THE LESION OF MYO-CARDITIS.

By JAMES GREY GLOVER, M.D.

THE following case is worthy of record because it presents a good instance of a rare lesion in a very pronounced form, and further because of the association of this lesion with, at one stage, very striking anginous symptoms, and finally with sudden death.

Mr. C—, aged fifty, who was the subject of emphysema and occasional attacks of bronchitis, was seized suddenly, on Sept. 15th, at his office, with symptoms thus described to me by Mr. Samuel Lloyd, of High-street, St. Giles's, who was summoned in the emergency. Mr. C— was suffering "from violent sudden pain in the region of the heart, and alarming syncope. It was impossible to properly examine him. The pain extended down the *left arm*." Under Mr. Lloyd's treatment he recovered so far as to get home in a cab. In my absence from town, he was kindly attended by Dr. Cribb, who describes him as suffering in the following way:—"I found him in bed free from all cardiac or respiratory distress, but complaining of pain across the transverse colon from side to side, saying he thought it was 'wind.' He complained of a feeling of 'depression,' and attributed his sufferings to indigestion from having eaten roast pork. His pulse was regular and quiet, respiration neither difficult nor accelerated, there was no pallor or appearance of syncope; extremities warm. I could detect no abnormal sound over the cardiac region, but any such sound may have been masked by his thick covering of fat. Respiration sounds deficient over both backs, but the percussion was clear. I concluded that he had been subject to asthmatic attacks depending on emphysematous lungs. Whatever the attack at the office might have been, of which I got a very imperfect account, it had clearly subsided when I saw him. I prescribed for him a stomachic alkaline mixture and hot applications to the seat of pain.—16th: Had not slept well, and said the pain came on again in early morning and in the same region—viz., across the diaphragm and especially to the *right side* over the liver. He described himself as much better and wanted to get up; no dyspnoea or cardiac symptoms. Temperature normal. His bowels had not acted, so I ordered him an aperient draught and light diet.—17th: The draught acted well, and he described himself as very much better and free from pain, but excessively weak, wanted to get up, and I believe did so. He still complained of an uneasy feeling across the diaphragm, but more over the liver than the heart, always indicating the right side rather than the left.—18th: Was up when I called and said he was getting all right, appetite returning and tongue cleaning, was in much better spirits and walked round his room showing me his paintings; said he should go to business next day, which I believe he did.—20th: Went to business and declared himself almost as well as usual, but weak from the attack. Had no return of pain or discomfort, nor did he complain of any thoracic trouble whatever. Arranged to call on me and report on 23rd; on that day, I believe, walked one and a half miles to my house. He said he only came to show himself, and thanked me for my attention, but would like to look in again in a week." He had so far improved as to have returned to his office, but on Tuesday, September 26th, not feeling well, and having pain in the chest, he was induced, against his strong inclination to go to his office, to remain at home, have poultices on, and to send for Dr. Cribb. Dr. Cribb, knowing of my return, sent the messenger to me. I saw Mr. C— a little after twelve in his library, and was just beginning to hear from him an account of his illness, when his head fell back in his chair, and his feet forward, and he died in a few minutes. A friend at whose house he called the night before said he looked ill and "altered" and complained of "a pain at the heart," but said he should soon be better.

Post-mortem examination.—The body was found very fat and the muscles well nourished. The cartilages of the ribs were so ossified as to require the use of the saw. There was a good deal of fat about the heart; but no hardening of the coronary arteries. The pericardium contained about an ounce, or less, of fluid. There was an ecchymosis on its inner surface opposite the base of the heart, to the left side in front. There was also a little recent lymph hereabouts. But the marked lesion was on the front of the apex of the heart, affecting, apparently, both the surface and a layer of

the substance of this organ. At this spot there was a well-defined roundish patch, less than the size of a five-shilling-piece. It looked badly damaged and on the road to gangrene or sloughing. In colour it was dirty red, with a little dirty lymph about it. The great vessels proceeding from the heart contained decolourised clots of fibrin. The opposing spot of the pericardium had a corresponding appearance—ecchymosed and with a little dirty lymph on it, but with no adhesion. The valves were unaffected. The lungs were emphysematous and congested, but everywhere free from consolidation. The liver was hard, and its capsule at parts opaque. The kidneys were similarly affected, and had a few small cysts on their surface.

Remarks.—I shall not attempt to trace the course of pathological processes in this painful case, nor assign their exact significance. The fibrinous clots in the large vessels probably had much share in causing death. Possibly some similar clotting may have occurred in the nutrient arteries of the heart and so led to the lesions described above, but the coronaries were free from obvious hardness. Possibly, a patient more willing to rest, from the beginning, might have fared differently. The case is interesting in this further respect as one of the gravest heart lesions, with an absence of physical signs thereof.

Highbury.

A NEW METHOD OF CATARACT EXTRACTION WITHOUT EXCISION OF THE IRIS.

