

To: projectivetest@yahogroups.com
Subject: [projectivetest] ZULLIGER Seminar

Despite his high respect for ZULLIGER whom he tries to emulate in his interpretive way, one of the fundamental points in which I disagree with PIOTROWSKI is when he asserts that "it cannot be said... that Rorschach's perceptanalysis developed from Freud's psychoanalysis. The roots of each are different. Their aims were so dissimilar that there was no need for a synthesis of the two scientific movements" (1958, Amer. J. Orthopsych. 28, p. 37). Like so many others, before and after him, this author tries to restrict the psychoanalytic contribution to the Rorschach exclusively to content analysis its unessential part (see pp. 660-662 and particularly Footnote 107 of my paper "Psychoanalytic Development...", in the 2nd package of Seminar literature). According to my view of the issue this is a complete misunderstanding. I can quote here in my benefit H. RORSCHACH himself in the OBERHOLZER case, referring to what may be called the 'basic rule' of inkblot interpretation: "One must warn, nevertheless, that what is really important isn't the interpreted object [the content], but rather the particular type of kinesthesia [the form] in the same way that in the interpretation of dreams the essential thing isn't the manifest content, the dream image". If you bother to check FREUD's 'Traumdeutung' you will be able to confirm that the founder of Psychoanalysis, 20 years earlier, took exactly the same revolutionary position about the preponderance of form over content in this area (chap. 6, letter C: "The form of the dream or of dreaming is used with an astonishing frequency for the representation of the latent content"; letter I, last footnote: "[erroneously, some analysts] try to find the essence of dreams in their latent content... In the last analysis, dreams are no more than a particular form of thinking, made possible by the conditions of sleep. It is the dream-work which creates this form and it alone is the essence of dream") as RORSCHACH rightly understood, which explains why both were able to interpret in a more revealing way than ever before their chosen objects of study, subjects' dream- and inkblot-images respectively.

It may seem surprising that the Rorschach-interpreter capable of the feats presented in the case studies already reviewed did not come in principle to be a part of the content-trend represented by authors like ROEMER (then) and ARONOW (today). For those who, on this basis, may be tempted to read the same equation (Psychoanalysis = content) in ZULLIGER, I warn you that this author was also the first to propose the _systematic_ conceptualization of the whole set of _formal_ factors in psychoanalytical terms ("Psychoanalytic Development..." p. 666), again in his all-important Behn-Rorschach book (1941, chap. 9). Let me confront PIOTROWSKI with himself: when he rightfully limits the contentions of "Lindner [who focusing on content] interprets responses like 'blobs of dirt,' 'dust mice,' 'termites,' 'petrified fecal matter,' 'animal droppings,' wherever seen, as indications of 'obsession-compulsion with typical anal-erotic aggressive character structure.' However, this interpretation is implied in the very fact that these patients select unusual small-detail areas for interpretation" ('Perceptanalysis' p. 381), he is only reproducing ZULLIGER's opinion quoted by him earlier in the same chapter (pp. 336-337 in your package, case of the obsessive-compulsive 16-y-o boy). The insightful correlations established by the latter, W-oral character, D-genital character, Dd-anal character, S-aggressive character, were then the 'declaration of intentions' of a new,

synthetic Rorschach-psychoanalytic System developed to a finished form by his direct disciple Fritz SALOMON (Zulliger-Salomon System, comparable in many respects to the Rapaport-Schafer one). I will not enter here at length into the latter's specific contributions to the Rorschach in this line since you have both a summarized ("Psychoanalytic Development..." pp. 667-668) and a detailed (my translation, with plenty of notes added, of his important paper in Rorschachiana VIII which includes a Z-Test case study) exposition of them in the last package of Seminar reading material.

The last task we have ahead of us in this Seminar is to focus on ZULLIGER's own three-plate inkblot series, which implicitly synthesizes the best he has left us to further our science. To offer a fair comparison of it with the original Rorschach series, I like to use the analogy of laptop/desktop computers: both can coexist without any clash, each one with its particular advantages and shortcomings. You have already had the opportunity to study the significant responses of a girl (Edith) to these images, and now I will advise you to concentrate on their specific formal features beginning by reading the respective parts of ZULLIGER's introduction to his Manual. As I said earlier I have also included two historical papers from the Journal of Projective Techniques (EBLE & al. 1963, LEFKOWITZ 1968) which despite their positive results concerning the usefulness of the Z-Test don't appear to have had any success motivating the U.S. public towards its use. You can find a more updated but equally positive overview in MAHMOOD's article (1990) although I don't share some of his specific assertions, particularly his high hopes for "Exnerizing" this instrument (p. 1). Let me explain myself in some detail.

