

To: projectivetest@yahoogroups.com  
Subject: [projective test] ZULLIGER Seminar

In his 1969 book 'The Rorschach Systems', EXNER 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 [his personal associates] Oberholzer, Morgenthaler, or Roemer assumed a more active leadership in Rorschach research" (p. 12). The importance of Hans ZULLIGER (whom he does not mention) resides precisely in the fact that this is the only author to have fulfilled both conditions, as indicated in pp. 4-5 of SALOMON's biographical remarks. Roland KUHN, who is one of the two last survivors of the Swiss Classical School (the other one being the same SALOMON) and whom despite his 90 years of age I'm trying to convince to join us at the forthcoming Roma Congress next September (as I did for the 1996 Boston one), and who was also a direct disciple of ZULLIGER in the '30s and '40s, has told me that H. RORSCHACH was not only the latter's teacher and subsequent friend, but also his original training analyst. Such a close relationship makes a strong identification with the Master's original concepts and work understandable, and makes his own life-long work the most suitable, the 'Via Regia' to reach (by deduction or reconstructive induction) some key, seminal concepts remained obscure or fragmentary in the former's sparse written legacy: this has been precisely one of the main goals of my own work until now, as I will explain in my final exposition.

Maybe one of the reasons that prevented ZULLIGER from becoming more widely known in the Rorschach community is the fact that the majority of his publications seem to concern exclusively other blot series, the parallel Behn-Rorschach Test (of which you heard recently how Helge managed to obtain a set) and his own complementary Z-Test. Take for ex. his four books (biography p. 4) of which three bear these latter titles all three available in English by the way. Unfortunately for the discriminating (non-)readers on these grounds (EXNER is a case in point: personal communication during the 1993 Lisboa Congress; RAUSCH DE TRAUBENBERG also made a similar assertion to me during the 1990 Paris Congress), this is an ill-advised hasty conclusion that without being aware keeps them away from a true gold-mine of Rorschachiana insights. The Behn-Rorschach book for instance is one of the best works on Rorschach interpretation I have ever read, filled with cases that are living proof of ZULLIGER's truly "exceptional ability to evaluate psychologically the various formal factors in their infinite combinations" (biography p. 5) as SALOMON puts it. In my opinion our author belongs to an elite of brilliant inkblot interpreters in line with RORSCHACH's own model, level reached by few others like SCHACHTEL and PIOTROWSKI (whose opinion about our author we will touch below). That's the reason why I chose to add still another case study to our Seminar material (the "blind report" from this book, as the first one) and because the subsequent, available ones you have received brilliant as they all are tend to give the wrong impression that he gave more importance to content than to form. I avow I'm not completely satisfied with this first choice since there are other even more impressive ones in the book concerning his interpretive mastery, but this one has the additional advantages of being a blind analysis with independent empirically validating criteria, and of including both the BeRo and the Ro protocols simultaneously demonstrating their nearly perfect accordance in numerical results. By the way, the letters you see in the protocol preceding the actual responses (customary in the German-speaking Rorschach literature) refer to the four positions of the plate from the upright one and successively turning it clockwise: a-b-c-d, that is  $A > V <$ . Elaborating over that formal basis anyway, towards 1950 appeared by him a series of papers and case studies concerning the complementary psychoanalytical content interpretation of protocols centered in the most original, complex-revealing responses, trend to which belong the remaining four cases you have received (Ella, Franz & Lotti, and Edith) that generated much interest at the time which explains why they were translated into English (the first two papers in the Journal of Projective Techniques, almost certainly thanks to the interest of its Editor Bruno KLOPFER; the

last one in the Intl. Journal of Psychoanalysis). One of those articles is an absolute 'must' but unfortunately has never been translated to any language other than Italian (lucky you, Piero!), "The static, dynamic, and depth-psychological diagnosis in the interpretation of the form-interpretation test" (1949, *Psyche* Vol. 3 No. 4, pp. 293-311; 1950, *Riv. di Psicologia* Vol. 46 No. 2, pp. 81-100) where he gives a much more rounded up idea of his whole interpretive method. To quote BOHM's Preface to his 'Vademecum' (introducing Helge's forthcoming Seminar): "To avoid misinterpretations, we warn that with very few exceptions... all the data of this Vademecum refer solely to the static evaluation of protocols [referring here to ZULLIGER's above-mentioned article]. The dynamic evaluation, extraordinarily passionating, and indispensable in the more differentiated protocols, is more art than science. It consists of a detailed analysis in part of the internal structure of each response, that is: of the mutual action between content, [ap]perception and determination, in part of the sequence of the specially important responses, as well as of the language (verbalization) used in the protocol. It is understandable that all this cannot be included in tables, as it happens with the static factors and syndromes". With the possible exception of the 15-y-o Ella, the rather brief four case studies mentioned above focus mainly on the last step, the depth-psychological (i.e., psychoanalytical) interpretation. Furthermore, in that paper ZULLIGER also makes an interesting reference to an unpublished collection of original blind case studies by H. RORSCHACH (cf. PIOTROWSKI pp. 331-332 of his book, included in the Seminar material) and explains in detail how his own technique derives directly from his teacher's. I have been fortunate enough to obtain a copy of a dozen of those protocols from KUHN's hands three years ago (as I mentioned then in Jack's list) that I will be commenting upon for the first time in public at the Roma Congress. They are all exactly of the same kind than the RORSCHACH-OBERHOLZER case study appended as chap. 7 of 'Psychodiagnostics' being contemporary to it: much more detailed than the 28 earlier cases of the book, form AND content are elaborated to new levels (see PIOTROWSKI, (loc. cit.), and the psychoanalytic terminology and conceptualization become ubiquitous. I can testify that the ZULLIGER interpretive developments contained in the cases you have just read are the legitimate and direct continuation of the work of the very last H. RORSCHACH, as exemplified in this collection of case studies that should be published as soon as possible.

Finally, of interest for the history of the method, in the text ZULLIGER takes distance from ROEMER, the black sheep of RORSCHACH's pupils that, between other things, rejected fundamental tenets like the primordial importance of form over content! We will return to this subject later on. Although we disagree completely on other issues as you will see shortly, the excerpts from PIOTROWSKI's book are of much interest because he analyzes with a sharp eye and in detail this changing approach of RORSCHACH to content, and because he is one of the few U.S. authors to sincerely recognize the important role of ZULLIGER in the Rorschach movement in line with this previous analysis on the Master. I would like to call your attention to the opinion that we share entirely about the interpretive ability of our author mentioned above (pp. 370-372, with quotations from the cases you already know). You can also find reference to ZULLIGER's interesting study on thieves (pp. 339-340); although I couldn't find a suitable case to share I can tell that with this syndrome I was once able to pinpoint blind the 3 authors of an inside job in an office from a group of about 25 employees.

At the end I have appended an interesting photographically document from the Journal of Projective Techniques / Personality Assessment, unfortunately not as sharp as expected: PIOTROWSKI looking at... plate II and, on the desktop, plate I of the Zulliger Test!

Of course your questions/comments are more than welcome. My next Seminar post in a couple of days.  
Alberto

---

Join the world's largest e-mail service with MSN Hotmail.  
<http://www.hotmail.com>

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

Buy Stock for \$4  
and no minimums.  
FREE Money 2002.

<http://us.click.yahoo.com/orkH0C/n97DAA/Ey.GAA/SJYoB/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/>