

EDITORIAL.

WE are somewhat surprised to see that Professor T. G. Thomas's article, entitled "The History of Eight Cases of Placenta Prævia," which appeared in, and was written *especially* for, our May number, has been copied from the latter, word for word from beginning to end, into the August number of the "Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal," without the slightest intimation of its source being given, so that the readers of the latter will naturally suppose it is a communication from Professor Thomas direct. If this was the first time the Richmond and Louisville Journal had been guilty of *such appropriations* of material from other journals, we might excuse, on the ground of carelessness or oversight, the non-accrediting of the above article to our journal, but it is only a short time since the "Pacific Medical and Surgical Journal" complained of a similar appropriation of one of its articles, and the guilty Editor, in his apology to the same, says, "This is a fault, however, common to all journals," and that "no medical journalist, so far as has been observed, has been able to avoid this error; a fact doubtless *very*

familiar to the complaining editors." We are sorry we cannot agree with the writer of this tribute to medical journalists, for we do not hesitate to say that there is not a journal of *high standing* which does not always accredit its abstracts to the proper source, and which, in case an error in that direction should occur once, would not allow its repetition in the next number. It is with no "dog in the manger" spirit that we make this complaint; on the contrary, we would have felt complimented had the article in question been accredited to the "American Journal of Obstetrics, etc."

EDITORIAL.

IT is with considerable reluctance that we engage the attention of our readers for a few moments, in order that we may lay before them for judgment matters which, though somewhat personal, must be of interest to some of them, relating as they do to this journal as well as to its editorship. In our last (August) number we saw fit to complain of an *appropriation* of material from our first (May) number by Dr. E. S. Gaillard, editor of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal*, the said material, an article written by Prof. T. G. Thomas especially for our use, having been reprinted in the August number of Dr. Gaillard's journal without his acknowledging the source from which it was obtained. In our complaint referred to, we stated our views in regard to such unfairness on the part of editors of medical journals, but we were not conscious of expressing our feelings either too fully or too sharply; as regards this latter point, however, we refer our readers to the editorial in question, that they may judge for themselves. To this editorial Dr. Gaillard replied in a pri-

vate letter, the tone of which was anything but gentlemanly, and indicated most plainly that the "shoe pinched" notwithstanding the lame excuse of "an oversight."

To this letter we made no reply, being desirous of letting the matter drop, and also feeling that we would gain nothing by further controversy. Dr. E. S. Gaillard, however, editor of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal*, was evidently wrathful that his letter, referred to above, elicited no reply from us, and probably regretting he had not said more cutting (?) things, sets himself to work at writing a lengthy editorial, in which he first kindly reprints our "editorial" complaint, and then sets to work slashing at it in grand style. Like many who try to get out of any trouble, Dr. E. S. Gaillard is profuse in his excuses. For example, he says: "In the *July* number of this journal (*Richmond and Louisville*) there is, on page 96, a complimentary notice of the first number of the *Obstetric Journal*. This notice is longer than usual; the journal mentioned is particularly welcomed, and in giving, in part, a summary of its contents, the following language is used: 'The *original* department contains an excellent article on placenta prævia, with records of eight type cases by Prof. Thomas, etc.' Is not this sufficient credit to give to any journalist for the contents of his work?" As regards the "sufficient credit, etc.," we entirely agree with Dr. Gaillard, but we would ask, does the acknowledgment of the appearance of a *new periodical* give Dr. Gaillard the privilege, or excuse him from the unjustness, of appropriating the *first* article in our *first* issue to his own use? Again, Dr. Gaillard, as a further excuse, says: "If, however, this ample credit had *not* been *previously* given, is it possible that any one reading this leading article in the '*Eclectic Department*' of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal*, with the Latin motto '*Carpere et Colligere*' placed conspicuously over the first line of the article,

