SYSTEMATIC STUDY OF THE PERSONALITY IN ESTIMATING ADAPTABILITY

G. S. AMSDEN, M.D.

BLOOMINGDALE HOSPITAL, WHITE PLAINS, N. Y.

If we were to summarize in the briefest way the advance of recent years in psychiatric teaching, we should be obliged to group what is to be said around a very conscious use of the conception of adaptation or adjustment of the individual to the needs presented within himself and by his environment. Problems involving the instinctive urgency for adjustment, the reaction of the individual in his failure to adjust himself, the alternatives automatically resorted to when for any reason there is resistance to adjustment, the interplay of partial adjustments and of alternatives—fortunate and unfortunate—have formed topics of intensive studies which have furnished the tools of modern psychiatric practice. Gradually these studies have brought into the foreground certain features and have, by detailed exposition, so adequately demonstrated their importance and significance that we are now justified in taking for granted that, wherever these particular features are found, there has been an approaching sequence of details the general nature of which may be assumed and depended on as known factors in figuring out the problems our cases bring to us.

SCOPE OF THE PRESENT ARTICLE

With this general assumption in mind I wish to present in a somewhat organized form observations relating to the personality which probably are individually not unfamiliar. The conception that the personality, as the accumulation of habitual reactions which the individual may under most circumstances be depended on to employ, gauges the adaptability of the individual, is, perhaps, a sort of truistic one. I wish simply to cite and organize the interpretation of those traces in the personality which, under circumstances of mental or nervous disorder, enable us to see more clearly and at the earliest possible moment the adaptive needs and deficiencies of our cases and so to handle them with greater precision.

It is, I assume, unnecessary in discussing the matter of adaptation, as it applies within the region of psychiatric interest, to express the imperative need of not neglecting the weight of toxic or other organic reducing causes which may enter into the etiology of mental disorders. Factors of that type are of the utmost importance. It may, however, only be fair to express the conviction that, for the most part, such

reducing factors tend mainly to reduce and, as a result, those forces which work after an habitual fashion are apparently left free, or in a less hampered way, to follow the course determined by their natural momentum, after the manner of the adage that "there is truth in wine." Whether the personality, as such an habitual force, serves to guide the individual into a psychosis is another question and may be left to a later time to discuss. I am now undertaking to present merely such indications of limitation of adaptability as a study of the personality may reveal.

In a somewhat academic way it can be stated that, with regard to adaptation, we may adapt ourselves with reasonable fulness, we may partially adapt ourselves, we may fail to adapt ourselves and remain inert, or we may more or less completely fail to adapt and, instead of being inert, we may engage in a variety of types of activity the most of which may have the function of substituting for good adaptation, or of serving in some other way as a blind or an excuse which enables us to evade the issue without the raw recognition of it we might otherwise have. It is with reference to some such scheme as this that I wish to arrange and present some illustrative cases, and to point out peculiarities of personality apt to be correlated with miscarriages of adaptation of one sort or another.

The first two cases are examples of personality of relatively well-balanced type.

ILLUSTRATIVE CASES

CASE 1.—Present History.—The first case is that of a minister, aged 26. When he entered the hospital he had an acute psychotic episode characterized by mental clouding, blind restlessness and hallucinations of sight and hearing. He could be aroused rather readily so as to respond fairly clearly for a few moments, only again to drop back into his previous state. His general attitude, nevertheless, was frank and free from restraint. He was much reduced physically. At the time he was regarded as an instance of delirium with exhaustion as a leading factor. This was confirmed by a speedy and complete recovery.

Past History.—His adolescence presented nothing especially striking. He was reared in a rather stiff, rigid family atmosphere. He progressed normally, or somewhat better than the average, in school. He entered college at 18, but after ten weeks left because he was homesick—an episode which unfortunately was not made clear. He then went to the Middle West and entered a high school. He soon became engaged. The next year he entered college. He did well there and supported himself by preaching. After college he taught Latin a year and then entered the theological seminary. He still supported himself by preaching and at the end of his first year in the seminary and six months before his admission to the hospital, he married. He started a strenuous course in the Fall. In November he began to sleep poorly. He received some medicine that helped him so much that he was a little suspicious of it. He did not relax in his work, became more sleepless, and finally after an especially difficult and successful undertaking he broke down in a delirium.

