

Peralta on Rorschach Movement Responses Card III Theoretical Foundations

From: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com [mailto:Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com] **On Behalf Of** Alberto A. PERALTA
Sent: Wednesday, February 17, 2010 05:00
To: rorschach_list@yahoogroups.com
Subject: RE: [Rorschach_List] Movement coding tradition

Hi Renata,

Yes, Gérald is right. Historically speaking, this coding rule proceeds from no other than RORSCHACH himself (*Psychodiagnostics*, chap. II.5.b) and was of course maintained in the manuals of the classical tradition like BOHM's and ZULLIGER's. BOHM in particular made a suggestion about giving some foundation to this practice through Gestalt psychology. One key aspect of this issue that should be simultaneously kept in mind is that for the creator of the method the mental "bridging of the gap" on plate III gives the response not only a *M* character, but also a *W* (the classical "technical whole" refused by BECK and EXNER: *Psychodiagnostics* chaps. II.6.b and VII.A.1, i.e. in the posthumous case study the footnote concerning plate III).

I addressed the meaning of the theoretical relationship between these two scoring categories. It is one of the essential aspects of my own work in line with this tradition RORSCHACH, chap. IV.1 and afterwards DWORETZKI, KUHN, PIOTROWSKI..., and I cannot disagree more with the CS's take on the issue as stated by Steve, "As I understand the C.S. rules, the location and the movement determinants are resolved totally independently of one another". For the theoretically- interested, let me just give one meaningful reference on this particular issue (where this classical representative reacts to BECK's position, making a veiled reference precisely to unifying character of Gestalt psychology):

-Binder, H. (1937). Discussion on "Some recent Rorschach problems"
Rorschach Research Exchange, 2, 43-44.

Besides what Gestalt psychology can offer here in the form of an explanation, I have found very enlightening the reference to some ulterior psychoanalysts' contributions in particular DOLTO's conceptions on the "unconscious body image". This touches on RORSCHACH's insistence on the human or human-like features of the *M* response. According to this theory for a subject to reach the mature stage of a unified, anatomically complete body image beyond partial-drives functioning there must be a dynamic unifying (libidinal) force in action, explanation that seems close to the whole-body "primary kinesthetic moment" RORSCHACH assumes at work in the typical *W M H P* interpretation of plate III (by the way this does not extend to just face interpretations, Gérald): *working over different projective material* (spontaneous drawings: I don't think she ever used the Rorschach) DOLTO found that mutilated subjects who had assimilated their *real* disability in a healthy way were perfectly capable of projecting whole

unconscious body images in their productions, while bodily unharmed neurotic subjects were in some way incapable of identifying with full-body characters in action (in connection with the “castration” concept). Pretty neat, huh? Therefore, RORSCHACH’s intuitions seem to have been well oriented in this case.

I apologize for the belated “reaction time” to this thread; I was quite tied up elsewhere.

Alberto

To: Rorschach_List@yahoogroups.com

From: renata.valach@yahoo.com

Date: Fri, 12 Feb 2010 21:50:59 -0800

Subject: [Rorschach_List] Movement coding tradition

Dear Colleagues,

I am writing on behalf of the Hungarian Rorschach Group which aim is to establish new Hungarian non-patient norms. We have almost finished with the protocols-collecting part of our research, and now really have to consider some of the old, traditionally accepted coding rules.

The one, which gives us a lot of thinking, originates from the fundamental principle of gestalt perception, namely the law of Pragnanz. There are some responses in which the white parts between the blots are visually ‘fastened’ to the percept. This gestalt law can very well explain this phenomenon.

In the Hungarian system, it is said that if the subject uses this law implicitly (for example on Table III - seeing people with leg ... which separates from the other parts of the body...still he/she sees the leg and the body as being undivided), a movement perception must have been occurred

Hence traditionally in our system there is no difference between:

- Two women (Table III)
- Two women dancing (Table III)

Because of this implicit law both of the answers are scored as Movement. It is unnecessary to express movement by gesture or verbally, **because the psychological assumption is that the gaps can only be used if the figures being perceived are in (any kind of) movement.**

We tried to trace the origin of this tradition, but have not found any publication yet which would explain the connection between law of Pragnanz and movement perception.

I wonder whether anybody from this list might have heard similar coding tradition for example in the German or Swiss system.

I would truly appreciate any kind of hints, comments, and ideas.

Thank you very much in advance,

Renata Valach, Psychologist
Member of the Hungarian Rorschach Group