

QUESTIONS & ANSWERS

As of 4/21/17

Q1: Why aren't you using the 1833 Book of Commandments (BoC) or 1835/1844 version of the D&C?

A: All the sections in the new D&C have been vetted by identifying the earliest extant transcript and removing any material that isn't available from that document. In other words, the 1835 D&C is not the base text, should not be considered as such, and any discovered alterations made to revelations in preparation for publishing the 1835 D&C have been removed. The base text for each revelation in this project is the earliest known version of the revelation as found through the Joseph Smith Papers project, generally handwritten pages by Joseph's scribes, predating the 1835 D&C and even the Book of Commandments whenever possible. We expect to make the Book of Commandments and even 1835 D&C available as online resources for research, but by collecting the earliest possible forms of every revelation through Joseph for the published version of the Restoration Edition, we are reaching back as close as possible to the original, unrevised content of the revelations given to Joseph and Hyrum. That is the best faithful effort we are capable of making at present, and so that is the approach we've used. Some have argued that because of the implied approval of the BoC by the Lord, the 1833 BoC should be the primary source of the text to be used in the Restoration Edition. And the particular point of support is the statement: *Behold this is mine authority, and the authority of my servants, and my preface unto the Book of my Commandments which I have given them to publish unto you, O inhabitants of the Earth... These commandments are of me...*

The exact language is "Book of my Commandments" which could be "book of my commandments" or could be "Book of my commandments" or "book of My commandments." The capitalization of writing in those days was nothing like the way it is done today, as evidenced throughout all their handwritten manuscripts. Therefore we need to allow for any combination of capitals.

The point suggests that there was a specific book that would later be compiled that was being approved by the Lord in this statement. There was no "book" extant on the day of the revelation of the "Preface". Nor was there a book with the title "Book of my Commandments" that existed thereafter, nor even as of today. There is a similarly titled book, close in wording, but the original revelation did not and could not have been referring to a proper noun. It was an adjective and general noun which was intended to describe what He (the Lord) commanded: a forthcoming book He described as something which was to contain "my [His] commandments". It is possible, however, that the Lord was approving His revelations, and expecting them to be compiled into a book that would contain them. In other words, the description is of a project He expected to be completed. It was an indication of the priority and importance He thought His revelations ought to hold for the saints. It was not a guarantee that the saints would actually give His revelations priority and importance and compile them in a pleasing way.

A logic chain from one group favoring the BoC, with our responses, looked like this:

1-The Lord told us that this generation would have His word through Joseph. (D&C 5:10)

2-Joseph told us that he would stake his eternal reward on his having faithfully delivered the Lord's word in the 1835 D&C. (Preface 1835 D&C) *Joseph did not personally work on anything in that volume other than: First, dictating the text of the original revelations (which a committee was allowed to prepare for publication), and second, the Lectures on Faith (which he spent months editing and preparing).*

The Preface includes: We do not present this little volume with any other expectation than that we are to be called to answer to every **principle** advanced, in that day when the secrets of all hearts will be revealed, and the reward of every man's labor will be given him. *Joseph's words point to his mindset - that what was written taught principles rather than listing rules. Principles enlighten, rules preoccupy. Is it possible for a person to see underlying meaning without attending to the specifics of the wording? We usually see what we're looking for. Perhaps Joseph was happy that what was presented taught correct principles, but later understood the errors in the presentation. And with no record of his disapproval, nor his approval, we are each left to figure it out for ourselves. We believe we are taking the safest course using the earliest texts.*

3-The sections in the BoC are pretty much the same as the equivalent sections in the 1835 D&C. *And both vary from the originally dictated revelations which may (or may not) be significant. IF significant, then we have a reclamation effort before us. If not, then either version or any other version may well be sufficient.*

4-This is evidence that Joseph's trust in W.W. Phelps editing of the BoC was well placed. *Not necessarily, and not given the downward trek taken from potential, to condemnation, to rejection. Given the run-up time required to compile and print a publication, that trust would be short-lived at best. Within 2 years a replacement was published. So the impetus for starting the 1835 D&C was found soon after the publication of the BoC. The question is, What prompted that? And WW Phelps wasn't the only one handling the BoC. So perhaps the problem didn't lie with Phelps.*

5-There is no evidence that Joseph ever condemned Phelps for the editing job Phelps did. *Nor approved. There is a lot we don't have, so we are left to interpret the results, which any of us can get wrong. There is, however, evidence that the course taken resulted in condemnation and then rejection. We cannot rule out, and can very well rule in, at least the possibility that "treating lightly" included how the revelations were handled.*

6-Joseph, being the great soul he was, would have taken seriously the Lord's directive to gather the relevant revelations and publish them in a book as section 1 instructs. *The BOC was his first opportunity to do so. Which he entrusted others to do, and which did not change the downward course the saints took. Being the great soul he was, he did what he could to attempt to reverse the course, including the Lectures on Faith. But, we know that the saints never took seriously the opportunity, and did "treat lightly" the things they received. The approval in D&C 1 was on the revelations themselves, not the presentation - the BoC. There was a year and a half there in which to possibly muck up or adulter the work.*

7-Joseph would have been extra conscientious in this task after his *faux pas* with the 116 page manuscript. *That would apply to his own behavior, not that of others. Once Revelation Book 1 left Kirtland, Joseph had no control over it.*

8-The compilation, editing, and publishing of the BOC and the 1835 D&C took place under Joseph's watch. He would have felt responsible for them. *However he felt, his control was quite*

limited. #7 points to the lack of control over the BoC, and Joseph's own words tell us that his attention was on the Lectures for the 1835 publication, not the sections. Based on results, those same men who handled the BoC mishandled the 1835 sections significantly. How would it be unfair to question their handling of the BoC?

9-Joseph never denigrated or otherwise called into question either of these books. *As far as we have record. We have Denver to thank for pointing out just how much mischief took place at the hands of Oliver and Sidney, for example, and we verified that when we compared the published sections to the handwritten records.*

Q2: Denver points out in the lectures that the original 1830 edition of the D&C has LOF in larger font size than the rest of the book. He emphasized that Joseph felt this was the doctrine of the D&C. So my suggestion is that we do the same with this new edition to respect how Joseph felt about it and how he wanted it emphasized.

A: That is already part of the formatting of the Lectures.

Q3: Was it discussed to include an appendix of all the stuff you are leaving out? If these are for study, it would be nice to have those things in a separate section (understandably not the copyrighted) so one can compare and contrast.

