1

A.

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

CANADIAN THESES
ON MICROFICHE

THÈSES CANADIENNES
SUR MICROFICHE

0-315-04896-4

52790

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR

Sean M. Kelly

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE

The Psychology of the Gnostic Phenomenon

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ

Carleton

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/
GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE

Master's

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ

1981

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE

Dr. John P. Dourley

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF
CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies
of the film.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-
QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et
de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the
thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or other-
wise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la
thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés
ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATE

24/9/81

SIGNED/SIGNÉ

Sean Kelly

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE

87 A Grange ave

Ottawa, Ont

K1Y-0P1

National Library of Canada
Collections Development Branch

Canadian Theses on
Microfiche Service

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Direction du développement des collections

Service des thèses canadiennes
sur microfiche

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

**THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED**

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

**LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE**

THE PSYCHOLOGY
OF
THE GNOSTIC PHENOMENON

by

Sean Kelly

A thesis submitted to the
Faculty of Graduate Studies
in partial fulfilment of
the requirements for the
degree of Master of Arts

Department of Religion

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario

August 31, 1981

The undersigned recommend to the Faculty
of Graduate Studies acceptance of the thesis

"The Psychology of the Gnostic Phenomenon"

submitted by Sean Kelly
in partial fulfilment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Arts

.....
Thesis Supervisor

.....
Chairman, Department of Religion

Carleton University

September 18, 1981

ABSTRACT

The aim of the thesis is to offer a comprehensive and systematic treatment of the Gnostic phenomenon in relation to the categories of Jungian psychology. The material under consideration spans the full range of Gnostic expression and draws heavily on authentic sources, especially the Nag Ham-madi Library. The thesis begins by tracing the emergence, in late antiquity, of the Gnostic ethos, which is found to be both introverted and regressive. This leads into an analysis of the role of the feminine in Gnosis. Such figures as Depth, Silence, Ennoia, Helen, Sophia, and Mary Magdelene, are seen to be expressions of the unconscious as matrix, or of the anima in her dual role as personification of the unconscious and mediator of unconscious contents. A consideration of the feminine as a component of psychic wholeness serves as the bridge to the third chapter which consists of a detailed treatment of the special phenomenology of Gnostic symbols of the Self. The concluding chapter consists, apart from the general recapitulation, of a discussion of the typology governing the relation between Gnostic and orthodox Christianity. This is followed by two appendices, the first of which considers the significance of the figures of Sophia and Logos in the transition from Gnosis to Orthodoxy. The second appendix attempts to establish the essential similarities and differences between Gnosis and alchemy.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank Professor John Dourley and Rosalind Kelly for their inestimable help these past months. I would also like to thank Professor Stephen Wilson for encouraging my initial interest in Gnosticism.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Emergence of the Gnostic Ethos	4
Chapter Two: The Role of the Feminine	27
a) the godhead	27
b) emanations	32
c) wholeness	53
Chapter Three: Gnosis and the Self	62
a) the godhead and the divine principle in the cosmos	63
b) the gnosis of the redeemer	74
c) the eschaton	85
Conclusions	93
Appendix One: Sophia and Logos	102
Appendix Two: Gnosis and Alchemy	107
References	110
Bibliography	124
Figures	129

The mysteries of truth are revealed,
though in type and image.

(The Gospel of Philip,
N.H.L., 84.20-23)

The better we understand the archetype,
the more we participate in its life
and the more we realize its eternity
or timelessness.

(C.G. Jung, "On Resurrection",
C.W., 18:1572)

INTRODUCTION

Jung's marked interest in Gnosticism dates from as early as 1918 when he began his search for the historical parallels which he hoped, in his own words, would provide the "prefigurations of my inner experience."¹ These inner experiences, as well as those of his patients, consisted of dreams and fantasies, and were to constitute the experiential basis for Jung's later formulations on the nature of the psyche. To prove to himself that the recurring figures, patterns, and motifs, which lived in the contemporary imagination were indeed, as he suspected, an expression of archetypal realities, he had to find evidence for a latent continuity with the past. In this endeavour he was particularly drawn to the Gnostics, and this for two related reasons. First, the Gnostics were heretics, their insights incompatible with what was to emerge as the dominant collective religious consciousness -- so-called "orthodox" Christianity. Similarly, the imaginative material that he, as an "alienist", concerned himself with was also beyond the pale of the social norm. Secondly, Jung was drawn by the richness of Gnostic symbols and imagery, which, to him, were manifestly psychological in nature.²

Jung, in fact, has asserted that many of the Gnostics "were nothing other than psychologists."³ Although it is

certain that they did not look upon the psyche as an object of scientific enquiry, it is equally evident that, as ones who "know", what we today would call the psyche was to them of the greatest concern. "For this cause I tell you this," says Jesus in the Apocryphon of James, "that you may know yourselves".⁴ Or again in the Dialogue of the Saviour, Jesus says: "But I say to [you, as for what] you seek after and inquire about, [behold, it is] within you...."⁵

Despite the manifest congeniality, however, Jung still felt uneasy about turning to the Gnostics in support of his views regarding the psychology of the unconscious. There were certain difficulties, which he sums up as follows:

Since we possess only very few complete texts, and since most of what is known comes from reports of the Christian opponents, we have, to say the least, an inadequate knowledge of the history as well as the content of this strange and confused literature, which is so difficult to evaluate Again, the connections were for the most part of a subsidiary nature and left gaps at just the most important points, so that I found it impossible to make use of the Gnostic material.⁶

Concerning the first point, with the recent publication of a large collection of original documents, collectively referred to as the Nag Hammadi Library, we are now in a position to evaluate the character of Gnostic belief first

hand. Even so, however, the literature remains strange, sometimes confused, and difficult to interpret. The second point, which follows in part from the first, brings us to the twofold objective of this thesis -- namely, 1) in making use of the recent discoveries (along with the consequent wave of related scholarship), and by filling in the "gaps" which prevented Jung from making more extensive use of the Gnostic material, to arrive at a more comprehensive understanding of the Gnostic phenomenon; and 2) to assess, and if necessary, suggest modifications to Jung's interpretation of individual elements of Gnostic tradition in the context of his expressed views on the significance of the Gnostic phenomenon as a whole.

CHAPTER ONE

THE EMERGENCE OF THE Gnostic ETHOS

The period of late antiquity was a time of great ferment, a time of widespread social, political, and religious change. Although one ought, out of respect for the complexity of historical phenomena, to take into consideration the full range of potentially operative factors, one is inevitably limited to a certain perspective. The perspective which Jung adopted was, of course, that of the psychologist. Jung's model of the psyche is characterized by the interaction of various structuro-dynamic polarities.¹ One of these -- the polarity instinct/spirit -- is central to his understanding of late antiquity.

Jung describes the instincts as "typical modes of action."² More specifically, instinct is man's "animal nature",³ which manifests itself in regularly occurring, unconsciously motivated, compulsions to act.⁴ These compulsions spring from man's groundedness in the physical. The fundamental locus for instinct, therefore, is the body. James Hillman sums up the notion of instinct as follows:

By "instinct" I mean native impulsion.... I consider instinct to refer to congenitally given...affectively charged psychic events in which "the body" is a paramount referent. (We imagine the body to be either the locus of instinct or its significance-- hunger, reproduction, defense, etc. -- so that the term, by conjuring up "body" in one way or another, is part

of the body's reverberation in consciousness....⁵

The polar opposite of instinct is spirit. Jung likens the relation between the two to that between the infra-red and blue, respectively, of the colour spectrum. Blue, "the colour of air and sky, is most readily used for depicting spiritual contents, whereas red, the 'warm' colour, is used for feelings and emotions."⁶ Spirit is the freedom to reflect,⁷ freedom from mere physicality.* Without such freedom, there can be no development of consciousness, as "consciousness struggles in a regular panic against being swallowed up in the primitivity and unconsciousness of mere instinctuality."⁹

This delimitation⁸ of the notion of spirit does not, however, exhaust the senses in which Jung sometimes uses the word. Often spirit refers to the autonomous character of certain unconscious contents (whether these be affects, complexes, or archetypes),¹⁰ a special instance of which is the paradoxical chthonic spirit, whose most characteristic manifestation is the alchemical Mercurius.¹¹

* "Reflection", says Hillman, "means bending back from the perceptual stimulus in favor of a psychic image, a 'turning inward'."⁸

Similarly, Jung's conception of the instincts embraces more, at least in potential, than their physiological basis might suggest. For instance, one of the chief characteristics of spirit -- the ability to reflect, is itself recognized as having an instinctual foundation.*

A few words should be said at this point concerning the archetypes, the so-called "dominants of the collective unconscious".¹³ Jung felt that, just as he was compelled to postulate the concept of an instinct as a determinant of conscious actions,

so, in order to account for the uniformity and regularity of our perceptions, we must have recourse to the correlated concept of a factor determining the mode of apprehension. It is this factor which I call the archetype or primordial image. The primordial image might suitably be described as the instinct's perception of itself, or as the self-portrait of the instinct.¹⁴

The archetype, then, is most succinctly described as an image of instinct which functions to determine a corresponding

* "Ordinarily we do not think of 'reflection' as ever having been instinctive, but associate it with a conscious state of mind. Reflexio means a 'bending back' and, used psychologically, would denote the fact that the reflex which carries the stimulus over into its instinctive discharge is interfered with by psychization Thus in place of the compulsive act there appears a certain degree of freedom, and in place of predictability a relative unpredictability as to the effect of the impulse."¹² (Note: unless otherwise indicated, all direct quotations appearing in the footnotes are citations of Jung.)

mode of apprehension. The archetype determines the mode of apprehension by giving a "coordinating and coherent meaning both to sensuous and to inner perceptions It releases unavailable, dammed-up energy by leading the mind back to nature and canalizing sheer instinct into mental forms."¹⁵

We have already entertained the analogy which conceives of the relation between instinct and spirit as that between the infra-red and blue, respectively, of the colour spectrum. To complete the analogy, the spectrum in its entirety may be said to constitute the full range of potential embraced by the archetype.

In spite or perhaps because of its affinity with instinct, the archetype represents the authentic element of spirit, but a spirit which is not to be identified with the intellect since it is the latter's spiritus rector.... The archetype is spirit or anti-spirit: what it ultimately proves to be depends on the attitude of the human mind.¹⁶

In saying that the archetype can present itself as spirit or anti-spirit, depending on the attitude of the human mind -- by which is meant the dominant character and orientation of ego-consciousness -- Jung has focused on the archetype as the source of the compensating forces of the unconscious. As its nature embraces opposed extremes*, the arche-

* These extremes include not only the instinctual and the spiritual, but also the light and dark, good and evil, etc.¹⁷

type functions to compensate the onesidedness of the conscious standpoint by presenting to it the other, neglected, side of the psychic potential, which is accomplished through the production of the appropriate images or symbols (whether in the form of dreams, visions, active imagination etc.).

Implicit in this compensating function of the archetype is an overriding tendency toward psychic wholeness. Although such a tendency may be said to pertain to the nature of the archetype as such, there is one in particular -- the archetype of the Self -- whose nature it is to organize or coordinate the movements of the individual archetypes in the interest of the whole.¹⁸ This whole extends beyond the collective unconscious to the conscious personality,¹⁹ since this too is rooted in archetypal reality. Thus the Self, though an archetype of the collective unconscious, is at once the virtual centre and circumference of the psyche in its totality.²⁰

Paradoxically, though the Self, as the central archetype, is present from the beginning as the motive force directing the whole, it also represents, as the "essence of wholeness",²¹ the ultimate goal of psychic development. Because of its developmental ubiquitousness, its centrality and totality, manifestations of the Self are empirically indistinguishable from the psychic manifestations of the Deity. Or as Jung has phrased it, coming at the relation from the other side: "As

the highest value and supreme dominant in the psychic hierarchy, the God-image is immediately related to, or identical with, the self, and everything that happens to the God-image has an effect on the latter."²² The nature of the Self will be dealt with in greater detail in the third chapter.

After this somewhat lengthy, though necessary, digression, we may turn to our elaborative exposition of Jung's view of the nature of late antiquity. When Jung speaks of the instincts in this context, he is referring for the most part to those dynamisms which constitute the "soul of the beast".²³ "We can hardly realize the whirlwinds of brutality and unchained libido that roared through the streets of Imperial Rome."²⁴ Rome may be taken to stand for the Empire at large which, on the whole, was "vegetating in spiritual darkness."²⁵ It was an age "where the crudest brutality was an every day spectacle,"²⁶ an age beset by "the moral and intellectual agnosia of the merely natural man."²⁷ This agnosia best describes the state of relatively unconscious instinctuality which, Jung believed, was rampant at the time in question.

Concerning the evidence for such claims, it is clear that, judging from contemporary sources, there existed a relative insensitiveness to brutality, to the worth and

dignity of the individual. Apart from the universal fact of slavery, one has only to think of the Roman spectacles. The kind of atrocities which passed for entertainment are too well known to be documented here.²⁸ These spectacles, contrary to popular belief, were not confined to Rome. "Wherever Roman civilization set its mark," writes Friedländer, "the amphitheatre also spread; from Jerusalem to Seville, from Scotland to the borders of the Sahara, any town of consequence had its ... victims of the arena."²⁹

Although Jung points only to Imperial Rome as the locus for what he sees as an inundating wave of unchecked instinctuality, there were of course historical precedents. Rome, at its worst, was the crest, but the wave itself began to gather impetus quite some time before. Certainly one of the most favorable opportunities for the exercise of blind passion and brutality is provided by war. The three and a half centuries prior to the Pax Romana were scarred by a long list of bloody conflicts which ravaged the ancient world from Spain to Persepolis. To name but the most famous engagements: beginning in the East, Persian aggression provoked first the Greek response, then the Macedonian which led to the conquests of Alexander.* After his death the wars of his successors,

* "Let judgement be passed", writes Orosius, "whether the days of Alexander should be praised on account of his valor in conquering the world or accursed because of the ruin he brought upon mankind."³⁰

as Toynbee relates, "kept the expanded Hellenic world to the east of the Straits of Otranto in turmoil, and, for the majority of the inhabitants of ... the former Persian Empire, the change from Persian to Greek rule was a change for the worse."³¹ The contending Diadochian Kingdoms passed, each in their turn, under Roman domination (these, however, were to prove a source of unending troubles, due to the rebellious nature of the conquered peoples); closer to home, the Romans were occupied in exterminating the Etruscans and repelling the Gauls; finally, there were the three Punic wars, the last of which, because of the tenacious Hannibal, threatened to eclipse the dawning empire. Not surprisingly, these "devastating Republican wars of conquest", writes Angus, "reduced provinces from a high state of civilization to a condition of misery and depopulation."³² All of these developments fall within Toynbee's reckoning of the Hellenic civilization's "Time of Troubles" (431-31 B.C.),³³ a period which he has termed an "Age of Agony".³⁴

The paradox of this period, which can only be explained by the principle of compensation, is that, toward the close of these dehumanizing outbursts of mass instinctuality, there arose, in increasing numbers of individuals, a growing affirmation of spirit. This spirit, moreover, was decidedly religious in nature. "After the unspeakable suffering caused by the republican wars of conquest in the provinces,"

writes Angus,

... the whole world was weary of war and longed for a cessation of bloodshed and a return to settled social and economic conditions.... The Pax Romana, the first settled peace since the days of Alexander's conquests, called forth a chorus of profound thanksgiving, which in that age was necessarily of a religious character.³⁵

Two of the most prominent manifestations of this spiritual affirmation are to be seen in the spread of the cult of Mithras and in the rapid dissemination of Christianity, both of which, Jung believes, were chief exponents in the fight against the "moral and intellectual agnosia" of the times. An essential quality of the consciousness embraced by these two religions -- or to be more precise, by the central symbols and constitutive principles³⁶ of these two religions -- is an unconditional renunciation of instinct. Jung contends that Christianity outdid its rival in this respect.

Whereas the Mithraic sacrifice was still symbolized by the archaic slaughter of an animal and aimed only at domesticating and disciplining the instinctual man, the Christian idea of sacrifice is symbolized by the death of a human being and demands a surrender of the whole man -- not merely a taming of his animal instincts, but a total renunciation of them...for

the sake of a spiritual goal beyond the world. This idea is hard schooling which cannot help alienating man from his own nature and, to a large degree, from nature in general. The attempt, as history has shown, was entirely possible and led in the course of a few centuries to a development of consciousness which would have been quite out of the question but for this training.³⁷

Apart from Christianity and Mithraism, the rise in popularity of the other mystery religions may also be taken as a manifestation of the same spiritual affirmation. Most of these, however, were not as successful in answering the markedly ascetic bent of the emergent spirituality. This is most likely related to the preponderance of the affective and sensual element in their ritual enactments,³⁸ which were more subject to questionable "degrees of excitation" -- such as the "drunken frenzy of the Bacchanalian rites, the maddening and bloody ritual of Cybele or Mên", and "the imposing pomp of the Isiac cult...."³⁹ Augustine's description of the ceremony associated with the "Heavenly Virgin" (i.e., the Great Mother), though a bit later than the period with which we are immediately concerned, is still worth citing.

