

*We must have the intellectual discipline to examine our assumptions,
the emotional discipline to admit the personal in the political,
and the spiritual discipline not to contend with our enemies,
but to worship our God in wisdom and truth.*

RENDERING TO THE CORPORATION: A PERSONAL ECCLESIOLOGY

By Kathleen Flake

THIS HAS BEEN A TERRIBLY DIFFICULT SPEECH for me to write. After several false starts and middles, I have had to go back to the basics of freshman composition and find my audience before I could find what I wanted to say. In doing so, I realized that if this were a gathering of bishops, or a talk in my little branch on Capitol Hill, or a conversation with my colleagues at Catholic University on the subject of church dissent and discipline, I would say something other than what I am about to say to you.

Who do I think you are? I know you only from these occasions when we gather at Sunstone, but I experience you to be believing and committed Latter-day Saints who subject your faith experience to conscious and critical reflection for the purpose of developing your faith. Or, straining Alma's famous analogy, I understand this audience to be Saints who care for their personal trees of faith by digging about them.¹ Because we live in a grove, however, it is hard not to disturb another's sense of security when digging about, especially when we do it carelessly or without charity. Be that as it may, you are who I would speak to today: you whose faith, like my own I admit, smothers easily, and who need to disturb the well-compacted ground around you if you are to grow. Because I assume that your faith requires it of you, I will not argue the rightness or wrongness of digging about. Rather, what I wish to talk about today are a few aspects of my personal discipline of digging which has, to date, enabled me to live in the LDS household of faith with my particular kind of faith. Thus, this speech proves the old adage: we teach what we need to learn.

I have been working at these lessons long enough that my book of digging now resembles the Federal tax code in its

breadth and depth. It includes such chapters as: "Kathleen, loving your neighbor does not include digging about his tree"; "Eden wasn't aerated in a day"; and even "All things are a compost in one." I will spare you these chapters and focus only on the chapter entitled, "Render unto the Corporation." The title comes, of course, from the Savior's reply to the Pharisees who asked if it was necessary to submit to temporal powers. Pointing to an image of the human face symbolizing the structure of government, he answered: "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." (Mark 12:17). Without Pharisaical malice, but with their wicked simplicity, I, too, have wanted God to tell me that he is my only reality or, at least, that I could, through him, transcend any other. I have wanted him to justify me in not cooperating with the governing structures of my society, which sometimes threaten my spiritual integrity. Instead, he has shown me that truth is found in the right relationship of these things, not in the abandonment of either for the other. Hence, my personal laws for digging begin with this chapter about the corporate "face" of the Church. It reminds me that I am not, by virtue of my spiritual aspirations, exempt from conforming to the requirements of a temporal, religious society. It attempts to teach me how to observe those requirements without losing my aspirations: my faith and hope in Jesus Christ.

The chapter itself begins, as do all books used by lawyers, with definitions. In this case, the critical definition is of the word "church." I have thought of this section often as I have read and listened to the many voices responding to the recent excommunications. To me, it seems that, regardless of their conclusions, all of these voices share the view that the Church is constituted by its organizational aspect, even its hierarchy of offices. For instance, one will say the Church is a kingdom in order to rationalize the exile of citizens who do not acknowl-

KATHLEEN FLAKE is an attorney in Washington, D.C. This address was given at the 1994 Sunstone Symposium in Salt Lake City.

edge the throne. Another will compare the Church to a family, to ration-alize disowning ram-bunctious children. Yet others liberally apply social theories or methods of organizational behavior to suggest a response to the crisis. All of these models assume the primacy of social structures in their understandings of the Church. Or, in the words of Avery Dulles, in his classic text *Models of the Church*, all sides share “the view that defines the Church primarily in terms of its visible structures, especially the rights and powers of its officers.”² This is, I think, one of the ironies of the debate. One group may want to change these structures in some respects, and the other preserve them in every respect, but both not only assume but privilege the identification of the Church with its structures.