A: The announcement explained that things that are removed from the print version may be found in the Research Version that is partially completed.

Q4: Is the section for new revelation limited only to revelations given to Denver Snuffer, and if so, why?

A: Likely not. As new revelation arrives, it will be given due consideration, whether from Denver or another. And it will be made available for critique by the full Assembly.

Q5: Was consideration given to add Teaching of the Prophet Joseph Smith?

A: Chris addressed this in his Q&A. Most teachings (vs. revelations) are left to the publications where they are now found and will not be added.

Q6: On a personal note, when the originals go to print, I would like to see margins wide enough to allow writing extensive notes possible.

A: We made the margins as big as we could given Amazon's guidelines. We like 'em wide, too. The fancier version can have even wider margins.

Q7: The Title Page to the Book of Mormon states twice that the interpretation of the plates is a "gift of God" and that it was done by the "power of God". Do we fail to receive the gift of the Book of Mormon by using editions with alterations, deletions, and additions than what was first revealed by God as a gift to Joseph?

A: Denver addressed this at the end of his Q&A.

Q8: Why can't we have chapter and verse numbers like most scriptures?

A: We do, in the Research Version. The Print version doesn't have them so that the reader is exposed to greater context in their reading and research.

Q9: We are wary of anything that a committee has had a hand in especially relating to the scriptures because every committee that we are aware of that dealt with the scriptures led in some part or another to alterations, additions, deletions or screwing something up in some way no matter how good the people or how well intentioned.

A: Come up with and propose a better solution. The only other possible solutions are to rely on a single person, which leans towards the charge of having a strongman, or not doing anything with the scriptures and failing to keep His commandments, therefore failing to qualify as a covenant people. Keep in mind that the Lord directed this committee to accomplish this work.

Q10: Why were chapters changed by committee when Joseph Smith Jr did not make those changes in the IV?

A: Joseph never addressed formatting in any scriptures, including the Book of Mormon. That was handled by others. The two formatting issues he did address, chapter groupings in the Book of Mormon and font size in the Lectures on Faith, were honored by the committee. Since he didn't think formatting was an essential issue (his focus was the content, not the delivery) we did not feel compelled to be rigid about our observation of it either. We do not believe that the chapter breaks in the Bible were inspired, and therefore felt that an inspired re-chaptering was justified; however, we accept inspired suggestions on how to improve.

Q11: It seems like some new entries in these scriptures are quoting the Lord, but it's not clear if it's through Denver.

A: The material is directly from the Lord in response to inquiries by the committee. They are His words, though they were delivered to men in their weakness (RE Ether 4, LE 12:23-25; RE Mormon 4 lines 25-37; LE 18:14-22). The responsibility rests on the reader to go to the Lord and determine for themselves whether they are His words.

Q12: It seemed like it was announced that either Chris or Denver was going to explain what happens when revelation comes to someone besides Denver and how that would be managed, sustained, and eventually implemented into the scriptures.

A: There are a stringent set of questions in the SUBMISSIONS GUIDELINES to help the committee simply determine if the person submitting "new revelation" is reasonable and of a sound mind. If so, the material is put on this SUBMISSIONS LIST for consideration, approval or rejection by the assembly.

Q13: JST Matt 13 / KJV Matt 26 - There were two translations of this chapter, and they're not the same. Which translation should be privileged, and on what grounds?

A: Online, every version will be available. In the publication, the one with the greatest number of changes will be adopted, to provide the greatest amount of deference to Joseph's effort.

Q14: Since we cannot trace the provenance of D&C 132 to Joseph, and since D&C 43 restricts the elders of the Lord's church to accepting as revelation or commandment only that which is brought forward by him who holds the appointment from Joseph to receive revelations and commandments unto the elders of the Lord's church, D&C 132 ought to be omitted entirely, as

well as any of Denver Snuffer's material, unless Denver Snuffer has the appointment from Joseph or D&C 43 is no longer valid.

A: On the Section 43 revelation:

First, Joseph organized the people into a formal organizational hierarchy with offices, including "elders" holding church offices. There is no such priesthood as "elder" but there is a church office called "elder." It is like "Sunday School President" or "Relief Society President." The office of "elder" is a church position. We don't recognize that office, or any others, nor do we have a hierarchy. This is a movement among equals, with each person accountable before God.

Second, Joseph did not follow the limitation and accepted commandments that were given by others. The hierarchy allowed those who "presided" over others to issue commandments to those under their jurisdiction. He expected members of the organization in organized wards to submit to commands from Bishops. He expected members of the organization in organized stakes to submit to commands from the stake president. And in church disciplinary proceedings the high councils were able to command others in a variety of ways. It was organizational, and probably necessary for the organization to work. We have not been similarly organized.

Hopefully we learn from the past example. It is not just learning from the positive achievements of Joseph's time, but also learning from the failures. This revelation provided order and structure. That is a good thing. But if you take the control from a good man and give it to a bad one, you continue to have order and structure but it can easily become abused.

Third, by the time Joseph was in Liberty Jail he provided a revelation that rescinded the authority to issue commands, even for himself. When he recorded "no power or influence can or ought to be maintained by virtue of the priesthood" he did not exclude himself or his office from that new, higher and necessary mandate. This was a substantive change that would have improved everything, if the saints realized that it altered the trajectory of what was rolling out. They failed to recognize the change.

Fourth, Joseph lived to regret the result of the Section 43 approach when the saints in Nauvoo failed to abide the new direction given in Liberty Jail: As a result he later complained to the Relief Society in Nauvoo that others were "darkened in their minds" because they were "depending too much on the prophet" and neglecting the duties to obtain revelation for themselves. That result is inevitable if this route is adopted again.

Finally, although not publicly disclosed in a fulsome way, Denver has mentioned in passing on several occasions that he has met both Joseph and Hyrum. But this is not accompanied by any authority claims for a very good reason: Authority claims stifle thought, prayer, meditation and even agency. Therefore even if there is no authority lacking for what has now begun, it is unlikely there will ever be a public declaration that tempts everyone to repeat errors from the past.

Concerning the inclusion of D&C 132 (now 54), this is the only place in scripture 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. Inquiry to the Lord as to the truthfulness of the content in its currently revised version would be a good way to approach the matter. If He claims the content, then we should all agree to its value as scripture, regardless of how it came to publication.

