

MARIA MAGDALA

Christ Sophia



By Dean Carter

© Dean Carter 2013 www.centreforpuresound.org
Maria Magdala-Christ Sophia

This essay seeks to put together all the scattered allusions to Maria Magdala, the Consort of Our Lord, She who is indeed Our Lady, from the so-called ‘Synoptic gospels’, (Gk *syn-optikos*, ‘seeing with one eye’), those four largely conflicting accounts of the life and ministry of Christ which are all the false Church of Rome and its heirs and successors (including those which claim to have set themselves up in defiance of Rome, but who actually are built on the same foundations of spiritual ignorance) have allowed humanity to see. That is until now. We take it for granted that any reader of this piece will already be familiar, either as a theory or with an innate knowing that comes from the intuitive realm of Sophia/ChoKhMaH (‘Wisdom’) which is indeed Our Lady Maria Magdala’s domain, that She and Jesus Christ were Master and most worthy Successor, Heir and Spiritual Disciple, and, even more controversially, physically man and wife. Maria Magdala was the incarnation of the Christ-Sophia, the Feminine Divine, that balanced complemented and was equal to Jesus the incarnated Christ-Logos, the Divine Masculine.

Writers such as Laurence Gardner have in their books sought to uncover the 2000-year old cover-up instigated by the Church of Lies on this issue, which has resulted in a continued repression of the Feminine Divine for this length of time. However, I think this is the first time that the evidence of Her status from the synoptic gospels had been put together all in one continuous and ‘unseamed garment’. It seemed like something that needed to be done.

The essay also necessarily quotes from major Gnostic gospels that have been hidden from the world by Rome’s edict until the middle of the last century, and which even now are largely ignored by most who call themselves ‘Christian’. One wonders if the finding of an amazing hoard of hitherto lost texts that purported to be the words of the Buddha would be sidelined and ignored by the Buddhist world? I have to say that were such a find to emerge, the answer would indeed be: no. There is something deeply awry, and has been all along, with established ‘Christianity’ as it has conquered and burned its way to power in the West. As we move to the great leap that our planet and our aspiring souls deeply need at this time, so the lost teachings have resurfaced—‘those who have ears, let them hear!’

Our key starting passage is *John 11*, the ‘raising of Lazarus’ episode, where it is made clear that *Mary, Martha and Lazarus are brothers and sisters* and that

It was that Mary that anointed the Lord with ointment, and wiped His feet with her hair.

So Mary Magdalene is also the woman (un-named in the other Gospels) who anoints Jesus with the ointment from the alabaster box.

Then starting in apparent order of composition (*Mark* being the first, *Matthew* being *Mark* with additions, *Luke* being *Matthew* with further additions), we have

Mark 14: 3-9. Here Lazarus is referred to as ‘Simon the leper’ and Mary as

A woman with an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard, very precious; and she brake the box and poured it on His head.

There are murmurings at the waste and the cost, to which Jesus replies

...you have the poor with you always, and whensoever ye will ye may do them good: but me ye have not always.

She hath done what she could: she is come aforehand to anoint my body to the burying. Verily I say unto you, wheresoever this gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, this also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.

Only a wife could anoint her dead husband. What she has done is ‘her memorial’, a statement of Her true status. Those who have ears, let them hear.

Mark 15:40. At the Crucifixion:

There were also women looking on afar off: among whom was Mary Magdalene, and Mary the Mother of James the less and of Joses, and Salome.

The triple goddess. The other Mary is the mother of Jesus, Joses and James here strangely called the less, Jesus’ brother, James the Just, who is, according to Laurence Gardner, ‘Joseph’ (his title) Ha Rama Theo, corrupted into ‘of Arimathea’, a so-called place which has never been found.

And after, (15:47)

And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid.

Mark 16: 1 continues directly:

And when the Sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Salome, had brought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him...

Here they find the tomb empty and a single

...young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted.

He tells them ‘He is risen’ and to

...tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him as he said unto you.

We are then told in verse 9

Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils.

(10) And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept.

(11) And they when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not.

So while the other two women accompany Maria Magdala to the tomb and see it empty, it is to Her that He first reveals Himself.

Now on to *Matthew*.

Matthew 26:6—13

Again Lazarus is referred to as ‘Simon the leper’ and Maria Magdala simply as

...a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head.

