AN ESSAY ON TRUTH AND DISCIPLESHIP

# THE COVENANT TO SEE

*Shared Sight, Covenant Action, and the Cost of Believing What We Teach*

> *"There is no ordinance formally called the covenant to see."*

August 2026

## Introduction

There is no ordinance formally called the covenant to see. Yet much of covenant discipleship begins there. One cannot bear a burden one refuses to notice. One cannot mourn with a grief one has decided is exaggerated. One cannot comfort a person whose account must first be reduced to preserve the comfort of the room. One cannot stand as a witness of God while training oneself not to see what the name of God is being used to conceal.

The people at the waters of Mormon did not merely promise private belief. They entered a peoplehood organized around shared moral attention: bearing one another's burdens, mourning together, comforting the afflicted, and standing as witnesses of God at all times (Mosiah 18:8-10). Each verb presupposes sight. The covenant does not require omniscience, identical judgment, or permanent suspicion. It does require a willingness to notice, to listen, to test what another has seen, and to let truth become a claim upon conduct.

That is the invitation many serious disciples believed they accepted. They were taught that truth matters, that councils matter, that every soul matters, that priesthood is governed by persuasion and love rather than position, and that covenants create real obligations between people. They learned to see suffering as a summons, hypocrisy as spiritually consequential, and stewardship as something more than maintaining appearances. They believed that shared sight would be yoked to covenantal action grounded in love for God and neighbor.

Then some discovered another set of rules operating beneath the stated ones. Bear burdens, unless the burden implicates someone important. Mourn, but not so honestly that grief unsettles the institution. Speak in council, but do not disturb the presiding conclusion. Sustain leaders, meaning protect them from scrutiny. Preserve unity, meaning suppress disagreement. Forgive, meaning end accountability. Let it go, meaning carry alone what the body has declined to bear.

The resulting pain is not simply disappointment with imperfect people. It is the cost of having believed the original invitation deeply. The disciple did not become injured because he cared too little about covenants. He became vulnerable because he took them seriously. He entered expecting a body whose members would help one another see, and found that the safest way to remain welcome was sometimes not to see at all.

## The Covenant Begins with Attention

Covenantal action begins before speech. It begins in attention. The Good Samaritan first saw the wounded man. The priest and the Levite also saw him, but arranged their conduct so that sight made no

claim upon them. The difference was not access to information. It was what each man allowed the information to require (Luke 10:30-37).

This distinction is essential. Merely observing a fact is not yet covenantal sight. Covenant sight is perception joined to moral availability. It is the willingness to be interrupted by what is true. It does not promise that every impression is accurate or that every perceived wrong belongs to us to correct. It does promise that we will not settle the question of responsibility by refusing the question itself.

A common religious reflex asks, 'Why does the Lord allow this?' Sometimes that is an honest lament. But it can also become a pious way of placing all agency in heaven while exempting every agent on earth. A second question belongs beside it: 'If I have been permitted to see this, what responsibility, if any, now rests upon me?' The answer may be to listen more carefully, verify, speak, protect, correct, document, seek counsel, set a boundary, or simply refuse to join a false account. It may also be to wait. What fidelity cannot mean is assuming beforehand that nothing is required because action would be uncomfortable or because responsibility has not arrived in an official envelope.

A witness is not automatically a commission. Spiritual seriousness requires that sentence. People can misperceive, exaggerate, project, or mistake urgency for revelation. Stewardship matters. Process matters. Evidence matters. But the converse is equally important: a witness is not morally inert. To see is at least to become responsible for discerning what faithful response may require. 'It is not my place' can be humility. It can also be the sentence by which a whole body teaches every member to look away.

## One Body, Many Eyes

Paul's image of the Church as the body of Christ explains why shared sight is not optional decoration. The eye cannot say to the hand, 'I have no need of thee,' and the head cannot dismiss the feet (1 Corinthians 12:12-27). Difference in function is not a defect in the body. It is how the body becomes capable of perceiving and acting as a whole.

No leader, however experienced, occupies every place in the body. No council member sees from every angle. No office supplies every spiritual gift. A bishop may see stewardship broadly while a parent sees the effect on a child. A stake leader may see policy while a quiet member sees the recurring human cost. A person at the margin may notice what remains invisible from the center. These views are not automatically equal in accuracy, but none is dismissible merely because it arrives from a different location.

