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“They’re Just Rehearsing”
Gospel Methodology and the Humanities

Rex P. Nielson

This article is adapted from a presentation given on November 6, 2023, as part of a lecture series titled “Inspiring Teaching: Gospel Methodology in the Classroom,” sponsored by Rick Gill, dean of undergraduate education at Brigham Young University.

As BYU approaches the fiftieth anniversary of President Spencer W. Kimball’s landmark speech “The Second Century of Brigham Young University,”¹ Church and university leaders continue to revisit this prophetic talk while reflecting upon the educational mission and potential of Brigham Young University. One notable phrase from President Kimball’s discourse that has gained currency at the university points to a potential difference between the educational efforts of BYU and the work of other universities: “Gospel methodology, concepts, and insights can help us to do what the world cannot do in its own frame of reference.”

The idea of a “gospel methodology” has a variety of implications for the pedagogical and scholarly work we are engaged in at BYU. For example, during the final years of his presidency, President Kevin J. Worthen repeatedly sought to interpret the phrase “gospel methodology,” including in his thought-provoking devotional given in 2021, “An

Obligation to the World,” which focused on how a “gospel methodology” can help us understand the principle of belonging in a university setting. Elsewhere, however, President Worthen admitted that he was not sure he fully understood “what President Kimball meant by the term ‘gospel methodology.’” BYU Administrative Vice President Keith Vorkink directly addressed the same topic in his 2022 University Conference address titled “The Gospel Methodology of Group Revelation,” outlining how a gospel methodology can lead to greater unity and inspired insights as we seek revelation in the process of addressing the challenges our administrative organizations face. Other reflections on this topic have come from the workshops prepared for the “Inspiring Teaching Series: Gospel Methodology in the Classroom” sponsored by Rick Gill, dean of undergraduate education at BYU. To date, this series has included presentations by Kim Clark, Richard Swan, Michael Johnson, Seth Bybee, Richard Osguthorpe, and Amy Jensen. While openly focused on President Kimball’s inspired invitation to adopt “gospel methodology, concepts, and insights,” the organizers of these workshops have also acknowledged that “this series won’t be the final word on ways to meet [President Kimball’s] charge but will provide individual case studies that generate new ideas and inspiration for instructors.” In fact, the diversity of these presentations has repeatedly pointed to the multiplicity of contexts and ways in which a gospel methodology “can help us do what the world cannot do in its own frame of reference.”

These reflections have inspired my own thinking about how a gospel methodology might inform my research and teaching in the field of the humanities. Over the course of my educational and professional

3. Kevin J Worthen, “This Is a Student” (University Conference address, Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah, August 22, 2022), https://speeches.byu.edu/talks/kevin-j-worthen/this-is-a-student/.
life, I have found countless examples of the ways my scholarly activities have given me insight into doctrines of the restored gospel and my relationship with my Heavenly Father and my Savior Jesus Christ. But in this essay, I would like to consider the inverse of that relationship—that is, the way in which “gospel methodology, concepts, and insights” have impacted my teaching and research. In other words, I am not concerned here with the gospel insights I’ve found in literary and cultural studies—and there are many—but instead with how a gospel methodology might inform my research and teaching practices.

What follows is a meditation on how the methodologies of the gospel might augment and enhance the epistemologies associated with my own disciplinary training in the humanities. First, I will offer some thoughts about gospel ways of learning and knowing and teaching and becoming. I suspect that what I outline here will not be new to most readers, but perhaps it may inspire you to think of yourself and your own work of teaching and researching in new ways. In the second part, I will present a case study from the humanities in the form of a short story about a man on a stage who is struggling to read a script and act a role. I imagine this story may be new to most readers. My hope in presenting it here is that it will provide insights not only into how you approach your teaching, and possibly your research, but also into how you view your students, yourself, and your relationship with God and Jesus Christ.

Toward a Gospel Epistemology

What are the gospel ways of learning and knowing and teaching and becoming? I want to emphasize from the beginning that as I invoke the term gospel methodology, I am not thinking about the gospel-related content that may be present in my classroom or may be the object of my research. I certainly think there is a place for reflecting on the kinds of faith-promoting and gospel-centered content we might include in our classrooms or that might be present in our research. Instead, however, I’m asking a different question: Are there gospel methods—that is, gospel modes of inquiry—that might influence the way I and my students approach what it means to learn and know and teach and become?

