

Rorschach Systematization Pitfalls

L. Szondi

News Szondi Institut Articles Literature New Developments Szondi's Applications Szondi Groups Links Personality Developments The Latin Section Rorschach Books Phoenix-Hus

SYSTEMATIZATION: A Definitive Breakthrough in Rorschach Theory

Alberto A. Peralta*

American Rorschach Archives, Miami FL, U.S.A.

To bind, that's good, to unbind, that's better, to rebind, that's perfect! [our translation] G. Bachelard (cited in Mélon, 1976, p. IV)

To have and to be in the child. The child expresses readily the relation to the object by the identification: I am the object. Having is the latter of the two; he falls back again into being after the loss of the object. [our translation, italics added] S. Freud (1941/1972)

Given Rorschach's (1921/1942, Introduction) avowedly inconclusive theoretical foundation of his "perceptual-diagnostic experiment," after his death have alternated an uninterrupted succession of so-called "systematizers"--particularly in the U.S.A. (Exner, 1969) who claim to have amended and completed the unfinished work of the Master mainly in the sense of the revision of the formal (structural) grid of analysis of his method, beginning with Klopfer (& Sender, 1936ab, pp. 5-6, 19) who set the model to others to come, and extending until today (Exner, 1974-1978-1982). However, with few exceptions (the main one being Rapaport et al., 1945-46/1968, pp. 18-19) their approach has been characterized from its inception--contrarily to Rorschach's manifest wish--precisely by a reluctance to make theoretical commitments (Klopfer & Kelley, 1942, p. 221; Exner, 1974, pp. x-xi), which necessarily has led to questionable (Schachtel, 1942, 1966 pp. v-vi, 1-3; Rosegrant, 1984) and most of the time unlasting results.

My point is: Was Rorschach's science-making really unsystematic? What do we really mean by the term system? Exner, the last and most comprehensively-focused of our systematizers and the one who popularized the use of the term in our field, put it this way in the work that announced his own endeavor (1969):

In that the principal author of the Rorschach technique died prematurely, it seemed only natural that a variety of new investigators soon would come on the scene and, in turn, attempt to extend his basic work. Surely, this has been the case and has led to he [sic] development of a variety of Rorschach Systems. The word Systems is used here as contrasted with theories, in that each System represents an approach to the Rorschach. Each System has its own underpinnings in some other general or specific theoretical approach [italics added]. (p. 7)

My point of departure, I must say, is diametrically different, as can be deduced by comparing this former quotation with the conception that I share with the noted French linguist G. Guillaume (cited in Mélon & Lekeuche, 1988):

An empirical science becomes theoretical science from the moment it agrees to see in reality more and other thing than what sensible appearances show. In other words, a science does not really become a science but by the acceptance of an intellectual operation, whose nature is to substitute for the object of empirical reality, not demanding from the mind but the effort of acknowledging it, an object of a superior reality, issued from a constructive operation of the mind. Now then this substitution is virtually accomplished matter from the instant one introduces in science the notion of system... A system is an abstract being, of pure relation, which intelligence sees with its own eyes, after having made its discovery in itself, on the basis of its more or less veiled existence behind the facts of empirical reality [our translation]. (p. 5)

I do believe there is a close relation between true system and theory, and--as surprising as it may sound--that there actually was from the beginning an intuitive (implicit) systematic conception behind Rorschach's original establishment of the schematic (formal) aspect of his method, that the latter already contains in its original version the germ of its own global structural foundation with no need of external additions or corrections: in his case (as I have demonstrated elsewhere: Peralta, 1995b), psychoanalytic theory prepared the soil for the creation of a specific--although incipient--perceptanalytic Rorschach theory.

Let's look a little closer at Rorschach's legacy. He indeed postulated a number of definite formal categories which organize into a tri-dimensional scheme (purposely leaving content aside) that allows the psychological analysis of the responses to his plates: these were--in exact order--the locations G, D, and Dd1 (Zw and Do were originally considered to be subtypes of the latter: 1921/1942, chap. II.6.a+b) on the one hand, and the determinants B, F, and Fb2 (chap. II.5; he introduced shading only later, being baptized since as Hd by Binder: Schachtel, 1966, pp. 75-77) on the other; and, more importantly, he clearly established the existence of particular interrelationships between them (for ex.: G-B, D-Fb, B:Fb). In what follows we'll concentrate in trying to demonstrate and further this conception.

In his already mentioned historical work Exner (1969), trying to find an explanation for the division in the Rorschach ranks into partially opposing schools, also finds unfortunate that "...none of the authors of the five [U.S.] Systems... had any direct experience with Hermann Rorschach" (p. 7), adding that "it is arduous to predict the extent to which any of these Systems might have developed had Rorschach lived longer or had Oberholzer, Morgenthaler, or Roemer assumed a more active leadership in Rorschach research" (p. 12). Actually, there is one researcher who has fulfilled both conditions and consequently has been able to make a fundamental contribution in the sense of attaining the systematization aimed at by Rorschach: that person is Hans Zulliger³.