By now, you may be wondering if I am crazy. This institutional approach is so much the water in which we Latter-day Saints swim that you may feel I am asking your fish to fly when I ask you to consider that there are other ways of understanding “church.” I suppose I am. Or, at least, I would argue that the experience of church includes a beach upon which we are to walk, and that ultimately we are all meant to fly as well. I do not deny that the Church is an institution. I simply resist the notion that this is all it is, or even that it is primarily an institution. I resist it because it is not dispositive of, what are to me, the most important questions that use this word “church,” including the question “When does dissent become apostasy from the Church?” For me, an understanding of the Church that privileges its social and governmental structures obscures more than it reveals. I agree with Dulles when he concludes that “exaggerated institutionalism”

tend[s] to lower the Church to the same plane as other human communities . . . and to neglect the most important thing about the Church: the presence in it of the God who calls the members to himself, sustains them by his grace, and works through them. . . .³

I believe that in the recent debate, we have engaged in “exaggerated institutionalism” by “defin[ing] the Church primarily in terms of its visible structures, especially the rights and



**FIGHTING ABOUT WHAT I
LOVE CAN CHANGE WHAT I
LOVE IN WAYS I CANNOT
ANTICIPATE. IT TEACHES
ME THAT, WITH THE BEST OF
INTENTIONS AND BRIGHTEST
OF IDEAS, I CAN DESTROY
WHAT I SEEK TO DEFEND.**

powers of its officers.” This has, indeed, “tended to lower the Church to the same plane as other human communities,” not only threatening our faith, but limiting the range of answers available to us on these questions. It is at times like this that I find it helpful to turn to my rule book on digging. It tells me that rendering to the Corporation does not require me to forget that the Church is also a body of people who bear organic relation, not merely status relation, to one another; a flock led by a Shepherd, not merely governed by priests; a witness, a light to the world; a loaf of bread leavened by faith; a tool, an instrument by which we work out our salvation; a shelter that we are to build upon the Rock; and a path for our journey to the Tree of Life.

PROCESS-ORIENTED METAPHORS

*By choosing our model of Church
we condition our response to the
Church.*

IF this is a little too idealistic for you, at least consider that even societal models of church need not be character-

ized by power and rights, hierarchy and “low-archy.” For example, the LDS church can be likened to a restaurant. Only it is a restaurant where everyone has to eat what he or she cooks. In stronger wards, of course, each member cooks a part of the meal, which all can share. This is not necessary, however, only desirable, to sustain spiritual life. We are expected to have the skill and stamina to dine alone sometimes. Alternatively, the Church can be compared to a gymnasium. Viewed this way, it does not make any sense for me to complain about how hard it is, or that it makes me sweat, or that the weights are too heavy and that it’s boring and, well, you know the rest: no pain, no gain. These process-oriented metaphors are much more useful to me than structural metaphors in explaining my experience with the Church. They also condition my answers to questions of Church dissent and discipline. I feel a little ridiculous protesting about the food when I’m the cook and the Lord’s pantry is full.

This is not to say that there are no problems with my understanding of the Church. Again, quoting Dulles: “Each paradigm [of Church] brings with it its own favorite set of images,

its own rhetoric, its own values, certitudes, commitments, and priorities. It even brings with it a particular set of preferred problems.⁴ Obviously, my social paradigms of the restaurant and the gym value personal needs, and express a commitment to growth. They place a priority on individual responsibility and effort. Thus, on the positive side, they distract me from the institutional struggles for power. They focus me on an activity other than being controlled by or controlling of others. On the other hand, these metaphors bring with them a set of “preferred problems.” For example, they naively assume the efficacy of individual effort over the work of the collective body. Because what we are lifting—through the grace of God—is each other, and because we never exceed a starvation diet unless everyone cooks, I have to wrestle with problems of how I get fed and how I conduct myself in relationships that strengthen me. Thus, my point is not that one metaphor is right and another wrong. Rather, I ask you to consider, first, that we have choices in defining the Church and, second, that when we choose a definition of church, we also choose our “preferred problems” and our range of solutions. I ask you to consider that when we embrace one definition over another we say at least as much about ourselves as we do about the Church. Hence, my book includes this warning at the beginning of its definitional options: “Be careful. This is a Rorschach test.”

If my book is right, then what I hear us saying about ourselves in the present debate is that we—all of us, both sides in the debate—prefer wrestling with the problems of control. By privileging the institutional model of church that equates the Church with its governing structures, we express a preference for the problems of government, or of power and rights. Thus, it is no surprise that much of the fight we are witnessing today has to do with *uncovering sin*, *not* gratifying pride and resisting domination. You will, of course, recognize these as the scripturally defined problems that characterize Church government when it is not “handled *only* upon the principles of righteousness.” (D&C 121:36, emphasis added.) If we understand the Church primarily in terms of its governing structures, we give priority to the working out of these three problems. This is a pretty big job given what “we have learned by [our] sad experience,” namely, “that it is the nature and disposition of almost all [of us] . . . as soon as [we] get a little authority as [we] suppose . . . [to] immediately begin to exercise unrighteous dominion.” (v. 39.) Therefore, my book notes that, if I choose this definition or focus for my understanding of church, I will have little time left from “sin revealing,” “pride deflating,” and “dominion resisting” to do much else.