Personality.—There were in the delirium plain enough disclosures of repressed instinctive tendencies both before and after his marriage. His conflicts in regard to his wife, which he repressed and which had caused him considerable struggle, stood out plainly in his productions. Yet, if we were to standardize him from his productions and general symptomatic behavior, he would undoubtedly compare favorably with the normal. In his delirium he presented a frankness and transparency incompatible with habitually poor adaptability. His history, furthermore, demonstrates a good adaptability. His interest in religion was apparently not one in reaction to any especially sharp internal conflicts. It was a rather natural outcome of his home environment.

His personality is likewise transparent. Intellectually he is above the average, both in acquisition and in application. In his application he shows a tendency to overactivity—that is, he is talkative, is very industrious and is inclined to work under tension. A motive for this is at once seen in a moderate feeling of insecurity. He is somewhat unduly concerned as to the estimation others make of him. However, he spontaneously recognized this and seriously sought to discipline himself in regard to it. This feeling did not work out as a craving for sympathy or as an undue concern about his physical health. Socially he showed no restrictions. He enjoyed people and was at ease with them. He is not stubborn. He takes advice well. He is frank and open, not a day-dreamer and he showed no inclination to phantastic schemes or plans.

His feeling of insecurity appears again in an inclination to be slightly over-sensitive, yet he was quite free from any distorted habits, such as jealousy and suspiciousness, based on it. It is also shown in a tendency to worry, though on the whole he is light-hearted and cheerful. He is free from unfortunate display of temper. He gives no evidence of habit distortion referable to sexual or instinctive interests. He is not prudish, not effeminate. He is quite open and natural with women. Finally, he is naturally interested in healthful physical diversions.

Comment.—In this personality we therefore see little evidence of poor adaptation in traits indicating habitual evasion or emotional absorption. He displays a feeling of self-insecurity and, though he adapted himself well toward it, it led to somewhat unfortunate results by causing him to work perhaps too industriously and under tension, to have too much regard for the opinion others held of him, and to worry somewhat unduly. His adaptability is further somewhat favorably documented by a ready appreciation, after his recovery, of his needs and a sensible attitude of correction toward them.

CASE 2.—History.—Another similar case is that of a woman who developed a deep delirium immediately after a confinement. She became a little restless and received morphin and later hyoscin, both in considerable amounts. She then, like the preceding patient, became hallucinated, restlessly and aimlessly active, quite disoriented, misinterpreted her surroundings and displayed a marked paraphasia. She showed also the same momentary mental clearness on being roused. She displayed, too, a similar directness and transparency of behavior, though she showed a rather strong tendency to occupy herself with fancies centering about other possible marriages she might have made. She recovered after about three months.

The patient, aged 35, passed through the period of adolescence without any especial irregularity or odd behavior. At about 8 years of age there were unfortunate sexual experiences which emphasized interests to which she adapted herself well, yet which nevertheless remained more or less in the

foreground. She had an uneventful, broad, rather full and efficient life up to her marriage at 27.

She had a stepson to whom she devoted herself happily, but owing to financial restrictions she denied herself children though she was eager for them. Nevertheless, she remained naturally happy. Later indications revealed that she allowed her fancies some play in the direction of what wider opportunities would have brought if she had married some one else, but this did not appear to modify her behavior or mood. On the whole, her adaptation appeared quite satisfactory.

Personality.—Her personal make-up, too, was quite clear and transparent. Intellectually, she was above the average. She is alert and a good manager. Perhaps she was a bit overtalkative, but was not overactive otherwise, and on the other hand she was by no means lacking in energy. She was not only free from stubbornness, but she profited by her mistakes and adjusted herself well to the plans of others without at the same time being too malleable. She was well liked socially, though it is said that she was inclined to devote herself to a few intimate friends rather than to seek a wide acquaintance. Nevertheless, she was quite at ease with strangers, quite tactful, and free from petty sensitiveness and jealousy. She was quite frank and open. Her mood was evenly cheerful. She did not worry. She took hardships well. She was not irritable. She was, however, rather easily startled by thunder and loud noises, but otherwise was not inclined to have fears. She was not bashful. She was quite naturally and frankly affectionate and passionate, but plainly guided this well, except possibly for a tendency in later years to indulge a little in fancies as stated above. She was naturally interested in healthy diversions.

