From the online library at www.worldwisdom.com

CHAPTER 6

The Torn Veil

Jean Borella

If one holds fast to maintaining the alternative "either esoterism or exoterism," the only solution would be to suppose that, *from the beginning*, a duality of initiatic rites and "religious" (in the sense that this term has for Guénon) rites has existed in Christianity; that baptism spoken about in Acts 2:37-41 being "evidently" of an exoteric nature, it would then be necessary to frame the hypothesis of another baptism, this one initiatic, to which will be eventually given the name "baptism in the Spirit," exoteric baptism being only "in water." Certain scriptural indications might seem to go in this direction (and yet there is nothing to this). But, however that might be, if this duality is admitted, the thesis of exteriorization which thereby becomes useless has to be abandoned. Besides, two renowned Guénonians have indeed favored such a "solution," perceiving that the thesis of their master was in reality insupportable. Of these two, Jean Reyor and Michel Vâlsan, I will now speak.

Of Jean Reyor I will say nothing except that he himself has informed me of his divergence, on this point, from Guénon's position during an interview. As for Michel Vâlsan, he has expounded at length on all aspects of the question in his answers to the study of Marco Pallis published in *Études Traditionnelles*, under the title "*Le voile du Temple*," a study in which he interprets the tearing of the Temple veil at the death of Christ as signifying the abolition of the separation, in Christianity, between esoterism and exoterism.[1] Michel Vâlsan rejects

[1] *Études Traditionnelles*, No. 384-385 (pp. 155-176), 386 (pp. 55-66); July-Dec. 1964 and March-April 1965. Michel Vâlsan, "L'initiation chrétienne," *Réponse à Marco Pallis*, *Études Traditionnelles,* No. 389-390 (pp. 148-184), May-Aug. 1965. The triple number 406-407-408, March-Aug. 1968 contains moreover a dossier entitled: *La question de l'Initiation chrétienne*, including "Notes supplémentaires sur l'initiation chrétienne" by Marco Pallis (pp. 116-141), and "Mise au point" by Michel Vâlsan (pp. 142-152), as well as "Études et documents d'hésychasme" (pp. 153-179). [Translator's note: For English translations of the Pallis articles, cf. "The Veil of the Temple: A Study of Christian Initiation," *Sophia: The Journal of Traditional Studies,* Vol. 5, No. 1, Summer 1999, pp. 113-145 (reprinted from *The Sword of Gnosis,* Jacob Needleman [ed.], Boston: Arkana, 1986), and "Supplementary Notes on Christian Initiation," *Sophia*, Vol. 6, No. 2, Summer 2000, pp. 37-70.]

this interpretation and thinks that "there are two lines of transmission of spiritual influences, one purely initiatic, the other simply religious, which go back to the same source, and that the ordinary sacraments, in their sacred institution, have been somehow modeled on the form of the original rites which were purely initiatic by nature and which have remained such, but in a strictly esoteric order."[2] What should we think about this?

First we have to recognize that, distinct from every other consideration, the significance attributed by Marco Pallis to the tearing of the Temple veil is self-evident, or else nothing means anything. By definition, the tearing of a veil separating two realms symbolizes the end of this separation and the revelation of the mystery hidden by this veil; this is why Marco Pallis was completely justified in making an emblematic argument in his remarks.[3] To the extent that the distinction between esoterism and exoterism can be identified with those between the spirit and the letter, reality and appearance, there is no Christian authority who has not seen in this event the passage from an exterior to an interior worship, from the shadow of mystery to the light of revelation, from a prophetic figurative heralding to the saving accomplishment in truth; the earlier worship no longer has any place, the earlier sacrifice has lapsed as to its own form, since what it represented in image has arrived in its perfect form: the priest and the sacrificial victim are only one.

[2] *Études Traditionnelles,* No. 389-390, p. 175. As we see, here there is no longer any exoterization; the initiatic's rites remain initiatic "in the strictly initiatic order," while the Church proceeds with the (early or late?) making of exoteric rites (the "ordinary" sacraments) modeled on the first which accounts for the formal similarity of the (supposed) two kinds of rite. This hypothesis, fabricated for the needs of the case, obviously has nothing to do with that of Guénon, which Michel Vâlsan, by a strange blindness, refused to admit ("Mise au point," 406-408, p. 150) when Marco Pallis pointed out this incontestable divergence (ibid., p. 120). Vâlsan's thesis is, in certain respects, more plausible than that of Guénon, but yet it does not escape every contradiction: if original Christianity had known two kinds of rite, how can it be seen as a "Jewish esoterism"? —which Vâlsan maintains contrary to all logic: "when the Christic way occupied in Judaism the *normal position* of an initiatic way within a general traditional framework . . ." (p. 149). What would then be the use of exoteric Christian rites? And if Christianity were only an initiatic Jewish way, how could it have experienced such a universal diffusion originally? One always comes up against the same insurmountable difficulties.

