


Madame Blavatsky rebuts unspiritual conceptions about God.



Deity is Life and immutable Divine Law.

Letter to “Lucifer” about God by J. Hunter.

First published in *Lucifer*, Vol. II (11), July 1888, pp. 417-20. Republished in *Blavatsky Collected Writings*, (WHAT IS GOD?) X pp. 42-47. The footnotes signed ED. are by H.P. Blavatsky, Editor of *Lucifer*. Title page illustration by Emrekunt.

I wish to thank you for reply to my former communication. I find I agree to an extent with your thought, but not wholly. With your permission I will open out my thought on this great subject a little more, if useful.

I have no conception of Infinite and Boundless as positive existence. The Eternal or Absolute Void may be said to be Infinite and Boundless, but this Void is nothing, and of which nothing can be predicated; so that Infinite or Boundless and Absolute in this respect are non-existent.¹ You seem to identify Deity with the Original Nothing, the absolute Negation. But such Deity has nothing to do with what we call the Something or the Real, and existence is quite independent of it.² If Deity or God is the same as Absolute Nothing, and all things came from Him or It, then something has come from nothing, [43] which, philosophy declares, cannot be.³ The real, as opposed to the unreal, can alone produce that which is real, whatever kind of reality it be, divine, spiritual or natural. In plain words nothing can produce nothing. Something only can produce itself in varied differentiations.⁴ Nothing is the Infinite. The Something (universal reality or the all) is the Finite; but (if you like) Infinite in this sense that, being all-inclusive, it is bounded by nothing beyond it. If Deity has originated form, size, number and motion as attributes of the concrete — spiritual or nature⁵ — how could He (allow me to use this pronoun) so have done unless these in some way are in Himself. As He has originated *all* conditions, He surely possesses in Himself the original of these conditions; and though He is not conditioned by any-

¹ To some minds, very likely. In the opinion of a Vedantīn or an Eastern Occultist this “Boundless” is the one deity and the one reality in this universe of Maya, and it is the one *everlasting and uncreated* principle — everything else being illusionary, because finite, conditioned and transitory. — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

² It cannot be *independent*, since “existence” is precisely that Deity which we call “Absolute Existence,” of which nothing can be “independent.”

³ Which philosophy? Not Eastern philosophy and metaphysics — the oldest of all. *Nothing* cannot come out of or from another nothing — if the latter word is accepted in our finite sense. All comes from Nothing, or NOTHING, En-Soph, the Boundless (to us) *nothingness!* but on the plane of Spirit the noumenon of ALL. — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

⁴ Our correspondent is very little acquainted, we see, with occult Eastern ideas and true metaphysics. The deity he calls “Nothing” and we “No-thing” can produce nothing, for the simple reason that IT is in itself ALL, the Infinite, Boundless and Absolute, and that even IT *could never produce anything outside of itself*, since whatever manifests is ITSELF. — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

⁵ Lightning is produced by electricity, and is an *aspect* of the concealed Cause. And because that Cause originates the phenomenon shall we call it “lightning” and a “He”? — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

thing beyond or greater than himself, yet He is Himself the sum total of conditions. That is, He is the *all* of conditions.¹ As I take it, Deity is the All of the Universe in its first, original or originating form, and what we call the evolved universe is Deity in his last or ultimate form. It is as if Deity out-breathed Himself forth into vastitude, then in-breathed Himself back into minutude.² He [44] is thus the all of substance as to Being, and the all of Form and of motions as to Truth. It is an alternation of states, the one the state of concentration, the other the state of diffusion or expansion. The Alpha and Omega, making true the saying “the first shall be the last, and the last shall be the first.” The Microcosm becomes the Macrocosm [?!] and this again resolves itself back into the Microcosmic form and state. The going forth of Deity from the self to the not-self and back again to the self constitutes in the motions the Age of ages or Eternity, and is the all of Truth, the all of cosmic and universal history.³

Of course the evolved, universal form, being a result, as to state, is not absolute or personal Deity, but only his image or reflection the shadow of the real as it were, an administration of the Original Being. I may here be expressing the same as you mean, when you call phenomena Maya or illusion, not being absolutely permanent. Yes, yet phenomena are real as appearances. The Māyāvic World is real while it is Māyāvic, just as a snowflake is until it melts.

I have said that the All, as the *little* Universe evolves itself into the form and state of the vast universe; but in the process it exhausts its potencies, and at this stage the evolution begins to cease, and involution begins; and Deity the *little* is recuperated by re-absorbing the substances and forms of the Māyāvic Universe, which thus in the process of ages ceases to be, returning to the Nirvānic state of Deific concentrated. Now — a Vedāntist would say — Brahm sleeps on the lotus, and will awake anew to create another Māyāvic Universe.⁴

[45]

The imperfect attempts at statement are but general, and do exclude all that can be conceived and known of the manifold planes and ranks of intelligent beings that exist in the manifold universe. You seem to think I am very materialistic in thought. But mystical thought that denies form to Spirit and thus to Deity, is no proof of superiority or spirituality of intelligence.⁵

¹ And why not “She,” the ALL? Just as natural one as the other, and, in our opinion, quite as incongruous. — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

² Say, at once, “itself,” instead of “Himself,” and do not make it a personal (on our plane) *conscious* action and you will be nearer the mark of our occult teachings.