In this case, too, we see a well-adapted individual. She displays a distinct, but on the whole healthy, passionate nature. Except for a tendency to let her fancy play and for a possibly too easy acquirement of contentment, we can scarcely criticize her capacity for adjustment.

For psychiatric interests it is fair to conclude that these two cases represent instances of average good adjustment. The terms used in a systematic description of them are those which tend to indicate, on the one hand, a not undue absorption or distraction interfering with a free disposal of energy on occasion of need, and those, on the other hand, which tend to show that the individual, automatically or consciously, tends to protect himself, to compensate habitually for deficiency in one field by activity in another, or by the employment of evasive traits.

In sharp contrast with this open, frank type of individual whom we instinctively trust, I wish to describe two patients who have, perhaps, a minimum range of adaptability compatible with average living conditions.

CASE 3.—History.—The patient, a man, aged 32, is employed as a clerk in a large metal business. He was a free, active, careless boy. At 9 he began to sing in a church choir. From about this age until he was about 17 he was out late at night, visited pool rooms and kept rough company. All this he did in disobedience to his parents. At 17, suddenly and immediately after

his father's death, he reformed. He became quiet, expressed regret for his former behavior, lived a strict life, and neglected physical exercise for his music. From about a year after this and continuing four or five years he complained of his stomach. He went from one physician to another, and thought he was going to die. At 20, he showed a good deal of animosity toward a fellow clerk who advanced more rapidly than himself. At 22, he became infatuated with his cousin and became so angry at his brother for calling on her that he left home for two or three days. Later he showed a more or less intense interest in particular women, but he dropped them suddenly one after another much to the mystification of the women and his family. At 25, he thought an old friend was conniving with another employee to injure the patient's standing with his firm. From now on he kept more and more on his guard and was more or less continuously in inward turmoil, which culminated in his admission to the hospital in an acute paranoiac episode. This development was in close relation to a feeling of guilt and apprehension concerning a habit, he had practiced for years, of getting into crowded street cars and allowing himself to be pressed against women passengers. He developed into a typical paranoid dementia praecox.

Personality.—His personality is characteristic. He is intellectually bright. He was closemouthed, but was a hard worker. He was inordinately proud and particular in personal appearance beyond what would naturally be expected. He was hypochondriacal. His leading characteristic was his unwillingness to take advice. He held his opinions stubbornly and would not acknowledge his faults. He had few friends, was not easily approachable. His behavior toward others was characterized by a whimsical changeableness. He was suspicious, jealous and envious. He was serious, readily became apprehensive. In matters relating to sex he was formally correct to the point of being strictly on his guard, but apparently he did not develop, as many do, a prudishness; on the contrary, he displayed a prurient hypocrisy. He had no virile diversional interests. He devoted himself narrowly to his music.

Comment.—This case is a very simple example of the so-called "shut-in" personality. The traits cited nearly all have the function of preventing any one from peeking over his private personal enclosure. He cannot receive advice, for he has so frail a sense of self-security that the admission implied in receiving correction or advice would tend to shatter his self-confidence and lead him too painfully close to an appreciation of his limitation.

CASE 4.—History.—Another case is that of a woman, aged 38. She was admitted after she had been distinctly abnormal for about three years. At the time of her admission she displayed much scattered aggressiveness. There was also a marked reduction of judgment in even simple, practical matters. She occupied herself with other people much to their detriment, but this she failed to appreciate. She developed poorly systematized delusions of persecution. She became quite inaccessible, and at opposition or even at attempts to guide her, she became violent to a degree which rendered her antisocial. She was regarded as a case of paranoid dementia praecox of very gradual development.

She developed normally and after an academic schooling and some training in physical culture she taught Delsarte in the Middle West. At about 21 she became engaged but broke this engagement when she met her present husband, who was then a minister. At this time she had a tic which consisted in a loud hemming in the throat and which persisted for several years afterward.

She was married at 24. Her husband soon drifted away from the regular church and finally became a Christian Socialist. The patient opposed this vigorously. She gave as the chief reason that they would be social outcasts and would also be in precarious circumstances financially, neither of which was the case. Quite soon her husband established a good reputation and she at once began to exploit it for gratification of her social desires.