By DR. H. GALEZOWSKI.

THE operation for cataract has always occupied the attention of surgeons, and justly so, and many methods, more or less ingenious, have been devised for the extraction of opaque lenses. One of the best of these methods was incontestably the French operation or method of Daviel by flap extraction, which gave numerous excellent results. Unfortunately, however, it not unfrequently happened that the most severe suppurative inflammation supervened even when the operation had been most skilfully performed, necrosis of the cornea and panophthalmitis destroying the eye. In presence of such facts it came to be asked whether a very large corneal flap was not the cause of the suppuration, and whether it would not be remedied by modifying the form of the incision. It was on this account that the old method by flap extraction was replaced by the method of extraction by peripheric linear incision. Our eminent London colleague Critchett, whose loss is regretted by all, brought forward an operation which bears his name, and which consisted in a peripheric linear incision of the cornea, iridectomy, and extraction of the lens with a large curette. After this came the method of von Graefe, or modified linear extraction, which, as is well known, was very soon tried in every country in the world and accepted as being the best, for it did not give rise to suppurative complications. As far as I am personally concerned, I had adopted this last method, and practised it with various modifications, till the last four months. For a long time I obtained satisfactory results, but occasionally I had to record cases of panophthalmitis in patients in whom there was not the slightest reason to anticipate any complication. I have for the last two years employed the most rigorous antiseptic precautions, but this has made no difference. Last year I had five cases of panophthalmitis in ninety-three operations, the results of which I communicated to the International Congress held in London. Quite lately another Parisian oculist has recorded seven cases of panophthalmitis in 150 operations, and in several other records of statistics similar data are to be found. What conclusion should one draw from this? That iridectomy as well as the linear peripheric operation do not prevent subsequent inflammatory mischief. This conviction seemed all the more plausible to me when, at the beginning of the present year, I saw a panophthalmitis appear in one of my town patients who was in an excellent state of health, and who had undergone the operation of iridectomy two years previously with a view of facilitating the subsequent operation. I extracted his cataract under the most favourable conditions; the operation went off perfectly well, and strict antiseptic precautions were observed. What then was my astonishment when, within the first twenty-four

hours, the symptoms of suppuration of the cornea with consecutive iritis appeared. It is difficult to find an explanation of this occurring notwithstanding the iridectomy, but it became evident to me that iridectomy did not prevent such complications. I then formed the idea of returning to the old French method of flap extraction without iridectomy, but I took care to make a different kind of flap. The results I have obtained seem to me so satisfactory that I have thought it useful to record them, and to show how unjust it was to attribute to the iris all the accidents which supervene after an extraction of the lens.

In making an analysis of the 959 cases of cataract extraction that I have performed since 1874, and of which I have preserved the records, I came to the following important conclusions:—1. That the excision of a portion of the iris does not in any way prevent inflammatory complications subsequent to the extraction of the lens. 2. That it is often the cause of secondary cataract. 3. That sclerotic or sclero-corneal incisions are far more prone to cause subsequent complications than corneal incisions, and that they do not prevent subsequent severe inflammation of the cornea and iris. In presence therefore of failures in my own practice, which could not in any way be foreseen, and taking into consideration the considerable number of failures recorded by De Wecker, Abadie, and others, I determined to modify the operative procedure and to bring it back as near as possible to the old French method or method of Daviel. The modification I employ refers to the form of the corneal incision; thus instead of having a large flap whose periphery is at all points 2 mm. distant from the sclerotic border, I make my puncture and counterpuncture in the cornea, just where it joins the sclerotic, but I make the summit of my flap 2 mm. distant from the superior sclerotic border. The incision is therefore entirely corneal. By this procedure the resulting flap is broader and not so high as in the old method of Daviel, and the incision is elliptical instead of being spherical, and in consequence coaptation is easier and cicatrisation more rapid. In giving this form to the incision a gain of 2 mm. on each side is obtained, and this allows even the most voluminous cataract to emerge without difficulty. The pupil dilates under the pressure of the lens and allows its free passage and then returns of itself to its former position, or is replaced by the aid of a fine silver stylet. Up to the present time I have performed fifty-six operations by this method, and I have not had any serious subsequent complications.

The following are the details of the operation I now almost exclusively perform:—The patient is placed upon an operating table or bed, and his eyelids separated by my articulated spring speculum. I then seize the conjunctiva just below the cornea with a fixation forceps, and gently draw the eye slightly downwards. I then puncture the transparent cornea just at its junction with the sclerotic with a very narrow-bladed von Graefe's knife, and at a point 3 mm. above the horizontal diameter. Pushing the point of the knife downwards to the border of the pupil, which has previously been dilated, I press on the capsule, incising it from below upwards, then, slightly withdrawing the knife, I push it into the transverse diameter of the capsule, which I then incise in its entire breadth, after which I make the counterpuncture at the opposite corneal border at a point also 3 mm. above the horizontal diameter. Then inclining the edge of the knife slightly forwards I cut the corneal flap in such a manner that its summit shall be 2 mm. distant from the superior sclerotic margin. This first step in the operation terminated, I remove the fixation forceps and spring speculum, and let the patient rest for a few seconds. I then continue the operation by elevating thoroughly the upper lid with my little finger, which, as well as the curette, presses upon the sclerotic border of the incision whilst the patient looks strongly downwards. With the thumb of my left hand I gently press up on the inferior border of the cornea, and then the lens is seen first to engage in the iris, then in the incision, and, finally, to emerge from the eye.