...we had a good view of her image standing in front of her temple; there were crowds converging from all directions, everyone taking

the best position he could find, and we watched the acted shows with the closest interest. We divided our gaze between the procession of harlots on one side, and the virgin goddess on the other. I saw powerful worship offered to her, and indecent performances enacted before her. I saw no sense of shame in the mimes, no trace of modesty in any actress -- all the duly prescribed obscenities were punctiliously performed. It was well known what would please the maiden goddess; and the exhibitions would enable the matron to leave the temple for home enriched by her experiences.⁴⁰

There was, of course, a great spiritual richness to these mysteries. But due to the temper of the times, this richness was too prone to concretization and abuse. As Proclus complains:

...nothing deters the vulgar from not suffering all kinds of distortions of these things and from misusing the benefits and the powers of them according to their own disposition towards the worse, whereby they are set aside from the gods and from the true holy worship, and are borne into the life of sensation and unreason.⁴¹

Similarly, Tertullian remarks with indignation that

it is what all know and will admit as readily to be the fact, that in the temples adulteries

are arranged, that at the altars
pimping is practiced, that often
in the houses of temple-keepers
and priests, under the sacrifi-
cial fillets and the sacred hats
and purple robes, amid the fumes
of incense, deeds of licentious-
ness are done.⁴²

Perhaps the most extreme representatives of the new spirituality were the Gnostics. Despite the charge of libertinism which the Church Fathers levelled against some of their sectaries*, all the evidence from authentic documents points to the other extreme. Gnostic spirituality is completely divorced from any positive relation with the natural order, and, therefore, with the instinctual sphere. However, this does not exclude the possibility of Gnostic libertinism. For, as Jonas has shown,⁴⁴ the Gnostic sense of being completely beyond the natural order might conceivably lead to a self-conscious defiance of established social and ethical norms. There is also, from the psychological point of view, the very real possibility of an enantiodromia⁴⁵ precipitated by the Gnostics' ascetic one-sidedness. But even apart from the documentary evidence to the contrary, this possibility is rendered unlikely for the simple reason that Gnostic spirituality is itself a

* Irenaeus in particular speaks of the "promiscuity" and "luxury" of the Nicolaitians and of the followers of Simon, Basilides, and Carpocrates.⁴³

compensatory reaction to a previous onesidedness. This is most evident in what the majority of scholars⁴⁶ consider to be the cardinal feature of the Gnostic ethos -- a radical ontological dualism which posits an irreconcilable split between matter and spirit. "In this very way", we read in the Authoritative Teaching, "when the spiritual soul was cast into the body, it became a brother to lust, and hatred, and envy, and a material soul.... Having left knowledge behind, she fell into bestiality."⁴⁷ Warning his disciples against the perils of the flesh, Jesus says in The Book of Thomas the Contender:

For that which guides them, the fire, will give them an illusion of truth, [and] will shine on them with a [perishable] beauty, and it will imprison them in a dark sweetness and captivate them with fragrant pleasure. And it will blind them with insatiable lust and burn their souls....⁴⁸

There are many passages of similar tone in the Nag Hammadi Library, the general import of which finds concise expression in logion 27 from the Gospel of Thomas: "[Jesus said] 'If you do not fast as regards the world, you will not find the Kingdom'."⁴⁹

So far we have been considering the emergence of the Gnostic ethos in relation to Jung's view of the nature of

late antiquity. This view was focused on the role of a fundamental psychic polarity -- instinct/spirit -- which, in the context of Jung's model of the psyche, is an expression of the dynamic character of the archetypes, the "dominants" of the collective unconscious. Most scholars, in approaching the Gnostic phenomenon, adopt a perspective which, while in certain respects far removed from that of depth psychology, nevertheless complements it in a way that parallels the developments we have been tracing. This perspective seeks to account for the spirit of late antiquity in connection with the contents of what Jung would term the collective consciousness (which contents take such forms as reigning philosophies, world-views, etc.).

To assess the character of the collective consciousness as this relates to the emergence of the Gnostic ethos, one must begin with the changes that take place in the forms of popular religion a few centuries before the birth of Christ. In the West, the dominant form at the beginning of this period was the worship of the Greek pantheon, which was later adopted, in translation, by the Romans. The Olympian religion was founded on the belief that the world is governed by personal gods who, though subject to the equivalent of certain human frailties, were, on the whole, guided by a sense of justness and virtue. But when, in fact of the ap-

parent contradiction of this belief through the frequency with which the good were punished and the bad rewarded -- not to mention the morally questionable behavior of the gods themselves -- it became increasingly difficult to subscribe to such a belief. "... it is clear that by the time of Plato", writes Gilbert Murray,

the traditional religion of the Greek states was, if taken at its face value, a bankrupt concern. There was hardly one aspect in which it could bear criticism; and in the kind which chiefly matters, the satisfaction of men's ethical requirements and aspirations, it was if anything weaker than elsewhere.⁵⁰

In light of this religious bankruptcy, rather than perceiving a divine providence at work in the world, all seemed for the most part a matter of chance. Such, at least, was the only rational explanation for it. But this insight was unable by itself to fill the gap left by the death of the Olympian religion. The personal element was missing. Consequently, Chance, or Fortune was deified in the popular mind. This apotheosis is well described in the following passage from Pliny.

Throughout the whole world, at every place and hour, by every voice Fortune alone is invoked and her name spoken: she is the one defendant, the one culprit, the one thought in men's minds,

the one object of praise, the one cause. She is worshipped with insults, counted as fickle and often as blind, wandering, inconsistent, elusive, changeful, and friend of the unworthy.... We are so much at the mercy of chance that Chance is our god.⁵¹

Concurrent in the ancient world with the popular deification of fortune is the growing popularity of the closely related notion of Fate. With the death of the Olympian religion there had been a resurgence of astral piety. The Greeks had always looked to the stars as divine and to their movement as the living symbol of order (hence *κόσμος*). Because of the universal state effected by the conquests of Alexander, routes were established by which eastern traditions could easily reach the West in answer to its needs. One of the most important traditions to infiltrate and permeate the West was Chaldean astrology*, which was a major factor in the increasing popularity of the notion of Fate.

Now Fate is a double-edged sword. It can be a means of solace or an instrument of tyranny. The Stoics were able to console themselves with the notion of Fate (*Εἰμαρμένη*) by identifying it with Providence (*Πρόνοια*). It was the *Λόγος τοῦ Κόσμου*, the *Νοῦς Διός*, the Reason of the World and Mind

* "Astrology", writes Murray, "fell upon the Hellenistic mind as a new disease falls upon some remote island people."⁵²

of Zeus.⁵³ This identification was buttressed by the analogy between the city and the cosmos, which was an attempt to give to every person a meaningful place in the overall scheme of things. It was one's duty to "play one's part". To do so was considered a virtue (*ἀρετή*).⁵⁵

Such was the manner in which the Stoics came to terms with the growing concern with Fate. But this was an alternative which the majority of people in the Empire, without the Greek tradition of *ἀρετή*, could not adopt. There was too great a sense of estrangement, too little a sense of identity and belonging, for the masses to reap any consolation from the notion of *ἡ κοσμοπολις*, "the universal city". And for those for whom the sense of estrangement was particularly intense, the Stoic vision of cosmic harmony, exemplified in the motion and order of the stars, was rejected and transformed into the very symbol of oppression. In the words of Hans Jonas:

Deprived of the venerability with which all sidereal piety up to then had invested it, but still in possession of the prominent and representative position it had acquired,

* Zeno likened *Heimarmenē* to a thread running through all existence.⁵⁴

the stellar firmament becomes now the symbol of all that is terrifying to man in the towering fastness of the universe. Under this pitiless sky, which no longer inspires worshipful confidence, man becomes conscious of his utter forlornness, of his being not so much a part of, but unaccountably placed in and exposed to, the enveloping system.⁵⁶

Apart from these predominantly ideological considerations, there were, as we have seen, socio-political factors (wars etc.) which contributed to the growing sense of alienation and oppression. Some scholars believe that there is evidence pointing to something more localized in the historical chain of events which may account for the peculiar quality and intensity of the Gnostic ethos. This evidence, which has been persuasively marshalled by R.M. Grant,⁵⁷ looks to the setting of heterodox Judaism. The focal point in this setting is the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D. which served as the catalyst that effected the radical change in the world-view and spirituality of certain apocalyptic groups or individuals.

Although it is doubtful whether the Gnostic ethos, whose roots are so diffuse, arose as a direct result of the fall of Jerusalem in 70 A.D., there is no question that such a cataclysmic event contributed greatly to the growing

sense of alienation and oppression, the concomitant of which was a turning away from the world, a desire to transcend the constricting bounds of material existence. The celestial spheres which were once worshipped as divine were now looked upon as demonic powers (archons) guarding the prison gates through which one must seek to escape.

Although the majority of the religious movements of the period exhibit a certain degree of this cosmic paranoia, it is most intense with the Gnostics. One can see this, for instance, in their characteristic transmutation of the notion of "the planetary equipping of the soul". The idea was that, prior to its embodiment, in its descent through the planetary spheres, the soul takes on various attributes contributed by each of the planets.* But instead of the former conception in which the planetary endowments were considered to provide the means for man's harmonious existence in the cosmos, these were now looked upon as corruptions of the soul's original nature ($\tau\psi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$). "As the souls descend", writes Servius,

they draw with them the torpor
of Saturn, the wrathfulness of

* The notion figures most prominently in Hermetic gnosis. Also, Basilides' son Isodorus is said to have written a treatise on the subject entitled On the Accreted Soul.

Mars, the concupiscence of Venus, the greed for gain of Mercury, the lust for power of Jupiter, which things effect a confusion in the souls, so that they can no longer make use of their own power and their proper faculties.⁵⁶

With the Gnostic version of the planetary equipping of the soul we come to the point of intersection between the two trajectories we have been tracing. For it is obvious from Servius's description that the accretions which the soul takes on in its descent are, in modern terms, the baser instincts, which manifest themselves in the form of undesirable affects. It was through such affects that the evil archons exercised their power of control, their Heimarmene, over their captives here on earth.*

To recapitulate our findings thus far: we saw how, amid a widespread and largely unconscious affirmation of the baser instincts there arose a compensatory affirmation of spirit. Insofar as such instincts together constitute the psychological correlate to the body (observable in the archaic expression, "the flesh") and, more generally, the material world, this affirmation of spirit brought with it a corresponding depreciation of the body and of matter. This development was paralleled by a growing consciousness of oppression and aliena-

* Jung likens Heimarmene to being "at the mercy of ... affects."⁵⁷

tion which, as we saw, was linked with a complex of ideological and socio-political factors. The combined result of these two distinct, though related, trajectories, was an intensely ascetic and transcendent orientation which, while observable in many different sectors, found its most acute expression in the Gnostic ethos.

This radically transcendent orientation, however, is complemented by an equally radical sense of divine immanence. Beneath the accreted soul, like a pearl buried in a mire, lies the divine spark, the $\pi\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ which is consubstantial with the transcendent Deity. Although salvation, for the Gnostic, is coextensive with escape from the cosmos, the way to salvation is inward-pointing. The Gnostic must come to "know" his divine essence, his true self. To do so is to realize the "Kingdom of Heaven within you."

Understood psychologically, therefore, the Gnostic paradox of transcendent immanence, or immanent transcendence, betokens an extreme introversion, which Jung defines as the "inward-turning of libido.... Interest does not move towards the object but withdraws from it into the subject."⁶⁰ With the Gnostics, however, it is not merely a case of introversion, but of regression as well. Regression "confronts consciousness with the problem of the psyche as opposed to the problem of outward adaptation."⁶¹ Not only were the Gnostics pos-

sessed of that attitude which places the value of subjective experience over and against the experience of the objective environment; but because of their maladaptation to that environment -- which included the body as its most proximate expression -- they were driven inwards to the experience of their own depths, to the experience of the collective unconscious. Victor White, in his treatment of Gnosticism, comes to a similar conclusion. However, although he recognizes the problem of outward adaptation, he chooses to characterize the phenomenon solely in terms of "a great reaction to introversion". With regard to the Gnostics, he writes: "Thwarted in its centrifugal flow into an external world which it is unable to assimilate and integrate, the libido of necessity is forced to flow back, centripetally, to the interior world of the collective unconscious."⁶² If the phenomenon is to be described accurately in relation to Jung's terminology, however, the notion of introversion must be qualified with that of regression.

Jung, of course, recognized that "the archetypal motifs of the unconscious are the psychic source of Gnostic ideas..."⁶³ But he never characterized the Gnostic ethos as both introverted and regressive. Nor did he ever address himself to the specific problems of outward adaptation which fostered the Gnostics' inward vision. Now that we have gained a certain insight into the nature and determinants of this ethos, we are in a better position to appreciate the psychological signifi-

cance of the otherwise potentially bewildering wealth of
Gnostic symbols and imagery.

CHAPTER TWO

THE ROLE OF THE FEMININE

a) the Godhead

The opening section of the Poimandres tractate presents us with a revealing description of an experience accompanying the introversion and regression of libido.

Once, when I had engaged in meditation upon the things that are and my mind was mightily lifted up, while my bodily senses were curbed... I thought I beheld a presence of immeasurable greatness that called my name and said to me: "What dost thou wish to hear and see and in thought learn and understand?" I said, "Who art thou?" "I am", he said, "Poimandres, the Nous of the Absolute Power...."

With these words, he changed his form, and suddenly everything was opened before me in a flash, and I beheld a boundless view, everything becoming light.... And after a while there was Darkness borne downward..., appalling and hateful, tortuously coiled, resembling a serpent.¹

This vision occurs in a state of meditation. Having "curbed" his bodily senses, which would have the effect of directing his consciousness inward,* the visionary beholds a "boundless view" -- which we may take to be the unconscious --

* "The supramundane world", writes Angus, "lay not in or beyond the highest heaven, but in the soul of man; it was indeed emphatically a world beyond the senses, but a world apprehended by Nous, or the highest part of man's life."²

first clothed in light, but then in downward borne darkness that assumes the form of a coiled serpent. The visionary has succeeded in penetrating to the deepest levels of the psyche, to the source of libido itself, which is evident from the appearance of the serpent. Now the serpent is perhaps the most ambivalent of all symbols.* However, it is clear that as we meet it here, the serpent is seen in its purely chthonic aspect -- it is pure instinct -- which explains why the visionary looks upon it as "appalling and hateful".

The vision continues. The humid nature, a kind of chaos, undergoes an initial differentiation through the power of the Word. The result is a separation of the elements -- air, fire, earth, and water. Then follows a recapitulation of the vision delivered by Poimandres in response to the visionary's question: "Wherefrom ... have the elements of nature arisen?" Poimandres answers: "From the Will [*Bouλη*, a feminine word] of God, who having received into herself the Word and beheld the beautiful [archetypal] Cosmos, imitated it, fashioning herself into a cosmos [or: ordering herself] according to her own elements....⁴ The source of all these processes, then, of the vision itself, is the *Bouλη* of God, which is identical with the humid nature

*"If all symbols are really functions and signs of things imbued with energy", writes Cirlot, "then the snake is, by analogy, symbolic of energy itself -- of force pure and simple -- hence its ambivalence and multivalencies."³

and Darkness that clothes the coiled serpent.* From this, as we have seen, we can understand the unconscious.

The Poimandres tractate presents us with a revealing description of the unconscious as confronted through the processes of introversion and regression. Of particular interest is the manner in which the functional equivalent of the unconscious is characterized as feminine (ἡ βουλή). One finds a similar situation in Irenaeus's description of the Sethian-Ophites⁵ (which, as it turns out, is probably based on the Paraphrase of Shem⁶) where the feminine Holy Spirit, like the Hermetic βουλή, presides over the elements of water, darkness, abyss, and chaos. That in both these instances one is confronted with feminine figures is what one expects, since the unconscious, as the source of "the elements of nature", is the matrix of all potentialities.** As such, it is essentially ambivalent in nature, it is a place, like Blake's Beulah, where "contraries are equally true".*** Thus we read in The Thunder, Perfect Mind:

For I am the first and the last.
I am the honoured one and the scorned one.
I am the whore and the holy one.
I am the wife and the virgin.

* Jonas argues convincingly for this identification (cf. the Gnostic Religion, p. 171f).

** The unconscious "can be regarded as the mother or matrix of consciousness."⁷

*** This is so because the unconscious is the realm of potential: "...the psychological condition of any unconscious content is one of potential reality, characterized by the polar opposites 'being' and 'not-being'...."⁸

I am the bride and the bridegroom....
I am knowledge and ignorance.⁹

Manifestations of the unconscious in Gnostic literature spring either from its isolated role as matrix, or as the depth dimension to the archetype of the Self. Depth, in fact, is one of the chief names for the Godhead in Ptolamaeus's system of gnosis as reported by Irenaeus. The description of the first moments in the Pleroma begins with these words:

There is a perfect and pre-existent Aeon, dwelling in the invisible and unnameable elevations; this is Pre-Beginning and Forefather and Depth. He is uncontainable and invisible, eternal and ungenerated, in quiet and in deep solitude for infinite aeons.¹⁰

There are two reasons why the Godhead is given a masculine name ("Forefather"). In the first place, because of the intensity of Gnostic spirituality, the father image, a representative of the spirit,¹¹ was chosen over that of the mother. Secondly, the appellation Forefather points to the fecundating element, the ability to beget (over and against the ability to give birth), within the unconscious. It will be noted, however, that the Godhead fecundates himself, that is, his "Depth", or "Silence" (Σιγή, a feminine word). The text continues.

Once upon a time, Depth thought of emitting from himself a Beginning of all, like a seed, and he deposi-

ted his projected emission, as in
a womb, in that Silence who is with
him.¹²

A passage in the Gnostic Prayer of Thanksgiving gives
expression to the same paradoxical idea of the "womb of the
Father".

O womb of every creature, we have
known Thee. O womb pregnant with
the nature of the Father, we have
known Thee. O eternal permanence
of the begetting Father, thus have
we worshipped Thy goodness.¹³

The Father, then, is also the Mother. They are in a primal
embrace. As the root of the All, the One impregnates, nourishes,
and gives birth, to itself. "I am androgynous", we
read in the Trimorphic Protennoia:

[I am both Mother and] Father since
[I copulate] with myself.... [and
with those who love] me, [and] it is
through me alone that the All [stands
firm]. I am the Womb [that gives
shape] to the All by giving birth to
the Light that [shines in] splendor.¹⁴

Although here, as with the Forefather (as Depth) and
Silence in Ptolemaeus's account, the male and female figures
are meant to constitute the primal pair, distinct from one another,
which enables both to join in creative union, it is
clear that the figures of Depth, Silence, and Womb (another
name given to this aspect of the Deity in Valentinian speculation
is "Grace", ἡ χάρις) give expression to the same psychic

reality -- the unconscious as matrix -- which is the true source of any of its particularized manifestations. One finds an illustration of this in Epiphanius's account of the Great Revelation, attributed to Simon Magus. It will be noted here that Silence precedes the primal pair.