Again the disciples murmur against this, and the response is virtually the same as in *Mark*:

Why trouble ye the woman? For she hath wrought a good work on me.

(11) For ye have the poor with you always; but me ye have not always.

(12) For in that she hath poured this ointment on my body, she did it for burial.

(13) Verily I say unto you Wheresoever this gospel shall be preached in the whole world, there shall also this, that this woman hath done, be told for a memorial of her.

In the next chapter (27) verse 56 the ‘women beholding afar off’ the Crucifixion are again listed as being

Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James and Joses [and Jesus, of course], and the mother of Zebedee's children. [=Salome again?]

A few verses later after 'Joseph of Arimathea' has laid the body 'in his own new tomb' we are told

And there was Mary Magdalene and the other Mary [not a very respectful treatment of the Catholic church's 'Holy Mother of God'!] sitting over against the sepulchre. The loyal women remain by Jesus' tomb.

Chapter 28: 1

In the end of the Sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre.

This version makes the announcement of Christ's rising more dramatic:

(2) And behold there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it.

Guards had been posted in Matthew's version: at this supernatural display, these 'become as dead men'. The angel then addresses the women more or less verbatim as in *Mark*. As they run to tell the disciples, *both* the Mother and the Consort are met by Jesus:

(9) And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him.

(10) Then Jesus said unto them, be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me.

The scene of the women delivering this message to the disciples isn't described, and we next see Jesus appearing to them, but even then 'some doubted'. We note that the women do not have this doubt.

The debt of *Matthew* to *Mark* in literary terms is made obvious by comparing these passages. By Luke things have become expanded, but on the other hand become garbled. Luke 7:36 describes Jesus as being at the home of 'a Pharisee' whom we later discover is called Simon, rather than calling him 'Simon the Leper'—or Lazarus.

(37) And behold a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought in an alabaster box of ointment,

(38) And stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment.

This is the first and indeed only time in the synoptic gospels Maria Magdala is depicted as a ‘sinner’, but we must remember also that ‘Luke’ has departed considerably from the source material as presented in *Mark* and/or *John* by now. It is clear to anyone with the least literary training or even simple observation that we have a process of ‘Chinese whispers’ going on, with either deliberate alterations being added to colour what would otherwise be yet another verbatim restatement of *Mark*, or a simple botching of the telling of the original.

In *Luke*’s version instead of the disciples murmuring against the ‘waste’ of this costly spikenard, ‘Simon’, supposedly now a Pharisee rather than a close disciple ‘whom Jesus loved’ as he is in *John*,

...spake within himself saying, This man, if he were a prophet, would have known who and what manner of woman this is that toucheth him: for she is a sinner.

Jesus then rebukes Simon and gives a parable about forgiveness, the implication of which is that the greater the sin, the greater the amount of love demonstrated in forgiving it.

(44) And he turned to the woman and said unto Simon, Seest thou this woman? I entered into thine house, thou gavest me no water for my feet: but she hath washed my feet with tears, and wiped them with the hairs of her head.

(45) Thou gavest me no kiss: but this woman since the time I came in hath not ceased to kiss my feet.

(46) My head with oil thou didst not anoint: but this woman hath anointed my feet with ointment.

(47) Wherefore I say unto thee, her sins, which are many, are forgiven; for she loved much: but to whom little is forgiven, the same loveth little.

(48) And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven...

(50) And he said to the woman, Thy faith have saved thee: go in peace.[Chapter ends here.]

‘Luke’ has misunderstood, it seems to me, not knowing the true nature of the relationship of Jesus and Maria, the whole nature of this incident, and it is this expanded but garbled and distorted version which has become the church favourite, if you like. Mary is reduced to a cipher, an object of the author’s invention, providing nothing more than an example of Jesus’ ability to forgive sins. The whole point has been changed, and indeed

completely obscured, by this new interpretation on the part of 'Luke' or the writer of *Luke* anyway, that 'the woman with the alabaster box' must have been a repentant sinner. This unforgiveable tinkering with a straightforward narrative on the part of 'Luke' has left us with a completely false idea of Maria Magdala as being a sinner who is then 'saved' by Jesus' forgiveness. In neither *Mark* nor *Matthew* is there any suggestion that 'the woman with the alabaster box', who we know via *John* to be Mary Magdalene, is a 'sinner'. *Luke*'s literary inventiveness and flight of fancy is completely against the grain of the earlier versions and that of *John*, and the writer of *Luke* is to be blamed here for this disparaging portrayal of womanhood, making a 'sinner' of the very Consort of Our Lord, the Christ-Sophia. Women throughout the centuries have paid in blood for such an imposed and distorted perspective.

