The inductive method of reasoning assumes false premises, from which it makes fake deductions.

The inductive method, bequeathed to modern scientists by Aristotle, can only lead to crass materialism.

First published in: *The Theosophist*, Vol. I, No. 1, October 1879, *pp.* 8-9.
Republished in: *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (ANTIQUITY OF THE VEDAS) II *pp.* 110-16.

A JOURNAL INTERESTED like *The Theosophist* in the explorations of archæology and archaic religions, as well as the study of the occult in nature, has to be doubly prudent and discreet. To bring the two conflicting elements — exact science and metaphysics — into direct contact, might create as great a disturbance as to throw a piece of potassium into a basin of water. The very fact that we are predestined and pledged to prove that some of the wisest of Western scholars have been misled by the dead letter of appearances and that they are unable to discover the hidden spirit in the relics of old, places us under the ban from the start. With those sciolists who are neither broad enough, nor sufficiently modest to allow their decisions to be reviewed, we are necessarily in antagonism. Therefore, it is essential that our position in relation to certain scientific hypotheses, perhaps tentative and only sanctioned for want of better ones — should be clearly defined at the outset.

An infinitude of study has been bestowed by the archæologists and the Orientalists upon the question of chronology — especially in regard to Comparative Theology. So far, their affirmations as to the relative antiquity of the great religions of the pre-Christian era are little more than plausible hypotheses. How far back the national and religious Vedic period, so-called, extends — "it is impossible to tell," confesses Professor Max Müller; nevertheless, he traces it "to a period anterior to 1000 B.C.," and brings us "to 1100 or 1200 B.C., as the earliest time when we may suppose the collection of the Vedic hymns to have been finished." Nor do any other of our leading scholars claim to have finally settled the vexed question, especially delicate as it is in its bearing upon the chronology of the book of *Genesis*. Christianity, the direct outflow of Judaism and in most cases the State religion of their respective countries, has unfortunately stood in their way. Hence, scarcely two scholars agree; and each assigns a different date to the *Vedas* and the Mosaic books, taking care in every case to give the latter the benefit of the doubt. Even that leader of the leaders in philological and chronological questions — Professor Müller, hardly twenty years ago, allowed himself a prudent margin by stating that it will be difficult to settle "whether the *Veda* is 'the oldest of the books,' and whether some of the portions of the Old Testament may not be traced back to the same or even an earlier date than the oldest hymns of the *Vedas*." *The Theosophist* is, therefore, quite warranted in either adopt-

ing or rejecting as it pleases the so-called authoritative chronology of science. Do we err then, in confessing that we rather incline to accept the chronology of that renowned Vedic scholar, Swami Dayānanda Sarasvatī, who unquestionably knows what he is talking about, has the four *Vedas* by heart, is perfectly familiar with all Sanskrit literature, has no such scruples as the Western Orientalists in regard to public feelings, nor desire to humour the superstitious notions of the majority, nor has any object to gain in suppressing facts? We are only too conscious of the risk in withholding our adulation from scientific authorities. Yet, with the common temerity of the heterodox we must take our course, even though, like the Tarpeia[1] of old, we be smothered under a heap of shields — a shower of learned quotations from these "authorities."