Also, what Joseph was doing regarding sealing kings and queens, priests and priestesses, can only find a scriptural basis in 54/132. Without that scriptural material, Joseph's sealings of kings and queens and priests and priestesses has no scriptural basis, which creates problems. Or, we retain the only material we have on the matter which gives Joseph's works a scriptural basis.

We do know from multiple sources that there was a revelation. And we do have some few accounts of things that were and were not contained within that 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. This is according to all known and prevalent practices among church leadership at that time, and evidenced by the acceptance of Kingsbury's copy by later church membership as though it was the original revelation. At least some few individuals knew the content of both, but no one spoke up about Kingsbury's copy being entirely inconsistent with Joseph's original revelation which Kingsbury's purported to be.

Denver has made a best effort to rectify that and provide text that reflects what was described as having been originally delivered.

Q15: I've talked with many people, and they have a problem with "sustaining" the scriptures this fall. What, exactly, is meant by sustaining the scriptures (it seems to mean different things to different people)? If it is covenanting with God, why don't we raise our hands to "covenant to obey what is in these scriptures, according to our understanding of them"? Why can't it be worded that way? Or in a way similar?

A: Sustain is not an essential word and likely may not be used when the final scriptures are voted upon.

Q16: The Research Versions have errors, lack page numbers, etc.

A: They aren't finished yet. They are a work in progress, but we determined to provide something up front and then refine it rather than hold back until everything is perfect - that could be a very long time.

Q17: Given the nature of section 170 (RE) as it correlates to section 107 (LDS), it seems that either the organization relating to the presidency of the high priesthood (church president) along with bishops, elders, priests, deacons, and teachers either doesn't apply given the update in 170 or, it WILL apply at some point, and some will apply it as such? I noticed that the offices of 70, apostles, and such, have been removed. It begs the question about what was kept.

A: Concerning the organized church with its offices and so forth, and the record of Section 107, Joseph, as the head of his dispensation, was given license to structure his dispensation's organization as he saw fit, provided God approved what Joseph sought to do. Joseph was pulled very much into the New Testament church direction by Sidney Rigdon and others, and the Lord saw fit to allow that structure to be implemented through Joseph. So Joseph received revelations in regards to that pattern, as well as making adjustments and innovations as he saw

fit to the pattern, all with God's allowance and approval. The records we have of this work are largely found in the Doctrine and Covenants.

Scriptures are meant to be a record of God's dealings with man. But with the Old Testament, the Jews functioned for most of that record under the Mosaic Law, which law we are no longer required to live under. Yet we retain and study the Old Testament because that record of God's dealings with man is still of value to us today, even if *portions* of it aren't directly applicable to our functioning anymore.

The record of God's dealings with Joseph's people is of similar value to us, having a great many teachings, prophecies, and unfolding of histories which we can benefit from, including the record of how Joseph organized *his* dispensation with God's approval. But the organizational model Joseph implemented is no longer imposed upon us, like the law of Moses, as something new has begun. It will unfold in time, and we will see what it looks like as it unfolds, but the prophecy at the end of the new Section 170 drawn from the Book of Moses gives insight into what might be expected.

Speaking specifically to Section 107, that text underwent such extensive, uninspired revision in preparation for the 1835 publication, that it became polluted by man's hand. Only one portion of the text had a pre-publication manuscript which survived to the present, which has been preserved as Section 74 in the Restoration Edition. Nothing else pre-dating the 1835 publication has survived so far as we know. Efforts were made for weeks to try and salvage the remainder of the text, but in the end the Lord saw fit to approve moving in a different direction, and we were given what we now have in Section 170 as a replacement text more relevant for us.

The familiar text of Section 107 will still be preserved on scriptures.info for study and research, but its corruption was too great for inclusion in the published "scriptures".

Q18: I am questioning why it takes 12 women to revoke a man's authority when it only took 7 to grant it? It would seem that those original 7 or another 7 would be sufficient. Many fellowships don't have 12 women in them, yet one man among them can still be a crook.

A: In the wisdom of the Lord it is intended to be easier to bless than to damn. Therefore the revealed numbers reflect this wisdom. The numbers are likewise Divinely revealed: Seven being a symbol of completion. Twelve being the number of judgment. The final judgment will include the Twelve who were with Christ in Jerusalem judging the Twelve Tribes. Likewise all British and American juries require twelve jurors to convict--modeled after the Biblical precedent. In the wisdom of the Lord the revealed numbers conform to the patterns he has established elsewhere. In the event that women of a small fellowship require more numbers than they possess, they can call a conference to do so if the man in question is also present, as can also be done in the case of sustaining.

Q19: Upon reading Denver's paper entitled Scripture, Prophecy, and Covenants, I am with the feeling that we are forcing things in one area - that is the area where there are supposed to be other books revealed. Denver seems to be making the case that this fulfills that prophecy - with the additions made in this project. That feels like a stretch to me. Can what is included in the scripture project be considered "books"?

A: The Lord often has multiple meanings in mind when He speaks, which is why a prophet is justified in declaring a specific application of prophecy to his people, or those of his day. A Prophet's Prerogative was written in response to the same dilemma (with respect to LE Isaiah 29) that provoked an inquiry to the Lord to seek understanding on how the process works. The short of it is that the Lord thinks much differently than we do (RE Isaiah 20), has multiple meanings in mind at one time (something impossible for us), and therefore a prophecy may accurately apply to several situations. While it is true that "other books" can and probably will come from outside the Western Catholic & LDS tradition, it is possible that accepting these scriptures is necessary for us to receive the "greater" things spoken of by Mormon and Moroni. Finally, it is worth noting that Nephi's explanation of the "other books" suggests they come "from the Gentiles (RE 1 Ne 4)."

Q20: First, where is the revelation from God authorizing these scriptures? I can find one to the Church in the D&C but where is the one to your committee and Denver? Also, when did Denver's stories and proverbs become revelations from God? Joseph Smith was able to produce "Thus Saith the Lord" revelations, but for some reason revelations regarding these scriptures is absent. It was said by Denver while holding up the set of scriptures that the acceptance of this set of scriptures is the acceptance of a new covenant--Where is the revelation that we can all read from God that declares this?

A: The revelation from God came to each person who was led by the Spirit to begin the work. It was confirmed in revelations given throughout the process. It was by the spirit of revelation that the entire project was prosecuted to a completion and then presented. It was also in the words used to announce the project and the talks and papers written to explain and defend the project.

