

## **Saint John of Damascus and the Iconoclastic Controversy: The Essential Need for Image(s) in Christian Worship**

In 754 Constantine V gathered the “Synod of Hieria” in Constantinople, with the main purpose of condemning those, who Satan supposedly misguided “so that they worshipped the creature rather than the Creator.”<sup>1</sup> The reasoning behind this increasingly aggressive stance against the Iconophiles was most likely more complex than suggested in the synod’s definition. It is difficult to understand what Constantine’s father, Leo III, had hoped to gain when he some twenty nine years earlier, in 725, issued his famous edict that ordered the discontinuation of images in worship and even their destruction. The next hundred years, before the controversy finally faded, the Eastern Empire took extremely harsh measures against those who were in favor of icons. For instance, in 767 the Patriarch Constantine was executed in the middle of the Hippodrome.

Scholars have pointed to various motives that may have induced the Iconoclastic emperors of the Isaurian dynasty (717-886). These motives have often been characterized as being mainly political: for one, the army was recruited from territories traditionally hostile to, not only the use of icons, but also the dominant Church and its practices (Armenians, Maronites of Lebanon, Isaurians, Manicheans, Paulicians).<sup>2</sup> Some have suggested that Leo was aiming to stabilize the Empire by suppressing local freedom. Unfortunately, for Leo III, this move seemed to have the opposite effect on the people. It increased the enthusiasm with which the images were defended, and Monks of the monastic movement, who stood for non-conformity, soon took advantage of the situation. They saw the opportunity to shake off the imperial yoke that the Emperor had placed on the Church, once and for all.<sup>3</sup> Finally, considering the heightened presence of Islam, and the ongoing dialogue with Jews, it made sense for the Emperor to suppress or at least limit the use of images.

As we shall see theology also played a role, even in the early stages of this conflict. At the same time, John Meyendorff suggests that it wasn’t until the Iconoclasts ran into severe opposition that they were forced to carefully formulate their own theology, specifically in terms of Christology.<sup>4</sup> Shortly after Leo III issued the Iconoclast edict, St. John’s mentor prompted him, to respond to the tumultuous situation. Safely situated in Jerusalem, from a Monastery by the name of St. Saba, he delivered in writing a heavy blow on the Iconoclasts. In doing so he became the main figure to oppose the Iconoclastic movement. He threw himself into a debate that would cost him his hand, just after Leo III forged a letter to local Caliph (according to legend his hand was restored to his arm through a miraculous healing).

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Joseph Von Hefele, *A History of the Councils of the Church, from the Original Documents*, (Edinburgh : T. & T. Clark, 1872), 309.

<sup>2</sup> H. Walsh-Packenham, *Light and Shades of Christendom*, (London: Headley Brothers, 1935), 313.

<sup>3</sup> The monastic movement can perhaps in itself, through out Church History, be seen as the core of Christian non-conformity.

<sup>4</sup> John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1975), 174.

Because of the strong political influences in this controversy, as alluded to above, and because much of the documentation of the Iconoclasts has been lost (only fragments remain), the theological nature of this debate is easily overshadowed. Therefore, the objective of this paper is twofold. First, briefly I will attempt to show that, during the reign of Leo III, the Iconoclasts relied primarily, just on fragments of Christian tradition and on Neo-Platonic aspects in the thought of Origen. Meyendorff suggests along these lines that “it seems probable that the direct and arbitrary tendency of the Emperor to ‘purify’ religion received little support at that time among theologians. The Origenist bishops of Asia Minor... seem to have been the only theological counselors of the Emperor.”<sup>5</sup> This came with the implication that the Iconoclasts justified a spiritualist outlook (docetism) and Christology with Monophysite tendencies. Second, in the main thrust of the paper, I will analyze St. John’s famous response to the Iconoclastic movement, *Three Apologies Against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*. In this writing, not only does he question the Emperor’s right to speak into the Church, but also reveals serious theological deficiencies in the Iconoclastic camp. At the end of the day, if the human nature of Christ is indescribable, as they claimed, it is also inaccessible, and therefore the salvation of our human nature is not possible. Furthermore, The image of Christ is the visible and required witness to the reality and humanity of Christ (an image). Without such witness, the Eucharist (an image) loses its reality, and the Church (an image) is instantly scattered. Thus, as we shall see in my conclusion, John of Damascus’ struggle has real implications even for the Church today.