could suppose it to be an *original* communication—‘a communication from Prof. Thomas direct?’ Surely no one but a simpleton could mistake for *original* matter any article in the *Eclectic* department of a work, or construe the words *Carpere et Colligere* to signify an original communication from Prof. Thomas!! The junior editor of the *Obstetric Journal* must give the members of the profession credit for some sense; he must not believe that they are as idiotic as he seems to fear they are.” We hope Dr. E. S. Gaillard and the “members of the profession” will excuse us if we say we think it is “possible that any one reading this leading article in the *Eclectic Department* of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal* with the Latin motto *Carpere et Colligere* could suppose it to be an original communication” from Prof. Thomas direct, for how many readers take the trouble to interpret the meaning of mottoes, or how many are able to do so even if they desired? and granting that all of Dr. Gaillard’s readers, as he supposes, are classical scholars, and know that the “*Eclectic Department* of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal*” is made up of articles appropriated from other journals, why then does Dr. Gaillard in *some cases* append the title of the journal from which the articles in said department are appropriated? We cannot see but that it is chiefly to show that the article is not original, but abstracted from a contemporary. Again, on the cover of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal* are imprinted the names of those whom Dr. E. S. Gaillard calls “Associate Editors,” which latter term, however, we well know in this case means nothing more than probable contributors of articles, and like the high-sounding Latin mottoes in which Dr. E. S. Gaillard indulges so profusely, “sounds big,” and is calculated to throw dust in the eyes of his readers, the names being mostly those of distinguished members of the profession. One of these so-called “Associate Editors” is Prof. T. G. Thomas, and

as his name is printed in large type on the cover of the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal* as "Associate Editor," and appears again as the author of an article within, is it "idiotic" to suppose that, as "Associate Editor," Prof. Thomas contributed the article to the *Richmond and Louisville Medical Journal* direct, or would "no one but a simpleton" think thus? Had our journal been one of long standing, and consequently more widely circulated, we might not have noticed the appropriation complained of, but as only the first number of ours had been printed and circulated to a limited extent, the matter could not be overlooked.

Thus much for Dr. Gaillard's excuses; and now for certain *false statements* which he has seen fit to print, doubtless thinking that his *classical* readers might be a little skeptical about his excuses. In the same editorial Dr. Gaillard says: "In the first number of the *Obstetric Journal*, in that portion of it devoted to its 'Abstracts,' there are three articles appropriated, for which no credit whatever has been given." For this apparently deliberate misrepresentation, to use Dr. Gaillard's own words, "the fullest credit should here be accorded to him for his honesty, candor, etc.," and we trust that Dr. Gaillard will excuse us if we challenge the truth of the statement, for there is *not a single abstracted, borrowed, or appropriated* article in the said number of our journal which is not accredited to its source; there are, however, three *small* notes (which together make *exactly* a single page) which are condensed translations from the French, made especially for us by Dr. F. G. Snelling, and which had been printed in no other journal before ours, and are simply notes on *certain subjects*, and not abstracted *material* from contemporaries; one of these "three articles appropriated" is of the *enormous* length of less than *three lines*. To use Dr. Gaillard's own language to us, "on this demonstration, it is clear that he (*editor of the Richmond*

& *Louisville Medical Journal*) either deliberately wrote what he knew to be untrue, or that he did not know what he was writing about. He may accept either position, and in doing so, the propriety of much solitary reflection and of retirement, until he obtains a little necessary information, is to all (but himself) decidedly apparent."

And now we think we have said sufficient to remind Dr. E. S. Gaillard, his *classical* readers and our own, that assertions do not always prove facts; and notwithstanding the "high tone and gentlemanly bearing" manifested in his editorial reply to us, we are forced to consider this "remarkable production" at the best but an amusing sample of vituperation, which it is surprising should emanate from the pen of the editor of a journal "on whose title-page editorial appears the names of some of the purest and most distinguished members of the profession."

In conclusion we wish to state to our readers, and to Dr. E. S. Gaillard, that with the above remarks we close this unpleasant controversy; and we also take this opportunity to say that we will in no manner notice publicly any private or published reply from Dr. Gaillard to the above.

D.