We are far from feeling ready to adopt the absurd chronology of a Berosus or even Syncellus — though in truth they appear "absurd" only in the light of our preconceptions. But, between the extreme claims of the Brahmans and the ridiculously short periods conceded by our Orientalists for the development and full growth of that gigantic literature of the ante-Mahābhāratean period, there ought to be a just mean. While Swami Dayānanda Sarasvatī asserts that "The *Vedas* have now ceased to be objects of study for nearly 5,000 years," and places the first appearance of the four *Vedas* at an immense antiquity, Professor Müller, assigning for the composition of even the earliest among the *Brāhmanas*, the years from about 1000 to 800 B.C., hardly dares, as we have seen, to place the collection and the original composition of the Samhitā, of Rig-Vedic hymns, earlier than 1200 to 1500 before our era![2] Whom ought we to believe; and which of the two is the better informed? Cannot this gap of several thousand years be closed, or would it be equally difficult for either of the two cited authorities to give data which would be regarded by science as thoroughly convincing? It is as easy to reach a false conclusion by the modern inductive method as to assume false premises from which to make deductions. Doubtless Professor Max Müller has good reasons for arriving at his chronological conclusions. But so has Dayānanda Sarasvatī Pandit. The gradual modifications, development and growth of the Sanskrit language are sure guides enough for an expert philologist. But, that there is a possibility of his having been led into error would seem to suggest itself upon considering a certain argument brought forward by Swami Dayānanda. Our respected friend and teacher maintains that both Professor Müller and Dr. Wilson have been solely guided in their researches and conclusion by the inaccurate and untrustworthy commentaries of Sayana, Mahīdhara, and Uvata; commentaries which differ diametrically from those of a far earlier period as used by himself in connection with his great work, the *Veda-Bhāshya*. A cry was raised at the outset of this publication that Swami's commentary is calculated to refute Sayana and the English interpreters. "For this," very justly remarks Pandit Dayānanda, "I cannot be blamed; if Sayana has erred, and English interpreters have chosen to take him for their guide, the delusion cannot be long maintained. Truth alone can stand, and Falsehood before growing civilization must fall."[3] And if, as he claims, his *Veda-Bhāshya* is entire-

[1] [In Roman mythology, Tarpeia, daughter of Spurius Tarpeius was a Roman maiden who betrayed the city of Rome to the Sabines in exchange for what she thought would be a reward of jewellery.]

[2] *Lecture on the Vedas*; [in *Chips*, etc., Vol. I.]

[3] Answer to Objections to the *Veda-Bhāshya*.

ly founded on the old commentaries of the ante-Mahābhāratean period to which the Western scholars have had no access, then, since his were the surest guides of the two classes, we cannot hesitate to follow him, rather than the best of our European Orientalists.

But, apart from such *prima facie* evidence, we would respectfully request Professor Max Müller to solve us a riddle. Propounded by himself, it has puzzled us for over twenty years, and pertains as much to simple logic as to the chronology in question. Clear and undeviating, like the Rhone through the Geneva lake, the idea runs through the course of his lectures, from the first volume of *Chips* down to his last discourse. We will try to explain.

All who have followed his lectures as attentively as ourselves will remember that Professor Max Müller attributes the wealth of myths, symbols and religious allegories in the Vedic hymns, as in Grecian mythology, to the early worship of nature by man. "In the hymns of the Vedas" to quote his words, "we see man left to himself to solve the riddle of this world . . . He is awakened from darkness and slumber by the light of the sun" . . . and he calls it — "his life, his breath, his brilliant Lord and Protector. He gives names to all the powers of nature, and after he has called the fire 'Agni,' the sunlight 'Indra,' the storms 'Maruts,' and the dawn 'Usha,' they all seem to grow naturally into beings like himself, nay, greater than himself."[1] This definition of the mental state of *primitive* man, in the days of the very infancy of humanity, and when hardly out of its cradle — is perfect. The period to which he attributes these effusions of an infantile mind, is the Vedic period, and the time which separates us from it is, as claimed above, 3,000 years. So much impressed seems the great philologist with this idea of the mental feebleness of mankind at the time when these hymns were composed by the four venerable Rishis, that in his *Introduction to the Science of Religion*[2] we find the Professor saying:

> Do you still wonder at polytheism or at mythology? Why, they are inevitable. They are, if you like, a *parler enfantin* of religion. But the world has its childhood, and when it was a child it spoke as a child [*nota bene*, 3,000 years ago], it understood as a child, it thought as a child . . . The fault rests with us, if we insist on *taking the language of children for the language of men* . . . The language of antiquity is the language of childhood . . . The *parler enfantin* in religion is not extinct . . . as, for instance, the religion of India . . .