[3] Pallis has let it be understood that he was inspired by a critique elaborated by Frithjof Schuon, a critique published twenty years later in the *Dossier H* dedicated to Guénon (Lausanne: L'Age d'Homme, 1984).

Contrary to this, however, Michel Vâlsan asserts that there were two veils in the Temple, and that it was the more exterior one that had been torn; the other, more interior veil continues to mark the separation, then, between the two "religious" and initiatic realms.

On this contested question, I will say this:

In the Temple, there was in fact an exterior veil called *masak* in Hebrew, separating the court from the Holy Place (where the ordinary liturgies took place), and an interior veil called *paroketh* in Hebrew, separating the Holy of Holies from the Holy Place (where, it seems, the high priest penetrated only once a year). The Greek biblical version called the "Septuagint" does not terminologically distinguish between these two veils, making use of the same word *kataphétasma* to distinguish them. Flavius Josephus, who has left us an admiring description of the first veil, the only one visible from without, does the same.[4] None of the evangelists specify which veil was torn at Christ's death: they speak only of "the veil." From this mention of the veil in the singular doctors and commentators have drawn different conclusions: some, like St. Jerome,[5] followed by St. Thomas Aquinas,[6] deem it could only be the exterior veil, the tearing of which alone was visible and had therefore the value of a sign for all; the others think that the mention of the veil without any other detail proves that it could only be the interior veil, the most important from the spiritual point of view.[7] This opinion is shared by some recent exegetes: "according to all likelihood the evangelists are thinking of the curtain to be found before the Holy of Holies, for the exterior curtain would have had too little significance." But, by strictly adhering to the positive data of the Gospel text, it is impossible to give a verdict.[8]

[4] *The Jewish Wars,* V, v, 4 and 5: "Before it was a Babylonian curtain . . . where blue, purple, scarlet and fine flax were mixed with such art that it could not be seen without admiration, and it represented the four elements" (scarlet = fire, fine flax = earth, blue = air, purple = the sea). Also to be seen there was "the whole order of the heavens."

[5] *Epist. CXX, ad Hedibiam,* P. L., t. XII, col. 992.

[6] *Summa theologiae,* Ia IIae, q. 102, a 4.

[7] For example: Cornelius a Lapide, in his monumental *Commentaria in Scripturam Sacram,* the edition procured by Auguste Crampon, Vivès, 1863, t. XV, *Commentaria in Matthaeum,* cap. XXVIII, 51, p. 633, which provides a brief patristic dossier. Jean Maldonnat, is his *Commentarii in quatuor Evangelistas,* edition procured by Conrad Martin, Moguntiae (= Mayence), 1853, t. 1, pp. 477-478, distinguishes several interpretations among the Fathers and Doctors (a sign of "desecration," announcement of the dispersal of the Jews, etc.). To him these various interpretations do not appear to be contradictory: "the tearing of the veil is the sign of some great mysteries."

[8] *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum neuen Testament,* von G. Kittel, Kohlhammer,