As some of you may know I have used ZULLIGER's insights to try to go deeper into the theoretical structure H. RORSCHACH had in the back of his mind when creating his test, I believe with some success until now. I will confine myself here to a very condensed exposition of my reasoning that can be followed at length in my paper "Systematization" available at www.motiv-analys.se/Szondi/t447/t447.htm. In short, I believe our author has been able to truly _systematize_, in the strong (philosophical, KANTian) meaning of the term and not in the rather superficial sense it is used by EXNER, the formal-scoring grid of analysis our common Master has left us by introducing what I like to call a _temporal_ perspective to a representation of things until then purely _spatial_; he has done this through an intuitive but clear-headed selection of the formal-symbolic features of each one of his three inkblots as well as of their original sequence order. RORSCHACH's triadic spatial schema, as bilaterally symmetrical as his ten inkblots, can be found in the interpretive table used to analyze the OBERHOLZER case: the formal categories of movement, form and color, that is M-F-C organized in just this left-center-right order that in my opinion also served as organizing principle for his series of plates, I to III the more movement-provoking, IV to VII the pure-form inducing ones, and VIII to X the color-offering. As you have read, apparently for a purely practical reason, ZULLIGER (who, coincidentally, also gave privilege to the number 3) has changed this by putting the multicolored card in the middle of the sequence as number II. The final result is that, without willfully pursuing it, he has perfectly reproduced in his series the genetic stages of the development of perception as established initially by MEILI-DWORETZKI with _RORSCHACH's original plates!: "The development toward the differentiation of configurational data is characterized by three main stages: (a) globalization (syncretism); (b) analysis; (c) synthesis [W --> D --> (W + D)]" (1956, KLOPFER's "Developments..." Vol. II, p. 115; compare with

ZULLIGER's own description of his cards).

In my opinion these original features of his own series of three plates is what makes understandable that he was so often able to accurately read from them so many things about his subject's personal life, and is what makes his test an extraordinary instrument that emulates the genius of RORSCHACH. Let me quote here BOHM again, at the very end of chap. 16 about theory of his Textbook: "As is known, an experienced Rorschach expert and, above all, familiarized with depth psychology can sometimes deduce important data of the subject's inner biography (let's recall here HANS ZULLIGER's case works). Precisely for this part of the experience with the Rorschach test there was until now no satisfactory explanation offered by experimental psychology... But not only personality, but also all perception, is the result_of_a_process_of_evolution... There exists a 'micro-macro' relationship in the form of a parallelism, first between the developmental phases of perception in isolation and of ontogenesis in general... Only through these relationships between mini-genesis of perception and ontogenesis of personality, is it understandable that a perceptual psychological experiment, like the Rorschach test, reflects and makes understandable in practice not only certain basic attitudes (spatial orientation, analytical or global experience type, and other things), but also the 'previous history' of the peculiarities of experience and of behavior of a personality".

This is precisely the reasoning behind my assertion at the end of my paper "Psychoanalytic Development..." (p. 668) that this unfortunately- widely unknown Zulliger-Salomon System has very efficiently met the shortcomings pointed out by ANZIEU in the Rorschach method as a truly psychoanalytic instrument, brilliantly refuting his assertion that "a projective test will never allow to grasp the pathogenic individual fantasm" (1970, p. 6). This concludes my brief exposition of Hans ZULLIGER's, you will agree, important contribution to the Rorschach field, that I hope you have found interesting enough and maybe has awakened the desire to continue your readings on this trail, using the distributed literature as springboard. I remain open and ready to assist anyone, back-channel or here on the list, who might feel interested in going still farther on. In the meantime and as far as I'm concerned, those ready with other Seminar subjects can go ahead.
Alberto

Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail.

<http://www.hotmail.com>

----- Yahoo! Groups Sponsor ----->

Kwick Pick opens locked car doors,
front doors, drawers, briefcases,
padlocks, and more. On sale now!

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/ehaLqB/Fg5DAA/Ey.GAA/SJYoIB/TM>

----->

To unsubscribe from this group, send an email to:
projectivetest-unsubscribe@yahoogroups.com

Your use of Yahoo! Groups is subject to <http://docs.yahoo.com/info/terms/>