

Cont.
Bartholow (Robt.)

TO THE MEDICAL PROFESSION.



PROF. R. BARTHOLOW, M. D.

DEAR SIR :

I understand that you are about to publish a pamphlet in reply to one issued by Prof. Blackman. The offensive personalities which have characterized this discussion are unprofessional in themselves, and injurious to the Medical College of Ohio, in which you are both Professors.

I have therefore to request, that you withhold the publication of your pamphlet until a Committee of the Faculty, consisting of Profs. Graham, Comegys, and myself, shall have determined in what way this controversy shall terminate.

Very truly,

M. B. WRIGHT,

Dean. Fac. Med. Col. Ohio.

The Committee of the Faculty, consisting of the undersigned, adjudge that the controversy between Profs. Blackman and Bartholow shall terminate, by a reply from Dr. Bartholow to Dr. Blackman's pamphlet—said reply to be free from personalities.

This reply is subjoined, and is considered by the Committee to be final. The Committee have the pleasure to state, that both parties have agreed to this conclusion of a very unfortunate public controversy.

M. B. WRIGHT.

JAMES GRAHAM.

C. G. COMEGYS.

The Faculty of the Medical College of Ohio have interposed to terminate the public controversy now going on between Dr. Blackman and myself.

My colleagues entertain the conviction, as they inform me, that a controversy which has been inaugurated and conducted throughout in a personal manner, is not only unprofessional but injurious to the Institution with which we are connected.

Feeling the force of these considerations thus urged upon me, I have consented to withhold the publication of a pamphlet now printed, which was written in reply to a pamphlet issued by Dr. Blackman. According to the rules of controversy, I am entitled to a reply. I am content, under the circumstances, to state the points of my argument as printed in my pamphlet, in respect to the only material accusation contained in Dr. Blackman's pamphlet—the charge of plagiarism.

My article on "Progressive Locomotor Ataxia" must be examined as a whole. It consists of three parts: the case of Kelch; a synopsis of the history and symptomatology as contained in Topinard's essay; and a discussion of the views of Trousseau, Meryon, Hughlings Jackson, etc., and an examination of the

original meaning of the term *tubes dorsalis*, as it occurs in the works of Hippocrates and Celsus. It appeared in the numbers of the *Cincinnati Journal of Medicine* for April, May, and June, 1866. In the beginning of the article, in a foot-note, I expressed my obligations to Topinard in the following language :

"I have made liberal use of the prize essay by Dr. Paul Topinard, *De L'Ataxie Locomotrice, et en particulier, De la Maladie appelée Ataxie Locomotrice Progressive*, Paris 1864."

The second part of the article appeared in the May number of the Journal, Drs. Blackman and Parvin being the editors. The manuscript of this part of my article had appended to it a foot-note in terms similar, and in meaning identical, with the following :

"This is a synopsis, chiefly, of the views of Topinard, *De L'Ataxie, etc.*"

This acknowledgment does not appear attached to my article. The following statement from Mr. H. T. Ogden, of E. Morgan & Co., who printed the Journal, will furnish information as to the disposition made of the note attached to the second part of my article.

"The manuscript of Dr. Bartholow's second part of the article, *Locomotor Ataxia*, was in hand at the time of the appearance of the *Medical Journal*. There was a short note attached to it,* I think to which I called Dr. Blackman's attention after he had read the article in the first number (April). On reading this, he (Dr. . .) thought it not satisfactory, and appended some explanation to the same. This I showed to Dr. Bartholow, who declined to permit the addition. I am clearly of opinion that the article, with the note appended, was in hand before any thing had been said of plagiarism; Dr. Blackman had not yet read the article, when it (the manuscript) was placed in my hands by Dr. Bartholow.

Respectfully,

(Signed)

H. T. OGDEN.

* The note, if I recollect correctly, Dr. Blackman tore up in my presence "

Mr. Robert Clarke, the Publisher, says that Dr. Parvin carried off the note appended to the second part of my article. Dr. Parvin, in answer to my request to be furnished with this note, writes as follows :

"Mr. Clarke is mistaken in his statement that I carried off from the printing-office a note appended to any of your contributions to the *Cincinnati Journal*. I have never had such note in my possession, nor do I remember ever to have seen it. You will thus see that it is impossible for me 'to give you the note' or 'to state its contents.'