However, it is important to consider the Epistle to the Hebrews. Whether it is from St. Paul or one of his disciples, its canonicity is incontestable: it forms a part of Holy Scripture. This epistle mentions the veil of the Temple in three places: 6:19, 9:3 and 10:20. The first mention: this hope "which we have as an anchor of the soul, sure and firm, and which entereth in even within the veil (*eis to esoterion tou katapesmatos*); where the forerunner Jesus is entered for us, made a high priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech." The second veil is obviously the one being dealt with here, which the second mention, that describes the interior layout of the earthly Temple—a description of archetypal rather than historical value—specifies in the following way: "After the second veil [but the first veil is not mentioned!] comes the tabernacle [= the tent] which is called the holy of holies" where "the high priest enters once a year" (Heb. 9:3, 7). "But Christ, being come an high priest of the good things to come, by a greater and more perfect tabernacle not made with hand . . . entered once for all into the Holies, having obtained eternal redemption" (Heb. 9:11-12). "The mediator of the *new testament*" (Heb. 9:15), "Jesus is not entered into the holies made with hands, the patterns of the true: but into heaven itself" (Heb. 9:24). According to the express will of the crucified Son, we have been "sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once" (Heb. 10:10). "Having therefore, brethren, a *confidence in the entering into the Holies* by the blood of Christ; a *new* and living way which he hath dedicated for us *through the veil* [third mention], that is to say, his flesh" (Heb. 10:19-20). As may be seen, these texts do not speak of a tearing of the veil expressly. However, in reading them, it is nearly impossible not to think of it, even if the last citation is hard to interpret. Anyhow, there is certainly signified, in the clearing of the second veil, a free access to the loftiest mysteries, which confirms—at the very least for a reader of Guénon—the mention of Melchisedek placed in direct rapport with the clearing of the veil, Melchisedek whose name characterizes the Christic priesthood: by the sacrifice of his blood, Christ, the eternal high priest, has opened to us the Holy of Holies. But the traversing of the interior veil does not only refer to the curtain of the sanctuary; it more generally signifies the traversing of corporeal appearances, the veil of the flesh, and entry into the heavenly liturgy. The relationship between the traversing of the veil and the traversing of the flesh could, it is true, lead us back to the first veil, since Flavius Josephus has informed us that is was decorated with a

Stuttgart, band III, 1967, *"katapesma im* N. T," pp. 631-632.

representation of the entire corporeal world, and, in particular, with a representation of the four elements inherent to all flesh. However, it is not excluded that the second veil had likewise borne such a symbolic decoration, or had an analogous symbolism, since Flavius Josephus tells us that it was "made of the same material." However that may be, what remains is that, by linking membership in the priesthood of Melchisedek with the clearing of the second veil, the epistle designates Christ's priesthood as the supreme priesthood, thereby identifying it with the highest "initiatic hierarchy."

Hence, whether the tearing affected the first or the second veil, the meaning remains the same: it is the abolishing of a separation between two orders, one exterior and the other interior. Basing himself on Origen, for whom it was, probably, the first veil that had been torn so that the second veil became visible, Michel Vâlsan concluded from this that, according to the great Alexandrian himself, the distinction between exoterism and esoterism has been preserved.[9] But the text of Origen cited by Vâlsan does not have the "Guénonian" significance attributed to it. For Origen, what remains veiled and hidden in the Holy of Holies is the perfect and definitive knowledge of the divine mystery, that which can be granted only at the end of the spiritual way when "I will know even as I am known," according to St. Paul's formula (1 Cor. 13:12), whereas "at present I know in part." It is precisely to this text of St. Paul that Origen alludes in the passage cited: "if we 'knew' not 'in part only,' if, from this flesh, Christ had revealed all to his beloved disciples, both curtains would have had to be torn, both exterior and interior. But since we still have to ceaselessly progress in knowledge, only the exterior veil was torn 'from top to bottom'; thus 'when perfect knowledge shall come,' and when all mysteries shall be unveiled, the second curtain likewise will be raised, and we will be able to see what is hidden behind, namely, the true ark of the covenant and its veritable aspect; and the true cherubim, and the veritable propitiatory, and the manna collected in golden vessels."[10]

[9] *Études Traditionnelles,* No. 389-390, May-Aug. 1965, pp. 154-155.

[10] *Commentarium in Mattaeum, Sermo* 138, Klostermann et Benz, Greichischen Christlichen Schrifsteller, t. 11, pp. 284-286. In this text, the passages in single quotes are from St. Paul. Let us recall that at the time of Christ the Holy of Holies was empty: the second veil did not, then, hide the ark of the covenant (which, according to one tradition, was taken away at the burning of the Temple, in 586, by Jeremiah, who buried it in a secret grotto of Mount Nebo), nor the propitiatory, the cherubim or the manna. Origen was not ignorant of the disappearance of these supports for the *Shekhina;* but he accommodates himself to the description of the Holy of Holies,

