carried from the focus into the circulation. As a consequence of this a deficiency in nutrition occurs causing the disease of the retina.

Consequently when diagnosing retinitis stellata we should give significance to the rôle of the teeth.
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ANNOTATION

The Blind Spot


reference to Birch has already been quoted and shows that the
communication to the Royal Society was made by Oldenburg, and
not by Mariotte, and there is good evidence that the king was not
present at the meeting. There is, in fact, no evidence that King
Charles II ever attended a formal meeting of the Royal Society,
though Sprat ("The History of the Royal Society of London, p.133,
1667") says: "he has been present and assisted with his own
hands at the performing of many of their experiments in his
Gardens, Parks and on the River."

The reference to Albrecht von Haller, also a foot-note, is in his
"Elementa physiologiae corporis humani" (Lausanae, 1763), also
contained in his "Anfangsgründe der Physiologie," V, p. 470
Berlin-Leipzig, 1772. This reads as follows: "Factum ann. 1668
p. 496, Ed. Holl." The references to Birch and Mariotte throw no
light on the question. Dr. Bröns thinks that Klügel expanded the
foot-note to "Factum anno 1668 coram Suæ Regia Majestati,"
adding his translation "Der Versuch ist 1668 vor dem König von
England gemacht," whereas it should read "Factum anno 1668
coram Societate Regiae Majestatis."—"the experiment was shown
before the Royal Society."

ABSTRACTS

I.—THERAPEUTICS

(1) Wolff, L. K. and Julius, H. W. (Utrecht).—Action of sul-
phanilamide in vitro and in vivo. (Action du sulphanilamide
in vitro et in vivo.) Annales de l'Institut Pasteur, T. LXII,
No. 6, Juin, 1939, pp. 616-651.

(1) A résumé of this article and the conclusions arrived at by
the authors is as follows:—

(1) In vitro sulphanilamide acts on a small number of bacteria
but not on a large number, as was determined by Colebrook.

(2) Sulphanilamide acts better in virulent bacterial infections
than in the less virulent.

(3) Sulphanilamide is more efficacious when blood is present in
the culture medium, thereby differing from other antiseptics. It
acts on bacteria in vitro when they are reproduced in the culture
medium a minimum number of times and with a minimum of delay.

(4) Sulphanilamide is not an antiseptic and acts quite differently
from phenol or trypaflavine; for these two substances the action
does not depend on the process of reproduction of the bacteria.
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