Zulliger's key accomplishment which contains in a condensed form his main scientific contributions to our field is the internationally well known three-plate inkblot series complementary to the Rorschach that bears his name, also known as the "Z-Test" (1948-54/1969: see Figure 1). Besides other Rorschach-domain interests he was particularly appealed by the inkblots' perceptual-formal psychologically meaningful characteristics, having studied them in depth throughout his life; few people know for example that he was for decades in Switzerland the scientific supervisor of the printing process of successive editions of Rorschach's original plates that we have all been using with plenty of success (Friedemann, 1956; Huber, 1956).

Figure 1. Zulliger's three-plate inkblot series (Z-Test): plate II includes the colors red (center), green (sides), and brown (below); the central and outer details of plate III are also red. Copyright 1951 by Hans Huber Publishers. Reprinted by permission.

If we concentrate now on his own three plates, there is one feature which immediately calls the expert's attention: the fully colored blot was positioned by him in the middle as plate II, instead than at the end like in Rorschach's original series; questioned on that point Zulliger, who was an intuitively enormously gifted practitioner rather than a theoretician, answered with the **very valid reason that otherwise it would be very difficult with his material to diagnose a color shock** (1948-54/1969, chap. 1). This feature has as direct result that on administering the Z-Test, while it is indeed very easy on plate I with its multiple simple G possibilities, it becomes very difficult if not impossible to obtain a good G to this middle plate II, finally resulting relatively less so on plate III requiring however some combinatory efforts (Zulliger, chap. 1; Simón H., 1973, pp. 139-141; cf. Piotrowski, 1957, pp. 73-74): it just happens that, inadvertently (he made no reference to any previous author or theoretical consideration, besides the above mentioned practical reason), Zulliger has unfailingly reproduced in the sequence order of his plates the course of the development of human perception ("syncretism, analysis and synthesis," in Renan's terminology) that Meili-Dworetzki (1939/1956, pp. 108-119) had first so masterfully established in Switzerland with Rorschach's original plates! 4

Salomon, the best Z-Test expert after Zulliger and more inclined into theorization than his mentor, without establishing however the correlations just mentioned had already felt previously to us that there were more powerful theoretical reasons behind his surprising decision (1959a, pp. 286-287; 1963/in press, case study; see below), designating his new series--in a very pertinent way--as "a genetic-structural Rorschach technique" (1962). Conversely, one of the byproducts of our research (see Endnote 2) is the disproving of the frequently endorsed hypothesis (Monod, 1963; Anzieu, 1967; McCully, 1971, pp. 99, 145-146; Simón H., 1993, pp. 274, 287-288) that Rorschach somehow symbolized in the sequence order of his plates from I to X the course of human ontogenetic development, something about what I cannot find the slightest hint (1921/1942, chaps. I.1, III.1; comp. Meili-Dworetzki, 1939/1956, pp. 255-258 in the orig. French version, and Chabert, 1983, pp. 53-55, 63-64).

But, there is more. Because of their respective formal features each one of Zulliger's plates is in practice not only characterized by a particular mode of apperception as we have seen, but simultaneously also by a specific determinant: I=Hd, II=Fb, III=B (Zulliger, 1948-54/1969, chap. 1; Vogel, 1959; Simón H., 1973, pp. 139-141). It is by the way a well-known fact to experts that these two dimensions of Rorschach formal analysis entertain with each other intimate relationships; well then, with an accuracy that gives testimony of the solid intuition which presided their composition, in their material crystallization these three inkblots spontaneously reproduce the findings and learned elaborations on these elective correlations of some of the most eminent Rorschachers: primitive G and shading--plate I--form a totally integrated duo (maintained from the beginning by Binder, 1932/1979 pp. 30-31, 1937 pp. 37-38, 43-44, against Beck; corroborated by Meili-Dworetzki, 1939/1956, pp. 119-122, 129-130, 154, by Holt, 1954, pp. 531-532, and by Salomon, 1962, p. 44), so as do D and color--plate II---on their own (already stated by Furrer, 1930, pp. 7, 20, 50-51, 53, and Meili-Dworetzki, pp. 117, 135; and analyzed by Bohm, 1959/1977, pp. 308-311), and finally also combinatory G and movement--plate III--mutually demonstrate to each other this elective affinity (about which H. Rorschach himself was already plainly aware: 1921/1942 chap. IV.1, the explicit assertion, and chap. VII plate III + Footnote, the explanatory intuition; verified by Meili-Dworetzki, pp. 139-140, and Piotrowski et al., 1963, p. 65; and reasoned by Kuhn, 1953/1977, pp. 505-506).

