

About Jesus and Mary Magdalene

Since decades, or maybe even a few centuries, the discussion is going on about if Jesus existed, or not. There are no concrete historical proofs, neither for nor against it. There is, however, [some evidence](#). It has even been suggested that the Biblical Jesus would be a conglomeration of 2-3 historical persons, and – really doubtful to me! – that he in reality would be a [pseudonym for Gaius Julius Caesar!](#)

And who is Christ? According to Gnostic Christianity (see the [Apocryphon of John](#)), he is a very high entity, who in the creation appeared out of himself: the Autogenes. The original creator and the highest God is the “invisible” and “indescribable”, who is pure light. Out of that light appeared Barbelo as his creative power, who is female (“giving birth to the creation”). As a third emanation, Christ appeared, whom we may regard as the love of the creator. Then creation went on in several steps.

“Christ” is not a name but a kind of “title” that means “the anointed one”, a Greek translation (*Christòs*) of the Hebrew title *Mashiah* (Messias). We do not know a name for him.

On a somewhat lower level Sophia came into being, the Wisdom, as an emanation of Barbelo. She is also called “bride of Christ”. She created an entity Yaldabaoth out of “error”. She had an incomplete thought, but on that level, thoughts are creative: one thinks it and then it is there. This Yaldabaoth then wanted to be god himself and is demonstrably (through comparison between Gnostic and Old Testament texts) the one, who in the Old Testament is called Yahweh (actually YHWH). He created his own world, in which we now live.

Who, then, is Jesus? Is it conceivable that one of the highest entities in the creation incarnates as a human being? Rather not... He is, therefore, more meaningfully understood as a *messenger of Christ*, who incarnated for this task. As is [here](#) shown in much detail, an important part of his mission was to make us humans understand who Yahweh really is. Because of that, Yahweh managed to have him crucified through manipulation of certain persons. Out of the inner circle around Jesus arose the Gnostic Christianity that preserved many truths and much knowledge that Jesus had talked about only in the inner circle, a.o. that Yahweh is not the real god. For that reason, Yahweh also wanted to get rid of the Gnostic Christians, which he achieved by means of Constantine’s foundation of what to day is the Church at the council of Nicaea in the year 325. The Gnostic Christians were then regarded as heretics and their texts were destroyed. Yahweh will then also have striven for eradicating historical proofs of Jesus’ existence.

Yahweh wanted to replace the Gnostic Christianity with the Paulinian Christianity, which was done at that council and this became the basis for the Church dogma. This Christianity is a modified and superficial, a “Christianity light”, that lacks the more profound truths of the Gnostic Christianity. Luckily, most of the lost Gnostic texts were rediscovered in the year 1945 in Nag Hammadi, Egypt, and we now have them back.

Who was Mary Magdalene? In the theology of the Church, she was long regarded as the whore, the “sinful woman”, mentioned in Luke 7:36-50, but this opinion was rejected by the Vatican in 1969. There is not valid ground to regard that woman and Maria Magdalena as one and the same, but this must rather be viewed in the frame of patriarch endeavors. And if she would have been that woman: note that Jesus forgave the prostitute. How could we then be such hypocrites so as to want to condemn someone who Jesus forgave? But that is a side remark, since they will not have been the same person. Much indicates that she and Jesus were very close, so close that they may have been a pair. A new text fragment has been found that recently actualized this question. Professor Karen L. King at the Harvard University has translated it, and in it, Jesus talks about “my wife”, see this article by her: [“Jesus said to them, ‘My wife...’”](#). The translation is quoted and discussed here: [Was Jesus Married?](#)

Now, since God (or the gods...) created us as man and woman and gave us sexual organs, it is obvious that sexuality is a gift of God. It can, of course, be abused like almost anything else. But it cannot be an abuse to enjoy it – why else would God have given the woman a clitoris? This organ is not needed for becoming pregnant (its only function seems to enable an orgasm), because the woman can get pregnant without it. However, a man would hardly make her pregnant unless he enjoys it.

