MOURNING AND MELANCHOLIA

though we are still told that 'it behaves like a derivative of the first, oral phase'. This view of identification is consistently emphasized in many of Freud's later writings, as, for instance, in Chapter III of The Ego and the Id (1923a), where he writes that identification with the parents 'is apparently not in the first instance the consequence or outcome of an object-cathexis; it is a direct and immediate identification and takes place earlier than any object-cathexis.'

What Freud seems later to have regarded as the most significant feature of this paper was, however, its account of the process by which in melancholia an object-cathexis is replaced by an identification. In Chapter III of The Ego and the Id, he argued that this process is not restricted to melancholia but is of quite general occurrence. These regressive identifications, he pointed out, were to a large extent the basis of what we describe as a person's 'character'. But, what was far more important, he suggested that the very earliest of these regressive identifications—those derived from the dissolution of the Oedipus complex—come to occupy a quite special position, and form, in fact, the nucleus of the super-ego.
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DREAMS having served us as the prototype in normal life of nar-
clinicist mental disorders, we will now try to throw some light
on the nature of melancholia by comparing it with the normal
affect of mourning. This time, however, we must begin by
making an admission, as a warning against any over-estimation
of the value of our conclusions. Melancholia, whose definition
fluctuates even in descriptive psychiatry, takes on various clini-
cal forms the grouping together of which into a single unity
does not seem to be established with certainty; and some of these
forms suggest somatic rather than psychogenetic affections. Our
material, apart from such impressions as are open to every
observer, is limited to a small number of cases whose psycho-
genetic nature was indisputable. We shall, therefore, from the
outset drop all claim to general validity for our conclusions,
and we shall confine ourselves by reflecting that, with the
means of investigation at our disposal to-day, we could hardly
discover anything that was not typical, if not of a whole class of
disorders, at least of a small group of them.

The correlation of melancholia and mourning seems justified
by the general picture of the two conditions. Moreover, the
exciting causes due to environmental influences are, as far as
we can discern them at all, the same for both conditions. Mour-
ning is regularly the reaction to the loss of a loved person, or to
the loss of some abstraction which has taken the place of one,
such as one's country, liberty, an ideal, and so on. In some
people the same influences produce melancholia instead of
mourning and we consequently suspect them of a pathological
disposition. It is also well worth notice that, although mourning
involves grave departures from the normal attitude to lift, it
never occurs to us to regard it as a pathological condition and to

1 The German 'Trauer', like the English 'mourning', can mean both
the affect of grief and its outward manifestation. Throughout the present
paper, the word has been rendered 'mourning'.

2 Abraham (1912), to whom we owe the most important of the few
analytic studies on this subject, also took this comparison as his starting
point. (Freud himself had already made the comparison in 1910 and
even earlier. (See Editor's Note, p. 240 above.)
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refer it to medical treatment. We rely on its being overcome after a certain lapse of time, and we look upon any interference with it as useless or even harmful.

The distinguishing mental features of melancholia are a profoundly painful dejection, cessation of interest in the outside world, loss of the capacity to love, inhibition of all activity, and a lowering of the self-regarding feelings to a degree that finds utterance in self-reproaches and self-revenges, and culminates in a delusional expectation of punishment. This picture becomes a little more intelligible when we consider that, with one exception, the same traits are met with in mourning. The disturbance of self-regard is absent in mourning; but otherwise the features are the same. Profound mourning, the reaction to the loss of someone who is loved, contains the same painful frame of mind, the same loss of interest in the outside world—in so far as it does not recall him—the same loss of capacity to adopt any new object of love (which would mean replacing him) and the same turning away from any activity that is not connected with thoughts of him. It is easy to see that this inhibition and circumscriptio of the ego is the expression of an exclusive devotion to mourning which leaves nothing over for other purposes or other interests. It is really only because we know so well how to explain that this attitude does not seem to us pathological.

