

# Re: THE ARYAN INVASION MYTH

---

*Source:* <http://sci.tech--archive.net/Archive/sci.lang/2008-06/msg00686.html>

---

- *From:* Joachim Pense <[snob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx](mailto:snob@xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx)>
  - *Date:* Thu, 19 Jun 2008 21:26:27 +0200
- 

analyst41@xxxxxxxxxxxxx (in sci.lang):

I was only responding to the poster who immediately characterized (facetiously, I am sure) a suggestion of Indian outmigration to Europe in ancient times as an "Invasion". Like it or not "Aryan Invasion" of the subcontinent lurks like a bad smell around "IndoEuropean" hist ling.

I was only responding to you who characterizes Aryan Immigration as invasion.

How responsible was William Jones for the AIT (to me a suggestion that anything but some basic lexical items of Sanskrit came from outside of India is an AIT – the conquest/migration aspect means nothing to me – although I have cited here a direct quote from Jones where he says Sanskrit was bequeathed to India by conquerors (words to that effect)).

Didn't Jones believe IE languages came from India?

start quote:

The Sanskrit language, whatever be its antiquity, is of a wonderful structure; more perfect than the Greek, more copious than the Latin, and more exquisitely refined than either, yet bearing to both of them a stronger affinity, both in the roots of verbs and the forms of grammar, than could possibly have been produced by accident;

end quote.

## Re: THE ARYAN INVASION MYTH

It is difficult to understand how an objective philologist who believed the above (who couldn't yet know about Hittite, Kentum/Satem etc. which allegedly proved after his time that Sanskrit could not have been "PIE") could draw any conclusion other than that Greek and Latin are largely derived from Sanskrit.

As I said.

I think it was Saussure a century later who threw those many a's out of reconstructed PIE.

Joachim

.