Stories, proverbs, dreams and accounts fill the scriptures from Adam to Joseph Smith. Most of Christ's teachings, Isaiah's teachings, Zenos' teachings and much of Joseph's teachings are stories or parables. If the standard you suggest requires something of Denver's to be rejected from the project, to be consistent do you likewise advocate removing all other similar accounts from the Bible, Book of Mormon, D&C and PofGP? If not, then is the standard you apply the defect rather than the content we have included?

Our approach is to use D&C 121 principles and attempt to persuade rather than compel through the use of a "thus sayeth the Lord" trump card. It is better to err on the side of agency and allow people the full range of freedom to choose. By polarizing the discussion and employing the tactic of "thus saith the Lord" Denver (and by extension, the committee) would abrogate the agency of some people who need to prayerfully study and choose themselves. He was the one who originally denounced the "strongman model" in Grand Junction, and has remained consistent in that approach ever since. He advocates gentleness, meekness, pure knowledge, love unfeigned and persuasion rather than the demand inherent in proclaiming God said it. But everything he has taught has its basis in revelation, as we who have worked closely with him in this project have come to understand.

Q21: Given that the Scriptures Committee has been responsible for adding to the scriptures, have they likewise answered the submission questions? If so, how have they responded?

A: As follows:

Mike Hamill

Have you gone to the Lord to verify that what you received is from Him? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is correct? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is intended for you/your family only or is for a wider audience? If it's for a wider audience, who is that audience? Yes. For those who are preparing for Zion and the Lord's return.

Have you asked the Lord if you should submit this to be added to the scriptures? Yes.

Why now? Why haven't you done anything with the message before this? I've been working to share this message, and specifically on this scripture project, for over two years. What was given to me in this project that was new, I began teaching as soon as it was given, while the project was already underway.

What is it about the scripture project that provokes you to speak up now? Divine direction.

What have you done before this to teach or preach the message? I've written and spoken to share the gospel, sacrificed as required, and sought to be obedient in what the Lord has asked of me in His work.

If it were not for the scripture project would you ever have publicized this? Yes.

What sacrifices have you made to preach the restoration to others? I have given up almost every last bit of my free time, outside interests, etc., for the sake of cleaning up the scriptures and preaching over the last two years. I have lost relationships, sacrificed time, money, energy, and personal interests, and been subject to false accusation, ridicule and revilings.

How long have you been preaching, sacrificing and teaching others the message of the restoration? At least since my rebaptism in autumn of 2014.

Denver Snuffer:

Have you gone to the Lord to verify that what you received is from Him? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is correct? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is intended for you/your family only or is for a wider audience? If it's for a wider audience, who is that audience? Yes. For those who are preparing for Zion and the Lord's return.

Have you asked the Lord if you should submit this to be added to the scriptures? Yes.

Why now? Why haven't you done anything with the message before this? I've been laboring for many years and now the project allows for something to be accomplished.

What is it about the scripture project that provokes you to speak up now? Divine direction.

What have you done before this to teach or preach the message? A great deal for a great many years at considerable personal sacrifice.

If it were not for the scripture project would you ever have publicized this? Yes.

What sacrifices have you made to preach the restoration to others? I've lost friends and alienated family members, spent tens of thousands of dollars to serve others and teach, and been excommunicated, reviled, mocked and threatened.

How long have you been preaching, sacrificing and teaching others the message of the restoration? Since publication of *The Second Comforter: Conversing With the Lord Through the Veil*.

Chris Hamill:

Have you gone to the Lord to verify that what you received is from Him? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is correct? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is intended for you/your family only or is for a wider audience? If it's for a wider audience, who is that audience? Yes. For those who are preparing for Zion and the Lord's return.

Have you asked the Lord if you should submit this to be added to the scriptures? Yes.

Why now? Why haven't you done anything with the message before this? I began years ago to push members to study, not read, their scriptures. I was eventually led to join with others as a team to clean up the scriptures.

What is it about the scripture project that provokes you to speak up now? Divine direction.

What have you done before this to teach or preach the message? Pushed the envelope in leadership callings to take a more expansive view of the gospel.

If it were not for the scripture project would you ever have publicized this? Yes.

What sacrifices have you made to preach the restoration to others? I've lost friends and alienated family members, been relegated to an ignored-member status, reviled, and criticized.

How long have you been preaching, sacrificing and teaching others the message of the restoration? Since 2010.

Kaai Lincoln:

Have you gone to the Lord to verify that what you received is from Him? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is correct? Yes.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is intended for you/your family only or is for a wider audience? If it's for a wider audience, who is that audience? Yes. For all interested in fulfilling the commandments of God and entering into a covenant that He will offer.

Have you asked the Lord if you should submit this to be added to the scriptures? Yes.

Why now? Why haven't you done anything with the message before this? I have attempted to, with the guidance of the Lord, teach, preach, exhort, and expound the message of the restoration. The scripture project is a purposeful attempt to restore what Joseph Smith began.

What is it about the scripture project that provokes you to speak up now? A desire to have a correct and true record from which covenants from God may be received and accepted and to build Zion.

What have you done before this to teach or preach the message? I have labored in multiple capacities to preach the message of the gospel according to personal revelation from God.

If it were not for the scripture project would you ever have publicized this? If ever asked, yes.

What sacrifices have you made to preach the restoration to others? I have counted the cost on multiple fronts to include loss of friends, family, ridicule, and scorn.

How long have you been preaching, sacrificing and teaching others the message of the restoration? Since October 2012 as the Lord directs by His Spirit.

Jeff Savage:

Have you gone to the Lord to verify that what you received is from Him? Yes, and since it was in response to an assignment, I have also gone to my wife, the scripture committee, and (now) many others.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is correct? Yes, though I will readily admit that there are flaws, as is always the case when a mortal attempts to communicate a heavenly message.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is intended for you/your family only or is for a wider audience? If it's for a wider audience, who is that audience? Yes. This material is intended

for individuals, families, fellowships and groups who hope to prepare to build Zion. But it is important to note that nothing was written in a “volunteer” fashion. I was given an assignment by Denver, confirmed it with the Lord, then proceeded. I believed that that was unnecessary to explain, because who would decide something they wrote on their own time could be considered scripture without an assignment, but I have been persuaded that it makes sense to explain it.

Have you asked the Lord if you should submit this to be added to the scriptures? Yes; I was instructed to do so by Him. I did not volunteer.