It frequently occurs that after the lens has emerged the iris returns of itself, and the edges of the incision come into apposition. In other cases the iris protrudes, and must then be replaced in the anterior chamber by a fine silver stylet. If any of the cortical substance of the cataract remains in the pupil, it is removed by a curette, which is introduced several times into the anterior chamber or the pupil. The operation being finished, and the eye being open, I turn the carbolic spray on to the eye, and dress

with carbolised cotton-wool, and bandage both eyes. As a rule the coaptation of the wound takes place in twenty-four or forty-eight hours. In one case it did not take place for six days. On three occasions there occurred slight attacks of iritis on the seventh, eighth, or tenth day, which easily yielded to antiphlogistic treatment, and on one occasion severe iritis appeared within the first twenty-four hours, but yielded to douches by the carbolised spray and to the application of leeches.

I have had two cases of hernia of the iris, both of which occurred on the fifth or sixth day, and in both cases I had to excise the protruded portion. The final results after extraction by this method are relatively superior to those I obtained with iridectomy. This I have had evidence of in two of my patients who underwent the operation for cataract, one twelve months and the other three years ago. In one of these cases one eye was operated on with iridectomy, and the other without. The visual keenness obtained in eyes operated on without iridectomy is superior by one-third or one-fourth to that obtained when iridectomy is performed. It will be easily understood that an eye with a round pupil is much better protected against excessive light, is less dazzled, and the dispersion of luminous rays is much less. Since my recent experience has demonstrated to me the considerable advantages of cataract extraction without iridectomy, I never touch the iris except in the following exceptional cases:—1. When during the incision of the cornea the iris bulges forward in front of the knife and is wounded. 2. In traumatic cataracts complicated by posterior synechiæ. 3. In cases where the lens covered by the iris does not engage in the incision. 4. I excise the iris when I perceive that it has been torn during the passage of a hard and voluminous lens.

Paris.

ON A CASE OF SYPHILITIC OZÆNA FOR WHICH ROUGE'S OPERATION WAS TWICE PERFORMED,

WITH REMARKS ON LAWRENCE'S AND ROUGE'S OPERATIONS.

By R. CLEMENT LUCAS, B.S. LOND., F.R.C.S.,
SENIOR ASSISTANT SURGEON TO, AND DEMONSTRATOR OF OPERATIVE
AND PRACTICAL SURGERY AT, GUY'S HOSPITAL.

THE operation for exploring the nasal cavity by raising the upper lip and cartilaginous portion of the nose, for which we are indebted to M. le Docteur Rouge of Lausanne, does not appear to have been performed many times in this country; and it is perhaps deserving of more attention than has at present been accorded to it. Although M. Rouge's *mémoire*¹ has now been published nine years, I can only find that the operation has been performed by three surgeons in this country—namely, Mr. Warrington Haward,² Mr. Harrison Cripps,³ and Mr. Holmes.⁴ It may, however, have been performed by other surgeons who have not recorded their experience. Among those who have practised it the operation does not meet with unqualified approval by all. Thus M. D'Azambria⁵ speaks of it as dangerous from phlebitis, purulent infection, and incomplete operation; and Mr. Holmes,⁶ after relating how in one of his cases serious danger was caused by the inhalation of blood into the lungs, states that "the surgeon cannot honestly represent to the patient or the friends that the operation is free from grave danger." Still, for my own part, I am inclined to regard the dangers as trivial; and the difficulties occasioned by the passage of blood into the trachea can be avoided by the means presently to be detailed. Indeed, it is a maxim which I endeavour rigidly to apply to myself, though I should be loth to apply it without limit to others, that whenever a patient dies from surgical hæmorrhage some blame should attach to the surgeon.

Whether the operation is one so generally applicable as the originator supposed, or whether its usefulness be limited

¹ Nouvelle Méthode pour le Traitement Chirurgical de l'Ozène. Par le Docteur Rouge, Chirurgien de l'Hôpital Cantonal à Lausanne. 1873.

² St. George's Hospital Reports, vol. viii.

³ THE LANCET, May 5th, 1877, p. 123.

⁴ Surgery, its Principles and Practice, p. 593, second edition.

⁵ Thèse de Paris, Dec. 1874, No. 465; London Med. Record, May 26th, 1875.

⁶ Opus cit.