Martin Louth suggests that St. John wrote the three treatises over a time period of ten to fifteen years (late 720’s to 740).<sup>6</sup> St. John died in 745, but his theological rebuke against the Iconoclasts was still echoing through out the Empire. Even after his death the Iconoclasts saw it necessary to, on a regular basis “anathematize” St. John. It is nothing less than fascinating that he is given mention by the Iconoclasts in the definition of the “Holy, Great and Ecumenical Seventh Synod” in 754:

Thus we all believe, we all are of the same mind. We have all with one voice and voluntarily subscribed. This is the faith of the Apostles. Many years to the Emperors! They are the light of orthodoxy! Many years to the orthodox Emperors! God preserve your Empire! You have now more firmly proclaimed the inseparability of the two natures of Christ! You have banished all idolatry! You have destroyed the heresies of Germanus (of Constantinople), George and Mansur (John Damascene). Anathema to Germanus, the double-minded, and worshipper of wood! Anathema to George, his associate, to the falsifier of the doctrine of the Fathers! Anathema to Mansur, who has an evil name and Saracen opinions! To the betrayer of Christ and the enemy of the Empire, to the teacher of impiety, the perverter of Scripture, Mansur, anathema! The Trinity has deposed these three!<sup>7</sup>

## **Iconoclasm as a Divine Mission: The Early Theological Mandate of Leo III to Purify Religion**

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 180.

<sup>6</sup> See Martin Louth, *St John Damascene – Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 209. Here Louth also shows how the nature of St. John’s argument slightly changes to better match the times.

<sup>7</sup> Fordham University: Medieval Sourcebook, 1996, available from <http://www.fordham.edu/halsall/source/iconocl754.html>; Internet; accessed 23 April 2010.

For the early Church, especially those Christians influenced by neo-Platonism, the presence of icons and images presented a peculiar problem. How should they, as Christians, relate to material religious symbols? On the one hand their pagan surroundings (including the neo-Platonist) valued cult-images, and thus Christians felt inclined to reject these practices. On the other hand, they had to live with the embarrassing reality that their God according to the Scriptures had become flesh. A Neo-Platonist like Celsus, was quick to point out “The human flesh (of Jesus)...was more corruptible than gold, silver or stone; it was made out of the most impure mud.”<sup>8</sup> And a philosopher by name of Porphyry argued similarly that

If some Hellenes are light-headed enough to believe that gods live inside idols; their thoughts remains much purer than that (of the Christians) who believe that the Divinity entered the Virgin Mary’s womb, became a fetus, was endangered and wrapped in clothes, full of blood, membranes, gall and even more vile things.<sup>9</sup>

John Meyendorff argues that during the second and third centuries, one could find neo-Platonist, whose metaphysics despised matter, defending the practice of worshipping cult-images, while many Christians, in light of the incarnation, still opposed such practices.

Martin Louth reminds us “the heart of the iconoclast controversy was a matter of tradition. Did veneration of icons belong to the tradition of the Church that went back to the Apostles? Or was it an innovation (and therefore corruption, the conclusion all sides would have drawn)? On this matter the iconoclasts lacked clear patristic references.”<sup>10</sup> They had only at their disposal “a series of fragments from Epiphanius, of dubious authenticity, and a letter of Eusebius of Caesarea to Constatia, Constantine’s sister.”<sup>11</sup> In a previous letter Constantia, a devout image worshipper, had requested icons from Eusebius. Eusebius’ response took the shape of a harsh rebuke against such practices and also included a theological explanation.

Interestingly enough, his letter contained a thorough exposition of Origen’s doctrine of salvation. According to Origen the Word did assume reality, but only in order to transform it into a divine reality. Thus Christian’s ought to contemplate God in the purity of their hearts and not see images from a past that is now over. In that same letter Eusebius writes, “The flesh of Christ has now been confused with the divinity.” In doing so he used the very terms of Christology that would become Monophysitism, “showing in this way that Origenism,<sup>12</sup> with its denial of proper value of the flesh and its indifference to the full reality of the incarnation, was ready to adopt the position of Eutyches.”<sup>13</sup>

Thus, in appealing to this specific tradition, the early Iconoclasts were forced to embrace the theological framework that came with it. Consequently, they mainly based their opposition towards the Iconophiles on the severe condemnation of images in the Old Testament, and the understanding of images as being always one essence with their prototypes. Such an

---

<sup>8</sup> Celsus quoted in John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1975), 175.

