Int. J. Middle East Stud. **41** (2009), 357. *Printed in the United States of America*

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A REPLY TO MICHAEL GUNTER (*IJMES* 40 [2008]: 728–29)

VAHAKN N. DADRIAN
10.1017/S002074380909093X

While avowing his concern for the "scholarly reputation of *IJMES,*" Michael Gunter is denouncing my lack of "common sense" and my "audacity to argue incongruously" in the debate about the general validity of the Naim-Andonian documents. To substantiate his argument Gunter once more resorts to the method of truncation through deletions; the essential part of my phrase is deliberately excised from the quotation he used. Here is the full text in question, with the deleted portion in italics:

Forgery presupposes skill, caution, and above all a measure of sophistication geared to avoiding mistakes. The presence and easy detection of such defects in the material under review mitigate against the charge [of forgery]. *Indeed, no forger of any value would have produced material, so incomplete and so flawed with glaring imperfections; these could have been easily avoided by anyone disposed to forge*.

Accordingly, if scholarly reputation should be made the central issue, the question that poses itself here is, Whose reputation is, in fact, at stake?

© *2009 Cambridge University Press 0020-7438/09 $15.00*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S002074380909093X Published online by Cambridge University Press