By the same token, relating both data clusters the determinant series ends by acquiring, by logical necessity, a genetic sequence order never before attained in its entirety, although suggested in isolated observations (compare with Hemmendinger & Schultz, 1960/1977, pp. 90 Footnote 6, 102, and Schachtel, 1966, chap. 6): it was already more or less known matter the primitive character of the usually undifferentiated reaction to shading, to which follows as intermediate stage the specific response--gradually implying each time a greater formal elaboration--to the different colors (exactly as in human development: Meili-Dworetzki, 1939/1956, p. 317 in the orig. French version; Salomon, 1962, p. 49; Schachtel, 1959/1984, chap. 6; Arnheim also, 1974, chap. 7 pp. 331-332); and the degree of maturity implied by movement, above all by contrast to color (Meili-Dworetzki, pp. 172-173; Rapaport et al., 1945-46/1968, pp. 357-359; Piotrowski, 1957, p. 120), has become commonplace knowledge. But there was still missing an overview (a *theôria*, in the original Greek meaning of the word) of all of this development, unless we consider as sufficient the induction implicit in Meili-Dworetzki (follow the sequence of her references in the previous paragraph; comp. Hemmendinger & Schultz, loc. cit.) or afterwards the even very explicit one in Mélon⁵. It is precisely this feature which characterizes Zulliger's contribution: without theorizing it and without voluntarily aiming at taking benefit from the progressive discoveries with the original series of other experts of his own stature, the quintessence of Rorschach practice and its successive theoretical acquisitions is nevertheless caught in the careful composition of this incomparable three-blot series.

To follow our initial conviction and connect then with the system of Psychoanalysis, as it has anew already been done by Salomon (1959b, 1962, 1963/in press; Peralta, 1995b, pp. 667-668), all that has been said until now allows us to analyze psychodynamically in the Z-Test in a manner much more closer to reality the specific biography of the person being studied in the different stages of its unfolding (psychosexual and/or Ego development), as well as to establish in a more sound manner the respective formal correlations with the Rorschach system. In that sense, the phases described by Renan and adopted by Meili-Dworetzki--“syncretism, analysis and synthesis”--can be translated into psychoanalytic language (Table 1): in plate I we can study the first stages of object relations, where subject and object still tend in a large measure to be confused with each other during the long process of separation of the dual-union (symbolized by the “interpenetrating” character of chiaroscuro: Salomon, 1962, pp. 43-53; corroborated by Schachtel, 1966, chap. 10; see also those intuitions in Zulliger, 1952); in plate II is represented the moment of emergence of specific (part) objects able to be manipulated, and of specific affects concerning them, of partial drives each one by its own way (thanks to the selective “cathexing” quality of color: Salomon, 1959b pp. 243-257, 1962 chap. 3; compare with Bohm, 1959/1977, pp. 308-311, and with Murphy's phrasing of the 2nd stage, 1947 p. 66); finally on III, “after the loss of the object” as Freud has it (castration acceptance, surpassing of Oedipus), turning his back on it the subject seizes himself again and his Ego is plainly constituted by way of identification, unified body image (“introversion” or narcissistic return of the libido, classically represented by the movement response: Salomon, 1962, pp. 84-90, 93-96; corroborated by Piotrowski, 1957, pp. 171-172, 305-306; compare with Dolto, 1961/1981, pp. 73-74). In this global circuit of the Ego which repeats itself un-endlessly during the course of life, the 1st and the 3rd moments are the main ones (intuitions already present in Binder, 1932/1979, pp. 46-60; and following his example in Salomon, 1962, pp. 63-70) because they face the subject with the crucial identification dilemma of “who am I?” (the poles Other/Self which concern total-object images, exactly as their representatives Hd/B show a close affinity with whole G responses), non-resolvable--or at least non-mobilizable dilemma without the mediation thru the in-between element that constitutes the (partial and invested: D Fb) object that one can have or not (Mélon, 1976, pp. 106-108 + 85, 38-44).

Table 1

Implicit Psycho-genetic Correlations in Zulliger's Inkblot Series (Z-Test)

Point of view

Plates II, III

Mode of Apperception

primitive G

combinatory D

delimited G (& D)
Determinants

Hd, Fb, B

Genetic Psychology (Meili-Dworetzki)

Primitive globalization

Primitive & Superior analysis

Superior globalization

Psychoanalysis (Salomon)

Pre-object: first stages

Object: libidinal organization

Ego (Subject): identification

Note. Symbols of the Classic Swiss School (abbrev. from German).

The apparent modification subtly introduced by Zulliger in the dynamic “reading” of Rorschach's original and simple perceptual-diagnostic formal scheme (his scoring and interpretation categories) has actually produced the unveiling of the secret of its infinite power as a mirror of the human reality, thru the demonstration of its perfectly projected good-Gestalt quality, of the absolutely meaningful articulation of its elements: in short, it has achieved its definitive systematization in the full meaning of this word. In Kant's (1781/1926) philosophical conception the true SYSTEM is composed by definition of a complete or finite number of CATEGORIES admitting no further additions, but significantly and intimately related to one another in such a way that the coherency and perfection of the whole assures its validity and richness as meaningful organizer and truth revealer of empirical reality. From this standpoint it becomes understandable why we are so critical of those theoretically blind successive “systematizers” of Rorschach's perceptanalytic scheme, who have attempted to amend and extend it, because with them one is never sure if this or the next one will be the final and “best” version of the method, or if there still is a new scoring “category” to be added. And also from this (psychoanalytic) theoretical perspective, confronted with the Classic System (in the sense of the “great classics,” that never get out of date) **Exner's comprehensive effort also falls short of attaining an improvement, chiefly because of the heterogeneous (atheoretical) origin of its elementary components:**