Personality.—As a girl she is said to have learned readily, but her attention was never very steady and early in her married life she said her mind wandered. She was never an accurate observer. She did not acquire a facility for adapting herself to work, which did not at the time afford her abundant satisfaction. She ruled her parents and other members of the family and did not know how to deny herself. She would not take advice and would not recognize her mistakes, and was firmly stubborn. She made friends readily but with one or two exceptions, did not retain them more than a short time. She has never been frank and when her weak points are touched, especially her lack of domesticity and maternal feeling, she either becomes angry or—to use her husband's expression—"shuts up like a clam," that is, she ignored them. She had moody spells which she is unable to account for and a temper which is violently excited by the slightest opposition. She differs, however, from most people of her type by quickly recovering from her temper and in being forgiving.

Comment.—Here, therefore, long before the onset of the psychosis, we find a vigorously developed faculty for evasion of adaptation and the most highly developed mechanisms for securing the evasion are those which constitute the chief features of the psychosis.

Earlier Personal History.—When she was about 30 years of age and eight years before she was admitted to this hospital, she began to pay much attention to abstruse philosophical problems, and in this she did not prevent herself from very cheap imposition. At about this time, her natural absent-mindedness began to be gradually more exaggerated. This was also the time of a lull in her husband's affairs. He had become more radical and to some extent was deserted by former supporters. The patient at this period had a vision in which she saw an elderly and wealthy gentleman whom she fancied would support them in their work. From this time on she has had occasional hallucinations. When the news of this wealthy gentleman's death was brought to her she claims to have heard his voice say, "Trust me my child." Some three years before admission her husband practically abandoned the church. He bought a farm and devoted himself to literary work. The patient was now much distressed at the situation. She was more or less isolated in the country, occupied with family cares for which she had no interest. Moreover, her husband was away from home much of the time. She began to worry lest some calamity befall her husband. She spent money foolishly and made elaborate presents without justification. She insisted on having her way and was unmanageable. While under observation she displayed an impenetrable resistance to all efforts to lead her to adapt herself. If met casually, she usually behaved with gracious but shallow heartiness. If, however, one attempted to guide her she became resentful, told how her children need her and what they are missing in her absence, and soon fell into a passion.

These same dangerous traits must, however, be interpreted entirely within the setting in which they occur, as in the following case, which recovered.

CASE 5.—History.—The patient was 31 years of age when admitted to the hospital. She was a healthy child and was reared in a crowded district in New York City and apparently under few elevating influences. She stopped school at 14 and was left an orphan between 15 and 16. From this time until her marriage at 22 she worked in a laundry. She remained well except for headaches which resembled a migraine and which ceased after her marriage. She went out nights a good deal and was inclined to be a little sporty. She had, however, only one intimate girl friend. She associated more easily with men than with women.

After her marriage she dropped her friends and made no new ones. Soon after her marriage, also, she displayed a rather gross jealousy of her husband. During the next eight years she bore several children and had numerous miscarriages. There were financial hardships also, but on the whole, except for a growing jealousy of her husband and a general willingness to be somewhat careless in her housework, she appeared to get on well enough.

About five months before admission she had her chest examined. She has had a return of the headaches she had before she was married. She then began to worry about herself, became a little absent-minded and finally definitely absorbed. She smiled a little to herself. About a month before admission she referred to her physician as if he were in some way hostile toward her. She spoke of hypnotism in this connection. A little later she said she was ashamed to look the doctor in the face. A few days later she said a girl who sat in front of her at the theater said something about her husband. Shortly after this she began to say that God spoke to her. Two days before admission she was unusually dreamy. She said she had a vision in which God addressed her as his St. Anne. A few hours afterward she became excited and said her physician was cutting up her husband.

Personality.—On admission to the hospital she was mentally clear, but continued to hallucinate and to persist in her delusions. For a short period she became rather excited and, at the time referred to, her delusions which had a decidedly erotic tinge, plainly served to obscure her own longings about which she had a sense of guilt. She at first displayed a considerable absorption in her ruminations, and on one occasion there was for a few hours a catatonic-like state with waxy flexibility. More and more a depressive affect now came into the foreground. The hallucinations and delusions retreated and she recovered in ten weeks, but without satisfactory insight.

