

SUBMISSION ITEMS

As of 4/30/17

Please keep your argument(s) brief and concise. If they are lengthy, they will be pared down - *significantly*. Please keep your remarks polite and respectful.

NOTE: Any additions for Governing/Guiding Principles will be handled separately by the subcommittee being organized to handle that document. You can still submit your ideas to the same email address. Also, any formatting submissions will be listed on a separate Formatting Submissions List, to be posted soon and voted on after July 4th.

ADDITIONS

- A.1 DS Blog: February 18, 2015 - *Babylon*: The God of Heaven tells me all the world should pray that Baghdad does not fall.

11 FOR: I guess my argument would be that when I read them, I felt an impact from the Spirit, and I have never forgotten these posts. Also the language: "The God of Heaven tells me..." seems to me clearly prophetic.

10 AGAINST:

- A.2 DS Blog: May 28, 2015 - *Lamentation for Baghdad*: Days of distress are upon Baghdad and the days of their troubles are begun. Distress shall overtake them, for those who come shall have no pity.

13 FOR: I guess my argument would be that when I read them, I felt an impact from the Spirit, and I have never forgotten these posts. Also the language: "The God of Heaven tells me..." seems to me clearly prophetic.

6 AGAINST:

- A.3 DS Blog: April 15, 2014 - *Abraham's Sons*

10 FOR: Denver prefaces the post by saying "Last night I was awakened by this" so it seems to have a place with his other publicly shared revelations. See the full text [here](#).

3 AGAINST:

- A.4 Add Joseph Smith's [Try the Spirits](#), an article written by Joseph Smith and published on 1 April 1842 in the Times and Seasons (See HC 4:571-581).

4 FOR: This is an editorial published by Joseph Smith himself, not taken from notes of a talk heard by others.

- a. This is one of the first things published by Joseph after becoming editor of the Times and Seasons on 15 March 1842 (see HC 4:551).
- b. He explains many things relating to the eternal nature of spirits.
- c. This would be an excellent replacement to the deletion of D&C 129

- d. I feel this was written under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost and is scripture.
- e. Although this is found in the TPJS, and I agree that "The instruction we have through the Book of Mormon is sufficient on its own to allow us to discern evil spirits", this article also puts forward a myriad of other important principles that would benefit us being in the scriptures.
- f. It emphasizes that we need to look at *ourselves* and the spirits that actuate each of us, which I think people are reluctant to do - and shows the dire consequences of being under the influence of an evil spirit when we think we are acting by the Spirit of God.

7 AGAINST

- A.5 Add the Song which was sung in tongues and translated, 27 February 1833, as recorded [here](#) in Revelation Book 2, with spelling and punctuation cleaned up.

5 FOR: Joseph personally edited this record of this song in Revelation Book 2, pointing to his acceptance of its veracity and correctness. If it was indeed correctly sung in tongues and then translated, this is a demonstration of God's declared gifts of the Spirit, pointing to His approval and providing of the event and content.
It is beautiful and moved my soul.

7 AGAINST: this could be added as a new hymn to the hymn project that is currently underway

- A.6 Add this Proverb written in Joseph Smith's journal (labeled and headered as "Proverb") to the *Proverbs of Joseph Smith*. Source [here](#).

As finest steel doth show a brighter polish
The more you rub the same;
E'en so, in love, rebuke will ne'er demolish
A wise man's goodly name.

7 FOR

1 AGAINST

- A.7 Add the following [letter](#) from President Hyrum Smith:

Nauvoo, March 15, 1844.

To the brethren of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latterday Saints, living on China Creek, in Hancock County, Greeting:—Whereas brother Richard Hewitt has called on me to-day, to know my views concerning some doctrines that are preached in your place, and states to me that some of your elders say, that a man having a certain priesthood, may have as many wives as he pleases, and that doctrine is taught here [at Nauvoo]: I say unto you that that man teaches false doctrine, for there is no such doctrine taught here; neither is there any such thing practised here. And any man that is found teaching privately or publicly any such doctrine, is culpable, and will stand a chance to be brought before the High Council, and lose his license and membership also: therefore he had better beware what he is about.

And again I say unto you, an elder has no business to undertake to preach mysteries in any part of the world, for God has commanded us all to preach nothing but the first principles unto the world. Neither has any elder any authority to preach any mysterious thing to any branch of the church unless he has a direct commandment from God to do so. Let the matter of the grand councils of heaven, and the making of gods, worlds, and devils entirely alone: for you are not called to teach any such doctrine—for neither you nor the people are capacitated to understand any such principles—less so to teach them. For when God commands men to teach such principles the saints will receive them. Therefore beware what you teach! for the mysteries of God are not given to all men; and unto those to whom they are given they are placed under restrictions to impart only such as God will command them; and the residue is to be kept in a faithful breast, otherwise he will be brought under condemnation. By this God will prove his faithful servants, who will be called and numbered with the chosen.