Why now? Why haven't you done anything with the message before this? The call to write and include this material came as a result of my asking God what I could do to help Him. In the Fall of 2016, my wife and I learned that we were pregnant with our first son, and I was offered my dream job after many years of poverty. I considered these to be covenant blessings, and wanted to show the Lord my gratitude. In response to my desires, He suggested that I try to produce a copy of the Book of Mormon that would reduce the errors introduced by men in prior editions. Eventually I was lead to a team of others who felt the same call to do the work. We did not know the full import of what we were doing until very recently, though there were signs that would have alerted wiser folks. It could not have been otherwise; our intent was only to help others and serve the Lord, but we had no grand ambition or desire to perform a "great" task, but rather to restore what the Lord gave us through Joseph.

What is it about the scripture project that provokes you to speak up now? I imagine that my labors with the scripture project led to the material I submitted to the group, since desires can qualify a man or woman for the Lord's service (RE D&C 99), and the assignment to write these materials came during those efforts.

What have you done before this to teach or preach the message? I try to help others love the scriptures, especially the Book of Mormon and the words of Isaiah, and live principles that can produce happiness. I have no desire to lead, control, or compel anyone, and I hope that desire comes through in what I have submitted. I don't want or expect any special “status” because of this material.

If it were not for the scripture project would you ever have publicized this? I will always try and do what the Lord asks, but I don't see how I could have qualified to submit this material before having given my time and talents, weak as they are, to this project for this long while.

What sacrifices have you made to preach the restoration to others? I count it a light thing to have been cursed, misjudged, mocked and vilified for the things I have submitted. Only looking at this project, the time spent has led to significant financial loss, has tarnished my name in many circles, and has led to the loss of friends and family. I pray that I will always be willing to sacrifice what is necessary for our Lord.

How long have you been preaching, sacrificing and teaching others the message of the restoration? I have labored to help others awake and arise since reading The Second Comforter back in the summer of 2013, but my efforts have been weak and unprofitable..

Scripture Team 1 (group)

Have you gone to the Lord to verify that what you received is from Him? Yes, repeatedly throughout this process.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is correct? I haven't written anything, but have simply compiled and formatted. I believe those things were asked of me by the Lord.

Have you asked the Lord if what you have written is intended for you/your family only or is for a wider audience? My purpose originally was to have my own functional set of scriptures to be shared with friends and family who were interested. The Lord made it clear to me that it would be important for anyone on the planet who would hear the message of the scriptures.

Have you asked the Lord if you should submit this to be added to the scriptures? Yes. I didn't compile anything I didn't feel inspired to add.

Why now? Why haven't you done anything with the message before this? I have been sharing the message of the scriptures ever since I read the book of Mormon as a teenager.

What is it about the scripture project that provokes you to speak up now? I have been involved with the project from it's beginning.

What have you done before this to teach or preach the message? I have tried to teach anyone who will listen to me.

If it were not for the scripture project would you ever have publicized this? The scripture project is what I am "publicizing".

What sacrifices have you made to preach the restoration to others? I have lost friends, sacrificed time with family and doing things I love, and lost good standing within the LDS church.

How long have you been preaching, sacrificing and teaching others the message of the restoration? Since 2011

Q22: I've noticed some small differences between the online and printed versions. Why is that?

A: When errors are pointed out to us, we make corrections immediately online so as to have the most correct version for review. If you see an error in the printed version, please verify that the error also appears online before sending us an email.

Q23: Tithing Should we formally declare that our specific fellowship is referred to with the phrase "the poor among us"? On the other hand, should we only give tithes to the members of our fellowship--what if I see a need outside of the fellowship that I feel directed to meet?

A: Defining terms is tricky, as it can quickly lead to control and compulsion. We attempted to answer these questions in the Governing Principles by wisdom, and not by command or constraint, so that individuals and fellowships could adapt these principles to themselves and their fellowships as guided by the Spirit. See [here](#).

Q24: What are some of the biggest challenges faced by the Scripture Committee?

A: There are several that make our work harder:

- People submitting questions and suggestions without first searching for answers themselves by reading:
 - the Introductions to the scriptures
 - the Official Announcement of the project
 - the Q&A document
 - the Submissions List
 - the Submissions Guidelines and Process

- or listening attentively to Denver's talk and Q&A session from the St. George conference.
- People not following the Submissions Guidelines (NOTE: Answering the list of questions applies only to those submitting additions to the existing body of proposed scriptures).
- People submitting questions and suggestions through *www.scriptures.info* instead of *restorationscriptures2017@gmail.com* as requested.
- Emotionally charged statements that invite contention.
- Personal opinion not supported by scripture (regarding additions, modifications and deletions of scripture).
- People asking questions that don't directly pertain to the scriptures project.
- Suggestions to change what Joseph Smith wrote. We are striving to be as accurate as possible to what the Lord gave us through Joseph. We are searching out the earliest manuscripts and only accept changes that were likely approved by Joseph himself. And if there are conflicts between two different statements in Joseph's texts, we have to leave the resolution of the conflict to the reader to take to the Lord for instruction. We take no license to edit his words, only to correct spelling and to relieve the restrictions of punctuation when possible.
-

Q25: In the *Governing Principles*, it states that a man need not be re-ordained "if he was ordained a priest before April 2014 and can trace his line of authority back to Christ through Joseph Smith." I would strike the words "through Joseph Smith." Can anyone trace his priesthood lineage back to Joseph Smith? I certainly can't. All of the church versions that I have seen go through the three witnesses; Oliver Cowdery couldn't trace his lineage to Joseph Smith!

A:

It should first be noted that quote above from *Governing Principles* is only meant to apply the advice "through Joseph Smith" when and if we are talking about re-ordination, as it allows for a previously-unordained (young) man to be ordained using whatever line is deemed best.

The history behind the quoted phrase is that an issue was raised regarding who exactly needed to be re-ordained. In *Preserving the Restoration*, Denver states that the re-ordination is necessary if you haven't been ordained a priest *in the LDS Church*. But since there are others joining us from different Mormon traditions (such as the Church of Christ) that could have an equal claim to a valid priesthood ordination as those ordained in the LDS tradition, we narrowed down the re-ordination to Joseph Smith as a way to suggest that priesthood lineage--to avoid re-ordination--had to come from a religion branching off from the restoration.