As I’ve reflected on what we might call a gospel epistemology, my mind has turned repeatedly to a talk given by President Russell M. Nelson on how we understand our identity. The humanities—like other

disciplines on this campus—are deeply and fundamentally concerned with questions of identity: how identity is constructed, the practices and politics that condition and are conditioned by identity, how identities intersect and relate to one another. This is the essence of what we in the Church would simply call “charity.” Understanding who we are and how we relate to others may, in effect, underlie not only the humanities but all modes of human inquiry. In a worldwide devotional address delivered in May 2022, President Nelson taught the youth of the Church that there are three fundamental markers of identity that we should prioritize:

1. First and foremost, we are each a child of God.
2. We are each a child of the covenant.
3. We are each a disciple of Jesus Christ.

After discussing the importance of these forms of identity, he added, I plead with you to take charge of your testimony. Work for it. Own it. Care for it. Nurture it so that it will grow. Feed it truth. . . .

Engage in daily, earnest, humble prayer. Nourish yourself in the words of ancient and modern prophets. Ask the Lord to teach you how to hear Him better. Spend more time in the temple and in family history work. . . .

. . . We live in the dispensation when “nothing shall be withheld.” Thus, in time, the Lord will answer all our questions.

In the meantime, immerse yourself in the rich reservoir of revelation we have at our fingertips. I promise that doing so will strengthen your testimony, even if some of your questions are not yet answered. Your sincere questions, asked in faith, will always lead to greater faith and more knowledge.8

There is much to unpack here, but I would like to focus on a possible gospel mode of inquiry that President Nelson emphasizes in this passage. First, he suggests that the foremost principle of the good news of the gospel is the truth that we are children of a Heavenly Being, God our Father, and that as his children we can discover joy and have an enhanced relationship with God by entering into a covenant with him and becoming disciples of his Son, Jesus Christ. But how do we learn this truth? What does it mean to learn the truth of our divine identity? Apparently, this truth is not learned simply by hearing it—even if it is a prophet of God.

who is speaking. Notice that President Nelson states, “I plead with you to . . . work for it.” What is this work? And well might we ask, What is this method? In answer, he offers both practical steps and some intellectual—and we might even call them philosophical—principles. The practical steps include daily practices of “earnest, humble prayer,” nourishing ourselves in the words of ancient and modern prophets, participating in the sacred rituals of the temple, and engaging in service, which will teach us to love God and our fellow brothers and sisters. The philosophical principles on which these practices are premised are found in cultivating (1) openness to what God might reveal to us, (2) sincerity in our desire to learn truth, and (3) a disposition of faith in relation to what we do not yet know or truths we might not yet understand.

If I can belabor this point for a moment, there is an interesting synthesis that emerges in President Nelson’s talk between practice and disposition and their relationship to truth.

![Diagram: Truth, Practice, Disposition]

The truth of the gospel is that we are children of God and that our eternal relationship with God can only be fully realized as we make covenants with him and keep covenants through discipleship. The gospel mode of inquiry that will help us to learn and know and teach this truth involves both practice (for example, prayer, scripture study, temple worship) and developing mental constructs or habits of mind that include an openness to what God might reveal, sincerity in our questioning, and a disposition of faith in relation to what we do not yet know or truths we might not yet understand.

My students never cease to impress me with their creativity, their goodness, their sincerity, and their aspirations. I also mourn with them over their very real struggles, their anxieties, and their crises of faith that are related to both their practices and their beliefs. They (like their instructors) are all at different phases of the process of learning the truth that we are children of God, children of the covenant, and disciples of Christ. And as primary as this truth may be, some of them (like their instructors) may struggle to embrace or understand this foundational truth because, to be brief, the world is complex, life is messy, they may not believe that they are loveable, their capacity for receiving divine love may be immature and underdeveloped, and they may not yet have learned how to hold multiple unreconciled truths in their hearts at once.
President Nelson’s gospel methodology thus teaches us how to seek truth and live in relation to truth that we do not yet fully know or understand. If we believe, as Elder D. Todd Christofferson taught in a 2018 address to Church Educational System religious educators, “that indeed all truth may be circumscribed into one great whole,” the implication is that all truth is not yet circumscribed. Consider, for example, the tensions between religious and scientific truths that defined the medieval world, the early modern period, and the Age of Enlightenment. These periods were defined in part by conflicts between science and faith that seemed irreconcilable at the time. Some of these tensions have been resolved, or at least we have developed ways of reconciling them here at BYU, but there may remain truths in tension that we have yet to navigate. At times, it may seem that God’s pure love for us stands in opposition to his divine gift of free will and agency. I have had students ask me, How can God love us if we are cast into bodies that are imperfect? How can God love us when there exist the atrocities of war? We have ways of talking about this in the Church, but for many in academia and in society writ large, these positions remain irreconcilable.