The gospel writers and therefore each gospel are each assigned a Zodiacal beast, and are therefore each equated with one of the four Elements. Churches throughout 'Christendom' carry this symbolism, with, often, the Christ depicted in the centre of the four, forming a perfect *maṇḍala* exactly analogous to those of Tibetan Buddhism: I daresay most so-called Christians would be horrified to know this, and that the origins of their narrow and reductionist interpretation of spiritual truth carries symbolism which transcends all creeds and predates church history, pertaining instead to the 'Perennial Philosophy' that all religions are initially founded upon, but then seem to distort. The four beasts are represented also in the Judaeo-Christian tradition by the 'ChIUTh Ha QoDeSh', the 'Holy Living Creatures' of Ezekiel's vision.

In this scheme *Luke* is quite rightly assigned to 'The Bull', the leading Earth sign, and therefore the Earth element, the esoteric meaning of which is that, out of the four-only Gospels we have been allowed to view through the centuries by the corrupt churches of history, *Luke* is the one designed for the 'hylic', those at the lowest level of comprehension and spiritual development, who need as many 'spicy' incidents, miracles, and so on to grab their attention. The far more spiritually developed *John* gospel, which is perhaps the most important in many ways, and contains far more teaching and far less incident, is assigned to the Water element, (*John* = the Eagle, the risen aspect of the chief Water sign Scorpio) the next highest level, for the 'psychic', those who are at least aware of the existence of a soul/those who actually have started on the spiritual path and who do spiritual practices. The next highest element (in the QaBaLaH) is Air, and this corresponds to Matthew (the Angel/Man = Aquarius), while Mark (the Lion) = Fire. Both of these higher elements are appropriate for the 'pneumatic', those of more advanced degree of spiritual outlook, who are aware of spirit itself, working beyond both the physical (Earth element) and soul/psyche (Water element) levels.

Luke's next chapter begins

(1) *And it came to pass afterward that he went throughout every city and village, preaching and shewing the glad tidings of the kingdom of God: and the twelve were with him.*

(2) *And certain women, which had been healed of evil spirits and infirmities, Mary called Magdalene, out of whom went seven devils.*

This is suspiciously close to the previous chapter dealing with the supposedly 'unknown' 'woman with the alabaster box', is it not? Again attesting to 'Luke' having the whole thing garbled, perhaps having seen in *John* that 'the woman with the alabaster box' *was* indeed Mary Magdalene, but having forgotten the details or having gotten confused—or hearing it at second hand. Of course the casting out of the 'seven devils' had also been alluded to in *Mark*. Anyway, it cannot be coincidental. And we note it is a very different thing for one to be 'healed' of 'seven devils' than to be described as a 'sinner'. Instead of Maria Magdala being rightly celebrated as His Consort, for only a wife could perform the function of anointing in this way, 'Luke' strips her of what Jesus gives in the other gospels as 'her memorial'. The detail, though, of the seven devils is perhaps interesting, pointing to what in modern Western spiritual parlance would be called a cleansing of the seven *cakras*, 'centres' which for all true adherents of spiritual philosophy and discipline, then as now, are a reality, but that the fake church founded in the name of Christ still denies the existence of. In the Gnostic *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene* we actually see this process of Maria's soul ascending through and triumphing over 'seven devils' such as Craving, Ignorance, etc. A far cry from what the ignorant would perceive as a 'casting out' of devils in horror-movie style!

