

of treatment will vary considerably from case to case, e.g. one or three sessions a week, for one to three years. Indeed, one of the cases described lost his symptoms after only one session. Orthodox psychoanalysts will judge such an outcome as an escape into health and express gloomy forebodings, but the author considers it as perfectly laudable and desirable from the point of view of psychotherapy, with which the vast majority of us will heartily agree.

Sixteen cases are described at length, and, in addition to the interspersed commentaries and interpretations, each section has an introductory discussion concerning problems which are illustrated in the recorded interviews which follow. Of special interest are Section IX (Therapy Technique and the Personality of the Therapist) and Section XI (The Evaluation of Results in Psychotherapy). Therapists are divided into those with all heart and no head, those with the opposites and those who are driven by a lust for power, corresponding to hysterical, obsessive and narcissistic types respectively. There are many other types, e.g. depressive, paranoid, schizoid. Another mode of classification suggested is into motherly, fatherly and brotherly. The failings of these types are exposed, and a valuable means of self-correction is recommended, viz. listening to the taped interview after an interval of one to two weeks. Unfortunately, as the author points out, many therapists lack powers of self-criticism and, moreover, are not immune from the art of weaving cloaks of rationalizations. All this makes the evaluation of psychotherapeutic claims difficult, and one must agree that "until psychotherapeutic procedures can be fully described, examined and evaluated, subjective impressions based upon personality characteristics of the therapist will always cloud the issue of who is doing what to whom". The variable of the personality of the therapist and the particular technique he utilizes is only one of many that make assessments difficult. Others are discussed at the beginning of Section XI, e.g. obscurities of diagnostic nomenclatures, selection of cases, the setting of therapy, the time factor, the difficulties of obtaining an adequate control series, the fallacies in judging results (who decides—the patient, the therapist, both together, the patient's relatives and friends, the family physician, a committee of psychiatrists?), not to mention philosophical and semantic problems. Indeed it seems that the "elimination of imponderables" is impossible, and one must admit that we are still very far from the ideal mentioned in the Preface—that psychotherapy should not be unduly influenced by "fashion, politics, religion, philosophy or imagination".

This book is highly praiseworthy as a valiant,

honest example of presenting a psychotherapeutic technique both for the student and for the expert of other schools. One can but share the author's hope that other schools will do likewise, "so that alternative explanations, theories and emphases can be examined". It is only natural, as the author reports, that psychoanalysts should "feel" that their theories and techniques are the "most holistic, rational and effective", but such a belief continues to be a matter of faith.

I. ATKIN.

**The Parapraxis in the Haizmann Case of Sigmund Freud.** By G. VANDENDRIESSCHE. Louvain and Paris: Editions Nauwelaerts, 1965. Pp. 192. Price F.B. 290.

In 1923, Freud reported the story of the 17th-century painter, Christoph Haizmann, who had suffered from what Freud, rather misleadingly, called a "*Teufelsneurose*", a neurotic fear of the Devil. Haizmann had been seized with convulsions and frightening visions of the Devil late in August 1677. He confessed that he had sold his soul to the Devil nine years before (i.e. in 1668) and that he was now in mortal fear that the Devil would claim his due by 24 September. The monks of a Holy Order in Mariazell, Austria, undertook to exorcize the Devil. On 8 September they seemed to succeed; Haizmann had a vision of the Devil, rushed towards him and returned with a bond written in blood and headed "Anno 1669". However, after Haizmann had left Mariazell, his hallucinations of the Devil returned. Another course of exorcism therefore took place in 1678. This time Haizmann recovered a bond written in ink and ending with the date "1669th year".

Freud applied psychoanalytic interpretations to Haizmann's symptoms and came to the conclusion that the unconscious psychopathology lay in Haizmann's ambivalent feelings and passive homosexual desires towards his father. In 1956, Macalpine and Hunter published reproductions of some of the manuscripts relating to Haizmann's illness, and also of the pictures Haizmann had painted to illustrate the events. They diagnosed Haizmann's illness as schizophrenia, and substituted for Freud's interpretation one based on pathogenic pregenital birth fantasies.