<sup>9</sup> Ibid.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid., 176.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid., 175.

<sup>12</sup> Origenism carries tendencies of neo-Platonic dualism.

<sup>13</sup> John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 175.

understanding makes every image to pretend to be God; therefore every image is an idol. Not surprisingly the Iconoclasts were also little concerned about the historical Jesus whom the disciples had seen and touched both before and after His resurrection. They spoke instead of a Jesus who lacked human characteristics. In other words, the Iconoclasts, as we have seen above, “dangerously approached the heresy of Eutyches, who spoke of the humanity of Christ as a mere drop in the ocean of His divinity,”<sup>14</sup> and Origen who tended to speak of contemplation of God merely in spiritual terms. We gather that, based on what has been presented above, Leo III accepted iconoclasm as a divine mission he was justified by God to perform. In fact, it has been argued that Leo III was convinced the veneration of images was a “stupid superstition.” Thus, he was determined to eradicate image worship from his empire.

The orthodox response to such views, and the action that flowed from them, soon came in the form of a treatise written by St. John. While the Iconoclasts’ desperately had sought to somehow find support among the Patristic Fathers, St. John, as we shall soon see, had no trouble locating plenty of support for icons. He was also able to support his views firmly upon the Old Testament, and showed that the image of a prototype does not have to be consubstantial, and should therefore not necessarily be considered an idol. Finally, and most importantly, John sensed that the Iconoclast had an incomplete understanding of the incarnation, ultimately stemming from a faulty Christology. Essentially, he opposed their negative view on matter. For him, as God united himself to human nature, through Christ, an eternal change took place in the relationship between God and the whole of creation. Saint John puts it well in his first oration:

In former times, God, being without form or body, could in no way be represented. But today, since God has appeared in the flesh and lived among men, I can represent what is visible in God. I do not worship matter, but I worship the creator of matter who became matter for my sake... ; and who, through matter accomplished my salvation. Never will I cease to honor the matter which brought about salvation!<sup>15</sup>

In other words, his argument, as we mentioned in the introduction, is ultimately concerned with Christology. We have here a classic example of the church trying to make sense of the relationship between the spiritual and material realm. This tension had up until this point in time been applied in numerous ways to the doctrine of Christ. The result was a quite impressive collection of heresies, with docetism on the one end and Adoptionism on the other. How can the divine be united to human nature without separation or confusion? There is no doubt that St. John views this question as being both principal and decisive, even for the salvation of man. He writes, “Therefore I boldly draw an image of the Invisible, but as having become visible for our sake by partaking of flesh and blood.”<sup>16</sup> Armed with the scriptures and Christian tradition he launched an effective counterattack on the Iconoclast.

### **John of Damascus’ response to the Iconoclasts: *Three Apologies Against Those Who Attack the Divine Images***

---

<sup>14</sup> St. John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images – Three Apologies Against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*, (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1980), 8.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, 23.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, 16.

John of Damascus is known as one of the greatest “synthesist theologian” in all of Church history. With impressive coherence and theological depth he effectively argues his case. Particularly impressive is the fact that he responds to the issue from so many different angles. Given his extensive knowledge of tradition he was well equipped to respond to the iconoclasts’ early but sparse appeal to the Patristic writings. Especially in his third treatise John is able to ground his iconophilic views as passed down by the early Church. Here he includes a whole florilegia (systematic collections of excerpts). Martine Louth argues that this collection is very revealing in that it “lay bare the patristic foundation that John had to hand for his defense of the veneration of icons.”<sup>17</sup> Consequently, John’s goal was to show that the iconoclastic argument was to be seen as a charge on religious practices since long established among Christians. This was a tradition that through out the centuries had become part of the fabric of religious devotion in both public and private. As a result, John quoted a broad range of Fathers, a few of which are listed below, and together they made his opponent’s appeal to tradition seem rather far-fetched:

