concept in C-Major, alphabetically between Car and Cigarette, so distinctively associated with the twentieth century.

Alfredo Morabia, City University of New York and Columbia University,
New York (US)

Akavia, Naamah: **Subjectivity in Motion.** Life, Art, and Movement in the Work of Hermann Rorschach. New York, Routledge, 2013. 208 p. (Routledge Monographs in Mental Health). £ 80.–. ISBN 978-0-415-53623-3

Hermann Rorschach's work is both famous and little known, reduced as it is generally to the inkblot test that he devised and published in *Psychodiagnostik* (1921). The literature devoted to it deals mostly with its practical uses and misuses, as it remains widespread and controversial to this day. In addition, the "Rorschach test" enjoys an immense following among artists since the 1930s and has become a "cultural icon" in popular culture. But despite this popularity or because of it, scholars have been less attracted to Rorschach. The main contributions are a examination of his life and work by Henri Ellenberger ("The Life and Work of Hermann Rorschach", *Bulletin of the Menninger Clinic* 18/5 (1954) 173–219), and, in recent years, a contextualization of the test by Peter Galison ("Image of Self", in: Lorraine Daston (ed.), *Things that Talk: Object Lessons from Art and Science*, 2004, 257–294, 414–418), a collection of essays on Rorschach and his wife (a Russian psychiatrist) (Iris Blum, Peter Witschi (Hrsg.), *Olga und Hermann Rorschach*, 2008), and a first assessment by this reviewer of his position in the history of art and images ("Un pli entre science et art: Hermann Rorschach et son test", in: Anne von der Heiden, Nina Zschocke (ed.), *Autorität des Wissens. Kunst- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte im Dialog*, 2012, 47–82). A monograph by Rita Signer, former curator of the *Archiv und Sammlung Hermann Rorschach* in Bern, is impatiently expected.

To this list can now be added Naamah Akavia's book, which proposes a "cultural-historical examination of the notion of movement in Rorschach's oeuvre" (170). A student at Tel-Aviv University, at the University of California in Los Angeles and at the Max Planck Institute for the History of Science in Berlin, Akavia specialized in the theoretical conceptualization and clinical practice of psychotherapy in Germany, Austria and Switzerland in the 1920s, publishing articles on Freud and Ludwig Binswanger. Her Ph.D. dissertation, edited posthumously for this book, was completed a few days before her death at age thirty-two in 2010. A sad parallel can be drawn with Rorschach's own demise shortly after the publication of *Psychodiagnostik*.

As a historian of science, Akavia proceeds with caution and is duly wary of "the limitations inherent in the employment of a simple narrative of influence to describe historical innovation" (75). She is convinced of the relevance of context and aims at providing two backgrounds for the development of Rorschach's theory and practice: the psychiatric culture of Switzerland and especially the Burghölzli hospital in Zurich on the one hand, and, on the other hand, the art and art theory of his time. She emphasizes Eugen Bleuler's and Carl Gustav Jung's role and situates the Burghölzli between Leipzig, Paris and Vienna, complicating Kurt Danziger's opposition between

a German laboratory-based model and a French clinic-based one (52). To her, the “Swiss model” is characterized by theoretical eclecticism and “a greater willingness to amalgamate elements borrowed from various investigative locales” (65). This sounds like a definition of *Helvetia mediatrix* and can be compared with what Galison described as a “search for neutrality” on Rorschach’s part, both in his relation to competing models and in the suggestivity of his blots (267–274). Rorschach himself had used cultural geography in his multidisciplinary study of two Swiss sect-founders, a connection that would be worth examining further. Akavia observes Rorschach’s rejection of “dogmatic distinctions” and writes that his psychological typology was “more plastic, dynamic and provisional than Jung’s” (15). While she clearly empathizes with this position and with her protagonist, she makes little use of biographical information. This may be due to the fact that despite her attention to context, ideas loom larger than persons, actions and institutions in her historical account.

Subjectivity in Motion rightly insists that Rorschach understood *Psychodiagnostik* as an experiment rather than a test, and as a tool for understanding perception more than for categorizing subjects or detecting pathologies. The kinaesthetic response suggesting human movement and its primacy over the response emphasizing colour were of great importance to him. He associated them with an “introversive” type of experience (v. an “extratensive” one), characterized by a greater creative ability, restrained affectivity and motility, and more “inner life” (126). This polar opposition had axiological implications and he argued that a “materialistic-extratensive epoch” was drawing to a close, giving way to “an unmistakable trend toward introversion again” (166).

Such statements justify the chapter in which Akavia turns toward the artistic and art theoretical context, examining Rorschach’s discussions of Alfred Kubin’s novel *Die andere Seite*, Ferdinand Hodler’s painting *Blick in die Unendlichkeit*, and the Russian avant-garde. A real discovery is the manuscript *Zur Psychologie des Futurismus* (c. 1915), translated into English (175–186) and made available in transcription on the UCLA website (www.history.ucla.edu/academics/fields-of-study/science/naamah-akavia). Although Rorschach’s assessment of the Russians’ “primitivism” is eventually negative, Akavia points out his open-minded rejection of all attempts at pathologizing new artistic tendencies. More generally, she finds “a homology between Rorschach’s tension-filled conceptualizations of movement and the contemporary culture’s conflicted approaches to motion and dynamism” (165). In this domain, the author’s selection of relevant references inevitably appears more limited and arbitrary. It would have been useful, for instance, to compare Rorschach’s valuation of form over content with the *reine Sichtbarkeit* art theory and the *Gestalt* psychology, or his interest for synaesthesia and the artistic production of the mentally ill with that of earlier French authors like Victor Segalen and Marcel Réja. But as it is, this is a precious chapter and it helps making *Subjectivity in Motion* an important and lasting contribution to the literature on Rorschach and, more broadly, on the interaction between art and science in the early twentieth century.

Dario Gamboni, University of Geneva (CH)