CORRESPONDENCE

INDUCED ELEVATION OF INTRA-OCULAR PRESSURE AND THE VISUAL FIELD

To the Editorial Committee of the BRITISH JOURNAL OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

SIRS,—I am sorry that the papers which Prof. Bietti refers to [in his letter published in the April issue of the *British Journal of Ophthalmology* (1965, 49, 222)] were not known to me while I was working on my research. When I read them later, I was very pleased to see that my observations on early glaucoma and optic nerve diseases—drawn from a different experimental procedure—corresponded closely to Prof. Bietti's.

Yours faithfully,

J. TSAMPARLAKIS

26 VENIZELOS AVENUE,
ATHENS,
GREECE.
March 3, 1965.

BOOK REVIEWS

Optics and the Eye. By S. STENSTRÖM. 1964. Pp. 190, 185 figs, 22 tables, bibl. Butterworth, London. (55s.)

"The object of this book is to give a general outline of optics with particular regard to the problems of interest to students of ophthalmology." "As my own experience is limited, I have naturally consulted various textbooks concerning the subject."

These quotations from the author's preface show that we are being presented with a new mixture of old (and some very old) ingredients, but it is very welcome. It is futile to expect an expert in one branch of knowledge to be completely *au fait* with everything that is going on in the spheres abutting on his. The most one can hope for is that his subsidiary sources are not further behind than, say, one generation, not necessarily equal to 25 years. And if Swedish ophthalmologists really are made to come to grips with the Bohr theory of spectra and the quantum theory, if they have interference effects carefully explained to them (as is done in this book), and if they get a good idea of photometry, light sources, photo-multipliers, and photo-luminescence, their surgery is unlikely to suffer. Alas, the book must not be sold in Scandinavia. Ocular optics is explained competently with lucid diagrams, and, much to our surprise, Stenström bases his formulae on the concept of vergence. This is healthy. The contrary is true of many of the author's ideas on visual physiology. It is obvious that he has misunderstood some of the textbooks and papers which he has told us he has consulted; the budding ophthalmologist should be advised to skip this section, and to move on to the discussion of instruments and photographic optics, catholic in concept even though marred by one or two puny half-tone illustrations. Perhaps the lily would be gilded if the units of Planck's constant were correct, and no mistake occurred in the spelling of proper names, but the author must be congratulated on his excellent command of English, and the book is to be recommended.