Among the totality of the Aeons, two emanations there are that have neither beginning nor end. They spring from the one and only root which is a power: the Silence invisible and incomprehensible. One of these is manifested on high, the Spirit of the All which governs everything; it is masculine. The other is from below; it is a great thought, feminine, which gives birth to all things.¹⁵

This description of "the one and only root", "the Silence invisible and incomprehensible", is echoed in many other Gnostic texts; as, for instance, in the Trimorphic Protennoia, where we are told that "she (the Mother) alone exists as Silence...."¹⁶ A coptic fragment reads: "(...) the spiritual force, before it had been manifested, its name was not this at all, but it was: Silence."¹⁷ Similarly, the author of A Valentinian Exposition states that the Monad "dwells alone] in silence...."¹⁸

b) emanations

So far we have been concerned with manifestations of the feminine which spring from an experience of the uncon-

scious as the ground, source, or matrix of the psyche. Closely related to this experience is the prominence accorded to the complex of feminine figures associated with the idea of the Ennoia (Thought) of God,* whose various manifestations include Protennoia, Epinoia, Barbelo, and Helen. All of these figures are, in fact, expressions of the same psychic reality which we have encountered under the names Depth, Womb, Silence, and Grace. But as they now appear as emanations, as direct or extended consequences of the Deity's act of self-reflection, they -- or rather the unconscious which they represent -- is perceived from the perspective of a more differentiated consciousness. The effect of this differentiation is a tendency to personification. It is therefore clear that, with this second group of figures, we are confronted with the archetype of the anima as personification of the unconscious.²⁰

A good illustration of the emergence of the anima through the differentiation of consciousness is to be found in the Apocryphon of John. The Spirit-Father, we are told, "[gazes upon] his image which he sees in ... the spring of the [pure] light-water [which] surrounds him."²¹ The "pure light-water" -- a kind of amniotic fluid -- gives expression to his initial state of unconsciousness. Consequent upon his growing self-

*According to Hippolytus, one Gnostic teacher, playing on the double sense of the verb "to conceive", has said that "The image of thought [ennoia] is feminine since ... it is a power of conception."¹⁹

consciousness, which is expressed by his gazing into the water, his Thought is born.

And [his Ennoia performed a] deed and she came forth, [namely] she who had appeared before him in [the shine of] his light. This is the first power... which came forth from his mind, that [is the Pronoia of the All]. Her light [is the likeness of the] light, the perfect power which is the image of the invisible, virginal Spirit who is perfect. [The first power], the glory, Barbelo This is the first thought, his image; she became the womb of everything for she is prior to them all....²²

The close relation between Ennoia, or Barbelo, and the Spirit-Father -- that is, between the unconscious and the anima -- is clearly stated by referring to her as his "image". In fact, the relation is stressed almost to the point of identity, as can be seen by the appellation "womb of everything", and later on in the passage by such epithets as "Mother-Father", and "thrice-named androgynous one". Similarly, in the Trimorphic Protennoia, the First thought, who is also called Barbelo, declares:

I am a Voice [speaking softly]. I exist [from the first. I dwell] within the Silence [that surrounds every one] of them. And [it is] the [hidden Voice] that [dwells within] me, within the intangible, immeasurable [Thought], within the immeasurable Silence I am the

Image of the Invisible Spirit
and it is through me that the All
took shape, and (I am) the
Mother (as well as) the Light
which she appointed as Virgin...,
the intangible Womb, the unre-
strained and immeasurable Voice.²³

The anima, as she appears here, is in her least differenti-
ated form. As consciousness becomes progressively more dif-
ferentiated, the anima too comes to maturity, now no longer
merely a personification of the unconscious, but, the function
and symbol of the relation between the unconscious and the
ego personality.* This process of differentiation is well
depicted in Valentinian gnosis with its theory of emanations.
As the Deity becomes ever more self-conscious, a series of
male-female pairs, or syzygies,²⁶ emanate from the creative
interplay within the "original tetrad". The female partner
of the last of these syzygies is Sophia, "our youngest sis-
ter", as she is referred to in the Apocryphon of John.

The Valentinian myth of Sophia elucidates most clearly
the role of the anima in the psychology of the Gnostic phe-
nomenon.** The first in the chain of events which consti-

* The anima "is the connecting link with the world beyond and
the eternal images...."²⁴ She "should function as a bridge,
or a door, leading to the images of the collective uncon-
scious...."²⁵

** There are, of course, several accounts of the myth, which
differ considerably in places from one another. This is not
surprising given the speculative character of Valentinian
gnosis as a whole. The version which I will be referring to
in what follows is based on Irenaeus's summary of the system
of "the Valentinians" (which probably refers mostly to the
system of Ptolemaeus).²⁷

tutes the myth occurs as a result of the desire of the Aeons to comprehend the greatness of the Father. Only Nous, however, the male partner of the first syzygy, is able to do so, since he is the "Only-Begotten", "the form of the formless", "the word of the unnutterable".²⁸ All of the Aeons accept their lot, except for Sophia who, without her partner (called Willed), leaps forward in a fit of passion in an attempt to comprehend the Father. But she is unable to succeed because of a certain Limit ($\delta\acute{\rho}\omicron\varsigma$) which "consolidates the All [i.e. the Pleroma] and keeps it off the ineffable Greatness".²⁹ This, as it turns out, is to her advantage, since she would otherwise "have been swallowed up by his sweetness and dissolved in the general being."³⁰

The Limit also restores Sophia to union with her partner. The result of Sophia's desire and passions is a kind of abortion ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\omega\mu\alpha$) which the Limit casts outside of the Pleroma. The disturbance does not end here, however, for Sophia continues to lament her deed, as she is in constant sight of her abortion, who is called Achamoth (from the Hebrew, chokmah, meaning "wisdom"), or the lower Sophia. To rectify the situation, the other Aeons together supplicate the Father to aid her in her distress, to which purpose he produces another syzygy, Christos and the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit reestablishes order in the Pleroma, while Christos extends himself to Achamoth (for he cannot leave the Pleroma)

giving form to her passions, though unable to impart to her the full gnosis, which could only be effected through a full coniunctio. This initial in-forming by Christos makes Achamoth become conscious of her isolation, as a result of which she undergoes sufferings similar to those of the higher Sophia. In response to this, all of the syzygies, in a concerted effort, produce a single Aeon, Jesus, "the perfect fruit"³¹ of the Pleroma, who, after his mission of salvation to humanity, is to be the consort of Sophia. In the meantime he leaves the Pleroma with an angelic entourage, separates Achamoth from her passions, and imparts to her the saving gnosis. Her passions become the prime matter of the cosmos. Her feelings of repentance become the psychic element, while the light she absorbed from the angels surrounding Jesus becomes the pneumatic element in the cosmos. From the psychic element she creates the Demiurge, "artificer of the left hand things" (i.e. matter) and "King of all outside the Pleroma"³²*

* The distinction between matter, soul, and spirit (ὕλη, ψυχή, πνεῦμα) is older than the Gnostics. Xenocrates, director of the Academy from 339 to 315 B.C., developed a comprehensive philosophical system based on a correspondence of many triads. Included among such triads as sun/moon/earth and God the Father/God the Mother/God the Son, was the triad body/soul/spirit. Like the Gnostics, Xenocrates associated the soul with the passions.³³

Such is the outline of the myth of Sophia up until the creation of the Demiurge. The psychological processes suggested by the main events in this myth are consistent both with what is already known about the functioning of the anima as well as with the specific character of the Gnostic ethos which, as we saw in the first chapter, was typically introverted and regressive. As that process which brings about a confrontation with the unconscious, regression necessarily involves the anima (at least in the male psyche) which, in this role, represents the function of inward vision. Thus Sophia (the anima) strives to know the Father (the unconscious). The point about Sophia undertaking the task without her consort Will'd points to the compulsiveness of the regression. To the Gnostic, the inward journey was not a question of "willing", it was a question of the sheer necessity of disposition and circumstance.

A figure in the myth that makes its appearance before the creation of the Demiurge is that of the Limit, which may be taken as a manifestation of the Self, which alone has the power to prevent a complete identification with the unconscious (the possibility of which is expressed in the myth by the image of being "swallowed up" by the "ineffable Greatness"). That this is so is also suggested by some of the other names associated with the Limit. Irenaeus writes that "Limit is also called Cross and Redeemer and Emancipator and Definer and Guide."³⁴

These cognomens indicate clearly the proximity between the Limit and the figures of Christos and Jesus who later perform similar functions in relation to the lower Sophia. Jung, in one of the few instances where he comments directly on some portion of the Valentinian myth, has ventured an interpretation of this episode in a section of his essay on "The Philosophical Tree". Because of a certain shortsightedness, however, his interpretation involves several false identifications. To begin with, he identifies the lower Sophia with the Manichaeic Primal Man³⁵, saying that she, like him, was "cast out as bait into the darkness".³⁵ There are two problems with this identification. First, there is no "bait" in the Syro-Egyptian variety of gnosis (of which Valentianism is the chief exponent), since the principle of evil and darkness itself issues from the Pleroma. Secondly, even if there were, the functional equivalent of Primal Man would be Jesus, not Sophia (as indeed Jung seems to recognize subsequently)³⁶, since it is the light which emanates from him and his angels that, as with the "light-armour" of Primal Man, becomes dispersed throughout the cosmos.*

The main point in Jung's interpretation also suffers from similar inadequacies. He focuses on the interaction between

* We will deal with this mythologem in more detail in the next chapter.

the lower Sophia and Christos, which he takes to be a description, in the form of a cosmic projection, of

the separation of the feminine anima from a masculine and spiritually oriented consciousness....

The emotional state of Sophia, sunk in unconsciousness (*áyvoid*), her formlessness, and the possibility of her getting lost in the darkness characterize very clearly the anima of a man who identifies himself absolutely with his reason and spirituality. He is in danger of becoming dissociated from his anima and thus losing touch altogether with the compensating forces of the unconscious. In a case like this the unconscious usually responds with violent emotions, Expressed in the language of myth, Christ (the principle of masculine spirituality) perceives the suffering of Sophia (i.e., the psyche) and thereby gives her form and existence. But he leaves her to herself so that she should feel the full force of her sufferings. What this means psychologically is that the masculine mind is content merely to perceive psychic suffering, but does not make itself conscious of the reasons behind it, and simply leaves the anima in a state of agnoia.³⁷

Although the psychology Jung describes is, in itself, quite convincing, he has mistakenly read it into the portion of the myth in question. For, in the first place, Sophia's agnoia is short-lived. Christos does not impart the full gnosis because he is unable to, as he must remain in the Pleroma with his syzygatic partner, Holy Spirit (who, by the way, is feminine). Also, if Jung would have read a little

further, he would have noticed that this problem is soon rectified, as we have seen, by the single Aeon Jesus, Sophia's destined consort, who proceeds to absolve her from her state of agnoia.

Secondly, the figures of Jesus and Christos, because of the similarity of their respective functions with that of the Limit (all three of which serve to reestablish order and harmony), may also be taken as manifestations of the Self. (This will become even more evident toward the end of this chapter.) Such an identification is closer to the facts than that offered by Jung, who would see them merely as representatives of a "masculine and spiritually oriented consciousness."

The third difficulty is related to the second. Because Jung has missed the creative function of Christos, he interprets the episode as betokening a dissociation between the ego and the anima, brought on by the extremity of Gnostic spirituality, which threatens a break with the compensating forces of the unconscious. The problem with this view is that Gnostic spirituality is itself a compensatory phenomenon which, moreover, is very much in touch with the anima and the unconscious (as the foregoing pages have shown).

The last difficulty with Jung's interpretation has to do with the meaning of the passions, or affects, which he at-

tributes to the psychic dissociation brought on by the extremity of Gnostic spirituality. Now these passions came about because of Sophia's inability to enter the Pleroma, which situation repeats the sufferings of the upper Sophia because of her inability to comprehend the greatness of the Father. We have already seen how Sophia's striving may be interpreted as the Gnostic's compulsive introversion and regression. Keeping this in mind, it will be remembered that her passions are that out of which the Demiurge and the cosmos take their being. Sophia's passions, then, are the embodiment of the negativities of material existence. To understand the psychology behind the relation of Sophia to her passions, therefore, it is necessary to invert the sequence which links the two together. In short: as it is set forth in the myth, the functional cause of the Gnostic's introversion and regression (viz. the negativities of material existence) is transformed into the effect: Sophia's passions, which eventually give rise to the Demiurge and the cosmos, the King and substance of material existence, are said to be the product of her striving to know the Father (i.e., the Gnostic's introversion and regression). Inversions of this kind are the result of that peculiar function of myth which seeks to account for the very conditions which called the myth into being.

These strictures aside, however, it must be said that the main point in Jung's interpretation, if modified somewhat to

conform with the myth, does contain an element of truth. There is indeed a split or dissociation, though entirely within the anima herself. This split provides the key to the initially perplexing Gnostic ambivalence toward the feminine. We have already seen the favorable prominence accorded in the Gnostic mythos to certain feminine figures: Sigé, Charis, Ennoia, Barbelo, Sophia (and two we have not yet encountered) Helen and Mary Magdelene. This prominence is also reflected on the social plane. The Valentinian Marcus, for instance, allowed women to act as priests in celebrating the eucharist and encouraged prophetic utterances from his women initiates (both of which practices were forbidden in orthodox circles). And Marcion appointed women as priests and bishops to serve along with the men.

In contrast to this one finds several disconcerting statements in Gnostic literature that paint the feminine in none too favorable colors. The author of the Book of Thomas the Contender declares: "Woe to you who love intimacy with woman-kind, and polluted intercourse with it."³⁸ In the Dialogue of the Savior, Jesus warns his disciples: "Pray in the place where there is no woman, (and) destroy [the] works of femaleness...."³⁹ Or in the Gospel of Thomas, Simon Peter says to the other disciples: " 'Let Mary [Magdelene] leave us, for women are not worthy of Life'. Jesus said, 'I myself shall lead her in order to make her male, so that she too may be-

come a living spirit resembling you males. For every woman who will make herself male will enter the Kingdom of Heaven'."40

Pagels attributes this devaluation of the feminine to the corresponding realities of contemporary social experience. "Some Gnostics, reasoning that as man surpasses woman in ordinary existence, so the divine surpasses the human...."41 But surely this does not get to the root of the problem. For there are archetypes beneath such stereotypes. In this case, it is the archetype of the feminine, or the anima, which, as we have seen, is a symbol of man's interiority and inner wisdom -- hence, Sophia. But Sophia gives expression to only one half of the archetype. Her complement, the earth-goddess, is conspicuously absent from the Gnostic pantheon. Sophia herself, in the Valentinian myth, must undergo a progressive spiritualization. She is separated from her passions which are pushed outside the realm of the purely spiritual (i.e., the Pleroma). These become the lower Sophia, who likewise suffers and is separated from her passions which, this time, become the soul and matter of the cosmos (soul, it will be recalled, was considered to be the locus for the passions). These successive splits in Sophia, separating the spiritual from the material, the purity from the passion, are in keeping with the character of the Gnostic ethos. Gnostic introversion and regression, though necessarily enlisting the power of the anima, looked only to the spiritual half of

the archetype, keeping a safe distance from the potentially engulfing instinctual half. That the agent in these splittings is the Self -- variously manifested in the figures of Limit, Christos, and Jesus -- indicates that the movement is toward a progressive differentiation of consciousness from the chthonic feminine in the interest of a relative wholeness.

Pursuing further the distinction between the two Sophias, it will be recalled that the upper Sophia has never come into contact with the material world. In this respect she is virginal. Thus in the Acts of Thomas, the mother of Wisdom (Sophia) is referred to as "the virgin" (παρθένος), "daughter of the light..."⁴² In the Apocryphon of John Barbelo is called the "virginal Spirit".⁴³ And "Virgin" is one of the names for the first Thought in the Trimorphic Protennoia.⁴⁴ The lower Sophia, on the other hand, is the mother of the world. In the systems of Ophite and Barbelo-gnosis she is called Sophia-Prunikos (the "prurient", or "lascivious"), which in Epiphanius's account of Simon's teaching appears as one of the epithets of Helen, "the harlot from Tyre".⁴⁵ In fact, in The Second Treatise of the Great Seth, Sophia is referred to as "she who is a whore."⁴⁶

Now although the images of the virgin and the harlot are polar opposites, they are both implicit in the archetype

of the anima. That the anima can manifest herself both as virgin and harlot points to the element of fertility which constitutes the central characteristic of the unconscious as matrix which the anima personifies. Eric Neumann has some helpful remarks in this respect.

The Great Mother [the image of which is the most inclusive expression of the feminine archetype] is a virgin... in a sense other than that intended by the patriarchate, which later misunderstood her as the symbol of chastity. Precisely in virtue of her fruitfulness, she is a virgin, that is, unrelated and not dependent on any man....

Accordingly, the fertility goddess is both mother and virgin, the hetaera who belongs to no man but is ready to give herself to any man.⁴⁷

The polarity expressed by the images of virgin and harlot also points to the Janus-like nature of the anima. As the mediator of unconscious contents, the anima gazes inward, her face to the unconscious. At the same time, however, she faces the ego with outstretched hands, ready to impart what riches of the depths are ever hers to give. The face that looks to the unconscious is that of the anima in her aspect as virgin, for she has never had intercourse with the outside world. But the face that looks in the opposite direction belongs to the anima in her aspect as harlot, for she must be ever ready to give of herself to the inquiring ego and

the world in which it lives.

The figure of Helen in Simonian gnosis calls for closer scrutiny at this point. Apart from the association between the harlot and Achamoth, there are other significant correspondences between the myths of Helen and Sophia. We have already seen the relation of Sophia to the various manifestations of the Ennoia of God -- the common substrate being the archetype of the anima. In keeping with this, one notes that Helen is called "the first Thought (*Ἐννοια*) of his [the divine] mind"⁴⁸ and, according to another source, "Wisdom" (*Σοφία*)⁴⁹. "This Thought", we read in Irenaeus,

leaping forth from him and knowing what her father willed, descended to the lower regions and generated angels and powers, by whom this world was made. But after she generated them, she was held captive by them because of envy, for they did not want to be considered the offspring of anyone else She suffered all kinds of humiliation from them, so that she did not run back upwards to her Father but was even enclosed in a human body, and through the ages transmigrated as from one vessel to another, into other female bodies.... she finally became a prostitute; she was the "lost sheep" [Luke 15:6]. For this reason he [i.e. Simon] came, in order to rescue her first and free her from her bonds, then to offer men salvation through his "knowledge".⁵⁰

God's Ennoia is degraded and abused by the powers she created which rule the cosmos and stand for the forces of material existence. They are self-assertive, envious, and conceited, refusing to acknowledge powers higher than themselves. This description, it will be recalled, fits very well with the character of the collective consciousness just prior to the emergence of the Gnostic ethos. Helen's plight, which corresponds to the later alchemical idea of "the soul in fetters",⁵¹ gives expression to the need of the psyche to differentiate itself from an unconscious instinctuality.

The image of Helen as harlot, writes Jonas, "is intended to show the depth to which the divine principle has sunk by becoming involved in the creation."⁵² Salvation comes not only through the realization that "the harlot from Tyre" is the Ennoia of God, but through the simultaneous recognition of one's own soul in Helen. That this is so is made more evident from the account of Simon's teachings in the Pseudo-Clementines. Sometimes, in this source, Simon passes over the figure of the Ennoia, and states simply that the Demiurge was originally sent out by the good God to create the world, but he set himself up as the Most High and holds captive the souls which belong to the true God.⁵³

Returning now to the Valentinian myth of Sophia, we recall that here too the cosmos is presided over by the Demiurge.

