

# *Insights to Universal History*



## *Abstract and train of thoughts*

### **The power of names is great, and was known since the first men were instructed by the divine masters**

The so-called barbaric peoples, the physical and political representatives of the nascent Aryan race speaking a now extinct Aryan language that stood before this division of nations, had a higher civilization as a root race and its sub-races than has yet been found in the geological strata. 3

We, who place the origin of the Pelasgians far beyond the Biblical ditch of historic chronology, have reasons to believe that the "most barbarous language" mentioned by Herodotus was simply the primitive and now extinct pure Aryan tongue that preceded the Vedic Sanskrit. 5

Pelasgians were a remnant of an Atlantean sub-race. 5

The Aeolic was neither the language of Æschylus, nor the Attic, nor even the old speech of Homer — it was Vedic Sanskrit. 6

### **In old Greece barbarous names were sacred and it was unlawful to change them**

#### **Yet, the Greeks got in the habit of twisting primeval names.**

They even besmirched their noble ancestry by belittling their Hierophants as Troglodytes. 7

Three Hierarchs represented Budhistical and Brahmanical power in Greece. 7

While the political power of Sri-B'dho-Lemos or Triptolemos was formidable, the cave-dwelling Budhist Priests or Sroo-cula-dutæ, Lords of the Cave, who protected their secret doctrines from profanation, are today belittled as Troglodytai. 8

Further examples of the profound Brahmanical influence in Greece are the Goghos or Cow-Killer that became Kakos, i.e., bad. Soo-Bhoo-ya or one engaged in abstract meditation became Sophos, i.e., Wise. Despatis or Land-Lord became Despotes, thus marking the transition from Oligarchic privilege to Democratic tyranny. 8



## **The power of names is great, and was known since the first men were instructed by the divine masters**

**As Solon had studied it, he translated the  
Atlantean names into names devised by himself.<sup>1</sup>**

**The so-called barbaric peoples, the physical and political representatives of the nascent Aryan race speaking a now extinct Aryan language that stood before this division of nations, had a higher civilization as a root race and its sub-races than has yet been found in the geological strata.**

*From Blavatsky Collected Writings, (FRAGMENT) XIII pp. 348-50.<sup>2</sup>*

The Medes, Kelts, Slavs, Hindus, Persians, Greeks, Romans, Germans make their appearance in your history as nations and peoples separate in language and history, each with its own far remote past, its distinct traditions and customs between 2,000 and 4,000 years ago. They are called Āryan and Caucasian races, all said to come from one and the same stock, the early Vedic Āryans of the Oxus and what not. And yet that separation of nations, since no more than between 3,000 and 4,000 years is allowed for the *Vedas*, though the Brahmans are known to have brought them with them to India [*sic*]. Thus your history thanks to philology, ethnology makes of this separation of nations a real Tower of Babel . . . *plus* language — as separate history, types, colours and customs for each. We say — and we have positive historical proof to that effect — that the so-called *barbaric* peoples “the physical and political representatives of the nascent Āryan race speaking a now extinct Āryan language” that stood before this division of nations, had a higher civilization as a root race and its sub-races than has yet been found in the geological strata. And thus though it is granted that the farthest date to which documentary record extends is but the first, the earliest glimmer, the nearest visible point of your historic period beyond which stretches back an immense and indefinite series of prehistoric ages, yet no civilization, nothing but barbaric savage men preceded for a 100,000 years the 3,000 or 4,000 years of comparative [word illegible] and the 200 or 300 hundred years of actual civilization. Nay the very period when nascent human speech was preceded by gesture signs, is found preceding the Sanskrit, the most perfect as the most grand of all human languages, but by a couple of thousand years or so!

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Secret Doctrine*, II p. 767

<sup>2</sup> Fragment in H.P. Blavatsky's handwriting in the Adyar Archives. — *Boris de Zirkoff*.

The process of induction is challenged by historical writers, lions followed by a herd of jackals of the daily press.

[Here follows a crossed out sentence.]