A more serious consequence of this focus is my little book’s warning printed in red, underlined, and in all caps: “This is a pit, the digging of which leaves you standing in the bottom.” In other words, when fighting about rights and powers, each side must deny its own sin or at least claim that the other’s is worse in light of its effect in the Church or out of the Church, respectively. Each will also take pride in exposing the other to justice. Finally, the whole point of the exercise is to force a change in the other. In short, there is not a safe side in this

fight. Or, as the Lord has said:

My disciples, in days of old, sought occasion against one another and forgave not one another in their hearts; and for this evil they were afflicted and sorely chastened. Wherefore, I say unto you, that ye ought to forgive one another. . . . (D&C 64:8–9.)

The Lord does not condition his warning. He does not say, “it’s okay if you’re right.” He just says, “it’s not okay.” Of course, he puts it a little more formally: “He that hath the spirit of contention is not of me.” (3 Ne. 11:29.) As a litigator—or one who manages contention the way a farmer manages a crop—I have had occasion to consider this indictment. It is tempting to rationalize it away. For example, how many times have we self-servingly presumed our adversaries to be moneychangers in the temple? This one story has covered a multitude of sins, I fear. Granting for the sake of argument that there are moneychangers out there in the temple somewhere, and that we may even find ourselves not enjoying their services, permit me to focus on the other dilemma: We are not Jesus. Returning to section 64 and its discussion of disciples who “sought occasion against one another,” we read:

I, the Lord, will forgive whom I will forgive, but of you it is required to forgive all. . . . And ye ought to say in your hearts—let God judge between me and thee, and reward thee according to thy deeds. (D&C 64:10, 11.)

Now, remember what I said in the beginning: I am not speaking to a group of bishops or to anybody other than to Saints who dig about their trees of faith. As a feisty root-digger myself with professional training in strife, I have had to wrestle with the Lord’s unequivocal rejection of strife. What I have concluded is that this, like so much of what the Lord says, is very practical advice.

THE FRUITS OF CONTENTION

By fighting each other, we change ourselves and the Church in ways that are not always intended.

CONTENTION is powerful medicine. It is so powerful, in fact, that one should probably be set apart with special powers in order to handle it for the community, and God help him if he mishandles it. But, as I said, that is not a “root digger’s” job. Our job is to remember that a shovel is not meant to be used as a weapon. Why not? Why is the Lord so adamant in his condemnation of contention and all its emotional offspring? My book of digging contains the following story in answer to this question.

In the second century, the devout and brilliant bishop of Lyons contended with his Gnostic brethren and sisters over the nature of matter. The Gnostics argued that, because matter was evil, Christ could not have assumed a physical body during his life. This doctrine threatened a most fundamental article of faith: the Incarnation, the reality of Christ’s physical suffering and physical death upon the cross. With the best of intentions to defend the doctrinal status quo, Bishop Irenaeus countered that by means of his resurrection Christ had re-

deemed all of the natural world, not just humankind, and, hence, matter is not evil. As proof of this, he pointed to the use of bread and wine, the material fruits of the earth, in the Church's commemoration of the Lord's redemptive action. How, he argued, could matter be evil if the Lord commanded us to remember him this way?⁵

This theologizing on the Christian sacrament presented such a powerful argument against such a powerful opponent that it was readily adopted throughout the Roman Church and produced, in large part, that most characteristic element of the Eucharist since the second century, namely, the dual offering of sacrifice in the Mass. Based upon Irenaeus's defense, the bringing of the bread and wine became understood as an offering. Whereas, earlier the presider had officiated at a table meal of the faithful, now the priest offered sacrifice to God on an altar in their behalf. What had been a plain table at the center of the church became an ornate stone altar at the front of it. As stated by one of Catholicism's leading historians:

in the Church's campaign against the *gnosis*, she was forced more and more to stress the outward, the material and the objective in Christian worship. No more do you hear that the Church's sacrifice is a spiritual sacrifice, but rather that it is a real sacrifice. And so, naturally, the table upon which the sacrifice is celebrated gains in importance. From a table of wood it becomes a table of stone. And the whole many-sided development of the altar sets in—a development which gradually reshaped the simple primitive altar of antiquity into the elaborate structure of a later age, surrounded it with railings or other enclosures, raised it upon steps and platforms. Over it baldachins [ornate fabrics] were to be placed and canopies were to be built, and behind it the rear screen that became the dossal [of ornamental hangings] and redoes [elaborate murals]. The glorious history of the Christian altar had begun.⁶