It is quite obvious that one of the reasons for the destruction and suppression of the non-Synoptic Gospels such as the *Pistis Sophia*, *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene*, *The Gospel of Thomas*, *the Gospel of Philip*, and so on, is that they show that the Church of Rome knew virtually nothing about the higher degrees of spiritual knowledge and the spiritual path, of Adept hood, and, like all those in ignorance, sought to suppress that which they did not understand for the sake of controlling the populace and keeping both temporal and spiritual power in their own hands. But even the (real, as opposed to the forged) *Letters of Paul* and the Synoptic gospels, if one knows what one is looking for, are full of clues and signs of the true spiritual science, the 'Perennial Philosophy'. Jesus the Christ was an Initiate, as was Maria Magdala, the Christ-Sophia to His Christ-Logos. The religion founded in his name became utterly debased and divorced from its true meaning and import, so much so as to become in effect the very opposite of the Church of Light of its time, and it became actually the Church of repression, lies, and Satanism. And it remains so to this day, deflecting any supposed true believers from a path of spiritual

ascension and enlightenment in the NOW, and promoting merely a pie-in-the-sky scenario that good people, when they die, will get a reward, while bad people, even if the victims of circumstances in this supposed one life only that a supposedly benign God would give them in which to work it all out, will suffer eternal damnation.

The sheer imbecility of the ‘Churchianity’ that arose in the stead of Christ’s true teaching, words, example, message, and practice then gave rise to the ‘Modernist/Materialist’ nightmare of a universe of blind random chance producing, from a complete blank meaningless, a life that will then return, a product of blind random chance and meaninglessness also, to a state of non-existence following on. They should be so lucky to escape the inexorability of Spiritual Law, that of karma!

We next encounter Maria Magdala, the beloved of Jesus Christ, in the 10th Chapter of *Luke*, but, again, the writer seems to be reporting on all these events from a distance, a distance which has resulted in misunderstanding. We know from *John* that Mary is both ‘the woman with the alabaster box’ and the sister of Martha and Lazarus. The writer of *Luke* seems curiously oblivious to the actualities of the events and persons about whom he, if it is a he, is writing. This is the ‘Martha and Mary’ episode:

(38) Now it came to pass, as they went, that he entered into a certain village: and a certain woman named Martha received him into her house.

(39) And she had a sister called Mary, which also sat at Jesus’ feet, and heard his word.

(40) But Martha was cumbered about much serving, and came to him and said, Lord, dost thou not care that my sister hath left me to serve alone? Bid her therefore that she help me.

(41) And Jesus answered and said unto her Martha, Martha, thou art careful [in the sense of ‘full of care’ one supposes] and troubled about many things:

(42) But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.

Mary here is portrayed as the disciple that is most heedful of and attentive to the Master’s word, as she is in the non-Synoptic/Gnostic gospels which the church tried so hard to suppress, (and for many centuries they were successful in their suppression.) She is the disciple of the disciples, ‘the apostle of the apostles’, and in *The Gospel of Philip* as many now know is referred to directly as ‘the Consort of the Lord’. The writer of *Luke* doesn’t really understand the very material he is attempting to set down from the source material of *John* and/or *Mark*. ‘Seeing-with-one-eye’ indeed!

Luke on the Crucifixion and Resurrection follows the other gospels. 23:55-56 describes how ‘the women...beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid’ after ‘Joseph of

Arimathea' has 'begged the body of Jesus' from Pontius Pilate. (Gardner points out that surely again only a family member could be given the body. 'Joseph Ha Rama Theo = James the Just, Jesus' Brother.) This time when the women come to the empty tomb on the Sabbath day, (24: 1—9)

...behold two men stood by them in shining garments:

men, not angels, two of them, and no earthquake. They speak to a similar end as in the previous versions, and this time all three women, (and in fact more) we are told deliver the news to the disciples, and are once again not believed:

(10) It was Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles.

(11) And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not.

Salome has turned now into Joanna. Mary Magdalene is not, here, granted a direct one-to-one encounter with Her Lord, nor is His Mother, as, perhaps, one might expect of the dubiously intentioned 'Luke' we have come to know and distrust in the re-casting of these events. The post-Resurrection aspect of *Luke* is much extended compared with *Mark* and *Matthew*, and includes the apparition of Christ to the disciples on the road to Emmaus. Unfortunately we now have reason to doubt and distrust the embroiderings and emendations of the writer of *Luke*. The idea of The Master re-appearing to the disciples and them not knowing who He is, is just too cinematically and aesthetically tempting to 'Luke', our would-be novelist/ Hollywood screenwriter.