Here now comes another study of the case, this time by the Belgian author Vandendriessche who, as Professor Nuttin mentions in a preface to the book, has special qualifications in historical and philological research, as well as in psychological and clinical investigations. Vandendriessche is mainly concerned with a symptom of parapraxis, a slip of the pen, which

Freud had diagnosed in order to explain away certain inconsistencies of dating. Freud had devoted a quarter of his paper and much ingenuity to unravelling these inconsistencies. His solution was this. In order to obtain the monks' help in 1677, Haizmann had invented the story of a pact with the Devil, signed in blood in 1668. He must therefore have pretended to recover such a bond with the date 1668 on it. In 1678, when he needed another therapeutic exorcism, he had to invent a previous pact, written in ink and dated 1668.

This solution, however, involved Freud in some very unlikely assumptions. He had to suppose that Haizmann had somehow exchanged the previously recovered bond in blood for one with the new date 1669 on it, and that somehow nobody had noticed this substitution. He had to assert that, in compiling the Haizmann story some 40 years after the events, a priest "in the interest of consistency, has falsified some things in the deposition made by the first Abbot" (though he mitigated this libel by adding that "a 'second revision' such as this does not go much beyond what is carried out even by modern lay historians, and at all events it was done in good faith"). Finally, he had to assume that Haizmann, in writing the bond in ink one year after the recovery of the bond in blood, had made a slip of the pen and written 1669 instead of 1668—a slip which Freud regarded as a "piece of unintentional honesty; it enables us to guess that the supposedly earlier bond was fabricated at a later date".

Freud had to negotiate many hurdles in defending his thesis, and he was never sanguine enough to persuade himself of complete success. Vandendriessche has had no difficulty in demolishing Freud's solution, though his own explanations are admittedly not definitive either. He follows up every clue, be it historical, textual or psychological; and he is painstaking in his interpretations. As a result, his discussion becomes, as he himself realizes, meandering and involved; it is also not always written in idiomatic English. Yet, like some authors of whodunits, he comes up, at the very end of the book, with a new discovery which could remove all inconsistencies of dating and show that Haizmann never committed the parapraxis which was a "piece of unintentional honesty" in Freud's opinion. Vandendriessche quotes from three old juridical books that it had been customary in the 17th century and afterwards to execute two drafts of a contract: a preliminary rough draft of the items on which agreement had been reached, and this might include the date when the contract should become valid; and a second, more solemn fair copy of the contract which legalized it and made it effective.

If this new interpretation is accepted, Haizmann's story of his pact with the Devil becomes consistent and was never changed by him. Evidence from his first visit to Mariazell mentions already that he had written a bond in ink in 1668 and a bond in blood "sequenti vero anno 1669". Only the second bond was effective. This bond, however, as Vandendriessche argues with some cogency, was not for nine whole years; it fell due "in 9. jahr", in the 9th year that began on 24 September, 1677. Haizmann wanted another therapeutic exorcism in 1678 because of the return of his symptoms. The bond in ink served him as an excuse. He was quite correct in writing the year 1669 at the end of this bond, as it was the year in which the contract was supposed to become effective.

F. KRÄUPL TAYLOR.

**Evolution of Psychosomatic Concepts. Anorexia Nervosa: A Paradigm.** Eds. M. RALPH KAUFMAN and MARCEL HEIMAN. London: The Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psychoanalysis, 1965. Pp. 399. Price 63s.

This contribution, No. 66 in the International Psychoanalytic Library Series, aims to describe the development of the psychosomatic concept over the last century. The senior editor, Professor Kaufman, is a former President of the American Psychoanalytic Association and the editors state their psychoanalytic orientation and probable bias in the introduction. The first part of their book takes the form of a general statement concerning the problem. This is embodied in the first 127 pages, which include reproduced papers by five senior physicians which in the editors' views represent landmarks of psychosomatic thought and criticism. These papers are by Edward Stainbrook (1952), Paul Klemperer (1953), Felix Deutsch (1927), Franz Alexander (1939), and Sir William Gull (1868). In each case the editors and their associates have added their own introductory and sometimes critical comments. In their own chapter on "psychogenicity" in this section, the editors, after making an attempt at analysis of the various interactions of body and mind in health and disease, conclude that psychoanalytic practice and consequent theory is now making a major contribution to the evolution of psychosomatic thought.

The last 250 pages of the book are devoted to this particular development of the psychosomatic viewpoint, using anorexia nervosa as an example. To this end a series of papers on anorexia nervosa are reproduced, each with editorial comment. They range from Gull's and Lasègue's original observational studies to present-day psychosomatic evalu-