From Irenaeus's brilliant defense of orthodoxy, an entirely new theology evolved that radically changed the Christian Church. The impact of this on doctrine, spirituality, and worship



**THIS FIGHT DOES NOT HAVE
SO MUCH TO DO WITH WHAT
IS RIGHT AND WRONG AS
HOW ONE IS TO RESPOND
RIGHTLY TO WHAT IS WRONG,
BECAUSE THERE ARE GOING TO
BE WRONGS IN THE CHURCH.**

cannot be overestimated: the Christian meal became a Christian sacrifice.

This story instructs and humbles me. It teaches me that fighting about what I love can change what I love in ways I cannot anticipate. It teaches me that, with the best of intentions and brightest of ideas, I can destroy what I seek to defend. I don't know all the ins and outs of how this works. To me, it is one of the mysteries of devilishness. Most superficially, it seems to prove one of Screwtape's insights: Satan does not care what we do as long as we are not doing what the Lord would have us do. I believe, however, that there is a more subtle and radical way in which contention is the devil's method of obtaining our cooperation, though our ends may differ.

In order to fight, one must find common ground upon which to fight, even if it is only in a premise of what matters. Else how could you or why would you fight? Therefore, I think that, first, it is in the agreement about what matters and how to define it that much of the evil of contention is ac-

complished. We cannot, any more than the good bishop of Lyons, know or control all the ramifications of our arguments when they are brought into contest with those of another. Unlike the wrestling mat or the boxing ring, there are no theological circles or ropes, and the referee—if able to be present at all—has a very still, small voice. Moreover, the heat of battle causes us to internalize these propositions: we bring ourselves, not just our ideas, into the fray. We begin fighting for ourselves in the guise of fighting for our propositions. In sum, there is no embrace so intimate and so obsessively out of control as that of combat. And we all know that it is intimacy that changes us most profoundly.

There is another part to this slippery slope. Anyone who debates or advocates knows that propositions formed in opposition to each other are caricatures. They exaggerate and understate at will depending upon the result desired. In artificial environments, this game can be played ad infinitum. The Church and the gospel are not artificial environments, however. Neither do they pretend to be. Everything about this religious activity we call "church" attempts to impress upon us that it is real, even the most real of all we know, and that its re-

ality is completely incompatible with contention or its derivatives. "Wherefore, I say unto you, that ye ought to forgive one another; for he that forgiveth not his brother his trespasses standeth condemned before the Lord; for there remaineth in him the greater sin." (D&C 64:9.) Or, as Joseph Smith said to the Relief Society: "Sisters of the Society, shall there be strife among you? I will not have it—You must repent and get the love of God. . . ."⁷

Avoiding contention and getting the love of God is very difficult, however, if you understand the Church as primarily an institutional distribution of rights and powers. As a feminist, this is one of the concerns I have not only for my sisters but also for the Church in all its definitions. By fighting each other on certain issues, we change ourselves and the Church; but I am not sure it is always a progressive change. We—both the defenders of and the challengers to the status quo—may be turning a table into an altar with the best of intentions. We could be living in the beginning of the "glorious history" of Mormon priesthood. Who knows where it will end?

EXORCISING PERSONAL DEMONS IN PUBLIC

The fight does not have to do with right and wrong as much as how one is to respond rightly to what is wrong.