the systematizers of the test have not reconciled... A [n]...element, in the decision to

develop the Comprehensive System, is the fact that most “Rorschachers” solve the dilemma of several systems privately, by intuitively adding a “little Klopfer,” a “dash of Beck,” a few “grains” of Hertz, and a “smidgen” of Piotrowski, to their own experience, and call it The Rorschach. This personalized approach frequently is very useful. In fact, when the work presented here, based largely on empirical data, is compared with the judgements of those who “personalize,” a significant congruence is noted [italics added].... The goal of this work is to present, in a single format, the “best of the Rorschach.” This system draws from each of the systems, incorporating those features which, under careful scrutiny, offer the greatest yield, and adds to them other components based on more recent work with the test... It is not based on any particular theoretical position [italics added], and hopefully, can be useful to both the behaviorist and the phenomenologist. (1974, pp. x-xi)

The method that the author is presenting in those words is exactly the kind of piecemeal approach that Kant criticizes as “**rhapsodical**” assembly by simple juxtaposition of more or less disparate elements in a global “mosaic” where the details, due to their heterogeneous origin (Exner's own opinion: 1974, pp. 7, 10-13, 16, 17), cannot hold together or make sense with the same power of meaning (compare with Arnheim, 1974, pp. 432-434; and Holt, 1954, p. 503 point 4); while in Rorschach's case he has, beginning from a global conception including a limited number of factors but obviously meaningfully interrelated, accomplished in his system sort of one of his own constructive and creative GB+ where all details are dynamically articulated with perfect coherence. Besides Psychoanalysis and despite Exner's final wish, what gives structure to Rorschach's perceptanalytic scheme (that is, the grid of his formal factors of location and determination, organized in the new way of, but implicit in, Zulliger: Table 16) is that in it is represented as well the “...accomplished series” of originary phenomenological dimensions of the unfolding human existence (according to Deese, who may be called Heidegger's successor, cited in Schotte, 1963/1990, pp. 52-54, and in Delion, 1999, p. 580: see below).

We cannot in the present context go into further detail, but we do not want to left unmentioned still other leads to a deeper theoretical (philosophical) foundation of our assertions (see Table 2): they concern the very close correspondence, already pointed at, between our developments and the “triads” that in the growing complexity of the concepts of which they are composed reflect the originary dimensions or structures of the development of human thinking according to several authors (European as well as American), besides, but particularly in, Deese (cited in Bohm, 1951/1958, chap. 15 Footnote 17 in the last German ed.; in Mélon, 1976, p. 29; and in Schotte, 1990, pp. 52-54, 206 Footnote 28). Let's choose here as a sole, but compelling, example of his series “pieces-parts-members” to show how some eminent Rorschach exponents have arrived, independently, to absolutely identical concepts. For example, a “primitive” response (Binder) to the shading of plate I, like “slag.” Has this feature of being composed of pieces that don't differentiate themselves essentially, neither from each other nor from the same homogeneous elementary ensemble (Kuhn, 1953/1977, p. 505)? Contrarily on plate II, the heterogeneity of the stimulation by the different colors

invites the expression in a separate way of action partial drives in (Salomon, 1959b pp. 243-257, 1962 chap. 3; cf Murphy, 1947, p. 66); and leading to the integration of the different details (as the members) of a complete human body thanks to a kinesthetic percept is what is expected in pl. III (Rorschach, 1921/1942, chap. II.5.b; Zulliger, 1948-54, 1969, chap. 1; Dolto, 1961/1981, pp. 73-74).

Table 2

Philosophical/Psychological Concepts (Structural Existential Triads), which Lay Foundation to Rorschach's Formal Scheme thru its Systematization in Zulliger's Inkblot Series (Z-Test)

Authors I

Plates II, III

Hegel - Thesis / Antithesis/Synthesis

Peirce Firstness/ Secondness / Thirdness

Spencer -

Incoherent homogeneity/ Incoherent heterogeneity/ Coherent heterogeneity

Renan (Claparède) -

Syncretism/ Analysis/ Synthesis

Murphy (Lewin/Werner) -

Globality/ Differentiation/ Integration

Bachelard -

Bind/ Unbind/ Rebind/Aulagnier (Freud)