In St. Dionysius the Aeropagite’s *The letter to Titus*, concerning veneration of images (525):

...And instead of attacking the common understanding of the (i. e., images), we ought to comprehend their sacred significance, and not despise their divine origin or the sacred things they portray, for they are visible manifestations of hidden and marvelous wonders.<sup>18</sup>

St. Basil on martyr Gordius concerning veneration of the Saints: (third century):

The people rejoice with spiritual joy at the memory of those who accomplished righteous deeds; when they hear of such holiness, they are urged to imitate it zealously. For the history of holy men lights the way for those who would follow the path of salvation. And again, whenever we glorify in the first place the place the Master of those servants and then we praise the servants, on account of the testimony we know them to have borne while the people are filled with joy when they hear such goodness.<sup>19</sup>

In Leo, Bishops of Neapolis in Cyprus’ *Against the Jews*, concerning veneration of the cross, images of the saints and relics of the saints:

If you, of Jew, reproach me by saying that I worship the wood of the cross as I worship God, why do you not reproach Jacob for bowing down before the point of Joseph’s staff? It is obvious that he was bowing down before Joseph by means of the wood. So with us, we glorify Christ through the cross, and not the wood itself.<sup>20</sup>

The last passage quoted above also illustrates how comfortable the fathers were finding support in the Old Testament. Similarly, although one of St. John’s strongest points in this controversy perhaps was that something new took place in the Incarnation of the Second person of the Trinity, he still didn’t hesitate to argue from the Old Testament. Even in the Old Testament creation was holy and good, for it is God’s creation. As we have seen the Iconoclast commonly referred to the Old Testament and specifically Exodus 20:4, “You shall not make for yourself an idol, or any likeness.” St. John’s response was to argue that those who insisted that the Old Testament condemns all forms of images were quoting the scriptures out of context.

---

<sup>17</sup> Martin Louth, *St John Damascene – Tradition and Originality in Byzantine Theology*, 209.

<sup>18</sup> St. John of Damascus, *On the Divine Images – Three Apologies Against Those Who Attack the Divine Images*, 34.

<sup>19</sup> *Ibid.*, 37.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.*, 41.

St. John cites passage after passage that illustrates how God forbade making idols, but at the same time commanded the use of material objects and images, which were not worshipped. For example while Samuel was building the temple he also made cherubim. Furthermore, in speaking of the honoring of the saints he includes passages from the Old Testament that incorporate people. For example, Abraham bowed down to the sons of Hamor, Jacob bowed to the ground before Esau, Joshua the son of Nun, Daniel bowed in veneration for an angel of God. John exclaims at one point, “Is it not even better to adorn the Lord’s house with the holy forms and images, instead of beasts and plants... I bow before images of Christ, the incarnate God; of our lady the Theotokos and Mother of our Son of God; all of the saints, who are God’s friends.”<sup>21</sup>

John shows that the Old Testament (all of the Scriptures) distinguishes between veneration and worship. He uses the Greek word *latreia* to indicate the absolute worship which only God is worthy by nature to receive, and describes the relative worship given to the Mother of God, the saints or sacred objects (books, relics, icons) by the word *proskinesis*.<sup>22</sup> He writes, “adoration (worship) is one thing and that which is offered to honor something (veneration) of great excellence is another.”<sup>23</sup> This quote explains the ontological distinction he makes between image and prototype. St. John opposes the iconoclastic view that every image must necessarily be identical with the divine model. John explains that, “An image is a likeness, or a model, or a figure of something, showing in itself what it depicts. An image is not always like its prototype in every way. For the image is one thing, and the thing depicted is another...”<sup>24</sup>

