applause. It tries to utilize ideas and findings from the experimental psychology of judgment to cast light on how clinical and social judgments are made. A further merit is the thoroughness with which the literature has been searched and summarized. It is a workmanlike and well constructed failure.

Part of the failure is due to two forms of theoretical indiscipline. The authors collect concepts from a variety of frameworks—psychophysics, information theory, construct theory, decision theory (cognitive dissonance seems to be the only missing candidate)—but neglect to say how or whether those diverse notions are to be welded into a coherent viewpoint. The "integration" offered is of the scholarly gossip type (the "Hackenback's cognitive dazzle equals Steinmacher's choice refraction plus or minus Winkelchorf's affective ambience" type of argument). The criterion for integration is as for putting knick-knacks on the mantelpiece—they look well together. Alternatively, formal theories are abandoned in favour of *ad hoc* notions which have an air of emergency about them.

Aside from repeated mixing of theoretical metaphors, the pay-off from each separate line of attack is meagre. The extensive discussion of information theory models is followed by reports of studies in which subjects categorize fabricated case histories of various types along prescribed dimensions (degree of defensiveness, clinical diagnosis, etc.) on the lines of psychophysical experiments. Whether or not inference from the fixed array, fixed dimension models to clinical judgment is ultimately meaningful or not, the authors clearly fail to make anything of it. They conclude, for example, that the capacity of a judge to discriminate among arrays of social or clinical stimuli is not large. This turns out to mean that if we ignore unmeasured and unexplained individual variance, limit our judges to a response system which we invent and which they must work to, make this a simple response system, supply a fabricated rather than a situation-generated series of social stimuli, subtract a constant term which we admit may be arbitrarily homogenizing transmitted information scores, then we may conclude that . . . .

The language of the book is in the tradition of psychological texts—doughy. Nothing is simple if it can be simplistic.

On reflection, the poverty of implication from the psychology of judgment to clinical and social practice reflects only partly the limitations of the authors—it reflects much more the poverty of psychological work on thinking and judgment. Maybe the authors can claim to have done the best that might be done in the light of Hebb's still true dictum of 1949 that "the failure of psychology to handle thought adequately . . . has been the essential weakness of modern psychological theory". If so, categorizing clinicians who wish to amend their sinful ways would do better to by-pass psychology for the time being and refer to semantics and logic for guidance.

D. BANNISTER.

Check your own I.Q. By H. J. EYSENCK. Penguin Books Ltd. 1966. Pp. 192. Price 3*s*. 6*d*.

On the principle that you can't have too much of a best seller, Penguins have issued this follow-up to the original *Know your Own I.Q.*

The tests are, strictly speaking, unassessable, since a veil hangs over the question whether and in what way item selection was carried out; whether, on whom, and in what way they were standardized; whether and with what results they were checked for reliability; whether, on whom and against what criteria they were validated; how they correlate with what other tests, and so on and so forth. The one known fact about them is that the I.Q. tables are without age weighting because this practice strikes the author as being "rather artificial"—Messrs. Terman, Wechsler *et al.*, please note.

Re-issued around Christmas as *Clever Hans's Bumper Book of Party Games and Puzzles* it would merit a fair sale. What it has to do with intelligence testing is one of life's uninteresting little mysteries.

D. BANNISTER.

CORRIGENDA

A Psychiatric Glossary. This book was reviewed in our August issue and it is regretted that the particulars were given incorrectly. The entry should have read as follows:

A Psychiatric Glossary. By the Committee on Public Information of the American Psychiatric Association. London: Basic Books. 1964. Pp. 79. Price 12*s*. 6*d*.

https://doi.org/10.1192/S0007125000082866 Published online by Cambridge University Press