We should regard it as an appropriate comparison, too, to call the mood of mourning a "painful" one. We shall probably see the justification for this when we are in a position to give a characterization of the economy of pain.¹

In what, now, does the work which mourning performs consist? I do not think there is anything far-fetched in presenting it in the following way. Reality-testing has shown that the loved object no longer exists, and it proceeds to demand that all libido shall be withdrawn from its attachment to that object. This demand arouses understandable opposition—it is a matter of general observation that people never willingly abandon a bibliotheca, positum, not even, indeed, when someone substitutes it for the book. This opposition can be so intense that a turning away from reality takes place and a clinging to the object through the medium of hallucinations or wishful psychoses.² Normally, respect for reality gains the day. Nevertheless its

¹ [See footnote 1, p. 147 above.]
² Cf. the preceding paper [p. 230.]
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orders cannot be obeyed at once. They are carried out bit by bit, at great expense of time and cathartic energy, and in the meantime the existence of the lost object is psychically pro-

longed. Each single one of the memories and expectations in which the libido is bound to the object is brought up and hyper-
castivated, and destitution of the libido is accomplished in respect of it.³ Why this compromise by which the command of reality is carried out piecemeal should be so extraordinarily painful is not at all easy to explain in terms of economy. It is remembable that this painful unpleasantness is taken as a matter of course by us. The fact is, however, that when the work of mourning is completed the ego becomes free and uninhibited again.⁴

Let us now apply to melancholia what we have learned about mourning. In one set of cases it is evident that melancholia too may be the reaction to the loss of a loved object. Where the exciting causes are different one can recognize that there is a loss of a more ideal kind. The object has not perhaps actually died, but has been lost as an object of love (e.g. in the case of a bereaved girl who has been jilted). In other cases one feels justified in maintaining the belief that a loss of this kind has occurred, but one cannot see clearly what it is that has been lost, and it is all the more reasonable to suppose that the patient cannot consciously perceive what he has lost either. This, in-
deed, might be so even if the patient is aware of the loss which has given rise to his melancholia, but only in the sense that he knows what he has lost but not what he has lost in this. This would suggest that melancholia is in some way related to an object-loss which is withdrawn from consciousness, in contradis-
ction to mourning, in which there is nothing about the loss that is unconscious.

In mourning we found that the inhibition and loss of interest are fully accounted for by the work of mourning in which the

ego is absorbed. In melancholia, the unconscious will result in a similar internal work and will therefore be responsible for the melancholic inhibition. The difference is that the inhibition

³ [This idea seems to be expressed already in Brentano's "Hysterie (1882); a process similar to this one will be found described near the beginning of Freud's "Discussion" of the case history of Pauline Elisabeth von R. ("Studien, 2, 162;]
⁴ [A discussion of the economy of the process will be found below \( p. 250.\)]
of the melancholic seems puzzling to us because we cannot see what it is that is absorbing him so entirely. The melancholic displays a certain indolence which is lacking in mourning—an extraordinary diminution in his self-regard, an impoverishment of his ego on a grand scale. In mourning it is the world which is empty and quiet, while in melancholia it is the ego itself. The patient represents his ego to us as worthless, incapable of any achievement and morally despisable; he reproaches himself for his weakness and expects to be cast out and punished. He abases himself before everyone and commiserates with his own relatives for being connected with anyone so unworthy. He is not of the opinion that a change has taken place in him, but extends his self-criticism back over the past; he declares that he was never any better. This picture of a delusion of (mainly moral) inferiority is completed by sleeplessness and refusal to take nourishment, and—what is psychologically very remarkable—by an overcoming of the instinct which compels everyone to give expression to life.

It would be equally fruitless from a scientific and a therapeutic point of view to contradict a patient who brings these accusations against his own ego. He must surely be right in some way and be describing something that is as it seems to him to be. Indeed, we must at once confirm some of his statements without reservation. He really is as lacking in interest and as incapable of love and achievement as he says. But that, as we know, is secondary; it is the effect of the internal work which is consuming his ego—work which is unknown to us but which is comparable to the work of mourning. He also seems to us justified in certain other self-acculpations; it is merely that he has a keener eye for the truth than other people who are not melancholic. When in his heightened self-criticism he describes himself as petty, egotistic, dishonest, lacking in independence, one whose sole aim has been to hide the weakness of his own nature, it may be, so far as we know, that he has come pretty near to understanding himself; we only wonder why a man has to be ill before he can become conscious of this kind. For there can be no doubt that if anyone holds and expresses to others an opinion of himself such as this (an opinion which Hamlet held both of himself and of everyone who was ill, whether he is speaking to the "every man after his own, and who shall scape whipping") (Act II, Scene 2).
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mourned, dissatisfaction with the ego on moral grounds is the most outstanding feature. The patient's self-evaluation concerns itself frequently with bodily infirmity, ugliness or weakness, or with social inferiority; or this category, it is only his fears and asseverations of becoming poor that occupy a prominent position.