John also writes concerning images: “all images (material) reveal and make perceptible those things, which are hidden (spiritual).”<sup>25</sup> These words point to St. John’s subtle dualistic influences, biblical and/or Neo-Platonic. Possibly, John here followed the Origenist School, which had previously adopted the view that the image could not too closely be identified with its prototype. The image was a material symbol of a comprehensible reality destined to elevate the mind toward the divine. This logic applied to the Logos, the image of the Father, to man who was created in the image of God, to images of the absolute that the human mind discovers within creation, and also to historical events as recorded for instance in the scriptures. While this particular Neo-Platonic influence remained in John’s thought, this however, definitely did not stop him from speaking of matter in very positive terms. His point here is to show that God chooses to reveal himself through matter. Or in other words, because man is physical, God expresses himself through physical images, and he always has. For John this was how God had related to matter from the event of creation. Therefore, for St. John, worship must somehow incorporate tangible ways for man to connect to His creation, or else He will remain unknown. He clearly acknowledges that his opponents sadly had fully fallen into the hands of Plato:

What I see with my eyes I venerate, but not as God; I revere that which portrays what I honor. You perhaps, are superior to me, and have risen so far above bodily things that you have become

---

<sup>21</sup> Ibid., 27.

<sup>22</sup> Ibid., 10.

<sup>23</sup> Ibid., 19.

<sup>24</sup> Ibid., 74.

<sup>25</sup> Ibid., 75.

virtually immaterial and feel free to make light of all visible things, but since I am human and clothed with a body, I desire to see and be present with the saints physically.<sup>26</sup>

Instead, St. John reminds his opponents that they too commonly use images in their worship. What about the Eucharist and baptism? Without physical expressions of God, man cannot know Him. In fact, if the Iconoclasts were to be consistent, according to St. John they should also deny the fellowship of the saints in that this community is created in the image of God.

The ultimate or natural image, for John, is Christ. He is distinguished as natural in that he is consubstantial with the Father: “The Son is the natural image of the Father, precisely similar to the Father in every way, except that he is begotten by the Father... And the son of any father is his natural image. Therefore the first kind of image is the natural image.”<sup>27</sup> According to St. John, it is only through Christ, the natural image, that we can truly know God. In him lies the mystery of an inseparable distinction between God and man.

But Christ becoming flesh also marks a new era, which allows for man to relate to God in a new way. Because God has revealed himself in human nature, man is also permitted, in a new way, to depict Him. In Christ, God is no longer hidden. He is no longer exclusively invisible. Germanus, of whom there is mention of above, and who was one of the patriarchs, during the reign of Leo, puts it well when he says

In eternal memory of the life in the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, of his passion, his saving death and the redemption for the world which result from them, we have received the tradition of representing him in his human form, i. e., in his visible theophany, understanding that in this way we exalt the humiliation of God.<sup>28</sup>

John picks up on this point and argues that if they were in the business of making images of an invisible God they would in fact be going against the clear prohibitions of the Old Testament, “but we do nothing of the sort; for we are not in error if we make the image of the incarnate God, who appeared on earth in the flesh, and who, in his ineffable goodness, lived with human beings and assumed the nature, the thickness, the shape and the color of the flesh.”<sup>29</sup>

We saw earlier that, because of their Neo-Platonic influences, the Iconoclasts hesitated to speak of the historical Jesus. Their views on metaphysics drove them to view matter negatively, and thus this also shaped how they viewed images. While their take on the use of images would remain static, Iconoclasm itself changed in that it shifted its focus from mainly prohibiting idolatry to a much deeper and thoughtful rebuke rooted in Christological error, and specifically how God related to matter in the incarnation. Later, in the 754 Synod they would accuse the iconophiles for being either captured by Nestorius in that, “if the image represents the humanity of Christ to exclusion of his divinity, it implies a Nestorian Christology and separates in Christ God from man”<sup>30</sup> or having resorted to Monophysitism, by confusing the two natures of Christ. Thus, the iconoclasts would disqualify images on the basis that they always would manifest one

---

<sup>26</sup> Ibid., 37

<sup>27</sup> Ibid., 75.

<sup>28</sup> John Meyendorff, *Christ in Eastern Christian Thought*, 178.

<sup>29</sup> John of Damascus quoted in Ibid., 179.

<sup>30</sup> Ibid., 180.

of these heresies in that they would either emphasize Christ's humanity or His divinity, or both mingled together.

