability and warmth.

This review, fragmentary and all-too-general, does not do justice to the originative power of Margaret Mahler's research and conceptualizations, to the rich complexity yet basic simplicity and straightforwardness of her work. In closing, I wish to stress its importance for the understanding of adolescents and adults, including, but by no means confined to, narcissistic and borderline patients.

Hans Loewald, M.D.
New Haven, Connecticut

FREUD AND HIS PATIENTS. Edited by *Mark Kanzer* and *Jules Glenn*.
New York: Aronson, 1980, 452 pp., \$25.00.

The book under review is the second in a series of four volumes celebrating the Downstate Psychoanalytic Institute's 25th Anniversary. It is a collection of articles by members of the faculty examining various facets of the five classical cases: Freud's patients of the title. Well known to all analysts, these cases continue to be a vital part of every candidate's psychoanalytic education—and rightly so. They display, in addition to the clinical content, the noted hallmarks of Freud's style. To this day they are impressive for their clarity of expression, sharpness of focus, and taut narrative line. One welcomes the opportunity to reexamine these cases and observe again the nuances of Freud's thought: what he did and did not know, the paradoxical keenness of his mind with regard to some matters and his obtuseness in others, what he considered important and what he overlooked. Above all one notes how often his clinical observations and inferences presaged later theoretical formulations.

In the preface the editors state their desire "to set forth some of the significance of [Freud's] explorations in a form which students and teachers of the broadest aspects of human relationship" can utilize. They do not claim "systematic or comprehensive review" but rather "pragmatic" exploration. And they promise, in addition to the articles themselves, a concluding summary attempting "a synthesis of the historical, technical and conceptual aspects of all the case histories." An ambitious project indeed.

The volume opens with an introduction by Jules Glenn in which the five cases are appropriately placed in the dual perspectives of psychoanalytic history and the development of psychoanalytic theory.

Glenn's comments on Freud's remarkable insights as well as his mistakes and blind spots are as cogent as they are fair. For the psychoanalytically unsophisticated reader Glenn is informative and helpful as he anticipates sources of confusion and assists in setting them right. However, for the analytically experienced reader these same explanations are superfluous. Glenn's introductory review is followed by the book's five sections, each containing two to six articles devoted to one of the cases and an integrating summary.

It is disappointing to find that for the book as a whole, only 13 of the 22 substantive articles are original contributions; nor are they evenly distributed. For example, in the Rat Man section four of the six articles are new, while in the Schreber section there is only one new contribution out of five. The fact that so many of these pieces were not written for the present work gives rise to a certain uneasy impression that the plan came after the product. Nor is one reassured to recall that the studies are, with perhaps more candor than wisdom, referred to in the introduction as "random studies."

The three tasks addressed by the articles are: to reexamine the case data in the light of modern psychoanalytic theory, knowledge, and practice; to provide new historical information (as, for instance, Niederland in his classic papers on Schreber's upbringing which are reprinted here); or to explore what Freud tells us about each case as an expression of his personality. Most of the original contributions in this book focus on the first of these tasks, that is to say on a comparison of the new with the old.

In the first clinical section of the book Dora, Katharina, and "the homosexual woman," are examined as Freud's adolescent patients, and the case material is explored from the vantage point of our current knowledge of adolescent development. Melvin Scharfman makes the interesting suggestion that the adolescence of Dora was unconsciously recognized by Freud as shown by some of his countertransference reactions. We know that Freud used her case material to confirm his ideas about dream interpretation. Scharfman suggests that Dora had a sense that Freud was not really interested in her *per se*. Certainly being used by her father and Herr K., which was never acknowledged in the written report, made this a critical reality and therapeutic issue. Unfortunately the four papers in this section tend to be repetitive in their exploration of the adolescent element and in their use of the cases to illustrate current knowledge and technique.