Shared sight therefore does not mean compulsory agreement. It means a covenantal willingness to receive and test another person's perception. It asks, 'What can you see from where you stand that I cannot see from where I stand?' It permits correction in both directions. The one who reports may need

refinement; the one who presides may need repentance. The purpose is not to make every voice sovereign. It is to keep any single location from pretending to be the whole body.

A healthy body can tolerate the report of pain. In fact, pain is one of the body's mercies. It directs attention toward injury before the injury becomes destruction. A body that treats every pain signal as disloyal may preserve calm for a season, but it does so by disabling its own capacity for protection. When the member who feels the wound is told that his feeling is the problem, the body has not achieved unity. It has anesthetized itself.

## When God Sees, God Weeps

Moses 7 presents a divine sequence that should govern every theology of sight. God looks upon the wickedness and suffering of His children, and He weeps. Enoch sees the heavens weep and initially cannot understand how the Holy One can sorrow. Then the Lord enlarges Enoch's vision. Enoch sees what God sees, understands more of what God understands, and begins to weep himself (Moses 7:2844).

The revelation does not deliver Enoch from pain by narrowing his sight. It deepens his pain by enlarging it. Divine vision is not sterile surveillance. God's sight is joined to love; therefore His knowledge includes grief. Enoch's growth into prophetic likeness does not make him less affected. It makes him capable of being affected by what affects God.

This is why there is often a direct relationship between seeing and felt pain. When love is absent, a person can observe injury without disturbance. When love is present, perception becomes costly. The cost is not proof that every conclusion is right, but neither is pain proof of spiritual disorder. Sometimes anguish is the normal consequence of perceiving a contradiction between what a covenant people profess and what their conduct permits.

The command to stop hurting can therefore become, in practice, a command to stop seeing. 'Let it go' may mean release vengeance, surrender fantasies of control, or trust judgment to God. In those senses it can be holy. But when the phrase is offered before truth has been received, it often means something else: detach your conscience from what you know so the rest of us can remain undisturbed. That is not the peace of Christ. It is relief purchased by the isolation of the person who still sees.

## Sight Is Not Morally Inert

Scripture repeatedly joins sight to obligation. Ezekiel's watchman is accountable not for controlling the response of the city, but for sounding a warning when he sees danger (Ezekiel 33:1-9). James teaches that knowing to do good and failing to do it is sin (James 4:17). The Savior's final judgment in Matthew 25 turns in part on whether people recognized Him in those who were hungry, estranged, exposed, sick,

or confined. The failure was not always active cruelty. Often it was life organized so that another's need produced no claim.

These passages do not authorize every observer to seize every office. They do destroy the fantasy that only formally assigned people possess moral responsibility. Jurisdiction determines what one may command. It does not determine what one may notice, mourn, truthfully report, or refuse to endorse. A member may lack authority to impose a remedy and still possess an obligation to bear honest witness.

Responsibility also increases with capacity. A person who merely overhears a fragment knows less than an eyewitness. An eyewitness carries more than a stranger. A council member carries more than an observer outside the room. A leader who receives repeated reports carries more than someone encountering the matter for the first time. Greater office does not reduce the burden to see; it intensifies the duty to receive, discern, and act within stewardship.

At times a disciple may feel drawn to attend, listen, or remain present and afterward conclude that little new was learned except confirmation. The experience may feel like one further witness. Such impressions should be tested with humility. Yet humility does not require pretending the witness did not occur. The proper question is neither 'How can I use this to vindicate myself?' nor 'How can I erase this so I can feel better?' It is 'What truthful, proportionate, loving responsibility follows from what I now know?'

## The Unwritten Covenant

Religious communities always possess an official theology and an operative theology. The official theology is preached in ordinances, scriptures, handbooks, and conference addresses. The operative theology is revealed by what happens when those teachings become inconvenient. A community may formally teach truth and functionally reward silence. It may praise councils and punish dissent. It may celebrate repentance while treating correction of a leader as disloyalty. It may testify that every soul is precious while asking one wounded soul to absorb whatever cost is necessary to preserve institutional ease.

This produces something like an unwritten covenant. Its terms are rarely announced because their power depends upon appearing natural. Belonging remains available if the member will not see too much, name too plainly, remember too accurately, or expect stated principles to govern actual decisions. The member may bear burdens, but not identify who placed them. He may mourn, but not ask the body to change. He may speak, provided his speech confirms what authority has already concluded.