Like the cosmic powers in the myth of Helen, he is jealous and conceited in his ignorance of the powers above him.

We learn from Irenaeus that the Demiurge

supposed that he made these things [i.e., the lower archons and the cosmos] of himself, but he made them after Achamoth projected them. He made heaven without knowing heaven; he formed man in ignorance of man; he brought earth to light without understanding earth. In every case he was ignorant of the ideas of the things he made, as well as of the Mother; and he thought he was entirely alone.⁵⁴

After the Demiurge has finished his creation, he utters the words (echoing the Old Testament Jahweh, Is. 45:5, 46:9) "I am God and apart from me there is no one."⁵⁵ Just as the cosmic powers in the Helen myth can be taken as representative of the conscious standpoint just prior to the emergence of the Gnostic ethos, so too with the ignorant Demiurge, though instead of an unconscious instinctuality, he is in the power of an equally perilous hybris. In terms of individual psychology, he is the projection of an ego seemingly secure in the illusion of its autarchy. This illusion, however, is shattered by a revelation from the Pleroma (i.e., the unconscious); for, as we read in The Apocryphon of John (the chief text of Barbelo-gnosis, the predecessor of the Valentinian speculation):

And a voice came forth from the exalted aeon-heaven: 'The Man

exists and the son of Man'.
And the chief archon, Yaltabaoth, heard (it) and ...
did not know from where she
(or:it) came.⁵⁶

Clearly, the "Man" and "son of Man" must be taken to refer to the Self -- one of whose most common root symbols is the Anthropos⁵⁷ -- which has proclaimed its presence, via the anima, to the deluded ego (see figure 1). Jung himself, again in one of those rare instances where he comments directly on some aspect of the Valentinian myth, recognized this to be the case. The ego-consciousness, he writes, "is ousted from its central position in a psyche organized on the lines of a monarchy or totalitarian state, its place being taken by wholeness or the self Gnosticism long ago projected this state of affairs into the heavens, in the form of a metaphysical drama: ego-consciousness appearing as the vain demiurge, who fancies himself the sole creator of the world, and the self as the highest, unknowable God, whose emanation the demiurge is."⁵⁸

It is perfectly in keeping with the psychology of the unconscious that in almost every account of the disillusionment of the Demiurge it is the Sophia figure (i.e., the anima) who communicates the revelation. In Irenaeus's account of the Ophites it is "the Mother",⁵⁹ while in the system of "the Gnostics" as reported by Epiphanius it is Barbelo⁶⁰ (both of

these are functional equivalents of Sophia).^{*} Even in The Trimorphic Protennoia, which contains no parallel to this scene, the Protennoia proclaims: "I am the Thought of the Father and through me proceeded [the] Voice, that is, the knowledge of the everlasting things".⁶¹ The only version where someone other than Sophia explicitly assumes this role is in the system of Basilides, where the revelation descends in the form of the gospel of "the blessed Sonship"⁶² and is mediated to the Demiurge through his son. But this son, as it turns out, is also a functional equivalent of Sophia, for we are told that, during the creation, "...his son worked in him and advised him, since he was much wiser [σοφώτερος] than the Demiurge."⁶³ Such a role is proper only to Sophia, as is evident throughout the whole corpus of Sophia speculation, starting with the Old Testament where she is depicted as God's master workman.⁶⁴ Hippolytus believed that "Basilides conceived the relation between the Great Archon and his son as Aristotle before him conceived the relation between body and soul [ψυχή, anima]".⁶⁵

The function of the anima as mediator of unconscious contents can also be seen in the role accorded to Sophia (or her equivalents) in her relation to mankind. Although it is the

^{*} So also is the figure of Pistis who utters the revelation in On the Origin of the World (103.15). In the parallel scene from the Apocryphon of John (14.14), the voice issues from "the exalted aeon-heaven", while in the Hypostasis of the Archons (87.1) it comes "forth from Incorruptability". In these instances, however, the presence of the Sophia figure is strongly felt (cf. also The Gospel of the Egyptians, 59).

redeemer who brings the saving gnosis, the way has been prepared by her. For it was she who implanted the pneumatic seed in the creation, in the souls of the elect, without the knowledge of the Demiurge. Thus the "Mother", we read in Irenaeus, "spoke many things concerning things above, but she did so through it [the seed] and the souls originating from it."⁶⁶ Particularly, it was through the prophets that she communicated with mankind.⁶⁷ In the Trimorphic Protennoia* this same Mother proclaims:

I am the Mother [of] the Voice,
speaking in many ways, completing the All. It is in me that knowledge dwells, the knowledge of things everlasting. [It is] I [who] speak within every creature It is I who lift up the Sound of the Voice to the ears of those who have known me, that is, the Sons of the Light.⁶⁸

In the Hypostasis of the Archons the anima manifests herself as the "spirit-endowed Woman", also described as Adam's "female counterpart."⁶⁹ Finding him asleep in the Garden (which the angel who delivers the discourse interprets as the state of "Ignorance",⁷⁰ presumably of mankind in general) the Woman says:

"Arise, Adam." And when he saw her, he said, "It is you who have given me life; you will be called 'Mother of the Living'."⁷¹

* This tractate is unusual in that the Protennoia plays the role of the redeemer.

Although the meaning of the text just prior to this passage is somewhat obscure, it seems as though the Woman has originated from within Adam (as in Gen. 2:20-23). A similar figure appears in The Apocryphon of John. She is described as "his counter-image",⁷² a "luminous Epinoia which comes out of him, who is called Life". This Life, we are told,

...assists the whole creature, by toiling with him and by restoring him to his fullness and by teaching him about ... the way of ascent, (which is) the way he came down. And the luminous Epinoia was hidden in Adam⁷³

One is reminded here of Marcus, a leading disciple of Valentinus, who is reported to have received a vision, the subject of which bears a strong resemblance to the figure of Adam's helper. This vision is said to have descended upon him "... in the form of a woman ... and expounded to him ... the origin of things"⁷⁴

c) wholeness

The effect produced by the assimilation of the unconscious contents which the anima mediates is, at least potentially, one of wholeness.* She communicates knowledge of "things everlasting", knowledge which nourishes the soul, which is why she

* I say potentially, for just as real a possibility is that of inflation, which is a pseudo-wholeness.

is called "Mother" and "Life". A powerful image of the potential wholeness which such nourishment offers is that of the marriage, at the end of time, of Jesus and Sophia (and of the souls of the elect with the angels surrounding Jesus).*

In the words of Irenaeus:

When the whole seed is perfected,
then our Mother Achamoth will depart from the place of the Middle and will enter the Pleroma and will receive the Saviour as her bridegroom, so that there will be a union of the Saviour with Sophia who is Achamoth. These are the bridegroom and the bride. [cf. John 3:29], and the bridechamber is the Pleroma.⁷⁵

Irenaeus's description is echoed in A Valentinian Exposition.

The author writes: "And whenever Sophia [receives] her consort and Jesus receives the Christ and the seeds and the angels, then [the] Pleroma will receive Sophia joyfully, and the All will come to be in unity and reconciliation."⁷⁶

The image of Jesus and Sophia, as bridegroom and bride, whose nuptials take place, beyond time, in the fullness of the Pleroma, is a symbol of the eternally creative union of the masculine and feminine principles of the psyche which constitutes, or rather consummates, the reality of the psychic totality or Self. As such, the image is well suited to its

* This scene is prefigured in the second in-forming of Sophia by the luminous Jesus.

function as a central eschatological symbol. The role of the feminine in this symbol is still that of the unconscious as matrix. However, that the feminine is now no longer characterized solely as mother and sister, but also as bride, points to the psychological maturity of the relation involved. In contrast to the androgynous nature of the Unknown (and unknowing) Father, the union of bridegroom and bride, as an expression of the androgynous nature of the Self, includes the element of consciousness. The one rests in the potentiality of the source, the other in the fullness of the goal.

The sacred marriage, however, was not exclusively an eschatological event. There was, for instance, the sacrament of the bridal chamber, involving a ritual marriage, which figures prominently in the Gospel of Philip. "The Lord [did] everything in a mystery", we read, "a baptism and a chrism and a eucharist and a redemption and a bridal chamber".⁷⁷ Although this sacrament probably originated as an anticipatory enactment, ensuring the elect of their participation in its eschatological counterpart, it seems, in this text at least, to have usurped the ultimate importance of the latter. For without it, the soul would not be able to secure its escape, after death, through the cosmic prison of the planetary spheres. Thus we read that "The powers do not see those who are clothed in the perfect light, and consequently are not able to detain them. One will clothe himself in this

light sacramentally in the union.."⁷⁸ The efficaciousness of the sacrament lay in uniting the soul with its heavenly counterpart, which was conceived as being of the opposite sex. We are told that

If the woman had not separated from the man, she would not die with the man. His separation became the beginning of death. Because of this Christ came to repair the separation which was from the beginning and unite the two But the woman is united to her husband in the bridal chamber. Indeed those who have united in the bridal chamber will no longer be separated. Thus Eve separated from Adam because she was never united with him in the bridal chamber.⁷⁹

Epiphanius has provided us with a less philosophical, though more visionary, illustration of this same theme in an excerpt from the so-called "Great Questions of Mary".⁸⁰ The scene described is reported to have served as the exemplar for one of the rites of the redemption peculiar to the "Gnostics".* The passage relates that Jesus gave Mary (presumably Magdalene)

....a revelation, taking her aside to the mountain and praying; and he brought forth from his side a woman and began to unite with her, and so, forsooth, taking his effluent, he showed that, 'we must so do, that we may live.'⁸²

* This sect is supposed to have originated with Carpocrates, but seems to have had wider affiliations.⁸¹

The relation of Jesus to Mary Magdelene is indeed an interesting one. According to orthodox sources, she is said to have stood by Jesus's cross (Mk. 15:40); and with two other women, to have discovered the empty tomb (Mk. 16:1 ff etc); she was also granted an appearance of the Risen Lord early the same day. Although there is no basis in the Gospels for such an assumption, she has been identified since early times with "the woman who was living an immoral life" who anointed Christ's feet (Lk. 7:37).⁸³ In the popular mind, she is thought to have been a harlot.

It is a curious coincidence that this "immoral" woman has the same name as Jesus's mother, the Blessed Virgin. One is reminded of the split in the figure of Sophia which, as we have seen, tended to constellate around the opposed ideas of the virgin and the harlot. Interestingly enough, in the Pistis Sophia, Mary Magdelene is referred to as the παρθένος (virgin or maiden).⁸⁴ Another aspect of Mary's character which reminds one of Sophia is her ardent curiosity about heavenly matters (in the Pistis Sophia 39 of the 46 questions addressed to Jesus come from Mary).⁸⁵ Sophia, one recalls, strives to comprehend the greatness of the Father.

The fact that two, or rather three in this case, of the most prominent women in Jesus's life shared the same name also seemed significant to the author of the Gospel of Philip who

writes: "There were three who always walked with the Lord: Mary his mother and her* sister and Magdelene, the one who was called his companion. His sister and his mother and his companion were each a Mary."⁸⁷

The three types of relation singled out here are also significant. They provide the basis for a fairly precise parallel to the threefold relation of Jesus to Sophia. One recalls the frequency with which Sophia is referred to as "the Mother". This, as we have seen, is due to her close association, as an anima figure, with the unconscious as matrix. According to Irenaeus's account of Valentinus's original teaching, "Christos did not issue from the Aeons in the Pleroma, but together with a shadow was brought forth according to the idea of the Better by the 'Mother' (Sophia) who had fallen outside of the Pleroma."⁸⁸ This view finds confirmation in A Valentinian Exposition where Jesus is referred to as Sophia's son.⁸⁹ Even the more prominent version in which the Demiurge is the Mother's only son can be brought to bear on this point. For as the Demiurge stands to Jesus as the ego to the Self, insofar as the Self is recognized in its rightful place at the centre of the psychic economy -- expressed by the myth in the belief that, at the end of time, Jesus will supplant the Demiurge in his position of power -- Jesus then becomes the Mother's son. In her aspect as mother, then,

* Schenke corrects "her" to "his" to agree with the following sentence.⁸⁶

Sophia corresponds to Mary the mother of Jesus. The parallel between the two extends even to the virginal conception. For Sophia conceives without any assistance from her partner "Willed", while the fecundating element in both cases is "the Father".

Jesus and Sophia are also as brother and sister, for they are children of the Pleroma with the same "Unknown Father". The psychological basis for this relation lies in the fact that both the anima and the Self share the same psychic foundation -- the unconscious as matrix -- which is mother, as well as Father, to them both.

Finally, we have seen how Sophia was considered to be Jesus's consort. Here on earth, Mary Magdelene is his "companion". But there is still some distance between the two notions. Mary, however, was no ordinary companion. In the Gospel of Mary, Levi says to Peter, "Surely the Savior knows her very well. That is why he loved her more than us."⁹⁰ These words are echoed in the Gospel of Philip, though with a significant difference. The author relates: "[But Christ loved] her more than [all] the disciples [and used to] kiss her [often] on her [mouth]. The rest of [the disciples were offended] by it [and expressed disapproval]."⁹¹ Clearly more is implied here than a figurative "sharing of bread".

The relation of Mary to Sophia is brought out in the two

sentences immediately preceding these lines. They read: "As for the Wisdom who is called "the barren", she is the mother [of the] angels. And the companion of the [Savior is] Mary Magdelene."⁹² Considering the seeming lack of logical continuity between these two sentences as here translated, is it not possible that, in fact, they should read as one, without the hypothetical "is" in the second brackets? If so, the sentence would read thus: "As for the Wisdom who is called "the barren", she is the mother [of the] angels, and the companion of the [Savior], Mary Madgelene." Even without such an explicit identification, however, the correspondences between Mary and Sophia as consort of Jesus are undeniable.*

We have already discussed the significance of the polarity that finds expression in the images of the harlot and the virgin. Once familiar with the nature of the archetype, one learns to expect the manifestation of such polarities in the realm of myth. And so the dual figure of Sophia becomes a little less cryptic, though none the less mysterious. But when these polarities extend into the realm of human relations, as in the case of Jesus and the two Marys, one is perhaps initially a little more surprised. Parallel relationships of this kind confirm the power of the archetype to constellate images, and not only images, but beliefs, and even lives, into the patterns of myth.

* Schenke also agrees, which is why he translates *κοινωνός* as consort rather than companion.⁹³

When looked at schematically (see figure 2), it becomes evident that, apart from the anima, there are forces at work which can only be attributed to the archetype of the Self. The common element in each relationship is the figure of Jesus. He stands at the centre, between two virgins and two harlots, between Heaven (the Pleroma) and Earth. Here we have a classic illustration of the Self as complexio oppositorum. There is, however, a certain problematic involved with the majority of Gnostic symbols of the Self, the special phenomenology of which will be the concern of the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

GNOSIS AND THE SELF

In his book Aion, Jung devoted a chapter to Gnostic symbols of the Self. Despite its penetrating analysis, it is by no means a comprehensive treatment of the subject. To begin with, the symbols which he examines, excluding the amplificatory material, derive almost entirely from Hippolytus's account of the system of the Naasenes. Apart from brief references to the Valentinian, Sethian, and Peratic varieties of Gnosticism, Jung confines himself to this relatively obscure sect. His treatment also suffers from a lack of references to primary sources. In part, of course, this was to be expected, since the Nag Hammadi Library was not at his disposal. Nevertheless, Jung could have made more extensive use of the sources that were available to him. A corollary to his limited selection from the Gnostic material is the incomplete picture he presents of the phenomenology of the Self. This chapter will constitute a kind of supplement to Jung's treatment, both in terms of reference to primary sources, as well as by offering a more comprehensive and systematic treatment of the relevant material.

We have already seen how Gnostic knowledge is characteristically inward-pointing, and in this sense, psychological. And that, moreover, this knowledge embraces not only the heights, but also the depths. The objective content of gnosis, therefore, can be said to consist of a Self-revelation, if by

Self we understand, with Jung, the psyche in its totality. The form which this revelation most typically assumes is that of a mythos of identity, which necessarily involves an answer to the dual question of origin and destiny. For, as we read in the Dialogue of the Savior, "He who will not understand how he came will not understand how he will go, and is not a [stranger] to this world which [will perish] and be humbled."¹ This saying echoes the famous description of the Gnostic by Theodotus as one who has come to know "who we were, and what we have become...; whither we are hastening...; what birth is, and what is rebirth."² The tripartite division of past, present, and future -- or, of origin, identity, and destiny -- is essential to all variants of the Gnostic mythos. Accordingly, this division will serve as the basic structure of this chapter.

a) the Godhead and the divine principle in the cosmos

Gnostic speculation concerned with origins almost invariably begins with a description of the Godhead, despite the fact that it is typically referred to as "indescribable", "incomprehensible", etc. The most common name for the Godhead is undoubtedly "Father". Less frequent variants include "Spirit-Father", "Androgynous Father", and "Mother-Father". As we have seen, however, because the Gnostic Godhead is an expression of the unconscious in its role as matrix, even in those cases where it is simply Father, more often than not one will find that the

feminine, if not explicitly present as a divine partner (Silence, Grace) is implicitly present as a characteristic of the Father (Depth, Womb). It is here that we come across one of the more paradoxical aspects of Jung's model of the psyche as this relates to the God image. For, on the one hand, Jung repeatedly affirms that the unconscious is the psychic source of religious experience.³ While on the other, as he himself emphasizes: "Strictly speaking, the God-image does not coincide with the unconscious as such, but with a special content of it, namely the archetype of the self."⁴ What distinguishes the Self from the unconscious is that the former possesses the element of consciousness -- i.e., an ego.⁵ Here we have the apparent contradiction. For if the Gnostic Godhead is an expression of the unconscious as matrix, then where is the element of consciousness? The answer is that it is there, but only in potentia.^{*} For "...in the beginning", we read in Epiphanius, "the Self-Father encompassed within himself the All, which rested unconscious in him...."⁷ Insofar as the unconscious is of the nature of potential⁸, this amounts, at least as far as the Gnostic Godhead is concerned, to a virtual identity between the unconscious and the Self. Jung himself makes such an identification in commenting on an alchemical description of a double quaternio which resides in the

* This state corresponds to Neumann's "ouroboric state" and Edinger's state of "ego-Self identity". Both Neumann and Edinger speak of a hypothetical "ego-germ".⁶

"Indian Ocean" (i.e., the unconscious). "It is without doubt the Microcosm", he writes, "the mystical Adam and bisexual Original Man [i.e., the Self] in his prenatal state, as it were, when he is identical with the unconscious. Hence in Gnosticism the "Father of All" is described not only as masculine and feminine (or neither), but as Bythos, and abyss."⁹

The image of the quaternio, as well as the ogdoad, plays a conspicuous role in Valentinian gnosis. In the various instances where these appear, however, it is impossible to identify them with the unconscious, or with the Self in its "prenatal state". For the process which gives birth to them -- namely, that of emanation -- is a clear indication of the differentiation of consciousness. Irenaeus describes the process as follows:

Once upon a time, Depth thought of emitting from himself a beginning of all, like a seed, and he deposited this projected emission as in a womb, in that Silence who is with him. Silence received this seed and became pregnant and bore Mind, which resembled and was equal to him who emitted him.... Along with him, Truth was emitted; this makes the first Four, the root of all: Depth and Silence, then Mind and Truth.