John is a completely different 'kettle of fish' from the other three supposed 'Synoptic' gospels. In fact it must have been very problematic for the censors who have trimmed down the basis of our understanding of the Master of the Dawn of the Piscean Age, His life or His message, and owes no basis to *Mark* or its obvious successors. It, though, is the only extant other gospel which attempts to draw some kind of narrative account of the life and acts of Jesus, as well as His teachings. All the other major banned/repressed Gnostic gospels are more focussed on the *teaching* rather than the *life*. If there is a narrative, it is about what Jesus did and taught *after* the Resurrection. In the *Pistis Sophia* for example Jesus gives a long and complex series of teachings (far beyond the understanding of the uninitiated, it would seem, and therefore of the phoney church erected on the ruins of His ministry) to the disciples, and among them the most prominent is Mary Magdalene.

In *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene* the Christ is again teaching the disciples after the Resurrection, then leaves, leaving Mary Magdalene again the main focus as she 'rallies

the troops' after The Master's departure and shares a visionary encounter she had had with him, including her soul's rising through the seven levels mentioned earlier, revealing Her to be enlightened—which of course is rejected by Andrew and Peter, the 'simple fishermen' who don't understand such advanced spiritual discourse or Pathwork. Peter and Andrew are also often 'put down' by Christ Himself in the *Pistis Sophia* as having not understood the teachings, so no wonder a church founded on the contrived apostolic succession of the bishops of Rome from Peter had the text banned. In the *Gospel of Thomas* we are given no narrative as such but a simple series of sayings of the teacher, although, again the final 'Logion' makes clear Peter's spiritual emotional and even basic human immaturity when he tries to make Jesus cast Mary Magdalene out of the disciples! (And is again repudiated by The Master.)

The *Gospel of Thomas* also had to be repressed as it makes it very clear that Jesus appointed not Peter but his own brother, James the Just or Righteous, titularly 'Joseph' Ha Rama Theo, as His successor. Oops! The whole 'apostolic succession' of the Roman church upon which it claims its authority is completely bogus and contrived. Peter was never even the first bishop of Rome, although a Briton, Linus, part of the true bloodline and therefore originally a true descendant either in genetic and/or spiritual terms of Jesus, was! (For more details here I must point the reader to Gardner's *Bloodline of the Holy Grail*.)

But I digress.

John begins with the celebrated 'In the beginning was The Word' (*logos* *λογος*) passage. This passage is often confused/conflated with the opening of the Bible itself, in *Genesis* which also opens with the words (in our translations) 'In the beginning.' That this is a mistranslation of the opening of *Genesis* (real name in Hebrew BeReShITh, 'Creation'), and that what this text deals with isn't actually necessarily a matter of the remote past only is something I will just allude to briefly here.

By Chapter 2 in *John*, having briefly mentioned John the Baptist, we are given the 'first miracle' of the Marriage at Cana: unmentioned by the other *συνοπτικοί synoptikos* gospels. This could be, in fact, allusively, the first mention of Mary Magdalene or her importance in this gospel which in many ways is the clearest on these subjects, as the careful reader will note that after having turned the water into wine, the 'governor of the feast called the bridegroom', and it must surely be Jesus who is the bridegroom in this instance, as he is the one who has performed the miracle. *John* is full of what seems to be very direct observation, and is reckoned to be the earliest of the synoptic gospels, dated as early by some as AD 37, whereas the other synoptic gospels even the churchianity-wallahs agree were written far later than the events they portray.

John 11, as stated earlier, makes clarity of the confusion of the other three gospels by making it clear that

- a) Mary Magdalene is ‘the woman with the alabaster box’
- b) Mary, Martha and Lazarus are brother and sisters.

The ‘raising of Lazarus’ episode is given at far greater length in this gospel, and the details are probably of immense importance, but make little sense, some of them. This is probably due to garbled translation. (The same can be said, frankly, for the entirety of both the Old and the New testaments!)

For example, Jesus is initially unmoved by being told of the death of Lazarus, and delays going to the scene to raise him. One strange detail that suddenly makes sense given Laurence Gardner’s reading is in verse 20 where

...Martha, as soon as she heard that Jesus was coming, went and met him: but Mary sat still in the house.

Later, after conversing with Jesus, Martha returns

(28) ...and called Mary her sister secretly, saying, the Master is come, and calleth for thee.

(29) As soon as she heard that, she arose quickly, and came unto him.

This, Gardner says, indicates that Mary and Jesus were man and wife, for it is only when her husband has expressly called for her that she can come. There are many aspects of Gardner’s interpretations of the gospels that I am not convinced of, but that the pair were united in a highly mystically significant marriage, and that Maria Magdala Sophia was the Christ-Sophia to the Christ Logos incarnated by Jesus whom we call the Christ is, for me, beyond doubt. And that ‘Simon the leper’ = ‘Lazarus’ seems equally obvious. ‘Lazar-like’ is an appellation of the disease of leprosy in Shakespeare, for example.