Intellectually she was up to the standard of her family and class. She was a good manager. Nevertheless, she was naturally not talkative and was somewhat indolent. She was very conceited, proud, and overindependent. In her associations with others she showed considerable restraint. She had few friends and was a little backward socially. She found it very difficult to take advice, was headstrong, wanted her own way and could not face her mistakes. She was jealous, sensitive and naturally suspicious so that she had ideas of reference, thought others talked about her. She was not frank. She was quite imaginative, but it was not determined to what extent she day-dreamed. It was known that she neglected her work to read novels. Her mood was naturally variable. She worried, felt abused, displayed tantrums of temper. She was vigorously passionate, liked to be petted, but was restrained and found it difficult to express her feelings to others.

Comment.—This personality closely resembles that of the two foregoing cases. They are all on the defensive and exhibit the correlative traits of that attitude. The last case, however, is in a degree less pronounced than the other

two. Her adaptability allowed her to meet her difficulties perhaps not half way, but nevertheless far enough to keep within a corrective distance of reality most of the time. That she displayed the symptoms she did can only be taken as further documentary evidence of a perilous exercise in the evasion of facts, and it places her adaptability close to the danger zone.

The foregoing cases represent instances in which the imperative to adaptation was urgent. There was in the first two of the just preceding three cases no middle ground at which it was comfortable to arrive. They had to adapt or were obliged to adopt a more or less completely overwhelming subterfuge. That adaptation may be avoided without such subterfuge is amply illustrated by the cases of dementia praecox which slip away without marked trends. The two following cases represent variants of this general type.

CASE 6.—History.—The first of these is a man, aged 40. He was reared in relative luxury in a family in which there were traditions of aristocratic comfort and ease. He had a personal servant from an early age, but developed no tendency to snobbishness. He was a happy, care-free boy. He went to boarding school early, and from 15 till 17 played a good deal, in an innocent way, and studied little. Then family reverses began and he went, at 18, to prepare for professional work. He worked rather hard and was a general favorite.

He finished his professional training at about 24. His father now died and the patient was obliged to shoulder responsibilities for a large family. He worked dutifully but was not happy. He longed for wider contact and he wished to specialize in his profession. He managed to do this. He lived up to and a little beyond his income. In this way and by being more obliging to others than he could afford, he was in continuous discomfort. After a disaster in his family he was much distressed, had difficulty in sleeping and on several occasions took a little chloroform. Then he took a small dose of morphin. Within a week or two he was taking morphin daily. Then he spent several months getting rid of it, but two years later after his child died, he began again and continued until he came to the hospital.

In the estimation of his friends he was a charming and successful man and though not one of great force, nevertheless a man who inspired confidence.

Personality.—The study of his personality served to shape more definitely the suggestions in the history. There is no question but that he was above the average intellectually. He was subject to enthusiasms, but they usually burned themselves out rather quickly. He was self-depreciatory but at times reacted by a show of stubbornness, especially if it were a question of gratifying a strong desire. Socially he was unusually adaptable—even too much so—as he did favors for others he could not afford to do and was timid lest he offended others. He cooperated well and was reasonably frank and open. He was very imaginative and sentimental. He was naturally cheerful but has mood changes downward and revulsions against application to his work. He was very affectionate. Toward matters of sex he is rather prudish. He has few virile interests. He was strongly attached to his church and holds a simple, childlike faith in it.

Comment.—This patient is therefore an individual with a marked intolerance of tedium and discomfort. He has a strong attachment to simple moral ideals developed in a chaste, sentimentally dominated home atmosphere. He

has never faced his problems carefully, but has drifted along instinctively. He is exceedingly docile and takes the line of least resistance, though when his trend in this direction is reinforced by a positive wish, he is capable of being quite stubborn. He is, in other words, an individual who describes the curve of his life docilely about a center of emotional fascination. In this particular case the fascination stood in an individual of otherwise relatively good adaptability.

In a companion case the same general mechanism works out more unfortunately.

