

has not had a privilege of being married, like thousands and tens of thousands that are abroad in the States and in all the world among the nations of Christendom: they have to live contrary to their own will, and die old maids, without a husband for time or eternity either. If one of this class, who had not had an opportunity of marriage with a righteous man, and who was unwilling to trust herself with those whom she considered unworthy of marriage for time or eternity either, should come to the Territory of Utah, and, still having no offer of marriage from a single young man here, she sees a good man that has a family; he proposes marriage to her; she voluntarily offers to become one of his wives; he accepts the offer; the ceremony is celebrated. What harm is done? Who is injured? What law is broken? None. I ask, Would it be right, with a view that marriage is to exist, not only in time, but in eternity, that this woman, who is a good, moral, virtuous woman, should remain without a husband through all eternity, because she did not have an opportunity of being married? If marriage be of any benefit in the eternal world, would it not be far more consistent with the law of God that she should have the privilege, by her own free, voluntary consent, to marry a good man, though he might have a family, and claim him for her husband, not only through time, but eternity?

Jesus informs us that in the resurrection mankind are neither married nor given in marriage: all these things have to be attended to here. In the resurrection, a man is not to be baptized. Here is the place to attend to these things. If we are to become the promised seed, and heirs according to the promise, we must be baptized into Christ and put him on, and do it before the resurrection; for if I put it off beyond this life, in the resurrection there will be no such thing

as putting on Christ by being baptized. Just so, in the resurrection there will be no such thing as attending to the ceremony of marriage, so far as we are informed. But Jesus further says, concerning those persons who have not attended to those matters here, that in the resurrection they are as the angels of God: and some of the angels are a little lower than men. In what respect? They have not the power to increase their kingdom by the multiplication of their species, and this because they have not lawful and legal wives. They are probably among that class who have put off marriage for eternity, and die without attending to it; and after the resurrection, they find themselves wifeless, without any family or kingdoms of their own offspring. In this single and undesirable condition they are to remain, because they cannot hunt up a wife after the resurrection. Such, instead of receiving crowns, will merely become ministers or messengers for the crown, being sent forth by those who have attained to a higher glory, who have the power of receiving kingdoms, and increasing the same, through their own offspring that are begotten after the resurrection by the wives given to them while here in this world. These angels have forfeited this privilege; consequently, they are lower than the man who keeps a celestial law; and if these angels lived on the earth, they would be called old bachelors.

Do you not see the difference between the glory of those who claim their privileges and those who do not? I am not speaking to the class who pay no attention to the law of God or to the nature of marriage; but I am speaking of those ancient Patriarchs, and Prophets, and holy men that understood the law of God, and practiced it, and prepared themselves here to receive an exceeding weight of glory hereafter. Do you not understand