In a notable sermon from the Book of Mormon, the prophet Mormon taught, “Wherefore, I beseech of you, brethren, that ye should search diligently in the light of Christ that ye may know good from evil; and if ye will lay hold upon every good thing, and condemn it not, ye certainly will be a child of Christ” (Moro. 7:19). Here Mormon provides a method for becoming a child of Christ that consists of searching diligently to learn good from evil and laying hold upon every good thing. But laying hold upon every good thing can also lead us to a feeling that we are being pulled in different directions by things that are good and true but are not yet reconciled with our current understanding of the gospel. So how do we do it? Mormon poses this same question: “How is it possible that ye can lay hold upon every good thing?” (Moro. 7:20). He answers, “And now I come to that faith, of which I said I would speak” (Moro. 7:21). Note the demonstrative pronoun here. He does not say, “And now I come to faith, of which I said I would speak.” Instead, he says, “And now I come to that faith” (my emphasis), meaning a specific kind of faith that will allow us to navigate tensions and seemingly irreconcilable positions.

Put another way, gospel methodology implies living at times in a kind of suspension, exhibiting what we might call a form of faithful patience, or what Alma calls a state of “looking forward with the eyes of faith” to a future moment of revelation and reconciliation. Note how President Nelson describes this faithful mindset in his 2022 devotional: “We live in the dispensation when ‘nothing shall be withheld.’ Thus, in time, the Lord will answer all our questions. In the meantime, immerse yourself in the rich reservoir of revelation we have at our fingertips. I promise that doing so will strengthen your testimony, even if some of your questions are not yet answered. Your sincere questions, asked in faith, will always lead to greater faith and more knowledge.”

There is a futurity implicit in this gospel disposition as we embrace the promise of an as-yet-unrealized wholeness, the promise of fusion, of integration, of synthesis of truth that is circumscribed into one great whole. Our faith is thus premised on a concept of belief and spiritual feeling that logic at times fails to explain, reconcile, and circumscribe. There is a tension at work here, and living with and in this tension is what we in the humanities sometimes call developing a tolerance for ambiguity, a tolerance for contradiction. It may be what causes us anxiety. It may be what sometimes makes it difficult for our students to embrace the truth of who they are and what their divine potential might be. The poet John Keats calls this a negative capability or a “state of being in uncertainty.” The poet Robert Frost calls it a “momentary stay against confusion.”

But if I can perhaps reframe it in more positive terms, we might also say that we are being asked to live in a state of openness toward new knowledge, an openness toward expanding horizons, toward what we often call continuing revelation. For what is revelation if not an invitation to rethink what we might call “orthodox,” a call from God to expand our

imagination, to reframe our understanding of the world and our place in it and our relationship with him?  

So back to the question: What are the gospel ways of learning and knowing and teaching and becoming? I have so far tried to suggest that learning the truth of who we are as children of God, children of the covenant, and disciples of Christ requires learning to process ambiguity and uncertainty, to live in a state of suspended disbelief. Paul refers to it as looking through a glass darkly or as not knowing even as we seek to know (see 1 Cor. 13:12). Faith within this gospel methodology means not just a practice but developing habits of mind and a kind of affect, a mood, even a disposition of faith that allows us to live and even thrive in ambiguity.

How do we do this? Among the many methods given by prophets, let us return to President Nelson’s counsel: daily practices of earnest, humble prayer; nourishing ourselves in the words of ancient and modern prophets; participating in the rituals of the temple; and engaging in service. Of these various practices, I will focus the remainder of my thoughts here on how the relationship between reading scripture and developing a disposition of faith can lead us to the truth of who we are as children of God.

