LEONTIASIS OSSEA.

By JAMES YOUNG, M.D.,
Medical Officer of Health, St. George's, Bristol.

The term "leontiasis ossea," by which Virchow described a rare affection which has as its distinguishing pathological feature a hyperostosis of the bones of the face and cranium, has been widely applied to express a variety of conditions of these parts. The most limited, and perhaps also the most generally recognised, as well as the most correct, application of this term is, however, to that condition in which the frontal and superior maxillary bones are alone involved and circumstances in the mercantile marine, just so long may we expect to hear of these terrible disasters.

Of the many thousands of collisions that have taken place our mighty Board of Trade has never—no, not in a single case—has ever instituted an inquiry into the eyesight of a surviving officer or look-out, but on the contrary has contumeliously declined to do so. Sailors, lawyers, and merchants have failed, while we, the ophthalmic section of the medical profession, have for nearly fifty years been crying in the wilderness.

Corrigendum.—The paper on Thyroid Extract in Lupus, published in the British Medical Journal of October 24th, p. 1200, was wrongly attributed to Dr. Barclay, of Wetheral. The author is Dr. John Barclay, of Banff.

A CASE OF LEONTIASIS OSSEA.

The following quotation taken verbatim from the Times, February 5th, 1889.

A terrible calamity occurred in the English Channel on Sunday night. During fine clear weather two vessels which had each other in sight for at least a couple of miles came into collision and sank within fifteen minutes, leaving their crews struggling amid the wreckage in the sea. Of forty-two men twenty-three went down, and all would inevitably have perished but for the presence of a tug and a lifeboat. All was expected the cause of this disaster lead to the same conclusion that it was due to one of those astounding errors of judgment on the part of one or other of the navigators, which seems to defy all attempts at reasonable excuse. Each blames the other.

Does anyone still think it unlikely? Then listen to one more quotation from the Times of August 20th, 1888.

It is admitted that the vessels knew of one another's proximity for several minutes before the one dashed into the other. The weather was not at fault, the sea was not unusually high, there was no fog at the crisis; each saw the other approaching in time to put a mile between them, and yet five minutes saw the whole tragedy played out. Both men and women have actually been sacrificed. But there ought to be some means of abolishing disasters like this of Sable Island altogether. Here was neither recklessness nor calculated audacity nor lethargy. All due vigilance seems to have been exerted, and on both sides. But somebody, whether it be the Geisser on the Thong as well as the Geisser of the Board of Trade still expecting the cause of this disaster lead to the same conclusion that it was due to one of those astounding errors of judgment on the part of one or other of the navigators, which seems to defy all attempts at reasonable excuse. Each blames the other.

The Times, in this last sentence, most unconsciously hit on the real cause of these terrible collisions, and just so long as men blind to colours—and therefore blind to every rule devised for safe navigation by night—are tolerated under any