Here's how I understand this. If you can remove the labels of Aaronic and Melchizedek, and strip down the ordinations to containing only a *lesser* portion of the Holy Order, then you can see the wisdom of the Lord in having LDS (and men in other branches of Mormonism) keep a line of authority that goes back to the Three Witnesses to Joseph Smith. We know the chaos that erupted when Joseph attempted to transfer a higher order of Priesthood in 1831. This failure suggests at least the possibility that while men were saying "I confer upon you the

Melchizedek Priesthood," God took that to mean the *lesser* portion of Priesthood that we might--today with our understanding--call the Aaronic priesthood. Or, as D&C 27 (LE 84) says (which, importantly, does not use the labels of Aaronic/Melchizedek):

"Therefore he took Moses out of their midst and the Holy Priesthood also, and **the lesser priesthood continued**, which priesthood holdeth the keys of the ministering of angels and the preparatory gospel, which gospel is the gospel of repentance, and of baptism, and the remission of sins, and the law of carnal commandments which the Lord, in his wrath, caused to continue with the House of Aaron among the children of Israel..."

In light of how fragile the Priesthood is (RE 47/LE 121), and how it comes by comes not by "the will of man (ruling out ordination), neither by father or mother (lineage), neither by beginning of days nor end of years (age), but of God. And it was delivered unto men by the calling of His own voice, according to His own will, unto as many as believed on His name." (Gen. 7), then it stands to reason that while one can't trace the *Melchizedek* portion of the Priesthood back to Joseph, he could indeed trace the *Aaronic* or *lesser* portion, which is the more enduring (and therefore lesser) portion of priesthood, through every single line, including the Three Witnesses, back to Joseph Smith. Here's a part of the relevant JS-H:

"Upon you my fellow servants, in the name of Messiah I confer the priesthood of Aaron, which holds the keys of the ministering of angels, and of the gospel of repentance, and of baptism by immersion for the remission of sins, and this shall never be taken again from the earth until the sons of Levi do offer again an offering unto the Lord in righteousness." He said this Aaronic priesthood had not the power of laying on of hands for the gift of the Holy Ghost, but that this should be conferred on us hereafter and he commanded us to go and be baptized, and gave us directions that I should baptize Oliver Cowdery, and afterward that he should baptize me. Accordingly, we went and were baptized. I baptized him first and afterwards he baptized me, after which I laid my hands upon his head and ordained him to the Aaronic priesthood, and afterward he laid his hands on me and ordained me to the same priesthood, for so we were commanded.

We know that there are three steps: Ordination (done by man), sustaining (done by women), and Confirmation (done by God). If we take off the labels, and look at it from a lesser or greater portion, then I think that we can see that it makes much more sense to view priesthood ordination lineages as tracing the lesser lines rather than that portion we now understand as pertaining to Melchizedek, or the Holy Order After the Son of God.

It is by now apparent that the Holy Order After the Son of God is not something that comes by lineage, so why would we believe that we could lay our hands on someone's head and pass that along, and expect God to honor that experience? It is noteworthy to me that the Three Witnesses were ordained (February 14, 1835) after the Church had been condemned and held the name of Church of the Latter-Day Saints (see [General Assembly 1835](#)). I believe that the only association of priests that can be passed on from man to man, or father to son, is the Aaronic (lesser) portion/degree, as we see with Aaron and the Levites. As I understand, this

transfer of a lesser portion of the priesthood is also that which is described as reaching Moses in RE 27 (LE 84), though that appears different from what is referred to as Aaronic.

In the end, I hope we are all in agreement that what really matters is the conferral of Priesthood by the voice of God. If someone is in doubt about their prior ordination, let them go through their fellowship and be re-ordained. I would take the time to proceed in certainty rather than in doubt.

Q26: Does the statement in Governing Principles that "none, except little children, are considered worthy to partake of the sacrament who have not repented and been baptized" contradict what Denver said in the 10th talk:

As to the Sacrament, only an antichrist would forbid you from partaking of the Sacrament in the way commanded by your Lord.

A: the question of forbidding the sacrament to someone is very important. We know the stakes. For those who partake unworthily, they "eat and drink damnation to their souls." Ouch. And for those who administer the sacrament, if we "knowingly" suffer them to partake unworthily, then we come under God's condemnation. Apparently this is not a matter to be taken lightly...For me, an important follow-up question is why does the Lord take the time to give this commandment? Why is it something that Mormon recorded for us, if it doesn't apply to us?

I agree with you that it is not right for those administering the sacrament to be policemen. The Lord's admonition is to forbid someone you "know" is unworthy; that's quite the high bar there. He says that unless someone believes on His name and is baptized He is not worthy. So if baptism is not the sign, as you suggest, then apart from personal revelations or multiple witnesses testifying of some grave sin, I would not personally want to be the one forbidding them, as you point out, though it behooves me to be cautious so I don't come under condemnation. From our limited record, it appears Joseph Smith forbade people from receiving the Sacrament:

Say to the brothers Hulet and to all others, that the Lord never authorized them to say that the devil, his angels, or the sons of perdition, should ever be restored; for their state of destiny was not revealed to man, is not revealed, nor ever shall be revealed, save to those who are made partakers thereof: consequently those who teach this doctrine have not received it of the Spirit of the Lord. Truly Brother Oliver declared it to be the doctrine of devils. We, therefore, command that this doctrine be taught no more in Zion. We sanction the decision of the Bishop and his council, in relation to this doctrine being a bar to communion. (Joseph Smith, TPJS, p. 24)

I agree with you that the Lord would not break His own commandment. That leaves us with a couple possibilities, one of which is that Christ didn't really mean we should forbid people from taking the Sacrament, or that He was referring to the Sacrament given in RE 3 Nephi 4 (LE 20) (as some have argued). Another, simpler argument (in my mind at least), is that everyone had already been baptized prior to entering. We are told that it was the "more righteous" who were

spared (RE 3 Ne. 2:37, 67). These are they who “received the prophets”. If that is the case, then for them to accept Nephi and his message of repentance, they must have necessarily been baptized. Mormon reminds us:

*Now I would have you to remember also, that **there were none who were brought unto repentance who were not baptized with water**. Therefore, there were ordained of Nephi, men unto this ministry, that all such as should come unto them should be baptized with water, and this as a witness and a testimony before God, and unto the people, that they had repented and received a remission of their sins. And there were many in the commencement of this year that were baptized unto repentance; and thus the more part of the year did pass away. (RE 3 Ne 1, sentences 229-232)*

This is Mormon taking the time to make sure that we know that all those who received Nephi’s message of repentance were baptized with water as a witness and testimony before God that they had repented.