It is obvious that God wanted that we should enjoy the sexual union. That is no abuse. The worst abuse is, however, when one of the two person is forced to it against the own will. True sexuality is an act of love, a love union. Sex only for the joy is not exactly as it should be, but if the participants take part in it voluntarily, why should that be wrong? Whom would it hurt? Sexuality can also become an addiction. Then, again, it becomes wrong and under circumstances abusive. But a sexual union in *mutual love* can never be wrong. The criterion and the key is *love*!

Why, then, should we want to “castrate” Jesus and expect from him to live like a eunuch? What would Christianity have to lose if he were married? Nothing! Rather the contrary! It has been suggested that the marriage in Cana (John 2:1-11) in reality was his marriage with Mary Magdalene. That she anointed him with spikenard (Mark 14:3, John 12:3) is was, actually, part of an Essene marriage ritual with an erotic flavor that we see also in the Song of Solomon 1:12 (Barbara Thiering: *Jesus the Man*, Corgi, London, 1993). Nothing contradicts that in the Bible, but it remains a possible interpretation. And if we accept that possibility, why should they not have had children? Regrettably, however, one wants to interpret the erotophobic Dogma of the Church backwards into the time of Jesus.

A few apocryphal texts indicate that Mary Magdalene and Jesus were a pair. One such text is the [Gospel of Philip](#), where it is written: “And the companion of the Christ is Mariam the Magdalene. The Lord loved Mariam more than all the (other) Disciples, and he kissed her often on her mouth.” Theologians date the text to the late first or the early second century and with that claim that the text would be invented, because it was written so late. This proves only one thing: that the oldest manuscript that we have can be dated to around the year 200 – i.e., the papyrus on which it is written. It, however, does not prove that the information therein could not be much older – either handed down orally or contained in still older texts we have lost. Dating of manuscripts alone does not prove that the contents could not be older.

The tradition has it that Mary Magdalene, her and Jesus’ daughter and a few others escaped from Israel on a boat or a small ship and after a long journey went ashore in the Camargue in southern France. There is today at that place a small town: [Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer](#) (see “*History*” > *The Provençal Legend* on that webpage). That would be the beginning of a bloodline of Jesus in southern France. Is that an invention? Who can really prove that it is one? And what would be so terrible if it were true?

As I wrote in my book [Reincarnation, Christianity and the Dogma of the Church](#), the Church liturgy has not one single prayer that Christ will return soon! It appears that they do not want him to come back, since that would be the end of the power of the Church. They would have to hand the power over to him and be made responsible for all that they did wrong. “We now have the power, Christ can wait”...

If there really is a bloodline with Genes that originate from Jesus, the Church would want to eradicate it!

In the South of France, there was a big and important community, the Cathars. Their world concept differed much from the one of the Church and they even taught reincarnation. They followed Jesus’ teachings strictly. They, for example, took his words “Thou shalt not kill” so literally that they were vegetarians. They were all killed in the 13th century and totally eradicated in a genocide organized by the Church, a holocaust against the Cathars. The motivation was that they would be heretics. But why then such a total genocide, more thorough than against other heretics? Could a secret motivation be to eradicate an assumed Jesus bloodline?

Would it not be a sophisticated strategy if Jesus, who was killed by his opponents, secretly left a bloodline behind that they could not fight? Like his parents went to Egypt to escape the mass murder on children ordered by Herodias, maybe his genes escaped the opponents through “relocating to France”, so that they could from there spread in the humanity. Would that not be a very clever strategy? Would then the return of Christ (through a new messenger) be expected with someone who carries his genes? Not necessarily, but possibly. Is that what the Church wanted to prevent (see my book mentioned above)? If that is so, it could actually have been a divine plan that Jesus and Mary Magdalene should be a pair...

The exceptionally thorough holocaust against the Cathars (no one survived, not even a child, a woman or an old man) under the excuse of “heresy” – including the knowledge about reincarnation! – to me rather confirms the idea of a Jesus bloodline in a part of the humanity, since that would make sense for the perpetrators... and it gives much hope that the eradication wasn't to 100%... that a part survived... and the future may show what good may come out of it...

As concerns sexuality, it has been alleged that the Cathars were against it. This is, however, not as simple as it may seem to the ones who advocate celibacy. The Cathars also taught reincarnation and that this world is on the dark side of a duality. We should strive for to no more have to be in this world. Sexuality generates new bodies in which souls have to incarnate. The real idea behind their attitude to sexuality is that we should give souls as few opportunities as possible to reincarnate in this world!

