Senile Cataract: Methods of Operating. By W. A. FISHER, M.D., F.A.C.S. Published by Chicago Eye, Ear, Nose and Throat College, Chicago, Ill. 256 pp. 1923.

In the preparation of this book Fisher has had the assistance of five confrères; indeed only three of the nine chapters of which it is composed are from his pen. His collaborators are Professor E. Fuchs (Vienna), and I. Barraquer (Barcelona), Lt.-Col. Henry Smith (London), Drs. H. T. Holland (Shikarpur, India), and J. W. Wright (Columbus, Ohio). Each of these writers describes the methods of operating which he has practised and which he advocates, and Barraquer, whose contribution to the volume is the most extensive, prefaces his description by a few pages on the "Evolution and Critique of the Cataract Operations." In the final chapter entitled "A method of acquiring technique," Fisher describes various operations for extraction of cataract as performed on the dead eye. For this purpose he prefers the eye of a kitten about six weeks old, because the diameter of its cornea is approximately the same as that of the human cornea (11 mm.).

The book is copiously illustrated, printed in excellent type and has a full index. As a guide to the technique employed by the writers it should prove helpful. We imagine, however, that the young surgeon who consults it will experience considerable difficulty in determining which method to adopt.

CORRESPONDENCE

WERNICKE'S PUPILLARY REACTION

To the Editor of THE BRITISH JOURNAL OF OPHTHALMOLOGY

SIR,—In the last number of the Journal I observe a note on "Wernicke's Pupillary Reaction," by Dr. J. D. Cummins. If the author of this note will refer to the Presidential address which I had the honour to deliver before the Ophthalmological Society of the United Kingdom (*Trans. Ophthal. Soc. U.K.*, Vol. XLI, 1921) he will see that I there indicated a method of testing this reaction of the pupil which is identical with that which he now suggests, with the exception that I employed the two eyes successively in making the observation, and not the two halves of the same eye. My method is, I consider, superior to that of Dr. Cummins in that the anatomically corresponding half of each retina successively receives an identical stimulus, the eye in each observation being that nearest to the source of lateral daylight illumination; such an equality of stimulus cannot be obtained when it is received first on the nasal half and secondly on the temporal half of the retina of the same eye, which during Dr. Cummin's first observation is next to the window, and during the second remote from it and to some extent shaded by the features of the nose and face.

Yours truly,

LONDON, Sept. 6, 1923.

J. HERBERT FISHER.