In one of the two essays on Little Hans, Martin Silverman declares his admiration for Freud's formulations and results but clearly describes how we would understand and treat the case in a very different

manner today. Silverman comments that Hans's treatment suffered from the lack of analysis of his passive feminine identification with his mother and his homosexual attraction to his father, while acknowledging that this material would not have been appropriate for his father to analyze. In general, Silverman is also critical of the treatment of a child through a parent. In his discussion of his colleague's paper, Glenn goes in the opposite direction, suggesting that today we might only consult about this case and not recommend psychoanalytic treatment at all. What are we to make of such diverse suggestions? One regrets that the integrative summary at the end of the section contents itself with restating the issue and does not choose to explore ways in which one might resolve the conflict.

In the Rat Man section, Robert Langs uses the case as illustrative material for a discussion of his concept, "the misalliance." He has already used the Dora case for this and later, in the Wolf Man section, repeats the process. The concept does not warrant the repetition. He also speaks of "deviations from current classical technique," which I believe is incorrect. Freud was involved in a process of discovery and exploration; if there were deviations they could only be from his own preferred technique of the moment. In other contributions to this section, Judith Kestenberg uses the Rat Man material to present her ideas about the significance of movement pattern, while Stanley Weiss uses the original record of the case to reflect on the transference and Freud's technique, reaching the conclusion that today the treatment would be viewed as a combination of psychoanalysis and psychotherapy.

The crux of the problem with this book lies, I think, in an editorial failure to reconcile the wish to look at these cases as literature, as marvelously written examples of brilliant thought and the history of a science, with the need to acknowledge the fact that psychoanalysis has moved significantly on. To use the cases as foils for illustrating modern elements of psychoanalytic technique, dynamics, or theories is, to my mind, of questionable validity and comes perilously close to the fallacy of which Anna Freud⁸ has warned:

The very familiarity which analysts began to feel with [the classical cases] aroused the temptation to deal with them in their imagination as if they were their own patients, to wish to know everything about them, to test the interpretations given, to probe

⁸ Foreword to *The Wolf-Man*, ed. M. Gardiner. New York. Basic Books, 1971, p. x.

beyond the conclusions drawn, and wherever possible to reconstitute once more the original data from which the author's abstractions had been made.

As a result the book is caught in the ambivalent intent to show how much psychoanalysis has progressed in its subtlety and complexity, while reiterating that all the seeds and elements can be seen in Freud's own work and are illustrated by it.

The question is then brought back to the reader: what is to be gained by reexamining these cases in the light of contemporary knowledge? It is a foregone conclusion that the early, pioneering studies, with their limited perspective, would be superceded by Freud's and others' later work. Freud used the cases in tightly drawn contexts. For instance, in Little Hans he sought to demonstrate the truth of childhood sexual theories, the curiosities of children, infantile sexuality, and the dynamics of phobic symptomatology. The Rat Man explicated the unconscious processes which lay behind obsessive-compulsive symptomatology. Do we really clarify modern psychoanalytic thought by repeatedly contrasting the new with the old? Is it useful to illustrate particular new ideas by using these classical cases? Does the new idea gain some special validity if it can be found illustrated in Freud's work? Does an idealization of these cases serve to inhibit, rather than encourage the writing of contemporary cases? By these questions I think my view is clear that the classical cases are often subject to misuse, as some of the articles in this book appear to demonstrate.

The continuing controversial nature of these issues is reflected in the placement of the cases in the didactic curricula of training institutes. For example, institutes teaching psychoanalysis in a historical developmental framework tend to place them early in the curriculum; others, following a different conceptual line, place them later on when, presumably, the candidates have more secure grounding in modern psychoanalysis.

To say admirably, as I have heard, that "the cases teach themselves!" is only true if one limits the understanding to what Freud explains. To integrate this into historical perspective and with modern knowledge is much more difficult and requires considerable background. For teaching purposes, the cases are excellent in the potential, but undeniably they place great demand upon both teacher and students.