“Read the scriptures.” It is a Sunday School answer so common we may sometimes fail to appreciate what both terms mean—that is, what scripture is and what it means to read scripture. I am interested in considering here how the practice of reading scripture might reinforce faith in Jesus Christ. How might the experience of reading scripture help us to navigate ambiguities and uncertainties and learn truth, even if that truth still has rough edges and unseen limits? Do we read scripture differently than we read other texts? And if so, what is the gospel method of reading, and how might this gospel method of reading provide us with a sense and a form of meaning about our identity as children of God? In the case study that follows, I will focus primarily on the sense and form of meaning that comes from the scriptures. My intent is to illustrate a possible gospel method of learning the truth of who we are as children of God, what our purposes are on this earth, and what it means to be a

13. I also readily admit that revelation may also call us to a kind of renewed orthodox practice. The point I am trying to make is that if we are truly committed to living in a state of openness toward God, then we must be prepared for the many and varied ways he might call us to live.
disciple of Christ. Accordingly, this gospel methodology involves a practice of engaging the word of God, of reading scripture while developing, as President Nelson suggested, (1) an openness to what God might reveal to us, (2) sincerity in our desire to learn truth, and (3) a disposition of faith in relation to what we do not yet know or truths we might not yet understand.

The Living Word

The case study that follows comes in the form of a short story titled “They’re Just Rehearsing,” which was published in the year 2000. The author, Bernardo Carvalho (b. 1960), is one of Brazil’s most celebrated contemporary novelists, and he has received both national and international acclaim for his creative work. Born in Rio de Janeiro and based in São Paulo, Carvalho trained as a journalist and worked for many years as a correspondent for the *Folha de São Paulo*, one of Brazil’s most respected and widely read newspapers. Given this trajectory, it is unsurprising that Carvalho’s creative writing mixes fact and fiction, intentionally drawing upon while simultaneously obscuring historical facts and current events. Carvalho’s fiction constantly challenges readers to question narrative authority even as it foregrounds the urgent and indispensable role fiction plays in making sense of human experience.14

The story “They’re Just Rehearsing” takes place in São Paulo at the beginning of the twenty-first century. São Paulo is one of the largest cities in the world, what we sometimes call a megalopolis. Its size and scope are on a scale difficult to understand unless one has visited in person or visited a similar place like Tokyo or Mexico City. With a metro population of over twenty-two million people, São Paulo is a teeming urban organism full of life and death and every form of human experience imaginable.

The story begins in a theater where the rehearsal of a play is underway. It is late in the afternoon. Everyone present is tired, perhaps a little irritable. From within the theater can be heard the exterior city sounds

of traffic and sirens. Inside the theater, up in the mezzanine, two lighting technicians hardly pay attention to the action on the stage as they tell each other jokes. Sitting out in the audience, the director of the play flirts with his assistant. And onstage, two actors step out to begin rehearsing a scene. The play is a fifteenth-century morality play. One of the actors embodies Death. The other actor is in the role of a humble peasant who has just lost his wife. In this scene, the peasant pleads with Death to bring his wife back to life.

However, rehearsal hardly progresses before the director interrupts. He is irritated that the actor playing the role of the peasant is not interpreting the scene properly. The director explains, “The humble peasant invokes Death with the only words he has left, as a last resort, that he wants Death to take pity on him and return his beloved wife, a victim of the atrocities of war.” And then the director “repeats, irritated, that the actor’s performance lacks vitality and desperation, and that it does not seem that the humble peasant is truly suffering or indignant at the injustice of the death of his wife in the flower of life.” Frustrated by the actors, the director instructs them to return to the wings of the stage and begin again.

Meanwhile, now offstage, the actor who plays the role of the peasant criticizes the director, “saying that it is impossible to show despair with a text like that, that it’s unrealistic, no one would talk to Death that way after losing his wife in such a violent matter.” The actor playing the peasant then further disparages the director for his lack of training, while looking at his watch and wondering when his wife will arrive to pick him up.

This opening confrontation initiates a cycle that repeats itself in the story. The lighting tech up in the mezzanine tries to finish telling his joke. Ambient city noises of traffic and sirens float in from outside the theater. The director flirts with his assistant. The actors begin the scene again. The director interrupts the action, insisting the interpretation is all wrong. The actor complains about the inverisimilitude and improbable nature of the text, saying that it is not authentic, that it does not correspond to real life, that it is not truthful. Meanwhile the narrator of the story justifies the interruption by flatly declaring, “They’re just rehearsing.”

And the cycle repeats: joke in the mezzanine, sirens outside, director flirting with assistant, peasant pleading with Death on stage, director interrupting, argument about interpreting the lines of the play.