Thus geologists carry man's first appearance into the period of post-glacial drift, in what is now called the Quaternary period. And while the former period was undeniably between 250,000 and 300,000 years back yet the Encyclopaedists persist in saying that it indicates an antiquity only of — “at least of tens of thousands of years.” The idea is supremely absurd both from physical and ethnological as from psychological evolutionary standpoint. Taking their own figures to imagine that the host of races during the last 25,000 years should have been no better than animals, savage and uncivilized barbarians at best, and then from men of the Palaeolithic, old stone age, followed by those of the Neolithic or new stone age down to the races of the bronze and early iron ages with which commences historical antiquity in Europe, to make a clear jump to the old Babylonian and Egyptian civilizations, is rather a risked undertaking. Why not rather infer that since between the high civilizations of Greece and Rome and the Modern one — hardly 200 years old — there was the black gap of the dark and Middle Ages, the miniature scale of one of the smaller cycles, so there may have been a similar gap between the older Babylonians and Chaldeans and such high civilization as traced by every [word illegible] unbiased Orientalist in Egypt and Babylonia 10,000 and 15,000 years, and the preceding high civilizations of sub-races now extinct. The 20 centuries of European history are unable either to fix an age for the stone implements found in the Thames or the French Somme. Not only that the drift of glaciers and ground-ice, but also other geological changes [have] to be taken into consideration before assigning an age even to the relics of the bronze, and the artistic and polished [word illegible] of the Neolithic age, let alone the drift implements of the older stone age. The modern reckoning of ages was never more vastly out of proportion to historical chronology than in the present case. Sixty feet deep in the borings made in the alluvium of the Nile Valley where burnt bricks and pottery were found represent at least 25,000 years, and when they dig in certain localities, 120 feet deep. If only traces of various intermediate civilizations of a lower order were hitherto found, it does not stand to reason that there were none of a higher order but only that ancient civilizations being of another order and the antiquity of monuments found being generally discarded and the relics of a more intellectual [word “being” crossed out by H.P. Blavatsky] having failed to reach us — as the relics of your modern literature, arts and sciences will fail to reach the 6<sup>th</sup> race archaeologists: — it is but natural to find, *etc.* Relics of social and psychological culture can hardly be found in geological strata, in layers of soil. In Italy, Germany and elsewhere remains of a long pre-Roman civilization have been found. The connection between inland seas and the Ocean has greatly changed, in many cases was entirely broken since the time of the Bronze Age. But so long as the ruined cities of Egypt, like that of Ramses will have to wait for and depend upon their identification and chronology in the Mosaic books, no age can be assigned to them. The Brugsch-Beys are numerous and their authority too little questioned and too much depended upon. All that which goes beyond the few pages of universal History now entirely in the hands of Western Christian nations becomes the mythical portion, all that is found recorded in the unauthenticated

chronicles of a small tribe the origin of which your historians cannot prove, is — *authenticated history*.

---

**We, who place the origin of the Pelasgians far beyond the Biblical ditch of historic chronology, have reasons to believe that the “most barbarous language” mentioned by Herodotus was simply the primitive and now extinct pure Aryan tongue that preceded the Vedic Sanskrit.**

**Pelasgians were a remnant of an Atlantean sub-race.**<sup>1</sup>

First published in: *The Theosophist*, Vol. V, No. 1 (49), October 1883, pp. 18-21. Republished in: *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (WAS WRITING KNOWN BEFORE PANINI?) V pp. 301-3. Consult full text in our Hellenic and Hellenistic Paper Series.

And now we may turn to the Pelasgians. Notwithstanding Niebuhr’s rebuke who, speaking of the historian in general, shows him as *hating* “the spurious philology, out of which the pretences to knowledge *on the subject of such extinct people* arise,” the origin of the Pelasgians is speculated upon to have been either that of swarthy Asiatics (*Pell-asici*) or from some mariners — from the Greek *Pelagos*, the sea; or again to be sought for in the Biblical *Peleg*! The only divinity of their Pantheon known well to Western History is Orpheus, also the “swarthy,” the “dark-skinned”; represented for the Pelasgians by *Xoanon*, their “Divine Image.”<sup>2</sup> Now if the Pelasgians were Asiatics, they must have been either Turanians or Semites, or — Āryans. That they could not be the former, and *must* have been the last-named, is shown on Herodotus’ testimony, who declared them the forefathers of the Greeks — though they spoke, as he says, “a most barbarous language.” Further, *unerring* philology shows that the vast number of roots common both to Greek and Latin, are easily explained by the assumption of a common Pelasgic linguistic and ethnical stock in both nationalities. But then how about the Sanskrit roots traced in the Greek and Latin languages? The same roots must have been present in the Pelasgian tongues? We who place the origin of the Pelasgoi far beyond the Biblical ditch of historic chronology, have reasons to believe that the “barbarous language” mentioned by Herodotus was simply “the primitive and now extinct Āryan tongue” that preceded the Vedic Sanskrit. Who could they be, these Pelasgians? They are described generally on the meagre data in hand as a highly intellectual, receptive, active and simple people, chiefly occupied with agriculture; warlike when necessary, though preferring peace.