And as to the celestial glory, all will enter in and possess that kingdom that obey the gospel, and continue in faith in the Lord unto the end of his days. Now, therefore, I say unto you, you must cease preaching your miraculous things, and let the mysteries alone until by and bye. Preach faith in the Lord Jesus Christ; repentance and baptism for the remission of sins; the laying on of the hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost: teaching the necessity of strict obedience unto these principles; reasoning out of the scriptures; proving them unto the people. Cease your schisms and divisions, and your contentions. Humble yourselves as in dust and ashes, lest God should make you an ensample of his wrath unto the surrounding world. Amen.

In the bonds of the everlasting covenant,

I am

Your obedient servant,

HYRUM SMITH.

(Times and Seasons 5 [March 15, 1844]: 474)"

11 FOR

0 AGAINST

DELETIONS

D.1 RE Section 54 (LE 132)

10 DELETE: We do not have the original.

Section 54 may have truth in it but it is problematic that the text surrounding the truth is riddled with error due to Brigham Young's attempt to legitimize polygamy. Even with edits, it is virtually impossible to separate the truth from the error. The edited document claims that Isaac and Moses were polygamists and that Abraham's and Jacob's polygamous unions were commanded by God. None of those things are substantiated by the scriptures and they are, for the most part, contradicted by the scriptures. The edited document also claims that David and Solomon were justified in having many wives and concubines and that David was given them by the Lord except for Uriah's wife. Those claims directly conflict with Jacob's teachings in the Book of Mormon. Jacob tells us:

"The people of Nephi...began to grow hard in their hearts and indulge themselves somewhat in wicked practices, such as like unto David of old, desiring many wives and concubines, and also Solomon, his

son...David, and Solomon truly had many wives and concubines, which thing was abominable before me, saith the Lord." (Jacob 2)

It would be foolish to canonize a document with uncertain origins that directly contradicts the Book of Mormon and allows for the possibility of someone being justified in polygamy (and there is no polygamy "loophole" in Jacob - see <http://bookofmormonpolygamy.blogspot.com/>). Since the revelation in question conflicts with the earlier testimonies of the Book of Mormon and the Bible, it does not align with the new inclusion criteria for additions to the scriptures because it fails to establish the truth of earlier testimonies. Additionally, if it is true that "it is adultery in your heart to continue to entertain the possibility that you will one day have multiple wives," then we should not allow followers of Christ to entertain that possibility because of what is in their scriptures.

Finally, the document in question cannot be authenticated to have come from Joseph Smith. Including it would be a deviation from the regular protocol of the scripture committee that has been throwing out things that can't be determined to have come from Joseph Smith. Even if there are special reasons for including Section 54 in the scriptures, it would be special pleading if we ignore the ways the document is disqualified due to falling short of important inclusion criteria.

However, a new revelation on the subject could restore what the Lord gave to Joseph without the corrupting influence of Brigham Young.

17 KEEP: This is the only place that eternal marriage and exaltation are discussed. Given that the Lord has stated that eternal marriage is essential for exaltation, we should have at least something to offer insight. Also, what JS was doing regarding sealing kings and queens, priests and priestesses can only find a scriptural basis in 54/132. Either he was freelancing – and 54/132 is illegitimate, or what he was doing was valid and justifies portions of 54/132. We know from multiple sources that there was a revelation. What William Clayton wrote did not survive. Kingston was never a scribe and was a follower of Brigham Young and wrote the only extant copy, so his text is questionable, internally inconsistent and anti-Emma. It is, however, far more likely an altered version of the real revelation than a total fabrication, according to all known and prevalent practices among church leadership at that time. Denver has made a best effort to rectify that and provide text that reflects what was described as having been originally delivered.

D. 2 Do not include any version of guiding or governing scriptures in the scriptures.

DELETE: The scriptures are sufficient enough for people to govern themselves. The desire to "assist new converts to get the basics right" indicates a paternalistic stance and assumes that we are currently in a position of great knowledge that would enable us to actually assist them. I believe that assumes too much and is prideful.

KEEP

MODIFICATIONS

- M.1 I'd like to make a formal proposal for naming the volumes:
- The Old Covenants
 - The New Covenants
 - Teachings and Commandments

"Testament" occurs twelve times in the New Testament (Hebrews 9:15 , etc.) as the rendering of the Greek diatheke, which is twenty times rendered "covenant" in the Authorized Version, and always so in the Revised Version. The Vulgate translates incorrectly by testamentum, whence the names "Old" and "New Testament," by which we now designate the two sections into which the Bible is divided. (<http://www.biblestudytools.com/dictionary/testament/>)

Therefore,

Vol. 1 "The Old Covenants" is really an account of multiple covenants, from Adam down to Moses. There isn't just one covenant being discussed in the volume. So I think it ought to be plural.

Vol. 2 "The New Covenants" is likewise an account of two covenants: one in Jerusalem and one in the new world. So it likewise ought to be plural.

Vol. 3 "Teachings and Commandments" is really a compilation of exactly that. The term "doctrine" was a misapplication of the term, given Christ's limit on the word. Since anyone who declares more or less than Christ's doctrine as His runs a serious risk, we probably ought to consider dropping the misuse and clarifying that the volume is just commandments and teachings. It contains some history, some principles, and some wisdom literature also, but the general term "teachings" would be appropriate as a title to describe them all.