In the midst of all this, the shadow of a person tentatively enters the back of the theater and slowly approaches the director. As the cycle of
scene, lines, and argument unfolds again, the shadow pauses with each interruption. Eventually, however, the shadow reaches the director, and there is a sudden and terrible moment of revelation. The story concludes with this paragraph:

The humble peasant wearing a watch and Death without a scythe or robe (they’re just rehearsing) enter the stage. The peasant turns to Death and recommences his litany with the same intonation and detachment that to him seem most appropriate. But this time, to his surprise, the director does not interrupt him, because his eyes are wide open and he is pale, while the man, previously just a shadow, whispers something in his ear. And as he sees the man whispering in the director’s ear, and the face of the director and his assistant, who for the first time do not interrupt him but continue to stare at him wide-eyed and aghast (the assistant with eyes full of tears before the peasant’s supplication of Death) while they listen to what the other tells them in their ears, leaning over the chair, even though the intonation on stage was the same and should therefore, logically, have been interrupted once more, the actor himself interrupts the action and finally understands, terrified and at the same time, the sinister coincidence of the scene and the moment, what that shadow has come to announce about the world outside, with horns, motors, and sirens; he understands why his wife has not appeared and finally what the humble peasant feels; he understands why the director has not interrupted him this time, because he is finally perfect in the skin of the peasant in his supplication before Death; he understands that for one instant he in fact has embodied the peasant, that involuntarily and unconsciously, by a trick of fate, he has become the peasant himself because of what that shadow has come to announce; he understands everything in a second, even without knowing the details of the accident that killed her crossing the street two blocks from the theater, before the wide-open eyes of the director and the assistant, beneath the unrestrained laughter of the lighting tech and the technician on the mezzanine, coming to the end of the joke. (my emphasis)

When I read this story with my students, a number of questions emerge. I typically use this story to introduce my students to concepts of metafiction and heterodiegetic narrative complexity. Our discussion focuses on the construction of space in the story, the theater as a real and metaphoric frame, the interplay between inside and outside, the transformation of the actor into a character, and the ironic meaning of the story’s title. But how might a gospel methodology also illuminate this story? In this case, a gospel methodology leads us to ask some additional questions of this text:
• Why does the author of the story repeat multiple times throughout the text the phrase “they’re just rehearsing”? What is the relationship between rehearsing and performing? Or between rehearsing and real life?

• What does it mean to read a medieval text today? How can we make ancient texts come alive in the present? In other words, how can a text from the distant past speak to us today? And what implications might the answers to these questions have for how we read and relate to scripture?

• Do we need life experience to help us understand text? Or do we need art to help us understand life? Does art imitate life, or does life imitate art? And if we think of scripture as a form of art, how might our answers to these questions change the way we understand and respond to scripture?

• How does reading shape us? How does it give us meaning? Does this story illustrate a gospel method of reading?

To begin answering these questions, let us focus on the turn or transformation that happens at the end of the story. Some critics might call it a twist. The narrator calls it a trick of fate. I like to think of it as a revelation.

Consider, for example, the narrator’s assertion that the actor is “finally perfect in the skin of the peasant” and that for an instant he “has embodied the peasant” and even that “he has become the peasant.” What forces made this transformation occur? If this text is a metafictional story about reading, we may well ask ourselves what role reading plays in our own transformations. Some might argue that it is only because the actor experiences the loss of his wife offstage—in real life, so to speak—that he is able to perfectly embody a character onstage who has lost his wife. This logic suggests that unless we have personally experienced the events, situations, and emotions presented in any given text, then we cannot fully understand that text. While I acknowledge that having firsthand knowledge or experience can certainly enhance and perhaps facilitate one’s understanding of and engagement with a text, I also think something entirely different is happening in this story. In other words, what happens if we explore the opposite conclusion—specifically, that it is the text, or the rehearsal of fiction, that prefigures, conditions, and enables meaning to be found in life?

