

DESERET NEWS

WEEKLY.

TRUTH AND LIBERTY.

WEDNESDAY, - AUG. 21, 1878.

MARRIAGE WITH UNBELIEVERS.

THE Chicago *Jewish Advance* greatly deprecates the increase of marriages between Jews and Christians, and quotes statistics to show that such marriages are becoming more and more frequent in Europe as well as America. The *Advance* maintains that the usual result of the union of Jews with Christians is disastrous to Judaism, the former generally embracing the religion of the latter. Commenting on this the *Advance* says:

"In the rays of the sun of freedom the wandering Jew loosens the Jewish cloak into which he had wrapped himself so closely while the storms of former ages were raging around him, and with unconcern throws it aside. It would be criminal neglect were we to take no notice of these disintegrating forces working within modern Israel, and threatening its dissolution."

All great religious bodies have recognized the importance of limiting the marriage of members thereof to those of their own faith. The marriage of a Catholic with a Protestant, or of a Protestant with a Catholic, has been authoritatively denounced by the opposing churches ever since the rise of Anglicanism. The union of an Israelite with a Gentile was forbidden under the law of Moses, and the Divine command on this point was particularly stringent.

"Neither shalt thou make marriages with them; thy daughter shalt thou not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son."—Deut. vii, 3.

The reason assigned for this prohibition was plain and potent:

"For they will turn away thy son from following me that they may serve other gods: so will the anger of the Lord be kindled against you, and destroy thee suddenly."—v. 4.

The history of the people to whom this law was given demonstrates the wisdom of the commandment and the propriety of the warning. While they observed the injunction they preserved their national strength and religious unity, and were prospered and blessed of heaven. When they rejected the Divine word they became a prey to their enemies, and by mingling with the heathen lost their faith in the true and living God and finally went entirely astray from His ways.

Latter-day Israel, or as they are popularly called, the "Mormons," have received similar directions to those given to the ancient descendants of Abraham. They have been instructed to marry with those only of their own faith. This "exclusiveness" has been violently assailed by some who are opposed to our Church and its institutions. But experience has proven that those who have chosen to violate the rule have, in nearly every instance, had ample cause to regret their course. If a "Mormon" young man or young lady chooses deliberately to turn from the "strait and narrow path that leadeth unto lives eternal," we have nothing to say about marriage in either case. But Latter-day Saints are earnestly advised to marry within the ranks of their co-religionists, and a little reflection will show that the counsel is wise.

There is nothing upon which either men or women are more sensitive than matters of religion. Disagreements on religious questions have caused untold strife and misery to families, communities and nations. It is therefore expedient that husbands and wives should be "joined together in the same mind and the same judgment," as well as by the bands of matrimony. That harmony and peace which is so essential to family happiness and the production of healthy, tractable and joyful children, cannot exist where the parents are in religious discord.

How often has it happened, when

a "Mormon" girl has been sought in marriage by a "Gentile," who has promised emphatically that he would never interfere with her religion, that after coming under his influence and direction, she has either been absolutely forbidden to perform her church duties, or associate with the Saints, or else has gradually drifted into his way of thinking, and become perfectly indifferent to things which she formerly deemed of vital and eternal importance!

The Bishop of Michigan has recently declared marriages between Catholics and Protestants antagonistic to true Christianity, and also illegal and void. From his standpoint he takes a correct view. Believing that his church is the true church of Christ, he is justified in the ground he assumes. For there is nothing plainer in the teachings of the Christian Church, in its primitive days of purity and Divine direction, than the prohibition against the marriage of Saints with unbelievers.

The "Mormon" church is not singular, then, in its opposition to the unequal yoking together of its members with outsiders. Neither do we think any rational and fair-minded "Gentile" will dispute the right and the wisdom of this rule of our Church, in view of the antagonism that exists between "Mormons" and non-"Mormons" on matters of faith and practice.

However, there are considerations of vast importance, which we do not expect unbelievers in our creed to recognize, but which the Latter-day Saints are in duty bound to be governed by. A true marriage, according to the revelations of God in our times, can only be solemnized in a holy place, by one having authority to "seal on earth" so that it shall be "sealed in heaven." It is a union for time and all eternity. Death has no permanent effect upon it. In the world and out of the world it stands of equal force and effect. In the resurrection state where there is "neither marrying nor giving in marriage," the partners to this union claim each other, with the offspring of this sacred wedlock. And herein is the beginning of a kingdom and a dominion to the increase of which there will be no end. By this are the works of the Father perpetuated and continued that he may be glorified, and unnumbered worlds created by His power are peopled with his descendants, begotten sons and daughters unto God. The view of eternal felicity and power opened up by the contemplation of this celestial order of marriage is ilimitable in its extent, and unspeakable in its majesty and might, and splendor.

A marriage, so-called, of a Saint with one not of the faith, cannot be solemnized in the manner revealed. It is a mere civil contract. It ends with the death of either party. The children which may be the result have no ties to their parents when the body is dissolved. In the world to come the former wife and husband are separate and single. When redeemed by the "blood of the Lamb," after suffering the just penalties of their sins, they cannot enter into the Order of the Gods, wherein are the keys to the heights and depths and breadths of eternal power and dominion, but will be as the angels, who are but ministering spirits to those who are counted worthy of "a far more and an eternal and exceeding weight of glory."