Yours truly,

(Signed)

THEOPHILUS PARVIN."

I now come, in chronological order, to the letter of Mr. Robert Clarke, publisher. This letter explains itself.

"You ask me to state the circumstances under which you wrote the note attached to your second paper on ataxia in the May (1866) number of the *Cincinnati Journal of Medicine*.

"The charge of plagiarism made against you by Dr. Blackman on the appearance of your first article with the 'liberal use' note, created considerable talk in the circle of physicians, who took an active interest in the journal. I spoke to you, as did also, I think, Dr. Parvin and others, and you promised to have an explanatory note in the next number. You took the 'copy' with your note attached to the printing-office yourself. I did not see it. Dr. Blackman, however, saw it there, thought it unsatisfactory and wrote an 'apology' over his own initials, to go among the 'miscellanies' of that number. The foreman had it set up, and sent a proof to me, asking if it should go in. It was about fifteen lines long; it was very personal, in very bad taste, and evidently written under excitement and on the spur of the moment. I sent word to Mr. Ogden, the foreman, not to insert it. I wrote a note to Dr. Blackman, informing him that I could not allow his note to go in, but would use my influence to obtain a satisfactory one from you. I then addressed a

note to you, requesting an interview. You called at the store immediately, and I told you how the matter stood. We sent up to the office for your first note; it could not be found. You then sat down and wrote the note as it at present stands; I sent it up and had it inserted. Dr. Blackman did not see it till after the sheet was worked off. He wanted the sheet suppressed, or another note inserted from himself, to which I would not consent, as I considered your note quite sufficient to cover the ground.

"The above are the circumstances, as I recollect them. Mr. Ogden, to whom I have read the above, says they agree with his own recollections.

Yours truly,

(Signed) ROBERT CLARKE."

The second part of my article, then, has attached to it the note I wrote at Mr. Clark's suggestion, and not the note appended to the original manuscript, which was destroyed at the printing-office.

It is thus apparent, I think, that I sought to give the author from whom I quoted, full credit. But the question now comes—did I, or did I not, make a synopsis of the author quoted? I affirm that I did. Now for the proof of this statement.

Topinard's essay contains 575 pages. The history in the essay is found from p. 135 to p. 142 inclusive. The leading facts of this, nearly in the author's language, is contained in my article in two pages. The symptomatology in Topinard's essay is comprised in 130 pages—from p. 143 to p. 273. I have stated the principal points in the symptomatology in 10 pages, chiefly in the author's own language.

It is perfectly evident, therefore, that the utmost that may be said is—I made a synopsis of a portion of Topinard's essay and in the language of the author.

In addition to the direct acknowledgments of the two notes appended to my article, are there any internal evidences of the liberal use I have made of the author? There are many.

1st. I describe *one* case of this disease.

2d. The symptomatology of this case is contrasted—by a special reference too—with the symptomatology as described by Topinard, after an analysis of 254 cases.

3d. The difference in style, manner, and matter, and the references to authorities not at all, or not readily procurable in this country.

4th. The use of the term "our author," as in the following paragraph:

"Our author strongly objects to the so-called *acute form* of this disease, in which the total duration of it is limited to some months. The age of the subject (referring to one of those cases reported by M. Burgulnon), the rapid succession of the accidents, the total duration of four months and a half, the prompt and radical cure, are all in contradiction with the mass of our observations."—*Cincinnati Journal of Medicine*, May, 1866.

Expressing at the outset the liberal use I intended making of the author; informing the reader in the second part that what he was reading was a synopsis of the views of Topinard, and not concealing the internal evidences of the liberal use I had made of the author, I think any unprejudiced person must agree with me, that evidence is wanting of a design to mislead the reader. If I intended perpetrating a plagiarism, certainly all who knew me, must do my understanding the poor credit to believe that I could have executed it more skilfully.

ROBERTS BARTHLOW.