We are told that they built canals, subterranean water-works, dams, and walls of astounding strength and most excellent construction. And their religion and worship originally consisted in a mystic service of those natural powers — the sun, wind, water, and air (our *Soorya*, *Maruts*, *Varuna* and *Vayu*), whose influence is visible in the growth of the fruits of the earth, moreover, *some of their tribes were ruled by priests, while others stood under the patriarchal rule of the head of the clan or family*. All this reminds one of the nomads, the Brāhmanic Āryans of old under the sway of their Rishis, to whom were subject every distinct family or clan. While the Pelasgians were acquainted with the art of writing, and had *thus* “a vast element of culture in their

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Secret Doctrine*, II p. 774

<sup>2</sup> [See “Orpheus’ legend and works” in our Hellenic and Hellenistic Series. — ED. PHIL.]

*possession before the dawn of history,”* we are told (by the same philologists) that *our* ancestors knew of no writing until the dawn of Christianity!

**The Aeolic was neither the language of Æschylus, nor the Attic, nor even the old speech of Homer — it was Vedic Sanskrit.**

Thus the Pelasgic language, that “most barbarous language” spoken by this mysterious people, what was it but Āryan: or rather, which of the Āryan languages could it have been? Certainly it must have been a language with the same and even stronger Sanskrit roots in it than the Greek. Let us bear in mind that the Aeolic was neither the language of Æschylus, nor the Attic, nor even the old speech of Homer. As the Oscan of the “barbarous” Sabines was not quite the Italian of Dante nor even the Latin of Virgil. Or has the Indo-Āryan to come to the sad conclusion that the average Western Orientalist will rather incur the blame of ignorance when detected than admit the antiquity of the Vedic Sanskrit, and the immense period that must have elapsed between this comparatively rough and unpolished tongue when compared with the classical Sanskrit — and the palmy days of the “extinct Āryan tongue”? The *Latium Antiquum* of Pliny, and the Aeolic of the Autochthones of Greece present the greatest kinship, we are told.<sup>1</sup> They had a common ancestor; the Pelasgian. What then, the parent tongue of the latter unless it was the language “spoken at one time by all the nations of Europe — before their separation”? In the absence of all proofs to the contrary, it might have been expected that the *Rig-Brāhmanas*, the *Mahābhārata* and every *Nirukta* should not be treated as flippantly as they now are. It is admitted that however inferior to the classical Sanskrit of Pānini — the language of the oldest portions of *Rig-Veda*, notwithstanding the antiquity of its grammatical forms, is the same as that of the latest texts. Everyone sees — cannot fail to see and to know — that for a language so old and so perfect as the Sanskrit to have survived alone, among all languages, it must have had its cycles of perfection and its cycles of degeneration. And, if one had any intuition, he might have seen that what they call a “dead language” being an anomaly, a useless thing in nature, it would not have survived, even as a “dead” tongue, had it not its special purpose in the Reign of immutable Cyclic Laws; and that Sanskrit which came to be nearly lost to the world is now slowly spreading in Europe, and will one day have the extension it had thousands upon thousands of years back — that of a universal *language*. The same as to the Greek and the Latin: there will be a time when the Greek of Æschylus (and more perfect still in its future form) will be spoken by all in Southern Europe while Sanskrit will be resting in its periodical *pralaya*; and the Attic will be followed later by the Latin of Virgil. Something ought to have whispered to us that there was also a time — before the original Āryan settlers marred the purity of the sacred Sanskrita Bhāshya among Dravidian and other aborigines admitted within the fold of Brāhmanical initiation — when Sanskrit was spoken in all its unalloyed subsequent purity and therefore must have had more than once its rises and its falls. The reason for it is simply this: classical Sanskrit was only *restored*, if in some things perfected by Pānini. Neither Pānini, Kātyāyana or Patañjali created it; it has existed throughout cycles and will pass through other cycles still.

---

<sup>1</sup> [See “Aeolians, Dorians, Ionians,” in our Hellenic and Hellenistic Series. — ED. PHIL.]

## In old Greece barbarous names were sacred and it was unlawful to change them

Contrary to profane belief,

. . . “barbarous names” were regarded as of the greatest efficacy and sanctity, and it was unlawful to change them.<sup>1</sup>

**Yet, the Greeks got in the habit of twisting primeval names.<sup>2</sup>**

— as much as the unlearned do today, who are ignorant of the Chaldean Logion:

Never change barbarous Names [*barbara nomina*];  
For there are Names in every Nation given from God,  
Which have an unspeakable power in [Sacred] Rites.  
When thou seest a sacred fire without form,  
Shining flashingly through the Depths of the World,  
Hear the voice of Fire.<sup>3</sup>

---

**They even besmirched their noble ancestry by belittling their Hierophants as Troglodytes.**

*Three Hierarchs represented Budhistical and Brahmanical power in Greece.*

From “The holy rites of Eleusis were archaic Wisdom Religion dressed in Greek garb,” pp. 97-98 (see full text here), quoting excerpts from E. Pococke’s *India in Greece* (1852).