In reading this text, we clearly see that the preservation of the second veil by no means signifies, for Origen, the preservation of a formal esoterism, that is to say the preservation of a certain order of knowledge reserved for a few. It only signifies the imperfect character of every knowledge, including esoteric knowledge, when the supreme of "face to face" (1 Cor. 13:12) gnosis has not been attained. Vâlsan's argument would make sense only if access to esoterism would necessarily imply access to such a knowledge; whereas, in fact, since, according to Origen, the second veil signifies the veiling, here below, of the supreme degree of gnosis, of entry into the beatific vision, of union with Absolute Reality ("the *true* ark of the covenant," that is to say not the historical ark, but the Reality of which it was the sacred manifestation), the tearing of this veil would signify that the Parousia, the total Presence (this is the meaning in Greek of the word *parousia*) of God within all people, would be realized. But what esoterist, including Guénon and Vâlsan, has ever claimed that initiation and esoterism would give access effectively and *ipso facto* to the ultimate gnosis? For the great majority of initiates, whatever their traditional affiliation, the ultimate mysteries remain equally veiled; they also dwell on this side of the ultimate veil, they also know "in a mirror" (1 Cor. 13:12). Nor has esoterism drawn aside the second veil; to the contrary, *it shows it,* it causes it to be seen, it reveals that all is symbol and prophecy, and not letter only, that all is anagogy, which especially the exoterist has a tendency to ignore. Besides, has not Guénon often stressed that the term *yogi* or *sufi* could be applied, in all rigor, only to someone who has arrived at the supreme realization?

The fact, then, that the second veil may not have been torn (if one opts, along with Origen, for this solution and accepts his interpretation) should not militate against the thesis of Marco Pallis. To the contrary, this thesis is found to be confirmed, since the tearing of the first veil makes the second veil visible, which means that esoterism is henceforth revealed *as such* to the crowds. Here we discover that the exoteric point of view is produced from an ignorance, or a misunderstanding of revelation's esoteric dimension. This ignorance is, henceforth, no longer possible. True, someone could object that, formally speaking, this revelation of the mystery by its very veiling was already realized by the exterior veil which showed to all, by its very existence, that there was

likewise ideal, given us by the Epistle to the Hebrews (Heb. 9:3-5), except on one point: he does not speak of "the golden altar for perfumes" which the Epistle places strangely in the Holy of Holies, whereas it was situated, it seems, in the Holies.

something of the hidden in the Temple. This is incontestable. But, as I have stressed, there is no pure exoterism; every revelation is already a process of interiorization, which the first veil marking the separation of the profane from the sacred symbolizes; then again, the existence of a second veil refutes beforehand an "exoteric" conception of esoterism, according to which the esoteric is identified with the *occulted visible,* the "mysterious" in the common sense of the term. The existence of the two veils is thus in harmony with the theses that I have developed on the nature of the esoteric and the exoteric, which are processes of interiorization or exteriorization, not statically defined regions. To enter into the esoteric is not to *see* what the exoteric has hidden away, it is to understand that we must plunge into the mystery of God. It is precisely this exoteric conception of the esoteric that Christianity has come to put an end to. By revealing the mysteries, it makes it obvious that the esoteric knowledge of revelation demands a complete conversion of the spiritual gaze; were everything open and betrayed to the curiosity of all, the essential would still be misunderstood. So it is with the body of Christ, abandoned to the stares of all, stretched out before the world, transpierced right to the heart, and yet who retains, invisible, the secret of his divine Resurrection.

This is not, for all that, to say that Origen denies any idea of a reserved teaching, very far from it; he even quite clearly affirms its existence, but by no means identifies it with the mysteries of the Holy of Holies. Thus, following a text whose beginning I have cited already, there is, in Scripture, "ineffable mysteries, too great to find human expression or to be heard by mortal ear. To set them forth in their integrity is impossible.... I do not even know if these mysteries are fully and entirely divulged by the holy apostles; I am not saying that they may not be fully known, but that they are not entirely divulged. It is in fact certain that these mysteries have been known and entirely grasped by the one who was raised 'up to the third heaven'.... St. Paul knows all and comprehends all in spirit, but he has not been permitted to divulge these secrets to men.... But without doubt he revealed them to whoever did not walk according to man (1 Cor. 15:9); he told them to Timothy, he told them to Luke, and to all the disciples he knew to be capable of receiving the ineffable mysteries."[11]

The ineffable mysteries as the object of a teaching, even if reserved, should not then be identified with those mysteries that remain under

