

ascribe it to weakening of resistance of the nervous system, from the strain of modern life. In support of this view, they call attention to the fact that although syphilis is extremely widespread in the Orient, it rarely attacks the nervous system of those apathetic peoples. He is himself inclined to adopt another explanation: syphilis, all are agreed, is becoming more and more widespread, and the successive and rapid passage of the spirochete from one individual to another may serve to increase its virulence, just as Pasteur was able in an identical manner to augment the virulence of the virus of rabies, but whatever be the reason, atrophy of the optic nerve and chorioretinitis of syphilitic origin, the prognosis of which is regarded as most somber, are of daily occurrence. He believes that it would be less so if two factors in the treatment were more thoroughly utilized: (1) the mode of administration of mercury, (2) perseverance and continuity of treatment. As regards the first of these, there is no doubt but that intravenous injections of cyanide of mercury in doses of 1 c.c. are curative of syphilitic manifestations which resist all other methods of administering the drug. As regards the second point, he thinks that the injections should be persevered in until 30, 40, or even more have been given at progressively lengthened intervals. In the great majority of cases, these infections are well supported; so long as this is the case they should be continued. He has treated a considerable number of such cases for the past twenty years, giving the injections as required. Some cannot go longer than three months without treatment, while others remain stationary one, two or three years without the same when lowered visual acuity gives the signal for further injections. No doubt great perseverance is required both on the part of the patient and surgeon; but this has its reward in that it saves from blindness.

Do Moving Pictures Injure the Eyes?—BAHN (*Ann. Ophthal.*, No. 3, xxvi, 427) comes to the following conclusions in regard to this question, which is frequently put to the ophthalmologist: Moving pictures, under favorable conditions, do not cause as much fatigue as the same period of concentrated reading. When ocular discomfort is complained of there is usually some ocular defect. When there is no such defect at least four sittings of one and one-half hours each per week can be tolerated without discomfort. Under favorable conditions, moving pictures cause increased fatigue, which, if continued, becomes unpleasant and may be harmful, a condition which is greatly increased by prolonged fixed staring at one spot on the picture, a practise which should not be indulged in. A review of the literature records no permanent harm to the eyes from moving pictures. The fact that 10,000,000(?) persons enjoy moving pictures daily, with no definite reports of specific harm or injurious effect, and with but few complaints of slight inconvenience, prove that the moving pictures can have no injurious effects upon the eyes.

Etiology and Treatment of Iritis.—In a discussion upon this subject before the Ophthalmological Section before the Royal Society of Medicine, England (*Arch. Ophthal.*, November, 1917, p. 572), the president, Mr. W. LANG, in opening, pointed out how desirable it was to arrive at some agreement as to the cause of iritis. In an analysis of 200 cases he