When Only-Begotten [i.e., Mind] perceived why he had been emitted, he too emitted Logos and Life.... From the union of Logos and Life were emitted Man and Church.¹⁰ This is the originative Eight...

The "first Four" and "originative Eight" are suggestive of wholeness¹¹ and, as they include the element of consciousness* -- which is especially evident in the two Aeons Mind and Logos -- may be taken together as a symbol of the Self. Also, Mind as such is symbolic of the Self,¹³ inasmuch as he is considered to be "equal to him who emitted him", which means that he encompasses or comprehends the Father. This assumption is supported by the fact that he is described as "the Father of all who were to come after him and was the beginning and form of the whole Pleroma."¹⁴

That Mind and Logos, as the representatives of consciousness, can, in the Pleromatic context, be equated with the Self, is an indication that we are here confronted with an ideal, or archetypal, situation. What this situation describes is a virtual, though not absolute, identity between the ego and the Self** -- that is, a relation in which ego and unconscious are in constant and creative dialogue with one another -- what the fourth century Christians tried to express with their idea of a unity of substance coupled with a distinctiveness

* "The totality appears in quaternary form only when it is not just an unconscious fact but a conscious and differentiated totality."¹²

** A helpful notion in this regard is Edinger's "ideal" or "paradigmatic" ego.¹⁵

of person.

We find a clear expression of the consubstantiality between Father and his Only-Begotten in the Tripartite Tractate. Here the place of Mind is taken by the more general designation "Son".

Just as [the] Father exists in the fullest sense, the one before whom [there was no one] else and [the one] after [whom] there is no other unbegotten one, so too the [Son] exists in the fullest sense, the one before whom there is no other and after whom no other son exists.¹⁷

Similarly, we read in the Gospel of Truth: "Now the name of the Father is the Son. It is he who first gave a name to the one who came forth from him, who was himself, and he begot him as a son."¹⁸ Epiphanius relates an interesting variation in Valentinian speculation concerning the Father and his Only-Begotten. Here, as we have seen, the "Self-Father" encompasses the All, "which rested unconscious in him". His Silence, we are told,

once willed to break the eternal bonds, and moved the Greatness to the desire to lie with her. And uniting with him she brought forth the Father of Truth, whom the initiated rightly call "Man", because he is the image of the pre-existent Unbegotten.¹⁹

With the explicit reference to "Man", we enter into the wide stream of speculation whose source is the figure of the

Anthropos, probably the most pervasive root symbol of the Self. We have already encountered a good illustration of how the Anthropos functions as a symbol of the Self in the system of Barbelo-gnosis, where the deluded Demiurge (i.e., the ego)* is told of the "Man" and the "Son of Man". Two important tractates for the Anthropos figure are Eugnostos the Blessed and its Christianized counterpart, The Sophia of Jesus Christ. In both tractates the Godhead consists of a quaternio of divine beings: the unbegotten Father; his androgynous image, Immortal Man; Immortal Man's androgynous son, Son of Man (also called "Adam of the Light"); and Son of Man's androgynous son, the Savior (see figure 3). One unusual thing about the Godhead in both of these tractates is that the unbegotten Father, who in most systems is an expression of the unconscious, is characterized with attributes suggestive of consciousness: "For he is all mind, thought, reflecting, and thinking."²⁰ As we have already seen, the reflecting stage is usually associated with the birth of the Self, or ideal ego, as Son, the Only-begotten, who is often characterized by the attribute "mind". That the description of the Godhead in these two documents is atypical finds support in Irenaeus's account of the Sethian-Ophites. Here too we find a quaternio of divine figures, though with a significant difference.

* At one point in "Gnostic Symbols of the Self" (par. 308) Jung seems to have confused the Valentinian Demiurge with that of the Hermetic speculation, for he identifies him with the Anthropos and Self, even though he has earlier identified him with the ego (par. 296).

There is a certain First Light in the Depth; this is the Father of All, who is called the First Man. The coming forth of his Thought is the emission of the Son of Man, the Second Man. Below these two is the Holy Spirit, and beneath her are the various elements -- water, darkness, abyss, chaos Then the First Man with his Son rejoiced over the beauty of the female Spirit, and he illuminated her and from her generated an imperishable Light, the Third Man who is called Christ... (see figure 4).²¹

This "First Light in the Depth", although he is called "the Father of All", does not seem to be the unbegotten Father, since he is also called "the First Man", corresponding to "Immortal Man" in Eugnostos and Sophia. Although the First Man of the Sethian-Ophites seems at first glance to be the ultimate ground or source of the Godhead, he is described as "a certain First Light in the Depth". Now we have encountered this Depth before in the Valentinian speculation as one of the names for the unbegotten Father. Furthermore, just as the Valentinian Depth, together with his feminine Silence, were seen to function as expressions of the unconscious as matrix, so too there is a silent affinity between the Sethian-Ophite depth and "the female Spirit", also called "Mother of the Living", who presides over the elements of water, darkness, abyss, and chaos. A further correspondence is the initial Ogdoad of syzygies in the Valentinian system, structured on a threefold emanation from the supreme Father (see figure 5).

Another parallel which contains all of the central elements is to be found in the Poimandres tractate of the Hermetic corpus. Here too we meet with three emanations from the supreme Father, the last of which is the figure of the Primal Man. Also, though the supreme Father, as the Absolute Nous, is suggestive more of consciousness than of the unconscious ground or matrix, we find on closer inspection that this Absolute Nous, as with the Sethian-Ophite "First Light", is intimately related to the feminine figure of the "Will [βουλή] of God", who in turn is associated with the elements of darkness and chaos (see figure 6). In all four systems, then, the Godhead is characterized by a quaternio which, in two instances at least, encompasses a threefold differentiation* of the Anthropos figure; while in the Poimandres and in the Valentinian system the Anthropos figure does not appear until the third differentiation.

Insofar as the single factor in these quaternios, which is also "the One", is the symbolic expression of the unconscious, the secondary triad would be associated with the element of consciousness. One finds a clear illustration of this in Manichaeism where the principle of Good, which is all Light (i.e., conscious) is said to have extended, prior to its be-

*Similarly, Eckhardt's divine quaternio is based on the distinction between the unknowable Godhead and God manifested as triune.

coming mixed with the principle of Evil, in three directions -- North, East, and West. The principle of Evil, on the other hand, which is all Darkness (i.e., the unconscious), extended infinitely to the South.²² This kind of relation between the three and the one accords with the phenomenology of the quaternity archetype.²³ One of its most typical manifestations is the relation of the three differentiated functions of consciousness to the one inferior function²⁴ which is firmly rooted in the darkness of the unconscious.^{25*}

In the Sophia, as well as in the system of the Sethian-Ophites, the Savior, who is the final differentiation of the Anthropos figure, is identified with Jesus (or Christ). The Pleromatic Jesus in Valentinian speculation is also related to the Anthropos figure, though the relation is not explicit. This is played out in his interaction with the lower Sophia. We have already seen how, unable to bear the sufferings of their sister, the other Aeons consort to produce a "common fruit", the Aeon Jesus, who functions to relieve Sophia's distress by hypostasizing her passions which ultimately become the matter of the cosmos. In the process, Sophia absorbs some of the light emanating from Jesus and the angels sur-

* Conversely, the one can represent the most differentiated function, and the three the less so. A fitting image for this relation is the tetramorph in Ezekiel's vision, or the depictions of the four evangelists, with three animal heads and one human.

rounding him*. It is this light which becomes the pneumatic element in the cosmos, the intermediate psychic element having arisen through the repentance (μετάνοια) of Sophia.²⁷ The pneumatic element takes the form of the "spark" (σπινθήρ, scintilla) which is the divine core of man's soul, of which we shall have more to say shortly.

The relation of Jesus to the Anthropos figure in his role as the source of the divine sparks is evident in the Manichaeon version of the same mythologem. Instead of the light emanating from him, it is the "Primal Man" himself**, or his five sons (the accounts are ambiguous on this point), who become dispersed throughout the cosmos.

After they had struggled long with one another, the Arch-devil overcame the Primal Man. Thereupon the Primal Man gave himself and his five sons as food to the five Sons of Darkness.... As the Sons of Darkness had devoured them, the five luminous gods were deprived of understanding, and through the poison of the Sons of Darkness they became like a man who has been bitten by a mad dog or a serpent. And the five parts of Light became mixed with the five parts of Darkness.²⁸

* In the Poimandres tractate it is the reflection of Primal Man which becomes entrapped in the lower Nature (φύσις).²⁶

** The Manichaen Primal Man is effectively identical with the older Zoroastrian Gayomart.

It is the case with both the Valentinian and Manichaeian versions of this mythologem that the divine sparks enter into the cosmos as a strategy against the powers of evil. In the Valentinian myth, Sophia secretly infuses the pneumatic element into Adam by means of the Demiurge as a compensation for the archontic endowment of "soul" ($\psi\chi\mu$). In the Manichaeian myth, Primal Man and his five sons offer themselves as a kind of bait to the forces of Darkness with the knowledge that, once they become mixed with their enemies they will act as a slow working poison making the Darkness fatally dependent upon the Light. The significant difference between the two versions is this: for the Valentinians the principle of evil -- or more precisely its hypostasization -- is conscent with the divine spark. Though it is the product of ignorance, it has nevertheless issued from the divine. For the Manichaeians, on the other hand, the principle of evil is from the beginning anti-divine. As we shall see later on, this difference is of the utmost importance for the respective eschatologies of both systems.

What is common to both, however, is the existential plight in which the spark finds itself as a result of the dispersal. Apart from the Manichaeian myth of the defeat and capture of Primal Man, probably the most dramatic account of the plight of the divine principle finds expression in the Simonian myth of Helen, which, as we have seen, tells of

God's Ennoia reduced to a harlot from Tyre. An equally powerful expression of the plight of the divine principle is to be found in the "Hymn of the Pearl" from the Acts of Thomas. The pearl belongs to the Heavenly King, but somehow it has left its proper abode, and now "lies in the middle of the sea which is encircled by the snorting serpent..."²⁹ The sea -- a common symbol of the unconscious -- combined with the image of the uroboric serpent,* suggest an unconscious identification with the instinctual sphere.** In fact, however, this identification is only partially unconscious, for the state of affairs has succeeded in expressing itself in symbolic form, which presupposes a certain degree of conscious awareness. Indeed, it is precisely this awareness of partial identification, of the poisonous mixture of the light with the darkness, which ensures the possibility of transformation.

b) the gnosis of the redeemer

The idea that the divine principle is as a spark of light -- which idea is common, at least implicitly, to all forms of Gnosticism -- is of extreme psychological significance.

* As Jonas notes, the mythological prototype of this figure "is the Babylonian Ti'amat, the chaos-monster slain by Marduk in the history of creation."³⁰

** Jung, therefore, is incorrect in identifying the dragon in the Acts of Thomas with the Self (cf. Aion, C.W. 9ii:307).

Looked at from the point of view of the Godhead -- i.e., the Self -- the innumerable sparks dispersed throughout the cosmos seem to correspond to the luminous, as well as numinous, contents of the unconscious. In his essay "On the Nature of the Psyche", Jung identifies these contents as archetypes.³¹ In Mysterium Coniunctionis, however, he states that the idea "testifies to the personality -- or ego -- character of psychic complexes: just as the distinguishing mark of the ego-complex is consciousness, so it is possible that other "unconscious" complexes may possess, as splinter psyches, a certain luminosity of their own."³² This latter assessment seems the most reasonable. But when one shifts from the point of view of the Godhead to that of the individual Gnostic -- which, psychologically, would correspond to the ego -- it no longer becomes tenable to look upon the divine spark as a mere complex. While Jung's earlier identification of the proliferation of sparks as archetypes is also unacceptable, it does seem to fit with regard to the spark in isolation. Because of its divine nature, its ultimate worth, and the fact that it constitutes the true center of the individual, one must agree with Jung in his belief that "the One Scintilla, or Monad, is to be regarded as a symbol of the self..."³³ But the Self, as re-

* Although Jung is here concerned with the idea of the spark as it figures in alchemy, because of the archetypal nature of the idea -- witnessed in the consistency of its manifestations, which extend over great lengths of time and across various traditions -- we are justified in applying his insight to its Gnostic counterpart.

flected in the plight of the divine spark, is in need of redemption -- i.e., actualization.

The task of effecting this Self-actualization constitutes the mission of the Gnostic Redeemer. But the Self is the psychic totality, which means that the role of the Redeemer, understood psychologically, must also pertain to the Self. Here we have the central mystery of Gnosticism. For insofar as the divine spark is consubstantial with the Godhead, the Redeemer* redeems himself. In the words of Henri-Charles Puech:

... the content of redemption is that we become aware of our true self, so releasing it from the world in which it is imprisoned and guiding it back to its heavenly home. But this is only possible because the ~~πνεύμα~~ or the luminous ~~vous~~ is consubstantial with the transcendent world or with a divine being to whose fall and redemption the myth links its fate.... In redeeming pneumatic men, this mythical being redeems itself, just as the pneumatic men, by redeeming themselves, contribute to the redemption of this being, whose parts they are.³⁴

The idea of the redeemed Redeemer aptly characterizes the paradoxical nature of the actualization of the Self. The psychological key to understanding the mythic elaborations of this idea lies in seeing through to the creative dialectic between the emergent Self and the individuating ego.* The

*This is Edinger's term. Whereas the ideal ego refers to the goal, the individuating ego describes the movement toward the goal.

Redeemer, from the perspective of the Godhead, assumes the role of the individuating ego, bringing to birth its own totality in reclaiming the scattered particles of its potential being. From the perspective of the individual Gnostic, however, the Redeemer functions as the Self, by whom the Gnostic, as individuating ego, is addressed, and to whom he must respond to bring about his own salvation. "Conscious realization", writes Jung,

or the bringing together of the scattered parts is in one sense an act of the ego's will, but in another sense it is a spontaneous manifestation of the self (insofar as it is the self that actuates the ego's self recollection), which was always there. Individuation appears, on the one hand, as the synthesis of a new unity which previously consisted of scattered particles, and on the other hand, as the revelation of something which existed before the ego and is in fact its father or creator and also its totality.³⁵

Expressed in terms of the Valentinian speculation, and of the Syro-Egyptian type of gnosis generally, the first truly momentous event in the process of Self-actualization occurs when the Redeemer penetrates the cosmic spheres which are presided over by the evil archons. In the Sophia Jesus says: "I broke the gates of the pitiless ones before their faces. I humiliated their malicious intent. They were all ashamed and rose from their ignorance."³⁶ Similarly, the Redeemer Der-

dekeas in The Paraphrase of Shem proclaims: "It is I who opened the eternal gates which were shut from the beginning."³⁷ From the perspective of the individual Gnostic, the image of the Redeemer breaking the gates of the archons is a dramatic depiction, in projected form, of the entry of the Self into the field of a constricted ego-consciousness. From the perspective of the Godhead, on the other hand, the image of downward penetration through the cosmic spheres and the defeat of the archons suggests the necessity of overcoming an unconscious bondage, most probably (in keeping with the nature of the Gnostic ethos) from the powers of the instincts,* through an act of critical-introspection.** We have already seen how the Gnostics conceived of the psyche as a layered accretion of undesirable proclivities and dispositions, endowed by the archons to the soul in its descent. It was through these that the powers of evil exercised their domination. As we read in the Letter of Peter to Philip, "the Archons are fighting with the inner man."³⁹

Once this preliminary penetration has taken place, the Redeemer seeks out the elect and proclaims the saving gnosis.

* As we saw to be the case with the descent of the Heavenly Prince in his search for the lost pearl which lay buried in the sea, encircled by the great serpent.