Originary Primary/ Secondary

Lacan -

Real/ Imaginary/ Symbolic

Fink -

Space Time/ Movement

Deese -

strength/ violence/ power
similar/ alike/ same

pieces/ parts/ members

quantity/ quality/ measure

Base/ Foundation/ Origin

Furthermore, that the material worked out by Zulliger and shaped by him into his three images has resulted so perfectly balanced that it has come to constitute inside science the equivalent to a Work of Art, like a triptych which reveals thru its equilibrated perceptual-formal symbolism the stages as well as the more important components in the development of that same human existence, can be demonstrated having recourse to the opinion of one of the most renown specialists in the field:

If one wishes to be admitted to the presence of a work of art, one must, first of all, face it as a whole. What is it that comes across? What is the mood of the colors, the dynamics of the shapes? Before we identify any one element, the total composition makes a statement that we must not lose. We look for a theme, a key to which everything relates [compare with Bohm, 1959/1977, pp. 308-309].... Safely guided by the structure of the whole, we then try to recognize the principal features and explore their dominion over dependent details. Gradually, the entire wealth of the work reveals itself and falls into place, and as we perceive it correctly, it begins to engage all the powers of the mind with its message [*italics added*] (Arnheim, 1974, p. 8)

(Compare also this quotation, as well as the following one, with Simón H., 1973, pp. 139-141). And still:

Why is balance an indispensable factor of aesthetic composition? One of the reasons, which is often overlooked in discussions of the subject, is that visually, just as physically, balance represents the state of distribution in which all elements have come to rest. In a balanced composition all factors of shape, direction, location, etc. are mutually determined by each other in such a way that no change seems possible and the whole assumes the character of "necessity" in all its parts [*italics added*]; (Arnheim, 1951, p. 267) and that's precisely what Zulliger accomplished with the specific placing of the locations, determinants, sequence, etc., of his plates, without willfully pursuing it but spontaneously, like the true Rorschach artist that he was (cf. on this issue: Mélon & Lekeuche, 1988, p. 80).

References

Anzieu, D. (1967). La signification particulière de chaque planche du Test de Rorschach [The particular meaning of each plate of Rorschach's Test]. *Revue de Psychologie et des Sciences de l'Éducation*, 2, 309-325.

Arnheim, R. (1951). Perceptual and aesthetic aspects of the movement response. *Journal of Personality*, 19, 265-281.

Arnheim, R. (1974). *Art and visual perception: A psychology of the creative eye (the new version)*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Binder, H. (1979). Die Helldunkeldeutungen im psychodiagnostischen Experiment von Rorschach: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur theoretischen Begründung des Experimentes [The light-dark interpretations in Rorschach's psychodiagnostic experiment: Simultaneously a contribution to the theoretical foundation of the experiment]. In H. Binder (K. W. Bash, Ed.), *Ausgewählte Arbeiten: Bd. II. Der Rorschach-Versuch* (pp. 33-154). Bern: Huber. (Reprinted from *Schweizer Archiv für Neurologie und Psychiatrie*, 1932, 30, 1-67, 233-286)

Binder, H. (1937). The "light-dark" interpretations in Rorschach's experiment. *Rorschach Research Exchange*, 2, 37-44.

Bohm, E. (1958). *A textbook in Rorschach Test diagnosis* (S. J. Beck, Trans.). New York: Grune & Stratton. (Orig. publ. in 1951)

Bohm, E. (1977). The Binder chiaroscuro system and its theoretical basis. In M. A. Rickers-Ovsiankina (Ed.), *Rorschach psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 303-324). Huntington, NY: Krieger. (Reprinted from *Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 1959, 34 [Rorschachiana, Vol. V], 160-178)

Chabert, C. (1983). *Le Rorschach en clinique adulte: Interprétation psychanalytique* [The Rorschach in clinical practice with adults: Psychoanalytic interpretation]. Paris: Dunod.

Delion, P. (1999). Penser la Psychiatrie selon les perspectives ouvertes par l'enseignement de Jacques Schotte [Thinking on Psychiatry: perspectives opened up by the teachings of Jacques Schotte]. *L'Information Psychiatrique*, 75(6), 571-585.

Dolto, F. (1981). Personologie et image du corps [Personology and body image]. In F. Dolto, *Au jeu du désir* (chap. 4). Paris: Seuil. (Reprinted from *La Psychanalyse*, 1961, 6)

Ellenberger, H. F. (1954). The life and work of Hermann Rorschach (1884-1922). *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic*, 18, 173-219.

Exner, J. E., Jr. (1969). *The Rorschach Systems*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Exner, J. E., Jr. (1974-1978-1982). *The Rorschach: A Comprehensive System* (3 vols.). New York: Wiley. (Re-edited in 1993-91-95)

Freud, S. (1940). *Drei Abhandlungen zur Sexualtheorie* [Three essays to a sexual theory]. In S. Freud, *Gesammelte Werke* (Vol. 5, p. 29). London: Imago. (Orig. publ. in 1905)

Freud, S. (1972). *Ergebnisse, Ideen, Probleme* [Results, ideas, problems]. In S. Freud, *Gesammelte Werke* (Vol. 17, p. 151). Frankfurt am Main: Fischer. (Orig. publ. in 1941)

Friedemann, A. (1956). *Le problème de la reproduction des planches de Rorschach* [The problem of the reproduction of Rorschach's plates] [*Rorschachiana: Communications of the International Rorschach Society*]. *Zeitschrift für Diagnostische Psychologie und Persönlichkeitsforschung*, 4, 97-100.