The renaming would also make us a very peculiar people...

11 FOR:

The only covenant referred to in the book by the Lord was in D&C Section 84 (now Section 27) where He called the Book of Mormon the "new covenant". The Lord never officially called it "Doctrine & Covenants". The Lord referred to the book that was to be printed (Section 1) as the "book of my commandments," but there is no revelation for changing "commandments" to "covenants". That was a change of men:

- "After a hymn was sung, President Cowdery arose and introduced the **"Book of doctrine and covenants of the church of the Latter Day Saints,"** in behalf of the committee: he was followed by President Rigdon, who explained the manner by which they intended to obtain the voice of the assembly for or against said book."
 - This is after the Lord's name has been removed from the Church and at a conference Joseph was not present for.
- RE 63 is a good example to look at, because it walks through one element of the covenant that the Lord is willing to make ends with His people, if they become His. I believe that the Book of Mormon lays out clearly the terms of that covenant and how it can be kept or broken. Most of the uses of the word covenant in the D&C refer to either "this covenant," which is the Book of Mormon, or "these covenants," as in the articles and covenants of the faith. In the latter case, I understand the word covenants to be more like rules (as in the case of restrictive covenants embedded in a neighborhood). One notable section is 54 (LE 132), but that is an oddball section in many ways. However, the D&C gives *commandments* in almost every single section. If you believe, as we have been persuaded to believe, that the title Doctrine and Covenants was not given by revelation (see 1835 General Assembly, where Joseph was not present), and you are simply looking at the material (with no history in the LDS church), with the additional understanding that the BofM is the new covenant, would you

choose to refer to those sections are covenants or commandments? This isn't baiting; I really would like to know.

7 AGAINST:

M.2 *Lectures on Faith* should be titled *Lectures on the Doctrine of Jesus Christ*

8 FOR: Options include: 1-No title. Not giving them a title is tantamount to guaranteeing that the lectures will continued to be called *Lectures on Faith* and a table of contents requires a name. Men need and will use a name in order to communicate. 2-call them *Lectures on Faith*. This continues the unfortunate title applied to them by the Brigham Young administration. The lectures are not lectures limited to the topic of faith as the name implies. The title *Lectures on Faith* obscures their breadth and depth. 3-Give them a new name that reflects their true purpose and content. I propose the lectures be referred to as the *Lectures on the Doctrine of Jesus Christ* for six reasons:

- a. First, the book in which these lectures were published was called *the Doctrine and Covenants*, the lectures were the **doctrine**.
- b. 2nd, The committee assigned to write the lectures were instructed "to arrange the items of **the doctrine of Jesus Christ**, for the government of the Church" (HC 2:165).
- c. 3rd, This same language, "**the doctrine of Jesus Christ**", was used August 17th, 1835 on the day all of the church quorums unanimously accepted the lectures as doctrine. (See second appendix restoration scriptures draft.)
- d. 4th, The first sentence of the first paragraph of the first lecture in the *Lectures on Faith* describes the Lectures as "a course of lectures designed to unfold to the understanding **the doctrine of Jesus Christ.**"
- e. 5th, the points of Christ's doctrine are taught in the lectures including faith, repentance (see for e.g. Lecture 2:24), baptism (see for e.g. Lecture 1:12, 1:32), the Holy Ghost (see for e.g. Lecture 2:24,), baptism by fire and of the Holy Ghost (see for e.g. Lecture 1:19), enduring (see for e.g. Lecture 6:2), coming unto Christ (see for e.g. Lecture 4:12), and seeing God in the flesh (see for e.g. Lecture 2:18)
- f. 6th, the proposed title emphasizes Christ who inspired the Lectures, is at the core of the lectures and is the object of our faith.

20 AGAINST:

- g. Each numbered numbered lecture is subtitled "of Faith."
- h. Christ explicitly warns against going beyond the "Doctrine of Faith." While these lectures treat the matter of faith, I worry about going beyond what He ordains, but the title is not the most important element for me.
- i. 3NE 11:32-40

M.3 that the *Lectures on Faith* be renamed the *Lectures on Theology*.

1 FOR: My main argument is that this is the title, Theology, given above the first page of the lectures. I believe this is what the early saints would have called them, but have no evidence. I think this title will provide easier communication with our LDS friends and family, as both my Deseret Book copies are subtitled, Theological Lectures.

20 AGAINST: This title is too broad. Theology is the study of God. The Lectures focus on the doctrine of Christ, as stated in the very first sentence.

M.4 Add to Section 170 to read as follows: As they organize their dispensation according to righteous principles and receive God's approval of the pattern, the dispensation is established and remains in effect until apostasy necessitates another restoration. *It is in the order of heavenly things that God should always send a new dispensation into the world when men have apostatized from the truth and lost the priesthood.* (addition from Joseph Smith, June 16, 1844, Sermon at the Grove)

5 FOR: This adds a little clarification to when and why God sends a new dispensation into the world; it is one of the most important points from one of Joseph's last discourses.

0 AGAINST: