

PROFESSOR BUSHKOVITCH REPLIES:

Mr. Lupinin clearly feels that I have challenged his competence as a translator, and he has a right to defend himself. But it is disingenuous of him to defend Vernadsky from me, as my review makes perfectly clear that I share his estimate of Vernadsky's stature.

On the other hand, I cannot find much merit in the unfinished text under discussion. The introductory disclaimer is irrelevant: the book does not have, in my opinion, enough value in the condition Vernadsky left it to warrant two editions.

I do not question the accuracy of the translation but the translator's English style. The examples I quoted are sufficient evidence. In English the phrase "Vilensk Commission" would mean a commission in the town of Vilensk: Lupinin should say "Vil'na Commission."

In scholarly disputes an argument from authority is not normally considered to have much weight. Richard Hellie has indeed passed favorable judgment on the Fedotov volume translated by Richard Haugh and Nickolas Lupinin, but it is Lupinin's translation of Vernadsky that is at issue. I do not see the relevance of Hellie's views.

TO THE EDITOR:

In his review of my book, *Bulgaria and Her Jews: The History of a Dubious Symbiosis* (*Slavic Review*, 39, no. 3 [September 1980]: 524–25), Frederick Chary contends that I have attempted to "demonstrate that Bulgarian anti-Semitism was and is among the most virulent in Europe," whereas in actual fact I state in the very preface, as throughout the book, that "for centuries Bulgaria was free of anti-Semitism, despite the persistent efforts of neighboring Byzantium to contaminate the Slavic populace and clergy with theological Judeophobia." Chary relegates my work to the "realm of popular rather than scholarly literature," yet other reviewers, along with "the prestigious Yeshiva University" (to use his own words), found it to be extremely scholarly with its 634 footnotes and three appendixes of meticulous documentation. Since it covers two thousand years of history, Chary's claim that "the narrative does not go much beyond a schoolgirl's recollection" would establish me as the oldest person on earth!

Chary asserts that my facts are "bolstered . . . by references to standard secondary works," whereas in reality the mainstays of my research were the works of Solomon Rosanes (awarded a medal of scholarship by Boris III of Bulgaria), Shaul Mezan (outstanding historian, poet, and publicist), and Benyamin Ardit (former member of the Israeli Knesset) — along with those of Constantin Jirecek, D. M. Dunlop, George Vernadsky, and others — which are universally considered to be invaluable primary sources on both Jewish and non-Jewish history. I did not "consult" Chary's own work, *The Bulgarian Jews and the Final Solution*, because, apart from containing nothing new beyond the original material to which I had direct access, it is no more than a technical report on Bulgarian-German relations during World War II.

Chary labels me "anti-Christian" (along with anti-Communist and anti-Russian), yet over and over again my book stresses that *precisely because Christianity failed to take root in Bulgaria*, the Bulgarian mind has remained primitive, pagan, and incapable of abstract theistic thinking. The author "believes that the Bulgarians should have become Jews in the Middle Ages" and that "since they did not, they remained basically uncivilized," writes Chary. In effect, my thesis — correctly interpreted by all other reviewers — is that the Bulgars, as kinsmen of the Judaized Khazars, could have become Jewish had the local Jews chosen to proselytize, but they did not because proselytism goes against the grain of Judaism; hence, Bulgaria turned to another civilized religion, Christianity, which she failed to understand and embrace properly.

A direct perusal of the book will leave no doubt in the reader's mind as to Chary's misrepresentations.

VICKI TAMIR
New York City

Professor Chary prefers not to reply.