There is one observation, not at all difficult to make, which leads to the explanation of the contradiction mentioned above [at the end of the last paragraph but one]. If one listens patiently to a melancholic's many and various self-accusations, one cannot in the end avoid the impression that "the most violent of these accusations is all applicable to the patient himself, but that with insignificant modifications they do fit someone else, someone whom the patient loves or has loved or should love. Every time one examines the facts this conjecture is confirmed. So we find the key to the clinical picture: we perceive that the self-reproaches are reproaches against a loved object which has been shifted away from it to the patient's own ego.

The woman who loudly pits her husband for being tied to such an incapable wife as herself is really accusing her husband of being incapable. Whatever sense the may mean is that there is no need to be greatly surprised that a few genuine self-reproaches are scattered among those that have been transposed back. These are allowed to obtrude themselves, since they help to mask the others and make recognition of the true state of affairs impossible. Moreover, they derive from the presence and one of the duties of love that has led to the loss of love. The behaviour of the patients, too, now becomes much more intelligible. Their complaints are really "plaints" in the old sense of the word. They are not ashamed and do not hide themselves, since everything derogatory that they say about themselves is at bottom said about someone else. Moreover, they are far from evincing towards those around them the attitude of humility and submissiveness that would alone befit such worthless people.

On the contrary, they make the greatest nuisances of themselves, and always seem as though they felt slighted and had been treated with great injustice. All this is possible only because the reactions expressed in their behaviour still proceed from a mental constellation of reality, which has then, by a certain process, passed over into the crushed state of melancholia.

There is no difficulty in reconstructing this process. An object-

[1] In the first (1917) edition only, this word does not occur.

S.P. XIX—8
it wants to do so by devouring it. Abraham is undoubtedly right in attributing to this connection the refusal of nourishment met with in severe forms of melancholia.

The conclusion which our theory would require—namely, that the disposition to fall ill of melancholia (or some part of that disposition) lies in the predominance of the narcissistic type of object-choice—has unfortunately not yet been confirmed by observation. In the opening remarks of this paper, I admitted that the empirical material upon which this study is founded is insufficient for our needs. If we could assume an agreement between the results of observation and what we have inferred, we should not hesitate to include this regression from object-cathexis to the still narcissistic oral phase of the libido in our characterization of melancholia. Identifications with the object are by no means rare in the transference neuroses either; indeed, they are a well-known mechanism of symptom-formation, especially in hysteria. The difference, however, between narcissistic and hysterical identification may be seen in this: that, whereas in the former the object-cathexis is abandoned, in the latter it persists and manifests its influence, though this is usually confined to certain isolated actions and innervations. In any case, in the transference neuroses, too, identification is the expression of there being something in common, which may signify love. Narcissistic identification is the older of the two and it paves the way to an understanding of hysterical identification, which has been less thoroughly studied.

Melancholia, therefore, borrows some of its features from mourning, and the others from the process of regression from narcissistic object-choice to narcissism. It is on the one hand, like mourning, a reaction to the real loss of a loved object; but over and above this, it is marked by a determinant which is absent in normal mourning or which, if it is present, transforms the hysteric's act into a pathological mourning. The loss of a love-object is an excellent opportunity for the ambivalence in love-rela-

[See above, p. 138 Cf. also Editor’s Note, pp. 241–2.]

[After having first drawn Freud’s attention to this, a private letter written between February and April, 1915. See Joan’s biography (1923, 260).]