Having read thus far, we pause and think. At the very close of this able explanation, we meet with a tremendous difficulty, the idea of which must have never occurred to the able advocate of the ancient faiths. To one familiar with the writings and ideas of this Oriental scholar, it would seem the height of absurdity to suspect him of accepting the Biblical chronology of 6,000 years since the appearance of the first man upon earth as the basis of his calculations. And yet the recognition of such chronology is inevitable if we have to accept Professor Müller's reasons at all; for here we run against a purely arithmetical and mathematical obstacle, a gigantic miscalculation of proportion . . .

---

[1] *Chips from a German Workshop*, Vol. I, *p.* 68

[2] *p.* 278

No one can deny that the growth and development of mankind — mental as well as physical — must be analogically measured by the growth and development of man. An anthropologist, if he cares to go beyond the simple consideration of the relations of man to other members of the animal kingdom, has to be in a certain way a physiologist as well as an anatomist; for, as much as ethnology, it is a progressive science which can be well treated but by those who are able to follow up retrospectively the regular unfolding of human faculties and powers, assigning to each a certain period of life. Thus, no one would regard a skull in which the wisdom tooth, so-called, would be apparent, the skull of an infant. Now, according to geology, recent researches "give good reasons to believe that under low and base grades the existence of man can be traced back into the tertiary times." In the old glacial drift of Scotland — says Professor W. Draper — "the relics of man are found along with those of the fossil elephant"; and the best calculations so far assign a period of two hundred and forty thousand years since the beginning of the last glacial period. Making a proportion between 240,000 years — the least age we can accord to the human race — and twenty-four years of a man's life, we find that three thousand years ago, or the period of the composition of Vedic hymns, mankind would be just twenty-one — the legal age of majority, and certainly a period at which man ceases using, if he ever will, the *parler enfantin* or childish lisping. But, according to the views of the Lecturer, it follows that man was, three thousand years ago, at twenty-one, a foolish and undeveloped — though a very promising — infant, and at twenty-four, has become the brilliant, acute, learned, highly analytical and philosophical man of the nineteenth century. Or, still keeping our equation in view, in other words, the Professor might as well say, that an individual who was a nursing baby at 12 noon on a certain day, would at 12:20 p.m., on the same day, have become an adult speaking high wisdom instead of his *parler enfantin!*

It really seems the duty of the eminent Sanskritist and Lecturer on Comparative Theology to get out of this dilemma. Either the *Rig-Veda* hymns were composed but 3,000 years ago, and, therefore, cannot be expressed in the "language of childhood" — man having lived in the glacial period — but the generation which composed them must have been composed of adults, presumably as philosophical and scientific in the knowledge of their day, as we are in our own; or, we have to ascribe to them an immense antiquity in order to carry them back to the days of human mental infancy. And, in this latter case, Professor Max Müller will have to withdraw a previous remark, expressing the doubt "whether some of the portions of the Old Testament may not be traced back to the same or even an earlier date than the oldest hymns of the *Vedas*."[1]

[1] *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (ANTIQUITY OF THE VEDAS) II *pp.* 110-16

Suggested reading for students.

She being dead, yet speaketh.

- “Blavatsky about to unveil Isis”
- “Blavatsky against Ecclesiastical Christianity”
- “Blavatsky against Spiritualism”
- “Blavatsky cuts down to size a carping critic of heterodoxy”
- “Blavatsky defends Isis Unveiled”
- “Blavatsky enlightens the sceptics of her Motherland”
- “Blavatsky expels a friend of Communists”
- “Blavatsky hated balls”
- “Blavatsky on a Case of Obsession”
- “Blavatsky on a Heavy Curse”
- “Blavatsky on an Intro- and retrospective dream”
- “Blavatsky on Animal Souls”
- “Blavatsky on Bulgarian Sun Worship”
- “Blavatsky on Christmas and the Christmas Tree”
- “Blavatsky on Elementals and Elementaries”
- “Blavatsky on foeticide being a crime against nature”
- “Blavatsky on Hindu widow-burning”
- “Blavatsky on Jesuitry in Masonry”
- “Blavatsky on Marriage, Divorce, and Celibacy”
- “Blavatsky on Nebo of Birs-Nimrud”
- “Blavatsky on Occult Alphabets and Numerals”
- “Blavatsky on Occult Vibrations”
- “Blavatsky on Old Age”
- “Blavatsky on old doctrines vindicated by new prophets”
- “Blavatsky on Plato’s Timæus”
- “Blavatsky on Progress and Culture”