Glenn and Rubin address this point directly when they describe in detail how they have taught the Schreber case at the Downstate Institute. It is their belief that the classic cases lend themselves very

well to the pedagogical necessities of integrating psychoanalytic knowledge and making psychoanalytic concepts come alive for students. They stipulate, however, that the instructor must know the state of analysis when the case was written, be able not only to interpret the data in the light of new concepts, but also to accept, articulate, and finally "observe Freud's shortcomings." I have taught the Rat Man in a similar manner to students in the second year of training at the Michigan Institute. At that time it was my impression that candidates so early in their training are really only minimally knowledgeable about past and current theory and practice. Understandably, but perhaps unfortunately, they are also extremely reluctant to raise questions about Freud's formulations, constructions, and techniques.

For whom is the book intended? One gains the impression that there was an interesting idea for a book, but it was never sufficiently developed to reach a synthetic integration. Instead, a wide range of random material, some old, some new and of varying significance, has been offered with the intent of attracting a diversified audience, with the result that the book probably will not satisfy any one group. For the experienced analyst there is little that is new, and that which is could be said much more succinctly. For the candidate some of the articles may assist in further thinking about one or another of the cases, but approximately a third of the papers are already in the literature. For others interested in human relationships, or Freud, it offers very variable fare—the kind which, without secure knowledge of present-day psychoanalysis, will seem obscure, minor, or faulty. One regrets that a potentially major contribution, a comprehensive bibliography of writing concerning each case, which would have been useful to libraries and readers, is not included.

One wishes that a contributor might have examined a question which is relevant and important when comparing the old with the new. That is the problem of result. We would all agree that Freud's formulations and treatment techniques of 65 to 80 years ago would be considered in significant error if carried out today. Yet with the exception of Dora and Schreber, whom Freud never treated, results with Hans, the Rat Man, and the Wolf Man were considered successful. Why? How? A discussion of this problem would be central to our struggle with the theory of treatment and the distinction between psychoanalysis and psychoanalytically oriented psychotherapy. Harold Blum alludes to this question when he suggests that the Wolf Man was a transference cure; but such cures are not supposed to be lasting! It is well known that the Rat Man's treatment included providing food to the patient, and with the Wolf Man there were discussions of politics

and art—all practices which today are thought to make analysis impossible. Similarly, Silverman is concerned that important aspects in Hans's treatment, as it would be conceived today, were ignored. But no one speaks to the question of how the results today would be better, and how would we know?

The integrative summaries which conclude each case section are a disappointment. They do not take up questions raised or struggle with differences posed by various authors' presentations. Instead they tend to recapitulate and summarize until eventually they imbue the volume with the quality of an elementary text in which basic points are repeatedly stated, often in the very same words as the original presentation. Equally disappointing is the promised concluding integration "New Dimensions in Human Relationships" by Mark Kanzer. It reads as a restatement of what has already been restated and does not unify the book or bring it to a conclusion with which one can be content.

Reaching this end, one reluctantly notes that the book as a whole is misleading. The integrative portions eschew that task. The book is not about Freud and his patients—and what a wonderful title that is and how full of promise! Rather it is primarily a showcase for contemporary analysts who use Freud's writings about his patients to explore their own interests. This is a very different proposition. The reviewer's problem with this book is that it is neither so bad that one can condemn it, nor so good that one may praise it. If the editors had taken a cue from Freud himself and worked with a sharp focus and singular purpose rather than being random and pragmatic, perhaps the results would have been a more pleasing *Festschrift*, a more rewarding celebration for a well-respected Institute, and a better book.

Peter Blos, Jr., M.D.
Ann Arbor, Michigan

CLINICAL PSYCHOLINGUISTICS. By *Theodore Shapiro*. New York: Plenum, 1979, xiv + 179 pp., \$22.50.

Ours is a talking profession. Language—more specifically oral language—is the principal instrument with which we work as therapists, our principal research tool, and the medium we use for communication. On the face of it, linguistics should be numbered among those basic sciences on which psychoanalysis depends. Yet it is the case that during some 80 years of psychoanalytic development the study of