The description of Mary’s anointing of her husband follows in *John* after the raising of her brother in Chapter 12.

(3) Then took Mary a pound of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: and the house was filled with the odour of the ointment.

No ‘sinner’ or apparently anonymous ‘woman’ in this version—and we remember that the gospel of *John* is said to significantly predate that of *Mark* and its derivatives *Matthew* and *Luke*. Mary is clearly named, and instead of being a sinner is one with the rest of the

household that is entertaining the Master—and, we believe, actually this act of anointing points to her true status as Christ's Consort and Holy wedded Wife.

However the disciples murmur against the use of the ointment as in the other gospels, and Jesus' response is largely reported as being the same:

(7) Then said Jesus Let her alone: against the day of my burying hath she kept this.

(8) for the poor always you have with you; but me you have not always.

In *John* the furore of the raising of Lazarus seems to be the 'last straw' for the Pharisees, who from then on intend to put Jesus to death, and His entry into Jerusalem, which itself precipitates the Crucifixion, follows hard upon this incident.

Once again, at the Crucifixion, it is the women who stand by Our Lord. Chapter 19 vs 25 states

Now there stood by the cross of Jesus his mother, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Cleophas, and Mary Magdalene.

The triple goddess again. Is 'Mary the wife of Cleophas' Salome aka Joanna? The use of 'Mary' is no coincidence if we realise (again this follows Laurence Gardner's interpretation) that Maria/MIRIAM is actually a title, just like 'Joseph' of 'Arimathea', like 'Soloman', like, even, 'David', and not a personal name. Maria/MIRIAM was the name of the prophetess as it were 'eclipsed' in the Old Testament by Moses, and to use this name as a title therefore makes sense. There are interesting revelations to be found in the Gematria of both names, for which there is no space here, but interested readers may contact me directly on the subject if they wish.

Chapter 20:

- 1) The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre.*
- 2) Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him.*
- 3) Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre.*
- 4) So they both ran together: and the other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.*
- 5) And he stooping low, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying; yet went he not in.*

- 6) *The cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie,*
- 7) *And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself.*
- 8) *Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed.*
- 9) *For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.*
- 10) *Then the disciples went away again into their own home.*
- 11) *But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre,*
- 12) *And seeth two angels in white, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain.*
- 13) *And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him.*
- 14) *And when they had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus.*
- 15) *Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou hast borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away.*
- 16) *Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him Rabboni, which is to say, Master.*
- 17) *Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended to my father: but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my father, and your Father, and to my God, and your God.*
- 18) *Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her.*

I have quoted here from *John 20* at length because many factors fall into place from reading this touching, intimate, and crucial scene. We note that, as earlier in the Lazarus episode, it is only in *John* out of the four synoptic gospels that we are permitted to hear Maria Magdala's voice: we hear her words, we hear her speak—as she speaks so eloquently in her own gospel and in the *Pistis Sophia*. She is no longer 'the woman with the alabaster box' only, or a mere figure fleshing out a parable. We are given her as a human being. Even if we were to take the narrative gospels as being fiction, she would now have the status of a major rather than a minor character. The fact that *She* is the one to whom Jesus first reveals His Risen Form, (although, we note, not yet fully Ascended!), makes her in fact THE most major figure in the gospels after Jesus Himself—just what the Church of Rome founded by the misogynist Peter has sought historically at every turn to conceal.

As a piece of literature, *John*'s treatment of the Resurrection is the most simple, real, yet dramatic, and authentic seeming. Bearing in mind that this is the earliest gospel, it is easy to see the others as in some ways pale copies of this original, copies which decay by *Luke* into outright distortions or embroiderings of events and people.

That there is a specific relationship rather than a general one between Jesus and Maria is implied in her use of the word 'Rabouni' in addressing Him at the Resurrection, rather than the more familiar (to us) 'Rabbi' for 'Master'. 'Rabouni' is interpreted by Jean-Yves Leloup in his excellent translation of *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene* as meaning 'beloved Master'.

