was to receive the consecrations of the people when they should present themselves to him; he was to divide up the inheritances for the people, and to sit as a common judge in Israel and hence he held charge, not as the Bishops do here, over a particular Ward, but over the whole of that district of country in the land of Zion. I would remark, again, that Bishop Whitney was chosen and set apart as a Bishop, to manage the affairs in Kirtland, Geauga County, Ohio, and not only there, but to preside over all affairs associated with that Bishopric in all of that country, and occupied the position of a general Bishop, presiding over a large district of country, the same as Edward Partridge did in Zion. But these are not what we call presiding Bishops. In the same revelation that George Miller was called to occupy the place of Edward Partridge, and to hold the same kind of Bishopric that he held, we find that there was a Presiding Bishopric appointed.

"141. And again, I say unto you, I give unto you Vinson Knight, Samuel H. Smith, and Shadrach Roundy, if he will receive it, to preside over the bishopric."

Now, I have briefly laid before you some ideas pertaining to these matters. I will explain them a little further. I will say that the Bishopric is a good deal like the High Priesthood in the position that it occupies. There have been men who, under the Bishopric, have been appointed to fill various offices in the Church, and at different times. I have told you, already, the nature of the office which Bishop Partridge held, the nature of the office which Bishop Whitney held; and then there were other men who did not hold the same kind of Bish-

opric that they did. For instance, there was Bishop Alanson Ripley, whom many of you know, who lived back in Nauvoo; and other Bishops were appointed in some Stakes that were then orga-And as it requires the direcnized. tion of the Presidency of the Church to regulate these general Bishoprics, such as Brother Partridge held, and such as Brother Whitney held, and also being appointed by the Presidency, they have a right to be tried and have a hearing before them. But that does not apply to all Bishops, or to all men who may be placed under different circumstances. For instance, you have here in this Stake of Zion, quite a number of Bishops. How far does their authority extend? It extends to the boundary of each of their respective Bishoprics. No further. You all know that-over their Wards where they preside, and not over somebody else's, unless they are appointed to it, which would be another thing. But without some special appointment, they are simply appointed to preside over their several Wards, and no one else's. That is the extent of their authority in the Bishopric. But a person holding a general Bishopric, the same as Bishop Whitney did, is different. He had that appointed unto him by revelation, and under the direction of the Presidency of the Church; and the appointment that Bishop Partridge held—that was under the direction of the First Presidency of the Church; and these Bishops would have the right to be tried by the same power that appointed them and set them apart. Still, how is it with other Bishops in Stakes; are they under the same direction? To a certain extent all are under the direction of the First Presidency; but unless the First Presidency shall