**See Jung's comments on the journey through the planetary houses which, in its alchemical context, he takes to signify "the overcoming of a psychic obstacle, or of an autonomous complex, suitably represented by a planetary god or demon. Anyone who has passed through all the spheres is free from compulsion...."³⁸

The objective content of this gnosis entails the entire Gnostic mythos, that is, the revelation as to the origin and destiny of the πνεῦμα, νοῦς, or spark of the individual Gnostic. But the distinguishing characteristic of gnosis is determined not so much by its objective content as by the effect which it has on the knowing subject.* The reason for this is that Gnostic knowledge is pre-eminently self-knowledge, and, more specifically, knowledge of the Self. Thus Jesus says in The Testimony of Truth, "This, therefore, is the true testimony: When man knows himself and God who is over the truth, he will be saved, and he will be crowned with the crown unfading."⁴² Or again, in The Book of Thomas the Contender, Jesus says, "... he who has not known himself has known nothing, but he who has known himself has at the same time already achieved knowledge about the Depth of the All."⁴³

Gnosis as Self-knowledge necessarily involves an increase in consciousness. Although this knowledge is inward-pointing, searching out "the Depth of the All", it is at the same time a light from the Depth, from the ultimate source of light itself. Thus the Gnostic Redeemer, insofar as he brings

* Combining the subjective and objective elements, Jonas defines gnosis as secret, revealed, and saving knowledge. "This is to say," he continues, "that it is of mysteries, that it is not come by in a natural manner, and that its possession decisively alters the condition of the knower."⁴⁰ Puech states that gnosis as a whole "can be defined as a mysticism of transformation, in which knowledge brings not only a theoretical solution to the problems raised by the need for redemption but an actual solution which results in the immediate and definitive liberation of the knower."⁴¹

consciousness of the Self, is consistently characterized as a light-bringer or illuminator. "I am Derdekeas", says the Redeemer in The Paraphrase of Shem, "the son of the incorruptible, infinite Light."⁴⁴ The Gospel of Truth tells us that Jesus "enlightened those who were in darkness. Out of oblivion he enlightened them."⁴⁵ Similarly, the Letter of Peter to Philip tells us that Jesus "became for us an illuminator in the [darkness]."⁴⁶ The "darkness" and "oblivion" refer to the state of relative unconsciousness in which the individual, or more precisely his inner spiritual principle (i.e., the latent Self), dwells prior to the reception of the gnosis. As we read in the Sophia, "It was withered and it slumbered in the ignorance of the soul."⁴⁷

The process which typifies the acquisition of gnosis, or an increase in consciousness, is that of differentiation. This process is clearly exemplified in Valentinian speculation with its progressive emanations of divine pairs or syzygies. "The emphatic differentiation of opposites", writes Jung, "is synonymous with sharper discrimination, and that is the sine qua non for any broadening or heightening of consciousness."⁴⁸ Therefore it is not surprising to find that the Gnostic Redeemer is also characterized as a differentiator. The Son of Man, we read in the Testimony of Truth, "divides] us by [the word of the] cross. It divides [the day from] the night and the light from the darkness and the corruptible [from] in-

corruptibility and it [divides] the males from the females."⁴⁹

One can see the differentiating function of the Self even prior to its expression in the person of the Redeemer. In the Poimandres, for instance, the Word descends into the chaos, bringing order by separating the four elements. In the Valentinian system, the related figures of Limit, Christos, and Jesus, all exhibit a similar function, as we have seen, with regard to Sophia's passions. The Valentinian Exposition tells of a more direct involvement of Jesus with the stuff of the cosmos than is familiar from the patristic testimony: "...this Jesus created the Creature [i.e., the Demiurge], and he fashioned out of the passions surrounding the seeds. And he separated them from one another, and the better passions he introduced into the spiritual and the worse ones into the carnal."⁵⁰

The most important differentiation which the acquisition of gnosis effects is, of course, that between the saved, the damned, and the intermediary group, whose fate is correspondingly indeterminate. Thus the Tripartite Tractate informs us that "Mankind came to be in three essential types, the spiritual, the psychic, and the material, conforming to the triple arrangement of the Logos They were not known at first but only at the coming of the Savior, who

shone upon the saints and revealed what each was".*⁵¹

Although the acquisition of gnosis involves a process of differentiation, its ultimate effect is a higher unity. In the Syro-Egyptian type of speculation, this higher unity is attained insofar as one comes to the conscious realization of the existence of the inner divine principle and identifies with it. In the Iranian type, its realization is more explicitly dependent upon the prior differentiation of the light from the darkness in one's nature. But the end product in both cases is the same. And so we read in the Gospel of Philip:

Light and darkness, life and death, right and left, are brothers of one another. They are inseparable. Because of this neither are the good good, nor the evil evil, nor is life life, nor death death. For this reason each one will be dissolved into its original nature. But those who are exalted above the world are indissoluble, eternal.⁵³

One is at first surprised at the grouping together of these opposites "as brothers of one another", since the Gnostic is characteristically very insistent upon the distinction be-

* The process of differentiation in the form of divisio and separatio was an essential element of the alchemical opus. "The separation" or unmixing enables the alchemist to extract the anima or spiritus from the prima materia.... The result of this unmixing is that what was previously mixed up with the "other" is now drawn to "its own place" and to that which is "proper" or "akin" to it....⁵²

tween such categories as good and evil, life and death, right and left (i.e., spiritual and material, or saved and damned). But as Wilson notes in his commentary on Philip, the opposites here "...appear to be contrasted not with each other but with 'those who are exalted above the world'.... it is therefore possible that the opposites refer to the illusory things of this world, which will be resolved into their origin..."⁵⁴ We find a similar expression of this transcendent unity in the Tripartite Tractate.

For when we confessed the kingdom which is in Christ, we escaped from the whole multiplicity of forms and from inequality and change. For the end will receive a unitary existence just as the beginning, where there is no male and female, nor slave and free... but Christ is all in all.⁵⁵

This state of affairs clearly refers to the actualization of the Self, an event marked by the identity of beginning and end, by an inclusive circle within which all opposites are transcended in a "unitary existence". The same theme is powerfully expressed in logion 22 of the Gospel of Thomas, which is also of interest in its use of the image of the infant*. "Jesus saw infants being suckled"; the logion begins.

* The idea of the infant, because of its associations with latent potential and residual wholeness, is a favorite symbol of the Self.⁵⁶ The Self, however, as a complexio oppositorum, is senex as well as puer.⁵⁷ Thus in the Apocryphon of John the author relates how the savior appeared before him: "...and behold I] saw in the light a [youth....] While I looked [at him he became] an old man."⁵⁸ Also in keeping with the all-inclusiveness of the Self is the proclamation of the Savior which immediately follows: "I [am the Father], I am the Mother, I am the Son."⁵⁹

He said to His disciples, "The infants being suckled are like those who enter the Kingdom." They said to Him, "Shall we then, as children enter the Kingdom?" Jesus said to them, "When you make the two one, and ... the inside like the outside... and the above like the below, and when you make the male and female one and the same... then you will enter [the Kingdom]."58

It is implied by these passages that the spiritual integration, the "unitary existence", which they describe is immediately consequent upon the attainment of gnosis. This is true insofar as the existential circumstance of the individual Gnostic is concerned. However, in the context of the Gnostic mythos as a whole, the attainment of gnosis, although it is the essential prerequisite, is not the ultimate salvific event. For as long as any portion of the divine principle lies trapped in the cosmos, the Godhead, and so too by implication the individual Gnostic, remains incomplete.

The correlative in Jung's psychology is the strong probability that the actualization of the Self is, at least on this side of eternity, an unrealizable goal. "There is little hope", says Jung,

of our ever being able to reach even an approximate consciousness of the self, since however much we may make conscious there will always exist an indeterminate and indeterminable amount of unconscious material which belongs to

the totality of the self.
Hence the self will always
remain a supraordinate quantity.⁶⁹

The Gnostics, however, were never in doubt as to the inevitable realization of their ultimate goal.

c) the eschaton

The kind of realized eschatology which tends to find expression in those passages concerned with the nature and effects of gnosis was in fact an explicit element in the doctrine of certain exponents of Valentinianism. This is most apparent in the sacrament of the Bridal Chamber. The marriage rite associated with this sacrament, it will be recalled, was that of the soul (in the general sense) of the elect with its heavenly counterpart or "image". Ultimately, however, the efficaciousness of the sacrament was dependent upon its assuring that the souls of the elect would be able to take part in the truly eschatological union in the Pleroma (of which we shall have more to say shortly). More immediately, the sacrament assured the soul's passage, after death, through the prison gates of the cosmic spheres. Logion 84 of the Gospel of Thomas refers to the final union in the Pleroma. "When you see your likeness," says Jesus, "you rejoice. But when you see your images which came into being before you, and

which neither die nor become manifest, how much will you have to bear!"

It is clear that, understood psychologically, this idea is an expression of the coniunctio which leads to the actualization of the Self. Insofar as the heavenly counterpart was considered of the opposite sex to the soul of the elect, the union would be that between the ego and the anima/animus. Gilles Quispel favours such an interpretation. In his article "Genius and Spirit", he reminds the reader that "some psychologists of our day consider the mysterium coniunctionis of the male consciousness or animus with the female unconsciousness or anima to be the real issue of man's life."⁶⁰ He even speaks of the marriage between the angel and the bride in terms of the "Self and the Ego".⁶¹ Technically, however, there is a difference in conceiving of the heavenly counterpart as the Self rather than the contrasexual. But this difference is merely one of perspective, since for Jung the more compendious personality emerges through the creative union of ego and the anima/animus. In the allegoric "Hymn of the Pearl" this union takes place between the King's son and his "robe of glory", which may be taken to be symbolic of the Self rather than his anima since it is of the same sex as he. The garment, in fact, is described as his double.

As I now beheld the robe, it
seemed to me suddenly to become
a mirror-image of myself: my-

self entire I saw in it, and
it in entire I saw in myself,
that we were two in separate-
ness, and yet again one in the
sameness of our forms....⁶²

The Manichaean version of this same idea takes the form of the identification of the individual with his inner *voũs* which, as we have seen, is a portion or spark of the Absolute *Noũs*. Some of the synonyms for this inner *voũs* are "Good Soul", "Pure I", "Pristine I", "Transcendent I", "Luminous I", "Divine I", etc.⁶³ Kephalaion 138 says of this "Divine I" that "...he comes and shines before the soul and purifies it and illumines it and [leads] it to the land of light, from which it issued at the beginning of things."⁶⁴ The effect of this union -- which, psychologically, can only be described as the encounter between the ego and the Self -- is to contribute to the restoration of Primal Man.⁶⁵ When the apocatastasis is complete, a final universal conflagration ensues which re-establishes the original unity of the Light over and against the Darkness which, however, is now forever incapable of mounting another attack.

In Valentinian speculation, as we have seen, the eschatological climax consists of the hieros gamos of Sophia and Jesus -- and of the souls of the elect with the angels surrounding him* --

* It will be recalled that the pneumatic element took its origin from the light issuing from the angels surrounding Jesus which Sophia absorbed prior to the creation of the cosmos.

in the bridal chamber of the Pleroma. Unlike the Manichæan consummation which results in the eternal restoration of the opposition between the Light and the Darkness, the consequence of the Valentinian eschatological coniunctio is a kind of evaporation of matter and the cosmos (which is the ontological equivalent of the Manichæan Darkness). This comes about because the cosmos was the product, even the substance, of ignorance -- viz. Sophia's inability to comprehend the greatness of the Father. Therefore it follows that to the extent that complete gnosis is attained, ignorance -- and so the cosmos -- is overcome. The Valentinian Gospel of Truth expresses the idea as follows:

Since the deficiency [i.e., the cosmos] came into being because the Father was not known, therefore when the Father is known, from that moment on deficiency will no longer exist. As with the ignorance of a person, when he comes to have knowledge, his ignorance vanishes of itself, as the darkness vanishes when light appears, so also the deficiency vanishes in the perfection.⁶⁶

The idea behind all of this is that of the privatio boni. Jung's repeated criticisms of this idea spring from his belief that it fails to do justice to the empirical reality of

* Jonas terms this the "pneumatic equation": "the human-individual event of pneumatic knowledge is the inverse equivalent of the pre-cosmic universal event of divine ignorance, and in its redeeming effect of the same ontological order. The actualization of knowledge in the person is at the same time an act in the general ground of being."⁶⁷

evil (he is not concerned with the metaphysical validity of the idea).⁶⁸ "Human nature is capable of an infinite amount of evil, and evil deeds are as real as the good ones so far as experience goes and so far as the psyche judges and discriminates between them."⁶⁹

But the interesting thing about the Valentinian formulation of the privatio boni, based as it is on a psychological ontology, is that it finds a fairly precise parallel in Jung's ethical categories. For the great evil to Jung is unconsciousness,* which is equivalent to Self-ignorance. From this it follows that inasmuch as one acquires Self-knowledge, ignorance, and so evil, disappears, which is as close as possible to saying that evil (i.e., Self-ignorance) is merely the privation of the good (i.e., Self-knowledge).

Another little worked out aspect of Jung's thought which has its parallel in Gnostic eschatology has to do with the collective dimension to the Self. "It would be wildly arbitrary", writes Jung, "and therefore unscientific to restrict the self to the limits of the individual psyche, quite apart from the fundamental fact that we have not the least knowledge

* "Man's worst sin is unconsciousness...."⁷⁰ "...I could wish that the saying of Jesus, 'Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, thou art blessed, but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the law, were still in the gospels.... It might well be the motto for a new morality."⁷¹

2 2
OF / DE

9

of these limits, seeing that they also lie in the unconscious."⁷² With this consideration, one might look upon the Gnostic vision of the final unity of all individual souls with the Godhead -- indeed, as the fullest expression of the Godhead -- as an intuitively apprehended symbol similar in nature to the later alchemical notion of the unus mundus.^{*} This notion was elaborated by the English alchemist Gerard Dorn, who conceived of the ultimate goal of the opus as, in Jung's words, "a union with the world -- not with the world of multiplicity as we see it but with a potential world, the eternal Ground of all empirical being, just as the self is the ground and origin of the individual personality past, present, and future."⁷³

Whether one chooses to interpret the central Gnostic eschatological symbols in terms of individual or collective psychology, one important issue remains to be addressed -- namely the degree to which these give full expression to the archetype of the Self. For although these symbols, on the one hand, are undeniably suggestive of wholeness, completion, and totality, on the other they are conspicuously one-sided. This one-sidedness manifests itself in an absolute exclusion of the chthonic principle -- darkness and matter are unconditionally rejected. This would seem to preclude the possibility of their

* The image would correspond in many ways to Teilhar's Omega point, especially in that, in both cases, the final unity is conceived in terms of pure spirit.

for the Gnostic are those of the source and goal of the divine drama, which are beyond time and history, and are conceived in terms of pure spirit. Although the question of whether or not the Gnostic eschatological vision is metaphysically or theologically valid is beyond the pale of this enquiry, from the psychological point of view -- that is, as a vision expressive of the ideal goal of psychic development -- it remains fundamentally incomplete.

CONCLUSIONS

We began our enquiry by tracing two separate trajectories central to the understanding of late antiquity. The first was seen to be operative at the level of the collective unconscious, involving a compensatory spiritual affirmation in response to a dehumanizing -- because onesided and unconscious -- affirmation of the baser instincts. This affirmation was manifest in the wave of socio-political unrest, in particular the many and devastating wars, immediately preceding the pax Romana. Parallel to, and to a certain extent, conditioned by, these developments, were significant changes at the level of the collective consciousness, characterized by a growing sense of alienation and oppression. Both of these trajectories contributed toward a radically transcendent orientation -- most pronounced in the emergence of the Gnostic ethos -- which, however, was coupled with an equally radical conception of divine immanence.

Coextensive with the movement from instinct to spirit, and implicit in the compensatory motive behind this movement, was a shift of effective centres from the ego to the Self. This shift was discernable in the dual directionality of the Gnostic orientation, pointing, on the one hand, to a transcendent -- i.e., supraordinate -- spiritual goal, and on the other, inward to the Gnostic's essential nature.

More immediately, the Gnostic orientation was seen to betoken an extreme introversion and regression leading to a confrontation with the collective unconscious. With these considerations we turned our attention to the many feminine figures that enjoy a certain prominence in the Gnostic mythos. These were found to be expressions of the unconscious as matrix (Womb, Depth, Silence, etc) or, in their more differentiated forms, of the anima, either as a personification of the unconscious (Ennoia, Barbelo), or in her function as the mediator of unconscious contents (Sophia). The role of the feminine in psychic wholeness then led us into an analysis of the phenomenology of Gnostic symbols of the Self. These symbols, though expressive of the relative wholeness to which the necessary extremity of Gnostic spirituality was directed, were seen to be, because of their unconditional rejection of the chthonic principle, fundamentally incomplete.

Jung rarely addresses the issue of this incompleteness in his treatment of the Gnostic symbols.¹ Where the issue does arise, as we have noted, is with his consideration of Christ as a symbol of the Self, which in turn must be understood in the context of Jung's critique of Christianity and Western civilization. There are two main points to his critique. The first has to do with the splitting of the opposites -- and one pair in particular -- entailed by the differentiation of consciousness made possible through the Christian revelation.

More immediately, the Gnostic orientation was seen to betoken an extreme introversion and regression leading to a confrontation with the collective unconscious. With these considerations we turned our attention to the many feminine figures that enjoy a certain prominence in the Gnostic mythos. These were found to be expressions of the unconscious as matrix (Womb, Depth, Silence, etc) or, in their more differentiated forms, of the anima, either as a personification of the unconscious (Ennoia, Barbelo), or in her function as the mediator of unconscious contents (Sophia). The role of the feminine in psychic wholeness then led us into an analysis of the phenomenology of Gnostic symbols of the Self. These symbols, though expressive of the relative wholeness to which the necessary extremity of Gnostic spirituality was directed, were seen to be, because of their unconditional rejection of the chthonic principle, fundamentally incomplete.

Jung rarely addresses the issue of this incompleteness in his treatment of the Gnostic symbols.¹ Where the issue does arise, as we have noted, is with his consideration of Christ as a symbol of the Self, which in turn must be understood in the context of Jung's critique of Christianity and Western civilization. There are two main points to his critique. The first has to do with the splitting of the opposites -- and one pair in particular -- entailed by the differentiation of consciousness made possible through the Christian revelation.

It is not the attitude as such to which Jung objects, but the "blindness" that follows from "the prejudice that God is outside man".⁸

While the Christian splitting of instinct and spirit is congenial to, and indeed congenital with, the same split at the heart of the Gnostic ethos, the attitude typical of the latter stands in outright opposition to the typically extraverted attitude of Christianity. This too is not surprising, since it was largely in response to the Gnostic threat that so-called "orthodox" Christianity came into being. There were two main issues in the conflict between both parties.

The first had to do with the person of Jesus. Orthodox Christians (eg., Irenaeus, Ignatius, Tertullian) believed in the true humanity and corporeality of Jesus. This meant that he both suffered on the cross and rose in the flesh. The majority of the Gnostics, on the other hand, were docetists with regard to the passion -- the crucifixion involved only an apparent suffering calculated to deceive the ignorant* -- and favored an exclusively spiritual interpretation of the resurrection. The concretistic view of the orthodox Christians

* The Acts of John provides some evidence that certain Gnostics, at any rate, were able to transcend the purely negative etherealization of the passion, seeing it as a "mystery" for the benefit of the elect.

was repulsive to the Gnostics who longed for escape from the prison of the flesh. The Gnostic position is perhaps best summed up by the author of the Gospel of Philip, who writes, "The mysteries of truth are revealed, though in type and image."⁹

As we have seen, it was the task of the Gnostic Jesus, as the Saviour and giver of gnosis, to bring the individual to consciousness of the Christ within, which lay as a spark from God at the heart of the Gnostic's being. The individual who gained such gnosis did not become "a Christian, but a Christ."¹⁰ This brings us to the second issue in the conflict -- the question of authority. For the orthodox Christian the matter was clear. Authority rested in the hands of the Bishop, whose title derived ultimately from the apostles of Christ. "To join with the bishop", writes Ignatius, "is to join the church; to separate oneself from the bishop is to separate oneself not only from the church, but from God himself."¹¹ A statement such as this would have seemed ludicrous to a Gnostic. How could he, a Christ himself insofar as he came into knowledge of the Christ-image within, be separated from God by refusing to bow to the authority of the bishop?