Reading this persuades me that the “more righteous part of the people” were those who repented and had been baptized, since these people were already under some sort of covenant, and refusing Nephi would have meant NOT receiving the prophets, and therefore refusing the Lord (in other words, there were no heathen in that group that could claim a free pass from baptism).

Looking at the transcription of the 10th Lecture, we find this:

As to the Sacrament, only an antichrist would forbid you from partaking of the Sacrament **in the way commanded by your Lord**. That is an abomination. If you get together, even if it is only in your own family, partake of the Sacrament together. Let no one forbid you from partaking in remembrance of Christ. He commanded that you do it.

This presents an interesting dilemma. Is Denver disagreeing with Christ, or is he making a specific point about the way in which the Sacrament should be taken? I’ll leave that up for you to decide, but there’s another idea here as well. What do the scriptures mean by “forbid”?

Personally, if I was administering the sacrament among strangers, I would declare what Christ said, then let all choose what they would like to do. I would not police it. I believe that this follows the example of our Lord. If you look at the story of Adam and Eve, God “forbids” them to partake of the fruit of the tree of knowledge (RE Gen 2, sentence 62), but He did not set up a flaming sword to guard the way. He simply forbade it, then let them choose.

Given the severity of the issue, and the lack of available evidence otherwise, I think the best course of action is to take the Lord’s words at face value unless there is a situation in a fellowship where the Spirit directs otherwise. That’s one of the beauties of the Governing Principles being written by way of wisdom and not by commandment. Now, when it comes to

children, we know that little children are alive in Christ, so they can't eat/drink damnation to their souls (RE Moroni 8, sentences 17-20). Even still, many fellowships don't give the children blessed bread and wine until they've been baptized; it's like a rite of passage for them. I kind of like that approach.

Q27: A lot of people are putting their emphasis on Volume 3. Is that where we should spend our time if the Book of Mormon is a Covenant?

A: Great question. I think the primary focus should be the Book of Mormon, as that is the "new covenant" that the Saints failed to adequately appreciate. There has been, and is still, a lot of labor to try and recover the precise language that the Lord would have used in the Book of Mormon. However, one possible reason so much focus is going into the third volume is because it represents our repentance process. While I understand that repentance can be as simply as turning around, the evidence of repentance is labor, it is the walk back home.

A lot has been said using section 27 (LE 84), but there are other places where I believe this "group" repentance process is spelled out. In [Section 40](#) (D&C 105):

"Were it not for the transgressions of **my people**, speaking concerning the **church** and **not individuals**, they might have been redeemed even now. But behold they have not learned to be obedient to the things which I require at their hands..."

Given in 1834, this suggests that the the group could have had a covenant by that time (remembering what that entails according to the Book of Mormon: a covenant means land, freedom, prosperity, etc.), had it not been for a group transgression. Part of that is not taking care of their own; that is what we are trying to do with tithes and offerings. But that's not all, since this group transgression can not be removed until a few things happen (from the same section):

"Therefore in consequence of the transgressions of my people, it is expedient in me that mine elders should wait for a little season for the redemption of Zion, that they themselves may be prepared, and **that my people may be taught more perfectly** and have experience and **know more perfectly concerning their duty and the things which I require at their hands**. And this cannot be brought to pass until mine elders are endowed with power from on high, for behold I have prepared a greater endowment and blessing to be poured out upon them inasmuch as they are faithful and continue in humility before me."

What is required at our hands? Part of the focus on the D&C--which at this point will likely be re-titled Commandments and Teachings--is to understand what is required of us. We are trying to get back to the Lord's exact language in these sections so as to not only say, but also do, what He has asked. Hence the great effort going on to pick apart what it was that the Lord commanded through Joseph. This has required a group effort; many suggestions and insights into Vol. 3 have come in that will greatly improve the work.

And the Lord has responded. He has spoken to us (most particularly Denver) and given additional clarifications and insights into the words used in scripture. That is both very humbling and very exciting, because it suggests that He is working with us on this almost-impossible endeavor. But this was prophesied as well. If you look at [section 39](#) (LE 103) you see that the Lord will raise up unto his "people a man who shall lead them like as Moses led the children of Israel...ye must needs be led out of bondage by power."

But this could not (and can not) happen until we hearken to "observe all the words which [He] the Lord shall speak unto them...." (Same section, sentences 2-5).

I'm sorry if this is coming across as disjointed. The point is, we need the (exact) words the Lord has spoken or, if we cannot recover them, then we need to get what He will accept in our handicapped condition. We did not create this problem, but it has become ours to bear. And we need to as Section 40 and [75](#) say:

"Nevertheless in your temporal things you shall be equal and this not grudgingly, otherwise the abundance of the manifestations of the spirit shall be withheld. Now this **commandment** I give unto my servants while they remain, for a manifestation of my blessings upon their heads and for a reward of their diligence and for their security, for food and for raiment, for an inheritance, for houses and for lands, and in whatsoever circumstances I the Lord shall place them, and whithersoever I the Lord shall send them."

The way I understand it, the terms of the new covenant are laid out in the Book of Mormon (and the New Testament), and the necessary commandments and teachings are laid out in Volume 3. It has become clear that part of those necessary C&T were among the things the early church did wrong. We must repent and return, hence the need for the present difficult work.

Q28: The Lord works in patterns so that His people know what to look for. The historical pattern of the way that God delivers messages to His people is that God (or an angel) delivers a message to a man (or woman)/Prophet and the Prophet declares the message. These new scriptures do not follow that pattern. Can the Scripture Group show how the method these scriptures came about follow God's patterns since the beginning of time? How is what is being proposed different than Moses and the children of Israel?

A: Good questions. Please read the transcripts of Denver's St. George talk, as well as his Q&A, to get a little more background.

That being said, the model that we are attempting to follow is that laid out by the Book of Mormon. King Benjamin had two portions of a talk. The first portion was that which he had labored with and prepared for quite some time. The second part (what is chapter 3 in the LE) was given by an angel. You could argue the same has happened for Mormon in his compiling of scripture. Alma's discourse on Faith was "given" to Mormon, but did an angel give that to Mormon? Were all the words that Mormon inserted given directly by God (according to him, Nephi and Moroni the answer is no--they all refer to their weakness in writing). The small plates follow the same pattern as the large plates. The same pattern is found all throughout the Bible, as Paul's letters do not claim to be a message directly from God, the 5 books of Moses were compilations of prior writings, and many other books were compiled by those who lived after the prophet's lifetime.