The betrayal is particularly severe for the disciple whose conscience was formed by the Church itself. He was taught to seek truth, honor covenants, protect the vulnerable, speak honestly in councils, and take

priesthood claims seriously. Then the very capacities cultivated in him become unwelcome when they reveal disorder close to home. The institution helped form the conscience that now troubles it.

Such a disciple may feel that he joined one covenantal society and later discovered that the practical rules had changed without notice. What had been called faithfulness now appears excessive. What had been called discernment now appears negative. What had been called moral courage now appears contentious. He bears the consequence not of rejecting the invitation, but of believing it deep to his core.

## When Unity Becomes Managed Blindness

Unity is a scriptural good, but counterfeit unity is among the most effective protections available to error. True unity is unity with the Father and the Son, and therefore with truth, charity, repentance, and righteous action (John 17:20-23). It is not the mere absence of audible disagreement. Silence can indicate peace. It can also indicate fear, exhaustion, learned futility, or the success of informal punishment.

Managed blindness occurs when the community protects a preferred account by controlling what may be noticed. The facts need not be denied explicitly. It is enough to change the moral subject. A report about leadership conduct becomes a lesson about sustaining. A question about recurring harm becomes concern about the questioner's tone. A request for accountability becomes counsel to forgive. A description of cultural disorder becomes a warning against criticizing the Church.

Each substitution contains a principle worth honoring. Leaders should be sustained. Tone matters. Forgiveness is commanded. Contempt corrodes the soul. But a true principle can still be used to evade the truth it should illuminate. Sustaining is not pretending. Charity is not credulity. Forgiveness is not the abolition of consequence. Unity is not unanimity purchased by making honest perception socially dangerous.

The Book of Mormon warns against being pacified by the assurance that 'all is well' (2 Nephi 28:21, 24-25). The warning is not an invitation to chronic suspicion. It is a refusal to make calmness the measure of righteousness. A covenant people should be capable of hearing that something is not well without treating the speaker as the principal threat to Zion.

## Councils and the Discipline of Shared Sight

The Church's own doctrine of councils assumes that no presiding officer sees enough alone. The General Handbook teaches that council members should speak and listen, that different backgrounds and viewpoints enrich deliberation, that leaders should encourage open and honest discussion, and that

unsettled feelings may justify more discussion before a decision. It also joins deliberation to assignments, action, and follow-up (General Handbook, 4.4.3-4.4.5).

Elder M. Russell Ballard likewise taught that effective councils require free and open expression, that participants should share concerns and solutions, and that members should advocate vigorously for what they believe is right while being led by love ('Strength in Counsel,' October 1993). Those principles do not describe a ceremonial exchange in which many people speak but only one perception is permitted to matter. They describe disciplined shared sight.

A council fails even when it follows an agenda if its members have learned which truths carry relational penalties. The leader may sincerely ask for input and still communicate, through defensiveness or selective follow-through, that certain observations are unwelcome. Soon members provide what the room can tolerate. The meeting retains the appearance of counsel while losing its revelatory purpose.

The presiding role is not made smaller by receiving correction. It is made more faithful. A leader retains responsibility to weigh evidence, discern revelation, and decide within stewardship. But the office makes listening more obligatory, not less. If the body exists partly so different members can supply different sight, then a leader who cannot be corrected is not protecting order. He is depriving his own stewardship of the very gifts the Lord placed around him.

## What the Pulpit Teaches About the Pulpit

Public religious speech deserves special care because the pulpit does more than transmit ideas. It teaches a community what kind of spirituality will be admired. A story may be factually true, warmly intended, and still form the hearer badly. The proper question is not only, 'Did this happen?' It is also, 'What does the telling train us to honor?'

Consider a generalized example. A speaker recounts a moment of financial scarcity, describes a large private gift to a stranger, and then relates a substantial financial blessing that followed. The intended lesson may be generosity, trust, or providence. Yet the details may direct attention toward the magnitude of the giver's sacrifice and the size of the subsequent reward. Charity can begin to sound like an exchange, and private alms like evidence offered on behalf of the giver's righteousness.