The Gnostic appreciation for image and symbol, as well as the preference for an inner source of ultimate authority, is quite in keeping with the introverted character of the Gnostic ethos. Conversely, the insistence on the concrete and exter-

was repulsive to the Gnostics who longed for escape from the prison of the flesh. The Gnostic position is perhaps best summed up by the author of the Gospel of Philip, who writes, "The mysteries of truth are revealed, though in type and image."⁹

As we have seen, it was the task of the Gnostic Jesus, as the Saviour and giver of gnosis, to bring the individual to consciousness of the Christ within, which lay as a spark from God at the heart of the Gnostic's being. The individual who gained such gnosis did not become "a Christian, but a Christ."¹⁰ This brings us to the second issue in the conflict -- the question of authority. For the orthodox Christian the matter was clear. Authority rested in the hands of the Bishop, whose title derived ultimately from the apostles of Christ. "To join with the bishop", writes Ignatius, "is to join the church; to separate oneself from the bishop is to separate oneself not only from the church, but from God himself."¹¹ A statement such as this would have seemed ludicrous to a Gnostic. How could he, a Christ himself insofar as he came into knowledge of the Christ-image within, be separated from God by refusing to bow to the authority of the bishop?

The Gnostic appreciation for image and symbol, as well as the preference for an inner source of ultimate authority, is quite in keeping with the introverted character of the Gnostic ethos. Conversely, the insistence on the concrete and exter-

nal is true to the extraverted character of orthodox Christianity. But just as we found, toward the end of the first chapter, that Gnostic introversion was coupled with a regression of libido, so too the character of orthodox Christianity is better understood if seen as progressive as well as extraverted. Progression, which Jung defines as "a continuous process of adaption to environmental conditions," springs from "the vital need for such adaptation. Necessity enforces complete orientation to these conditions and the suppression of all those tendencies and possibilities which subserve individuation."¹² That orthodox Christianity is progressive as well as extraverted is clearly attested to by the establishment of that (at least initially) supremely adaptive institution -- the Catholic Church. The categorical suppression of non-progressive tendencies is equally evident in the Church proclamations against the many "heretics" (such as the words of Ignatius concerning respect for the bishop).

The relation between regressive Gnostic and progressive orthodox Christianity, although ostensibly one of conflict, is, at a deeper level, one of historical and psychological continuity. Regression and progression are linked by the "tidal laws of the libido, by which systole alternates with diastole...."¹³ Arnold Toynbee conceives of these alternate movements in terms of a "withdrawal and return" which characterizes an essential aspect of the relation of the creative

individual to his society.

The withdrawal makes it possible for the personality to realize powers within himself which might have remained dormant if he had not been released from his social toils and trammels. Such a withdrawal may be a voluntary action on his part or it may be forced upon him by circumstances beyond his control; in either case the withdrawal is an opportunity, and perhaps a necessary condition, for the anchorite's transfiguration.¹⁴

The literal meaning of anchorite is "one who goes apart."

"Blessed are the solitary and elect", runs a saying in the Gospel of Thomas, "for you will find ~~the~~ Kingdom."¹⁵

Pagels links this solitude to the Gnostic insistence on the primacy of immediate experience.¹⁶ "Only on the basis of immediate experience could one create the poems, vision accounts, myths, and hymns that gnostics prized as proof that one actually had attained gnosis."¹⁷ The Gnostics were thus engaged "on an intensely private interior journey."¹⁸ This interior journey was indeed intensely private, though, as we have seen, it was also collective in that the journey brought the individual into touch with the depths of the Self -- the psychic substratum of all humanity. Nevertheless, it is true that Gnostic introversion and regression, stimulated as it was by an oppressive alienation, was at most capable of an extremely selective social sensibility. The Gnostics were

"the few" amid "the many". The intensity of the Gnostics' withdrawal was such they they could not manage the return, which for Toynbee is "the essence of the whole movement as well as its final cause".¹⁹ On the other hand, orthodox Christians who fought for the return lost something in the conflict. The purging of the Gnostic threat, like the Roman salting of Carthaginian soil, destroyed much of worth along with the perceived evil.

To the extent that modern Western civilization has inherited the legacy of the orthodox triumph, it has also had to live with this portion of devastated spiritual soil. To make it fruitful again, Western consciousness must reappropriate the Gnostic insights. "From this point of view", as Jung says, "disparagement and vilification of Gnosticism are an anachronism. Its obviously psychological symbolism could serve many people today as a bridge to a more living appreciation of Christian tradition."²⁰ A reappropriation of Gnostic insights must be founded on a sustained self-enquiry, a passion for gnosis in the truest sense. This passion, unlike that of Sophia, must be free from blind compulsion, motivated instead by the desire for psychic well-being. With this prime motivation, certain elements of Gnostic spirituality would have to be rejected or qualified. In particular, the Gnostic devaluation of matter and the body would give way to the more tempered orthodox acceptance of the created order. Similarly, the po-

tentially exclusive and isolating character of gnosis would find a healthy complement in the orthodox ideals of agape and communitas. The reappropriation of Gnostic insights, therefore, is not a question of abandoning one tradition in favour of the other. Rather, it is a question of bringing the best of both together in the interest of a religious consciousness which, because more whole, must also be more truly human.

APPENDIX I
SOPHIA AND LOGOS

Hans Jonas has put forward the thesis¹ that the historical transition from Gnosis to Orthodoxy is also a transition from mythos to logos. In support of this thesis, Gilles Quispel has drawn attention² to an important text in the Nag Hammadi Library, The Tripartite Tractate,³ believed to have been written by the Valentinian Heracleon some time around 160 A.D. What makes this text particularly valuable is that the theology it elaborates represents the mid-point between classical Valentinianism and later Orthodoxy. As we have seen, it was in the Valentinian speculation that the myth of Sophia received its most extensive elaboration. Although Heracleon was a chief disciple of Valentinus, he broke company with the master (if indeed he was the author of the text) in transposing the myth of Sophia into a myth of the Logos.

This transposition, however, did not merely involve a simple exchange of names. A significant difference between both myths is that, in contrast with the traditional Valentinian myth where it is implied that Sophia's striving to know or imitate the Father is a violation of the Pleroma's established harmony, in the Tripartite Tractate the corresponding action of the Logos is endued with a providential sanction. For we are told that

it was not without the will of the Father that the Logos was produced.... Therefore it is not fitting to criticize the movement which is the Logos, but it is fitting that we should say... that it is a cause of a system, which has been destined to come about.⁴

Another significant difference has to do with the respective functions of Sophia and Logos as intermediaries between the Pleroma and the cosmos. Although Sophia gives birth to the Demiurge and, indirectly, to matter itself, she always remains at a certain distance, and seems more inclined to the Pleroma than to the cosmos. In the Tripartite Tractate, on the other hand, the Logos is more immediately involved in the creation of the cosmos. Like the Platonic Demiurge, he creates after the likenesses of the eternal images of the Pleroma. And to these "He gave to each one an appropriate rank, and it was ordered that each one be a ruler over a place and an activity, yielding to the place more exalted than himself..."⁵ Also, whereas in the myth of Sophia the chief archon is depicted as an ignorant and unruly son, here we are told that

Over all the images he established an Archon... the countenance which the Logos brought forth in his thought as a representation of the Father of the Totalities.... The Logos uses him (the Archon) as a hand, to beautify and work on things below, and he uses him as a mouth to say the things which will be prophesied.⁶

These differences are all in accord with the earlier speculation (eg. by the Stoics and Philo) on the nature of the Logos as the instrument of creation and principle of order in the cosmos.

That the transition from mythos to logos should be mirrored in the shift in prominence of the figure of Sophia to that of the Logos is perfectly understandable in view of our findings concerning the psychology governing the relation between Gnostic and orthodox Christianity. The introversion and regression characteristic of the Gnostic ethos necessarily elicited the powers of the anima -- hence the prominence of Sophia. However, with the gradual reversal of psychic energy in the service of outward adaptation -- that is, with the emergence of progressive orthodox Christianity -- the figure of Sophia naturally began to recede. In her place, the idea of the Logos -- because of its positive relation with the created order, which made it more congenial to progressive orthodox Christianity than the Gnostic Sophia -- assumes an ever greater prominence. Apart from the Tripartite Tractate, one sees this, for instance, in the growing authority of John's gospel and in the increasing popularity of Justin's theology of the Logos.⁷ The corresponding shift from mythos to logos is manifested in the work of Origen, perhaps the first systematic theologian, and in the rising concern with Christology and Trinitarian theology which culminated in the great doctrinal de-

debates of the fourth and fifth centuries.⁸

The supplanting of Sophia by Logos, then, along with the corresponding shift from mythos to logos, both of which movements parallel the transition from Gnosis to Orthodoxy, can be meaningfully related to the regression and progression of libido. As the problem of individuation cedes to that of outward adaptation, the function of inward vision and mythic expression (i.e., the anima-Sophia) ceases to be uppermost in the psychic economy. Instead, energy is directed to the ego which, insofar as it is the seat of the intellect (at least in the male psyche⁹) and the psyche's link with the outside world (i.e., creation), finds apt expression in the Logos.

With the shift in focal points of psychic energy from the anima to the ego, it became possible for Christianity to forward the cause of institutionalization and dogmatic formulation. In consequence, however, the Grace of God and power of His revelation in the Word became the sole possession of the Church. While the offices of bishop, priest, and deacon, remained, that of the prophet disappeared.

Roman Catholicism, at any rate, has compensated Christianity's Logos dominance with an increasing reverence for the Blessed Virgin. But there is still little talk of Sophia and

Mary Magdelene, the mythic and earthly counterparts, respectively, of the Blessed Virgin. It remains to be seen whether the promulgation of the Assumptio Mariae will, by itself, prove an adequate response to the popular sentiment which motivated the papal decree.

APPENDIX TWO

GNOSIS AND ALCHEMY

"In spite of the suppression of the Gnostic heresy", writes Jung, "it continued to flourish throughout the Middle Ages under the disguise of alchemy."¹ There is indeed, as Jung has shown, a certain continuity between Gnosis and alchemy.* But there are also essential differences which preclude the possibility of looking upon the latter as a mere "disguise" of the former. The continuity between both traditions takes the form of several shared symbols, the most important of which is that of the spark, scintilla, or monad.³ Perhaps a more fundamental affinity between both traditions -- which, moreover, would account for shared symbols -- is that both Gnosis and alchemy are instances of regressive phenomena which, therefore, enjoy a close proximity to the collective unconscious. However, whereas the Gnostic regression was provoked by the negativities of life in late antiquity, the alchemical regression was in large measure a compensation for the inadequacy of medieval Christian spirituality.⁴

Gnosis and alchemy also diverge with respect to the ori-

* I am here considering alchemy as a historical phenomenon whose heyday, according to Holmyard, was from² about A.D. 800 to the middle of the seventeenth century.

entation, or attitude, typical of each tradition. As we have seen, and as the name itself suggests, gnosis is characteristically self-knowledge. The entire Gnostic mythos has the knowing subject for its explicit reference point. Gnosis, then, is unambiguously introverted. Alchemy, on the other hand, is (at least) explicitly concerned with the transformation of chemical substances (which is also clearly indicated in the name).⁵ Regardless of whether or not certain of the more enlightened alchemists were equally, if not even primarily, concerned with corresponding transformations of character⁶, the fact remains that, from the phenomenological point of view, alchemy looks to the object for its prime reference point. It is, from this perspective at least, extraverted.

We have noted that the alchemical regression was largely a response to the inadequacy of Christian spirituality. The problem lay in a negative valuation of the baser instincts and, consequently, of the body and matter. This negative valuation was itself, as we have seen, due to an overcompensation (the three chief exponents being Christianity, Mithraism, and Gnosis) for a previous onesidedness. Here we have the final significant difference between both traditions. For whereas Gnosis seeks to escape the body and the cosmos, alchemy seeks to redeem them. Matter, to the Gnostic, is merely a prison for the spirit, while to the alchemist, it is

also a shrine. Matter is holy for the very reason that it harbours the divine principle. To be sure, the alchemists recognized the need to gain control over mere physicality. One sees this in the common alchemical image of the lion with its paws cut off, or more explicitly with Dorn's first conjunction, the unio mentalis. But in contrast with Gnostic or Christian asceticism, in alchemy the unio mentalis is followed by the unio corporalis, the re-incarnating of the purified spirit.⁷

One can see this same divergence with the respective goals of Gnosis and alchemy. Gnostic eschatological symbols are, as we have seen, conceived in terms of pure spirit. Matter either ceases to exist or is banished forever from the realm of spirit and light. Alchemical symbols of the goal, on the other hand, tend to include the chthonic and material in a higher synthesis.⁸ The lapis consists of body and soul as well as spirit.⁹ It "grows from flesh and blood".¹⁰ In contrast with the Gnostic ideal of the primacy of the spirit, the alchemical opus "requires the whole man".¹¹

When Jung stresses the continuity between Gnosis and alchemy, then, one ought to bear in mind the foregoing considerations. For, despite the correspondences, both traditions are, in fact, in greater tension with one another than Jung would lead us to believe.

REFERENCES

Introduction

1. Memories, Dreams, Reflections, (Fountain Books, 1977) p. 226.
2. Cf. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:444*; Aion, C.W. 9ii:350; and The Symbolic Life, C.W. 18:1647.
3. Aion, C.W. 9fi:347.
4. The Apocryphon of James, in The Nag Hammadi Library, (edited by James M. Robinson, Harper and Row, 1977), 12.20-22.
5. The Dialogue of the Savior, N.H.L., 128.2-5; cf. also The Testimony of Truth, N.H.L., 44.30f; The Book of Thomas the Contender, N.H.L., 138.6-19; and The Gospel of Mary, N.H.L., 9.15.
6. Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13, p.3.

I. The Emergence of the Gnostic Ethos

1. Cf. "On the Nature of the Psyche", in The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:343f.
2. Ibid:273.
3. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, C.W. 7:35.
4. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:270.
5. Hillman, James, Revisioning Psychology, (Harper and Row, 1977), p. 244.
6. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:414n.

* Unless otherwise indicated, references to the Collected Works of C.G. Jung (second edition) are to volume and paragraph number.

7. Cf. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:235, 406.
8. Hillman, p. 245.
9. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:415.
10. Cf., for instance, ibid: 379, 585 n, 587, 628, 643, 660; and Aion, C.W. 9ii: 396.
11. Cf. Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13:416.
12. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:241.
13. Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:611; Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, C.W. 7:102, 151; The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:423; Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:845.
14. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:406.
15. Psychological Types, C.W. 6:749.
16. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:406.
17. Cf. Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:576; Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i:293; and Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12:192.
18. Cf. Civilization in Transition, C.W. 10:694.
19. Aion, C.W. 9ii:115, 426; Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:959.
20. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12:44.
21. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:959.
22. Aion, C.W., 9ii:170.
23. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, C.W. 7:35.
24. Symbols of Transformation, C.W., 5:104.
25. Ibid.
26. Ibid: 105.
27. The Symbolic Life, C.W. 18:1830.
28. Cf. Friedländer, Ludwig, Roman Life and Manners, (Barnes and Noble, 1965), esp. Vol. II.

29. Ibid, p. 82.
30. Quoted from Löwith, Karl, Meaning in History, (University of Chicago Press, 1949), p. 179.
31. Mankind and Mother Earth, (Granada Publishing Ltd., 1978), p. 200.
32. Angus, S., The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World, (Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929), p. 14.
33. Toynbee, Arnold, A Study of History, an abridgement by D. C. Somervell, (Dell Publishing Co., Inc., 1978) Table 1 in Vol. I.
34. Toynbee, Arnold, Mankind and Mother Earth, p. 202.
35. Angus, S. The Mystery Religions and Christianity, (University Books, 1966), p. 36.
36. The idea of constitutive principles is elaborated in Peter Slater's The Dynamics of Religion (Harper and Row, 1978). Constitutive principles are "virtues in the classical sense. They are... spiritual powers which define the ethos in which end-states are realized" (cf. p 79f).
37. Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:674.
38. Cf. Angus, Mysteries, p. 87.
39. Ibid, p. 59.
40. Augustine, The City of God, (Penguin Books, 1980), II. 26.
41. Quoted from Angus, Religious Quests, p. 90.
42. Quoted from Halliday, W.R., The Pagan Background of Christianity, (University Press of Liverpool, 1925), p. 277.
43. Cf. Grant, R.M., Gnosticism, (Harper and Brothers, 1978), pp. 25, 34, 37, 43.
44. Jonas, Hans, The Gnostic Religion, (Beacon Press, 1963), p. 270.
45. Cf. Psychological Types, C.W. 6:708.
46. Cf. Yamauchi, Edwin M., Pre-Christian Gnosticism, (Eerdmans's, 1973), p. 15; and Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p.42.
47. Authoritative Teaching, N.H.L., 23.14-23; 24.24.

48. The Book of Thomas the Contender, N.H.L., 140.20-30.
49. The Gospel of Thomas, N.H.L., 38.17-19.
50. Murray, The Five Stages of Greek Religion, (London: Watts and Co., 1946), p. 126.
51. Quoted from *ibid*, p. 134.
52. *Ibid*, p. 144.
53. Cf. Murray, p. 135.
54. Cf. *ibid*, p. 134.
55. Cf. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 241 ff.
56. *Ibid*, p. 255.
57. Grant, Gnosticism and Early Christianity, (Columbia University, 1959), p. 39.
58. Quoted from Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 157.
59. Psychological Types, C.W. 6:644.
60. *Ibid*.:769.
61. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:66; cf. also Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:450.
62. God and the Unconscious, (Fontana Books, 1952), p. 208.
63. The Symbolic Life, C.W. 18:1480; cf. also Civilization in Transition, C.W. 10:169.

II. The Role of the Feminine

1. Quoted from Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 148.
2. Angus, Religious Quests, p. 293.
3. Cirlot, J.E., A Dictionary of Symbols, (Philosophical Library, 1976), p. 285.
4. Quoted from Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 149.
5. Cf. Grant, Gnosticism, p. 52.