Leaving the 'synoptic' gospels, which, we have found, are far from seeing events or persons 'with one eye', let us look briefly at two of the most important gospels from the Gnostic tradition, gospels which have been burned and banned for centuries so that our understanding of the spiritual importance of Mary Magdalene to Christianity has been buried by an entirely unenlightened 'Church of Lies'.

The *Gospel of Philip* has no narrative scheme and comprises of disjointed teachings, commentaries on Christ and the events of his ministry, etc. Among them we hear that

There were three who always walked with the lord: Mary his mother and her sister and Magdalene, the one who was called his companion. His sister and his mother and his companion were each a Mary.

'Mary', we must remember, we should see as a title not a personal appellation. This passage makes it clear that the three women (whatever the actual name of the third) were if anything more important and of higher rank, i.e. closer to The Master, than any of his male disciples. No wonder the Church of Rome had this gospel burned! But there's more:

And the companion of the [...] Mary Magdalene. [...] her more than [...] the disciples and [...] kiss her [...] on her [...] The rest of [...] They said to him 'Why do you love her more than all of us?' 'Why do I not love you like her? When a blind man and one who sees are both together in darkness they are no different from one another. When the light comes, then he who sees will see the light, and he who is blind will remain in darkness.'

I have left the above passage complete with its ellipses without putting in any conjectural words on the behalf of the reader: he or she may do that for him/her self. That Maria Magdala is the chosen Companion or Consort of The Master is absolutely

clear, and that she was regarded by Him in an entirely different light from the other disciples is also made clear from the parable offered, in which an obvious criticism of the disciples is levelled by Jesus: Mary is the one who now 'the light' has come, can see, while the others still 'remain in darkness'. A church founded in the name of a Roman Emperor who then distorted all its precepts and created a bogus 'apostolic' succession from Peter (who was never, historically, the first Bishop of Rome) could hardly allow a gospel making it clear that the true disciple and highest ranking person in terms of closeness to the Christ and understanding of His ministry was—a woman! From their distorted perspective it was necessary propaganda to have Christ's successor on earth and perhaps even the bearer of a Royal Bloodline, the *Sang Real* of Gardner's and others' interpretation, sidelined into a minor character, be deprived of a voice, and even branded 'a sinner'.

The spiritual Stalinism that the suppression of the truth represents triumphed for nearly 2000 years, and it is only in these changing times that the truth is emerging. But it is only emerging for that minority who are true seekers after truth, not lazy adherents of a cosy dogma which they can hide behind. How many so-called Christians have read the amazing hoard of gospels found at Nag Hammadi in the 1940s? These, along with the Dead Sea Scrolls, have revolutionised our perception of Christ and His times—and yet, most so-called Christians, rather than rushing to hear for themselves words of their Master hidden for millennia, have not read any of these gospels. In England the dear old Anglican Church doesn't even bother to denounce such works or make any kind of fuss, simply ambling along in the same old way, itself a clever form of censorship.

I would urge anybody reading these words to actually read *The Gospel of Mary Magdalene* in its entirety. As well as being available in compilation volume of the Nag Hammadi gospels and tracts, I would recommend the translation by Jean-Yves Leloup, published by Inner Traditions, of Vermont. Some major passages are here reproduced briefly.

From the point of view of this essay, we will restrict ourselves to a few passages making clear Maria Magdala's high status and superior level of spiritual perception. The gospel opens with very 'Buddhistic' and Eastern-tradition-sounding pronouncements by Jesus on the nature of the material universe, karma and 'sin', the latter being defined as acting 'by the habits of your corrupted nature'. He is present physically to the other disciples, and, when Jesus then physically departs from them, it is made clear that this is a post-Crucifixion and Resurrection scene when they say

How are we to go among the unbelievers and announce the gospel of the kingdom of the Son of Man? They did not spare his life, so why should they spare ours?

It is Mary then who emerges as the new spiritual leader of the disciples on The Master's departure:

*Then Mary arose,
Embraced them all, and began to speak to her brothers:
'Do not remain in sorrow and doubt,
For his Grace will guide and comfort you.
Instead let us praise his greatness,
For he has prepared us for this.
He is calling upon us to become fully human.'*

'Anthropos' is the word used. We might say, 'a whole and complete human being'.