- “Blavatsky on Religious deformities”
- “Blavatsky on Ritualism in Church and Masonry”
- “Blavatsky on Shambhala, the Happy Land”
- “Blavatsky on Spinoza and Western Philosophers”
- “Blavatsky on Sunday devotion to pleasure”
- “Blavatsky on Teachings of Eliphas Levi”
- “Blavatsky on the Boogeymen of Science”
- “Blavatsky on the Book of Enoch”
- “Blavatsky on the doomed destiny of the Romanovs”
- “Blavatsky on the elucidation of long-standing enigmas”
- “Blavatsky on the Harmonics of Smell”
- “Blavatsky on the hidden Esotericism of the Bible”
- “Blavatsky on the history and tribulations of the Zohar”
- “Blavatsky on the introversion of mental vision”
- “Blavatsky on the Key to Spiritual Progress”
- “Blavatsky on the knighted Oxford Sanskritist who could speak no Sanskrit”
- “Blavatsky on the Letters of Lavater”
- “Blavatsky on the Luminous Circle”
- “Blavatsky on the modern negators of Ancient Science”
- “Blavatsky on the Monsoon”
- “Blavatsky on the New Year and false noses”
- “Blavatsky on the New Year’s Morrow”
- “Blavatsky on the Qabbalah by Isaac Myer”
- “Blavatsky on the quenchless Lamps of Alchemy”
- “Blavatsky on the Rationale of Fasts”
- “Blavatsky on the Roots of Zoroastrianism”
- “Blavatsky on the Secret Doctrine”
- “Blavatsky on the Teachings of Eliphas Levi”
- “Blavatsky on the Vishishtadvaita Philosophy”
- “Blavatsky on Theosophy and Asceticism”
- “Blavatsky on whether the Rishis exist today”
- “Blavatsky rebuts unspiritual conceptions about God”
- “Blavatsky's last words”

- “Blavatsky's open letter to her correspondents”
- “Gems from the East”
- “Inductive reasoning leads to fake deductions”
- “Madame Blavatsky enlightens the sceptics of her Motherland”
- “Madame Blavatsky on the philosophical mind of the Chinese”
- “Obituary to Mikhail Nikiforovich Katkov”
- “Obituary to Pundit Dayanand Saraswati”
- “Open Letter to the American Section of the Theosophical Society”
- “Open Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury”
- “Open Letters to the American Convention”
- “Pages from Isis Unveiled”
- “Pages from the Caves and Jungles of Hindostan”
- “Pages from The Secret Doctrine 1 - abridged”
- “Pages from The Secret Doctrine 2 - full text”
- “Pantheistic Theosophy is irreconcilable with Roman Catholicism”
- “Rosicrucianism was an offshoot of Oriental Occultism”
- “Rosicrucians emerged as an antidote to the material side of alchemy”
- “The Hermetic Fire of the mind is the key to the Occult Sciences”
- “The real meaning of the first line of Genesis”
- “The Secret Doctrine (1888) Vol. 1 of 2 on Cosmogenesis”
- “The Secret Doctrine (1888) Vol. 2 of 2 on Anthropogenesis”
- “Thoth is the equivalent of Hermes and Moses”
- “Unpopular Philosopher on Criticism and Authorities”
- “Unpopular Philosopher on the Eighth Wonder”
- “Unpopular Philosopher on the Morning Star”
- “We are more often victims of words rather than of facts”
- “Without the revival of Aryan philosophy, the West will fall to even grosser materialism”