6. Cf. N.H.L., VII:1
7. Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:320; cf. also 508.
8. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12:557.
9. The Thunder, Perfect Mind, N.H.L., 13. 17-20; 14.26.
10. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 163.
11. Cf. Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:396.
12. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 163.
13. Prayer of Thanksgiving, N.H.L., 64.24-31.
14. Trimorphic Protennoia, N.H.L., 45.3-9.
15. From Doresse, Jean, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics, (Viking Press, 1960), pp. 17-18.
16. Trimorphic Protennoia, N.H.L., 46.14.
17. From Doresse, p. 89.
18. A Valentinian Exposition, N.H.L., 22.22.
19. From Pagels, Elaine, The Gnostic Gospels (Random House, 1979), p. 54.
20. Cf., for instance, Aion, C.W. 9ii:20n; and Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:48, 107; and Psychology and Alchemy, C.W., 12:65, 112, 129, 145, 192, 242n.
21. The Apocryphon of John, N.H.L., 4.22-26.
22. Ibid, 4.26-5.6.
23. Trimorphic Protennoia, N.H.L., 35.34-36.4, 38.10-16.
24. Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13, p. 337.
25. The Visions Seminars, quoted from Memories, Dreams, Reflections, p. 411.
26. For Jung on syzygies, cf. Aion, C.W. 9ii: 298, 301, 303.
27. For a hypothetical reconstruction of the original myth see Quispel's article "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus" (in Gnostic Studies I, Istanbul, 1974-5). For an amplified version of Irenaeus's account see Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, chapter 8, Part II. For a good treat-

ment of the evolution of the myth with some sound speculations as to origins, see G.C. Stead's article "The Valentinian Myth of Sophia", (Journal of Theological Studies, 20, 1969, pp. 75-104).

28. Tripartite Tractate, N.H.L., 57, 7-19.
29. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 182.
30. Ibid.
31. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 167.
32. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 190.
33. Cf. Wili, Walter, "The History of the Spirit in Antiquity" (in Spirit and Nature, Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks, Bollingen, 1954, pp. 75-106).
34. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 166. For an authentic Gnostic text in which the Limit plays a prominent role, see A Valentinian Exposition, N.H.L., XI:2.
35. Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13:452.
36. Ibid.,:456.
37. Ibid.,: 453, 4,5.
38. The Book of Thomas the Contender, N.H.L., 144.8-10.
39. The Dialogue of the Savior, N.H.L., 144.17-21.
40. The Gospel of Thomas, logion 114. Cf. also The Gospel of Mary, N.H.L., 9.20.
41. Pagels, The Gnostic Gospels, p. 67.
42. Cf. New Testament Apocrypha, (SCM Press, 1973) Vol. II, p. 445.
43. The Apocryphon of John, N.H.L., 5.2.
44. Trimorphic Protennoia, N.H.L., 38.14.
45. Cf. Grant, Gnosticism, p. 23ff; and The Gnostic Religion, p. 103 ff.
46. The Second Treatise of the Great Seth, N.H.L., 50.29.

47. Neumann, Eric, The Origins and History of Consciousness, (Bollingen, 1973), p. 52.
48. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 107.
49. Cf. Grant, Gnosticism, p. 27.
50. From *ibid*, pp. 24-25.
51. Cf. Jung, Aion, C.W. 9ii:307n, 326n; Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:152n.
52. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 109.
53. Cf. *ibid*, pp. 110-111.
54. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 173.
55. *Ibid*, p. 174.
56. The Apocryphon of John, N.H.L., 14.14-16; for two slightly different depictions of this scene see The Hypostasis of the Archons, N.H.L., 80.30f; and On the Origin of the World, N.H.L., 103.10f.
57. Cf. The Archetypes of the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i: 529, 550; Aion, C.W. 9ii: 296; Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:444; Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12:210; Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13: 173, 220, 268, 372, 458; and Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:152-3, 209, 498.
58. The Symbolic Life, C.W. 18:1419.
59. Cf. Grant, Gnosticism, p. 54.
60. Cf. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 135.
61. Trimorphic Protennoia, N.H.L., 36.17-19.
62. Cf. Grant, Gnosticism, p. 171.
63. *Ibid*, p. 129.
64. Cf. Prov. 8.22-31.
65. From Quispel, "Gnostic Man: The Doctrine of Basilides" (in The Mystic Vision, Papers from the Erano Yearbooks, Bollingen, 1970), p. 220.
66. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 178.
67. *Ibid*.

68. Trimorphic Protennoia, N.H.L., 42. 9-17.
69. Hypostasis of the Archons, N.H.L., 89.19.
70. Ibid., 89.6.
71. Ibid., 89.14-15.
72. Apocryphon of John, N.H.L., 23.9.
73. Ibid., 20. 15-25.
74. From Pagels, p. 20.
75. Cf. Grant, Gnosticism, p. 176.
76. A Valentinian Exposition, N.H.L., 39.29-35.
77. The Gospel of Philip, N.H.L., 67.20-30.
78. Ibid., 70. 5-9.
79. Ibid., 70.10-22.
80. Cf. New Testament Apocrypha, Vol. I, p. 338.
81. Cf. Doresse, p. 41.
82. From New Testament Apocrypha, Vol. I, p. 389. For Jung's interpretation of this text see Aion, C.W. 9ii:314ff.
83. Cf. The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, (Oxford University Press, 1977) under Mary Magdelene.
84. Cf. New Testament Apocrypha, Vol. I., p. 256.
85. Ibid.
86. Cf. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, (London: A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1962), p. 97.
87. The Gospel of Philip, N.H.L., 59. 6-10.
88. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 186. This doctrine was retained by the Anatolian branch of the school.
89. A Valentinian Exposition, N.H.L.; 33. 30-36.
90. The Gospel of Mary, N.H.L., 18.14.
91. The Gospel of Philip, N.H.L., 63.34-64.1

92. Ibid., 63.31-34.
93. Cf. Wilson, p. 97.

III. Gnosis and the Self

1. The Dialogue of the Savior, N.H.L., 134.20-24.
2. From Pagels, p. xix.
3. Cf. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:3, 740; and Civilization in Transition, C.W. 10:26, 265.
4. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:757.
5. Cf. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, C.W. 7:274; and Aion, C.W.: 9ii: 115, 426.
6. Cf. Neumann, Origins and History of Consciousness, p. 5ff, 266ff; and Edinger, Ego and Archetype, (Penguin Books, 1974), pp.6, 40, 102.
7. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion p. 180.
8. Cf. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W., 12:557.
9. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:8.
10. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 164.
11. Cf. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i: 425, 637; Civilization in Transition, C.W. 10: 738; Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11: 176, 198, 332; and Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12: figure 93.
12. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14: 261.
13. Cf. ibid., 128, 133.
14. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 164.
15. Cf. Edinger, Ego and Archetype, p. 154f.
16. For Jung on the psychological significance of the homousios doctrine, see esp. his essay on the Trinity in Psychology and Religion, C.W.: 11.
17. Tripartite Tractate, N.H.L., 57. 7-19.

18. Gospel of Truth, N.H.L., 38. 6-12.
19. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 180. References to the "Father of Truth", the "Man of Truth", and the "Man of Greatness", also occur in The Second Treatise of the Great Seth, N.H.L., VII:2
20. Eugnostos the Blessed, N.H.L., 73.9.
21. From Grant, Gnosticism, p. 52.
22. Cf. Puech, Henri-Charles, "The Concept of Redemption in Manichaeism," (in The Mystic Vision, Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks, Bollingen, 1970.) pp. 269-70.
23. Cf. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i: 611.
24. Cf. Psychological Types, C.W. 6:666-70.
25. Cf. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i: 431f; and Part 5 of Jung's essay on the Trinity in Psychology and Religion, C.W. :11
26. Cf. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, pp. 150-1, 161.
27. Cf. *ibid*, pp. 187-9.
28. From *ibid*, p. 218.
29. From *ibid*, p. 113.
30. *Ibid*, p. 117.
31. Cf. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:388.
32. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:47.
33. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8: 388.
34. Puech, p. 255.
35. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:400. This whole essay is extremely valuable for how Jung understands the relation between ego and Self in the process of individuation.
36. The Sophia of Jesus Christ, N.H.L., 121.15-122.6.
37. The Paraphrase of Shem, N.H.L., 36.
38. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:308; cf. 297 f.

39. The Letter of Peter to Philip, N.H.L., 137.23.
40. Jonas, "Delimitation of the Gnostic Phenomenon" in Origins of Gnosticism, (Leiden, Brill, 1970), p. 71.
41. Puech, p. 250.
42. Testimony of Truth, N.H.L., 44.30-45.6.
43. The Book of Thomas the Contender, N.H.L., 138.16-19.
44. The Paraphrase of Shem, N.H.L., 8.23.
45. The Gospel of Truth, N.H.L., 18.19.
46. The Letter of Peter to Philip, N.H.L., 133.26-27.
47. The Sophia of Jesus Christ, N.H.L., 120.
48. Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13:291; cf. also Aion, C.W. 9ii:301.
49. The Testimony of Truth, N.H.L., 18.19.
50. A Valentinian Exposition, N.H.L., 35.30-36.
51. The Tripartite Tractate, N.H.L., 118.14-29.
52. Aion, C.W., 9ii:292.
53. The Gospel of Philip, N.H.L., 53.15-20.
54. Wilson, The Gospel of Philip, p. 73.
55. The Tripartite Tractate, N.H.L., 132. 17-28.
56. Cf. Jung, "The Phenomenology of the Child Archetype", in The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i.
57. Cf. Aion, C.W. 9ii:355; and Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:400.
58. Cf. also The Gospel of Philip, N.H.L., 67.30-34; 68. 24-25.
59. Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, C.W. 7:274.
60. Quispel, "Genius and Spirit", in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts, (Leiden, Brill, 1975) p. 165.
61. Ibid, p. 164.

62. From Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 115.
63. Cf. Puech, p. 285.
64. From ibid, p. 290.
65. Cf. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:401.
66. The Gospel of Truth, N.H.L., 24.29-25.2.
67. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, p. 176.
68. For Jung on the privatio boni see esp. Aion, C.W. 9ii:80-85; Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:456-70; and The Symbolic Life, C.W. 18:1592-5.
69. Aion, C.W. 9ii:97.
70. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 9i:455.
71. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:291.
72. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12.247.
73. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:760.
74. Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5:576.
75. Cf. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:283, 284.

Conclusions

1. The only place where it is dealt with explicitly and in any detail is in his essay on "The Structure and Dynamics of the Self" in Aion, C.W. 9ii.
2. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:773.
3. Ibid: 747.
4. Ibid: 670.
5. Ibid: 672.
6. Cf. Ibid: 616
7. The most extensive treatment of the extraverted attitude of Christianity and Western civilization is to be found

in his essay on "The Difference Between Eastern and Western Thinking" in Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11: esp. 770ff.

8. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:100.
9. The Gospel of Philip, N.H.L., 84.20-29.
10. Ibid, 67.26-27.
11. From Pagels, p. 105.
12. The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:74.
13. Psychological Types, C.W. 6:356; see also The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8:70n.
14. Toynbee, A Study of History, Vol. I, p. 256.
15. The Gospel of Thomas, N.H.L., logion 48.
16. Cf. Pagels, The Gnostic Gospels, p. 145.
17. Ibid.
18. Ibid, p. 144.
19. Toynbee, A Study of History, Vol. I, p. 256.
20. Psychology and Religion, C.W., 11:444.

Appendix I: Sophia and Logos

1. Cf. (according to Quispel, "From Mythos to Logos", in Gnostic Studies I, Istanbul, 1974-5, p. 158, 161) Gnosis und Spätantiker Geist, I,II, 2nd edition, Göttingen, 1954.
2. Cf. Quispel, "From Mythos to Logos".
3. N.H.L., I:5.
4. The Tripartite Tractate, N.H.L., 76.24-25; 77.6-11.
5. Ibid, 99.24-29.
6. Ibid, 100.19-24, 34-35.
7. Cf. Chadwick, The Early Church, (Penguin Books, 1980), p.77.

8. Cf. Ibid, and Pelikan, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition, (University of Chicago Press, 1975).
9. For Jung on the relation of Logos to the male psyche (and Eros to the female psyche) see esp. Civilization in Transition, C.W. 10:255-6; and Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:224-233.

Appendix II: Gnosis and Alchemy

1. Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11:60; cf. also Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13, pp. 3-4; and Aion, C.W., 9ii:287.
2. Holmyard, E.J. Alchemy (Penguin Books, 1968), p. 15.
3. For Jung on the significance of the idea of the spark and the monad, cf. esp. The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W. 8:388-9; and Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:42 ff.
4. Cf. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12, esp. pars: 26f; and Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:124, 643.
5. Cf. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12:40; and Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14:773.
6. Cf. Burckhardt, Titus, Alchemy (Penguin Books, 1974), p. 28f; and Holmyard, pp. 15-16, 156f.
7. For Jung on the unio corporalis, cf. Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W., 14:679f.
8. Cf. esp. ibid:676.
9. Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12:243.
10. Ibid.
11. The Symbolic Life, C.W., 18:1414.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Angus, S., The Mystery Religions and Christianity.
University Books, 1966.
- The Religious Quests of the Graeco-Roman World.
New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1929.
- Augustine, The City of God.
Penguin Books, 1980.
- Barrett, C.K., editor, The New Testament Background.
New York: Harper and Row, 1961.
- Burkhardt, Titus, Alchemy
Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Chadwick, Henry, The Early Church.
Penguin Books, 1980.
- Cirlot, J.E., A Dictionary of Symbols.
New York: Philosophical Library, 1976.
- The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church.
London · New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Doresse, Jean, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics.
Viking Press, 1960.
- Edinger, Edward, Ego and Archetype.
Baltimore, Maryland: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Friedländer, Ludwig, Roman Life and Manners, Vols. I and II.
Barnes and Noble, 1965.
- Gärtner, Bertil, The Theology of the Gospel According to Thomas.
Harper and Brothers, 1961.

- Grant, R.M., editor, Gnosticism, (a source book of heretical writings from the early Christian period). New York: AMS Press, 1978.

Gnosticism and Early Christianity.
Columbia University Press, 1959.

- Halliday, W.R., The Pagan Background of Early Christianity. University Press of Liverpool, 1925.
- Haardt, Robert, editor, Gnosis (Character and Testimony) Leiden, Brill, 1971
- Hennecke, E., and W. Schneemelcher, editors, New Testament Apocrypha, Vols. I and II. SCM Press, 1973.
- Hillman, James, Revisioning Psychology. Harper Colophon Books, 1977.
- Hölmyard, E.J., Alchemy. Penguin Books, 1968.
- Jonas, Hans, "Delimitation of the Gnostic Phenomenon", in The Origins of Gnosticism. Leiden, Brill, 1970.

The Gnostic Religion.
Boston: Beacon Press, 1963.

- Jung, C.G., Collected Works (Bollingen Series XX), translated by R.F.C. Hull, and edited by H. Read, M. Fordham, G. Adler and W. McGuire. Princeton University Press, 1953-:

Aion, C.W., 9ii.

Alchemical Studies, C.W. 13.

The Archetypes and the Collective Unconscious, C.W., 9i.

Civilization in Transition, C.W. 10.

- _____ Mysterium Coniunctionis, C.W. 14.
- _____ The Practice of Psychotherapy, C.W. 16.
- _____ Psychology and Alchemy, C.W. 12.
- _____ Psychology and Religion, C.W. 11.
- _____ Psychological Types, C.W. 6.
- _____ The Spirit in Man, Art, and Literature, C.W. 15.
- _____ The Structure and Dynamics of the Psyche, C.W. 8.
- _____ Symbols of Transformation, C.W. 5.
- _____ The Symbolic Life, C.W. 18.
- _____ Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, C.W. 7.
- also by Jung, Memories, Dreams, Reflections.
Fountain Books, 1977.
- Löwith, Karl, Meaning in History.
University of Chicago Press, 1949.
- Murray, Gilbert, The Five Stages of Greek Religion.
London: Watts and Co., 1946.
- The New English Bible.
New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Neumann, Eric, The Origins and History of Consciousness.
Princeton University Press, 1973.
- _____ The Great Mother.
Princeton University Press, 1974.
- Pagels, Elaine, The Gnostic Gospels.
New York: Random House, 1979.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav, The Emergence of the Catholic Tradition.
Chicago · London: University of Chicago Press, 1975.
- Puech, Henri-Charles, "The Concept of Redemption in Manichaeism", in The Mystic Vision,
Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks.

Pantheon Books, 1970.

- Quispel, Gilles, "Genius and Spirit", in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts, Martin Krause, editor. Leiden, Brill, 1975.

_____ "Gnostic Man: The Doctrine of Basilides", in The Mystic Vision, Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks. Pantheon Books, 1970.

_____ "From Mythos to Logos", in Gnostic Studies I. Istanbul, 1974-5.

_____ "The Original Doctrine of Valentinus", in same.

- Robinson, James M., editor, The Nag Hammadi Library (in English). San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1977.

- Shiel, James, Greek Thought and the Rise of Christianity. Longmans, Green, and Co., 1968.

- Slater, Peter, The Dynamics of Religion. San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1978.

- Stead, G.C., "The Valentinian Myth of Sophia", in Journal of Theological Studies, 20, 1969, pp. 75-104.

- Toynbee, Arnold, Mankind and Mother Earth. Granada Publishing, 1978.

_____ A Study of History, a two volume abridgement by D.C. Somervell. Dell Publishing Co., 1978.

- White, Victor, God and the Unconscious. Collins, Fontana books, 1960.

- Wili, Walter, "The History of the Spirit in Antiquity", in Spirit and Nature, Papers from the Eranos Yearbooks. Pantheon Books, 1954.

- Wilson, R. McL., The Gospel of Philip.
London: A.R. Mowbray and Co. Ltd., 1962.
- Yamauchi, Edwin M., Pre-Christian Gnosticism.
Eerdman's, 1973.

FIGURE ONE

THE ANIMA AS MEDIATOR OF UNCONSCIOUS CONTENTS — THE BARBELO-VALENTINIAN SYSTEM

FIGURE TWO

A QUATERNITY OF FEMININE FIGURES
AS CONSTELLATED BY THE SELF

FIGURE THREE

THE GODHEAD IN EUGNOSTOS AND SOPHIA

- (1) Unbegotten Father ("all mind")
↓
 - (2) Immortal Man (androgynous)
↓
 - (3) Son of Man (androgynous)
↓
 - (4) Savior (Jesus, also androgynous)
-

FIGURE FOUR

THE GODHEAD OF THE SETHIAN-OPHITES

- "a certain Light = in the Depth" [1]
- (1) First Man ("Father of all") [2]
↓
 - (2) Second Man ("Son of Man") [3]
↓
 - (3) Third Man ("Christ") [4]
↓
 - (4) Holy Spirit ("First Woman", "Mother") [1]
↓
- water, darkness, abyss, chaos
-

FIGURE FIVE THE VALENTINIAN OGDOD

FIGURE SIX (COMPARE ESP. WITH FIG. 4) THE GODHEAD OF THE POIMANDRES

END

0 2 H 0 9 H 8 2

FIN