[The whole subject of identification was discussed later by Freud in Chapter VII of its Group Psychology (1921c), Standard Ed., 14, 105 ff. There is no early account of hysterical identification in The Interpretation of Dreams (1900a), Standard Ed., 4, 149–51.]
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1. Where there is a disposition to obsessive neurosis the conflict due to ambivalence gives a pathological cast to mourning and forces it to express itself in the form of self-reproaches to the effect that the mourner himself is to blame for the loss of the loved object, i.e. that he has wilfully. These obsessive states of depression following upon the death of a loved person show us what the conflict due to ambivalence can achieve by itself when there is no regressive drawing-in of libido as well. In melancholia, the occasions which give rise to the illness extend for the most part beyond the clear case of a loss by death, and include all those situations of being slighted, neglected or disappointed, which can import opposed feelings of love and hate into the relationship or reinforce an already existing ambivalence. This conflict due to ambivalence, which sometimes arises more from real experiences, sometimes more from constitutional factors, must not be overlooked among the preconditions of melancholia. If the love for the object—a love which cannot be given up though the object itself’s given up—takes refuge in narcissistic identification, then the hate comes into operation on this substituted object, abusing it, disfiguring it, making it suffer and deriving sadistic satisfaction from its suffering. The self-abandoning itself in melancholia, which is without doubt enjoyable, signifies, just like the corresponding phenomenon in obsessive neurosis, a satisfaction of trends of sadism and hate which relate to an object, and which have been turned round upon the subject’s own self in the ways we have been discussing. In both disorders the patients usually still succeed, by the circuitous path of self-punishment, in taking revenge on the original object and in tormenting their loved one through their illness, having resorted to it in order to avoid the need to express their hostility to him openly. After all, the person who has occasioned the patient’s emotional disorder, and on whom his illness is centred, is usually to be found in his immediate environment. The melancholic’s erotic cathexis in regard to his object has thus undergone a double vicissitude: part of it has regressed to identification, but the other part, under the influence of the conflict due to

1 [Much of what follows is elaborated in Chapter V of The Ego and the Id (1923c).]

2 For the distinction between the two, see my paper on “Instincts and their Vicissitudes” [pp. 138–9 above].
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Ambivalence, has been carried back to the stage of sadism which is nearer to that conflict. It is this sadism alone that solves the riddle of the tendency to suicide which makes melancholia so interesting—and so dangerous. So immense is the ego’s self-love, which we have come to recognize as the primal state from which instinctual life proceeds, and so vast is the amount of narcissistic libido which we see liberated in the fear that emerges at a threat to life, that we cannot conceive how the ego can consent to its own destruction. We have long known, it is true, that so neurotic harbours thoughts of suicide which he has not turned back upon himself, and that he is tormented by the tension and impulses against others, but we have never been able to explain what interplay of forces can carry such a purpose through to execution. The analysis of melancholia now shows that the ego can kill itself only if, owing to the return of the object-cathexis, it can treat itself as an object—if it is able to direct against itself the hostility which relates to an object and which represents the ego’s original reaction to objects in the external world. Thus in regression from narcissistic object-choice the object has, it is true, been got rid of, but it nevertheless proved more powerful than the ego itself. In the two opposed situations of being most intensely in love and of suicide the ego is overwhelmed by the object, though in totally different ways.

As regards one particular striking feature of melancholia, that we have mentioned [p. 248], the prominence of the fear of becoming seduced, it is plausible to suppose that it is derived from anal eroticism which has been torn out of its context and altered in a regressive sense.

Melancholia confronts us with yet other problems, the answer to which in part eludes us. The fact that it passes off after a certain time has elapsed without leaving traces of any gross changes is a feature it shares with mourning. We found by way of explanation [pp. 244–5] that in mourning time is needed for the command of reality-testing to be carried out in detail, and that when this work has been accomplished the ego will have succeeded in freeing its libido from the lost object. We may imagine

