

Letter to the Editor: A Question on Schuon

Charles Upton

In *Stations of Wisdom*, Frithjof Schuon says:

...orthodoxy is the principle of formal homogeneity proper to any authentically spiritual perspective; it is therefore an indispensable aspect of all genuine spirituality....To be orthodox is to participate by way of a doctrine that can properly be called "traditional" in the immutability of the principles which govern the Universe and fashion our intelligence.

and:

Intellection outside tradition will have neither authority nor efficacy.

In *Esoterism as Principle and as Way*, he says:

Revelation is an Intellection in the Macrocosm, while Intellection is a Revelation in the Microcosm.

So it would seem to be his position that individual Intellection, if it is valid, cannot contradict the doctrines taught by an orthodox tradition based in Revelation. However, in *Logic and Transcendence* he says:

...if in truth the Eucharistic species have literally become the flesh and blood of Jesus, how much better off are we for this so to say "magical" operation, given that the value of this flesh and this blood lies in its Divine content, and that this same content can itself penetrate the bread and the wine without any "transubstantiation"?

In this passage he not only denies "transubstantiation" as a valid, or at least intellectually useful, explanation of what happens at the Consecration, but also denies the necessity and thus the validity of the Consecration of the Eucharist itself, in so doing rejecting the central mystery of the traditional Christian Way, in both its Roman Catholic and its Eastern Orthodox forms.

Question for the readers of *Sacred Web*: Does this represent a contradiction in his teaching, or a subtlety that I have not yet grasped?

Charles Upton
Louisville, Kentucky