HERE is one last rule I feel I should share from my personal book of root-digging. It is a version of Pogo's famous dictum: "We have met the enemy, and he is us." Once, a long time ago, I had to report to one of the Brethren for a review of my status in the Church. He clearly wanted to excommunicate me, and he just as clearly felt he was not to do what he wanted. In the silence, I watched him arguing with himself and whatever power was attending him. Finally, he looked up at me standing in front of his desk, fixed a very unloving, even unsympathetic eye upon me and said, "All right . . ." to no one in particular, since I hadn't been saying anything. "All right," he said, "but if this ever happens again, you're out." Immediately, I heard a voice respond: "Promise?" He didn't react, and I realized it had come from deep in me and had not been vocalized. The feeling was unmistakable, however. "Promise?—is that all it takes?" I heard myself say, to myself, hopefully. I learned, then, for the first time, how badly I wanted someone to free me from having to decide whether to stay or to leave the Church. I learned I was not what I seemed even to myself and that I was blind to my own motivations. It took me another fifteen years to figure out what was really going on that day. It is a long story with many lessons about counter-dependence, compulsions to repeat, and projection. The short of it is that I learned that sometimes it is simply too frightening to fight the primary sources of pain in our lives, so we attack the secondary ones. This allows us not only to feel strong, but at the same time, absorbs the poisonous energy of the pain that breeds such destruction in our hearts. If our defenses are sophisticated enough, we do not ever have to admit "we've got the wrong guy."

I had landed in this Elder's office after a series of miscommunications and misunderstandings, in which I played no

small part. He did the right thing ultimately. I had not sinned. But the trauma of that encounter was more than compensated for in the valuable lesson I learned that day. I learned that one of life's biggest challenges is to not fight personal battles in the wrong (and very often public) forum. The complex series of events that resulted in my being subject to Church discipline had less to do with the Church than it did with me. In short, I had hoped to exorcise my personal demons by demonizing the Church and then exorcising it. The feminist truth that the personal is political is no less true when stated in reverse: The political is also personal. This phenomenon occurs on both sides of the battle line, and it makes the fighting fierce. The dirtiest fights I have known are those where people do not know this. I have been present at some pretty dirty Church fights in the last twenty years. I believe one of the reasons I have survived to tell you this tale is that I have tried very hard to know what ails me, to be honest about my personal demons, as opposed to their public, negligent accessories after the fact. This is not to say that the Church—the collective we, or those individuals among us who exercise broad authority—does not volunteer to be a lightening rod to storms of personal, psychological pain. It does, and sometimes it deserves what it gets, but it's a lose-lose interaction: new hurts are piled upon old ones, further obscuring cause and effect and delaying cure. So, one of the things I am asking you to consider today is that this fight we are in is, in certain respects at least, as procedural as it is ideological. It sometimes does not have so much to do with what is right and wrong as how one is to respond rightly to what is wrong, because there are going to be wrongs in the Church. "We" are going to commit wrongs whoever "we" are, and "they" are going to commit wrongs whoever "they" are. We are all in here together in this thing we call "church" and we bring our histories with us.

FOUR RULES FOR PROTECTION

What we must render to the corporation is charity.

NOW, I know that avoiding contention is difficult even if you don't have an exaggerated view of the Church as an institution, and even if you do not seek to exorcise personal demons in public places. Governing structures exist and there are people who exploit them for their own purposes, as mentioned, to cover sin, to gratify pride or vain ambition, and to exercise control. So the question becomes, if we are to turn the other cheek, what protects us from losing our heads, or at least our minds, in such an abusive atmosphere? Being a woman in this church has taught me some valuable lessons. Unfortunately, many of them have to do with this question. That doesn't mean I think men escape it. Though they are more likely to be perpetrators than victims, we know that the great majority of perpetrators have been victimized. What goes 'round seems to keep coming 'round in ever widening circles these days. The evil of unrighteous dominion is perpetrating many ills upon all of us. What are we to do if we are not to contend among ourselves about this evil?

My personal book of digging provides me with several rules

in this regard, some of which are evident from what I have already said. I believe I must not accept the premise, regardless of how attractive its accompanying conclusion is, that the Church is primarily a social institution defined by the rights and powers of its officers. Such social structures are but conveniences that serve greater purposes: they facilitate access to other-than-governmental powers. To be fixed on these forms is to overlook the substance of things hoped for. It is a subtle invitation to idolatry. I also believe I must remember, as if my spiritual life depends upon it, that contention perverts the best ideas and the purest intentions. With it, I risk making altars out of tables. With it, I dig a pit and must live at its bottom in the company of my enemies. If I would have any positive influence on or power over sin, I must do so:

by persuasion, by long-suffering, by gentleness and meekness, and by love unfeigned; By kindness and pure knowledge . . . [r]epeating betimes with sharpness, [and only then] when moved upon by the Holy Ghost; and [even] then showing forth afterwards an increase of love toward him whom [I have] reprov'd, lest he esteem [me] to be his enemy; [t]hat he may know that [my] faithfulness is stronger than the cords of death." (D&C 121:41–42.)