Furrer, A. (1930). *Der Auffassungsvorgang beim Rorschach'schen psychodiagnostischen Versuch* [The Apperceptive Process in Rorschach's Psychodiagnostic Test]. Zürich: Buchdruckerei zur Alten Universität.

Hemmendinger, L. (1953). *Perceptual organization and development as reflected in the structure of Rorschach test responses*. *Journal of Projective Techniques*, 17, 162-170.

Hemmendinger, L., & Schultz, K. D. (1977). *Developmental theory and the Rorschach method*. In M. A. Rickers-Ovsiankina (Ed.), *Rorschach psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 83-111). Huntington, NY: Krieger. (Orig. publ. in 1960)

Holt, R. R. (1954). *Implications of some contemporary personality theories for Rorschach rationale*. In B. Klopfer, M. D. Ainsworth, W. G. Klopfer & R. R. Holt, *Developments in the Rorschach technique: Vol. 1. Technique and theory* (pp. 501-560). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World.

Huber, H., Jr. (1956). *La qualité des planches de Rorschach* [The quality of Rorschach's plates] [*Rorschachiana: Communications of the International Rorschach Society*]. *Zeitschrift für Diagnostische Psychologie und Persönlichkeitsforschung*, 4, 115-118.

Kant, I. (1926). *Kritik der reinen Vernunft* [Critic of pure reason]. Leipzig. (Orig. publ. in 1781)

Klopfer, B., & Kelley, D. M. (1942). *The Rorschach technique: A manual for a projective method of personality diagnosis*. Yonkers-on-Hudson, NY: World Book.

Klopfer, B., & Sender, S. (1936a). *Application of the Rorschach Test to child behavior problems as facilitated by a refinement of the scoring method*. *Rorschach Research Exchange*, 1, 5-17.

Klopfer, B., & Sender, S. (1936b). A system of refined scoring symbols. *Rorschach Research Exchange*, 1, 19-22.

Kuhn, R. (1977). Some problems concerning the psychological implications of Rorschach's form interpretation test: Part II. In M. A. Rickers-Ovsiankina (Ed.), *Rorschach psychology* (2nd ed.) (pp. 503-511). Huntington, NY: Krieger. (Reprinted from *Rorschachiana: Internationale Zeitschrift für Rorschach-Forschung und andere projektive Methoden*, 1953, 1, 320-333)

Kuhn, R. (in press). Ma vue sur l'histoire, l'état actuel et l'avenir du test de Rorschach [My view on the history, the present state and the future of Rorschach's test]. *Bulletin de Psychologie*.

Leichtman, M. (1988). When does the Rorschach become the Rorschach? Stages in the mastery of the test. In H. D. Lerner & P. M. Lerner (Eds.), *Primitive Mental States and the Rorschach* (pp. 559-600). Madison, CT: International Universities Press.

Leichtman, M. (1996). *The Rorschach: A developmental perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Analytic Press.

Loosli-Usteri, M. (1969). *Manuel pratique du Test de Rorschach* [Practical manual of the Rorschach Test]. Paris: Hermann. (Orig. publ. in 1958)

McCully, R. S. (1971). *Rorschach Theory and Symbolism*. Baltimore: Williams & Wilkins.

Meili-Dworetzki, G. (1956). The development of perception in the Rorschach. In B. Klopfer (Ed.), *Developments in the Rorschach technique: Vol. 2. Fields of application* (pp. 104-176). New York: Harcourt, Brace & World. (Reprinted from *Archives de Psychologie*, 1939, 27[Suppl., Serial No. 107-108], 233-396)

Mélon, J. (1975). Rorschach et Szondi: Eléments pour une compréhension réciproque [Rorschach and Szondi: Elements for a reciprocal understanding]. *Les Feuilles Psychiatriques de Liège*, 8, 252-272.

Mélon, J. (1976). *Figures du Moi: Szondi, Rorschach et Freud* [Ego figures: Szondi, Rorschach and Freud]. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Université de Liège, Belgium.

Mélon, J., & Lekeuche, P. (1988). *Dialectique des pulsions* [Drives dialectics]. Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium: Academia.

Monod, M. (1963). Le symbolisme des planches et leur succession dans l'interprétation du Rorschach [The symbolism of plates and their sequence in Rorschach interpretation]. *Bulletin de Psychologie*, 17, 155-157.

Murphy, G. (1947). *Personality: A biosocial approach to origins and structure*. New York: Basic Books.

Oberholzer, E. (1968). Rorschach - the Man and the Test. *Journal of Projective Techniques and Personality Assessment*, 32, 502-508.