I typically teach this story in an upper-division literary studies course in which 99 percent of my students have had the experience of serving as
missionaries. Given this unique demographic, when I present this story in class, I draw upon my students’ missionary experience and ask if they have ever felt that they have come to embody a scripture. I invite them to consider the NIV translation of Hebrews 4:12, which states that “the word of God is alive and active,” and I ask my students to reflect on a time when the word of God became “alive and active” for them. In response to this question, my students frequently share touching and emotional experiences in which a scripture has given meaning to their lives. I have also noticed that these students often describe experiences in which they first became familiar with a scripture (perhaps through a learning process of hearing, reading, or memorizing) and then later discovered that this scripture becomes “alive and active” due to the circumstances of their lives in a particular moment. In other words, this pattern suggests that familiarity with the text can precede a transformational moment in life.

I then invite my students to think about when they were missionaries and teaching others about Joseph Smith’s First Vision, and I ask them, “Why as missionaries, when we get to the account of the First Vision, do we change into the first person?” In other words, why don’t we typically tell the First Vision in the third person? We don’t say that Joseph saw a pillar of light, directly over his head, above the brightness of the sun, which descended gradually until it fell upon him. Instead, we say, “I saw a pillar of light exactly over my head, above the brightness of the sun, which descended gradually until it fell upon me.” We say, “I saw two Personages, whose brightness and glory defy all description, standing above me in the air.”

Why do we do this?

My suggestion to my students is that in this moment we become Joseph Smith to the people we are teaching. But there is something additionally transformative that can also happen in this moment—how many missionaries gain their testimony of Joseph Smith’s First Vision while recounting Joseph Smith’s First Vision? To put it another way, how many missionaries develop a testimony of Joseph Smith’s First Vision

15. The KJV translation of this scripture states that “the word of God is quick, and powerful” (Heb. 4:12).
while performing the role of Joseph Smith for those they are teaching? In my limited experience, I would submit that many if not most missionaries receive revelation about the truth of Joseph Smith’s testimony by recounting that testimony themselves, by rehearsing and then performing it. We might consider this phenomenon an example of President Packer’s well-known dictum that “a testimony is to be found in the bearing of it.”

To return to the case study at hand, “They’re Just Rehearsing” is a story in part about a script and the relationship of that script to events in the world outside the script. For me, the gospel methodology that illuminates this story lies in the way that scripture can give form to our experience, through which we can find meaning in our lives. The scripture is a form, and our engagement with it can in turn—or in revelation—give meaning to our lives.

Have you ever read a novel and discovered that the novel gave shape to something within you that you had not yet even articulated for yourself? Perhaps reading the novel called forth that something within you.

If I might indulge your patience as a reader, allow me to share a personal anecdote. Years ago, I felt inspired by the Spirit to try to memorize something long. At the time, I was studying the New Testament, and I decided to memorize a specific chapter from Paul’s letter to the Romans. I began reading this chapter every day as I worked to commit it to memory. There was one verse in particular that spoke to me, and I assumed that it was because of this verse that the Spirit had inspired me to memorize the whole chapter. Sometime later, however, an event happened in my life that was acutely distressing. As I faced this difficult situation, suddenly one of the other verses from the chapter in Romans that I had memorized burst into my mind. And in that moment, this verse of scripture became alive and active in my life. In an unexpected way, I found myself living out that scripture as it gave form and meaning to my life. In a flash of revelation, I learned a truth about myself and my place in the world. Now, if I had not been familiar with the scripture—that is, if I had not nourished myself with the words of the prophets—or to put it in even another way, if I had not learned this specific scriptural and literary form—would I have been able to grasp the spiritual truth of that experience? Perhaps. Revelation, after all, might be thought of as God’s way of giving us forms that the world does not yet know. But I can

17. Boyd K. Packer, “That All May Be Edified” (Salt Lake City: Bookcraft, 1982), 340, emphasis in original.
assure you that the form I had previously learned undoubtedly prepared me to learn a new truth.

So then is scripture art? In this way, I would suggest that it is. Is all art scripture? Of course not. But scripture, like the best kinds of art, has this function. It provides a form through which we can make sense of life. The story “They’re Just Rehearsing” demonstrates this principle in a powerful way, suggesting that art may most forcefully impact us by giving shape, form, and meaning to our lived experience. And scripture shares this potential as well.

To return to my earlier framing comments, if we adopt a gospel methodology of developing (1) openness to what God might reveal to us, (2) sincerity in our desire to learn truth, and (3) a disposition of faith in relation to what we do not yet know or truths that we might not yet understand, and if we engage with scripture and with art, stepping into an eternal role as we make the text come alive, we will more likely learn truth and make the revelatory and transformational jump from rehearsal to lived experience, from practice to becoming.
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