

becomes more general in that the negative loadings are reduced from four to two, and the second factor becomes more bipolar, or differentiating, the negative loadings being increased from 10 to 18 out of 30. The four highest positive loadings on the rotated second factor are associated with the following features in order: 'self-pity, reactivity of depression, hypochondriasis, demanding'. The four highest negative loadings on the same factor in order are: 'retardation, guilt, worthlessness, suicidal symptoms'. Thus, by a suitable rotation, their two descriptive factors produce a factor clearly differentiating neurotic from endogenous depression. Perhaps Rosenthal and Gudeman could be persuaded to rotate their factors, as I have done, and publish the distribution of patients' scores on the rotated second differentiating factor. Is this distribution bimodal?

R. F. GARSIDE.

*Department of Psychological Medicine,
University of Newcastle upon Tyne.*

REFERENCES

- CARNEY, M. W. P., ROTH, M., and GARSIDE, R. F. (1965). "The diagnosis of depressive syndromes and the prediction of E.C.T. response". *Brit. J. Psychiat.*, **111**, 659-674.
- HAMILTON, M., and WHITE, J. (1959). "Clinical syndromes in depressive states". *J. ment. Sci.*, **105**, 985-998.
- KILOH, L. G., and GARSIDE, R. F. (1963). "The independence of neurotic and endogenous depression". *Brit. J. Psychiat.*, **109**, 451-463.
- MCCONAGHY, N., JOFFE, A. D., and MURPHY, B. (1967). "The independence of neurotic and endogenous depression". *Ibid.*, **113**, 479-484.
- ROSENTHAL, S. H., and GUDEMAN, J. E. (1967a). "The self-pitying constellation in depression". *Ibid.*, **113**, 485-489.
- (1967b). "The endogenous depressive pattern: an empirical investigation". *Arch. gen. Psychiat.*, **16**, 241-249.
- and KLERMAN, G. L. (1966). "Content and consistency in the endogenous depressive pattern". *Brit. J. Psychiat.*, **112**, 471-484.

"NEUROTIC STYLES"

DEAR SIR,

Dr. Brenda Grant's review of my book, *Neurotic Styles*, has recently come to my attention (*Journal*, August, 1966, Vol. 112, p. 849). May I reply briefly to this extraordinary piece?

Dr. Grant complained of my book, in the first place, that its whole aim or thesis was "difficult to grasp", meaning, of course, that it had none. It has, but Dr. Grant did, indeed, fail to grasp it. The book's thesis is that the nature or form of the specific traits,

symptoms, and defence mechanisms that comprise the well-known neurotic syndromes derives from, and can be understood in terms of, more general modes of function (or what I call "styles"), such as mode of thinking, characteristic of the various conditions. I attempt to explain this thesis, to relate it to the stream of psychoanalytic theory, and to indicate something of its practical significance in an Introduction of 32 pages out of the book's total of 200 pages. What Dr. Grant made of that Introduction I cannot imagine; she simply does not refer to it. The major part of the book is then devoted to a close examination of the form of well-known traits and symptoms of a number of syndromes in order to show the general formal principles, i.e. the characteristic modes of thinking, of action, and the like, manifest in them. Since she has missed the point, however, to Dr. Grant all of this apparently remains aimless and therefore peculiarly "minute" description. In a grand sweep, she asserts "Like many of the writers on psychoanalytic theory" (who?) I have "fallen into the trap" of confusing description with explanation.

To this Dr. Grant adds charges of unsubstantiated speculation and vagueness or meaninglessness of formulation, but she supports these charges with remarkably selective editing of what I actually said. She charges me with arbitrary assertions while ignoring my clinical evidence, with overgeneralization while ignoring my qualifications, and with vagueness of formulation by quoting out of context. Thus, she quotes the following in order to ask "what this really means": "a consequence of any neurotic style is the exclusion from consciousness of certain classes of subjective experience and mental content." She omits the preceding words, "If we say that . . ." as well as a following clause. In so doing she avoids indicating to the reader that this is a summary statement referring to an immediately preceding argument of some length, in which I develop the thesis that in neurosis it is not a single or a few specific mental contents that are excluded from consciousness, as is sometimes assumed in psychoanalysis, but whole kinds, or classes, of subjective experience and mental contents.

In short, I believe Dr. Grant has yielded to the temptation to make a speech of one full page in length, but has not really reviewed my book at all.

DAVID SHAPIRO.

*427 North Camden Drive,
Beverly Hills, California.*

DEAR SIR,

It is apparent that Dr. Shapiro believes I have reviewed his book with neither understanding nor