

REMOVAL OF A WORM FROM THE EYE OF AN ARAB HORSE.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—As surgeon, for many years, to the Bombay Eye Infirmary, I had, occasionally, through the kindness of friends, an opportunity of seeing diseases of that organ in the horse and other animals. To the pathologist, a close observance and comparison of diseases in animal life is both interesting and instructive.

Inclosed is a case of a worm in the horse's eye, which I successfully extracted. Such cases, I am informed, are not of very unfrequent occurrence in India. To such surgeons as, like myself, have been long located in India, and almost in the daily habit of seeing and removing the dracunculus, or guinea-worm, from almost every part of the human body, the mere surmise of the possibility of the human eye being the seat of this affection, will not appear to be entirely hypothetical. I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

WM. JEAFFRESON, Surgeon-Oculist.

Clarges-street, Piccadilly,
25 July, 1837.

A high-bred Arab race-horse, then in the possession of Captain Seton, town-major of Bombay, when under training was observed to become out of condition. The horse was dull, and "off its feed," and had, what I have invariably observed, the strange and almost unaccountable symptom of very great weakness in the loins. The eye affected was slightly weak, and watery, but free from any perceptible inflammation. The aqueous and other humours were in a perfectly natural state. A worm had been distinctly seen, for several days, moving about in the whole circumference of the anterior chamber, exactly like an eel in a basin of water, apparently in the full enjoyment of its natural element. It was nearly, if not quite, an inch long, of the diameter of sewing silk, and of a beautiful silvery whiteness.

Having previously secured the animal, by casting him on a soft bed of straw, in a strong light, several persons held his head down, securely. In the presence of many sporting gentlemen (one of whom secured the upper lid, with Pellier's silver elevator), with a common cataract knife I made a free crucial incision into the cornea, below the pupil. The aqueous humour, all escaping in a sudden gush, brought in its tide the worm with it, which did not long survive the change of its situation, continuing to writhe about, as if in the agonies of death.

The eye was now secured, much after the same manner as after the operation for ex-

traction of the cataract in the human eye, taking measures to prevent the animal rubbing it against the manger. The wound healed without a bad symptom; the aqueous humour was soon reproduced; the sight was not in the least degree injured; and the animal rapidly improved in health, and became a great and deserved favourite on the turf at Calcutta, where he was afterwards sent, and won many races.

It is well to observe that in performing this operation a strong light is desirable, as it is a satisfaction to the operators to see whether the worm comes away with the aqueous humour. I have, in two instances, performed this operation, when the aqueous humour spirted into my face, and fell on the ground, and the worm could not be found, though, from the favourable issue of the cases, I infer that it must have come away. The worm does not always confine itself to the aqueous humour in the anterior chamber. I have seen it disappear, apparently, behind the iris, and again return through the pupil.

One cannot but conceive that much mischief is likely to arise from the continuance of the worm, even in the anterior chamber. How much more injurious would it be in the posterior and more sensitive parts of the organ, and out of reach of observation. It is true that I have no means of knowing it to be the fact, but, nevertheless, I firmly believe, judging from probability alone, that many eyes are lost from the same cause, simply by the inflammation and ulceration which are likely to be produced by the presence of an irritating foreign body of this kind.

VACCINATION AND RE-VACCINATION.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—As there exists at the present day a strong, and, I almost fear, a growing prejudice against the preventive power of vaccination, I beg leave to submit to the notice of the profession the following case, which appears to me to possess one or two points of interest:—

On the 17th of April last, William Kersey, ætat. 25, a native of Wethenden, near this place, arrived at his home, from the neighbourhood of Leicester, where he had been working. He had travelled and slept with a man, on his route, who had just recovered from the small-pox. The day after his arrival at home he sickened, and became affected with the disease, in its distinct and mildest form. He was immediately carried to the pest-house attached to the union workhouse, where, under the treatment of Mr. S. Freeman, he passed favourably through the different stages of the disease. He had been vaccinated in early life.