Matthew 6:1-4 should be allowed to interrupt that form of telling. The Savior warns against giving alms before others in order to be seen and commends secrecy even from one's own self-congratulation. Matthew 5:16 also tells disciples to let their light shine. The two teachings are not contradictory. In one, visible goodness directs glory to the Father. In the other, religious performance directs attention to the performer. The decisive question is not simply whether an act becomes known, but whose goodness the story teaches the audience to behold.

No listener can finally judge the speaker's heart. A personal story may be offered with sincere gratitude, and grace can work through an imperfect account. But humility about motive does not require passivity about formation. A covenant community may test the message without condemning the messenger. It may ask whether the story's structure obscures Christ, romanticizes prosperity, or makes generosity appear spiritually authenticated by financial return.

What would make some good deeds better stories? Sometimes, in the moral economy of Matthew 6, it is precisely that nobody ever hears them. The kingdom contains acts whose hiddenness is part of their beauty. A healthy pulpit culture knows that not every impressive deed should become a credential, and a healthy leadership culture can gently correct even a sincere message when its implications are spiritually misleading.

## When Correction Almost Never Comes

The absence of correction is never neutral. What is repeatedly permitted becomes instruction. People learn not only from what leaders affirm, but from what leaders decline to address. A single careless message can be ordinary human weakness. A pattern of uncorrected messages becomes culture.

Doctrine and Covenants 121 rejects the idea that priesthood office makes influence self-validating. Authority may be exercised only through persuasion, long-suffering, gentleness, meekness, love unfeigned, kindness, and pure knowledge. The same revelation permits timely reproof when moved upon by the Holy Ghost and requires an increase of love afterward (Doctrine and Covenants 121:3446). Correction and love are not enemies in that pattern. Loving correction is one of the means by which unrighteous dominion is prevented.

Paul's confrontation with Peter at Antioch likewise demonstrates that visible office and genuine apostleship do not eliminate the need for correction (Galatians 2:11-14). The episode is not a license for contempt, public spectacle, or disregard of stewardship. It is evidence that truth-telling is not structurally incompatible with Church order. No calling places a disciple outside repentance. No sustaining vote promises immunity from being told that conduct has contradicted the gospel being preached.

When correction is rare, defenders often elevate the hypothetical danger of 'overcorrection.' That danger is real; zeal can become self-righteousness, and accusation can outrun evidence. But a system in which meaningful correction almost never occurs cannot honestly treat excessive correction as the coequal present threat. When zero has become normal, one feels extreme. When silence is the baseline, a measured question appears disruptive simply because it is not silence.

Others may then over-index precisely because ordinary channels have under-functioned. Pressure accumulates where release is repeatedly blocked. This does not make every reaction wise. It does make

the reaction intelligible, and it places responsibility upon those who controlled the channels long before the eventual protest became difficult to hear.

## The Command to Let It Go

'Let it go,' 'move on,' and 'get over it' are often offered as counsel toward freedom. Sometimes freedom truly requires relinquishing the demand to control another person's repentance. The injured must not make his own life permanently contingent upon an offender's awakening. He may need to release vengeance, surrender imagined trials, and refuse to let another's failure consume every good thing that remains.

But those phrases can also privatize a communal failure. The body declines to see, declines to act, and then instructs the member who still feels the wound to solve the resulting pain privately. What began as a shared covenantal obligation is converted into an individual emotional-management problem. The institution preserves peace; the witness carries both the original sight and the shame of not recovering quickly enough from being left alone with it.

Moving on is not the same as moving past untruth. Letting go of control is not letting go of moral clarity. Forgiving a person is not declaring his conduct harmless. Refusing obsession is not agreeing to collective amnesia. The soul can release hatred while retaining an accurate memory. It can stop demanding an outcome while continuing to bear witness. It can desire peace without purchasing it through a lie.

Counsel becomes cruel when it makes the wounded responsible for eliminating every consequence of a wrong that others remain unwilling to name. It asks him to absorb not only what happened, but the cost of everyone else's comfort afterward. That is not healing. It is the redistribution of institutional burden onto the person least able to carry more.

## The Arena

For a person whose sight has repeatedly been resisted, church participation can begin to feel like entering an arena. Each return exposes the same impossible alternatives. If he sees and speaks, he risks rejection. If he sees and remains silent, he experiences self-betrayal. If he withdraws, he loses worship, community, service, history, and sometimes the confidence of people he loves. If he teaches himself not to see, he may preserve external belonging only by violating the conscience through which he once believed God addressed him.