This is what my rule book tells me must be rendered to the Corporation. It is a hard lesson. I think: If I do this, my faithfulness had better be stronger than death, because how can I make myself so vulnerable without risking death, or at least one hell of a wounding? And I mean that literally. If we are not allowed to contend with our enemies but must love them, what is to prevent hell from overcoming us? If we are not allowed to pick up a sword, how are we to defend ourselves? Where is our shield and protection? I believe it lies in four principles. These principles are not original to me, but I am very grateful to have found them because in them I have found protection.

The first of these principles is the importance of keeping God's commandments with exactness and honor: not begrudgingly or haphazardly observing Church standards, but keeping both the letter and spirit of God's law with the highest sense of personal integrity, even out of love for the Lord. Second, I have also learned the importance of keeping my appetites and passions—yes, my intellectual ones, too—within the bounds that the Lord has set. To me this is an organic, not a juridical boundary. It is a human version of not trying to bloom in the winter or to hibernate through the summer. If I live within the bounds the Lord has set, the Lord can say of my enemies, "Their bounds are set, they cannot pass," and he can say to me, "Thy days are known, and thy years shall not be numbered less; therefore, fear not what man can do, for God shall be with you forever and ever." (D&C 122:9.) Third, I must ensure constant nourishment of my spiritual life as necessarily as I do my physical life. This includes being careful of what I eat—not only when I am cooking, but when I dine with the Saints. Some foods are empty calories, at best. What my spirit needs is "the true bread from heaven . . . [which] giveth life unto the world." (John 6:32, 33.) All that I learn must find its meaning

in him for, as he said, to know him is to have eternal life. (John 17:3.) Thus, it is fitting that the final, protective law is that I must humbly, as if always on bended knee, ever confess that Jesus is the Christ. Faith in Jesus Christ is, of course, the first principle of the gospel. We are also taught that it is a principle of power, even the power by which the worlds are and were created.⁸ It is the power "to break up mountains, to divide the seas, to dry up waters, to turn them out of their course; To put at defiance the armies of nations . . . to subdue principalities and powers . . ." (JST Gen. 14:30–31.) These four laws constitute a shield and a protection to us until we have finished our work upon the earth. The Lord spoke of these four laws—sacrifice, obedience, virtue, and consecration—when he said:

And again, verily I say unto you, that which is governed by law is also preserved by law and perfected and sanctified by the same. That which . . . abideth not by law, but seeketh to become a law unto itself . . . cannot be sanctified by law, neither by mercy. . . ." (D&C 88: 34–35.)

These laws place us in relationship to Jesus Christ, and it is this relationship that saves us, protects and preserves us.

So, if we would dig about our roots, this is the discipline I believe we must have: the intellectual discipline to examine our assumptions; the emotional discipline to admit the personal in the political; and the spiritual discipline not to contend with our enemies, but to worship our God in wisdom and truth. Most especially, however, if we chose to "reprove" with respect to matters of Church government—and I pity those whom God has called to that task, and fear for those who assume it on their own initiative—what we must render to the Corporation is charity.

Let thy bowels also be full of charity towards . . . the household of faith, and let virtue garnish thy thoughts unceasingly; then shall thy confidence wax strong in the presence of God; and the doctrine of the priesthood shall distill upon thy soul as the dew from heaven. The Holy Ghost shall be thy constant companion, and thy scepter an unchanging scepter of righteousness and truth; and thy dominion shall be an everlasting dominion, and without compulsory means it shall flow unto thee forever and ever." (D&C 121: 45–46, emphasis added.)

May this be the power that is over us and in us through time and throughout all eternity. ☩

NOTES

1. Alma, no doubt with prophetic wisdom, does not advocate "digging about," but only nourishing our trees of faith. (Alma 32:37–42.)
2. Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (New York: Doubleday, 1987), 34.
3. Dulles, *Models*, 17.
4. Dulles, *Models*, 31.
5. *Adversus haereses*, IV, 18, 3 as quoted in Josef A. Jungman, *The Early Liturgy* (Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1959), 116.
6. Jungman, *Liturgy*, 120.
7. Andrew F. Ehat and Lyndon W. Cook, *Words of Joseph Smith* (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, Inc., 1980), 124.
8. *Lectures on Faith*, N. B. Lundwall, comp. (Salt Lake City: n.d.), 8.