To continue the worship introduced in this captivating guise, three sacred individuals were specially appointed, who may be distinctly recognised as the representatives of the Brāhmanical and Budhistic power, in the vicinity of Athens in the most ancient times. These hierarchs were,

SRI-B'DHŌ-LEMOS, the “SACRED BUD'HA LAMA” (TRI-P'TO-LEMOS);<sup>4</sup>  
SU-MOL-BOODHA (EU-MOL-PODOS), the “VERY GREAT BUDHA,” and the  
DEO-C'L-ES (DIO-CLES), the Deva, or “BRAHMIN TRIBES' CHIEF.”

---

<sup>1</sup> *Simon Magus*, p. 70

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, IX p. 271. *Caves & Jungles of Hindostan*, pp. 609 fn. & 615

<sup>3</sup> *The Oracles of Zoroaster* by Franciscus Patricius, p. 36. Quoted in: Stanley T. *The Chaldaick Oracles of Zoroaster and his Followers*. (Poems in Greek, Latin, and English translations) London: Printed for Thomas Dring, 1661; [quoting Psellus 7; Nicephorus Z. or T.]

<sup>4</sup> *Sri*, (the Greek interchange for *Tri*, see Appendix, Rule xxiii) a prefix to the names of deities. It is also used as a token of religious respect as “The Rev. — The Right Rev.,” in England. *P'to*, is a very common Greek contraction for *Bodh*. See the varieties of this name in Appendix: *Lema*, is Lama; *P'to-Lema*, is Bud'ha-Lama. *Su-mal*, very great; Podos (Boodhas), is the original form of the last member of the compound. *Deva* or *Dev*, a Brahmin; *cul*, a tribe; *es*, a chief. The “u” suffers the ordinary apocope. (See Appendix, Rule i.)

**While the political power of Sri-B'dho-Lemos or Triptolemos was formidable, the cave-dwelling Buddhist Priests or Sroo-cula-dutæ, Lords of the Cave, who protected their secret doctrines from profanation, are today belittled as Troglodytai.**

The Deva did not long continue to enjoy his quasi-regal position. He was obliged to surrender his country to the TRI-P'TO-LEMOS, whose political weapons were very possibly keener than those of his adversary. Both at Eleusis and Athens, however, conspicuous temples and statues declared his deity. The GEPHU-RAE ("GOPHA-RAE," or "LORDS OF THE CAVE," sometimes called SROO<sup>1</sup>-CULA-DUTÆ), TRO-G'LO-DUTÆ, the special ministers of the Bud'histic faith, who kept their mysteries closely concealed, being a particular gens at Athens, were the genuine cave-hermits, and Jainas, of the highest antiquity. Perhaps in nothing were the different phases of ancient Indo-Hellenic society so distinctly marked, as in the enduring records of the Greek language.

**Further examples of the profound Brahmanical influence in Greece are the Goghos or Cow-Killer that became Kakos, i.e., bad. Soo-Bhoo-ya or one engaged in abstract meditation became Sophos, i.e., Wise. Despatis or Land-Lord became Despotes, thus marking the transition from Oligarchic privilege to Democratic tyranny.**

Thus the Brähmanical influence is seen in one of the most ordinary vocables. The KA-KOS or Bad-man, is the "GO-GHŌ-S" or COW-KILLER; the latter member of which compound, as indicative of the worst of beings, again permeates into the language of the SACA-SOOS or SAC-SONS, as BAD, from the Indian source, BADH, to "KILL." So too, the SO-PHOS or the WISE-MAN is the representative of the "SOO-BHOO-YA," or the high abstract meditation, by which humanity was supposed to be absorbed into the divinity. Then again, the DES-POTES or the LAND-LORD, (DES-PATI'S)<sup>2</sup> became synonymous with an "OPPRESSOR," and strongly marked the struggles through which one portion of Hellas had gone, in establishing a more extensive system of representative power, in which effort it passed from one extreme of Oligarchic to the opposite limits of Democratic tyranny.



"Buddhism is Inner Wisdom," in our Confusing Words Series.

---

<sup>1</sup> Sroo-cula. The tribe of *Sroos*, or Hearers, i.e., Jainas, a sect of the Bud'hists. Of this the Greeks made Trog'lee, a hole or cave, the place of worship for this sect. Troglodutos, a Troglodyte, properly a Hermit of the Cave, and one of the SROO-CULA (TROG'LO). See "Sracas," and Appendix, Rule xxiii.

<sup>2</sup> Des, land; pa, a lord or ruler