[11] *Homilies on Joshua*, XXIII, 4; Latin text, introduction, translation and notes by Annie Jaubert, S.C. No. 71, 1960, p. 467.

the "second veil," and that cannot be the *object* of a teaching in the ordinary sense of the term, that is to say of a theoretical statement, since it is exclusively then a question of their perfect realization. If Christ had not revealed them "in the flesh," this is because they do not belong to the order of formulation, and not because they involve a reserved teaching. As for mysteries that do involve a reserved teaching, their formally esoteric character is quite relative—for all authentic esoterism, as I have maintained—since Origen's just cited text ends with a prayer in which he begs God to grant, to him and to all Christians who hear his sermon, the grace of a plenary gnosis of the scriptural mysteries. Remember that this text where, for a Guénonian, the distinction of esoteric from exoteric is formally attested to, this text is a sermon preached to an audience of "all-comers,"[12] which renders somewhat "surreal" the remark of Michel Vâlsan on the prudence that Origen had to observe in his declarations on esoterism, mindful of "ecclesiastic censure,"[13] which refers to a much later time. In reality, as Marguerite Harl[14] has recalled, Origen does not formally distinguish two categories of Christian, but degrees of knowledge that everyone is called to traverse, even if everyone does not do so. The terms designating these degrees have a symbolic or, if preferred, an emblematic rather than a technical significance: the same person can belong, under different rapports, to several "spiritual types" at once, and no one is excluded, *by nature,* from supreme gnosis.[15]

Nevertheless, for Origen, "to be 'incapable' (Mt. 3:11, in connection with John the Baptist) or to be 'unworthy' (of untying the strap of Christ's sandal) is not the same thing. For it is possible to become

[12] Henri Crouzel, *Origène*, Lethielleux, Collection "Le Sycamore," 1985, p. 158.

[13] Michel Vâlsan, "L'initiation chrétienne," *Études Traditionnelles,* No. 389-390, p. 165. To affirm the existence, for Origen, of two classes of Christian, Vâlsan is basing himself on a study by Jules Lebreton.

[14] *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné* (Paris: Seuil, 1958), pp. 264-266.

[15] Origen dedicates one of the longest chapters of the *Treatise on First Principles* (III, 1), to refuting the doctrine of Valentinus' disciples, according to whom the spiritual destiny of a soul is determined by its "hylic" (or "choïc" = earthy), "psychic" or "pneumatic" nature. According to Origen, beyond individual differences, human nature is one and each person who, being free, is responsible for either his salvation or his loss, as well as for the degree of knowledge to which his love of God gives access. Origen, moreover, distinguishes (according to 1 Cor. 12:8-9) not two but three degrees of knowledge: faith, gnosis (the perfection of faith) and wisdom which knows in the Son, Wisdom of the Father. However, with respect to the beatific vision, these three degrees are almost nothing (*Homilies on Exodus*, III, 1). Likewise see Crouzel, *Origène*, pp. 112-116, the best current synthesis on Origen.

capable without being worthy of it; it is also possible to be worthy, yet without being capable. If graces have been bestowed according to our interest and not only 'in proportion to faith' (Rom. 12:6), this would be a manner of acting for a God who loves men, as in sometimes denying someone an aptitude he would be worthy of, because he foresaw the harm that presumption and the ensuing haughtiness would cause." And Origen concludes: "However we might arrive at understanding, there remains something which we have still not grasped, since 'when a man has finished, he is just beginning, and when he stops, he will be at a loss' (Eccles. 18:7)."[16]

For Origen, the profound opposition is not then between categories of believers, the simple and the perfect, but between those who hear and do nothing and those capable of passing from power to act: "All have the possibility of becoming children of God; only some of them change this possibility into reality."[17] And this is precisely what—eschatologically—the preservation of the veil before the Holy of Holies signifies, that veil which will only disappear on the day of the apocatastasis, when Christ will be all in all.