*Thus Mary turned their hearts toward the Good,
And they began to discuss the meaning of the teacher's words.
Peter said to Mary
'Sister we know that the Teacher loved you
differently from other women.
Tell us whatever you remember
Of any words he told you which we have not yet heard.'*

Even Peter here tacitly acknowledges Maria Magdala's superiority and greater intimacy with the Master, and that she may have been the recipient of secret or higher teachings unknown to the other disciples. Maria duly agrees and tells them about a visionary episode in which the Teacher came to her, and then how her soul travelled up and escaped from all material constraints, until it could say:

*That which oppressed me has been slain,
That which encircled me has vanished;
My craving has faded,
And I am freed from my ignorance.
I left the world with the aid of another world,
A design was erased
By virtue of a higher design.
Henceforward I travel towards repose,
Where Time rests in the Eternity of Time.
I go now into Silence.*

This summation of spiritual transcendence has all the hallmarks of authority and actual experience rather than mere theory. This pronouncement, this teaching, from the lips of Maria Madgala herself, we have been robbed of by the church of lies for millennia. But we have Her words now.

Andrew, Peter's brother, and then Peter himself repudiate Mary's words:

*How is it possible that the Teacher talked
In this manner with a woman
About secrets of which we ourselves are ignorant?
[How indeed Peter?]
Must we change our customs
And listen to this woman?
Did he really prefer her to us?*

Sadly, Peter and the Church founded on his name and principles rather than those of the Christ did indeed cling to its 'customs' and repudiate spiritual growth and ascension in favour of worldly and political power—and does so until this very day.

*Then Mary wept,
And answered him:
'My brother Peter, what can you be thinking?
Do you believe that this is just my imagination,
That I invented this vision?
Or do you believe that I would lie about our teacher?'
At this Levi spoke up:
'Peter, you were always hot-tempered,
and now we see you repudiating a woman
just as our adversaries do.
Yet if our Teacher found her worthy
Who are you to reject her?
Surely the Teacher knew her very well,
For he loved her more than us.
Therefore let us atone
And become fully human [Anthropos]
So that the teacher can take root in us,
And walk forth to spread the gospel'.*

Hooray for Levi, say I! Instead of the pathetically juvenile jealousy and culturally-ingrained misogyny of Peter—you know, the one who in all the synoptic gospels

denies Christ and is actually referred to by Him as ‘Satan’!—we have true spiritual humility and sense, confirming that The Master was wise in His choice of a Companion and favoured disciple.

Levi is another disciple that the subsequent church of lies conveniently sidelined. Yet another reason why if it weren’t for the ‘chance’ finding of the Nag Hammadi hoard just after World War Two, you, dear reader, would not be reading these words from Our Lord and Our Lady, and indeed this whole essay, written in the spirit of Truth, and submitted in the hope for the Ascension of all true light-workers and walkers upon the Inner Path of Light, whatever their external cultural spiritual heritage, at this cusp of the Age of Pisces turning into the Age of Aquarius.

May the words, works, presence and Light of all true Masters bring about a Golden Dawn in the hearts of all peace-loving sentient beings; may the Kingdom of Heaven and its Righteousness become manifest reality on earth, and may the *heiros gamos*/ ιερος γαμος, the Sacred Marriage of Divine Alchemy, the perfect balancing of the polarity of the Divine Masculine and the Divine Feminine, the Bridegroom and the Bride, as exemplified by Our Lord Jesus-Christ Logos, Our Lady Maria-Christ-Sophia, and of The Mother and The Father in all recognisable forms of all spiritual cultures and traditions through ages past and those to come, take root in all our hearts.

Blessed be.

Stay tuned!

Oṃ tāre tuttāre ture swāhā!

EHleH ASheR EHleH

Dean Carter
Centre for Pure Sound
Dorset, Albion.

March, 2009
www.centreforpuresound.org

© Dean Carter 2013 Maria Magdala-Christ Sophia

Bibliography:

Mark, Matthew, Luke, John. The canonical/synoptic gospels of the New Testament. King James Version, 1611.

The Gospel of Mary Magdalene. Translation by Jean-Yves Leloup, Inner Traditions, Vermont.

The Nag Hammadi Library. Compilation volume includes *The Gospel of Philip*, *The Gospel of Thomas*, and an inferior translation of *The Gospel of Mary*. General editor James M. Robinson. Harper SanFrancisco.

The Grail Enigma, The Magdalen Legacy, The Bloodline of the Holy Grail. All by Laurence Gardner. Harper/Element. London