Final Reply To Fournet 12/6/2010

It is clear that Fournet really does not have the guts in his balls to deal with the data and facts in my book. But since he has made the mistake of taking up one piece of data, the Mitanni name Deuwatti, we can confine the whole debate to this one word. [Incidentally, as I pointed out, Fournet demonstrates here also his inability to understand English: he quotes me saying "we have the equivalents of Maryatithi, Priyatithi, Mitratithi, Indratithi, Suryatithi, etc. in the Mitanni names.", but he is not able to understand what "the equivalents of" means, and thinks he is countering me by making silly statements like "Indratithi does not exist. Indaratti exists" etc.! Apparently he is quite incapable of understanding that what I said was not that the word "Indratithi" in this Sanskrit form is found in Mitanni, but that "the equivalent of" Indratithi (=Indaratti) is found in Mitanni. It is impossible to debate anything with a person whose brain is so extremely obtuse].

In respect of Deuwatti, note that this name is found in company with a host of other names: we will only take here those Mitanni names accepted by Fournet in his response: Mariatti, Biriatti, Mitaratti, Indaratti, Suriatti. Is it Fournet's claim that the atti in all these names is not atithi? If so, what does he claim it is? More importantly, how many other serious scholars studying the subject can he produce who will agree that the atti in all these words is not atithi? Two of these names, Mitratithi and Devatithi are found in the Rigveda itself. Or does Fournet claim that the atti in Deuwatti alone (which he will claim is actually vatti) is different from the atti in the other words (which is clearly not vatti)? Again, how many serious scholars will agree with this convenient exception?

Further, Fournet childishly argues: "The reading -atithi (with three syllables) for -ati or -atti (with two syllables) is invention". Then what about his reading "vatti" with two syllables for his claimed "vat" with one syllable (since he claims Deuwatti=Devavat)? Why the additional "ti" if it represents Devavat? Also, ignorant Fournet (ignorant even after it is clearly given in my book) is unaware that the known Avestan equivalent of three syllabled Vedic "atithi" is two syllabled "asti"!

Fournet has staked his all on the one word Deuwatti. I challenge this pathetic joker to show that the consensus or even the majority scholarly opinion is on his side on this point.


Arnaud's Letter Dt. 11/6/2010


The Chicken-Run show goes on. So we have the second final final reply.

It's really funny to see that
1. on the one hand, we have Koenraad Elst parading on Cybalist, where I cannot even post any reply at all...
2. on the other hand, Mr Talageri, who speaks about "having the guts in their balls", is not even capable of showing up here himself...


Apart from these pathetic features,
if we address a real issue, we can see that Talageri is just completely distorting the data.

<De-u-wa-at-ti> impossibly stands for devatithi as the sequence -atithi is written <Su-wa-

ti-ti> in the name Šuwatiti.

The reading -atithi (with three syllables) for -ati or -atti (with two syllables) is invention.

As far as inventing data goes, we can further discuss the other words:

Talageri wrote: "we have the equivalents of Maryatithi, Priyatithi, Mitratithi, Indratithi, Suryatithi, etc. in the Mitanni names."

- Maryatithi  does not exist. Mariatti exists.
- Priyatithi  this word is Bi-ri-(a)-at-ti possibly standing for viryatti (Note that the vowel -a- seems to be long).
- Mitratithi  what exists is a mutilated word mi-it-ta-xx-at-ti possibly mittaratti? this word is not listed as potentially IA by some authors (Gelb for example).
- Indratithi  does not exist. Indaratti exists.
- Suryatithi  does not exist. Suriatti exists.
- etc.  which etc.??

Best

A.