

a definite power of accommodation and acuity of vision which varies but little in different subjects, though in all these particulars a certain physiological variation is recognised, it would be strange if the muscular movements of the eyes did not correspondingly follow approximately definite laws. In all probability they do, and it is not unlikely that estimated rotating power of the different muscles, as determined by innumerable examinations of the normal muscular functions, is fairly correct as regards both monocular and binocular vision. It is also probable that very considerable variations from the alleged physiological standards of motility thus obtained are consistent with easy and accurate vision. Since, however, slight errors in refraction in certain subjects unquestionably give rise to intense visual disturbance, there seems no reason why the same rule should not apply in cases of defective or faulty motility, except that in so complicated a piece of machinery it may fairly be assumed that the physiological limit is still more variable than is the case with any of the other factors which contribute to the act of vision. However this may be, there is no question as to the existence of serious visual and even systematic disturbances due to faults in the extrinsic muscles of the eyes, especially those which render the function of binocular vision difficult and wearisome.

The series of observations which form the basis of this communication relate, indeed, only to this class of cases.

To begin with I have relied chiefly upon the equilibrium tests made at the standard distance of six metres and assumed that the normal for this distance is the status known as orthophoria. Allowing for physiological variation from this, I have attached little or no importance to lateral deviations of two or three prism-degrees, and I am quite certain there are many persons who present much greater deviations than