³ This is Kabbalistic and, on the whole, correct, but too indefinite for esoteric philosophy. Does our critic mean to say that it is the microcosm which becomes the Macrocosm, instead of the reverse? (See Editors’ *Notes* at the end). — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

⁴ Aye, Brahmā “sleeps” on the lotus during the “nights,” and between the “days” of Brahma (neuter). But Brahmā, the Creator, *dies* and *disappears* when his “age” is at an end, and the hour for the MAHĀ PRALAYA strikes. Then NO-THING reigns supreme and alone in Boundless Infinitude and that No-thing is non-differentiated space which is no-space, and the ABSOLUTE, “The most excellent *male* is worshipped by men, but the soul of wisdom, THAT in *which there are no attributes of name or form* is worshipped by Sages (*Yogins*)” (*Vishnu-Purāna*). This, then, is the point of difference with your correspondent.

⁵ None whatever. It only denotes better knowledge of metaphysics. That which *has form cannot be absolute*. That which is conditioned or bounded by either space, time, or any limitation of human conception and growth — cannot be INFINITE, still less ETERNAL. — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

You will perceive the point toward which my line of thought strains. The beings on the highest ranges of the Universe are far more glorious in form than those on the lower ranges. Those on the terrestrial globes, such as ourselves, are the most shadowy, as to our outer forms. He who centres the myriadal hosts of His children, must be the most and all-glorious.¹ But surely this is because He must be the most *concentrated* in substance and the most *complex* in his form, inconceivably so. The human forms of the Elohim are as floating shadows compared to Him. His form, as to organization and shape, is the Human, the dual human. [!] The infinitesimal cells in His body are the germ points of Solar Systems, to be realized during the ages in the Mâyāvīc expanses.²

Each plane of existence is organic, and the most refined is the most dense and vital and potential. All Spirits are human forms, all the Elohim (if you like) — male and female — or two in one — are human forms. In fact, existence is form, Life is form, Intelligence, Love and the human affections are based upon and held in the continent of the human organization, and all lesser or fragmentary formations of mineral, vegetable, animal or sphered world, are its production. It is the one Truth, the eternal, the uncreated and [46] unimagined, the continent of universal particulars, The All Father-Mother in whom we and all things live and move and have our being.

Respectfully yours,

J. HUNTER

April 30th, 1888

Editorial response by Madame Blavatsky.

The writer seems a little confused in his ideas. He launches in one place into verbal pantheism and then uses language embodying the most curious anthropomorphic conceptions. Deity, for instance, is regarded as “outbreathing Himself into vastitude,” and as the “*all* of substance as to Being, and the *all* of Form and motions, as to Truth.” Later on “he” is described as an apparently gigantic organism: “His form . . . is *the Human*, the *dual human*.” The “*all* of Forms” and conditions, merely an enormous hermaphrodite? Why not a monkey or elephant, or, still better, a mosaic pieced together out of all the different organic types? It is unphilosophical to regard such a *thing* as the “*All of forms*,” if it only reproduces the *human* organization, though it may be strictly *theological*.

¹ Undeniably so, “He who centres the myriadal hosts” is not ABSOLUTE DEITY, not even its LOGOS, *Aja* (the unborn), but at best Adam-Kadmon, the *Tetragrammaton** of the Greeks, and the Brahmā-Vishnu on the Lotus of Space, the HE which disappears with the “Age of Brahm.” — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]

*[Consult “Tetragrammaton is the Key to Occult Theogony,” in our Secret Doctrine’s First Proposition Series. — ED. PHIL.]

² Just so, and this is Adam-Kadmon, the heavenly man, the “male-female” or the symbol of the material manifested Universe, whose 10 limbs (or 10 Sephirōth, the numbers) correspond to the zones of the universe, the 3 in 1 of the upper and the 7 of the lower planes. — ED. [H.P. Blavatsky]


In another place the writer speaks of this anomalous creature — the “All Father-Mother” — as “unimaginable.” After allusions to the function of its organic cells, its human organization, its substance and relation to the Universe, etc., this epithet appears sufficiently bewildering. We are also assured that “what we call the evolved universe is Deity in his last or ultimate form.” Has Deity, then, several forms or states? Obviously so, if our critic is identifying him with plane after plane in this summary fashion. Such an interpretation would, however, result in the dethronement of the big Hermaphrodite, the only form Deity patronizes, according to his present biographer.

All argument based on the idea of reading such qualities as “form, size, number and motion,” etc., into Deity is necessarily worthless. It utterly ignores the distinction between Substance and Attribute. Notice, also, such obvious objections as the following:

- 1 If Deity is a *form*, he cannot be Infinite because form implies a boundary line somewhere.
- 2 If Deity can be *numbered*, polytheism is a truth.
- 3 If it possesses *size*, it is no [47] longer Absolute, size being a relative notion derived from phenomena.
- 4 *Motion* again involves limitation, inasmuch as it only means the passage *through space* of an object. Deity if infinite can have nothing to traverse, and like contradictions.

Our critic objects to being classed among materialistic thinkers; unfortunately for him it is his own writings that denounce him as such. For a Deity in form, obviously possesses *all the qualities which make up matter*, viz., extension in space, form, size, etc. He must even possess that of colour, to be distinguishable from other objects of perception according to him! Where then are we to stop?

Mr. Hunter’s conceptions are, in fact, so extremely unspiritual, that they far outvie in “materialism” the utterances of the most “advanced” agnostics, who, at least, grasp one fact, viz: — that the realm of matter and the realm of mind cannot be jumbled up at random.



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's last words”
- “Blavatsky's open letter to her correspondents”

BLAVATSKY SPEAKS SERIES
SUGGESTED READING FOR STUDENTS

- “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 Cosmogogenesis”
- “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”