This whole doctrine is summarized by St. Thomas, with his customary clarity, not in the oft-quoted text of the *Summa Theologiae*,[18] but in his *Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew*, where we read the following text: "These two veils would signify a double veiling: the most interior veil would signify the veiling of the heavenly mysteries, when his glory will have appeared. The other, more exterior veil would signify the veiling of the mysteries relative to the Church. Hence the more exterior was torn and the other not so to signify that, in the death of Christ, the mysteries relative to the Church became manifest; but the other veil was not torn because the celestial arcana remain as yet veiled." This veil, St. Thomas explains citing St. Paul (2 Cor. 3:16), will only be raised at the end of time, at the moment of the conversion of the Jews.[19]

To close this debate, perhaps it would be appropriate to meditate not only on the tearing of the Temple veil, but also and above all on the death of Christ which is its cause. What, then, might this death signify

[16] Origen, *Commentary on John*, VI, 36, §§ 180-181, 183; S.C. No. 157, introduction, translation and notes by Sister Cécile Blanc, pp. 265-267.

[17] Marguerite Harl, *Origène et la fonction révélatrice du Verbe incarné*, p. 264.

[18] I-II, q. 102, a. 4, ad. 4^0.

[19] *S. Thomae Aquinitatis in evangelia S. Matthaei et S. Joannis commentaria,* t. I, ed. II, Taurinensis, Eq. Petri Marietti, Roma, 1912, c. XXVII, p. 391.

as to the question that preoccupies us? The answer is given by Christ himself who teaches us that, in death, his body is "*the body given for all*" (*to soma mou to hyper hymon didomenon,* literally: the body of me for you being given—Luke 22:19). Now what is the body of Christ, if not first the very body of revelation, revelation made body: "Who has seen me has seen the Father." A synthesis of all revelation, the body of Christ becomes, in the Passion, the body given, the body abandoned: everything which can be revealed, everything, of the mystery of God, which is teachable to some degree, communicable, everything is delivered up, abandoned "for us," into our hands like the corpse of Jesus into the hands of his Mother. Even more: this body has been "bled to death"; the true immolated lamb, he has given all of his blood, right down to his transpierced heart: *he has kept nothing for himself*. Thus, it is not only the exterior form of the body of revelation, it is also its most intimate secret by the blood shed "for you and for many," which is revealed, uncovered; and not only uncovered and transpierced, but even exposed and stretched out in its nakedness, and raised aloft on the cross in the sight of all until the end of the world. Now who will deny that the blood symbolizes the initiatic mysteries? The death of Christ constitutes, then, a unique and decisive event *completely* changing the "economy" of tradition. Clearly, it has the significance of a rupture with the ancient and universal economy which divided the degrees of sacred knowledge and participation in divine grace according to the distinction of exoteric and esoteric orders. To tell the truth, and this remark is important, this rupture is an anticipated realization of what will be perfectly accomplished only at the end of time, when the distinction of interior and exterior will definitively cease. This is why Origen or Thomas refer the tearing of the second veil to humanity's eschatological horizon. This is, as I will perhaps explain on another occasion, in conformity with the function of Christianity, the prophetic anticipated and therefore *imperfect* realization, "in image," of the religion of the new "Aeon," or "future Age," since that is, from the "cyclical" point of view, the *raison d'être* of Christianity in the sum of religious forms. This complete change in the economy of tradition is *signified* explicitly by the tearing of the veil and *realized* by the death of Christ. It is inscribed in the very nature of the New Covenant. With respect to the Parousia, or total and universal Presence of the divine Word in every creature and every creature in the divine Word, the distinction between esoterism and exoterism no longer makes any sense. And so this New Covenant is,

as I have stated, eschatological in its very substance; it is formed by the echo of the future Age prophetically reverberating in the today of post-Pascal time.

Thus, it is by very virtue of the privilege of its cyclic function that the Christian religion "ignores" the formal separation between esoterism and exoterism. This "ignorance" flows from its very essence, insofar as it realizes, during the eschatological wait, the anticipatory image of the religion of the second coming. But it is only an image of it, which means that, although in its very form it has to reflect beforehand the parousial disappearance of the two realms of every traditional economy, it also has to continue to distinguish them, no longer as formal structures of its charismatic economy, but as the ever pregnant effect of the nature of things. This is not then, as has sometimes been said, because as a way of love Christianity feels repugnance for such an institutional distinction, but because Christianity is set between the first Testament, of which it is the unveiling, and the last Testament, of which it is the veiling and the prophetic figure.

The Torn Veil
by Jean Borella

Features in

The Essential Sophia
© 2006 World Wisdom, Inc.
edited by Seyyed Hossein Nasr & Katherine O'Brien
All Rights Reserved. For Personal Usage Only.
www.worldwisdom.com