

course of treatment, illustrating the rule that when *sympathetic ophthalmia breaks out after the exciting eye has been removed, it occurs in a less virulent form than where enucleation has been delayed until the sympathetic affection has actually made its appearance.*

This fact appears to be one of very great importance, not only on account of its prognostic value, but because it gives us an insight as to the nature of the disease, which fully establishes the *rationale* of its prevention. It is the strongest possible proof that the exciting eye continues to supply some morbid influence to its congener so long as it remains undisturbed. This might, of course, be the case whichever theory of the etiology of sympathetic ophthalmia we choose to accept, but since we may discard as untenable every explanation of the nature and origin of so-called sympathetic ophthalmia, excepting the bacterial, we have simplified the problem of prevention, at least to the extent of directing our attack against an enemy no longer in ambush, but entrenched in a camp, easily accessible to our surgical forces.

Speaking of the theories of sympathetic ophthalmia, I have always been at a loss to understand how the neuropathic theory ever came to be generally accepted, its most substantial support being an isolated observation or two (probably imaginary) on the part of an ophthalmologist of high repute in his day, that sympathetic ophthalmia commenced in the sympathizing eye at a point symmetrical with the seat of injury in the exciting eye. The result of this observation shows how a fallacy emanating from some high authority may tend to retard the acquisition of truth. There is certainly nothing else in physiology or in neural pathology at all parallel with the phenomena of sympathetic ophthalmia. If the bacterial explanation be accepted (and even of this positive proof is wanting) we have in it an adequate explanation of the lapse of time between the original injury and the outbreak of sympathetic disease as well as for the immunity which an early enucleation commonly secures, and also of the less virulent form which we occasionally meet with after timely enucleation. But we have also in these facts a forcible intimation that some less radical procedure might accomplish the purpose of enucleation with equal certainty. Here, if anywhere,