Latter-day Saints by such marriages, except with those of their own faith in the manner and place prescribed by the law of the Lord, are simply cut off from all opportunities of a celestial inheritance and the gift of endless lives. We do not expect non-"Mormons" to give credence to these things. But we write for those who profess to believe in them, so as to put them in mind of their faith and their covenants, with the hope that parents will make these matters plain to their children. It is neither wise from a social point of view nor right from religious grounds, for Saints of either sex to marry with those who are not of their faith. History, the experience of other denominations, sound policy, and regard for the welfare of future generations forbid such alliances. And the voice of God, from Abraham to Joseph Smith, in the code of Moses the law-giver, as well as in the precepts of Jesus the Messiah, warns His covenant people not to join themselves to unbelievers. While the promises of everlasting increase and glory in the written revelations are resplendent

with heavenly light for the guidance and encouragement of the dutiful, and the great and irreparable loss to the disobedient is pictured therein as a solemn warning, in colors that are striking and unmistakable.

A POEM AND A PRINCIPLE.

THE celebrated author of "John Halifax, Gentleman," recently wrote a short poem in honor of a child of English parentage which was born at Jerusalem. It was published in *Scribner's Magazine*, and has been copied into several papers. We give below the second stanza, as it conveys a sentiment generally shared by Christian and Jew alike, but strangely inconsistent with the popular opposition to plural marriage:

"Or, if of still older creed,
Ere the world of Christ has need,
I should think of Rachel fair,
Hannah, who child Samuel bare;
Hebrew women, grand and calm,
Whose pure lives roll like a psalm
Down the centuries. Who like them,
Mothers of Jerusalem?"

Rachel and Hannah are here, as frequently in pulpit eulogies of the holy women of old, set up as striking examples of purity and the calm grandeur of virtuous motherhood. Did the poet while penning these lines, or do the preachers who laud the ancient mothers of Jerusalem, ever think that these same historic matrons were each of them the plural wife of a polygamic husband?

Rachel was the second wife of Jacob, and supported the polygamic family relation by giving to her husband a third wife in the person of Bilhah, her handmaid. And as a reward for this act God remembered Rachel, who was childless, and gave her a son, Joseph, who afterwards obtained the birthright.

Hannah was one of the two wives of Elkanah, and the mother of Samuel the Prophet, who was given to her of the Lord in answer to prayer, she being childless, while her husband's other wife had both sons and daughters.

If the pure lives of these Hebrew women "roll like a psalm down the centuries," which we have now set to dispute for a moment, how is it that "Mormon" women, who exhibit in their faith and sacrifices, their devotion to principle, their triumph over passion and their innumerable proofs of supreme regard for the will of God, at least as much grandeur and purity of character as the subjects of the poem, should be the objects of "Christian" derision and contempt, and that what is praised in one case should be denounced in the other? The argument that plural marriage is unsuited to the age and in opposition to the sentiment of the period, does not approach the point. Purity does not become filthiness by reason of age. And that which is essentially vile to day must have been wrong at any time however remote. But the same thing which many call evil in the nineteenth century they worship as good in patriarchal times. And the same newspapers which publish the verses praising the plural wives of Jacob and Elkanah, have nothing but abuse and contumely for the ladies of latter days who are placed in a similar marital position.

The question of expediency we do not now wish to examine. It is the inconsistency of the condemnation of "Mormon" women and the laudation of ancient Hebrew women for the same practice, and of calling a system exalting in one age and debasing in another to which we desire to draw attention. And in answer to the question, "Who like them, mothers of Jerusalem?" We answer, the heroines of Utah, the wives and mothers in the modern Jerusalem. For, like the holy women of old, they regard the revelations of the Most High rather than the voice of human selfishness, and the raising up of a righteous seed more than the gratification of personal desires. Among them may be found many a Rachel who has been favored of God with offspring as the reward of giving another wife to her husband, and many a Hannah who, for the same reason, has been delivered from "reproach" and blessed with a son of promise. And in the great day of accounts, when all shall receive "according to their works," the virtues, self-denial

and heroism of the "Mormon" mothers in Israel will shine as brightly as the lustre which crown any of their Biblical prototypes, and Sarah and Rebecca, Rachel, Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, Mary, Martha, Dorcas and the rest of the historic daughters of the ancient covenant, will be proud to welcome to their royal company the faithful and devoted women who grace and glorify the latter-day dispensation. The poem we quote from is pretty, the principle we point out is worthy of temperate consideration—that which was pure in Palestine cannot be impure at Salt Lake.

WORK FOR ALL THE IDLE.

ONE of the standing statutes in Ancient Israel required farmers to leave in their fields the gleanings of the gathered grain for the benefit of the needy:

"And when ye reap the harvest of your land, thou shalt not make riddance of the corners of thy field when thou reapest, neither shalt thou gather any gleanings of thy harvest, thou shalt leave them unto the poor, and to the stranger. I am the Lord your God." Leviticus xxiii, 22.