1 Cf. ‘Instincts and their Vicissitudes’ [p. 196 above].

2 Later discussions of suicide will be found in Chapter V of The Ego and the Id (1923b) and in the last pages of ‘The Economic Problem of Masochism’ (1924c).
the first is a psycho-analytic impression, and the second what we may perhaps call a matter of general economic experience. The impression is based on several psycho-analytic investigations that have already put into words is the content of mania is no different from that of melancholia, that both disorders are wreathed with the 'complex', but that probably in melancholia the ego has succumbed to the complex whereas in mania it has mastered it or pushed it aside. Our second point is afforded by the observation that all states such as joy, exaltation or triumph, which give us the normal model for mania, depend on the same economic conditions. What has happened here is that, as a result of some influence, a large expenditure of psychical energy, long maintained or habitually occurring, has at last become unnecessary, so that it is available for numerous applications and possibilities of discharge—when, for instance, some poor wretch, by winning a large sum of money, is suddenly relieved from chronic worry about his daily bread, or when a long and arduous struggle is finally crowned with success, or when a man finds himself in a position to throw off at a single blow some oppressive compulsion, some false position which he has been so long used to keep up, and so on. All such situations are characterized by high spirits, by the signs of discharge of joyful emotions and by increased readiness for all kinds of action—in just the same way as in mania, and in complete contrast to the depression and inhibition of melancholia. We may venture to assert that mania is nothing other than a triumph of this sort, only that here again what the ego has surmounted and what it is triumphing over remain hidden from it. Alcoholic intoxication, which belongs to the same class of states, may (so far as it is an elated one) be explained in the same way; here there is probably a suspension, produced by toxins, of expenditures of energy in repression. The popular view likes to assume that a man in a manic state of this kind finds such delight in movement and action because he is so 'cheerful'. This false connection must of course be put right. The fact is that the economic conditions in which the subject's mind referred to above has been fulfilled, and this is the reason why he is in such high spirits on the one hand and so uninhibited in action on the other.

If we put these two indications together, what we find is this,

1 [The 'psycho-analytic impression' and the 'general economic experience'.]

In mania, the ego must have got over the loss of the object (or its mourning over the loss, or perhaps the object itself), and thus the whole quota of antithesis which the painful suffering of melancholia had drawn to itself from the ego and 'bounds' will have become available [p. 235]. Moreover, the manic subject plainly demonstrates his liberation from the object which was the cause of his suffering, by seeking like a ravenously hungry man for new object-cathexes.

This explanation certainly sounds plausible, but in the first place it is too indefinite, and, secondly, it gives rise to more new problems and doubts than we can answer. We will not evade a discussion of them, even though we cannot expect it to lead us to a clearer understanding.

In the first place, normal mourning, too, overcomes the loss of the object, and it, too, while it lasts, absorbs all the energies of the ego. Why, then, after it has run its course, is there no hint in its case of the economic condition for a phase of triumph? I find it impossible to answer this objection straight away. It also draws our attention to the fact that we do not even know the economic meaning of the mourning carried out its task [p. 245]. Possibly, however, a conjecture will help us here. Each single one of the memories and situations of expectancy which constitute the libido's attachment to the lost object is met by the verdict of reality that the object no longer exists; and the ego, confronted as it were with the question whether it shall share this fate, is persuaded by the sum of the narcissistic satisfactions it derives from being alive to sever its attachment to the object that has been abolished. We may perhaps suppose that this work of severance is slow and gradual that by the time it has been finished the expenditure of energy necessary for it is also dissipated.1

It is tempting to go on from this conjecture about the work of mourning and try to give an account of the work of melancholia. Here we are met at the outset by an uncertainty. So far we have hardly considered melancholia from the topographical point of view, nor asked ourselves in and between what psychical systems the work of melancholia goes on. What

1 The economic aspect has hitherto received little attention in psycho-analytic writings. I would mention as an exception a paper by Victor Tausk (1915) on motives for repression developed by recompenses.
part of the mental processes of the disease still takes place in connection with the unconscious object-cathexes that have been given up, and what part in connection with their substitute, by identification, in the ego?

The quick and easy answer is that 'the unconscious (thing) presented as an object has been abandoned by the libido.' In reality, however, this presentation is made up of innumerable single impressions (or unconscious traces of them), and this withdrawal of libido is not a process that can be accomplished in a moment, but must certainly, as in mourning, be one in which progress is long-drawn-out and gradual. Whether it begins simultaneously at several points or follows some sort of fixed sequence is not easy to decide; in analyses it often becomes evident that first one and then another memory is activated, and that the elements which always sound the same and are wearisome in their monotony nevertheless take their rise in some different unconscious source. If the object does not possess this great significance for the ego—a significance reinforced by a thousand links—then, too, its loss will not be of a kind to cause either mourning or melancholia. This characteristic of the losing the libido hit by hit is therefore to be ascribed alike to mourning and to melancholia; it is probably supported by the same economic situation and serves the same purposes in both.