Repeated entry into an unchanged arena makes injury reasonably foreseeable. That observation is not cynicism. It is ordinary moral causation. If the same conditions persist, the same vulnerable points remain exposed. Courage does not require pretending otherwise. Faith does not repeal pattern recognition.

The oft-repeated definition of insanity - doing the same thing while expecting a different result - is not a clinical definition, but it names a real dilemma. A disciple may keep returning because covenants, ordinances, family, hope, and love matter. Yet repeated return without changed conditions cannot be treated as costless evidence of devotion. It may become an offering the community consumes without ever asking what it owes the person who keeps making it.

The Church should not require a member to become less perceptive in order to feel safe among the Saints. Nor should the only available peace be geographic escape. Moving may sometimes be prudent. It may be wise for a family to seek a healthier congregation, and no one should shame that choice. But when relocation is the most credible pastoral recommendation, the recommendation itself bears witness: the local body has become unable or unwilling to make room for truthful belonging.

## When Distance Preserves Covenant

There is a difference between abandoning covenant and refusing indefinite exposure to preventable harm. The Savior sometimes withdrew from crowds, passed through hostile settings, or declined to entrust Himself to people whose hearts He knew (Luke 5:16; John 2:24-25). Withdrawal was not always fear. Sometimes it was stewardship over life, timing, and mission.

A boundary can therefore be an act of truth. A person may reduce participation, attend selectively, change the conditions under which conversations occur, decline callings that require self-erasure, seek worship elsewhere for a time, or leave a local setting entirely. None of these actions is automatically faithful, but neither is constant exposure automatically virtuous. The question is whether the boundary preserves the person's capacity to love God, love neighbor, keep conscience, and remain available to truth.

Distance should not be romanticized. It can involve loneliness, grief, family strain, lost service, and the painful feeling of exile from a spiritual home. Telling a wounded family simply to move may protect the existing culture by exporting the evidence of its failure. The person who leaves gains distance; the community gains the appearance that the problem has disappeared.

Yet staying at any cost can become another form of falsehood. A covenant does not require a person to present his nervous system continually to an arena that has announced no intention to change. Purposeful sacrifice is offered toward a holy end. Indefinite self-abandonment merely proves that the institution can continue without paying attention.

## The Responsibility of the One Who Sees

The failure of others does not make the witness infallible. Indeed, the more costly the sight, the more carefully it must be carried. A covenant witness owes truth not only courage, but discipline.

First, he must distinguish observation from inference. 'This was said' is different from 'this motive caused it.' 'This pattern has recurred' is different from 'everyone involved intends harm.' Facts should be made as specific as possible; conclusions should be held with a degree of confidence proportionate to the evidence.

Second, he must test his sight against scripture, the Spirit, wise counsel, and the possibility that he is partly wrong. Humility does not mean assuming the institution is right and the individual is wrong. It means permitting truth to correct every participant, including the one who first named the concern.

Third, he must act within stewardship while refusing the fiction that lack of command authority equals lack of moral agency. He may ask questions, report what he witnessed, seek an appropriate interview, use formal channels, protect a vulnerable person, decline participation, or preserve an accurate account. He should prefer the least coercive action capable of serving the truth, but he need not prefer an action so weak that it merely performs concern.

Fourth, he must guard against contempt. Repeated evasion makes contempt understandable, but contempt eventually deforms sight. It turns pattern recognition into total judgment and makes another person's repentance emotionally unwelcome because repentance would disturb the settled verdict. Charity does not require softening what is true. It requires desiring redemption even for those whose conduct must be opposed.

Finally, he must accept that faithfulness does not guarantee institutional response. The watchman's obligation was to warn, not to control the city. A witness can speak truthfully and still be dismissed. He can seek correction and receive none. At that point his responsibility may shift from persuasion to boundary, from repeated argument to an honest record, from seeking permission to preserving integrity. Failure to produce repentance in others is not proof that his witness was wasted.

## The Responsibility of the Covenant Body

The body has reciprocal duties. It must not make the witness carry all the epistemic burden while everyone else enjoys the privilege of doubt. A person who raises a serious concern owes evidence and humility. Those who receive it owe attention, inquiry, and an answer proportionate to the claim. 'We do not see it' is not a complete response when the very allegation is that the room has learned not to look.