This is one of the sections of the Mosiac code that are good for all time and suitable to nearly every place. The land-owners of Utah, generally, keep the law so far as leaving in their fields a large quantity of grain is concerned. For though the binder uses a rake, and machine reapers are close harvesters, considerable escapes both man and implement except when a "Header" is used in gathering the crop. But the poor and the stranger rarely avail themselves of their privileges. How seldom is any gleanings done in the fields! Yet there are a great many idle hands in the Territory, and quite a number of persons, of both sexes, depend for support almost entirely upon the aid obtained from the Bishops' and donations furnished by the Relief Societies.

We write this for the benefit of the poor and unemployed. The harvest in most parts of the Territory is over. The sheaves are hauled into the stackyards. And already the threshers are humming their songs of plenty and separating the wheat from the chaff. But thousands of bushels of grain are lying scattered upon the ground. To leave it there is shameful waste. Not a head of wheat should be left to spoil in the fields. Grain will be cheap this Fall, no doubt. But unless we mistake the signs of the times it will be precious next year. And many bins that will soon overflow, will look as forlorn in their emptiness as their owners who squander their breadstuffs, before many months have slipped by into the shades of memory.

But be this as it may, an opportunity is now open for many families to obtain their winter's bread without cost except the outlay of labor. They may pick it up in the fields. There are many idle men and women in this city, who talk as though they are anxious to work. Let them take their children and go into the fields and glean. Do they despise this method of gaining their bread? If so they deserve to suffer for the lack of it. Gleaning is far more honorable than pauperism. The Divine law says, "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." And every man and woman with proper feelings would sooner support themselves by individual exertion, than be dependent on Church or State for the necessities to existence.

If those who are appointed to look after the poor will direct the able to the best places to glean; they will help the needy and benefit the public, and at the same time be the means of placing a great deal of the earth's produce where it will do the most good.

In the whole farming region south of this city, as well as in places near the settlements throughout the Territory, there are opportunities to glean grain in abundance. It will pay for picking up. The backbone of the heated term is broken, and the mountain breezes temper the rays of the August sun. All the unemployed, except the sick and feeble, may spend many days profitably in gleaning, without injury from exposure, and those who will not

try to gather up something for their own support can have little lawful claim on the bounty of their brethren and the charity of the Church. Glean! Glean! Glean!

[From Monday's Daily.]

FAREWELL.

TO-MORROW morning Elder John Nicholson, of this city, will take his departure for Europe, to fill the mission to which he was appointed at the Quarterly Conference of this Stake, held July 6th and 7th. He goes to labor in the editorial department of the *Millennial Star*, and as he may be directed in the British mission.

Elder Nicholson is eminently qualified for the position to which he has been assigned. Previous to coming to Utah he labored in the ministry in England and Scotland for several years with excellent success, and for the past ten years has been connected with the DESERET NEWS office, acting for most of the time as its local editor.

Brother Nicholson is widely known and respected for his sterling qualities of heart and mind, and his hosts of friends will join us in wishing him a pleasant journey and a prosperous mission. God bless him, and good bye!

"MURDER WILL OUT."

THE sensation of the day at Sacramento, Cal., is the Tullis murder, to which we made some allusion on Friday last. The crime is one of unusual atrocity. It was deliberately planned and executed with cold-blooded determination. No other object was in view except gain. The case is exceptional in its character. A public functionary whose office turns out to be unremunerative, actually plans the murder of a man with whom he has no quarrel and with whom he is personally unacquainted, in order to make money by administering to his estate. And he finds two willing tools to carry out his plot, on the promise of pay for their work of assassination.

When the murder was first reported and the evidence began to accumulate against Troy Dye, Public Administrator of Sacramento County, the papers almost apologized for publishing facts apparently implicating an officer considered of unimpeachable character. And even after his arrest, when the proofs of his complicity with the crime were too plain to be denied, still the hope was expressed that he might be able to clear away the clouds that had rolled up over his fair reputation.

But the full confession of Dye and one of his fellow conspirators, Edward Anderson, places their guilt beyond doubt, and unfolds one of the blackest deeds of cupidity and blood that ever darkened any State in the Union.

The remarkable chain of evidence that was formed, link by link, until it was complete and perfect, is another distinctive feature of the Tullis horror, and the rapidity with which the officers have collected the facts and fitted them together is highly creditable to their energy and ingenuity. On the 1st inst. the murder was committed; on the 14th inst. two of the assassins were in jail and their confessions made in full to the authorities, while the officers are on the track of the third party to the crime.

Troy Dye having received little benefit from his office, wealthy persons who died during his term having made their wills, he conceived the plan of getting some persons owning property killed, in order that he might get his percentage for administering to the estate, and make money by handling the property. Edward Anderson and Tom Lawton became his confederates. A. M. Tullis, an old orchardist on Grand Island, whose estate was worth \$100,000, was selected, after failure to poison another man by the name of Jackson. First some poisoned whiskey was taken to Tullis, but the plot did not carry. Next Dye and Anderson made a boat in which the latter and Lawton went down the river.