As we have seen, however [p. 256], melancholia contains something more than normal mourning. In melancholia the relation to the object is no simple one; it is complicated by the conflict due to ambivalence. The ambivalence is either constitutional, i.e. is an element of every love-relation formed by this particular ego, or else it proceeds precociously from these experiences that involved the threat of losing the object. For this reason the exciting causes of melancholia have a much wider range than those of mourning, which is for the most part occasioned only by a real loss of the object, by its death. In melancholia, accordingly, countless separate struggles are carried on over the object, which hate and love contend with each other; she seeks to detach the libido from the object, the other to maintain this position of the libido against the assault. The location of these separate struggles cannot be assigned to any system but the Ucs., the region of the memory-traces of things.\(^{1}\) ["Devalorization." See above p. 204.]
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(as contrasted with neuro-cathexes.) In mourning, too, the efforts to detach the libido are made in this same system; but in it nothing hinders these processes from proceeding along the normal path through the Pts. to consciousness. This path is blocked for the work of melancholia, owing perhaps to a number of causes or a combination of them. Constitutional ambivalence belongs by its nature to the repressed; traumatic experiences in connection with the object may have activated other repressed material. Thus everything to do with these struggles due to ambivalence remains withdrawn from consciousness, until the outcome characteristic of melancholia has set in. This, as we know, consists in the threatened libidinal cathexis at length abandoning the object, only, however, to draw back to the place in the ego from which it had proceeded. So by taking flight into the ego love escapes extinction. After this regression of the libido the process can become conscious, and it is represented to consciousness as a conflict between one part of the ego and the critical agency.

What consciousness is aware of in the work of melancholia is not the essential part of it, nor is it even part which we may credit with an influence in bringing the illness to an end. We see that the ego debases itself and rages against itself, and we understand as little as the patient what this can lead to and how it can change. We can more readily attribute such a function to the unconscious part of the work, because it is not difficult to perceive an essential analogy between the work of melancholia and of mourning. Just as mourning impels the ego to give up the object by declaring the object to be dead and offering the ego the inducements of continuing to live [p. 255], so does each single struggle of ambivalence loosen the fixation of the libido to the object by disparaging it, designating it and even as it were killing it. It is possible for the process in the Ucs. to come to an end, either after the fury has spent itself or after the object has been abandoned as valueless. We cannot tell which of these two possibilities is the regular or more usual one in bringing melancholia to an end, nor what influence this termination has on the future course of the case. The ego may enjoy in this the satisfaction of knowing itself as the better of the two, as superior to the object.

Even if we accept this view of the work of melancholia, it still does not supply an explanation of the one point on which
MOURNING AND MELANCHOLIA

we were seeking light. It was our expectation that the economic condition for the emergence of mania after the melancholia has run its course is to be found in the ambivalence which dominates the latter affection; and in this we found support from analogies in various other fields. But there is one fact before which that expectation must bow. Of the three preconditions of melancholia—loss of the object, ambivalence, and regression of libido into the ego—the first two are also found in the obsessive self-reproaches arising after a death has occurred. In those cases it is unquestionably the ambivalence which is the motive force of the conflict, and observation shows that after the conflict has come to an end there is nothing left over in the nature of the triumph of a manic state of mind. We are thus led to the third factor as the only one responsible for the result. The accumulation of cathexis which is at first bound and then, after the work of melancholia is finished, becomes free and makes mania possible must be linked with regression of the libido to narcissism. The conflict within the ego, which melancholia substitutes for the struggle over the object, must act like a painful wound which calls for an extraordinarily high anti-cathexis—but here once again, it will be well to call a halt and postpone any further explanation of mania until we have gained some insight into the economic nature, first, of physical pain, and then of the mental pain which is analogous to it. As we already know, the interdependence of the complicated problems of the mind forces us to break off every enquiry before it is completed—till the outcome of some other enquiry can come to its assistance.8

1 [See footnote 1, p. 147 above.]
2 Frances as of 1925: O Z a continuation of this discussion of mania in Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego (1921) (Standard Ed., 18, 190-3).
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