Peralta, A. A. (1995a). Notice pour introduire le problème structural de la Perceptanalyse [Notice to introduce the structural problem of Perceptanalysis]. *Cahiers du Centre d'Etudes Pathoanalytiques*, 5, 155-163.

Peralta, A. A. (1995b). Psychoanalytic development of the Classic Rorschach System. In V. Moita & A. A. Pires (Eds.), *XIVth International Congress of Rorschach and Projective Methods – Proceedings Book* (pp. 659-682). Lisboa: Sociedade Portuguesa de Rorschach.

Piotrowski, Z. A. (1957). *Perceptanalysis: The Rorschach method fundamentally reworked, expanded, and systematized*. Philadelphia: Ex Libris.

Piotrowski, Z. A., Rock, M. R., & Grela, J. J. (1963). *The Perceptanalytic Executive Scale*. New York: Grune & Stratton.

Rapaport, D., Gill, M. M., & Schafer, R. (Holt, R. R., Ed.). (1968). *Diagnostic psychological testing* (rev. ed.). London: University of London Press. (Orig. publ. in 1945-1946)

Rorschach, H. (1942). *Psychodiagnostics* (P. Lemkau & B. Kronenberger, Trans.). Bern: Huber. (Orig. publ. in 1921)

Rosegrant, J. (1984). Rorschach object relations and fantasy themes incorrectly scored as determinants. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48, 467-475.

Salomon, F. (1959a). Diagnostic des mécanismes de défense dans le Test Z individuel et collectif [Defense mechanisms diagnosis in Zulliger's individual and group test]. *Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 34(Rorschachiana, Vol. V), 286-296.

Salomon, F. (1959b). Fixations, régressions et homosexualité dans les tests de type Rorschach: Contribution B un diagnostic dynamique et structural [Fixations, regressions and homosexuality in Rorschach-type tests: Contribution to a dynamic and structural diagnosis]. *Revue Française de Psychanalyse*, 23, 235-282.

Salomon, F. (1962). *Ich-Diagnostik im Zulliger-Test (Z-Test): Eine genetisch-strukturelle Rorschachtechnik* [Ego-diagnostics in Zulliger's Test (Z-Test): A genetic-structural Rorschach technique]. Bern: Huber.

Salomon, F. (Peralta, A. A., Ed. and Trans.). (in press). The symbolic meaning of the formal Rorschach factors. *British Journal of Projective Psychology*. (Reprinted from *Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 1963, 45[Rorschachiana, Vol. VIII], 163-175)

Schachtel, E. G. (1942). [Review of *The Rorschach technique. A manual for a projective method of personality diagnosis*]. *Psychiatry*, 5, 604-606.

Schachtel, E. G. (1984). *Metamorphosis: On the development of affect, perception, attention, and memory*. New York: Da Capo. (Orig. publ. in 1959)

Schachtel, E. G. (1966). *Experiential foundations of Rorschach's Test*. London: Tavistock.

Schotte, J. (1990). Notice pour introduire le problème structural de la Schicksalsanalyse [Notice to introduce the structural problem of Schicksalsanalysis]. In J. Schotte, Szondi avec Freud (pp. 21-75). Bruxelles: De Boeck - Wesmael. (Reprinted from *Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 1963, 47[Szondiana, vol. V], 144-201)

Schotte, J. (1990). Szondi avec Freud: Sur la voie d'une psychiatrie pulsionnelle [Szondi with Freud: On the way of a drive-based psychiatry]. Bruxelles: De Boeck - Wesmael.

Simón Hernández, M.-E. (1973). El Z-Test (Test de Zulliger) en niñas valencianas de 6-6;11 años [The Z-Test (Zulliger Test) in valencian girls aged 6-6;11 years]. *Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 55(Rorschachiana, Vol. X), 139-168.

Simón Hernández, M.-E. (1993). El Cosmodrama Rorschach: Nuevas hipótesis metodológicas sobre el Rorschach [The Rorschach Cosmodrama: New methodological hypotheses on the Rorschach]. Valencia: M.E.S.H.

Szondi, L. (1956). *Ich-Analyse [Ego-Analysis]*. Bern: Huber.

Vogel, H. (1959). Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Aufforderungscharaktere des Tafeln-Z-Tests [A contribution to the question of the stimulus value of the Z-Test plates]. *Beiheft zur Schweizerischen Zeitschrift für Psychologie und ihre Anwendungen*, 34(Rorschachiana, Vol. V), 351-360.

Zulliger, H. (1952). Ein Ablösungs-Konflikt [A separation conflict]. *Psyche*, 6(3), 210-218.

Zulliger, H. (Salomon, F., Ed.). (1969). *The Zulliger individual and group Test* (D. T. Dubrovsky., Trans.) (comb. ed.). New York: International Universities Press. (Orig. publ. in 1948-1954)

Notes

* Director, American Rorschach Archives: EPS# Y-10241/ P.O. Box 02-5556, Miami FL 33102-5556 U.S.A. (Ameroarchives@hotmail.com). This work was originally delivered at the Zulliger Workshop of the XIVth International Rorschach Congress (Lisboa, July 1993), to honor Hans Zulliger in his birth centenary (there is also a previous French version of this paper: Peralta, 1995a).