The first responsibility is reception. Reception is more than allowing words to be spoken. It means restating the concern accurately enough that the speaker recognizes it, separating the claim from discomfort with the claimant, and resisting the impulse to substitute a safer moral subject.

The second responsibility is discernment. Leaders and councils should seek relevant witnesses, examine recurring patterns, distinguish rumor from substantiated report, and ask what conduct the gospel

actually requires. Discernment is not the spiritual name for defending the first institutional instinct. It is the willingness to let revelation overturn convenience.

The third responsibility is action. The Handbook's council pattern does not end with discussion; it includes assignment and accountability. A concern endlessly 'heard' but never investigated, corrected, or followed up has not been received in the covenantal sense. Listening without consequence can become a refined method of containment.

The fourth responsibility is repair. Where injury occurred, repair may include clear acknowledgment, apology without qualification, correction of teaching, protection from recurrence, and visible changes in practice. Confidentiality may limit what can be announced, but it cannot justify pretending nothing happened. Wise confidentiality protects souls. Institutional secrecy protects systems from the moral meaning of their own conduct.

Above all, the body must share the cost of sight. No member should be required to bear morally consequential knowledge alone merely because others do not want to look. To mourn with those who mourn means permitting another person's grief to alter the community's behavior, not merely offering sympathy while leaving every condition intact.

## Restoring the Original Terms

The needed reform is not a new covenant. It is a return to the one already taught. Bear burdens means the burden does not remain privatized. Mourn means another's pain is allowed to disturb us.

Comfort means more than urging emotional closure. Witness means tell the truth about God and tell the truth before God. Counsel means different members contribute real sight. Sustain means help leaders fulfill their divine obligations, including the obligation to repent. Unity means common submission to Christ, not common silence around avoidable harm.

In such a culture, a leader can say, 'I may not yet see what you see, but I will not decide that your sight is disloyal. Help me understand what you observed, what you inferred, what it has cost, and what faithful action you believe may be required.' A member can answer, 'I will speak specifically, accept correction where I am wrong, and refuse both exaggeration and concealment.' That exchange does not abolish authority. It makes authority accountable to the means the Lord prescribed.

A healthy covenant body also corrects ordinary moments before they harden into types. It does not need to humiliate a speaker or dramatize every mistake. Sometimes a private conversation, a clarifying lesson, or a better example is enough. But it refuses the superstition that silence is harmless. Gentle correction is one way a community teaches that no personality, title, or cherished story is more important than the formation of souls.

This kind of shared sight will not eliminate pain. Moses 7 suggests the opposite: greater holiness may enlarge the capacity to grieve. But shared sight changes the distribution of pain. The person who first sees no longer stands alone. The body helps examine the truth, accepts its portion of responsibility, and converts grief into protection, repentance, and repair.

That is the difference between an arena and a covenant community. An arena makes sight dangerous and suffering solitary. A covenant community makes sight shareable and suffering actionable. It does not promise that every observer is right. It promises that no honest report will be treated as a defect merely because receiving it would require change.

## Conclusion

There is a cost to seeing. Love makes that cost greater, not smaller. The more deeply a person believes that the Church should embody the covenants it teaches, the more painful contradiction becomes. He may be told that peace lies in letting go, moving on, getting over it, or leaving. Sometimes distance will indeed be necessary. But the deepest injury remains: he sought shared sight yoked to covenantal action and discovered that belonging was safest when sight was surrendered.

He should not romanticize his pain or assume that every perception is revelation. He should test, refine, and act proportionately. But neither should he betray conscience simply because others have made non-seeing the price of peace. The question 'Why does the Lord allow this?' must be joined by the more dangerous question: 'Am I among those to whom He has shown it, and if so, what does love now require?'

Someone has an obligation. Usually more than one person does. The one who sees must carry the witness honestly. The one who hears must receive it seriously. The leader must discern and act. The body must share the burden. Where those obligations have rarely been met, the answer is not to shame the remaining witness for caring too much. It is to recover the covenantal practices that make truthful belonging possible.

The disciple who asks for shared sight is not asking the Church to become something alien. He is asking it to honor what brought him there in the first place. He is asking the Saints to see, to mourn, to counsel, to correct, to repair, and to act in love. He is asking for the original terms.