So yes, while your question points to a pattern for material becoming scripture, it does not appear that the pattern you refer to is the pattern the Lord uses:

We have therefore a more sure knowledge of the word of prophecy, to which word of prophecy ye do well that ye take heed, as unto a light which shineth in a dark place until the day dawn, and the day star arise in your hearts, knowing this first, that no prophecy of the scriptures is given of any private will of man. **For the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.**(1 Peter)

Most of the efforts of the group consisted in compiling records that are already considered scripture, but have not been formally made a covenant by God. Most notably the Book of Mormon. I think that we differ between Moses and Israel because Moses hasn't yet ascended from the mountain with a covenant and found us worshipping a golden calf...but I guess your point is justified, because that MAY still happen.

The materials written by members of the committee came by assignment (first from the committee, then from the Lord), and were reviewed by the entire committee prior to their being published in the Preview edition of the scriptures. They were not freelance work. That being said, everything contained in the current version of the scriptures is theoretically on the chopping block. Our goal is not to include everything, but rather to have the Lord accept the work. After the committee and the entire body have voted and labored to compile the best record we can, it will be up to Him to make corrections and, hopefully, approve the record.

Q29: Were you (the scripture committee) commanded to do this work? If not, how can you feel that it is your place to take on such an important work?

A: Good questions!

I think that if we had been given the assignment to compile the scriptures that would serve as the law and covenant for the disparate group of Gentiles to become the covenant people Israel, that knowledge would have quickly gone to our heads and would have resulted in pride, rendering us useless in the Lord's hands. As it unfolded, there were inklings that something significant was happening (such as meeting the other group who had performed a similar, complementary work), but it really wasn't until February, with the release of the Testimony of John, that it became apparent that the scope of this work was much greater than creating a cool and useful tool for our friends and family.

Knowing human frailty and weakness, it is amazing to us how the Lord was able to inspire this work with such a soft touch that none of those involved realized what He was doing. Even now, we are gaining more clarity with each passing day. For instance, it is abundantly clear now that we need the efforts of **everyone** to create a product that He will accept. In our minds, this is not a "done deal;" we are working harder than ever--with a lot more people--to try and offer up an offering in righteousness.

I think that if we had been given the assignment to compile the scriptures that would serve as the law and covenant for the disparate group of Gentiles to become the covenant people Israel, that knowledge would have quickly gone to our heads and would have resulted in pride, rendering us useless in the Lord's hands. As it unfolded, there were inklings that something significant was happening (such as meeting a second group who had performed a similar, yet highly complementary work), but it really wasn't until February, with the release of the Testimony of John, that it became apparent that the scope of this work was much greater than creating a cool and useful tool for our friends and family. In all honesty, that was the initial group's entire goal. We emailed all of the major bloggers in November and asked them to put up a version of the scriptures that "more qualified" people could take and improve upon. So while we may be considered self-appointed, we were not self-appointed to do the task that we now find ourselves doing. That only came later, as we joined the two teams into one and received assignments that went beyond the scope of what we originally planned to accomplish.

Knowing human frailty and weakness, it is amazing how the Lord was able to inspire this work with such a soft touch that none of those involved realized what He was doing. Even now, we are gaining more clarity with each passing day. For instance, it is abundantly clear now that we need the efforts of **everyone** to create a product that He will accept. In our minds, this is not a “done deal;” we are working harder than ever—with a lot more people—to try and offer up an offering in righteousness. He is driving this car, and not us, and it will be up to Him to accept this work.

Q:30 I noticed that the price for the preview edition scriptures jumped. What's up with that?

A: Benchmark Books has inundated Denver with requests for the books, so we decided to expand the distribution on Amazon. This has led to an increase of the price. Sorry. If it is a big burden, please reach out to us and we can try and order a copy for you (or work out another arrangement).

Q31: Regarding the sacrament, the proposed governing principles say, "The officiator may bless and break the bread." In 3 Nephi 8 [RE] Jesus "brake and blessed" the bread. Should the language in *Governing Principles* be changed to match the wording in the Book of Mormon?

A: The Governing Principles were not given by commandment, but by wisdom, suggesting that if individuals feel inspired to do so, they are free to change the order. Unless commanded otherwise, it is better to have harmony among believers than a strict order. In our movement, there are groups that break and bless, others bless then break, and yet other groups that bless both, then break and administer, etc. In this case, I believe that the order in the GP should stand so that we do not become hyper-sensitive to something that the Lord has not revealed by way of commandment. Unless the Lord has commanded otherwise, I would hate for people who do it differently to feel like their experience has not been blessed by the Lord. The current wording allows people the freedom to choose, and it does not attempt to force people to do it just one way. I've been surprised, in researching this, to see just how differently people administer the sacrament. Diversity is a beautiful thing.

Q32: Why would we consider changing the title of the D&C to Commandments and Teachings? Wasn't that given by revelation? Conversely, should the name be Book of Commandments since the Lord appears to refer to it by that title? Should we remove covenants from the title when there are covenants in the text (such as RE D&C 63)?

A: There are a few parts to this answer. First, there is a related answer in the Submissions list (number XX). Second, the Lord never officially calls the book "Doctrine & Covenants". Two years prior to the printing of the Book of Commandments, the Lord commanded that a book be printed (see RE Section 1), and He referred to it as a "book of my commandments." But that was not necessarily giving the book a title, but seems to be how the Lord referred to the revelations that Joseph had (and would) receive. Teachings is vague enough title, 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.

Q33: Why have A Prophet's Prerogative and Governing Principles been moved to the Submissions List and out of where they were found in Pearls of Great Price? And what happened to Section 170?

A: The submission process wasn't available to the committee until after the Preview edition had been prepared for printed in time for the St. George conference. By the time the submission process was adopted it would have been difficult to delete them from the printed edition and move those items to the Submissions List and then reformat volume 3. The committee recognized that they could be voted out of the scriptures, and therefore it didn't seem to be a significant issue. It has become significant to a group who are adamant that they ought to have been put onto the Submissions List and not into the proposed scriptures, so the committee has agreed to move them to the Submissions List.

Regarding Section 170, the names of Mike Hamill and Jeff Savage are a concern for some people who have provided feedback. When it was explained that what Mike had written was an introductory explanation for the verses that come from Joseph Smith, it was recommended that they be moved into a header for the section, rather than scriptural content. Again, the committee has complied.

Also of note, when the new introduction to Governing Principles was read to the group, they were satisfied that it explained Jeff Savage's participation clearly and should stay as is.