

LETTERS

TO THE EDITOR:

I wish to bring to your attention a blatant plagiarism found in Francis W. Carter's *Dubrovnik (Ragusa): A Classic City-state* (London and New York: Seminar Press, 1972). After consultation with professors Alan Fisher and William McCagg, the three of us agree that Carter owes a large and unacknowledged debt to the work of Luigi Villari, *The Republic of Ragusa: An Episode of the Turkish Conquest* (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1904).

Carter plagiarizes in three ways. First, he copies word for word from Villari's text (vide Villari p. 2 and Carter p. 32). Second, he includes, without reference, many of Villari's footnotes in his own text (e.g. Villari p. 175, n. 2 and Carter p. 176, lines 1–2). Third, Carter presents Villari's references to archival and secondary works as his own (for example, Villari, p. 174, n. 1 and Carter p. 175, n. 9). Examples of Carter's plagiarism can be found in chapters 2 through 12 and in some instances are verbatim reproductions several pages long.

Within Carter's book, the work of Luigi Villari is noted only twice: a one-line citation within a dense 22-page bibliography entitled "Suggested Further Readings" and a passage on page 599:

The only special history of the town itself in English is by the Italian political historian, Luigi Villari: L. Villari, *The Republic of Ragusa, an Episode of the Turkish Conquest*, London (1904). This book provides a mine of information but deals principally with the internal development, archaeology and the architecture of the town and does not dwell enough on its international position.

In the notes found at the end of each chapter, however, the work of Villari is never cited.

It is interesting to note that only one review article written on Carter's book contained strong reservations about his work. Bariša Krekić (*Slavic Review*, 33, no. 2 [June 1974]: 386–87) pointed out numerous flaws with Carter's footnotes and bibliography. Krekić also emphasized that Carter had borrowed, through translation, from other works about Dubrovnik. The discovery of Carter's plagiarism from the standard English language account of his subject shows that Krekić's reservations were well founded.

An examination of three of Carter's journal articles about Dubrovnik revealed similar cases, albeit less extensive, of unacknowledged borrowings from Villari's work. The essays can be found in the following journals: *Balkan Studies*, vol. 9, no. 1, Thessalonica (1968): 127–38; *Slavonic and East European Review*, vol. 47, no. 109 (1969): 335–68; and *The Economic History Review*, 2nd ser., vol. 24, no. 3 (August 1971): 370–94.

The discovery of plagiarism in a book and three journal articles brings into question the credibility of Carter's other academic writings. That Carter's deception has gone undiscovered for twelve years is surprising and unfortunate. More regrettable, however, is Carter's breach of scholarly ethics.

DAVID F. DECKER
Michigan State University

David F. Decker has provided to the *Slavic Review* a "Table Summarizing a Chapter by Chapter Sampling of Carter's Use of Villari" with more than 40 separate cases, many of which run to several pages. Decker has also supplied photocopies showing paragraph by paragraph comparisons of several of these cases. The journal has also made independent verifications.—The Editor