The [Provençal tradition](#) tells that Mary Magdalene escaped from the Holy Land in a miraculous boat without rudder and sail and at the end reached [Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer](#) in the Camargue. She later continued to Marseille, where she converted the population. Then she went to live in a cave in the mountains of Sainte-Baume. She was buried in Saint-Maximin.

[In the boat](#) were also Mary Salome (who many assume was the wife of Zebedee) and Mary Jacobe, wife of Clopas, as well as a few others, who began their journey in Alexandria. Among them were also [Sarah](#), who according to an early tradition is regarded as the daughter of Jesus and Mary Magdalene. [Other traditions](#) claim that she was the maid of the Maries and that Mary Magdalene was pregnant during the boat journey. The gypsies regard her as their patron saint (which was secret in the medieval times) and they every year pilgrim to Saintes-Maries-de-la-Mer on May 24 to worship her. I once participated in that ceremony, which was a very special experience. The statue of Sara, that stands in the crypt, was taken out by the priest and carried to the sea, where it was dipped in the water and then brought back, followed by a long line of gypsies (in which I also marched along).

Sarah is said to have been dark-skinned, which suits the theory that she was a servant and not the daughter. The gypsies, therefore, call her Sarah la Kali (Sarah the dark). (It would, of course, be a grave mistake if someone would mix that up with the Indian goddess Kali, even though the gypsies are said to originate from India. Kālī, as a Sanskrit word, simply means “dark”.)

Thus, the bloodline theory makes sense in relation to the Holy Grail. Accordingly, this would not have to do with a chalice and also not with a stone, but this bloodline of Jesus. In the old Provençal language, *sanc real* means “royal blood”, in to-day's French: *sang royale*, which has become understood as “san graal” or “san greal”, in English: Holy Grail.

An anecdote to this: Many years ago, I did a regression with a woman who experienced herself being a girl on a gypsy wagon, and they were on their way to the Camargue. I asked, “What do you want to do there?” – “That is secret and I cannot tell you!” – I, however, knew about the veneration of Sara by the gypsies, and that they call her Sarah la Kali, so I asked, “Does it have something to do with Sarah la Kali?”, and she said, “How do you know that? Are you a gypsy, too?”)

So who, then, is Mary Magdalene according to the Gnostic tradition? She is called “the apostle of the apostles” and is regarded as the favorite disciple of Jesus, about which one can read much in [Pistis Sophia](#). There is also a Gnostic text, [The Gospel of Mary Magdalene](#). It was she, who as the first came to know that Jesus was resurrected and then told it to the disciples (Math 28, Mark 16, Luke 24:-10, John 20:11-18).

Returning to the Gnostic teaching about the creation in the [Apocryphon of John](#), it is therein told that Sophia descended in the form of the *Epinoia of light* (Epinoia = insight through divine inspiration) to be Adam's assistant, and she was called Eve (mother of the living ones, Hebrew *cheva* = life). Thus, I could well imagine that it actually was Sophia, who in this manner manifested herself through Mary Magdalene (who then would be a kind of messenger of her).

Is Mary Magdalene incarnated again to day? There are several, maybe tens, of women who claim to have been her. What should one think about that? It could not well be more than one...

Here are but a few examples: [Couple Claim They Are Jesus Christ and Mary Magdalene](#) and [Cult leader claims to be Christ... and his partner says she's Mary Magdalene](#), as well as by Edgar Cayce: ["she was Mary Magdalene"](#).

I once had a young woman for a regression who claimed to have been Mary Magdalene, which I found hard to believe. Asking her Higher Self about it (in the regression) – referring to the fact that several women claim that – the answer was something like this: “Many women have a connection to Mary Magdalene since they were among the first Christians” – which will mean that she was not really her, but that it was a case of a kind of “resonance” (or in a certain sense unconscious “wishful thinking”). Furthermore – in other cases – having been Mary Magdalene is sometimes told by less positive entities in, e.g., channeling’s, which then is pure manipulation...