details from one who had told us, punctiliously, how carefully records are made in Madras.

But Major Wright does not tell us: (1) the size of the incision he made; (2) in how many cases lenses were left in the eye; (3) how many capsules burst; (4) how often the instrument lost its grip; (5) how often the instrument sucked up the vitreous into its concealed machine chamber (the instrument works at a vacuum of 70 centimetres of mercury); (6) how often he had to finish by other means the operation begun with this instrument, and by what other means; (7) how often he caught up the iris with the instrument; (8) what were the after-complications.

I submit that the above is the class of information that your readers have the right to expect before deciding on this issue. Instead of supplying evidence on which to base judgment, Major Wright asks them to take him on trust, and to condemn, as he does, both Barraquer's operation and all other intracapsular operations. It is to be inferred from his article that he cannot do Barraquer's operation satisfactorily. Nevertheless, we cannot get away from the fact that Barraquer himself can do the operation well, and that he gets good results. Results in cataract are determined on the operating table.

Major Wright goes on to say that nothing will decide the issue except by following up the results. Yet he is satisfied with *one* year. He slurs over the fact that Colonel A. E. J. Lister, I.M.S., Dr. Arnold Knapp, and myself have followed up the results in ample numbers, and over periods ranging from *one to fifteen* years.

Major Wright then falls back upon what we may call "the tradition of the Elders," and this he uses in a manner more becoming to a priest of a temple of ophthalmology than to a professor of a modern scientific school. If he were situated ten or fifteen hundred miles further north, in the Central Punjab, he would soon recognize the cogency of the argument I have advanced. For his capsulotomy school would disappear just as that "tradition of the Elders" disappeared, though it held out to the end. His article seems to me to be, so to speak, but a rear-guard action of the capsulotomy school.

Yours truly,

HENRY SMITH,
Lt.-Col., I.M.S., retired.

CATARACT

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

SIR,—In addition to the authorities cited by the Editor with reference to the use of the word *καταράκτης* in the sense of an obstruction, it may be of interest to note that the word rendered

"windows"—in the margin "floodgates," in the story of the flood—Genesis, Ch. 7, v. 11, is in the Septuagint *καταράκται* "the windows or flood-gates of heaven were opened." Clearly in this instance the word cataract is used, not for the water which flowed, but for the obstruction the removal of which allowed the water to flow.

Yours truly,

PERCY FLEMMING.

The relevant portion of the sentence in question is as follows:—

και οι καταράκται του ουρανου ηνεώχθησαν.

The Hebrew equivalent is "areboth hasamīm." "Arebah" derived from "arab," to knot or weave means a lattice, hence a window, Ecclesiastes, 12, 3; a dove house, Isaiah, 68; a chimney, Hosea, 13, 3; all of which were closed in with lattice work; hence "areboth hasamīm," "the windows or flood-gates of heaven," which are opened when it rains, Genesis 7, 11; 8, 2; 2 Kings, 7, 19; Isaiah 24, 18; Malachi, 3, 10.—EDITORS.

NOTES

The Association of
Dispensing Opticians

It will be recalled that there appeared recently in these columns an announcement of the inauguration of an Association of Dispensing Opticians, the membership of which is confined to those opticians who devote themselves exclusively to dispensing the prescriptions of ophthalmic surgeons. One of the objects of this Association is to perpetuate and to encourage this spirit of craftsmanship, and in pursuance of this object, what is believed to be a unique competition has recently been held under the auspices of the Association. The craftsmen members were invited to submit for examination hand-made spectacles made entirely by themselves in one of three media: tortoiseshell, gold, and steel, prizes being offered for the three best in each of the three sections. A large number of entries was received; the work was of remarkably high standard, and very effectively refutes the contention that modern workmanship is inferior. It would be difficult to find more perfect specimens of the spectacle-maker's art than the winning entries in this competition.

The prize-winning frames were exhibited at the office of the Association, 439-441, Oxford Street, W.1., on March 7, 8, and 9.

* * * *

Appointment

DR. KENNETH REED HILL has been appointed Honorary Ophthalmic Surgeon to the Kent County Ophthalmic Hospital, Maidstone.