CASE 7.—History.—This patient is a man of 45 and of whom very careful anamneses were taken from several different sources. These indicated that he was on the whole an exemplary, somewhat retiring boy. He received highest prizes for scholarship in school. He went to a well-known college. He was supplied by his father with all reasonable necessities, yet he on one occasion stole money and property from other boys. This was patched up. He finished college and took up a law course. While at this he appropriated for his own use a small amount of money entrusted to him for other purposes. He entered the practice of law and did chiefly an office practice. He became much respected and was known as a man who was able to settle differences out of court. He was intrusted with numerous fiduciary accounts. He was particularly kind and went out of his way to do a good turn for others. He was much depended on in his church. It was apparent that in his inclination to help others he was a little gullible. He was a little extravagant in his way of living.

Slightly suspicious indications were carefully followed up, and it was found that not long after his marriage at 28 he became mixed up with a woman and there were suggestions of affairs of the same nature later on from time to time. At 39, it is known that he drank some. At 44, it is known that on one occasion he was intoxicated. His income probably at no time exceeded \$2,000. Just before admission it was discovered that he had appropriated for his own use—by forging—funds intrusted to him by clients. Soon it was found that these speculations had been extending over many years and were considerable in amount. In a somewhat careless way, from period to period, he robbed Peter to pay Paul and then took from Paul to replace what he had taken from Peter.

Personality.—He is an individual who, after this revelation, would pass as an arch-hypocrite. Yet if hypocrisy implies a conscious false pretense for a clearly worked out purpose he is no more an hypocrite than an hysterical patient is. He is really an individual at the mercy of his tendencies.

A systematic study of his personality showed that intellectually, on the side of acquisition, he was up to the average of his family, if not above it. He was, however, impractical, planned poorly or not at all, and was a poor observer. While his attention appeared good (and on formal test proved to be so), he was rambling in his talk and seemed to have a subnormal capacity for coordinating his data. He was always more or less hesitating in his opinions. This intellectual lethargy had its correlate in his physical activity which was quite scattered. While he had little impulse to physical activity, he nevertheless kept busy doing what in the case of an orderly man would have been unnecessary.

Consistent with this he was self-depreciatory, lacking in self-reliance and generally timid. He was very sociable and made acquaintances readily. For this he apparently relied on a very responsive, sentimental sympathy which,

while it was awake, quite completely dominated him and led him into promises which he fulfilled only at considerable sacrifice. As a boy it was learned that he was obedient, but secretive. He was tactful, but it was the tactfulness of one who yields without planfulness and, currying favor in this way, accepts whatever this sort of near-wheedling happened to bring him.

He was not frank. In a way this conception is not applicable to him. He is a good example of an individual who by a certain careless procrastination is always in arrears and is so busy juggling expedients that he seems to himself too occupied to be able to take time to see himself and his affairs in any correct perspective. He was too close to them. He worked in a hard, uneconomical way and attained no satisfaction from it. He never got ready to be frank.

His mood was quite closely parallel with the ups and downs of his affairs. He often appeared worried, again on slight provocation he saw things in very rosy colors. At home he was often pettish and displayed a spoilt-child behavior. He had a poor sense of humor.

He was very sentimental. As a boy he was always in love. He is a day-dreamer. His fancies went far afield and had a strong sexual coloring. He took alcohol to encourage them.

Comment.—The personality status and a somewhat careful analysis made later, indicate a strong fascination capable of competing favorably against a natural inclination to reality. He surrendered in a considerable measure. His real life became a sort of fiction. His wish fancies covered over reality in such a way as to deprive him of a clear vision of the seriousness of his misdeeds. He would not in clear consciousness have injured any living thing but by a little indirection he was led to rob widows and orphans. This fascination also makes clear why he was not a good observer, why he was not practical, why he was not energetic, and why he had a sense of insecurity with traits developing from that. He is a constitutionally inferior individual and was obliged to go to prison.

OBSERVATIONS

The forger, while evidently subject to the same disabling difficulty as the preceding case, is plainly much more disabled. The most obvious, and perhaps the most important difference between the two cases is that the first one was occupied with fascinations which, though auto-erotic in character, still remained, after a fashion, objective — if that is not a contradiction in terms. His interests are, to a large degree, centered about chaste, domestic, sentimental ideals which lend themselves in some measure to specific objective embodiment. The forger, on the other hand, was occupied with fascinations more of an imaginative, subjective type. He confessed that he was much occupied with erotic fancies. He was so subject to the tendency as to fictionalize reality in a mild way. For his own welfare it must be said that his compromises, or, perhaps better, his compensating activities — such as devotion to personal service, sentimental loyalty, and objects of an altruistic nature — tended to offset by somewhat practical contact, his tendency to unreality.