1. Symbols of the Classic Swiss School (abbrev. from German): Bohm, 1951/1958, appendix "Symbols and abbreviations".

2. See Endnote 1. In my opinion these intuitions were essential in his work unfolding, for ex. this latter (determinants) series was the guiding principle that dictated the for a long time remained very enigmatic sequence order of his inkblots: I-III respectively as the B plates (Rorschach, 1921/1942, chap. II.5.b; Bohm, 1951/1958, chap. 4.A.I.2.b; Loosli-Usteri, 1958/1969, chap. III.B.3 p. 50), IV-VII the predominantly F-suggesting (Rorschach, chap. III.1), VIII-X obviously the Fb ones; as Ellenberger (1954, chap. III.D) has pointed out this organizing principle he adopted from Jung and manifests itself everywhere in his work: in the left-right composition of Erlebnistypus (compare Schachtel, 1966, pp. 76-77), in the presentation of the determinants in the psychograms of all of his cases in chap. V (cf. Oberholzer, 1968), and in the interpretive table in chap. VII.3 that Klopfer has popularized as the determinants bar graph in his tabulation sheet.

3. Not only did he undergo his training analysis with Rorschach (Kuhn, in press, Pt. Ia) and learn the method from the man himself (Zulliger, 1948-54/1969, "Biographical remarks" pp. 3-7), but his works and influence amount to a "System" in Exner's sense pretty much comparable to the Rapaport-Schafer one (Zulliger-Salomon System: Peralta, 1995b).

4. Her results were by the way completely and independently replicated in America by Hemmendinger (1953). Curiously, as Bohm (1951/1958, chap. 15 Footnote 17 in the last German ed.) elaborating on Holt (1954, pp. 518-519, 531-534) points out, the existence of these three stages has been independently established, rediscovered and reported many times since the XIXth century by several philosophers and general psychologists in different countries, which is very eloquent concerning its universal validity: Spencer, Renan, Claparède, Lewin, Werner, Murphy, etc. (see Table 2 below). Despite the utmost importance of these findings for a systematic Rorschach theory (Holt, p. 503 point 3; Bohm, loc. cit., ref. to "evaluation" i.e. chap. 7; Salomon, 1959a pp. 286-287, 1962 pp. 11-12, 13-14, see next paragraph in Hemmendinger & Schultz, 1960/1977, pp. 83, 90. Footnote 6, 102, 103, 108) it is only now that the contributions of those few Rorschach researchers seem to have been developed to their full implications (comp. the present work with Leichtman's, 1988, 1996).

5. Who is not only "undoubtedly the best connoisseur and practitioner of the Szondi test today" [our translation] (Schotte, 1990, p. 154) but also one of the most eminent contemporary specialists of the Rorschach: he serves himself of the former instrument to explore the latter with a sounder theoretical basis (Mélon, 1975, 1976), making profit

from Schotte's (pp. 5-11) "drive circuits theory" which approaches from an advantageous genetic perspective Szondi's profound analysis of the elementary psychoanalytical mechanisms of the Ego; one of the results commented upon orally in a group discussion at Louvain-la-Neuve (personal communication, 1984-1988) was precisely the aforementioned Ego-attuned developmental sequence of Rorschach's determinants: I=Hd, IIa=F, IIb=Fb, III=B. If in his Doctoral Dissertation he was searching "...in the ego vector (Sch) sort of a compass for exploring the Rorschach domains and elevate kind of a new geographical chart" [our translation] (1976, p. III), we'll dare say that now that's already accomplished matter! (See Table 1). Our own steps forward, obviously, owe a lot to our personal association with the Louvain School during the years indicated.

6. Our exposition is certainly simplified, in the sense that we have alluded only implicitly to the apperception of rare details Dd and to the pure formal determinant F, which by the way form also both a new perceptanalytic unity: the one that makes possible and in fact initiates analysis ("objectivation": Schachtel, 1966 p. 60 Footnote 9, 1959/1984 chap. 6; Meili-Dworetzki, 1939/1956, pp. 112, 119, 130-135, 172; Mélon, 1975 p. 268, 1976 pp. 76, 68; cf. Endnote 5 above). The intermediate stage (the having issue) is, as Freud clearly recognized, a double-faced one actually with two sub-stages dominated by opposing positions, as very ably demonstrate the perverted (to have the object, no matter what) and the neurotic (not to have, to renounce) disturbances, being both concerned with the same problem but regarding its solution the latter becomes "the negative" of the former (1905/1940, Essay 1 Pt. 4); there is of course the more paramount problem, as Shakespeare's Hamlet very well knows, of "to be or not to be" with which psychotics and thymo/psychopaths are respectively concerned. All these problems are elaborated in the most illuminating way by Szondi (1956) and Schotte (1990).