In contrast the iconophiles saw in the images a confession of faith against the docetic (Neo-Platonic) tendencies in the Iconoclasts, as discussed above. They also highlighted the danger of equating, as the iconoclasts did, the prototype with the image. According to this view the human and divine natures of Christ are confused, with a Monophysite Christology as a result. John exposed in this sense a weakness in his opponents in that Iconoclast Christology does not properly assimilate "the real conception of a properly hypostatic union, implying a real distinction between nature and hypostasis."<sup>31</sup> This Christological deadlock between the Iconoclast would literally be broken in the body of Christ. For what the Iconoclast failed to see was that, in the personalism of Chalcedonian patristic theology, Christ's divinity and humanity are perfectly united, "making possible the preservation of the natural characteristics of the divinity and humanity within a single or personal hypostatic existence."<sup>32</sup> What is represented in the images of the Iconophiles is the person of Christ, for "the image and the similitude with the prototype can only refer to one hypostasis and not to two."<sup>33</sup> The two natures of Christ exist in perfect union in the body of Christ. In becoming incarnate the Word assumed human nature in order to save it, not transform, as for Origen, and not eradicate it as for the Monophysites. This becomes ever so clear in the fact that even after Christ was glorified he "remains a fully human body, that is a describable body."<sup>34</sup>

We arrive, then, at the point I initially made in the introduction, At the end of the day, if the Christ is indescribable, as the Iconoclasts claimed, he is also inaccessible, and therefore the salvation of our human nature is not possible. If Christ cannot truly be known, man cannot attain salvation. Salvation is possible and tangible in the person of Christ, the image of God, the body of Christ, specifically through the Eucharist

is in communion with the divine nature...at least those who are in communion with the holy body of Christ and receive his blood; for the body and blood of Christ are hypostatically united to the divinity, and in the body of Christ with we are in communion, there are two natures inseparably united in the hypostasis.<sup>35</sup>

Consequently, if Christ remains indescribable after his resurrection, not only does this make God unknowable, and thus salvation not possible, we literally cease to be members of Christ. We lack means to relate to one another. The real implication of the Iconoclast controversy finally becomes clearly visible. The image of Christ is the visible and required witness to the reality and humanity of Christ. If there is no such witness, the Eucharist itself loses its reality, and the Church is instantly scattered.

---

<sup>31</sup> Ibid., 182.

<sup>32</sup> Ibid.

<sup>33</sup> Ibid., 188.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., 189.

<sup>35</sup> Ibid.

## Conclusion

H. Pakenham-Walsh reminds us of the danger of the use of images, pictures, and relics. While religious leaders may draw fine distinctions between adoration and worship (as we have seen above that may not always be the case), the ignorant churchgoer may not have this proper discernment when he bows before an image, when he kisses a relic, lights a candle or burns incense. The people of the Byzantine Empire loved and cherish their icons. In many cases veneration probably turned into worship or at least superstition.<sup>36</sup> There are numerous accounts of bravery where people, included women, risked their lives for the sake of these images. As we have seen, the solution to such idolatry is not to clear the religious life of the Church from symbols, thinking that this would somehow put us in the clear.

This is in some ways evident among many American Evangelicals. Their suspicion towards the use of images and symbols have caused them to embrace subtle forms of Neo-Platonism and Gnosticism, with the result that they struggle with how to relate to God-given things like money, sex, food (who will pick up the baton on this issue) etc. Today, the spiritual is often emphasized over the physical. Consequently, today we currently have an undeveloped theology of creation and anthropology and I suspect much of this error stems from how we view Christ. Christian leaders must therefore think through the implications for the Christology they preach from the pulpit and also how they live their lives (they overweight pastor always gets me thinking about these matters).

But, as I have hopefully clearly shown, there are more important matters at stake in the debate over images. The Iconoclastic controversy started out, theologically, as a controversy mainly concerned with idolatry. When the Iconoclasts were opposed by St. John the debate gradually switched into a debate over Christological error. In the end though, it became clear that this matter had real and potentially haunting implications for the Church. St. John helped us understand that we desperately need images to orient ourselves in this world. Ultimately we need the person of Christ who is the image of the living God. Without Him we cannot know God, ourselves or even others. Without this Image, we cannot attain salvation, and the church ceases to exist as it exists today.

---

<sup>36</sup> H. Walsh-Packenham, *Light and Shades of Christendom*, 310.