To illustrate a still more pernicious extension of this tendency I wish briefly to present another case.

CASE 8.—History.—This patient was 29 years old when admitted to the hospital. It was stated that as a child he appeared normal enough, except that he did not remember his lessons and that at about 10 he developed a tendency to be quarrelsome. At 17 he failed college entrance examinations. His father bought a manufacturing business for him to grow into and finally own. But he took little interest in it, left it and wandered off into this and that enterprise, always unsuccessful, always gullible. He drank and dissipated some. Finally he reformed and became religious. He gradually developed delusions, and said eventually that Astor was God and that he was Astor's son, Christ. Finally he showed very florid wish-fulfilment delusions tinged with homosexuality. There was no acute episode. He drifted along serenely. Remained quite clear and was just grandiose and patronizing enough to tell about himself very fully.

Personality.—The personality analysis covering a time well antedating the distorted behavior representing the psychosis, describes him intellectually as poorly retentive, though he appeared to grasp things well enough. He was impractical and appeared to expect the world to lend itself to interpretation in his rather juvenile terms. He was lacking in energy, though he had enthusiasms, which, however, soon spent themselves. He was a little overbearing and "chesty." Socially he was somewhat snobbish. He was not stubborn, but on the contrary rather too pliable. He was free from malice. He day-dreamed to a marked degree. Was serious minded and inclined to have the blues. His fancies ran luxuriantly to sexual topics. There were contrary sexual tendencies.

He said, and there seemed to be no reason to doubt his very consistent statements, that at as early an age as 5 he had sexual thoughts and soon afterwards thought of girls in an erotic way. At 7 or 8, probably after seeing his father exposed, he felt as if he must look at the genital region of men. It troubled him. He felt he was dirty. He frequently said his peculiar tendencies made him feel different from other boys. Apparently he developed a marked feeling of self-depreciation in relation to it. He showed also, undoubtedly as a reaction to it, a behavior of superiority toward his family. He belittled the culture of his family, admired the refinement of aristocracy and became haughty and disdainful and very precise. He said he always felt restricted and penned in and never felt happy. He always felt as if he were under a cloud.

Comment.—This case represents an extreme instance of habitual surrender to the auto-erotic. He had essentially no objective application of his interest. He worked over his world into romantic juvenile terms. From the standpoint of adaptability this general type of case is to be estimated by the degree it is intellectually practical, physically energetic, and the extent to which he has interest to dispose on objective reality. This type of case emphasizes the general observation that lack of mental and physical energy, other things remaining equal, is usually to be accounted for by an emotional satisfaction or indulgence which short-circuits it.

GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

The cases cited have, I believe, illustrated practically all the traits of personality important in routine practice, and the cases also suggest the adaptive correlates of the traits. The cases, in addition, illustrate

two general types of personality. One may be described as presenting a strong impulse to adaptation, and, failing of adaptation, is prone to develop traits of personality representing extreme measures of evasion. The other type is that in which the impulse to adaptation appears to be more or less neutralized. The characteristic traits of this type are those of hebetude and romantic dreaminess.

The types of personality intermediate between these extremes, those in which adaptation is distinctly partial, I have not represented. They would include those who break down in the manic-depressive way, the psychoneurotic fashion, and those of that miscellaneous remainder we are content to refer to as the psychopathic inferiors.

It will have been noted, and perhaps with some question, that a systematic study of the personality is, in a way, only an emphasis laid on a special feature of the anamnesis. A good history would probably include practically all that would be inquired about in a systematic study of the personality. That which makes an anamnesis satisfactory is the degree to which it gives a satisfactory status of the personality. There are a number of reasons, however, for still keeping a sort of special department of the history for the personality status. These reasons have to do with the informant, the patient, and the person who takes the history. A history properly taken in such a way that it adequately and progressively cross-sections the patient's life from point to point, is an undertaking which relatively few have the patience and aptitude for, and on the whole one secures better uniformity if the inquiry as to the make-up is concentrated into a special corner of the anamnesis.