In March, 1836, I vaccinated all the children (upwards of one hundred) in the parish of Wethenden, including the younger brothers and sisters of William Kersey, with one exception, that of his brother Isaac, a strong, healthy youth of eighteen, who, being at work at some distance from the village, did not apply to me with the rest. As soon, however, as I was called in to the case now mentioned, I procured some recent lymph, and vaccinated him, on Thursday, the 20th of April.

The vaccine disease appeared on the fourth day, and went through its usual stages without any unusual symptoms. On the ninth day, however, when the disease was declining, he was attacked with headache, sore throat, and other febrile symptoms, which were speedily followed by an eruption of the genuine small-pox, in its confluent form. He was immediately removed to the pest-house, where, after suffering very severe symptoms, he gradually recovered, though he is still unable to leave the house. No other member of his family, though equally exposed to infection, has taken the disease, nor have I been called in to any other case in the parish.

The following conclusions, I think, may be fairly drawn from the above cases:—

First, that recent vaccination affords a more certain security against small-pox than that performed at a distant period; and hence is derivable an argument in favour of re-vaccination.

Secondly, that in those cases in which vaccination does not afford perfect immunity from small-pox, it has the effect of greatly modifying the symptoms and character of the disease.

Thirdly, that if vaccination be performed after the individual has been subjected to the influence of contagion, it has no power of preventing, or even modifying, the small-pox, which clearly points out the great yet common error, of waiting for the appearance of the disease in the neighbourhood, before having recourse to the protecting powers of vaccination. I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,

C. R. BREE, M.R.C.S.

Stowmarket, June, 1837.

GLANDERS.

GLANDERS, the nature of which is yet a problem, is it contagious? Huzard says, "yes," with Solleysel, La Guirinière, and Gaspard Saunier. Camper, Godine, Magendie, Dupuy, say, "no." La Fosse says, "yes" and "no." Coleman, Delabère Blaine, and Dutz, neither say yes nor no! Chabert, after having, during his whole life, maintained the contagiousness of glanders, has retracted this opinion in his old age.

Last of all comes M. Galy, the great partisan of non-contagion, and the inventor of a new mode of treatment. He proposed to the minister of war the institution of certain experiments, which was accepted. Certain horses labouring under glanders were mixed with others, perfectly sound, on the farm of M. Gelinier. The experiment was so far successful that, on the proposition of M. de Champagne, inspector-general of the studs, it became a question to reconsider the ordinance of the 16th of July, 1784, which required the destruction of all glandered horses.

M. Dreux, proprietor of the park in which this farm was situated, saw, as he thought, in these experiments, an infraction of the conditions on which he let the farm. The question was brought before the first chamber of the Court Royale, which decided that a farmer cannot bring on his grounds any horses labouring under glanders, in order that they may be submitted to treatment, without a breach of the terms of his lease, and without the security of a good housekeeper that recompense shall be made for the mischief that may be done.—*Veterinarian*, Aug., from *Le Droit*.

FRACTURE, DISLOCATION,

AND

SEPARATION FROM THE ULNA, OF THE
RADIUS.

To the Editor of THE LANCET.

SIR:—The maid servant of Mr. C., residing in Westmoreland-place, City-road, obtained permission from her mistress to go out for the day, and while coming down stairs, after dressing herself for the holiday, slipped, and fell backward. In the attempt to save herself, she carried her hand behind her, the back of which, the hand being doubled upon the wrist, first came in contact with the boards. By this means the head of the radius was fractured, and partially dislocated, and the ulna so completely loosened from its connections with the radius and interarticular cartilage, as to be moveable in all directions. Under these circumstances I was requested to see her, twenty minutes after the occurrence took place, and, having adjusted the parts with as much precision as possible, there being a good deal of tumefaction, I enveloped the forearm in a bandage from the wrist to the elbow. Splints were then applied, and the bandage kept constantly wet with a lotion, consisting of acetate of lead, and camphor mixture. By this simple treatment, the arm rapidly mended, and at the expiration of three weeks, when the splints were removed, was as well as could be expected.