

pathology, and physical trauma can lead to psychopathology. Usually, the two processes occur together. Knowledge steadily reduces the number of unknown morbid processes that are not understood.

The period from the seventeenth to the nineteenth century is the most confused one-twentieth of the recorded span of medical history, a period when psychopathology was almost ignored. A brief excursion into history will show that this neglect did not always obtain. From Hippocrates to Galen and Timothy Bright, the physician's concern was with psychic as well as organic pathology. Indeed the humoral theory, found not only in ancient Greek and Roman medicine but also in the medical systems of India, China and Egypt, is an attempt, within the limits of knowledge available to those civilizations, to explain the interchange between psyche and soma, this being, then as now, a matter of prime concern to the physician. Unhappily for psychiatry, the seventeenth century saw an upsurge in physiology and organic (physical) medicine; psychic pathology tended to be overlooked in the new enthusiasm. Today we see a move within medicine to redress the balance. The dynamically orientated psychiatrists were an active group in founding the Royal College, independent of the physicians but still within the corpus of Medicine.

It is now possible to understand the mistake made by Szasz. He states (Szasz, 1974), 'illness means there is something wrong with the *body* of the person said to be ill' (my italics). Wrongly, by ignoring psychic pathology, he limits the definition of disease and the function of medicine. The same misunderstanding is seen in the statements by critics of the 'medical model'.

The patient being ill-at-ease psychically, somatically, or both, seeks the help of a healer, and this constitutes the reason for the intervention of the medical practitioner. This clinician is ready to help with, for example, an ulcer—the end product of anxiety, or with, for example, depression—the end product of physical injury. Where special knowledge of a system is required, the medical practitioner becomes a specialist. In the case of the psychic system the specialist is the psychiatrist, a term meaning 'healer of the psyche', originally defined and described by J. C. Reil in a book (Reil, 1803) devoted to treatment by psychic methods. Thus disorders of the psyche is the true field of the psychiatrist. If insanity is a matter of psychopathology, that too is a part of this field. But should insanity be a matter of somatic defect, as is likely, then it becomes the field of the neurologist or neuro-psychiatrist.

A concept of 'biological defect' based on statistics, confuses anomaly with morbid process and gives an unclear guide to aetiology, diagnosis, pathology, and treatment. The concept does not face up to the finding that the norm may be unhealthy. It is particularly unfortunate to equate disease with low fertility; history amply demonstrates the high fertility of those suffering from an undoubted disease, for instance, in the early stages of GPI or in a state of severe neurosis, as in a problem family.

JOHN G. HOWELLS

*The Institute of Family Psychiatry,
The Ipswich Hospital,
23 Henley Road,
Ipswich IP1 3TF.*

REFERENCES

- KENDELL, R. E. (1975) The concept of disease and its implications for psychiatry. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, **127**, 305–15.
- REIL, J. C. (1803) *Rhapsodien über die Anwendung der psychischen Curmethode auf Geisteszerrüttungen*. Halle: Curt.
- SZASZ, T. S. (1974) Medicine and madness. In *Britannica Book of the Year*. Chicago, Ill.: Encyclopaedia Britannica.

SPEECH IN SCHIZOPHRENIC PATIENTS

DEAR SIR,

I was interested to read the comments made by Silverman and Marcus (*Journal*, October 1975, **127**, 415) on the paper by myself, Wishner and Callaghan (*Journal*, June 1975, **126**, 571). Because the sampling constraints necessarily imposed by our design may have led to the selection on unrepresentative speech passages (a point, which, of course, we acknowledged in the paper), we have recently conducted two follow-up studies. In the first, 200-word passages from ten schizophrenic speakers and ten normal speakers were 'Clozed' by normal raters under fourth-word deletion, and no difference was found between the two types of passage. In the second, passages from twenty-five schizophrenic speakers were rated by normals under both fourth- and fifth-word deletion, and the two deletion conditions produced identical scores. The findings of both studies are, I think, quite different from what Silverman would predict.

D. R. RUTTER

*Department of Psychology,
University of Warwick,
Coventry, CV4 7AL.*