

### More Jokes from Fournet.

Arnaud Fournet has responded to my reply (“A detailed reply to a joker’s ‘review’ of my book”) to his “review” of my book in the only way he knows how: through bluster, polemics and escapist rhetoric.

First, he begins by protesting against being clubbed with the Farmer-Witzel pack of jokers, forgetting that it was this pack of jokers alone who welcomed his original “review” of my book with gleeful enthusiasm. I am aware that he is not on good terms with them, but that has nothing to do with the fact that he and they have common reactions when it comes to OIT writings in general and my books in particular.

Next, stung at his cheap comments on the color and smell of my book being exposed in my reply for what they reveal of his mentality and attitude, Fournet goes on the defensive: **“I never mentioned the smell as unpleasant. It is only his own personality that turns a neutral sentence into a personal aggression”**. Oh really? How many people would agree that his cheap comments were neutral, or that such comments are what one can expect in a decent scholarly review of a book?

Next, he makes a pathetic attempt at sarcasm: **“In his reply states that ‘[he is] not answerable for a number of problems in the book, such as wrong page numbers or ‘Incidentally, Elst in the index in bold type with no page number’ [...] Who is the author of the book? I seriously doubt that the printer and publisher is responsible for these features of the book [...] things would be clearer if Mr. Talageri could indicate what parts of the book he considers to be answerable for”**.

This whole thing only emphasizes again the pathetic nature of Fournet’s criticism that a wrong page number cited in the contents and a wrong inclusion of a word in the index constitute the big **“problems”** in my book! It also shows his utter non-acquaintance with the process of book publication. For his information, the printed versions of the book were sent to me twice (in Mumbai) for proof reading (by the publishers in New Delhi). After I had completed all my corrections, the publishers prepared the final version for print, and it was only at this point that they finalized the page numbers. It was not sent to me again for proof reading the page numbers! I sent the publishers two lists of words to be included in the index. The page numbers for each word were to be listed in the index by a mechanical computer process (not my field), and it was not expected that I would have to proof read this also. If a word in my list had no page number (the publisher did not include my preface, which mentioned Koenraad, in his index listing), the word should have been excluded by the publisher from the index. At any rate, I only saw the final printed version. Typically, Fournet makes an issue of this, and uses this as an excuse for his failure to deal with the real issues in my book.

After the references to Farmer and Witzel, the smell of my book, and the printer's errors, Fournet next turns to my use of fonts. I have answered this pathetic issue in my reply, and wont waste more time on it.

Finally, Fournet ends his response to my reply (or rather, he ends his "Review part 2") with rhetoric and polemics in arguing that the pages and pages and pages of data and references in my book are "**either irrelevant or inconclusive. They just prove nothing per se**". Therefore it does not matter whether or not "**the data are false or need to be falsified or improved**"! So he only succeeds in emphasizing my point that, to him, rhetoric and polemics are a substitute for data, facts, references and statistics.

If nothing else, the sharp difference between my reply and his response to it must be noted. My reply takes care to reply to every point raised by him, and even to every comment made by him, with logic and facts. Like his "review", his response to my reply avoids replying to or dealing with anything written by me, and seeks to escape with name calling and general rhetoric.

But most pathetic of all is his attempt, in a mail debate on an internet site following my reply, to try his hand for once at interpreting data instead of only depending on rhetoric. In this mail, he writes: "**we have De-u-wa-at-ti in Mitanni (in the late period!) and this is the same as Deva-vat in the old books [...] one of the late Mitanni princes has a name which is the same as one of the oldest RV names!**"

Firstly, Fournet has not at all understood the nature of the data. We can have someone named Vikramaditya in twentieth century India, but we could not have a name such as Rocky, or even Gurpreet or Pandurang, in fifth century India. The point is that the Avestan and Mitanni names predominantly include name types which only came into existence in the Late period and books of the Rigveda, and were *completely missing* in the Early and Middle periods and books. If Fournet could manage to find an old name still in use among the Mitanni, it would prove nothing.

But Fournet can not even find that. He tries to identify Mitanni De-u-wa-at-ti with the old Devavat. But he only succeeds in putting his foot in his mouth. De-u-wa-at-ti is not Devavat but the late Devatithi (the name of the composer of hymn VIII.4). It is not a lone or isolated name: we have the equivalents of Maryatithi, Priyatithi, Mitratithi, Indratithi, Suryatithi, etc. in the Mitanni names. Are they all Maryavat, Priyavat, Mitravat, Indravat, Suryavat, etc.? Fournet should stick to jeering rhetoric. That is his only forte.

I don't think his pathetic response merits any further response.